

Final Evaluation of the WASH in School Program (WISE) in Indonesia



Funded by Dubai Cares

Implemented by CARE, Save the Children and UNICEF

WISE

Water, sanitation and hygiene in schools empowerment

Supported by



Save the Children

unicef

Executive summary

The evaluation team acknowledges upfront the general ambition and the complex operating environment of the program. The program selected remote, underserved and far apart project sites that made implementation time-consuming and costly. Moreover, the formal partnership arrangements were not appropriate or conducive to efficient and effective implementation. The evaluation team commends the WISE partners for delivering a value-for-money project with an overall positive impact on target groups and final beneficiaries. Project activity targets were largely met and outputs reported by the partners were achieved at a satisfactory level. The conceptual design was relevant and based on good contextual analysis, but there were gaps in the detailed design and implementation of activities.

Quality of WASH facility construction in the 450 target primary schools was in line with government standards and most facilities were well maintained.¹ The potential for continued utilization of the WASH facilities is high. School-based hygiene promotion activities contributed to personal hygiene improvements among the almost 70,000 students in the target schools, particularly hand washing. More work will be needed to consolidate the positive behavior change and ensure project gains are not reversed. Target schools included WASH in their curricula and annual plans and budgets. Additional schools were indirectly reached through the district school cluster meetings.

Coordination at district level through the AMPL notably improved with direct attribution to WISE. Working relationships among AMPL members contributed to better planning and budget allocation processes beyond the WISE program domain. Improvements at national level are more limited but still constitute a positive result. WISE guidelines informed development of the Clean and Healthy schools program, contributed to an improved monitoring framework to map WASH in schools through EMIS, and improved awareness among government departments. Government will require additional support to properly apply the WISE model through the enabling framework of strategies, policies and plans.

There remains a short-term window of opportunity in 2014 for WISE to build on its institutional and program investments to promote scaling up of the WISE model. The main channel for continued WISE engagement is direct technical support to the government agencies involved in decision-making around resource allocation to community and school WASH infrastructure, and school budgets, i.e., by supporting technical facilitators to work closely with national, provincial and district AMPLs.

¹ 450 schools with completed facilities as per WISE final workshop report, February 2014

Acknowledgements

TANGO International wishes to thank the WISE partnership, including Dubai Cares, UNICEF, CARE, Save the Children and especially the Government of Indonesia for making the final evaluation a very constructive and positive experience. While it is not possible to exhaustively identify every individual involved, the team is particularly grateful to a number of WISE colleagues for their efforts and contributions to the evaluation: Asma Malik and Ana Nieto of Dubai Cares; Claire Quillet and Aidan Cronin of UNICEF; John Lundine and Tasman Silverius of Save the Children; and Helen Vanwel and Rieneke Rolos of CARE. Special thanks also go to the UNICEF colleagues who coordinated the overall logistics for the evaluation, and to all the WISE field staff who provided excellent support to the TANGO team during field data collection.

Finally, we are most indebted to the school staff, parents, students and government officials who gave freely of their time and company to be interviewed by our team. Without their generosity and openness in welcoming us into their schools and offices and sharing invaluable information about their lives, this important evaluation would have never happened.

TANGO International
4 June 2014



Table of Contents

Executive summary	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Acronyms	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Purpose of the evaluation.....	1
1.2. Audience for and use of the evaluation.....	1
1.3. Objectives of the evaluation	1
1.4. Evaluation methodology	2
1.5. Composition of evaluation team.....	3
1.6. Limitations to the evaluation	3
2. Program description	4
3. Evaluation Findings.....	7
3.1. Appropriateness of the project.....	7
3.1.1. Appropriateness to needs and realities of beneficiaries and target groups	7
3.1.2. Coherence with government policies and initiatives	13
3.1.4. Geographical targeting.....	14
3.1.5. Partnership design.....	15
3.2. Results of the project.....	16
3.2.1. Attainment of planned outputs.....	16
3.2.2. Attainment of planned outcomes	20
3.2.3. Contribution towards project goal	26
3.3. Contributing factors	26
3.3.1. Internal factors	27
3.3.2. External factors	29
4. Conclusions.....	30
4.1. Relevance and program design.....	30
4.2. Efficiency of implementation	32
4.3. Effectiveness	32
4.4. Sustainability.....	34
5. Lessons learned and recommendations	36
5.1. Recommendations for the WISE model	36
5.2. Recommendations for Dubai Cares and the WISE partners	37
Annexes	40

List of Figures

Figure 1: provinces where WISE was implemented (indicated by red triangles)	5
---	---

List of Tables

Table 1: project budget and duration, by WISE partner	7
Table 2: distribution of WISE schools (as reported at WISE final workshop Feb'14)	15
Table 3: student behaviour change indicators (revised analysis 2014)	21

List of Acronyms

AMPL	Air Minum dan Penyehatan Lingkungan (Drinking Water and Environmental Sanitation coordination body)
Bappeda	Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah (Provincial/District Planning and Development Board)
Bappenas	Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (National Planning and Development Board)
BOS	Biaya Operasional Sekolah. School Operational Fund
BOK	Biaya Operasional Kesehatan. Health Operational Fund
CLTS	Community-led Total Sanitation
DAK	Dana Anggaran Khusus. Specific Fund from National Level
DoH	Department of Health
EMIS	Education Monitoring and Information System
ET	Evaluation Team
HWWS	Hand Washing With Soap
IEC	Information, Education and Communication material
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices
LPEM-UI	University of Indonesia's Faculty of Economics
MoEC	Ministry of Education and Culture
MoH	Ministry of Health
NTT	Nusa Tenggara Timur (East Nusa Tenggara)
Pokja	Kelompok Kerja (working group)
PPSP	Percepatan Pembangunan Sanitasi Pemukiman (Urban sanitation program)
SAP	School Action Plan
SBM	School-Based Management
SC	School Committee
SEAMEO	The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
STBM	Sanitasi Total Berbasis Masyarakat (Total Sanitation with 5 Pillars)
ToT	Training of Trainers
UKS	Usaha Kesehatan Sekolah (School Health Programme)
WISE	Wash in Schools Empowerment
WASH	Water Sanitation and Hygiene
WSP	Water and Sanitation Program

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the evaluation

Dubai Cares commissioned the evaluation of the WISE program as part of its commitment to an evidence-based approach where monitoring, evaluation and learning are an integral part of every program. Final program evaluations conducted by an external consultant aim to provide an unbiased opinion on the programmatic achievements in order to raise awareness of activities/approaches that yield results to relative stakeholders as well as guide future decision making.

1.2. Audience for and use of the evaluation

A range of stakeholders can use the evaluation findings and analysis for different purposes. Dubai Cares can use the evaluation to inform the strategic direction and design of future WASH in school programs. The Government of Indonesia can use the evaluation to strengthen its work on WASH in schools, in particular drawing on the implementation model developed by WISE at the local level. The WISE implementing partners and other stakeholders (civil society, UN, donor and academic organizations) can use the evaluation to strengthen their ongoing programming in Indonesia, including but not limited to WASH in schools.

1.3. Objectives of the evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation were twofold. First, the evaluation aimed to provide an independent verification of the program outputs and achieved outcomes in line with the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee evaluation guidelines. In particular, the evaluation will organize its conclusions along the following main OECD-DAC indicators: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation is provided in Annex 1.

In addition, the evaluation aimed to derive key learning and recommendations on specific areas of interest identified by Dubai Cares and WISE partner and stakeholders, as follows:

1. The effect of the program on government policy and financial decision making on WASH, including the way in which the government monitors and evaluates WASH interventions
2. The effect of the program on school WASH awareness levels, and policy and decision making on WASH
3. The effectiveness of the tri-partite partnership model used in the program in achieving project objectives, with a focus on influencing policy change and enabling continuity of WASH interventions beyond the project timeframe

1.4. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation methodology was organized in three phases. The first phase was undertaken in March 2014 and consisted of a desk review, distance interviews and redoing the baseline-endline analysis. During this phase, the ET organized a structured review of secondary data made available by Dubai Cares and the WISE implementing partners, including grant agreements, internal progress reports and baseline/endline data sets. The ET also organized a round of exploratory phone/Skype interviews with Dubai Cares and WISE implementing partners to gain an improved understanding of the program design, implementation realities and results, understand the partner expectations for the evaluation, and optimize the relevance of the evaluation design.

It is important to note that the initial methodology proposed by the ET for this evaluation included a comprehensive endline survey; essentially to redo the endline survey that was carried out in 2013, which had methodological and analytical flaws. However, extensive consultation with Dubai Cares, and preliminary review of the baseline and endline data sets and analysis indicated that: 1) baseline data was not reliable enough to warrant the additional expense of a comprehensive endline survey for meaningful comparison, and 2) both the baseline and endline analysis showed limited use of proper statistical techniques and, in general, limited analysis of findings in relation to project interventions. It was more cost effective to clean the existing data sets and redo the analysis for basic presentation of progress towards program outcomes, than to collect high quality new data that still could not meaningfully be compared to the problematic baseline data. This underlines the importance of a good baseline design that is properly resourced, without which any subsequent data collection exercises are compromised. The ET subsequently cleaned both datasets and redid the analysis. The results of this analysis were presented to Dubai Cares in a revised and more accurate baseline/endline comparison report, attached as Annex 1. The ET further triangulated the revised analysis with additional studies, including the observational study on hand washing with soap (HWWS) commissioned by UNICEF in 2013. This provided the evaluation team with an improved understanding of WISE progress towards outcomes, which was essential in guiding the fieldwork.

During the second phase in the period 17 March – 4 April 2014, the ET collected primary data with a focus on information gaps identified in phase 1, in particular the quality and sustainability of activities. The Team Leader, accompanied by a team of local facilitators, undertook key informant interviews, focus group discussions and structured observation during a field study of schools and government offices in 5 of the 6 project districts, and meetings in Jakarta. Prior to leaving Indonesia, the Team Leader presented preliminary findings to WISE implementing partners for initial feedback and to guide further analysis as part of phase 3.

The third phase consisted of analysis and triangulation of primary and secondary data to provide an in-depth examination of the research questions and emerging issues. The report was prepared in the period May – June 2014 following the guidelines provided by Dubai Cares. Following a review of the draft by partners in July 2014, TANGO revised and finalized the report for external circulation. A detailed timeline is provided in Annex 3.

1.5. Composition of evaluation team

The ET was composed of a multi-disciplinary three-person team consisting of a Team Leader and Evaluation Specialist who also undertook the field work, a WASH Technical Specialist who provided distance support and an Evaluation Coordinator in Indonesia who supported field logistics and organized experienced field facilitators to work with the Team Leader during the field study. Short bios of the team members are provided in Annex 8.

