

TAG Technical Note Number 7

United Nations Development Programme
Interregional Project INT/81/047
Executing Agency: World Bank

Community-Based Workshops for Evaluating and Planning Sanitation Programs: A Case Study of Primary Schools Sanitation in Lesotho

By Piers Cross, Technology Advisory Group



A joint United Nations Development Programme
and World Bank Contribution to the International
Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade

PREFACE

The Lesotho Primary Schools Sanitation Project, undertaken in 1976-79, had limited success. When a follow-up project was proposed, it was decided to hold workshops in two typical districts affected, to find out the community's views on how the follow-up project should be designed. This paper, "Community-Based Workshops for Evaluating and Planning Sanitation Programs: A Case Study of Primary Schools Sanitation in Lesotho" by Piers Cross, describes the results of those workshops held in March 1981, and the fairly radical changes which, in consequence, were made in the original project concept.

This paper is one of a series of informal Working Papers prepared by TAG ^{1/} on various aspects of water supply and sanitation programs in developing countries. The papers were originally prepared as internal discussion documents; their wider distribution does not imply endorsement by the sector agencies, governments or donor agencies concerned with the programs, nor by the World Bank or the United Nations Development Programme. Comments and suggestions on the papers should be addressed to the Project Manager, UNDP Project INT/81/047, Water Supply and Urban Department, at the World Bank, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington D.C., 20433.

Richard N. Middleton
Project Manager

COMMUNITY HEALTH CELL
326, V Main, I Block
Koramangala
Bangalore-560034
India

^{1/} TAG: The Technology Advisory Group established under UNDP's Global Project GLO/78/006, executed by the World Bank; in January 1982 this project was renumbered INT/81/047.

ACRONYMS

GOL	Government of Lesotho
LDTC	Lesotho Distance Teaching Center (in MESC)
LEHCo-op	Lesotho Low-Cost Housing Co-operative
LEC	Lesotho Evangelical Church
MCRD	Ministry of Cooperatives and Rural Development
MESC	Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture
MOHSW	Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
PSSP	Primary Schools Sanitation Project
RCM	Roman Catholic Mission
TAG	Technology Advisory Group operating under UNDP Interregional Project INT/81/047 (Executing Agency: The World Bank)
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

Currency Equivalents

Fiscal Year

Local unit of currency: Maloti

April 1-March 31

100 s(cents) = M1 (one Maloti)

M1 = US\$0.96

Country, People and Language

Lesotho = the country

Basotho = the people

Mosotho = a single inhabitant Sesotho = the language

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1	FOREWORD
2	1. INTRODUCTION
3	2. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE
4	3. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
5	4. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
6	5. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
7	6. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
8	7. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
9	8. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
10	9. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
11	10. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE

TABLE

1	1. INTRODUCTION
2	2. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
3	3. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
4	4. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
5	5. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
6	6. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
7	7. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
8	8. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
9	9. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE
10	10. THE SCOPE OF THE COURSE

SUMMARY

1. The Lesotho Primary Schools Sanitation Project (PSSP), assisted by United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) and undertaken between 1976 and 1979, had limited success. The Technology Advisory Group (TAG) was invited by UNCDF to assist UNCDF and Government of Lesotho (GOL) in developing proposals for reactivating the project and improving its impact. As part of this work TAG organized two district-based one-day primary schools sanitation workshops. These workshops are of interest for two reasons: (a) they helped GOL planners and the UNCDF consultants to improve the PSSP through evaluating school and community experiences under the earlier phase of this project, identifying needs and preferences in the project areas and assisting in planning future initiatives; and (b) they provided a replicable planning procedure which involves community representatives who have intimate knowledge of the local situation and whose ideas and experiences can help identify viable solutions.

2. The participants in the workshops included school and community representatives from fifteen rural schools which had been included in the earlier PSSP, together with district and Central Government representatives. Participants were divided into three groups to discuss: technical design; construction, maintenance, cleaning and emptying; and latrine usage and health education needs. They had decided ideas about acceptable and practical improvements that could be made if the PSSP was reactivated, and many workshop recommendations presented radical departures from the approaches used in the earlier PSSP.

3. The workshops concluded that substantive changes should be made to the existing designs, for example:

- individual latrines should be provided instead of communal latrine blocks;
- latrines should be provided with seats rather than squat slabs;
- latrines should be located closer to classrooms, otherwise children will continue to use traditional defecation sites; and
- emptying of latrine pits, when full, is impractical, so latrines must be designed to be readily relocated.

4. In addition, more latrines are needed (to cope with crowding during school breaks); smaller children need to be reassured that the latrines are safe and that they are in no danger of falling into the pit (which implies better structural design and provision of mini-seats); and latrines for younger children should be separated from those for the older children.

