



# World Vision

## Peer Education Training

Summary Report of Follow Up Workshops:

July 2010

Limpopo

Free State

Eastern Cape

Centre for the Support of Peer Education

## Executive Summary

CSPE and World Vision (WV) have an MOU in place, where they requested CSPE support to pilot a school-based HIV peer-led prevention programme in three provinces (Free State, Eastern Cape and Limpopo) in communities where WV is currently working. Six schools in each province have been targeted to pilot the prevention programme, 18 schools in total. The schools were selected based on their proximity to the other WV intervention programmes in the target communities as a way to enhance linkages between all of WV's programmes and expand their circle of influence within the communities. The methodology of the programme is based on the CSPE philosophy for prevention education using peer education as the strategy and focusing on the multiplier effect of reach to beneficiaries.

WV has strengthened their infrastructure to respond to this programme by appointing 18 Youth Facilitators (YF) who are based at each of the schools. The YFs report to the ADP office based in each of the communities. All 18 were trained by CSPE in February 2010 in addition to an extensive orientation programme presented by WV. The Youth Facilitators are supported by the HIV/AIDS Regional Coordinators based at the WV office in each of the communities. These teams are responsible for the implementation of the peer education programme together with their DoE Educator counterpart selected from each school.

During the months of March and April 2010 CSPE trained 225 learners as peer educators and 31 Educators as Site Supervisors. The learners were expected to go back to their schools and implement 5 pre-designed peer-led lessons between May and June 2010.

200 Learners and 16 Educators came back for the follow-up training in July 2010. Some peer educators have dropped-out of the programme and some could not make it due to school engagements and challenges with parental consent.

Due to budgetary constraints, World Vision opted for a model where CSPE does not provide onsite support to the programme, which was provided by WV YF and National Prevention Coordinator. Follow-up trainings were therefore the only opportunity CSPE had to gather information on what is taking place at the sites and to deal with any challenges that the sites were experiencing. The follow-up trainings took place over weekends and were conducted with the same peer educators and educators in their respective provinces (Limpopo, Free State, Eastern Cape) during July 2010. The main purpose of the trainings was to reflect on implementation progress, to provide M&E support and to improve lesson planning and facilitation skills.

World Vision Regional Coordinators from each of the Area Development Programme (ADP) offices and the National Prevention Coordinator conducted site visits after the initial trainings and observed sessions where possible. Youth Facilitators who were based at the schools provided direct onsite support to the programme, where they planned and debriefed with the peer educators and conducted ongoing advocacy to ensure support for the programme.

The trainings in Limpopo and Free State were not residential, i.e. the participants were travelling to and from the venues which were schools. In Limpopo the training was conducted at two of the schools that are implementing the programme (Mahudu High School and Seagole High School); in the Free State, World Vision opted to hire a school hall in Nthaba-Nchu (Tlotlanang Combined School) because it was more accessible than the target schools. Eastern Cape was the only province that had a residential training at two separate venues, i.e. Matatiele and Fort Beaufort; because the children lived far from their own schools and would therefore be unable to travel in and out on a daily basis like in the other provinces.

### Successes

As with the initial peer educator training the arrangements were planned and organised very professionally by World Vision, it was evident that they had built solid relationships with the sites. The schools that were selected in Limpopo and Free State were all accessible and very conducive to learning; the hotels in the Eastern Cape were also selected well, the space was acceptable. In Matatiele, however, the hotel was far from where the people lived and led to the workshop starting late because the children arrived late. The ADP offices were given enough notice and all the expected participants arrived and stayed for the duration of all the trainings. Transport arrangements were also coordinated well because the children were brought to the venues on time except for the Eastern Cape where the children were late because of distances.

Of the 18 target schools, only 1 had not implemented any lessons. This gives some indication that the schools are supportive of the programme and are providing the necessary support and space to the peer educators. The 1 school that had not implemented had a lot of challenge, over and above programme implementation; the challenges within the school have made it difficult for the programme to be successfully implemented. World Vision has also provided the necessary support to the sites through their Youth Facilitators to ensure that the programme is implemented in the schools.