1.6. Limitations to the evaluation

Several factors did influence the design and implementation of the evaluation and for completeness will be mentioned here. However, overall, the ET was able to collect the necessary information to present a reliable and valid evaluation report.

Loss of institutional memory in WISE: key program and field staff members were no longer employed or had moved to other roles in the organization resulting in limited institutional memory with regard to the design, implementation and continuation strategies for the program. Where possible, the ET met with former WISE staff in their new roles to mitigate this limitation.

Baseline and endline design: information on baseline and endline sampling strategies was incomplete. However, documented aspects of the design and analysis of those surveys show sampling and statistical techniques were not properly applied. A new endline survey, as initially planned, was not cost-effective, as comparisons would still be compromised by baseline design problems. To allow for basic comparisons between baseline and endline data that could inform the evaluation, the ET exerted significant effort to clean the data sets, and redo the analysis. However, it is important to note that any comparisons are still indicative not absolute.

Timing of the evaluation: the evaluation was organized after the programs of UNICEF, CARE and Save the Children had closed at the end of 2013. This complicated evaluation design and limited the participation of partner field staff and management in the evaluation. To some extent, this limitation was mitigated due to continued presence of UNICEF staff in the project areas and their involvement in the evaluation, as well as pro-bono support from former WISE staff who pro-actively sought engagement with the evaluation team.

Documentation: there were separate contractual arrangements with each WISE implementing partner. As a result, documentation prepared by each partner only responded to that partner's contractual obligations. There was no project-level M&E that consolidated the reporting by each partner to measure overall project progress. This resulted in inconsistencies in terminology, phrasing and numbers reported. As part of Phase 1 of the evaluation methodology, the ET undertook significant efforts to understand and reconcile existing information on design and implementation. The first attempt at consolidation of reporting was presented in the inception report but this work was only completed during phase 3 during report preparation.

Level of effort: the level of effort provided by TANGO for this evaluation well exceeded the contractual arrangement. This resulted in some delays in evaluation timelines but did not compromise the quality of analysis.

Scope of the evaluation: during the evaluation process, partners and stakeholders indicated interest to review additional aspects of the program, including cross-cutting themes such as gender equity and women's empowerment and environmental impacts. The ET focused its efforts on areas of inquiry where WISE had substantive interventions and where attribution to observed changes could realistically be established. For example, the WISE design did not include any specific gender-focus in design or implementation, and this topic could therefore not meaningfully be evaluated.

2. Program description

The Wash in School program (WISE) in Indonesia was a partnership project among UNICEF, CARE and Save the Children with the overall goal to contribute to the improvement of the wellbeing of children through the integration of water and sanitation facilities and hygiene activities in primary schools.

The main strategic objective was to collaborate with the Government of Indonesia to develop and consolidate a model for the sustainable integration and scaling-up of best practices in low-cost settings, as demonstrated through WISE activities, in Indonesia's primary schools that improves access to sanitation in schools and fosters adoption of health practices among school-aged children.

There were multiple specific objectives with slight differences in formulation presented across different WISE documents. In the absence of one consolidated project implementation or M&E framework, the ET finds the following five specific objectives (adapted from the UNICEF contractual agreement and project documents) to best represent the WISE project:

1. Improve hygiene education component in schools including the revision and testing in pilot demonstration schools of the current *Usaha*

KesehatanSekolah(UKS) system

2. Improve access to low-cost, child-friendly and gender-sensitive WASH facilities in pilot demonstration schools with the aim of replication
3. Consolidate the management and technical capacity of school committees to better plan, supervise, manage, finance and maintain wash facilities
4. Develop together with the governments at national, provincial and district levels a road map specifying the financing, scaling-up and monitoring strategy for the next five years
5. Document the project implementation steps and six learning themes

The six learning themes stated in objective 5 are as follows:

1. Revitalization of the UKS program.
2. Appropriate WASH technology in schools in a low cost setting.
3. Policy/ governance on WASH in schools
4. Hygiene promotion
5. Role of the community in supporting behavior change in children and the community, and
6. Role of the school-based management (SBM) in sustainable management of WASH facilities.

Figure 1: provinces where WISE was implemented (indicated by red triangles)



To achieve the five specific objectives and the main strategic objective, and to make a meaningful contribution to the WISE project goal, the ET finds that the WISE partners focused on four main intervention domains with associated activities. Activities were implemented in six districts across South Sulawesi, East Nusa Tenggara, Papua and West Papua Provinces, and in Jakarta:²

1. Facility construction: activities included construction and rehabilitation of adequate, safe, low cost, child friendly and gender sensitive latrine units, hand washing facilities and improved water for hand washing and flushing in 450 pilot schools. These were termed facilities that use ‘appropriate technology’, to emphasize the importance of local contextual factors beyond only costs.
2. Hygiene promotion: activities included capacity development of children, teachers, headmasters, parents and community members to improve the hygiene behavior of primary school children in 450 pilot schools.
3. Enabling environment: activities included strengthening of School Committees in 450 pilot schools; capacity development of Government staff from the Departments of Education, Health and Planning to plan, budget, and monitor WASH projects in Schools for replication – mainly through the support to Pokja AMPL in 6 project Districts; and a review of the national strategies and policies on WASH to inform advocacy efforts for scaling up of effective WASH in schools models.
4. Monitoring, evaluation and learning: activities included various assessments, mapping exercises, documentation efforts, coordination and management meetings, and information dissemination events.

Under the WISE project, technical and implementation roles were divided among UNICEF, CARE and SAVE as follows. Roles and responsibilities in the four main intervention domains can best be described as follows:

- UNICEF: led the WISE partners in activities on ‘enabling environment’ and ‘monitoring, evaluation and learning’; acted as WISE project focal point for Government agencies at all levels; and coordination of the facility construction in pilot schools with local government departments and managed the financing;
- CARE: developed the low-cost facility model for the ‘facility construction’ intervention; facilitated the ‘facility construction’ and ‘hygiene promotion’ activities in 3 of the 6 project Districts, namely Takalar, TTS, and Jayapura
- Save the Children: developed the information, education and communication material (IEC) for use in the ‘hygiene promotion’ intervention; facilitated the ‘facility construction’ and ‘hygiene promotion’ activities in 3 of the 6 project Districts, namely Soppeng, Belu and Manokwari

The WISE project budget totaled USD 5,501,915. Separate contracts were signed with

² South Sulawesi Province: Takalar and Soppeng Districts; East Nusa Tenggara Province: Belu and TSS Districts; Papua province; Jayapura Districts; West Papua Province: Manokwari District.

UNICEF, CARE and Save the Children. **Table 1** below provides the project duration and budget for each partner.

Table 1: project budget and duration, by WISE partner		
<i>WISE partner</i>	<i>Project duration</i>	<i>Budget</i>
UNICEF	1 March 2011 – 30 November 2013	USD 3,417,045
CARE	15 February 2011 – 31 October 2013	USD 1,059,146
Save the Children	1 April 2011 – 30 September 2013	USD 1,025,724

3. Evaluation Findings

3.1. Appropriateness of the project

3.1.1. Appropriateness to needs and realities of beneficiaries and target groups

The ET finds that the overall WISE goal was, and still is, appropriate and relevant to the needs of primary school children in Indonesia. Primary school access is nearly 94%, but according to the MDG report for Indonesia, the proportion of students starting first grade who completed primary education was only 74.1% in 2008. It is widely acknowledged that enrollment and attendance rates have a positive correlation with the quality of the overall school experience, of which water and sanitation provision in schools is an important element. To improve the wellbeing of children and achieve universal access to education as a right for children, it is important to address the underlying factor of poor WASH in schools and the impact this has on health and educational outcomes.

It is difficult to get current and reliable data on WASH in schools due to the enormous amount of schools in the country and their geographical dispersion. Findings from a baseline survey conducted in 2008 by the University of Indonesia's Faculty of Economics (LPEM-UI) in cooperation with UNICEF in the six provinces of East Nusa Tenggara, West Nusa Tenggara, South Sulawesi, Maluku, West Papua and Papua, show that despite significant cross-provincial variation in terms of water supply and hygiene, school WASH facilities remain poor, thus undermining children's personal and environmental hygiene. More recently, the Ministry of National Education (PDSP) reported that in 2013: 45.5% of school have separate functioning toilets for girls, 63.8% of schools have separate functioning toilets for boys, and 85.9% of school have safe tap or tube-well water (up from 77% in 2009).³ According to Ministry of Health Data, circa 2010, only roughly 12% of children aged between 5 and 14 engaged in proper handwashing practices post-defecation, only 14% washed hands with soap prior to eating, and 35% wash hands with soap after eating.⁴

³ UNICEF WISE Final Report, December 2013, based on numbers reported by GoI

⁴ WISE project proposal, UNICEF (Jan 2011)

As determined from the WISE partner proposals and ET qualitative findings, the project design was based on adequate context analysis. However, the choice of transfer modalities, activities and targeting was not always appropriate to the needs and realities of the target groups and beneficiaries.

Facility construction: The transfer modality for the funds for the facility construction was not appropriate. UNICEF was supposed to transfer the funds needed to the Bappeda of the selected districts. Bappeda would then coordinate with the schools, procure the construction material, including organizing the bidding process, and arrange for delivery of the material to the respective schools where facilities would be built with local labor. However, an internal UNICEF audit found gaps in the capacity of the local government to conduct the bidding and procurement process in line with international standards. UNICEF could no longer transfer these funds to Bappeda to manage subsequent disbursement until capacity gaps had been addressed. This, together with other factors, such as local labor shortages and poor supply mechanisms, caused significant delays in construction processes. As a result, hygiene promotion activities no longer aligned with availability of the improved facilities. For example, in several districts training of teachers and parents was completed before the facilities were constructed, which undermined utilization of the improved knowledge.

UNICEF proved flexible in developing a range of alternative models to enable bidding and procurement to proceed while taking into account contextual factors. All alternatives still involved coordination with Bappeda to support capacity strengthening, with funding channeled through Bappeda where possible. First, in Takalar the funds were passed through Bappeda directly to the schools who then managed procurement of materials with oversight by Pokja AMPL. Second, in Soppeng UNICEF transferred the funds to Bappeda, which then procured the materials through competitive bidding under supervision of the UNICEF Supply Unit. Third, to speed up the process in Manokwari UNICEF hired a contractor to manage all aspects of procurement and construction. Finally, for high-risk counterparts UNICEF directly managed the bidding and procurement through its Supply Unit.

Findings show that the models implemented in Takalar and Soppeng built strong local ownership over facilities. There are indications that the Takalar model encouraged greater community contributions (in-kind and financial) to facility construction and that reduced wastage of material as schools procured only what was needed. However, at the same time the Takalar model was very time consuming, which delayed implementation of other WISE activities. It is important to note that direct involvement of UNICEF slowed down the process due to strict UNICEF procurement regulations.