5. Few teachers or community representatives had the skills to build safe and sanitary latrines, although they were prepared to help this work to the extent of their ability. Self-help labor by itself was felt to be an inadequate method of project implementation. Extra technical assistance in construction and maintenance was considered important.

6. To improve school hygiene generally, it was agreed that water supply and washing facilities should be provided at the same time as the latrines, and a hygiene education program implemented (aimed particularly at the children, but also reaching village chiefs, teachers and parents), the target being to eliminate specific unhygienic practices at school and at home.

7. Recognizing the difficulty in controlling misuse of the latrines by outsiders when there are no other latrines available, and the contradiction in teaching children about better hygiene when they have no latrines at home, the workshops also concluded that the program should be closely linked to the government's more general efforts in rural sanitation.

8. These workshops provided government planners and UNCDF consultants with first-hand information on community preferences, and enabled them to test out many hypotheses derived from the sociocultural evaluation (ref. 2).^{1/} Almost all the recommendations of the workshops, particularly those affecting technical design and the development of educational and promotional activities, were included in a proposal on school sanitation submitted by GOL for UNCDF consideration (ref. 1).

9. Community-based workshops are a planning procedure which may have applications in other development contexts. They are relatively low in cost, do not require a great deal of preparation and are of short duration. Such workshops are not a substitute for other forms of community participation but may be used as an intermediary device to enhance project design and demonstrate the benefits of community involvement to central planners. While the Lesotho workshops centered on discussion of an earlier phase of a project this need not always be the case. They can also be used for initial assessment of community preferences and resources and for ensuring that the people the project will serve become involved in and enthusiastic about it.

^{1/} References are listed in Annex VII.

I. WORKSHOP ORIGIN AND OBJECTIVES

1.1 In Lesotho there are about 1,080 primary schools, largely run by the missions. These schools are in general poorly equipped and in chronic disrepair. Most lack adequate classrooms, storage, kitchens, water and sanitation facilities (a brief overview of the primary schools in Lesotho is given in Annex II).

1.2 In 1976 the Government of Lesotho (GOL), assisted by the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), embarked on the Primary Schools Sanitation Project (PSSP), a three-year project intended to improve sanitation in 600 primary schools. By the end of 1978 it was clear that the program was in severe difficulties; two evaluations (ref. 3 and 4) found that, although a great deal of the project funds had been spent, only 86 latrines had actually been built, and about half of those were in disrepair (see Annex III for further details).

1.3 GOL therefore requested UNCDF to consider providing additional assistance to overcome the problems being experienced in the PSSP. UNCDF sent an appraisal mission, staffed by the Technology Advisory Group (TAG), to recommend the best ways to reactivate the program. It was evident that one reason for the problems with PSSP was that project design had taken insufficient account of local needs, conditions and preferences. GOL and UNCDF placed great emphasis on these aspects when considering reactivating the project, and TAG undertook, as part of the appraisal work, a sociocultural evaluation of PSSP (ref. 2) as well as organizing the community-based workshops described in this paper.

1.4 The immediate objectives of the workshops were:

- (a) to learn from the communities concerned about their experiences with PSSP;
- (b) to obtain their recommendations on the planning, design, implementation and operation and maintenance of any latrines to be provided under a renewed program; and
- (c) to find out whether they saw the need for other inputs (such as better water supplies or hygiene education programs) to complement the latrine program.

1.5 Program evaluation and planning in Lesotho, and in the sector generally, have traditionally been the sole responsibility of centralized planning units. An ancillary objective of the workshops was to test a model of community-based planning to off-set the 'top down' bias in development planning. This reflects the emphasis given to community participation in water and sanitation programs in the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (1981-1990).

COMMUNITY HEALTH CELL
326, V Main. I Block
Koramangala
Bangalore-560034
India

II. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORKSHOPS

2.1 Two district-based, one-day primary schools sanitation workshops, funded by UNCDF and hosted by GOL, were held in Lesotho in March 1981: on March 24 at the Leribe Farmers Training Center, Leribe District, and on March 26 at the Mophato Conference Center, Morija, in Maseru District. A list of participants is in Annex II. Invitations to each workshop were sent to school and community representatives of 15 primary schools. Participants were invited from schools which were within reasonable reach of the workshop centers and which had received latrines through PSSP. (Schools without latrines were deliberately not included, in order to avoid stimulating a demand which government might not be able to meet; a copy of the letter of invitation is in Annex IV.) Other participants included representatives from central and district offices of the Ministries of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC) and Health and Social Welfare (MOHSW), both of which hosted the workshops; representatives from the Central Planning and Development Office; representatives from District Administrations; and the UNCDF Primary Schools Sanitation appraisal mission.

