



Rapid Appraisal
Students Partnership
Worldwide/Zambia

(SPW Zambia)



Acknowledgments

The Rapid Appraisal (RA) of Students Partnership Worldwide (SPW) described in this report relied on the efforts and cooperation of many people, including the RA team made up of staff of SPW, Family Health International (FHI), and the Zambia Ministry of Education (named in the report); Sally Griffith at SPW; Julia Masterson at FHI; Mrs. Kapulu, Permanent Secretary at the Ministry of Education (MOE); Mr. Bowasi, Director of Human Resources and Administration at the MOE; Mr. Sikazwe, Director of Standards and Curriculum Development at the MOE; Rick Henning at USAID/Zambia; all SPW Zambia staff; and the staff, students, and community members from the 10 schools visited. We graciously thank everyone who provided support or participated directly in this assessment.

This publication is funded through the USAID Cooperative Agreement with FHI for YouthNet, No. GPH-A-00-01-00013-00. YouthNet is a five-year program funded by USAID to improve reproductive health and prevent HIV among young people. The YouthNet team is led by FHI and includes CARE USA and RTI International. The information and views contained in the publication do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of FHI or USAID.

©2006 Family Health International

Family Health International, YouthNet Program
PO Box 13950
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Telephone: 1.919.544.7040
Fax: 1.919.544.7261
Web site: www.fhi.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Background	3
II. Objective	4
III. Methods.....	4
The team.....	4
Sites	5
Stakeholders interviewed.....	5
Questions.....	5
Interviews and observations.....	6
Analysis process.....	6
IV. Key Findings.....	7
Background on the schools	7
Intervention implementation.....	8
Student perceptions of what they learned from each element	9
Outcomes attributed to the SPW program	10
Role of the elements in bringing about outcomes by target groups.....	12
V. How Well Is SPW Achieving Its Strategic Aims?	13
Strategic Aim 1 – Bringing about behavioral change among the target groups.....	13
Strategic Aim 2 – Demonstrating the effectiveness of SPW’s volunteer peer education model	14
Strategic Aim 3 – Capacity building with the Ministry of Education at a school level.....	15
VI. Program Strengths and Weaknesses and Recommendations for Improvement .	16
Program strengths	16
Program weaknesses	16
Recommendations for improvement.....	17
VII. Recommendations for Evaluating Program Impact.....	17
List of Tables	
Table 1. Support for SPW	19
Table 2. How Well SPW Elements Are Implemented, by School.....	19
Table 3. Student Ratings for Relative Importance of Elements by Selected Topics ..	20
Table 4. Stakeholder Perceptions of Student Outcomes That Resulted from the SPW Program.....	21
Table 5. Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Outcomes That Resulted from the SPW Program.....	21

Table 6. Stakeholder Perceptions of Parent/Community Outcomes That Resulted from the SPW Program.....	22
Table 7. Relative Importance of Elements for Student Outcomes (RA Team Ratings).....	22
Table 8. Relative Importance of Elements for Teacher Outcomes (RA Team Ratings).....	23
Table 9. Relative Importance of Elements for Parent/Community Outcomes (RA Team Ratings).....	23

List of Appendices

Appendix A. List of Schools Visited	24
Appendix B. Daily Activities.....	25
Appendix C. Question Guides	26
Head/Deputy Head Teachers	26
Parents.....	29
Students.....	31
Teachers.....	33
Volunteer Peer Educators	36
SPW Support Teachers (SSTs)	39
Appendix D. Observation Guides.....	42
SPW Lesson Observation Sheet.....	42
YRC Observation Sheet.....	45

Executive Summary

Students Partnership Worldwide (SPW) Zambia recently began the third year of its School HIV/AIDS Education Program (SHEP) in conjunction with Zambia's Ministry of Education (MOE). The three aims of the program are to:

- (1) Raise awareness of HIV/AIDS and related issues and life skills among students, enabling them to change their own behavior.
- (2) Demonstrate the effectiveness of trained young Zambians as an untapped resource in a long-term, school-based HIV/AIDS intervention.
- (3) Enhance the implementation of the MOE's HIV/AIDS strategy and build capacity at a national, provincial, district, and school level.

SHEP is implemented by volunteer peer educators selected from a pool of applicants who have completed at least a secondary education and who may have completed tertiary level education. Thus, they are closer in age to students than most teachers, although they are not exactly same-age peers. After an intensive training, volunteer peer educators are placed in same-sex pairs at one of the SPW schools. Each placement school is paired with an extension school in which some program elements are implemented.

There are five elements¹ of the SHEP program:

- (1) In-class adolescent sexual and reproductive health (ASRH) lessons
- (2) Extra-curricular activities, including anti-AIDS clubs and sports
- (3) In-school, inter-school, and community events
- (4) Youth-friendly resource centers (YRCs)
- (5) Capacity building within the MOE at all levels

A rapid appraisal (RA) was conducted to gauge the relative importance of each of the five major elements within specific school contexts from a wide range of perspectives, including those of head teachers, teachers, parents and community members, students, and volunteers from a sample of 10 placement schools, representing all districts in Central Province. The goal was to see how each of the elements addressed the three strategic aims of SPW. The findings of this appraisal will inform plans for scale-up and potentially for the integration of this program into the MOE. These findings also define the outcomes that should be measured as part of any additional impact evaluation.

The RA team visited 10 SPW placement schools and used a participatory team approach to develop question guides, conduct interviews, and analyze findings. The team met for a day and a half before site visits began to discuss RA objectives, to develop question guides for each stakeholder group, and to decide which team members would talk to which stakeholders. A different school was visited every day for the first five days. After a one-day break, the team completed the next five site visits over the following five days, again visiting one school per day. Each night after the site visit, the team met to discuss any interesting

¹ These elements are referred to as "pillars" in the SPW program.

findings. After the team completed the site visits, they met for a day to identify key findings and make recommendations for program improvement and outcomes to be measured for impact evaluation.

The key findings identified by the rapid appraisal are best summarized as the program's strengths and recommendations for improvement, listed below.

Program strengths

- Volunteer peer educators, because they are younger than teachers, find it easier to talk to young people about HIV/AIDS and sexuality.
- Volunteer peer educators, because they are well-trained for the task at hand, are perceived as credible sources of information about HIV/AIDS and sexuality.
- While lessons impart important factual information, the variety of program components—including the YRC, clubs, and community events—encourages reinforcement of what students learned from the lessons.
- Informal interaction between students and volunteer peer educators outside the classroom (through sports and the YRC) helps volunteer peer educators develop trust, which makes them more influential in the classroom and in the community.
- The teacher workshops provide an opportunity for the teaching staff to learn new things and develop trust in the volunteer peer educators.
- The five elements give the program a structure that creates a sense of continuity from year to year. Even if volunteer peer educators change, the program does not.
- Due to the nature of the elements themselves, the program is able to reach a wide audience and a variety of target groups.
- The program commands a great deal of acceptance from people both within and outside the school.
- The most important outcome of the program is that students, teachers, parents, and other community members all become more comfortable talking about HIV/AIDS and sexuality, which allows a number of other positive outcomes to follow.

Recommendations for improvement

- The RA team recommends that the capacity-building element of the program be further examined to help it achieve its set objectives.
- Community involvement should also be increased, since under the current program structure, community members benefit least of all stakeholders.
- The team also recommends that this program be scaled up, in consultation with the Ministry of Education, in order to reach the widest possible audience in Zambia.

Though this rapid appraisal found widespread belief that the program has an impact on knowledge and risk-taking behaviors of Zambian students, a rigorous impact evaluation is still needed to test this assertion. It is recommended that such an impact evaluation be conducted as well as a study of the program costs, and this information should be used to develop a plan for sustainable scale-up.

I. Background

In Zambia, the HIV/AIDS pandemic is not only a serious health problem but also a core issue in the national development agenda. Accordingly, the fight against HIV/AIDS is prominently featured in the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, which is the fundamental statement of Zambia's development efforts.

Students Partnership Worldwide (SPW) Zambia seeks to improve the HIV/AIDS-related knowledge, skills, and behaviors of pupils in rural schools in the six districts of the Central Province in Zambia, while also engaging young people in HIV/AIDS awareness campaigns in their communities. SPW works in primary and high schools, but the majority of its activities are carried out with primary school pupils. Specifically, 107 of the 120 schools targeted in this program are primary schools.