The ET finds that the provision of appropriate technology training to school committees was insufficient to instill a comprehensive understanding of the construction technologies required and drive local participation in design and construction.

Interviews with WISE staff, school staff and parents indicate that committee members were, in many cases, not able to provide meaningful input into the design and construction process. This was, in most cases, very much supported by WISE staff. One reason for this was poor targeting of the training participants, which did not include community members who have an affinity with construction and became natural leaders in the construction processes. The targeting of exclusively school committee members was not appropriate for such training.

The design of the school action plan (SAP) activity was not appropriate. The aim of the SAP activity was to enable school management and school committees to think strategically about and plan for health and hygiene in schools. WISE trained school committees to review existing plans or develop a new one, where missing, to include a focus on WASH. These were one-off trainings with the SAP draft as a training output. Every school had a SAP in some form but these varied in quality due to differences in training participant composition, and differences in training methods and content among the provinces. There was not enough follow up to ensure plans were put into practice. Qualitative findings show that in many cases the SAPs were not further imported or used as a management/planning tool. This was compounded by the fact that only a few members from each school committee participated in this training. Those who did participate, did not feel empowered to drive this process forward with the other members after the training. There was also turn over in committees, which affected institutional knowledge on purpose of the plan. In some schools that the ET visited, SC members appeared unaware of the existence of the SAP.

In parallel, WISE also supported the review and revisions of school annual plans, which are formal school planning and budgeting tools. This activity was more appropriate than the efforts to improve the SAPs, as it strengthened an existing institutional process that was already considered useful by school management.

Hygiene promotion: The ET finds that the activities for hygiene promotion were not consistent or coherent enough to enable effective behavior change. Activities like the hand washing song developed by WISE that has been picked up by government as well will likely sustain but were not complemented by other activities to enable consistent behavior change at scale. This 'light touch' approach was not appropriate for most of the schools where WISE worked, where WASH may have been a known concept through the UKS national program but implementation of WASH in schools was still a challenge for both teachers and students. Hygiene promotion training included a focus on personal hygiene⁵ as well as environmental cleanliness through the 3R's: Reduce, Reuse, Recycle. Training was organized for school staff and school committee members, and was generally a one-time event with limited follow up. Teachers received limited

⁵ Save the Children also included Oral Health into hygiene promotion activities with co-financing from the Wrigley Foundation.

support to utilize their improved knowledge to promote behavior change among students. Teacher engagement with WISE staff was mainly restricted to the infrequent training events with very little follow up and in-school coaching on how to apply and adapt learning in the school context. Qualitative findings show that training participants considered the technical training content appropriate, there was not enough focus on effective approaches to train peers and students on the same issues. More in-school coaching by WISE staff to adopt the hygiene promotion to the unique school context would have been more appropriate. WISE documentation states that a needs assessment was carried out to inform the training approach but the ET was not able to acquire a copy of the assessment results nor was it clear from staff interviews how those results were applied to training design. Interviews with WISE staff indicated that there were internal brainstorming meetings that informed training design but that this was not properly vetted with government or school stakeholders.

The 'little doctor' program builds on an existing UKS initiative. The ET finds that in WISE it is a minor supporting element for teacher-driven hygiene promotion. The majority of 'little doctors' interviewed by the ET indicated that their main role was to be a 'passive' role model and that they were generally selected because they already demonstrated good personal hygiene. Both 'little doctors' and general students indicated that the 'little doctors' did not pro-actively undertake hygiene promotion, unless specifically directed by teachers. WISE trained only two students per school as 'little doctors', mostly in the higher grades. As students graduated, knowledge was lost and in some schools visited by the ET no new candidates were selected. While the 'little doctor' intervention is certainly a supporting one in promoting hygiene improvements in schools, it does not carry the power afforded to it in the WISE peer education design. The ET found no evidence of formation of so-called 'little doctor' clubs in the schools visited, so could not verify the appropriateness of this activity. The ET explicitly recognizes the value of child participation and peer influence that is incorporated in the WISE design. However, it appears that not enough effort was made to ensure that the 'little doctor' program was properly implemented, i.e., selection of 'little doctors', enabling environment for pro-active activities by the 'little doctors', and the formation of the clubs to allow more structured and regular engagement by school staff. Qualitative findings indicated that the investments made in the 'little doctor' program were not properly focused and that there were insufficient resources allocated to follow up support to teachers.

The ET further finds that working through existing class structures, such as the annually (or sometimes quarterly or semi-annually) elected class president, is more appropriate to build a pro-active and continuous hygiene program in schools. In some schools visited by the ET, teachers had expanded the hygiene promotion role beyond the 'little doctors' to include class presidents, also known as 'little generals'. In all cases observed, 'little generals' demonstrated more confidence on hygiene promotion and were more pro-active in reaching out to other students than 'little doctors'.

The ET did not find evidence of so-called ‘WASH parent clubs’⁶ in the schools visited so could not assess the appropriateness of this activity. In those schools, the only parents who received any type of hygiene promotion information were school committee members. These members indicated that they undertook no outreach to other parents or to the community as a whole. WISE organized community activities, such as Global Hand Washing Day celebrations, in some schools but these had limited engagement with the broader community. It is important to note that the so-called Hygiene Behavior Jamboree, organized in Takalar at the district level was widely acknowledged in qualitative findings as an appropriate awareness raising intervention for students, teachers and parents, which should be expanded. The Jamboree included such activities as song competitions, storytelling, school health competitions and parades.

In general, the ET finds that the lack of community engagement was a gap in the WISE design. Project activities, and associated benefits, were too limited to the school setting. In some communities, where the schools already had a pro-active role in community issues, the benefits of community engagement were apparent in higher resource contributions from community members to facility construction and a higher level of participation from general parents in school, and therefore also WISE, activities.

The ET finds that not enough meetings were organized that involved all the stakeholders in WASH in schools, including principals, teachers, parents, nurses and local government departments, to review and reflect on the progress of the hygiene promotion activities. Qualitative findings show that the majority of stakeholders who were interviewed acknowledged the significant contribution made by the WISE activities to improved hygiene in schools, but indicated results could have been better with improved coordination among stakeholders and more in-school follow-up by WISE staff to identify and replicate good practices. The ET does note that a reflection exercise was organized by WISE with selected schools in 2013 to update the training and IEC material.

The ET finds that the WISE support to organization of school cluster meetings was a highly appropriate activity to reach other schools through a peer-driven approach. Some non-WISE schools subsequently incorporated WASH into lesson plans following the example of WISE schools. This spillover effect was primarily undertaken on own initiative. The ET could find no evidence that the inclusion of health and hygiene in the other schools was supported by any specific WISE activities to ensure messages and activities were properly incorporated.

Enabling environment: the main activity under this intervention domain was the continuous support by WISE partners, led by UNICEF, to the operation of the AMPL at district and national levels. The ET finds that this activity was highly appropriate at both levels, but questions the omission of similar support to the provincial AMPL. Although

⁶ This intervention was only indicated in CARE documentation

some activities like the roadshows in NTT did engage the provincial AMPL to help mobilize district AMPLs, in general the provincial level was not an explicit target group for WISE interventions. The ET acknowledges the more limited role of provincial stakeholders under the ongoing decentralization in Indonesia. However, qualitative findings indicate that this gap did affect the sharing of experience on WISE model from district level to national level, and among districts in the same province.

Prior to the project, the district AMPLs did not focus specifically on WASH in schools although some were already active on WASH in the community. Coordination among participating departments was limited and an appreciation of the importance of WASH in schools was lacking. As a result, there was no leadership or an effective platform to drive forward WASH in schools. The WISE design squarely addressed this gap by organizing full-time facilitators whose main job was to mobilize and organize the district AMPLs into more effective coordination and decision-making platforms led by Bappeda. The AMPL was the appropriate platform to receive WISE support; decisions made by the district AMPL affected all schools in that district, not only the WISE schools.

The WISE partners together advocated with schools to allocate part of their annual school funding (BOS) to the maintenance of the new WASH facilities. Current BOS regulations indicate use for certain light repairs but does not specify the broad range of maintenance items required for the sustainability of the WASH interventions. This resulted in school management's reluctance to use BOS funds for WASH maintenance not specified; schools are not clear on what it can and cannot be used for.

At the national level, the issue of WASH in schools was not prioritized until UNICEF took on a more direct role in convening and setting the agenda for AMPL meetings. Also at the national level, UNICEF organized a review of frameworks, laws and standards regarding WASH in schools to inform the content and strategic direction of WASH interventions. As already indicated, the ET finds that the WISE design was based on robust context analysis mainly led by UNICEF

Together, the WISE partners worked with government stakeholders to organize inter-district and national meetings to inform development of a roadmap for financing and scaling up of WASH in schools. The ET finds this an appropriate activity for scaling up but questions the usefulness when such a road map is developed at the end of a project, when there is no further support to promote utilization of such essential guidance. The ET also could not find documented evidence of a comprehensive understanding among WISE partners and stakeholders of the 'drivers' and 'spaces' for scaling up.

Monitoring, evaluation, sharing and learning: WISE project documentation indicates the three partners conducted separate monitoring activities. There was no consolidated M&E framework for the WISE project, and there was not structured sharing and analysis of progress data among the WISE partners. UNICEF was tasked with developing a project-level M&E system but the quality of work delivered by the consultant was of

poor quality. Progress was instead communicated through a quarterly partner meeting in Jakarta. These meetings proved essential to coordinate coherency among different partner activities and to troubleshoot challenges.

Other WISE M&E activities included a baseline and endline survey, and a mapping exercise of the school health system. It is important to note that these studies were poorly conducted and of limited immediate use to the WISE project. There were several meetings organized by partners separately and jointly that stated a sharing and learning purpose. However, in most cases it is not clear to the ET how the results of such event were used to strengthen program implementation and results, with the exception of the updating of training materials. There was no learning strategy to guide partners in their documentation efforts and information utilization. Overall, the ET finds the M&E, and the learning activities of the WISE project to be very weak and not appropriate for a project that seeks to develop an evidence-based model for scaling up.

3.1.2. Coherence with government policies and initiatives

The ET finds that the overarching strategic objective to develop a model for scaling up of WASH in schools was appropriate to the needs of government stakeholders working on this issue. Education is increasingly becoming a priority in the Indonesian government's development agenda and the WISE project directly support implementation of key laws, including No. 23/1992, 20/2003, 57/2004, and 24/2007. Following a constitutional amendment in 2003, the government is mandated to spend at least 20% of its expenditure on education. Spending doubled between 2000-2006 and by 2007 public spending on education comprised 16% of the total government budget. However, it is not properly explained to the national and local government tasked with budgeting and planning that this budget could be used for School Sanitation. The ET confirmed this lack of understanding. Qualitative findings indicate that the main reasons for this include: limited coordination among the Health, Education and Planning Departments at national and local levels compounded by a persistent institutional resistance to change; limited awareness of the importance of WASH in schools; and, where there is awareness, limited knowledge about how to integrate improved WASH in schools. These WISE-specific finding resonate with the findings of the regional review of the SEAMEO 35th High Officials Meeting in Bangkok in November 2012.