2.2 A workshop agenda is in Annex V. Workshops were opened by District Coordinators and introductory addresses given by representatives from MOHSW and MESC. The Urban Sanitation Coordinator, Ministry of Interior, gave a brief explanatory address on the importance of sanitation, and the Chief Health Educator, MOHSW, chairman at both workshops, explained the purpose and proposed structure of the workshops.

2.3 The main work of the day was carried out by dividing the participants into three discussion groups, dealing respectively with:

- A. Technical design.
- B. Construction, maintenance, cleaning and emptying.
- C. Latrine usage and health education needs.

The discussion groups were asked to draw on their own experience of sanitation in schools in Lesotho and, within their topic, to identify problems, possible solutions and responsibility for appropriate action. Each group reported back its findings, leading to a discussion of future policy suggestions. The workshop was concluded by the Chief Health Educator, MOHSW.

2.4 Workshops were well attended by school, community and government representatives. Addresses and discussions were mainly in Sesotho.

III. FINDINGS OF THE WORKSHOPS

3.1 Sanitation is not the most pressing need in primary schools, but all participants in the workshops were concerned about the inadequacies of school water supply and latrines and so joined in the group discussion with alacrity; many had definite ideas about the acceptability of alternative types of sanitation and were able to contribute constructively to program design.

3.2 The detailed findings of each group discussion are summarized in Annex VI.

Technical Design

3.3 The participants considered that the present designs did not meet the essential criteria of providing privacy, safety and comfort. Suggested changes in the present designs included:

- (a) to provide greater privacy:
 - fit doors;
 - improve cubicle dividers;
 - provide individual latrines rather than communal units.
- (b) to improve structural stability and safety:
 - provide concrete foundations;
 - line latrine pits;
 - construct smaller pits and superstructures.
- (c) to improve comfort:
 - provide seats instead of squat plates;
 - provide various types of seats to suit children of various ages.
- (d) to improve hygiene generally:
 - provide boys' urinals;
 - provide sufficient seats to cater for levels of usage at school breaks;
 - design latrines with movable superstructures so that they can be relocated easily and promptly when the pits become full.

Construction and Maintenance

3.4 Participants at both workshops emphasized the need for greater technical assistance in constructing latrines, and for construction procedures which reflected the resources and commitment of the villagers as a whole.

- (a) Siting: Latrines need to be close to schools; a combination of local knowledge of soil conditions and outside technical advice should lead to selection of more suitable sites than in the past.
- (b) Construction: Few teachers or interested parents know how to construct secure, hygienic structures; they are willing to participate in the work, but need additional technical guidance. Self-help labor by itself was felt to be inadequate (and some tasks, such as difficult excavation, are too hard for the children to do); it was suggested that local builders, under the supervision of MCRD, could provide the necessary technical advice and carry out particularly difficult work. One group mentioned that schools may already be in a delicate position with their local communities (who may resent the level of fees or the school's use of local resources), and that the school cannot ask too much by way of community participation.
- (c) Maintenance: Participants were unanimous that children should continue to clean latrines, but felt that teachers should supervise this more closely and that cleaning materials should be provided. It was also agreed that toilet paper (e.g., scrap paper from the school itself) should be provided. Routine structural maintenance was seen as a problem that the villages could not deal with themselves, because of lack of skills and the high cost of materials and tools. No clear solution emerged from the workshops, except a feeling that GOL should develop a maintenance capability in each village (from this, in the project proposal, emerged the recommendation for a school workshop with a skilled caretaker, who would undertake maintenance of all school facilities and train the children in the use of tools).
- (d) Emptying: Emptying full latrines was generally regarded as impractical; latrine pits and super-structures should be relocated when the pits become full [see 3.3 (d) above].

Latrine Usage and Health Education Needs

3.5 Latrine usage should be greatly encouraged by the recommended changes in design (para. 3.3), by siting the latrines closer to schools and keeping them clean (para. 3.4), and by improving the structural stability of the units. These changes should overcome a number of current problems:

- the use of traditional defecation sites (dongas - erosion gullies), which are closer to the schools than the latrines;

- the widespread fear of falling into the pits^{1/}; and
- the wide age range of children using communal latrines, which leads to elder children bullying the younger ones, and to younger children fouling latrines used by their elders.

3.6 The provision of latrines, by itself, will not necessarily have a significant impact on the health of the community. The participants recognized the need, in addition, for:

- (a) water supplies and washing facilities at the schools; and
- (b) a hygiene education program directed particularly at children (but also at chiefs and parents).