SPW Zambia has recently begun the third year of its School HIV/AIDS Education Program (SHEP) in conjunction with Zambia's Ministry of Education (MOE). The three aims of the program are to:

- (1) Raise awareness of HIV/AIDS and related issues and life skills among students, enabling them to change their own behavior.
- (2) Demonstrate the effectiveness of trained young Zambians as an untapped resource in a long-term, school-based HIV/AIDS intervention.
- (3) Enhance the implementation of the MOE's HIV/AIDS strategy and build capacity at a national, provincial, district, and school level.

SHEP is implemented by volunteer peer educators selected from a pool of applicants who have completed at least a secondary education and who may have completed a university degree. Thus, they are closer in age to students than most teachers, although they are not exactly same-age peers. These volunteer peer educators are paid only a cost-of-living allowance and thus can be considered volunteers. After an intensive training, volunteer peer educators are placed in same-sex pairs at one of the SPW schools. Each placement school is paired with an extension school² in which some program elements are implemented.

There are five elements³ of the SHEP program:

- (1) In-class adolescent sexual and reproductive health (ASRH) lessons
- (2) Extra-curricular activities, including anti-AIDS clubs and sports
- (3) In-school, inter-school, and community events
- (4) Youth-friendly resource centers (YRCs)
- (5) Capacity-building within the MOE at all levels

During the first year of the SPW's intervention, 40 volunteer peer educators worked in 50 schools in five districts of the Central Province for eight months (the first two terms). In the second year, 90 volunteer peer educators lived and worked in 100 schools in six districts,

² Extension schools implement some SHEP elements but not all.

³ These elements are referred to as "pillars" in the SPW program.

where they reached approximately 72,000 students, facilitated over 5,000 classroom lessons, conducted over 100 events, and established more than 60 YRCs. In this, the third year, 120 volunteers have been placed in 60 placement schools, reaching another 60 extension schools.

SPW staff conducted a number of monitoring and evaluation activities. One of these activities was a qualitative examination of the five program elements by convenience samples of volunteer peer educators and students in August and September 2005 at the SPW headquarters in Kabwe. Findings from this exercise alerted program managers that not all elements were being implemented with equal strength and that some further investigation should be made into which elements were most critical to the program.

II. Objective

Building on these findings, a rapid appraisal (RA) was conducted. Its objective was to gauge the relative importance of each of the five major elements within specific school contexts from a wide range of perspectives, including those of head teachers, teachers, parents and community members, students, and volunteers from a sample of 10 placement schools, representing all districts in Central Province. The goal was to see how each of the elements addressed the three strategic aims of SPW. The findings of this appraisal will inform plans for scale-up and potentially for the integration of this program into the MOE. These findings also define the outcomes that should be measured as part of any additional impact evaluation.

III. Methods

The RA team visited 10 SPW placement schools and used a participatory team approach to develop question guides, conduct interviews, and analyze findings. The team met for a day and a half before site visits began to discuss RA objectives, to develop question guides for each stakeholder group, and to decide which team members would talk to which stakeholders. A different school was visited every day for the first five days. After a one-day break, the team completed the next five site visits over the following five days, again visiting one school per day. Each night after the site visit, the team met to discuss any interesting findings. After the site visits were completed, the team met for a day to identify key findings and make recommendations for program improvement and outcomes to be measured for impact evaluation.

The team

The following people participated on the rapid appraisal team:

- Mr. Edward Francis – SPW monitoring and evaluation coordinator
- Mr. Charles Banda – Ministry of Education representative
- Ms. Wazoka Nyau – Ex-volunteer peer educator
- Mr. Chola Kunda – Ex-volunteer peer educator
- Dr. Cindy Geary – FHI consultant
- Mr. Edward Scholl – FHI consultant⁴

⁴ Mr. Scholl's participation was limited to RA preparation, the first two site visits, and review of the final document.

Sites

The RA team identified a sample of 10 schools from among a list of placement schools at which the SHEP program had been operating for at least two years. Only one school was sampled each from Mumbwa and Serenje districts because of the difficulty of reaching schools there. Two schools were sampled from each of the remaining four districts. Random number tables were used to select the schools from each district. A list of schools, arranged alphabetically, is found in Appendix A. In the results tables, schools are identified by a letter that was assigned to each school and the order is not alphabetical. The order of results for each school is consistent across tables. That is, School A is the same School A across all tables. This allows the reader to identify patterns of results across tables. The identities of the schools are not revealed in this report to maintain assurances of confidentiality.

Stakeholders interviewed

To get the broadest perspective on the SPW program's impact and on how the program elements relate to this impact, several sets of stakeholders were interviewed. These included:

- Head and deputy head teachers
- SPW support teachers (SSTs)
- Peer educator volunteers
- Teachers (interviewed separately by sex)
- Parents and community members
- Students (interviewed separately by sex)

The daily timetable for these interviews at each school is found in Appendix B.

Questions

The RA team developed the interview questions, which followed this general outline:

- Contextual factors about the school setting that might have influenced program implementation and impact
- Perceptions about the volunteers
- Questions about each of the elements
 - Description of implementation
 - Positive and negative aspects of each element
 - Respondents' perceptions of how useful each element was in creating behavior change
 - Respondents' perceptions of how each element could create behavior change
 - Recommendations for improving each of the elements
- Judgment of the relative importance of the various elements
- Perceptions of how important the volunteer peer educators are to the program (as opposed to training teachers to implement the program)
- Whether/how the program had changed the school, the students, or the interviewee
- Overall evaluation of the program

Separate interview guides were developed for each set of stakeholders. These can be found in Appendix C.

Interviews and observations

Two team members conducted each interview (in most cases). One team member asked questions and the other took notes. These notes were the primary source of data. Interviews were conducted by same-sex interviewers for sex-segregated interviews (i.e., teachers and students). The groups of parents and community members were interviewed by the Zambian team members because they could conduct the interviews in local languages.⁵

In the student discussions, participants were also asked to rank the elements in order according to their importance in teaching them about various topics or skills.

One or two of the SPW ex-peer educators also observed a lesson taught by volunteer peer educators in each school, and one of the ex-peer educators inspected the YRC. Observation sheets and checklists were developed for each of these activities during the preparation meetings and can be found in Appendix D.

Analysis process

Analysis of the core elements' effect on each of SPW's strategic aims was a participatory and iterative process. After each day's site visit, team members met to discuss findings and to identify observations related to each of the strategic aims. A running list of these observations, plus other findings about school context and implementation, were generated from these nightly meetings. During this process, themes emerged that were also integrated into this list.

Quantitative ratings of volunteer peer educators' lessons and the YRC were entered into spreadsheets, and overall scores were assigned to each of the schools based on these ratings. Student rankings of the elements (by school and participants' sex) were entered into spreadsheets, and mean scores were assigned to each element by topic and by sex.

After completing the site visits, team members met to participate in several rating activities. First, team members rated the schools' implementation of each of the intervention components or elements. Team members also were asked to rank certain school characteristics—such as staff and community support for the program and trust they placed in the volunteers—that seemed to be relevant to the implementation of the program.

Next, the team looked for evidence that stakeholders perceived that the SPW's activities made an impact on specific outcomes. In many cases evidence of impact was in the form of personal disclosure, but for some outcomes we have only perceptions of others. This paper reports on what various stakeholders told the rapid appraisal team.

After looking at the schools as a whole, the team considered the degree to which each of the elements contributed to outcomes for each of the target groups (students, teachers, and parents/community).

⁵ In all the sites visited, the predominant local languages were either Bemba or Nyanja.

IV. Key Findings

Background on the schools

All interviews with stakeholders began with questions about the community and the school to assess the school environment and possible risks to the students' reproductive and sexual health.

Reproductive health and risk behaviors. Heads, deputies, teachers, and students at all schools reported that at least some of the students in their schools were sexually active, and that some of them became sexually active at a young age. Students as young as those in Grade 4 were reported to have gotten pregnant. While it was generally agreed that sex *was* taking place between boy and girl students, pregnancies mostly were attributed to sex between male community members and female students.