The WISE project strategic objective and specific objectives directly addressed the needs of government stakeholders by improving coordination and awareness, and documenting a clear model for WASH in schools in low-cost settings. In addition to aiming to improve hygiene behavior and access to WASH facilities, the objectives also state appropriate focus on strengthening school and local government capacity to plan, finance and scale up WASH in schools. In particular, the specific objective to document project implementation, thereby developing a model blueprint, and organizing research on specific learning themes is highly appropriate and essential for evidence-based advocacy and scaling up.

The WISE project was consistent with the principal National Medium-Term Development Plan (2010-2014). This Plan declares the Government commitment to improved sanitation and aims to achieve 100% Open Defecation Free rural and urban areas through community-led total sanitation (CLTS), including schools by 2014.⁷ The Plan also includes the 3R's, which are a minor but important component of the WISE project. The WISE project also support implementation of the National Policy for Development of Community-based Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation. The WISE project is consistent with the new National Policy for Sanitation Development (2015-2019), and contributes to meeting the reduction in open defecation and child diarrhea targets stated in that policy, as well as contributing to the cleaner environment objectives.⁸

The WISE project was designed to support implementation of the 1976 National School Health Policy for all schools under 4 different Ministries: Ministries of Health, Education, Religious and Home Affairs with the aim of meeting the target of quality education and health for all children. This was followed by the establishment and implementation of a school health program in 1984 - Usaha Kesehatan Sekolah program (UKS) - in every district. The UKS program is covering not only WASH but also environmental health, nutrition in schools, and regular health monitoring (dental and immunization). As indicated in the WISE specific objectives, the project aimed to revitalize the UKS and improve the hygiene promotion in the UKS program.

The UKS program was reorganized in 2011, at the start of the WISE project. To date, roles and responsibilities under the new UKS structure are not clear. While UKS revitalization provided a strong rationale and platform for the WISE interventions during the design phase, it was of limited relevance during implementation. Instead, the WISE program aligned itself with the increased momentum around the STBM and PPSP programs. This provided the WISE project a meaningful platform for implementation and advocacy. The ET considers this shift in policy alignment the right decision.

WISE project documentation makes some reference to coherence with related initiatives, specifically the World Bank's funded Water and Sanitation Program (WSP) in the development of the initiatives Public-Private Partnership strategy and impact monitoring component. However, the ET found no evidence of meaningful engagement with other initiatives besides through the WISE partner program portfolios.

3.1.4. Geographical targeting

The WISE Project was implemented in six selected districts in four provinces. The WISE

⁷It is widely acknowledged that current efforts to reach this target are not on track.

⁸ WISE helped inform development of the National Policy for Sanitation Development (2015-2019), which will be discussed in section 3.3. of this report

design stated a distribution of selected schools along three strata, namely: remote (30%), rural (60%) and urban (10%). Following this stratification, schools were located be in both coastal and inland areas. The distribution of schools and students (December, 2013) by district is presented in **Table 2**.

Table 2: distribution of WISE schools (as reported at WISE final workshop Feb'14)						
Province	South Sulawesi		East Nusa Tenggara		Papua	West Papua
District	Takalar	Soppeng	Belu	TTS	Jayapura	Manokwari
Schools	90	125	75	90	20	50

The ET acknowledges the importance to build an evidence base for WISE activities across different strata, and considers the proportionate selection of the rural, urban and remote areas relevant. However, the wide geographic distribution of project sites was not appropriate to the project resources and limited the meaningful achievement of the project strategic objective. The ET finds that the transaction costs for the WISE partners to effectively coordinate across the different technical domains and project sites were too high. This was not properly budgeted for and, as a result, coordination was not optimal. For example, there was not enough budget or time for CARE and SCF technical staff and managers to visit each others project sites for coaching or quality control purposes in the main technical domains, facility construction and improved hygiene, respectively. This had a negative impact on quality of implementation and overall project coherency. There was also insufficient budget for field and management staff to meet, both at the partner level and at the overall WISE project level. Staff interviews in Jakarta and in the field confirmed that the 'distance' between WISE management and field implementers was considered too great. Finally, the geographic distances among the project sites also limited the interaction among project target groups, i.e., local government and schools, and beneficiaries. Essentially, the projects remained siloes at district level and there was no meaningful engagement with or ownership over the site activities at provincial and national level to support scaling up of a consolidated model.

3.1.5. Partnership design

The WISE design combined the technical and implementation (i.e., geographic experience and field capacity) strengths of the three implementing partners but lacked clear institutional arrangements for program cycle management and lines of accountability among the partners. UNICEF, CARE and Save the Children each had separate contractual agreements with Dubai Cares, with a combination of technical responsibilities for the program and implementation responsibilities for specific project provinces. This was a complicated set up to manage, and division of labor was confusing to government counterparts.

Project management would have been more effective if one organization, like UNICEF, held overall project responsibility through a single contract with Dubai Cares, with the

other partners organized under the lead partner with distinct roles and responsibilities. The ET finds that UNICEF took more management responsibility at the overall project level than the other two partners who focused more on field implementation. Dubai Cares and government partners also viewed UNICEF as lead partner. In practice, this created a workable solution for all partners. However, formalization of this set up would have established supporting processes that facilitate effective project implementation.

The partner contracts had independent reporting requirements to Dubai Cares and were essentially managed as three separate projects. There was no overarching contract or management framework that guided working arrangements among the partners and there were insufficient resources allocated to intra-partner coordination and program-level monitoring, and learning and knowledge management processes.

3.2. Results of the project

This section presents the evaluation findings assessing the outputs in terms of the four main intervention domains, and the outcomes in terms of meeting project objectives. It is important to note that in lieu of a project-level M&E system, i.e., project-wide consolidated reporting against agreed indicators, the ET cannot provide reliable quantitative data for all indicators. However, an informed assessment of relevant indicators drawn from the UNICEF final report is provided based on the documentation review and the primary findings from the fieldwork.

3.2.1. Attainment of planned outputs

Facility construction: WISE partners constructed improved toilet and hand-washing facilities in 450 schools, as planned and following the distribution in table 2. The target schools in Jayapura were reduced from 50 to 20 due to the high construction costs. At the end of the project, an additional 30 schools were added in Soppeng using remaining project funds bring the total number of schools back up to 450. The ET finds that the facilities in all project districts meet minimum government construction standards. The 2013 endline survey further indicated that the quality of facilities in WISE schools was better than that in control schools in the same district.⁹

Sphere standards were also largely met, with the exception of the maximum ratio of users per toilet. Project resources did not allow every school to construct enough facilities to meet full demand. However, in all schools ratios with the new facilities were better than under the old situation. Some schools had locked toilet cubicles and shut off water access for selected taps, apparently for fear of students damaging the facilities and with the notion that that students and teachers could make do with less facilities. In the majority of schools visited, there were separate facilities for boys and girls, and in

⁹ This survey was only undertaken in Belu, Soppeng and Manokwari

many schools teachers also had separate facilities. In all schools visited, the ET found that new facilities were much improved compared to the old facilities. In the majority of schools, the old facilities were no longer used. It is important to note that newly constructed improved facilities were more centrally located on the school grounds than the older facilities, which improved access and further emphasized the importance accorded to WASH.

Investment in school water sources was not part of the project design. Supposedly, schools were selected that already had access to a clean water source. However, the ET found that, where necessary, the project did facilitate investments in school water supply improvements, such as pumps, piping and wells. In a small number of schools, the ET found that the improved WASH facilities were constructed before reliable water access was in place. As a result, such facilities could not be used until the end of the project.

There were some differences in facility construction across schools. Facilities in the more remote project districts in Papua, West Papua and NTT, where construction costs were higher, were less elaborate than the facilities in South Sulawesi. Within districts, facilities in schools with a stronger community engagement were able to mobilize greater in-kind and financial community contribution to facility construction. In such schools, the facilities were more elaborate than in other schools in the same district; use of tiles instead of cement, and better quality taps and piping. The WISE project did not quantify the in-kind or financial contribution but the ET finds that in all schools some in-kind contribution did occur. Financial contributions, usually provided by community leaders or well-to-do families, were less frequent.

In general, the ET found facilities clean and functional. The ET found numerous small maintenance issues, mainly broken taps. The majority of schools where this was found had already planned repairs and relied on taps located elsewhere on school grounds in the meantime. A small number of schools indicated that there was no funding for repairs because such expenses were not allowed under the BOS funds or there were insufficient funds in the BOS for the repairs.

The ET can verify that the WISE project trained schools committee members, including parents and teachers, on construction and maintenance of the improved facilities, in all 450 schools. Quality of training materials and of WISE partner trainers was satisfactory. However, the overall quality of the training was less than satisfactory, largely due to poor participant selection, the one-off nature of training events and limited follow up – as also discussed in section 3.1.

Hygiene promotion: hygiene promotion activities were carried out in all 450 schools. The majority was undertaken directly by WISE implementing partners but in some schools, where facility construction was completed after the CARE and SCF contract completions dates, hygiene promotion was undertaken with government support. This

was the case in Soppeng where additional facilities were constructed at the end of the project.

In all schools, hygiene promotion topics covered diarrhea, hand washing with soap, clean drinking water, food hygiene, and waste management.¹⁰ The ET finds that student most commonly recalled messages on personal hygiene (hand washing, nail cutting, bathing) and to a lesser degree keeping the school environment clean. Qualitative findings indicated limited knowledge on the 3Rs, despite reinforcement through the regular school cleaning activities commonly organized on Fridays.

Training was provided to school committees, including teachers and parents, and to students through the 'little doctor' program. In all schools, teachers were a driving factor in dissemination hygiene information to other teachers and to students. The parents in the school committees played a limited role in supporting hygiene promotion in schools. As also discussed in section 3.1, the role of the 'little doctors' was not effective to support student behavior change. The ET considers that a higher investment in teacher capacity and in-school coaching, and creating an enabling environment for the 'little doctors' activities would have been a more efficient use of project resources.

The quality of the training materials developed by WISE for hygiene promotion was satisfactory and made appropriate use of clear visuals. While the same material was used to train a wide range of stakeholders, the ET found that this did not affect quality of training as messaging was kept simple and trainers appropriately tailored their messaging to the different audiences. As also discussed under section 3.1., the main point of critique is that trainings were too few and with limited follow up. Essentially, beneficiaries had only one formal training exposure from WISE. While WISE partners completed their contractual obligations, this light touch approach had a negative impact on the effectiveness of the training provided.