3.7 School facilities are often the objects of vandalism and misuse by outsiders, particularly when the school is situated near a public facility such as a bus stop, church or secondary school without facilities, or over the school holidays when no staff are present. Suggested solutions to this problem include:

- (a) the promotion of rural sanitation in the villages, so there are latrines more generally available (this is also desirable on other grounds: having instilled into children at school the need for better hygiene and sanitation, they should not have to return to a house with no facilities for this);
- (b) closer collaboration between schools, missions and chiefs;
- (c) the appointment of someone to care for schools when teachers do not live on the school site.

^{1/} In many countries, the squat slabs have not always been built adequately, and villagers have an inherited fear that the slab will collapse under them and they may fall into the exposed pit.

IV. IMPLEMENTING THE FINDINGS OF THE WORKSHOPS

4.1 The workshop findings played a considerable part in shaping the design of the GOL/UNCDF proposal (ref. 1) for further development of primary school sanitation in Lesotho. The workshops gave GOL and UNCDF planners first-hand insight into community and school attitudes, knowledge and practices with regard to sanitation, and provided a forum in which to test out hypotheses derived from the results of the sociocultural evaluation (ref. 2).

4.2 The final appraisal report and project design were undertaken by GOL and UNCDF planners. The decision on whether to accept or reject each workshop proposal was made on the basis of the logic and force of the recommendation; the degree of general agreement in the workshop on its validity; the extent to which it was confirmed in the sociocultural evaluation; and its feasibility in the light of other planning constraints.

4.3 The findings of the workshops were most useful in describing preferred patterns of latrine usage, in suggesting socially-acceptable modifications to sanitation technologies, and in describing problems of social control of school facilities and relations between communities and schools. For example, the most important specific finding to be adopted in the GOL/UNCDF proposal was that individual latrines with child seats and movable superstructures should be used, in place of the existing immovable communal latrines with squatting slabs. Workshop findings also confirmed the need to support self-help resources by training local builders, and to establish a local system of maintenance and caretaking. Key complementary inputs - improved water supply to the schools and a hygiene education program - were also incorporated in the final proposal.

4.4 The workshops were least useful in proposing clear ministerial responsibilities. School and community representatives knew little of the breakdown of ministerial responsibilities, and the assignment of responsibility for future actions proposed in Annex VI was arbitrary and largely prompted by the GOL representatives.

V. THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY-BASED WORKSHOPS IN DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

5.1 Community-based workshops, similar to those described in this paper, may make a valuable contribution in a variety of development contexts. As a means of obtaining community inputs into the planning and design of development projects they have a number of advantages:

- (a) Low-cost. The sanitation workshops cost US\$12 per head (US\$400 per workshop) for transport, hire of workshop facilities, and food for a mid-day meal and other refreshments.
- (b) Minimal planning/preparation time. The preparation time for the workshops was five weeks, thus allowing time for discussions with planning and administrative authorities, the preparation of invitations and workshop materials and a field trip to each site to confirm local arrangements.
- (c) Short duration. The one-day workshops caused minimal disruption to the activities of civil servants or participants and allowed great flexibility in timing and organization.

5.2 For the workshops to be effective, careful attention must be paid to a number of points:

- (a) Site selection:

The workshop location must be convenient for the key participants, and the venue must be one which will not inhibit free expression of opinions.

- (b) Participant selection:

Detailed knowledge of likely key program issues, followed by a preliminary field trip, should enable the workshop planners to ensure that the participants are reasonably representative of the various interested parties.

- (c) Workshop management:

In a short workshop, care must be taken to explain clearly, to both officials and community representatives, the specific purposes of the planning exercise, and to steer group discussions accordingly. It may be difficult to encourage the frame of mind in which the community representatives believe that they can have a major impact on program design, or in which local officials see themselves as listeners rather than managers.

5.3 A precondition of the usefulness of community workshops is that central government should be committed to incorporating community views into development strategies. Lesotho has so far had limited experience in community-based planning, but it is hoped that these workshops can themselves be a force for change, by demonstrating the effectiveness of planning with the community, particularly in an activity such as low-cost sanitation in which local-level perceptions are critical to project success.