When asked about whether they knew people who were suffering from STIs, stakeholders pointed out that it was difficult to know for sure because of the secrecy surrounding this issue. Some stakeholders did know of people with STIs, but the cases described were all among members of the wider community. When asked about HIV in the school and the community, teachers in one school said that they had an HIV-positive student attending school, while teachers in another said that there were many HIV-positive students at the school. Stakeholders at most schools said that they were very aware of the problem of HIV in the community, and many said that the problem of HIV was considerable:

“Many many people in the community are HIV positive and have died of AIDS. No one has come out into the open in the school but the problem is rampant in the community.” *SPW support teacher*

Gender. When asked how boys and girls were treated in the school and the community, all stakeholders said that there was a policy of gender balance in the schools. Teachers did not treat boys and girls differently in the schools, and this was confirmed in discussions with the students. The RA team also asked how boys and girls were treated at home, and here it was noted that in general, girls and boys performed traditional gender roles. Some stakeholders reported that the schools' gender balance policy was having some impact on the traditional roles that children held at home.

Support for SPW. The RA team ranked support for SPW by school administration, teachers, and community for each school (on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 signifying no support and 5 excellent support) (Table 1). The team also ranked the level of trust that these stakeholders had for the volunteer peer educators.

Support from the school administration (including from the head and the deputy) was generally very strong. Only in two schools was there a slight lack of support from the school administration. Without the support of the school's head and deputy, the program would be

extremely hard to implement because of the power that these two people exert within the school.

Teacher support was generally favorable. In only three of the schools was there deemed to be some lack of support from the teachers.

For most schools, community support for the program was good; more than half of the schools received a rank of 5. One school, however, had very poor community and parental interaction and was given the lowest rating for its support of the SPW program. Community support in three other schools was also relatively low.

In some cases, the program was viewed with hostility when it was in its infancy at a school. Head teachers often received complaints from members of the Parent/Teacher Association (PTA) who were upset that traditionally taboo subjects (such as sex) and religiously objectionable topics (such as condoms) were being taught. Some parents thought that the ASRH lessons in particular were unacceptable and were covered in too much detail. However, as parents gained more exposure to the program and as syllabi and modules were explained to them, members of the PTA and the wider community began to accept the program and in many cases became its fiercest advocates. In communities that were more scattered and not as physically close to the school, lack of interaction among parents and program implementers persisted.

Volunteer peer educators were well trusted in all schools. In fact, trust in volunteer peer educators was the only factor that received the highest rating in every school.

Intervention implementation

The RA team ranked how well each of the SPW's five main elements were implemented in the schools: ASRH lessons in the classroom, extra-curricular activities, events and festivals, youth-friendly resource centers, and capacity building with the Ministry of Education (Table 2). Each element was individually ranked in each school from 1 to 5, where 1 meant the element was not being implemented at all, and 5 meant that it was being implemented to a high standard. In half of the schools visited the overall intervention received the highest possible rating and the other half received a score of 4.

The lessons element was the only one given the highest rating across all schools. Although the elements' ratings generally showed little variation among schools, ratings of extra-curricular activities and the YRCs were the most varied. To be effective, a YRC ideally should be located in a physical structure within the school. Many of the more rural schools lacked infrastructure and could not allocate dedicated space to the YRC. Their YRC materials had to be set up and taken down daily at a specified time, sometimes in different rooms on different days. This lack of constancy might explain the YRC's varied ratings among schools. In schools where any particular element was not implemented to the highest standard, often other elements were rated below 5 as well.

One explanation for less effective implementation is a lack of staff and community support. Whether lack of support is a cause or a consequence of weaker intervention is unclear,

although there is probably a reciprocal relationship. The few schools that received an implementation rating below 5 were also rated lower in teacher and community support. The schools with lower ratings were predominantly larger schools, often with weekly boarders,⁶ and were located in peri-urban environments rather than in rural areas where support and implementation were generally high. The school with the lowest rankings was also the only school where support was lacking in some degree from administration, teachers, *and* community members. In larger schools like this one, competition from activities such as FAWEZA⁷ and CHAMP⁸ also might have contributed to diminished support for SPW. Finally, communities surrounding larger schools are themselves larger and less cohesive.

Student perceptions of what they learned from each element

The RA team asked students to rank the elements in order of their importance in teaching them about certain topics or skills. Mean rank scores were calculated for each element by topic and by sex across schools (Table 3).

Both boys and girls rated the ASRH lessons the best in teaching them about most topics, except for the notable exceptions of performance skills, sports skills, trusting the volunteer peer educators, and interaction with fellow pupils. For both boys and girls, the lessons informed them the most about HIV/AIDS, STIs, teenage pregnancies, contraception, saying no to sex, increasing their self-confidence, and improving their communication skills. The lessons did not score well in outcomes such as presentation and sports skills, for which other elements, like extra-curricular activities and events, were the more obvious way to pass along these skills.

Boys and girls were split in their ranking of some of the elements. Boys ranked the events lowest, while the girls gave events and clubs low ratings.

Consistently, the second-highest ranked element for most topics in the exercise was the YRC. For both the boys and the girls, trusting the volunteer peer educators was a key outcome of having visited the YRC. Youth's ability to trust volunteer peer educators is an important factor in the success of the SPW program. The YRC scored lower than lessons in teaching students about HIV/AIDS, STIs, teenage pregnancies, and saying no to sex. However, the girls ranked the YRC as the best element for learning about contraception. Possibly, girls felt more comfortable approaching the volunteer peer educators in private, rather than in the more public surroundings of the other elements.

Events and festivals promoted the development of psychosocial and other life skills and encouraged interaction with the volunteer peer educators. Clubs and sports (C/S) scored highest for both boys and girls in the sports skill category. Boys also scored the extra-curricular activities element the most useful to them for interacting with the volunteer peer educators. Both boys and girls scored this element the second highest for increasing their communication skills. Girls scored this element second highest for increasing their

⁶ "Weekly boarders" refers to students who stay at the school or in a nearby rented house during the weeknights and return home on the weekends.

⁷ Forum for African Women Educationalists in Zambia

⁸ Comprehensive HIV and AIDS Management Program

performance skills and boys scored it second highest for increasing their self-confidence. Events scored the highest among both boys and girls for increasing their performance skills, and second for both sports skills and interaction with the volunteer peer educators.

Every element was ranked most important for at least one of the topic areas in at least one school. Generally speaking, sex differences were not strong in this exercise except that boys were less likely to find events useful. Boys and girls also differed in how they learned the most about self-confidence. The girls ranked the YRC just behind the lessons in this category, whereas the boys felt that the clubs and activities were more helpful in building their self-confidence.

Outcomes attributed to the SPW program

Through the RA process, stakeholders identified a number of outcomes that they attributed to the SPW program. Not all of these were behavioral outcomes, but all are linked to behavior, such as increases in knowledge and self-confidence. These outcomes were not limited to students, but were also identified for teaching staff and community members alike, although the greatest number of SPW-related outcomes was found among the students. It should be noted that we are reporting on the perceptions of people interviewed in each school (Table 4 to 6) and cannot, from these data, ascertain the reliability of their perceptions.

Students. Students are the most important target group for SPW. Students and other stakeholders mentioned a number of different ways in which the students had changed their behavior as a direct result of the SPW intervention. Participants in all schools mentioned that pregnancy rates had decreased in the schools.

“The cases of pregnancies have decreased in the school. Last year we only had two, but in previous years the rates were very high.” *Head teacher*

In nine out of the 10 schools, stakeholders believed that more students were abstaining from sex than had been before. Also, stakeholders from nine out of 10 schools reported that they suspected that when students *were* having sex, greater percentages were using a condom. Although many stakeholders mentioned that it was difficult to know whether students were actually using condoms, they cited an increase in the number of condoms being obtained from local shops. Some stakeholders also said that there was an increase in the number of discarded condom wrappers found around the community.

“We have heard of cases of boys going to the local clinic to get condoms. When we move around, we see discarded condoms on the footpaths so we can say that some are now using condoms.” *Head teacher*

It was also noted that the SPW program had empowered the students to negotiate condom use.

Many of the participants mentioned that sexual risk-taking behavior was decreasing in the schools and the communities. The stakeholders believed that decreased risk-taking resulted

from both an increase in the amount of information students received, and from the students' active participation in other activities, such as sports or clubs.

“If a child was at home and had nothing to do, he would find something to occupy him like sex, drinking, smoking or fighting. SPW has reduced these things because he has been kept busy.” *Male teacher*

Stakeholders from all schools reported that the program had increased assertiveness in the students, especially among the girls. Stakeholders at all schools also noted that the students were open to interacting with the volunteer peer educators, possibly as a result of increased self-confidence.