Hygiene promotion activities were largely completed on time, based on the individual partner implementation plans and to meet the separate contract obligations with Dubai Cares. However, the ET considers this a project weakness as these plans quickly became irrelevant in areas where there were delays in WASH facility construction. The adherence to the original planning limited the effectiveness of trainings, which in some cases were organized almost 1 year before the facilities were in place. By that time knowledge had been lost.

Enabling environment: the WISE partners supported the operation of the district AMPLs in the six project districts. As already discussed under section 3.1., the ET considers this a highly appropriate intervention and efficient use of project resources. The ET further

¹⁰ Save the Children also included oral health as part of their hygiene promotion activities, with co-financing from the Wrigley Foundation

confirms that the full-time support provided by AMPL facilitators, hired by Bappeda but funded through the WISE project, was highly effective in supporting organization of formal meetings as well as informal communication and coordination. District AMPL meetings were generally organized every 2-3 months with regular and consistent participation of the appropriate senior representatives. Qualitative findings indicate that these meetings were considered highly useful by participants and generated improvements in institutional relationships that yielded benefits beyond the WISE activities. It is important to note here that, in general, institutional relationships are still very much based on personalities. This will be discussed further in section 3.3.

WISE, through extra effort by UNICEF, also directly facilitated AMPL meetings at the national level. The ET finds this activity less effective than the district support. National AMPL meetings were less frequent and had a high turnover in participants; different people from participating departments participated depending on the agenda items. As a result, quality of discussion and contribution to meaningful decision-making was low. There was a lot of repetition required to induct continuously new participants on the issue of WASH in schools. However, the ET does note that the facilitation of these meetings played an important role in raising awareness of WASH in schools within participating departments, which was confirmed through direct participation in one such AMPL meeting by the ET.

As already indicated under 3.1, the ET finds that activities to create an enabling environment at the community level, and to through community processes more effectively reach parents, were largely missing from the project design. While some attempts to engage with community leadership did occur, this was mainly in schools that already had a higher level of community participation in school activities. In these cases, parents and community members demonstrated a higher level of participation in school activities. The ET finds that the WISE project did not make a meaningful contribution to improved WASH outside of the direct school environment.

Monitoring, evaluation, sharing and learning: in general, the ET finds that WISE activities in this intervention domain were not effective. There was no consolidated M&E framework, no common reporting, nor was there an effective system to collect and use data in general. As a result, project management by the three WISE partners required high levels of coordination through regular meetings and informal communication to ensure a minimum level of synergy among the various partner activities. While this speaks positively of the high level of commitment by the WISE partners, it is not an effective or efficient way to run a multi-component, multi-site and evidence-based pilot project like WISE.

The ET found no evidence of comprehensive documentation for the six pre-identified learning themes, with the exception of references to these themes in the main project publication. The quality of M&E activities, such as the baseline and endline surveys, was

poor. As already stated in section 3.1, the ET finds the M&E, and the learning activities of the WISE project to be very weak.

3.2.2. Attainment of planned outcomes

Specific objective 1: the first specific object states ‘Improve hygiene education component in schools including the revision and testing in pilot demonstration schools of the current UKS system’. The re-analyzed baseline and endline data, and the ET qualitative findings show that there are improvements in the project hygiene behavior and practice indicators among students in WISE schools. This is in line with the main qualitative findings of the 2013 endline report; note that original quantitative data could not be used. While the ET can confirm a positive trend with attribution to WISE, it is not possible to state absolute values or measures of change due to the data quality problems in the baseline and endline surveys.

Direct observation and qualitative findings show that students are washing their hands more frequently, demonstrate better personal hygiene and contribute to actively to keeping the school environment clean. Although this is neither consistent nor common for all students, the ET finds a meaningful improvement from the pre-WISE situation in all schools visited. The HWWS survey commissioned separately by UNICEF to assess hand washing with soap behavior in WISE and control schools, confirmed that hand washing behavior is better in WISE schools. However, It is important to note that absolute values found by the direct observation technique used in the HWWS survey are still low and lower than self-reported hand washing rates, indicating more work needs to be done.

Local health workers further indicate improved health among students as a result of improved hygiene practices, i.e., fewer students reported absent from school due to sickness, and a reduction in reported diarrhea cases. The ET did not independently verify these records.

An overview of values for key indicators from the re-analyzed baseline and endline survey data is provided in **Table 3**. While not fully representative or reliable, comparisons generally do confirm positive trends in comparison to baseline values and control schools.

Table 3: student behaviour change indicators (revised analysis 2014)

Indicator	Baseline	Endline	Control	Total
Percentage of children report washing hand with soap at the two most critical times of day	22.6%	26.3%	10.7% ^{2,3}	22.8%
N	900	909	242	2051
Percentage of children who demonstrated the key steps to handwashing with soap	27.0%	45.7% ^{1,3}	23.1%	34.8%
N	900	909	242	2051
Percentage of children who know that handwashing cleans germs/ prevents communicable diseases or diarrhea	55.7% ^{1,2}	41.6%	39.3%	47.5%
N	900	909	242	2041
Percentage of children who used the school toilet to defecate when they were at school	89.1%	86.1%	67.0% ^{2,3}	47.5%
N	636	907	242	1785
Percentage of children who know that one must defecate in the toilet to prevent communicable diseases/ diarrhoea	3.3%	26.2% ^{1,3}	18.2% ²	15.3%
N	889	909	242	2040
Percentage of children who know that toothbrushing prevents cavities/ toothache/infection/ plaque	48.2%	64.6% ^{1,3}	53.3%	56.1%
N	893	909	242	2044
Percentage of children who reported throwing garbage in the garbage bin in school	91.7% ²	94.8%	79.0% ^{1,3}	91.5%
N	893	787	219	1898
Percentage of children who know that safe waste disposal helps to avoid germs/ illness	17.7%	43.0% ^{1,3}	30.2% ²	30.4%
N	890	909	242	2041
Percentage of children who know that water needs to be boiled to kill germs or prevent illness	48.9% ^{1,2}	82.2%	76.9%	67.1%
N	882	909	242	2033
Percentage of children who mentioned fecal-oral transmission as a cause of diarrhea	14.3%	14.8%	7.4% ^{2,3}	13.7%
N	897	909	242	2048
p<.05 - ¹ : BL vs. EL, ² : EL vs. Control, ³ : BL vs. Control				

The baseline and endline surveys also collected information on hygiene behavior change among parents. However, the ET has decided not to use this information due to the problems with the quality of data and the weak attribution of any identified change to WISE project activities. Parent indicators were not included in the various outcome indicator iterations in WISE project documentation and the actual WISE activities cannot reasonably be expected to effect any such change.

The ET finds that there has been positive systems change in the majority of WISE schools, and certainly in all the schools visited by the ET in five of the six districts. In all schools visited by the ET, hygiene education was integrated into school curricula, mainly for Physical Education, Biology and Religious classes. Based on qualitative findings, the ET finds the assertions in WISE documentation that this change occurred in all 450 schools to be highly credible. The ET further confirms through qualitative findings that such changes have indeed occurred in non-WISE schools as well, as indicated in WISE progress reports. The main channel for effecting such change was through awareness raising in the local school cluster meetings and through direct intervention with these schools by district AMPL members.

Specific objective 2: the second specific objective states ‘improve access to/construct low-cost, child-friendly and gender-sensitive WASH facilities in pilot demonstration schools with the aim of replication.’ Under the output section above, the ET concluded that appropriate facilities have been established in all targeted schools, including toilets and hand-washing facilities, and that utilization of functioning hardware is high. In other words, students and teachers much prefer using the new facilities.

Specific objective 3: the third specific objective states ‘consolidate the management and technical capacity of school committees to better plan, supervise, manage, finance and maintain wash facilities.’ The stated indicators for this are the number of SAPs and the number of school committee members actively participating in the development of these SAPs. The ET verifies that all 450 schools have a SAP in its most basic form, and that all SAPs were developed with some involvement of the school committee members. The majority of schools only used the plan for the construction phase. Schools generally did not use the SAP plan to inform their maintenance of the new facilities and participation of school committees in phases beyond construction planning was very low. Instead, as discussed in section 3.1, the ET finds the existing school annual plans were the more useful tool for school administrators.

Moreover, the school committee capacity is not the correct determinant for whether schools have demonstrated capacity to properly operate and maintain the WASH facilities, which the ET argues is the main outcome-level change of interest. In general the school committees play a small role in school management and operational issues. Principals play more meaningful roles with support from teachers and, in some cases, village leaders. School committee members are primarily involved in the actual undertaking of minor chores/tasks/repairs around the school grounds. They are not decision-makers or decision-influencers.

Despite inappropriate selection of the school committees as project target group for this intervention set, qualitative findings indicate that that the majority of schools, through their formal management structure and with some support from community leaders, do demonstrate capacity to manage minor maintenance issues of the WASH facilities

through the use of BOS funds and in a few cases through additional fund raising from the community.

Specific objective 4: the fourth specific objective states ‘develop together with the governments at national, provincial and district levels a road map specifying the financing, scaling-up and monitoring strategy for the next five years. The stated indicators for this are that the district strategic plans and budgets include WASH in schools activities, the number of schools replicating the WISE model with government resources, and that the recommendation of the UKS evaluation is implemented by district government. The ET finds that progress has been made during the project with regards to the stated indicators, but that the road map to guide work beyond the project was not developed beyond the overview of key implementation steps in the WISE final publication.

WISE progress reporting indicates that all districts have included WASH in schools activities in their strategic planning and budgeting. Qualitative findings confirmed that planning and budgeting by local government of WASH in schools did indeed improve with direct attribution to WISE. In all districts AMPL members provided in-kind support to WASH in schools coordination and training activities, ranging from direct participation indirect endorsement of WISE activities. In all districts, the DoH allocated BOK in-kind resources to support regular health promotion and outreach in schools with active engagement of Puskesmas staff. In some cases, this included providing specific funds for the ‘little doctor’ training and use of DoH training facilities. Also in all districts, DEO actively supported the use of BOS funds for maintenance of WASH facilities in schools; either through a local directive like in Takalar and Belu Districts that stipulates a minimum of 5% should be used, or through informal endorsement like in the other districts.

In West Papua, the district allocated DAK funds to WASH activities. In East Nusa Tenggara, WASH was incorporated into district legislation for education. In South Sulawesi, the provincial department of education allocated funding to support WISE implementation, which also included specific funding to sharing hygiene education guidelines with additional schools. Also in South Sulawesi, the district government of Takalar indicated that it will continue to sponsor the Hygiene Behavior Jamboree, which was a highly successful awareness raising event covering several hundred schools.

In all districts, AMPLmembers indicated that WASH in schools would be included in their next strategic plans but that budgeting of specific activities remained problematic. The ET still finds confusion about which department should be contributing the financing for WASH in Schools.