As with the initial training, there was a lot of support from WV throughout the trainings; the National Prevention Coordinator was present at one of the venues for all the trainings and there was representation from the ADP offices in each of the target areas. All the Youth Facilitators attended the trainings and continued to work with their schools to plan for sessions, and provided input during the training.

### Challenges

In general, there were few challenges with the planning and implementation of the trainings. As mentioned above the logistics were well managed and WV was well organised, except for the few challenges experienced with transportation in Matatiele, where the children lived very far apart and also very far from the venue, this led to the training starting late. As the trainings were not residential it meant that sometimes participants were late because of transport. This did not affect the agenda as much as during the initial trainings, as facilitators ensured that the reflection and M&E were done in full. In some provinces participants only completed the section of the agenda of planning for facilitation of new sessions but did not get an opportunity to facilitate. This was not seen as a disadvantage because the peer educators have been facilitating and are given opportunity to practice when they plan for their lessons.

It was disappointing that the number of Educators at the follow-up trainings was less than in the initial trainings. Most Educators found it difficult to work over a weekend and in Limpopo one of the Educators arrived in the morning but was not part of any of the discussions because he kept disappearing into the nearby village.

In the Free State, Educators were present, but seemed to be still somewhat disengaged although this did not affect the peer educators as it had in the initial trainings. The presence of the Youth Facilitators working with the Peer Educators seemed to bridge the gap created by the lack of support from the Educators and did not seem to have any impact on the implementation of the programme. The Eastern Cape, which had the lowest number of Educators during the initial trainings, remained so from two of the schools; one school had 2 Educators. Again, this did not affect the peer educators in any negative way, as they seemed to be very comfortable working with the Youth Facilitators.

WV's appointment and placement of Youth Facilitators at the target schools has ensured that the programme continued, even with minimal support from the Educators. Although this is not the ideal approach to implementation and denies the school the proper ownership of the programme, the process has allowed the schools to see the benefit of the programme and will hopefully provide the necessary stimulus. During the follow-up trainings CSPE got a preview of what is taking place at the various sites and the feedback received has been positive. All the schools expressed an interest in continuing with the project in the second year of implementation, even the school that has not implemented was keen to continue with the programme.

The following report provides a summary of the concurrent trainings in each province. The report gives a profile and progress of each school in each province. This will assist World Vision and CSPE in planning for support and continuation of the programme.

## Limpopo 17-18 July 2010, Mahudu High School and Seagotle High School, Limpopo

### **Facilitators**

#### *Mahudu High School*

1. Busisiwe Baloyi
2. Barbara Michel

World Vision Representative: Kediemetse Sekhabisa

#### *Seagotle High School*

1. Thabile Shange
2. Theo Sesinyi

World Vision Representative: Maria Kgabo

## **Day 1: Saturday, 17 July 2010**

The workshop at Seagotle started late because the school gates were locked when everyone arrived. This was because the caretaker of the school had not been informed about the training taking place over the weekend. The workshop at Mahudu High School started on time. 68 Learners, 5 Educators, 6 Youth Facilitators, 1 Regional Coordinator, and 1 National Prevention Coordinator attended the trainings at the two venues. There were 5 Educators less than the numbers trained at the initial training and there were 5 peer educators less than the number initially trained. This is because some of the peer educators were actually representatives from the RCL. Youth Facilitators provided most of the support to the learners during the training, it was evident that they were used to working together.

The agenda (appendix 1) was adjusted as needed to make up for time lost in the morning or during sessions.