5.4 Community-based workshops are by no means a complete answer to the need for community participation, and can have the danger of being used as a token endorsement of the principle of planning with the community. A government committed to community planning might use the workshop forum as a medium through which a community would themselves take the principal planning decisions affecting local development. In situations where this is not immediately possible, community-based workshops on the model of the Lesotho primary school sanitation workshops may be an intermediate step to improve the effectiveness of project design.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTSLERIBE WORKSHOP

<u>Name</u>	<u>Designation</u>
L. Mokhachane	District Coordinator, Ministry of Interior
M. Petlane	Chief Health Educator, MOHSW
M. Ntsane	District Education Officer, MESC
B. Jackson	Urban Sanitation Coordinator, Ministry of Interior
L. Nkunyane	Health Assistant, MOHSW
T. Mosoang	Senior Health Educator, MOHSW
E. Molefi	Health Assistant, MOHSW
M. Makhetha	Health Inspector, MOHSW
G. Mohobori	Teacher, Subeng Primary School
L. Tsae	Teacher, Tsikoane Primary School (ACL)
L. Khoarai	Teacher, Khanyane Primary School
M. Malebo	Community Representative, Khanyane Primary School
R. Lehloaea	Teacher, Qoqolosing Primary School (LEC)
M. Morallana	Teacher, Nqechane Primary School (LEC)
A. Molapo	Community Representative, Nqechane Primary School (LEC)
C. Nyamane	Teacher, Nqechane Primary School (RC)
S. Mokhachane	Teacher, Mpharane Primary School (ACL)
P. Hlapisi	Teacher, Jonathan Community School
J. Molapo	Community Representative, Jonathan Community School
S. Ntaso	Teacher, Mpharane Primary School
P. Ntlaoe	Community Representative, Qoqolosing Primary School (LEC)
S. Becker	TAG/UNCDF Consultant
P. Cross	TAG/UNCDF Consultant
G. Read	TAG/UNCDF Consultant

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTSMORIJA WORKSHOP

<u>Name</u>	<u>Designation</u>
P. Atoro	District Coordinator, Ministry of Interior
M. Petlane	Chief Health Educator, MOHSW
M. Sekese	District Education Officer, MESC
P. Soqaka	District Education Officer, MESC
P. Fanana	Senior Planner, Central Planning Office
M. Makhetha	Health Inspector, MOHSW
A. Hartwell	Educational Planning Advisor, MESC
W. Moholisa	District Education Officer, MESC
B. Jackson	Urban Sanitation Coordinator, Ministry of Interior
G. Gatchlian	Program Officer, UNDP
K. Eibert	Resident Program Officer, UNICEF
L. Nkunyane	Health Assistant, MOHSW
C. Makhanya	Assistant Teacher, Motse Primary School
P. Lekoeke	Head Teacher, Motse Primary School
P. Cekwane	Head Teacher, St. Louis Primary School
D. Sekonyana	Head Teacher, Leqetsona Primary School
R. Maloisane	Head Teacher, Mahoetje Primary School
E. Ramalefane	School Manager, Tlametlu Primary School
R. Talanyane	Assistant Teacher, Morija Primary School
S. Motsetsela	Head Teacher, Litlapeng Primary School
S. Rampai	Community Representative, Litlapeng Primary School
P. Makhabu	Community Representative, St. Joseph's Primary School
P. Nkunyane	Head Teacher, Sebelekoane Primary School
M. Petje	Assistant Teacher, St. Louis Primary School
M. Moshoeshoe	Head Teacher, Molungoa Primary School
M. Sejanamane	Assistant Teacher, St. Peter Claver Primary School (RCM)
M. Letsie	Head Teacher, Maholi Primary School
M. Chile	Community Representative, St. Joseph's Primary School
M. Chopho	Community Representative Molungoa Primary School
M. Mataboe	Community Representative, Molungoa Primary School
E. Makhomo	Head Teacher, Botsoela Primary School
M. Challa	Head Teacher, Lehahaneng Primary School
E. Sibeko	Head Teacher, Ramokoatse Primary School
P. Mokolokho	Community Member, Tlametlu Primary School
E. Bofelo	Assistant Teacher, Maholi Primary School
J. Jane	Head Teacher, Emmaus Primary School
G. Read	TAG/UNCDF Consultant
P. Cross	TAG/UNCDF Consultant
S. Becker	TAG/UNCDF Consultant

PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN LESOTHO

2.1 At independence, Lesotho inherited an extensive network of primary schools established and controlled by Christian missions. Of the 1,080 primary schools in the country (1979) over 90% remain under the control of the missions, predominantly the Roman Catholic Mission (RCM) and the Lesotho Evangelical Church (LEC). While the number of schools has actually declined in recent years, enrolments and the number of classes have increased. The sizes of primary schools vary greatly: the larger schools, mainly in the lowlands, have over 1,000 pupils, while many schools have less than 100 pupils, particularly in the mountains. The mean primary school size is estimated to be about 250. Lesotho has a very high rate of participation in primary schools, and, as a result, has a literacy rate of approximately 60%, which is among the highest in Africa.