At national level, the ET confirms that the visibility that the WISE program gave to WASH in schools and the facilitation of intra-governmental collaboration contributed to conceptualization of new national programs such as the SDBS (Clean & Healthy primary

schools) program, which is officially included in the Government of Indonesia's new Five Year Plan, and informed the National Policy for Sanitation Development (2015-2019). Qualitative findings indicated in particular that the facilitation role of WISE among AMPL stakeholders at national level in Jakarta provided an essential platform for government agencies to engage formally and informally on the issue of WASH in schools. Key informants indicated that the facilitation by WISE through UNICEF was crucial to develop consensus on the importance of WASH in schools to the work of the AMPL departments, and to start basic discussions on the roles and responsibilities in government initiatives like SDBS and STBM.

It is difficult to indicate the number of schools that have replicated the WISE model because the key activities and associated results have not yet been effectively documented or promoted as part of a consolidated and evidence-based model. The basic documentation of the WISE model was only completed at the end of the project. However, the ET finds encouraging evidence that shows that WISE activities have reached schools beyond those directly involved in the project. In all districts, the ET found that the WISE partners effectively worked with the existing school cluster system to more widely disseminate information and materials to non-WISE schools. Project monitoring data shows that hygiene training participants even regularly included representatives from schools not directly targeted by WISE. Participants from the non-WISE schools were mobilized through the representatives from WISE schools at the cluster meetings.

WISE did not actively promote the results and recommendations of the UKS mapping exercise to WISE schools – certainly not at a level that would promote adoption by local government. The primary reason for this is clearly indicated in the UNICEF final report, which states that ‘findings and recommendations were not up to the level expected and could not be used.’ Secondly, the mapping results were very specific, which limited usefulness beyond the UKS program. WISE partners linked their policy advocacy efforts more closely to more appropriate initiatives like STBM as opposed to focusing on UKS, which remained a disjointed program.

However, the ET finds that WISE did successfully incorporate key recommendations with relevance beyond the UKS program into the advocacy work. As already indicated, the ET finds good attribution to the WISE activities of the positive results at local government level described in this section. In particular, the ET commends the WISE program for improving utilization of existing funds allocated or directed by local government, i.e., school BOS and BOK funds, and district DAK funds, to support WASH in schools. This underlines the feasibility of financing WASH in schools through existing policy and planning frameworks.

It is important to emphasize that WISE made important progress in strengthening the capacity of government to monitor WASH in schools. Through national advocacy work by UNICEF, WASH indicators were included in the national Education Monitoring and

Information System (EMIS) for which data is collected on an annual basis. The first round of data collection including the full set of WASH indicators will take place in 2015.

Specific objective 5: the fifth specific objective states ‘document the project implementation steps and six learning themes.’ The stated indicators for this are that all defined indicators are monitored and reported according to the M&E framework, and the number of books printed and distributed. As already indicated throughout the analysis so far, the ET finds the WISE project does not have a functional and consolidated M&E framework, so the first indicator has not been properly met. This undermined the effectiveness of all associated data collection and documentation activities, as is evidenced by the poor quality of the external baseline and endline surveys, the UKS mapping exercise and the lack of coherency among progress and final reporting. While all reports touch on the main WISE intervention domains, there are significant differences in indicators and activities discussed. This made it challenging for the ET to develop a clear picture of what the project did and for WISE partners to manage the program.

The ET commends the WISE partners for their ability to still deliver a relatively on-track project that has yielded overall positive results under these circumstances. However, the ET also finds it very concerning that these very evident issues were not more squarely addressed either by the WISE partners or by Dubai Cares during the implementation period. Not doing so has severely compromised the ability of WISE to quantify the project results and to formulate an evidence-based model for further advocacy.

In terms of project publications, the ET finds that WISE produced a range of information materials that are generally of high quality and have potential use in future WASH initiatives, including training/orientation materials on WASH facility construction and maintenance, and hygiene behavior improvement; and the final publication that explains the operational steps that have to be in place to prepare and implement a school sanitation program. The ET finds that some of the training materials have already been used by district AMPL members, in particular the DOH through the Puskesmas, to inform current iterations of government materials. At national level, the ET found no specific evidence of utilization beyond a general acknowledgement of the potential usefulness of the WISE materials. The ET finds that the attribution of project results to the WISE documentation efforts is quite weak, mainly because key materials like the final publication were available too late to be utilized effectively. Instead, and as already discussed in previous sections, the positive changes at district level are a result of the consistent mobilization of district AMPLs and the schools by WISE field staff.

The strategic objective: the strategic objective was ‘to collaborate with the Government of Indonesia to develop and consolidate a model for the sustainable integration and scaling-up of best practices in low-cost settings, as demonstrated through WISE activities, in Indonesia’s primary schools that improves access to sanitation in schools

and fosters adoption of health practices among school-aged children.’ Essentially, this means that WISE aimed to consolidate all project experience into a usable model for others, in particular government partners. As per the project logic, this extra step, beyond simply achieving the project specific objectives, would allow a relatively small project like WISE to contribute to improved well-being of children at scale in a way that is greater than the sum of the project parts.

The ET finds that WISE has for the large part achieved this strategic objective. By the end of the project, the WISE model was captured in the final publication, which sets out clear steps for scaling up WASH in schools based on the experience of WISE and its government partners at district level. As already discussed, the lack of robust M&E means that the model is not based on robust evidence. However, a realistic and experiential reflection on the 8 steps and associated activities shows that these are sensible and informed by global and national good practice around WASH in schools.

The ET finds that the WISE model lacks sufficient specificity in terms of operational and policy opportunities for scaling up, which is a key part of the strategic objective statement. As a result, government users may identify with the model proposed but will find it challenging to apply within their scope of work. This links to the ET analysis around specific objective 4, which confirms that key elements of project design and experience have been captured in WISE documentation, but that a specific roadmap for building on the results so far is not yet available.

3.2.3. Contribution towards project goal

The overall goal of WISE was to contribute to the improvement of the wellbeing of children through the integration of water and sanitation facilities and hygiene activities in primary schools. The ET finds that WISE has indeed made an important contribution to this goal. Direct student beneficiaries in schools have improved access to WASH facilities and demonstrate improvements in hygiene behavior. Teachers and local government have improved awareness of the importance of WASH in schools and indicate a basic commitment to continuing their work on this issue within an enabling policy environment.

The contribution of WISE to wellbeing of children through WASH is less pronounced beyond the direct scope of the project. The WISE model has great potential to support implementation of government policies and plans on WASH, but the actual application has yet to be demonstrated.

3.3. Contributing factors

While some of the factors affecting the results have already been touched on in sections 3.1 and 3.2, this section will provide a more structured overview of the internal issues

and external factors that affected the project performance. Internal factors include resource availability, procurement, staffing and management, M&E, and partnerships. A key internal factor is the design of the WISE project but this has already been discussed extensively in section 3.1, and will not be repeated here. External factors relate to local conditions, reconfiguration of districts, government capacity, and policy environment.

3.3.1. Internal factors

Resources: in general, the mismatch between project resources, parameters and ambition contributed to the range of design problems already discussed in section 3.1. More specifically, the level of resources allocated to project management, coordination and M&E was too low given the geographic spread and remoteness of the WISE project sites. This affected the level of intensity of WISE activities, i.e., one-off trainings with limited follow up and not enough attention to quality control, which had a negative impact on the achievement of project specific and strategic objectives.

The ET finds that all partners undertook effective efforts to achieve cost reduction and efficiency of implementation. There were some delays in fund disbursement, which had a negative effect on timeliness of implementation. In particular, the delay for UNICEF in receiving the second installment and the reduction in amount received in 2012 delayed construction processes and had a negative impact on the relationships of the WISE partners with local government counterparts and schools.

The ET finds that the WISE partners were successful in mobilizing additional funds to support project implementation. UNICEF, in particular, leveraged additional funds from the government to support construction work in extra schools in Papua. WISE partners were also able to mobilize additional funds from some communities, which supported construction of more elaborate WASH facilities. It is important to note that all WISE partners used institutional funds, either from core funding or co-financing from other projects, to cover their operational costs and strengthen WISE implementation, where possible. To some extent, this helped fill the resource gap in project management and coordination.

Procurement: the original procurement modalities were problematic. Again, the ET finds that this was a design problem. It is clear that the decision to work through local government procurement systems had a strong capacity strengthening rationale. However, under such rationale the project should have put in place resources to address the capacity gaps that would expectedly emerge. This was not done. WISE was not able to manage the capacity needs identified and alternative procurement mechanisms had to be sought. This delayed construction of WASH facilities and had a negative impact on coordination with local government and government ownership. At the same time, the testing of alternative procurement channels did contribute to the development of the school-based construction model, which proved an important project result.

Staffing and management: a key contributing factor to the positive results of the WISE project despite the design and implementation problems discussed in section 3, has been the overall quality and professionalism of WISE partner staff. The ET finds the partner organizations and staff highly committed to the issue of WASH in schools; a commitment that was present before WISE and continued after the WISE project ended. Staff dedication and technical competence played a major part in enabling a working environment characterized by flexible decision making and adaptive management, which was necessary to run the project in lieu of clear management and coordination structures.

The ET finds the vertical linkages within partner organizations, and the horizontal linkages among the partners to be limited. Qualitative findings indicate that field staff received limited feedback and strategic direction from management in Jakarta. Interaction between field staff and headquarters was mainly oriented around activity completion and budget burn rates. This applies to varying degrees to all WISE partners.

Coordination among the three partners at management and senior technical level was good, and was – in fact – the glue that kept the three partner contracts somewhat aligned. However, there was very little structured coordination among the three WISE partners at field level – mainly because this was not budgeted for and the geographic spread of the project made such meetings cost prohibitive. Where coordination did take place, this was mainly based on good personal relationships among partner staff. The limited coordination at field level was evident to local government counterparts, who were at times confused about the roles and responsibilities of the different WISE partners. Moreover, the coordination gaps meant that activities like facility construction and hygiene promotion were not always effectively coordinated, which had a negative impact on results.

Monitoring and evaluation: the lack of a consolidated M&E framework has been referenced multiple times in the analysis so far. However, it is of such critical importance that the ET is emphasizing it again here. The lack of guidance that a well-considered M&E framework, if based on a good project design, gives to project implementation had a direct negative impact on project results and the development of an evidence-based model for scaling up. There is opportunity loss here. The lack of an M&E framework, and a supporting system and staff capacity to use the framework effectively, also contributed to the overall poor quality of external M&E activities commissioned under the WISE project.