### **Session 1: Getting Started**

Ground Rules were pre-written on flipchart and presented to the groups, they were given an opportunity to add to them, there were no additions. The following ground rules were adopted by both groups:

1. Respect
2. Active participation
3. Cellphones off
4. Be Punctual
5. Be honest
6. Team work
7. No side talks

When asked what they had learned/ remember from the previous training, participants at Mahudu High School came up with the following:

1. Risky behaviours
2. Decision-making
3. HIV prevention
4. Managing peer pressure
5. Asking good questions
6. Facilitation skills
7. How to summarise lessons
8. What is an ice-breaker
9. How to work as a team

The group at Seagotle High school did not manage to discuss a re-cap of the last training in detail because they started late. After this participants were taken through the session on reflections.

### **Session 2: Reflecting on our Journey**

Questions were pre-prepared for this part of the workshop (Appendix 2: Framework for training); participants were expected to work in their school teams to respond to the questions. The different responses are presented below in tables and organised according to the two ADPs.

**Kodumela ADP**

**Name of School: Ramatau Senior School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 13**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

<b>School Structure</b>	<b>Scheduling</b>	<b>Peer Education Practice</b>	<b>Curriculum</b>	<b>Technical Assistance</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>
No. of active peer educators: 12; 1 got pregnant and decided to drop-out.	Sessions taking place after school because the Principal offered only 30 minutes for peer education and peer eds opted for an after school programme where they would have more time.	Peer educators planned as a team but practiced in smaller groups.	They tried very hard to stick to the allocated time.	The peer educators felt that the initial training had provided them with sufficient training to be able to implement the programme, especially the ability to ask questions to make people participate.	
No. of grade 8 classes: 3	The lessons had to be pre-arranged with the grade 8 classes and the transport drivers so that they could get home after the lessons. This was a challenge initially because kids did not come, but once transport arrangements were made, then they stayed.	The grade 8 classes participated and asked questions where they needed clarity.	The second lesson worked better than the first because they had learned from their mistakes.	Both the Youth Facilitator and the Educators were present during sessions and this did not affect participation in the class.	
No. of kids per class: 50	Peer educators have not missed any lessons.	They found it difficult to talk less as they had to explain a lot of	The Protection lesson did not work well because it was their	Peer Educators felt that they needed more support in simplifying	

		things, so they did approximately 30% of the talking.	first and they were nervous.	the lesson instructions in the manual and help them improve voice projection.	
No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams working with individual classes.	1 Educator stays behind after school to observe the session and to make sure kids come.	Their biggest challenge has been translating the lessons to their own language, i.e. they were facilitating in English.	The participants learned a lot from the lessons especially the Protection lesson that they can talk to many different people.	Peer educators would like to spend more time planning because they feel they don't do this sufficiently.	
No. of lessons implemented: 2 to 2 grade 8 classes. 1 grade 8 class has never had a peer ed lesson and 1 team have never facilitated. This is because the class is known as the "problem class". Educators also have challenges with the class, but peer educators have vowed to try again.		Observer played his/her role and reported back during debriefing.	They suggested changed to the ice-breakers in both lesson 1 and 2		
Lessons taking place twice a week.					
Code of conduct was developed but has not been used.					

Participants were given scenarios to practice completing the forms for the M&E component of the programme due to time adjustments.

**Name of School: Seagotle High School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 13**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; 1 passed away.	Sessions taking place after school because Educators could not allow kids to miss classes.	Peer educators work with both Supervisors and Youth Facilitators to plan for sessions after school. Planning takes place on Mondays.	The peer educators were taking up to 48 minutes to do sessions, even though sessions are meant to be done in less time.	The peer educators felt that the initial training had provided them with sufficient training to be able to implement the programme, especially facilitation skills.	
No. of grade 8 classes: 2	Peer educators offered study period after school and given opportunity to catch up on weekends.	The first session was most difficult as grade 8 learners were not participating, this improved in subsequent lessons, where grade 8s were participating and peer educators did less talking.	The Protection lesson (Lesson 1) worked well, the kids loved it and the peer educators found it easy to implement.	The Youth Facilitator was always present during sessions, the Educator only attended debriefing sessions.	
No. of kids per class: 80	The programme is not part of the school timetable.	The most difficult facilitation skill has been asking good questions. They found it difficult to ask follow-up questions.	The decision-making lesson was a challenging for both peer educators and participants to understand.	Only the Youth Facilitator was present during sessions, the educators never attended any of the sessions.	
No. of peer educator		The observer was	The participants	Peer educators would	