2.2 The Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture (MESC) which has the responsibility for developing primary school education, involves the missions in planning educational policy, and supports the primary schools by providing services which improve the quality of education; the government contribution comprises the training and payment of teachers, the development of curricula and setting of examinations, the improvement of physical facilities and the provision of supervisory services through an inspectorate. The schools are, however, owned, controlled and managed by the missions. Management is in theory exercised through Parish Councils who employ School Managers; each School Manager is often responsible for a number of schools. Schools are expected to have a School Committee to liaise with parents and the local community; membership generally includes a teacher and leading members of the congregation.

2.3 The existing system has the following weaknesses:

- (a) The responsibility for school management is unclear, and MESC has not always been able to provide adequate support to school staff; this has frequently led to mismanagement. There is, for example, no adequate policy on the maintenance of school facilities, or on the requirements for auditing the school accounts.
- (b) Relations between MESC and school managers are ill-defined and loosely coordinated, with the result that the style and quality of school management varies widely and is beyond the control of MESC.
- (c) Primary school attendance is high in the early grades and for girls only. Almost 60% of schools do not offer the full course from Standards 1 to 7, and the drop-out rate is particularly high for boys, principally because many are needed as herdboys. As a result, the primary school population contains approximately 60% girls.

- (d) The number of repeaters is considerable, so that primary schools have an age range of between five and eighteen years. Thirty-five percent of the total enrolment is over twelve years old.
- (e) Notwithstanding the establishment of the National Teachers Training College, there is still a large shortfall in the number of teachers. The primary school pupil:teacher ratio remains high (about 50:1), and approximately 35% of primary school teachers are unqualified.
- (f) The physical condition of primary schools in Lesotho is very poor. There is a severe shortage of classrooms and those in use are in poor repair. In 1980, 63% of primary school classes were judged to be inadequately housed (ref. 5). In the past five years, the number of classrooms has remained constant, while the total enrolment has increased by 14,000. The 1979 pupil/classroom of 83:1 is one of the worst in Africa, and in many schools there are over 150 children in a single room (in many cases this is a church, which doubles as a classroom during the week). There are about twice as many classes as classrooms, and many classes are always conducted in the open air. There is also a shortage of desks, tables, blackboards and other teaching aids. For example, 40% of pupils sit on the floor and another 27% are inadequately seated. In addition, a 1981 survey (ref. 5, p. 10) of facilities in 182 primary schools found the following deficiencies:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Percentage Schools in which Facility is Inadequate</u>
Cooking utensils	83%
Storage facilities	71%
Adequate water source	57%
Kitchens	40%
Eating utensils	31%

Furthermore, the report suggests that the schools' gardening program, which has an inadequate crop performance, is a cause for national concern.

- (g) It is estimated that only between 180 and 200 ^{1/} primary schools (16-18%) have latrines of any description, and most of these are either unsafe or not in use.

^{1/} In 1974, there were reportedly about 100-120 in the country and the Primary Schools Sanitation Program constructed a further 86.

THE PRIMARY SCHOOLS SANITATION PROJECT (PSSP)

3.1 In 1974 the Government of Lesotho (GOL), the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) embarked on a three-year project to improve sanitation in 600 primary schools and water supplies in 90 primary schools. The project was executed by the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MOHSW) and started in 1976. UNCDF provided capital assistance for the project (\$296,000), UNDP provided technical assistance in the form of a volunteer, the World Health Organization (WHO) gave technical advice to the project, and MOHSW provided administrative support and technical backup. Materials were purchased and delivered to schools, and latrines were then constructed through the efforts of the teachers, children and parents, assisted by the project which supplied tools for construction as well as the materials. Details are contained in the original UNCDF project document (ref. 6).

3.2 By the end of 1978, it was clear that the progress on the project was unsatisfactory. A WHO report (ref. 3), prepared in October 1978, brought out certain shortcomings of the project. The volunteer who was in effect running the project finished his contract in December 1978 and was not replaced. Work on the project was suspended in January 1979, and, apart from inviting interested schools to collect materials and implement projects themselves, no progress has been made since.

3.3 In August 1979, UNDP, at the request of government, instructed a firm of consulting engineers, Binnie and Partners, to prepare a further report on the state of the project (ref. 4). The report found that by July 1979:

- a total of \$258,000 had been spent on the project;
- materials had been delivered to about 206 schools;
- latrines had been built at 86 schools;
- approximately half of those built were in disrepair.