“Girl children are exhibiting more confidence and more assertiveness. You can talk to the girls without them becoming intimidated.” *Female teacher*

With this increase in confidence and assertiveness, peer pressure was reported to have become less apparent in the schools.

“Many pupils now do not succumb to peer pressure and are concentrating on their academic studies. Peer pressure has also changed. There is now pressure to do the right thing rather than the wrong thing.” *Head teacher*

Students found it easier to make friends because of the increased interaction taking place at all levels of the school, not only among students but between students and teachers. This, as one school reported, had led to a decrease in bullying.

A reduction in early marriages was also reported at many schools as was improved student retention and a decrease in absenteeism.

Staff. Several positive outcomes were noted among teachers. In all schools, the RA team found that teachers' knowledge of HIV and AIDS had improved. Teachers also reported that they were more open to talking about HIV/AIDS and sex than they had been before the SPW program. In addition, teachers in four of the schools reported a decrease in their own sexual risk-taking behavior. In half the schools, at least some teachers reported that they had gone for counseling and testing after learning about it from the SPW program. In three of the schools, teachers also reported a decrease in nonsexual risk-taking—such as smoking cigarettes and drinking alcohol to excess—since the initiation of the SPW program.

“SPW gave me a lot of information about HIV. From this, I thought that I needed to know my status, so I went to get tested. On seeing me go for VCT my wife went and we both came out negative.” *Head teacher*

Parents and the community. In all schools, stakeholders reported that parents and other community members were more open to talking about sexual issues, not only among themselves, but also with their children and students at the school. Perhaps as a result, knowledge on HIV and AIDS had also increased in this target group. In two of the schools

visited, it was reported that sexual risk-taking behavior among this group had decreased as a result of the program.

Role of the elements in bringing about outcomes by target groups

The RA team synthesized the findings from all schools to rank the elements according to their importance in achieving specific outcomes by target group. Overall, different elements were important in their impact on different target groups (Tables 7, 8, and 9).

Students. For the most part, the ASRH lessons in the classroom were the most critical element for the students. Lessons were consistently ranked high in all outcomes (as perceived by stakeholders): decreases in pregnancy and STIs, increased reports of abstinence, increased knowledge of HIV/AIDS, increased self-confidence, and decreases in absenteeism.

The YRC was ranked second in most areas and ranked highest for outcomes such as condom use and openness to talking to the volunteer peer educators. The YRC was also important in encouraging students to access VCT services, as well as encouraging abstinence and disseminating information on HIV and AIDS.

Clubs and sports (the extra-curricular component of the intervention) were the next most critical areas for the students. Presentation and sports skills ranked highest for this element. This extra-curricular component was also perceived to be important in combating absenteeism, since students looked forward to playing sports after school and were therefore motivated to attend school. Clubs and sports also were the next most important element, behind the lessons and the YRC, in information dissemination, openness to the volunteer peer educators, self-confidence, and encouraging abstinence and condom use.

Events and festivals were the fourth most important element to the students; this element did not receive the highest ranking for influence on any of student outcomes. However, this element did rank highly for encouraging a decrease in pregnancy, for improving sports and presentation skills, and for building self-confidence.

Understandably, the capacity-building element (i.e., teacher workshops) consistently ranked the least critical for the student outcomes, achieving the lowest score throughout the outcomes.

Staff. For the teacher outcomes, the capacity-building element of the intervention was the most critical component. It achieved the highest score consistently across all the outcomes. Knowledge absorption, being more open to talk about RH issues, accessing VCT services, gaining experience in new teaching methods, and decreasing risk behaviors were all attributed to the capacity-building element of the program.

Events were consistently the next most important element for the teachers. The only exception was the acquiring of new teaching skills, which, in addition to capacity building, was attributed to the lessons themselves. Teachers often reported that they would sit in on the ASRH lessons in the classroom so that they would be able to learn interactive methodologies from the volunteer peer educators. Clubs and sports were deemed the next most important

element for the teachers, followed by the YRC. Consistently, the weakest element for the teachers was the ASRH lessons, apart from teachers' ability to gain new teaching methods from the lessons.

Community. For the community and parents, the most critical element was events and festivals. Here, community members acquired knowledge on HIV and AIDS, became more open to talking about these issues, and decreased their own sexual risk-taking behavior. The next most critical element for the community was clubs and sports, which were ranked second to events as a means for learning about HIV and AIDS as well as for helping community members reduce their own sexual risk behaviors. For the openness to talking about HIV and sex, the lessons were deemed the next most important element; both students and community members reported that students shared what they learned in the lessons with their parents. The least critical element for the community and parents was capacity building.

V. How Well Is SPW Achieving Its Strategic Aims?

In addition to examining the relative importance of each of the elements, the RA team explored stakeholders' perceptions about how well SPW was achieving its stated aims. The RA team synthesized data from the interviews and ranking exercises to answer this question.

Strategic Aim 1 – Bringing about behavioral change among the target groups

Community members perceived a decrease in sexual risk behavior and a decrease in student pregnancies since the initiation of the SPW program in all schools. A few positive outcomes were noted in some but not all schools. These included a decrease in STI infections (this outcome is not easily recognized), a decrease in absenteeism, and an increase in use of VCT services.

In many schools, teachers attributed their own decrease in sexual and other risky behaviors to what they had learned from the SPW program. Teachers in a number of schools also mentioned that they learned about and used counseling and testing services because of SPW. In a few schools, changes in risk behavior were also noted among parents and other community members.

In all schools there were intermediate outcomes that undoubtedly contributed to behavior change: greater knowledge about HIV/AIDS among students, teachers, and the community; greater self-confidence among the students; and among all groups, greater comfort in discussing sex and HIV/AIDS.

Strategic Aim 2 – Demonstrating the effectiveness of SPW’s volunteer peer education model

Stakeholders at all schools agreed that the outcomes outlined in the previous sections were entirely attributable to the volunteer peer educators at the schools.

There were several reasons why the peer education model worked so well in the schools. For one, volunteer peer educators, unlike teachers, have dedicated time to devote to the project. When teachers were asked if they felt capable of taking over the program from the volunteer peer educators, their responses were mixed. Many said that they would be able to run the program because they are professionals and had been trained to teach and to run activities in schools. However, when pushed further about the time they would need and about why the volunteer peer education model was such a success, they began to express doubts about whether they could effectively implement the program.

Another reason the peer education model was successful is that students spoke more freely with the volunteer peer educators than with other groups, such as teachers or parents. Many stakeholders said that teachers need to maintain a level of professional distance from the students in order to earn their respect. Stakeholders believed that if teachers were to talk freely to the students about sex and HIV, the lines of respect would become blurred.

“We wouldn’t tell teachers private things because teachers gossip and volunteers⁹ wouldn’t tell anyone. We would tell the volunteers before the teachers because the volunteers know more than the teachers about these issues.” *Male student*

“If I was to go into the classroom, they would see me as their father and not talk to me as they do the volunteers.” *Male teacher*

Students in rural communities felt most strongly that it was easier to talk to volunteer peer educators than others in the community. This likely resulted from the fact that volunteer peer educators were well-educated and mostly from towns and cities, which meant that they were not exposed to the traditional views often strongly held in rural communities. Stakeholders in rural communities also felt that teachers would be tongue-tied about certain topics, whereas the volunteer peer educators were able to teach all the topics, no matter what their content.

“These peer educators are like friends to the pupils they are teaching. We teachers can be tongue-tied with certain topics, but the peer educators are open.” *Female teacher*

Another important reason the peer education model worked was that volunteer peer educators held dual roles: they were friends of the students as well as trusted and respected sources of information. Also, the volunteer peer educators were not members of the communities in which they were working. As a result, students felt free to talk to them and were safe in the knowledge that the volunteer peer educators would not reveal their discussions to others, since they did not know anyone in the community. Some students were not willing to talk to teachers because the teachers were members of that community and were perhaps friends of

⁹ Stakeholders refer to the SPW volunteer peer educators as “the volunteers.”

their parents. Another advantage for teachers was that because volunteer peer educators ran specific ASRH lessons, teachers could spend their time focusing on core subjects. Finally, an important benefit of the SPW model noted by people interviewed for the RA was that it employed a number of young people as volunteer peer educators, which could also potentially improve their future job opportunities.