teams: 3		doing what s/he needed to do as they were able to keep the class quite and give feedback during debriefing.	learned a lot from the lessons especially the Protection lesson.	like Educators to also be present during the lessons.	
No. of lessons implemented: 2			The only change suggested was the replacement of the Decision-making lesson. It should be replaced with an easier lesson.		
Lessons implemented after school because Educators refused to do peer education during class time.					
Peer educators not seeing the same kids because they come when they want to because it's after school.					
Lessons taking place twice a week.					
Code of conduct was developed but has not been used.					

Participants were given scenarios to practice completing the forms for the M&E component of the programme due to time adjustments.

**Name of School: Rakgolokwane High School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 1**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; none have dropped out.	The programme has not been given time within the school.	Peer educators would like to practice more.	No Comment	No comment	
No. of lessons implemented: 0					
No lessons have been implemented because the school has not been supportive in giving time for peer education to take place. It seems like the school did not understand how the programme works when it was introduced during advocacy meeting. The Youth Facilitator and the National Coordinator will continue negotiating with the school. The peer educators are still enthusiastic about the programme.					

Participants were given scenarios to practice completing the forms for the M&E component of the programme due to time adjustments.

### Thusalushaka ADP

**Name of School: Mulima Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 13**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; 1 has dropped out with no explanation. The Youth Facilitator decided to add a new peer educator as a replacement.	The school offered 2 grade 8 periods but only 1 is being used on Fridays. So that peer educators don't miss too many subjects.	Planning only done with Youth Facilitator because Educators cannot stay after school due to transport problems. However, they meet with peer educators to check on the programme.	The lessons are taking approximately 30 minutes, but sometimes longer.	The training prepared them for implementation but they would like more information on HIV/AIDS so that they can be able to answer questions from the grade 8 classes.	The observer is responsible for completing the M&E forms during the sessions.
No. of grade 8 classes: 2	The periods are normally 30 minutes, but some teachers allow the session to go on beyond the allocated 30 minutes.	The grade 8 classes were attentive and listened to the peer educators.	Only 1 session has been implemented and it went well.	Both the Youth Facilitator and the Educators were present during sessions.	Forms used: Session Observation Form; Face-to-Face Discussion Form.
No. of kids per class: 30	Peer educators are given opportunity to make up for subjects that they have missed. Educators stay with them after school	They managed to get the kids to talk more than them.	The kids seemed to like the lesson and they learned about where they can get help.	They would like to be supported in classroom management because some of the classes are difficult to work with.	They found the forms easy to work with and not difficult except for the Summary Session Attendance Register.
No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams working with groups of 20.	The school management has been very supportive of the programme.	There was one learner who was disruptive during the session, but the peer educators	It was suggested that the time allocation should be increased.	They would like to have a T-shirt or badge that will identify them as peer educators in	

		gave him a warning which calmed him down.		the school.	
No. of lessons implemented: 1		They would like support to improve their facilitation skills.			
Lessons taking place once a week.					
Code of conduct was developed and used to try and get the peer educator that has dropped out to come back to the programme, but he still has not come back.					