3.4 The principal recommendations of the WHO (Krafft) report (ref. 3) are:

- that manpower in the Environmental Health Section in MOHSW be strengthened;
- that additional project vehicles be provided; and
- that village artisans be paid to assist construction work.

The principal recommendations of the Binnie and Partners' report (ref. 4) are:

- that an autonomous construction group be established in either LEHCo-op or MCRD, the only function of which would be to construct school latrines;
- that alternative latrine designs should be considered (particularly a fiberglass superstructure);
- that self-help be retained; and
- that health inspectors undertake health education.

3.5 Neither report adequately addresses the following issues:

- encouraging children to use the latrines;
- the perceptions of the PSSP by children, teachers and parents;
- proper school management of school facilities, including cleaning and maintaining latrines;
- the appropriateness of self-help; or
- health education needs and strategies.

3.6 In November 1980, after considering the two reports submitted by WHO and Binnie and Partners, government requested that UNCDF reconsider capital assistance to the rural sanitation sector. UNCDF advised GOL that it might consider funding proposals for rural sanitation, subject to government developing and implementing rational proposals for reactivating or rehabilitating the initial program, and specifically investigating the issues outstanding from the previous evaluations. The March 1981 UNCDF appraisal mission, in the course of which the workshops described in this paper were organized, assisted GOL in investigating these issues.

LETTER OF INVITATIONA WORKSHOP ON PRIMARY SCHOOLS SANITATION

Dear:

You are invited to attend a one day workshop to discuss sanitation facilities in primary schools. The workshop is being organized by UNDP consultants who are working with the government to reactivate and extend primary school sanitation in Lesotho. The United Nations have declared 1981-1990 to be the International Drinking Water and Sanitation Decade, the aim of which is, ultimately, to extend the basic human rights of adequate water and sanitation facilities to all people in all countries. The provision of sanitation in schools is a first step, and one that is of fundamental importance to the health and welfare of the children in your school.

The purpose of the workshop is that those planning how best the facilities should be built can hear your views, and your opinions on what needs to be done. Some primary schools have latrines, many of which are poorly designed, unhygienic, dangerous or have collapsed. A few have clean, hygienic, stable latrines. Most primary schools have no latrines at all. Whether or not your school has a latrine we would like to hear of your views on the design of latrines, who should build and pay for them, who should clean and repair them, and how we might encourage children to use them. To plan for the future we need to learn from the past and we would be glad of your attendance and participation at the workshop.

A WORKSHOP AGENDADate:Venue:

- 9:30 Opening by the District Coordinator.
- 9:40 Welcome by Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.
- 9:50 Welcome by Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture.
- 10:00 Introductory address:
 'Sanitation, Health and Hygiene' by the Urban Sanitation
 Coordinator, Ministry of Interior.
- 10:30 'The Purpose of the Workshop' by the Chief Health Educator.
- 10:40 Questions and Discussion.
- 11:00 TEA
- 11:30 Group discussions on: A. Technical Design.
 B. Construction, Maintenance,
 Cleaning and Emptying.
 C. Latrine Usage and Health Education Needs.
- 1:00 LUNCH
- 2:00 Group Reports and Discussion on Future Policy.
- 3:00 Closing Address and Summing Up by the Chief Health Educator.

GROUP DISCUSSION FINDINGSGROUP A: TECHNICAL DESIGNLERIBE WORKSHOP

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>POSSIBLE SOLUTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY:</u>
1. Slabs collapse in pits	- concrete foundations to superstructure - line pits - smaller structures	MCRD Technicians
2. Squatting is inappropriate to young children	- low seats needed for children especially for under-tens	MCRD Technicians
3. Squat hole poorly designed for girls	- seat needed	MCRD Technicians
4. Privacy	- fit doors - better cubicle dividers - single latrines	MCRD Technicians
5. Present structures immovable	- replace slabs with wooden floor	MCRD Technicians
6. Vandalism	- fit locks - encourage rural sanitation	MCRD Technicians MOHSW + MRCD
7. Boys urinate against walls	- construct boys' urinal	MCRD

GROUP A: TECHNICAL DESIGNMORIJA WORKSHOP

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>POSSIBLE SOLUTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY:</u>
1. Privacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- separate older from younger children- cubicle doors- smaller structures	MCRD Technicians
2. Squatting uncomfortable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- seats for older children- small seats for young children- educate youngest to use seats	MCRD Technicians Teachers
3. Vandalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- lock latrines during holidays	MCRD/Teachers
4. Boys urinate against walls	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- construct urinal	MCRD/Teachers
5. Queueing in breaks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- more seats	MCRD