Teachers did say that if a young teacher was adequately trained and could dedicate all of his or her time to conducting HIV and AIDS activities in the schools, then the program could work without volunteer peer educators. However, they stressed that this person needed to be young, and have no responsibilities other than covering ASRH issues. A number of teachers also suggested that this training could be achieved directly from colleges of education.

SPW's model also received praise for its continuity.

“There are a lot of NGOs dealing with HIV issues, but the difference between SPW and the rest is that they have resident peer educators, who not only teach the children in class, but on their way home, they will walk with them. They deal with youth issues right at the station.” *Head teacher*

Strategic Aim 3 – Capacity building with the Ministry of Education at a school level

Teachers' skills in several areas improved as a result of SPW. For example, they felt more confident teaching students about HIV/AIDS.

“We have been given information which we never had or have been reminded of information that we might have forgotten. We have also learned skills like better communication; our last workshop was about how to communicate better with the pupils. We have moved away from the era of shutting down the child. We are now patient and willing to listen to them.” *Head teacher*

Teachers improved their teaching skills by watching the volunteer peer educators use interactive methodologies in their classes. Teachers also are now able to talk more openly to the students about HIV and sex. In addition, some of the teachers said that they gained skills in public speaking.

However, when asked if their capacity had been developed enough to effectively run the program, the teachers felt that they did not have the necessary skills.

“As teachers we would be able to present the information but because we don't have the confidence of the students, there would be no interaction. We are not ready yet; the preparation has not been there.” *Deputy head*

One suggested method of ensuring sustainability was to integrate the program into all areas of the curriculum. HIV/AIDS is not a topic about which exams are given, and teachers are not inspected on their HIV and AIDS activities in the schools, which results in teachers dedicating far less time to these topics than to their own core subjects.

“It is important to get this program into the curriculum. This disease has come to stay; we must get this program into the curriculum so that all schools in the country can be benefiting.” *Head teacher*

VI. Program Strengths and Weaknesses and Recommendations for Improvement

Program strengths

- Volunteer peer educators, because they are younger than teachers, find it easier to talk to young people about HIV/AIDS and sexuality.
- Volunteer peer educators, because they are well-trained for the task, are perceived as credible sources of information about HIV/AIDS and sexuality.
- While lessons do impart important factual information, the variety of program components—including the YRC, clubs, and community events—encourages reinforcement of what students learned from the lessons.
- Informal interaction between students and volunteer peer educators outside the classroom (through sports and the YRC) helps volunteer peer educators develop trust, which makes them more influential in the classroom and in the community.
- The teacher workshops provide an opportunity for the teaching staff to learn new things and develop trust in the volunteer peer educators.
- The five elements give the program a structure that creates a sense of continuity from year to year. Even if volunteer peer educators change, the program does not.
- Due to the nature of the elements themselves, the program is able to reach a wide audience and a variety of target groups.
- The program commands a great deal of acceptance from people both within and outside the school.
- The most important outcome of the program is that students, teachers, parents, and other community members all become more comfortable talking about HIV/AIDS and sexuality, which allows a number of other positive outcomes to follow.

Program weaknesses

- The capacity-building element of the program is not yet having the desired effect on the teachers.
- Some schools do not have the necessary resources to fully implement the program. For example, some schools do not have a room for the YRC.
- Community support is more difficult to obtain in some schools than others, especially those where people live further away from the school or where there is less social cohesion. Lack of community support makes implementation of some of the elements more difficult.
- Although community members are involved in the program, they are by far the target group that benefits the least from the intervention.
- Some teachers felt that annual turnover of volunteer peer educators was a problem.
- The program depends on outside funding and is not sustainable without integration into the MOE.

Recommendations for improvement

- The RA team recommends that the capacity-building element of the program be further examined to help it achieve its objectives. Under the program's current structure, capacity building and the rest of the intervention areas, such as the lessons and clubs, are all given equal importance. The team recommends that the program design be altered so that more time and resources are devoted to capacity building. The objectives of the capacity-building element also need to be clarified so that staff, volunteer peer educators, and stakeholders know exactly what the program trying to achieve. It is only through effective capacity building that the program will be sustained.
- Community involvement should also be increased, since under the current program structure, community members benefit least of all stakeholders.
- The team also recommends that this program be scaled up in order to reach the widest possible audience in Zambia. Scale-up should be achieved in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and should involve consultation and collaboration at all levels. The program is highly effective and should therefore benefit as many people as possible.

VII. Recommendations for Evaluating Program Impact

It was clear to the RA team that young people and adults alike, in every school, believe that SPW has made a difference in their lives – in what they know, what they believe, and what they do. This perception has not, however, been confirmed through a rigorous evaluation. On the basis of this appraisal, the team believes the following outcomes should be measured in such an evaluation:

- Knowledge of RH and HIV/AIDS
- Positive attitudes toward abstinence
- Positive attitudes toward being faithful
- Positive attitudes toward condom use
- Tolerant attitudes toward people living with HIV/AIDS
- Egalitarian sexual gender norms
- Self-confidence
- Lower absenteeism
- Greater sexual self-efficacy
- Delayed sexual debut
- Fewer students with multiple partners
- Greater condom use among sexually active students
- Use of counseling and testing among sexually active students
- Fewer STIs
- Fewer pregnancies

Ideally, this evaluation would be a quasi-experimental design, comparing outcomes for students in randomly chosen schools where SPW has been implemented for at least two years

compared to randomly chosen schools within the same province where it has never been implemented. A questionnaire, written in the appropriate local languages, could be administered at each selected school over a period of three weeks.

Table 1. Support for SPW

Indicators	Schools									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K
Support of administration	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Teacher support/ involvement	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
Community/parental support/ involvement	5	5	2	3	5	2	5	5	5	1
Trust in the PEs	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Table 2. How Well SPW Elements Are Implemented, by School (RA Ratings)

Indicators	Schools									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K
Implementation of pillars:										
Lessons	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Extracurricular activities/ events	5	5	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
YRC	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Capacity building	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	3	5	3
	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	3
Observation of lessons	51		51	46	44			48	50	50
Rating of YRC			38	34		36		38	36	34

Table 3. Student Ratings for Relative Importance of Elements by Selected Topics

From which pillar did you learn the most about...?	Girls				Boys			
	Lessons	C/S*	Events	YRC	Lessons	C/S*	Events	YRC
HIV	3.4	1.8	2.3	2.5	3.9	1.8	1.6	2.7
STIs	3.7	2.1	1.9	2.2	4	1.8	1.4	2.8
Teen Pregnancy	3.7	1.9	2	2.3	3.8	2.3	1.2	2.7
Contraception	2.9	1.7	2.7	2.9	3.2	2.2	1.6	3
Saying no	3.3	2	1.9	2.9	3.9	2.3	1.2	2.6
Self-confidence	3.6	1.8	1.9	2.7	3.4	2.6	2.3	1.7
Communication	3.2	2.4	2.3	2.1	3.9	2.4	1.5	2.2
Performance skills	2.1	2.5	3.1	1.3	2.2	2	3.7	3.2
Sports skills	1.8	3.8	2.6	1.5	2.3	3.5	3.1	1.1
Interaction	3.3	2.4	2.5	1.9	2	3.6	2.8	1.6
Trusting the PEs	3.1	2.3	1.4	3.2	3	2.3	1.2	3.5

* Clubs/sports

Key:

□ = Highest Rating

□ = Lowest Rating

Table 4. Stakeholder Perceptions of Student Outcomes That Resulted from the SPW Program

Outcome	Schools									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K
HIV knowledge	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Self-confidence	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Openness to peer educators	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Presentation skills	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sports skills	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Absenteeism				+					+	
Abstinence	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+
Condom use	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
VCT					+					
STI decrease			+	+			+		+	+
Pregnancy decrease	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Table 5. Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Outcomes That Resulted from the SPW Program

Outcome	Schools									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K
HIV knowledge	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Openness to talking about HIV/AIDS and sex	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sexual risk behavior	+	+	+			+				
VCT use		+		+	+	+	+			
New teaching methods	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	
Other risk behavior		+				+			+	

Table 6. Stakeholder Perceptions of Parent/Community Outcomes That Resulted from the SPW Program

Outcome	Schools									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K
Acceptance of SPW	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
HIV knowledge	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Openness to talking about HIV/AIDS and sex	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sexual risk behavior					+					+

Table 7. Relative Importance of Elements for Each Student Outcome (RA Team Ratings)