**Name of School: Mahudu Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 13**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 13; no drop-out.	Peer education takes place during grade 8 LO periods and during study period after school.	Planning is done together with Youth Facilitators and Educators.	Some teams are taking 50 minutes and some keeping to time.	The training did not prepare them sufficiently for implementation; they would have liked the training to be longer.	The observer and the facilitators complete the forms
No. of grade 8 classes: 3	Peer educators have missed classes but teachers have helped them catch-up through being given class-work as homework.	One of the classes was noisy and disruptive whilst the other classes were quiet and shy with only a few people participating.	Only 1 session has been implemented and it went well.	Both the Youth Facilitator and the Educators were present during sessions.	Forms used: Session Observation Form; Summary Session Attendance register was not used, only World Vision Attendance Register used.
No. of kids per class: 40, 42, 43	The school management has been very supportive of the programme.	The facilitators were only asking questions, so the kids were talking more.	The kids learned that they could go to peer educators when they need help.	They are getting a lot of support from the Educators and World Vision during planning and facilitation of lessons.	They found the forms easy to work with because the Youth Facilitator had shown them how to complete them.
No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams working with groups of 20; so each team is responsible for 2		The observer was doing his job and gave feedback for them to improve.	It was suggested that the ice-breaker for the first session be simplified.	They would like more training on facilitation skills and a manual only on facilitation.	They would like more practice on the forms.

groups.					
No. of lessons implemented: 1		They would like support to improve time-management and asking questions.			<i>Suggestion: information from the WV Attendance Register should be transferred to the CSPE SSAR.</i>
Lessons taking place twice a week.					
Code of conduct was developed and has not been used.					

**Name of School: Vhaluvhu Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; no drop-out.	The SMT and WV signed an agreement that sessions would take place only twice a month and peer educators could use empty classes with the groups of 20.	Peer educators only planning with Youth Facilitator, no Educator.	The sessions took 70 minutes.	They felt that training prepared them sufficiently for implementation.	The observer is responsible for completing the forms
No. of grade 8 classes: 2	The school has made arrangements for peer educators to catch-up on what they have missed. Educators stay with them after school or during break.	The first lesson did not go well because the kids were noisy and disruptive. The second lesson was much better because they knew the peer educators.	The 2 <sup>nd</sup> lesson: Decision-Making worked well because the peer educators had learned from the first lesson.	Only the Youth Facilitator was present during the sessions. He also helps them with their assignment.	Forms used: Session Observation Form; Summary Session Attendance register was not used, only World Vision Attendance Register used.
No. of kids per class: 58, 59 (total= 117)	The school management has been very supportive of the programme.	The learners did most of the talking in the second lesson.	The 1 <sup>st</sup> lesson did not go well because the classes were disruptive and the peer educators were not very well prepared.	They are getting a lot of support from the Youth Facilitator.	They found the forms easy to work with because the Youth Facilitator had shown them how to complete them.

No. of peer educator teams: 6 teams working with groups of 20; so they work in pairs.		They had to deal with a situation where a peer educator and a learner got into a physical fight. They were both given a warning.	The kids learned about where they can get help and how to make decisions.	They need more peer educators because they have a large number of grade 8s.	They would like more explanation about the forms.
No. of lessons implemented: 2		They need support with time-management.	They would like the following improvements: more time for the sessions; more facilitators as they are working in pairs; simpler ice-breakers.		<i>Suggestion: information from the WV Attendance Register should be transferred to the CSPE SSAR.</i>
Lessons taking place twice a month.		The observer was doing their job and gave feedback during debriefing.			
Code of conduct was developed and has been used, where a peer educator was given a warning for fighting with a learner during a session.					
They did not see the same group of grade 8s in the two sessions.					



### **Session 3: Lesson Preparation**

Participants were taken through the planning form and told to use it as a guide to help them prepare for facilitation. There were only 3 lessons to facilitate; the schools would have to prepare as a bigger group and then select a team to facilitate.

*The day ended at 17:00*

### **Day 2: Sunday, 18 July**

The second day started late because of transport problems.