The ET acknowledges that in many large organizations, M&E systems are largely process-driven and mandated by headquarters or donor requirements, but the value of the WISE reports appear to be pro forma and as routine obligations rather than reflective efforts to understand the performance of an intervention. A review of WISE progress reporting shows that the partners collected a range of relevant information; the problem is that it appears the importance of this information for decision making

was not recognized, and that this information certainly was not fully utilized. Many of the problems raised in this report were already flagged by partners in early progress reports, but were subsequently not acted upon. The ET finds a missed opportunity by Dubai Cares and the WISE partners to address these issues, which would have benefited the project results.

Partnerships: there are two aspects to WISE partnerships. First, there is the relationship among the WISE partners. As already discussed in sections 3.1 and 3.2, the separate contracting relationships between each partner and Dubai Cares, and the overlapping geographic and implementation responsibilities were not conducive to an effective WISE partnership. At the same time, the flexibility and capacity of each organization as an established development actor to still operate under such a challenging arrangement made a positive contribution to the results.

Second, there is the relationship with external initiatives. Project documentation references the intention to develop strategic partnerships with other WASH initiatives, such as the World Bank WSP program. The ET found no evidence of this. Moreover, the ET finds the lack of engagement with other active actors in WASH, such as Plan International, a missed opportunity to build a higher level of critical mass around WASH in schools and to contribute more directly to, and learn from, what others are doing.

3.3.2. External factors

Dynamic local conditions: There were security incidents in Papua in 2012, which affected implementation as certain field activities were postponed. Fuel and material price increases complicated procurement processes and subsequently led to construction delays. Construction material costs in remote areas like Papua and West Papua turned out higher than anticipated. This led to a downward adjustment in target schools in Jayapura, which was later compensated by an increase in schools in Soppeng. Facility construction was also delayed more than expected in the wet season.

Reconfiguration of districts: this was stated as a constraint to project results in project documentation. In particular this relates to establishment of new districts in East Nusa Tenggara and West Papua, which may affect sustainability, as the new local government officials do not share the same level of understanding, commitment or support for WASH in schools.

Government capacity: at both national and local government level there was frequent turnover in key counterparts. As a result, institutional memory and investments in personal relationships were lost, and significant resources had to be expended to re-establish these with incoming staff. This compromised effectiveness of AMPL collaboration and the engagement of government agencies with WISE activities. It is important to note that low levels of meaningful coordination and collaboration among AMPL members were already a pre-existing condition to the project. Qualitative findings

also confirm a general reluctance by government departments to play a formal leadership role on WASH in schools for fears that this may overwhelm available resources.

Enabling policy environment: as already noted in section 3.1, the policy environment became more enabling as the WISE project progressed. Existing national policies and programs were gaining momentum, and new frameworks like the National Policy for Sanitation Development increased the relevance of WISE activities and supported an improved awareness on WASH in schools among government partners and schools. The ET confirms that many of the schools and district AMPLs had linked the WISE activities to the STBM initiative.

4. Conclusions

This section summarizes the key findings and conclusions of the evaluation based on the criteria stated on the evaluation ToR: relevance of program design, efficiency of implementation, effectiveness and sustainability.

4.1. Relevance and program design

The WISE project is relevant to the needs of primary schools children in Indonesia. The project design was based on adequate context analysis that demonstrates the need for improved access to WASH facilities and improved hygiene practices in schools. The WISE project is consistent with key national strategies, policies and laws. The original WISE design was aimed to support the still nascent national UKS program that aims to improve health and hygiene in schools. However, during implementation the STBM emerged as the more enabling government initiative for WISE implementation and advocacy activities.

The overarching strategic objective to develop a model for scaling up of WASH in schools is appropriate to the needs of government stakeholders working on this issue. There is an enabling policy environment for WASH inschools, but applicable budget is not allocated to support implementation of policies and plans, and there is a general lack of understanding of implementation models for WASH in schools. In aiming to improve hygiene behavior and access to WASH facilities, the specific objectives also state appropriate focus on strengthening local capacity to plan, finance and scale up WASH in schools.

While the project design is highly relevant and forms a coherent conceptual intervention set, the ET concludes that the choice of transfer modalities, activities and targeting was not always appropriate to the needs and realities of the target groups and beneficiaries. The fund transfer modality for facility construction was not appropriate. If using local

government procurement systems then there should have been adequate support provided to the project to strengthen these systems before and during their utilization for project purposes. An even more appropriate mechanism would be to use the school-based construction model developed under the WISE project, which proved highly effective and is in-line with global practice on school-based WASH.

Training content was appropriate but the training approaches for both facility construction and hygiene behavior change were too 'light touch.' Trainings were generally one-off events with limited follow up or coaching in the school context to reinforce utilization of improved knowledge. The WISE design did not allocate enough financial resources and technical oversight to its training activities; either increase resources or reduce training topics. The specific targeting of school committee members for many of the trainings was not appropriate. School committees have a limited role in school decision making and lacked capacity and mandate for further knowledge transfer and action. Instead, higher investment in capacity of school staff supported by targeted community-level activities would have been more appropriate. The lack of community engagement to support WASH in schools and reinforce behavior change at home is a gap in the WISE design. Similarly, the high level of investment in the 'little doctor' program and the development of school action plans were not appropriate. Working through existing class structures, such as class presidents or 'little generals' and through existing annual planning processes would have been more effective. In general, the WISE design did not properly take into account the opportunities of strengthening existing school systems and processes, instead of coming up with new ones that highlight WASH but also isolate it from established institutional processes.

Under the enabling environment intervention domain, the design of the activities to support operation of the AMPL at district and national level was highly appropriate. Inclusion of the provincial AMPL would have strengthened vertical and horizontal integration of this intervention. The design did not give appropriate emphasis to developing a scaling up strategy that builds on the government capacity investments.

The design did not include enough focus on monitoring and evaluation. This is a major gap in any project, but more so for a project that aimed to develop and evidence-based model for scaling up. The wide geographic distribution of project sites was not appropriate to project resources and further limited achievement of the project strategic objective. Projects were set up in district siloes and there was no meaningful engagement with provincial and national government to support scaling up of a consolidated model. Given the project resources and the strategic objective of the project, it would have been more appropriate to select a smaller number of sites in closer proximity to each other for greater critical mass and project learning.

The separate contracting arrangements between Dubai Cares and the three WISE partners was not appropriate. With all partners having their own lines of accountability directly and only to Dubai Cares, the project lacked a clear management structure.

Moreover, the partnership design gave partners overlapping technical and implementing roles in all project districts. In this case, it would have been preferable if each implementing organization had full technical and implementation responsibility for a distinct geographic target area.

4.2. Efficiency of implementation

The ET concludes that the costs incurred to implement the WISE project are realistic and that, within design and implementation constraints, the WISE project has been a moderately efficient operation. Activities were implemented with high levels of dedication and professional skill, but there was efficiency loss due to a weak formal management structure and associated high transaction costs for day-to-day coordination among and within partner organizations.

With necessary revisions to project work plans and a short extension, partners were able to complete most project activities by the end of 2013, with the exception of some construction activities. Timeliness of implementation by individual partners is satisfactory in recognition of the implementation challenges experienced. There was regular internal coordination through the project management meetings organized in Jakarta to keep partners updated on activity progress of each organization. However, effective corrective action at the overall project level was limited and alignment between among activities went off track. This resulted in too much time between hygiene training and facility construction, which undermined the coherency of the WISE intervention set. The ET concludes that partners were too focused on the need to keep their own activities on track and deliver on their own contracts. There was not enough attention at the project level to the need to reorganize planning of all partners combined to ensure better complementarity and coherency among the partner activities. In lieu of a formalized project management structure, this should have been the responsibility of Dubai Cares.

Project resources were distributed appropriately across facility construction and hygiene promotion activities, with the majority going to construction activities. The ET concludes that the WISE partners were successful in navigating the procurement challenges and in doing so have developed a good model for school-based construction. Quality of hygiene promotion activities was satisfactory but could have been improved with a better design. The ET findings regarding the design of hygiene promotion activities are discussed in section 4.2. The ET finds the ‘little doctor’ activities to not be cost effective.

4.3. Effectiveness

Project activity targets were largely met and the ET has verified the outputs reported by the partners. The combined project interventions have generated the desired results at a level that can reasonably expected of a three-year project of this size. The overall

impact of the WISE program was positive, despite design and implementation challenges. Similar levels of results were achieved across the program when taking into account the differential factors among the four project provinces.

The program has made an important contribution to the improvement of the wellbeing of children through the integration of water and sanitation facilities, and hygiene activities in primary schools. In the six program districts across the 4 target provinces in Eastern Indonesia, WISE has catalyzed broader awareness and action by schools and government agencies on the importance of WASH in schools. Through the experience gained in WISE, government has integrated WASH awareness in school curricula across the project districts, including schools not directly targeted in WISE. At district level, WASH has been integrated into various strategies and planning processes, including specific budget allocation to scaling up WASH activities through the WISE model. WISE has also helped catalyze implementation of the national STBM program in project districts through its school-level interventions and local government capacity building. At national level, WISE guidelines informed development of the Clean and Healthy schools program, have contributed to an improved monitoring framework to map WASH in schools through EMIS, and improved awareness among government departments of importance of school interventions to achieve MDG targets for water and sanitation.

WISE activities reached almost 70,000 students in 450 schools. At school level, quantitative and qualitative data shows that students demonstrate improved knowledge of WASH practices. Observation shows techniques are generally carried out correctly in schools where WASH facilities are fully functional. Local health workers further indicated some evidence of improved health among students as a result of improved hygiene practices. At community level, the reach of WISE was limited and did not catalyze significant changes in WASH awareness or action. This is largely due to lack of comprehensive engagement by WISE with community leadership and as the limited community reach of parent associations. However, parents of children in WISE schools did acknowledge improved WASH practices in the home, which has a positive influence on other household members.

WISE constructed toilets and hand washing facilities in 450 schools. Where necessary, investments were also made to improve water supply, although verification surveys ensured that most of the schools had pre-existing and functional water infrastructure. It is important to note that in several cases, community members and schools elaborated on the low-cost design and co-financed construction of these facilities. In general, the facilities were well constructed, child and gender friendly, and well maintained. School staff pro-actively identified maintenance issues although identifying funding for this remains problematic due to unclear government guidelines. Funds for maintenance in many schools was structurally included in school budgets, although some confusions remains on whether it is formally allowed to use BOS funds for this. Some progress was made in improving school waste management practices, mainly regular classroom cleaning and only limited examples of more advanced initiatives like recycling. School

staff demonstrated improved knowledge of WASH in schools and integrated WASH in their lesson plans. Messaging was only to a minor extent supported through the little doctor program.