	Lessons	Clubs/sports	Events	YRC	Capacity building
HIV/AIDS	5	3	2	4	1
Self-confidence	5	3	4	2	1
Openness to PEs	4	3	2	5	1
Presentation skills	3	5	4	2	1
Sports skills	3	5	4	2	1
Absenteeism	5	4	2	3	1
Abstinence	5	3	2	4	1
Condom use	4	3	2	5	1
VCT	5	2	3	4	1
STI decrease	5	3	2	4	1
Pregnancy decrease	5	2	4	3	1

Table 8. Relative Importance of Elements for Teacher Outcomes (RA Ratings)

	Lessons	Clubs/sports	Events	YRC	Capacity building
HIV/AIDS	1	3	4	2	5
Openness to talking about HIV and sex	1	3	4	2	5
Sexual risk behavior	1	3	4	2	5
VCT	1	2	4	3	5
New teaching methods	4	3	1	2	5
Other risk behaviors	1	3	4	2	5

Table 9. Relative Importance of Elements for Parent/Community Outcomes (RA Ratings)

	Lessons	Clubs/sports	Events	YRC	Capacity building
HIV/AIDS	3	4	5	2	1
Openness to talking about HIV and sex	4	3	5	2	1
Sexual risk behavior	3	4	5	2	1

Appendices

Appendix A: List of Schools Visited

David Ramushu Basic School, Kabwe District
Ilume Basic School, Mkushi District
Mabonde Basic School, Serenje District
Mishede Basic School, Kabwe District
Mkushi Boma Basic School, Mkushi District
Muchenje Basic School, Chibombo District
Mulungushi Power Basic School, Kapiri-Mposhi District
Muswishi Basic School, Chibombo District
Nampundwe High School, Mumbwa District
Palamedes Basic School, Kapiri-Mposhi District

Appendix B: Daily Activities

Time	Description of Activity
0900 - 0930	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Introductory meeting with the Head- Introductions of the group- Assessment of mobilization of groups for discussions
0930 - 1000	Meeting with the Head and Deputy for discussion of the SPW program
1000 - 1100	Interview with teachers, male and female
1100 - 1200	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Interviews with members of the PTA- Interviews with members of other community groups
1200 - 1300	Interviews with the volunteer peer educators
1300 - 1400	Lunch
1400 - 1430	Witness SPW lesson led by volunteer peer educators
1430 - 1530	Group meetings with a group of male students and a group of female students
1530 - 1545	Look at YRC
1545 - 1600	Wrap up and leave

Appendix C: Question Guides

Interview Guide: Head/Deputy Head Teachers

My name is _____ and I am here to ask you some questions about the SPW program and my colleague _____ is going to take notes. Your answers to these questions will help SPW know more about how their program is going in schools. We are talking to head teachers in this and nine other schools in the Central Province where SPW has programs. When we make a report about our assessment, we will not use your name or describe you in any way that will be recognizable.

First of all, can you tell us a little bit about your school? How many students? What their families are like? How long you have been here?

How active are parents and other community members in the affairs of your school?

What kinds of problems do students in this school have? Where do they usually get help for their problems? What adults do they trust to help them?

Are girls and boys treated differently in this community/school? How?

Do you think most of the kids in this school are having sex? Any of them? For those who might be having sex, do you think they are using a condom? Do you know if any of your friends had ever had an STI? Do you know anyone who is HIV+?

Is there a problem with girls getting pregnant in this school? What is the problem? Why do they get pregnant? Who are the fathers?

What is your general feeling about the importance of HIV/AIDS education in the schools?

What is your feeling about the SPW program in general? What kind of feedback do you get from the teachers? The parents? The students?

What are the SPW volunteers like? How do the students get along with them? How do the teachers interact with them? How do you interact with them?

I'm going to ask you about some of the different activities of the SPW program here. First, there are the lessons. How many lessons do the volunteers teach a week? How many students are there in the lessons? Is that too many or about the right number?

What do you think is the best thing about these classes? What are the things you don't like?

Do you feel that these lessons are useful for students? Do they learn a lot? Do they know more about HIV/AIDS than you knew before the SPW lessons? What about these lessons is

helpful to students? Do you think these lessons teach students things that keep them from getting HIV/AIDS? How? Have you seen any changes in the students because of these lessons? Do you think these lessons help teachers in any way?

Ok, let's talk about the extra-curricular/after-school activities? What kinds of activities does SPW organize after school? How often? How many people participate? Boys or girls? Is that enough or are there too many? Why?

What do you like about these activities? Do students enjoy them? What don't you like about them? Is there anything that could be done differently for these events? What do you think parents think about these activities?

How do you think these activities help the kids? In what ways are these activities helpful? Do you think these events keep kids from getting HIV/AIDS? How does it do this? If not, are there other ways in which it is useful?

Now let's talk about the in-school, inter-school and community events coordinated by SPW? Have there been any this year? How many people participate? Have you participated in these events?

What do you like about these events? What do you not like about them? What would make them better?

Are these events helpful? Who do these events benefit? In what way do they benefit these people? Do people learn about HIV/AIDS at these events? Is there any way that they might prevent the spread of AIDS? What kind of feedback do you get from the parents or the community about these events?

How aware is your community of the SPW program? How well does your community support the SPW program? Do these events help build support?

Now we're going to talk about the YRC. Where is it? How much time do students spend there? When? In your opinion what is the purpose of the YRC? How many people actually go there? Do you have any suggestions for improving the YRC?

Is the YRC helpful to students? What is it about the YRC that benefits students? How do you think it helps prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS?

Finally, let's talk about the teacher workshops conducted by the SPW volunteers? How many of your teachers have attended these? Do you think the teachers find these useful? Have you gotten any feedback from the teachers about these? Do you think teachers who've attended these would be able to teach an SPW lesson – using interactive methods – on their own? What recommendations do you have for improvements in these workshops?

Do you think there are any components of the SPW project that are more critical for the success of the program than others? Which ones do you feel are most useful (useful in what way)? Why?

Do you think that SPW has changed this school? In what ways?

Have you noticed any differences in the students as a result of SPW? Please describe.

Have you noticed any differences in the teachers as a result of SPW? Please describe.

Do you think SPW has changed you? In what ways?

How critical do you feel is the role of the volunteer peer educators in the SPW program? Do you think it would be as effective a program if teachers took over these activities? Why or why not?

What is the thing you like best about the program overall? What is the thing you like least overall? Do you have suggestions for SPW to improve the program?

Interview Guide: Parents

My name is _____ and I am here to ask you some questions about the SPW program. My colleague _____ will be taking notes to help us remember what you said. Your answers to these questions will help SPW know more about how their program is going in schools. We are talking to parents in this and nine other SPW schools in the Central Province. You don't have to answer any questions, but your answers are very important because you are the ones that this program is for. When we make a report about our assessment, we will not use your name or describe you in any way that will be recognizable.

First of all, tell us what you like about this school?

What do you not like about this school?

What are students like in this school?

What are the teachers like? How much do you interact with the teachers?

What kinds of problems do students in this school have? Where do they usually get help for their problems? What adults do they trust to help them?

Are girls and boys treated differently in this community/school? How?

Do you think most of the kids in this school are having sex? Any of them? For those who might be having sex, do you think they are using a condom? Do you know of students getting STIs? Do you know of any who are HIV+?

Is there a problem with girls getting pregnant in this school? What is the problem? Why do they get pregnant? Who are the fathers?

Are you aware of the SPW program at this school? Do your children ever come home and talk to you about the program or about the volunteers? What do they tell you?

I'm going to ask you about some of the different activities of the SPW program here. Are you aware of the lessons that are taught by the volunteers? What have you heard about these lessons? Have you ever been concerned about what they are being taught? What is the best thing about these lessons? What are the things you don't like?

IF THEY DID KNOW ABOUT THE LESSONS – Do you feel that these lessons are useful for students? Do they learn a lot? Do they know more about HIV/AIDS than you knew before the lessons? Do you think these lessons teach students things that keep them from getting HIV/AIDS? How? Do you think these lessons help parents in any way?

IF NOT – Do you believe it is a good policy that schools teach students about HIV/AIDS and ways to protect themselves?

Another part of the SPW program is the extra-curricular activities – Did you realize that the volunteers organize clubs and sports for the students after school? What kinds of activities were you aware of? Do your children participate? Why or why not? What do think the benefit of such activities are to your children? How do you think these activities contribute to the health of your children?