GROUP B: CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, CLEANING AND EMPTYINGLERIBE WORKSHOP

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>POSSIBLE SOLUTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY:</u>
1. Lack of construction skills	- teach skills to teachers/ older boys	MCRD
	- train community work teams	MCRD
2. School/Community relations poor	- establish school committee	School
	- outside assistance in discussions	MCRD/MESC
3. Shallow rock	- skill in site selection	MCRD/MESC
	- mounting latrines	MCRD/MESC
	- machinery needed	MCRD/MESC
4. Clayey soils	- line pits	MCRD/MESC
	- skilled site selection	MCRD/MESC
5. Difficulty in locating site	- local participation in site selection	Community/ Chiefs
	- cooperation of chiefs	Community/ Chiefs
	- technical skills necessary	MCRD
6. Inadequate maintenance	- train school staff	MCRD
7. No water for cleaning	- school water supply needed	MCRD
8. No cleaning materials	- provision by government	MCRD
9. Inadequate cleaning	- supervise children	Teachers
10. Emptying not feasible voluntarily	- design movable structure	MCRD
	- paid labor for emptying	MCRD

GROUP B: CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, CLEANING AND EMPTYINGMORIJA WORKSHOP

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>POSSIBLE SOLUTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY:</u>
1. Outstanding materials missing	- provide additional materials	MCRD
	- transport to collect materials	MCRD
2. Shallow rock	- wider choice of sites	Chiefs/MCRD
3. Lack of construction skills	- teach school staff	MCRD
	- built in stone with local masons	MCRD
4. Children unsuited to hard labor	- paid labor	Local builders
5. Parents non-cooperation	- educate parents	MOHSW/MCRD
	- village meetings	MOHSW/MCRD
6. Lack of tools for maintenance	- provide tools and workshop	MCRD
7. Tools poorly cared for	- care for tools	Headmaster
8. High cost of maintenance	- generate cash contributions from community	Teachers, Community Leader

GROUP C: LATRINE USAGE AND HEALTH EDUCATION NEEDSLERIBE WORKSHOP

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>POSSIBLE SOLUTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY:</u>
1. Ignorance of health hazards without latrines	- educate parents and children	MOHSW/MESC
2. Dirty latrines discourage use	- establish regular cleaning	Schools
	- provide cleaning materials	MCRD
3. Wide age range using communal latrines	- individual latrines	MCRD
4. Instability discourages child usage	- build more secure structures	MCRD
5. Great distance to latrines	- site near classrooms	MCRD
6. Outsiders misuse toilets	- fit locks	MCRD
	- encourage rural sanitation	MCRD
	- employ caretaker	School
7. No toilet paper	- use old examination papers	Schools

COMMUNITY HEALTH CELL
326, V Main, I Block
Koramangala
Bangalore-560034
India

GROUP C: LATRINE USAGE AND HEALTH EDUCATION NEEDSMORIJA WORKSHOP

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>POSSIBLE SOLUTION</u>	<u>ACTION BY:</u>
1. Outsiders using school facility	- local decision on whether to permit this or not	School Committee
2. Wide age range of children using latrines	- separate latrines and different size seats for different age groups	MCRD/Teachers
3. Children fear falling	- provide seats not squat slabs	MCRD/Technicians
	- provide stable structures	MCRD/Technicians
	- education	Teachers
4. Ignorance of how to use latrines	- educate children	Teachers
	- teach parents to teach children	MOHSW
	- teach chiefs to teach parents	MOHSW
5. Water needed for hygiene	- school water supplies needed	MCRD/School/Community
6. No washing facilities	- school washing facilities needed	MCRD
7. Vandalism over holidays and at weekends	- promote rural sanitation	School Committee
	- appoint watchman	MOHSW/MCRD

REFERENCES

1. UNCDF/GOL Appraisal Report of the Primary Schools Water and Sanitation Program, TAG, June 1981
2. UNCDF/GOL Sociocultural Evaluation of the Primary Schools Sanitation Project, TAG, June 1981. An amended version will be part of a publication entitled "Sociocultural aspects of sanitation programs in Africa", to be issued by WHO/IRCWD in late 1983.
3. Krafft, R. G. Report on Improved Sanitation and Drinking Water Supply in Primary Schools, WHO, October 1978.
4. Binnie and Partners, Report on the status of UNCDF Project LES/74/036 and proposals for Reactivation of Construction, Lesotho, August 1979.
5. Shepherd, S. E., Anderson, J. H., Khitsane, T. Summary Report on the Primary Schools Feeding Project Evaluation in Lesotho, Food Management Unit, Lesotho, February 1981.
6. UNCDF/GOL 'Improved Sanitation in Primary Schools', Project Memorandum (Project No. LES/74/036), 1974.