Coordination at district level through the AMPL notably improved with direct attribution to WISE program activities. Working relationships among AMPL members contributed to better planning and budget allocation processes beyond the WISE program domain. Improvements at national level are more limited. Coordination remained based on personal relationships, which was negatively affected by regular government staff turnover. Awareness among government representatives improved but there are limited improvements to inter-department institutional arrangements. This compromised effective decision-making around scaling up WASH in schools within existing policy frameworks. There was also limited understanding at national level of the practicalities of WISE model implementation. This was largely due to limited channels for effective communication and coordination between national- and district-level government stakeholders within the WISE program. The WISE final publication was of high quality and is an important stepping-stone to achieve the project strategic objective. However, additional targeted efforts will be needed to facilitate adoption of the WISE model in government decision-making for meaningful scale. The ET does note that the final workshop in February 2014 did show high levels of commitment from Province level officials to continue and expand the WISE approach and learning.

When assessing the impact and effectiveness of the WISE program, it is essential to take into account the general ambition and the complex operating environment of the program. The program selected remote and far apart project sites, including a mix of geographic areas with each selected province that made implementation even more time-consuming and costly. Moreover, the program was undertaken in underserved areas with local governments not yet fully habituated to working with international partners on the issue of WASH in schools, which at the time was just emerging as a topic of policy attention. It is also important to note the relatively high turnover in program staff and government counterparts, which affected institutional memory and relationships. Moreover, the formal partnership arrangements were not appropriate or conducive to efficient and effective implementation. The ET commends the WISE partners for delivering positive results under challenging circumstances.

4.4. Sustainability

Key sustainability aspects for the various WISE project components and overall results are the following: the continued utilization and maintenance of the WASH facilities, the continuation of AMPL meetings at district and national level with a continued focus on WASH in schools, the continuation of mutually reinforcing hygiene promotion activities in schools by school staff, parents, students and local government workers.

It is important to note here that the WISE project does not have a clear exit or continuation strategy, and that the concluding workshops with local government had limited added value to government action to support WISE schools beyond what had already been achieved through out the project.¹¹ In general, the ET finds that local government will take a reactive/passive approach, if at all, to supporting WISE schools. The ET concludes that WISE efforts to ensure continuation of key activities and promote sustainability of project results were insufficient.

The ET concludes that the potential for continued utilization and maintenance of the WASH facilities is high. The majority of schools have capacity to manage minor maintenance issues and to fund these through the BOS, with additional support possible through fund raising with the local community. In case of larger repairs that cannot be financed through the BOS, schools can reach out to the AMPL for special support.

Under the project, the district AMPLs met more frequently than before. The ET concludes that the potential for continuation of regular district AMPL meetings is medium to low. The ET finds that in many districts the frequency of AMPL meetings dropped immediately after the WISE support through AMPL facilitators ended. The contracts of the AMPL facilitators have ended and their institutional memory has been lost. MPL members indicated that without additional support, the level of effort on WASH in schools will decrease over time and the momentum gained through the WISE project will be lost.

At national level, the AMPL meetings will continue but the focus on WASH in schools will be lost without additional support. The WISE progress in making WASH in schools an important issue for the national AMPL was insufficient to expect this to sustain. At the time of the evaluation, the ET concludes that only the first seeds have been sown and much more needs to be done to foster meaningful collaboration between national-level government stakeholders.

The ET concludes that the potential for continuation of mutually reinforcing hygiene promotion activities in schools is medium. There will be a number of schools where activities have matured sufficiently to continue without external support. Such schools will typically be those that have participated in clean school competitions or have received some external recognition for their activities. In schools where the results of WISE activities have not yet come to full fruition, additional follow up will be required to ensure sustainability of hygiene promotion activities. In schools where these activities are not continued, the ET expects the hygiene behaviour improvement will be reversible.

¹¹ The ET does note that as per the WISE final workshop (2014) there was province level commitment to expanding the work to other Districts via the Govt system and mechanisms

Finally, the ET concludes that further scaling up or out of project results, beyond the levels found at the time of the evaluation, will not be achieved without additional and targeted support to promote appropriate adaption of the WISE model within current WASH strategies and policies. It is important to note that there remains a short-term window of opportunity in 2014 for WISE to build on its institutional and program investments to promote scale. The main channel for continued WISE engagement is direct technical support to the government agencies involved in decision-making around resource allocation to community and school WASH infrastructure, and school budgets, i.e., by supporting technical facilitators to work closely with national, provincial and district AMPLs.

5. Lessons learned and recommendations

5.1. Recommendations for the WISE model

This section provides lessons learned and subsequent recommendations to improve the WASH in schools model based on the WISE experience.

Recommendation 1: there are relevant and effective institutional systems in schools that should be built on when promoting WASH in schools. There is no need to add additional activities or to reactivate activities that for good reason have not worked in the past. The ET recommends that in future adaptations of the WISE model, partners prioritize building on existing and functional student participation models, like elected class presidents before reactivating the ‘little doctor’ model. Future hygiene promotion should also focus more squarely on strengthening institutional teacher capacity with an enabling environment for ‘little doctor’ activities in a supporting role. Similarly, planning for WASH maintenance should be embedded in the annual school planning process, which also links it more specifically to use of BOS funds. Avoid a separate planning process for WASH in schools; link more directly with existing systems and strengthen where necessary.

Recommendation 2: The role of communities as a key element of the enabling environment for WASH in Schools, as well as the potential additionally of community resources, was mistakenly ignored. The ET recommends that in future adaptations of the WISE model, a specific objective and associated interventions around community engagement are added to the design that at a minimum: (1) use community outreach to reach parents and reinforce behavior change at home, ideally as part of a broader CLTS intervention; (2) draw more explicitly on community capacity to construct and maintain WASH facilities; and (3) engage formal and informal community leaders in planning and implementation processes to maximize synergies with other community functions.

Recommendation 3: resources were distributed among too many target beneficiaries, all of whom were not effective agents of change. The school committees should not be

a primary target group for capacity strengthening on hygiene promotion. Instead, more focus should be placed on training of schools staff with additional coaching in schools. The ET recommends that in future adaptations of the WISE model, hygiene promotion activities (including training, monitoring and reflection) focus on building the institutional capacity in schools to continuously promote behavior change through curricula changes and complementary in-/out-of-school activities.

Recommendation 4: the school cluster meetings were highly effective in reaching other schools through a peer-driven approach. The interaction among teachers that occurred during these meetings also contributed to further improvements in WISE schools. These cluster meetings were the only real platforms for target groups to reflect and learn in the WISE project. The ET recommends that in future adaptations of the WISE model, school cluster meetings receive dedicated support similar to the role of facilitators in the AMPL meetings.

Recommendation 5: organizing the construction of WASH facilities through local government or international development partners is a resource-intensive process. Instead, where there is sufficient capacity among local technical and education counterparts and schools, a more appropriate model is to have schools directly undertake the procurement and construction process with local labor. This engages the community better, builds strong ownership for future maintenance, and is more cost effective. However, caution will be needed to ensure that schools do not directly engage local contractors and thereby undermine local community participation. The ET recommends that in future adaptations of the WISE model, Bappeda transfers funds for construction directly to schools after government approval of facility construction plans. Schools should then manage all subsequent aspects of the procurement construction process with oversight from AMPL, including the raising of additional funds, if necessary.

5.2. Recommendations for Dubai Cares and the WISE partners

This section provides recommendation for Dubai Cares and the WISE partners for action in the short term to consolidate the WISE work done to date and maximize potential for scaling up, where funding is available, and to inform design of future projects.

Recommendation 6: the support provided to the district AMPLs through the WISE-sponsored facilitators was highly effective in creating an enabling environment for WISE implementation and potential scaling up. However, scaling up will not occur without continued mobilization of district AMPL members and additional support to provincial AMPL. The ET recommends that Dubai Cares and the WISE partners prioritize funding continued support of district and provincial AMPL facilitators to strategically scale up the WISE model in selected areas, taking into account the other recommendations in this section. This low-cost intervention will directly support consolidation of gains achieved to date and will provide a model for further scaling up of WASH in schools.

Recommendation 7: schools will not maintain WASH facilities if there is no dedicated funding source to pay for the cost of repairs. Despite progress in allowing use of BOS for facility maintenance at local government level, current regulations are still unclear. This is confusing to local government and school officials and will undermine the effectiveness of the WASH investments as the condition of facilities deteriorates. The ET recommends that WISE partners intensify work with national government counterparts, specifically the Ministry of Education, to revise the current BOS directives for WASH facility maintenance.

Recommendation 8: the tri-partite partnership and contractual arrangements were not appropriate or effective, and had a negative impact on project results. The partnership arrangements should be tailored to the project design; future project may require different types of partnerships. However, for future multi-partner projects similar to WISE, the ET recommends to identify a lead partner who has overall responsibility for management and coordination. Technical and implementing partners should then be organized under the lead partner. It is also recommended to identify separate partners for project-wide technical and site-specific implementation roles, if that division of labor is applicable. Where possible, an implementing partner should have full responsibility for all activities within a specific geographic area, and a technical partner should have a degree of responsibility for quality assurance. Geographic overlap among partners should be avoided unless responsibilities are distinct and coherency is proactively managed. All contracts should reference a common program framework, and clearly stipulate roles, responsibilities and internal accountability arrangements.

Recommendation 9: a proper M&E framework was missing from the WISE design and the M&E system was under resourced. There was also no learning strategy to guide partners in their documentation efforts and information utilization. This was a major oversight in any project, but especially in a project that seeks to develop an evidence-based model for scaling up and especially for project financed and undertaken by experienced development organizations. In all future projects, the ET recommends that the M&E framework is developed as an integral part of the iterative causal design process and is closely linked to the overall theory of change that guides project contributions to longer-term program goals. It should not be a consultant output, as was the case for WISE. For projects that have a specific learning or proof-of-concept objectives, the ET further recommends to have additional metrics to track progress towards those objectives.

Recommendation 10: while the overall design at objective level was conceptually sound, the detailed intervention design was of lesser quality. One main reason for this is that the project resources were spread too thinly across too many project sites that were too far apart. The project design was not realistic within the available resources. The ET recommends that future project designs be developed in closer cooperation with government and local actors to ensure proper grounding of the design in field realities.

Recommendation 11: the WISE model has high potential to support the Government of Indonesia in scaling up WASH in schools. However, government stakeholders were not presented with an evidence-based model to inform their decision making until the very end of the project. This was too late. The ET recommends that future projects develop and maintain a comprehensive advocacy strategy that matches available evidence throughout the project timeframe with relevant advocacy opportunities. The strategic information, i.e., the implementation evidence, produced by the program must be purposive and well documented, and there must be effective channels for feeding this information into relevant advocacy opportunities at multiple levels in a timely manner.

Annexes

- Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the evaluation
- Annex 2: Inception report: revised baseline/endline comparison analysis
- Annex 3: Timetable
- Annex 4: List of meetings
- Annex 5: List of documents reviewed
- Annex 6: Research instruments
- Annex 7: Program logical framework and progress towards indicators
- Annex 8: Short biographies of the Evaluation Team