Are you aware of in-school, interschool and community events? Have you been aware of any this year? Have you ever attended a community event? What did you think about it? Do you think these events benefit the students? The community? How?

How aware of SPW is your community? How supportive? How is it supportive?

Are you aware of the Youth Resource Center as one of the SPW program elements? What do you know about it? Has your child ever talked to you about it? In what way could something like this benefit students?

Now that we've talked about the different program components, which do you think are the most important ones? Are there any that you think are not important?

Do you think that SPW has changed this school? In what ways?

Do you think SPW has changed your child? In what ways?

Have you personally talked to any of the SPW volunteers? What is your impression of them? What do you children think of them? Do you have any advice for them? How would the program change if the work done by volunteers was replace by teachers? Is there any advantage to having student volunteers?

Interview Guide: Students

My name is _____ and I am here to ask you some questions about the SPW program. Your answers to these questions will help SPW know more about how their program is going in schools. We are talking to students in this and nine other schools in the Central Province. You don't have to answer any questions, but your answers are very important because you are the ones that this program is for. When we make a report about our assessment, we will not use your name or describe you in any way that will be recognizable.

First of all, tell us what you like about your school.

What do you not like about your school?

What kinds of things do students in this school like to do when they are not in school or studying?

What kinds of problems do students in this school have? Where do they usually get help for their problems? What adults do they trust to help them?

Is it a problem being a boy/girl? Is it better being a boy/girl?

Do you think most of the kids in your school are having sex? Any of them? For those who might be having sex, do you think they are using a condom? Have any of your friends ever gotten an STI? Do you know anyone who is HIV+?

Is there a problem with girls getting pregnant in this school? What is the problem? Why do they get pregnant? Who are the fathers?

Do you participate in any of the SPW programs?

Who are the SPW volunteers in this school? What do you think about them? Do you trust them? Are they helpful? Would you go to them for help?

What do your parents think about the SPW program? Do they know anything about it? Do you ever talk to your parents about it?

What do other members of the community think?

I'm going to ask you about some of the different activities of the SPW program here. First, there are the lessons. Do all of you go to the lessons? How many times do you go a week? How many people are there in the lessons? Is that too many or about the right number? Do you always go? How many volunteers teach the lessons? What kinds of things do you learn in them?

What is the best thing about these lessons? What are the things you don't like?

Do you feel like you have learned a lot in them? Do you know more about HIV/AIDS than you knew before the lessons? Is there anything the volunteers could do to make them better? Are these lessons useful to you? In what way are these lessons useful? Do you think these lessons teach students things that keep them from getting HIV/AIDS? How?

Ok, let's talk about the extra-curricular/after-school activities? What kinds of things do the SPW volunteers organize after school? How often? How many people participate? Boy or girls? Is that enough or are there too many? Why? Do you participate?

What do you like about these activities? What don't you like about them? Is there anything the volunteers could do to improve these events?

How do you think these activities help you? Do you think these events keep kids from getting HIV/AIDS? How?

Now let's talk about in-school, inter-school and community events organized by the SPW volunteers? Has there been one this year? Do you remember one from last year? How many people participate? Did you?

What do you like about these events? What do you not like about them? How could they be improved?

Are these events helpful? How do you think these events benefit people? Who do they benefit? Do people learn about HIV/AIDS at these events? Is there any way that the events might help prevent the spread of AIDS? Have you learned any skills by participating in these events? (for example, dancing, drama, sports)

What does your community know about the SPW program? How does your community support the SPW program?

Finally, we're going to talk about the YRC. Where is it? How often are volunteers there? What is the purpose of the YRC? How many people actually go there? Do you?

What is the best thing about the YRC? Is there anything you don't like? What? Do you have any suggestions for improving the YRC?

Is the YRC helpful to you or others? How does it benefit students? How do you think it helps prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS?

Do you think that SPW has changed your school? In what ways?

Do you think the SPW has changed you? In what ways?

Interview Guide: Teachers

My name is _____ and I am here to ask you some questions about the SPW program. Your answers to these questions will help SPW know more about how their program is going in schools. We are talking to teachers in this and nine other schools in the Central Province where SPW has programs. You don't have to answer any questions, but your answers are very important because you are the ones that this program is for. When we make a report about our assessment, we will not use your name or describe you in any way that will be recognizable.

First of all, tell us what you like about this school?

What do you not like about this school?

What are students like in this school?

What are the parents like? How supportive have they been to you and this program?

What kinds of problems do students in this school have? Where do they usually get help for their problems? What adults do they trust to help them?

Are girls and boys treated differently in this community/school? How?

Do you think most of the kids in this school are having sex? Any of them? For those who might be having sex, do you think they are using a condom? Do you know if any of your friends have ever had an STI? Do you know anyone who is HIV+?

Is there a problem with girls getting pregnant in this school? What is the problem? Why do they get pregnant? Who are the fathers?

What are the SPW volunteers like? How do the students get along with them? How do the teachers interact with them?

I'm going to ask you about some of the different activities of the SPW program here. First, there are the lessons. How many lessons do the volunteers teach a week? How many students are there in the lessons? Is that too many or about the right number?

What do you think is the best thing about these classes? What are the things you don't like?

Do you feel that these lessons are useful for students? Do they learn a lot? Do they know more about HIV/AIDS than you knew before the SPW lessons? What about these lessons is helpful to students? Do you think these lessons teach students things that keep them from getting HIV/AIDS? How? Have you seen any changes in the students because of these lessons? Do you think these lessons help teachers in any way?

Ok, let's talk about the extra-curricular/after-school activities? What kinds of activities does SPW organize after school? How often? How many people participate? Boys or girls? Is that enough or are there too many? Why? Do you ever participate in any of these with the volunteers?

What do you like about these activities? Do students enjoy them? What don't you like about them? Is there anything that could be done differently for these events? What do you think parents think about these activities?

How do you think these activities help the kids? In what ways are these activities helpful? Do you think these events keep kids from getting HIV/AIDS? How does it do this? If not, are there other ways in which it is useful?

Now let's talk about the in-school, inter-school and community events coordinated by SPW? Have there been any this year? How many people participate? Did you?

What do you like about these events? What do you not like about them? What would make them better?

Are these events helpful? Who do these events benefit? In what way do they benefit these people? Do people learn about HIV/AIDS at these events? Is there any way that they might prevent the spread of AIDS? What kind of feedback do you get from the parents or the community about these events?

How aware is your community of the SPW program? How well does your community support the SPW program? Do these events help build support?

Now we're going to talk about the YRC. Where is it? How much time do you spend there? How much time do students spend there? When? In your opinion what is the purpose of the YRC? How many people actually go there?

What is the best thing about the YRC? Is there anything you don't like? What? Do you have any suggestions for improving the YRC?

Is the YRC helpful to students? What is it about the YRC that benefits students? How do you think it helps prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS?

Finally, let's talk about the teacher workshops conducted by the SPW volunteers? Have you attended any of these? Have you found them useful or not useful? In what ways was it useful or not useful? Did you learn new things? Do you think you would be able to teach an SPW lesson – using interactive methods – on your own? Have you ever helped with an SPW lesson with the volunteers? What recommendations do you have for improvements in these workshops?

Do you think that SPW has changed this school? In what ways? Have you noticed any differences in the students as a result of SPW? Please describe.

Do you think SPW has changed you? In what ways?

How critical do you feel is the role of the volunteer peer educators in the SPW program? Do you think it would be as effective a program if teachers took over these activities? Why or why not?

What is the thing you like best about the program overall? What is the thing you like least overall? Do you have suggestions for SPW to improve the program?

Interview Guide: Volunteer Peer Educators

My name is _____ and I am here to ask you some questions about the SPW program. My colleague _____ will be taking notes. Your answers to these questions will help SPW know more about how their program is going in schools. We are talking to SPW volunteers in this and nine other schools in the Central Province. You don't have to answer any questions, but your answers are very important because you are the ones that this program is for. When we make a report about our assessment, we will not use your name or describe you in any way that will be recognizable.

First of all, tell us what you like about this school?

What do you not like about this school?

What are students like in this school?

What kinds of problems do students in this school have? Where do they usually get help for their problems? What adults do they trust to help them?

Are girls and boys treated differently in this community/school? How?

Do you think most of the kids in this school are having sex? Any of them? For those who might be having sex, do you think they are using a condom? Do you have any friends who have gotten STIs or know of anyone who is HIV+?

Is there a problem with girls getting pregnant in this school? What is the problem? Why do they get pregnant? Who are the fathers?

What are the teachers like? How much interaction have you had with them since you've been here? How has your relationship with the SST been?

How much interaction have you had with parents in this school? How supportive have they been to you and this program? Can you give examples of their support or non-support?

I'm going to ask you about some of the different activities of the SPW program here. First, let's talk about the lessons. How many lessons do you teach a week? Do you teach alone or together? How many students do you teach at one time? Is that too many or about the right number?

What do you like most about these lessons? What are the things you don't like?

Do you feel that these classes are useful for students? Do they learn a lot? Do they know more about HIV/AIDS than you knew before the classes? Is there anything about the curriculum or the SPW program that could make teaching these classes easier for you? What is it about the lessons that help students? In what ways do you think these lessons help

students? Do you think these classes teach students things that keep them from getting HIV/AIDS? Do you think these classes help teachers in any way?

Ok, let's talk about the extra-curricular/after-school (clubs or sports) activities? What kinds of things do you organize after school? How often? How many people participate? Boy or girls? Is that enough or are there too many? Why?

What do you like about these activities? Do you enjoy them? What don't you like about them? Is there anything that could be done to help you with these activities? What do you think teachers and parents think about these activities?

How do you think these activities help the kids? What is it about these activities that are useful to the students? Do you think these activities keep students from getting HIV/AIDS? How?

Now let's talk about in-school, inter-school and community events? What has happened so far this year? Describe your event(s). How many people participated from the school and the community? Are you planning others?

Do you enjoy these events? What do you like about these events? What do you not like about them? What kind of help do you need for planning and conducting one of these events?

Are these events helpful? What is it about these events that is helpful? Who do these events help? Do people learn about HIV/AIDS at these events? Is there any way that they might prevent the spread of AIDS? What kind of feedback do you get from the parents or the community about these events? Do think these events are worth the effort they take?

Do you think these events help build community support for your program? How does your community support the SPW program?

Finally, we're going to talk about the YRC. Where is it? How much time do you spend there? When? What is the purpose of the YRC? How many students actually go there? Do you? Do teachers ever use the YRC?

What is the best thing about the YRC? Is there anything you don't like? What? Do you have any suggestions for improving the YRC?

Is the YRC helpful to students? What is it about the YRC that is helpful to students? How do you think it helps prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS?

How many workshops have you held for teachers since you've been here? Do you think the teachers find these helpful to them? What kind of feedback have you gotten from them?

Which components of this program are most useful for the students? Why? Are there any of them that, if they were dropped out, would not change the impact of the program?

How critical do you feel is the role of the volunteer peer educators in the SPW program? Do you think it would be as effective a program if teachers took over these activities? Why or why not?

Do you think that SPW has changed this school? In what ways?

Do you think being an SPW volunteer has changed you? In what ways?

What is the thing you like best about being a volunteer? What is the most difficult thing about being a volunteer? Do you have suggestions for SPW to improve the program?

Anything else?

Interview Guide: SPW Support Teachers (SSTs)

My name is _____ and I am here to ask you some questions about the SPW program. Your answers to these questions will help SPW know more about how their program is going in schools. We are talking to teachers in this and nine other schools in the Central Province where SPW has programs. You don't have to answer any questions, but your answers are very important because you are the ones that this program is for. When we make a report about our assessment, we will not use your name or describe you in any way that will be recognizable.

First of all, tell us what you like about this school?

What do you not like about this school?

What are students like in this school?

What are the parents like? How supportive have they been to you and this program?

What kinds of problems do students in this school have? Where do they usually get help for their problems? What adults do they trust to help them?

Are girls and boys treated differently in this community/school? How?

Do you think most of the kids in this school are having sex? Any of them? For those who might be having sex, do you think they are using a condom? Do you know if any of your friends have ever had an STI? Do you know anyone who is HIV+?

Is there a problem with girls getting pregnant in this school? What is the problem? Why do they get pregnant? Who are the fathers?

Now, to talk about the SPW program a bit...Please tell me about your role as the SST?

What are the SPW volunteers like? How do you interact with them as the SST? How do the students get along with them? How do the other teachers interact with them?

I'm going to ask you about some of the different activities of the SPW program here. First, there are the lessons. How many lessons do the volunteers teach a week? How many students are there in the lessons? Is that too many or about the right number? Do you ever co-teach with them?

What do you think is the best thing about these classes? What are the things you don't like?

Do you feel that these lessons are useful for students? Do they learn a lot? Do they know more about HIV/AIDS than you knew before the SPW lessons? What about these lessons is helpful to students? Do you think these lessons teach students things that keep them from

getting HIV/AIDS? How? Have you seen any changes in the students because of these lessons? Do you think these lessons help teachers in any way?

Ok, let's talk about the extra-curricular/after-school activities? What kinds of activities does SPW organize after school? How often? How many people participate? Boys or girls? Is that enough or are there too many? Why? Do you ever participate in any of these with the volunteers? Do you ever help the volunteers plan and coordinate them?

What do you like about these activities? Do students enjoy them? What don't you like about them? Is there anything that could be done differently for these events? What do you think parents think about these activities?

How do you think these activities help the kids? In what ways are these activities helpful? Do you think these events keep kids from getting HIV/AIDS? How does it do this? If not, are there other ways in which it is useful?

Now let's talk about the in-school, inter-school and community events coordinated by SPW. Have there been any this year? How many people participate? Did you? Have you ever helped the volunteers plan or coordinate them?

What do you like about these events? What do you not like about them? What would make them better?

Are these events helpful? Who do these events benefit? In what way do they benefit these people? Do people learn about HIV/AIDS at these events? Is there any way that they might prevent the spread of AIDS? What kind of feedback do you get from the parents or the community about these events?

How aware is your community of the SPW program? How well does your community support the SPW program? Do these events help build support?

Now we're going to talk about the YRC. Where is it? How much time do you spend there? How much time do students spend there? When? In your opinion what is the purpose of the YRC? How many people actually go there?

What is the best thing about the YRC? Is there anything you don't like? What? Do you have any suggestions for improving the YRC?

Is the YRC helpful to students? What is it about the YRC that benefits students? How do you think it helps prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS?

Finally, let's talk about the teacher workshops conducted by the SPW volunteers. Have you attended any of these? Have you found them useful or not useful? In what ways was it useful or not useful? Did you learn new things? Do you think you would be able to teach an SPW lesson – using interactive methods – on your own? What recommendations do you have for improvements in these workshops?

Do you think that SPW has changed this school? In what ways? Have you noticed any differences in the students as a result of SPW? Please describe.

Do you think SPW has changed you? In what ways?

How satisfied have you been with your work as the SST? Do you feel the need for more training or more support from SPW? What kind of training or support do you feel like you need?

How critical do you feel is the role of the volunteer peer educators in the SPW program? Do you think it would be as effective a program if teachers took over these activities? Why or why not?

What do you consider the key elements of the SPW program? Are there any elements that are less critical to the program than others?

What is the thing you like best about the program overall? What is the thing you like least overall? Do you have suggestions for SPW to improve the program?

Appendix D: Observation Guides

SPW Lesson Observation Sheet

1. Degree of interactiveness of the lesson.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

2. How the volunteers are coordinating/controlling the class.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

3. Coordination between the volunteers in terms of information dissemination.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

4. Class environment (i.e., arrangement).

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

5. Vibe/mood of volunteers (enthusiasm).

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

6. How well they are prepared for lesson.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

7. Pupil participation.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

8. Communication, clarity, explanation, and audibility.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

9. Structure (i.e., intro, main body and conclusions).

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

10. Mix of different activities.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

11. Participation between boys and girls.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

12. Encouraging responses from girls.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

Size of the class: _____

Number of girls: _____

Number of boys: _____

School: _____

Observed by: _____

YRC Observation Sheet

1. How well organized books are.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

2. Youth-friendliness of the room.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

3. Cleanliness.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

4. Location.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

5. Structure (i.e, material structure of the room).

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

6. Arrangement of the books in terms of topic.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

7. Accessibility to pupils.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

8. Accessibility in terms of times it is opened.

1	2	3	4	5
Very poor	Poor	Fine	Good	Excellent

Notes: _____

School: _____ Observed by: _____