#### **Session 1: M&E**

The M&E questions were given on flipchart of the participants to respond to. (*Responses in the tables above*)

The schools had only completed the Attendance Register given to them by World Vision and did not use the Summary Session Attendance Register (SSAR) provided by CSPE. It was suggested that they transfer the information from the one attendance register to the other because the CSPE form does not require signatures, they just need to fill-in the numbers of people attending sessions.

Participants were then given scenarios to practice completing the forms.

#### **Session 2: Lesson Facilitation**

There were no lessons facilitated from the Thusalushaka ADP as participants did not follow the instructions given to them by the facilitator. They did not plan as a team, only the facilitation team was prepared to facilitate. It was emphasised that it is very important to plan as a team and make sure that all peer educators are ready to facilitate.

The group in the Kodumela ADP managed to facilitate lessons and the feedback was as follows:

- The peer educators' facilitation skills have improved drastically from the first time we trained them, they still need to pay more attention on the following:
- Following the instructions in the manual; they are not to add their own stuff that would not help them meet the session goals.
- Observers to pay attention so that they give useful feedback.
- Peer educators to always keep in mind that all activities need to be debriefed.
- Summarizing is very important, some members still miss it.
- Working as a team will help them achieve the goal better and faster, they need to support each other.
- Participants should always be kept active otherwise they get bored and they would have no interest in the programme.

#### **Way Forward and Closure**

- CSPE thanked the participants for attending the workshop especially the Educators who had availed themselves for the weekend.

- World Vision also gave thanks and commended the peer educators for the work they had already done.
- The groups were then taken through a formal closing of the workshop.

The workshop ended at 12:00

### **General Observations:**

Only 5 out of the 10 Educators that were present at the initial training were present during the follow-up training.

It is clear that the 5 schools that have implemented sessions were getting a lot of support from the school and this is what has led to success of the programme.

The Youth Facilitators at the schools are providing the adult infrastructure to support the peer educators, this seems to be working well for the programme, however it is not sustainable as World Vision is only in the schools for a limited time.

In general, the programme seems to be progressing well in the schools. It is not expected that the schools will get it right the first time, however, they are on the right track. The programme is expected to continue next year if funding permits, the schools are looking forward to continuing with the programme.

## Final Evaluation Summary:

### Evaluation forms received from 41 out of 79 participants that attended the training.

1. Opening and welcome
  - All the participants felt that the welcoming was done very well.
  - They all felt comfortable to ask questions during the workshop.
  - All enjoyed the facilitation and ice-breakers.
2. Facilitation
  - The presentations were clear to everyone.
  - Facilitators responded clearly to everyone's questions.
  - The facilitators were friendly and open.
3. What do you feel you still need more training/ information on?
  - The importance of working as a team
  - More information on HIV and AIDS
  - Completing M&E forms
  - Understanding lesson instructions
  - Facilitation
  - Supervision
4. What was most enjoyable?
  - Giving input
  - Lessons
  - Communication with other schools
  - Presentations
  - Group discussions
  - Facilitating
  - Team-work
  - Ice-breakers
  - The facilitation
  - Learning from mistakes
  - Responses from other schools
5. General Comments
  - All participants were pleased with the facilitation.
  - Everyone agreed that they enjoyed the training.
  - They would like the training to be longer

## Free State

### 24-24 July 2010

### Plotlanang Combined School, Thaba-Nchu

#### **Facilitators:**

##### *Thaba-Nchu ADP:*

1. Thabile Shange
2. Busisiwe Baloyi

##### *Botshabelo ADP:*

1. Tanja Dodd
2. Theo Sesinyi

##### *World Vision Representatives:*

1. Kediemetse Sekhabisa, National Coordinator
2. Mmamakgala Lefalatsa, Free State Regional Coordinator

## **Day 1: Saturday, 24 July 2010**

The workshop was conducted at a central venue in Thaba-Nchu. World Vision had rented a hall and two classrooms at Tlotlanang Combined School. The workshop was conducted in two classrooms where participants were divided according to ADPs, i.e. Botshabelo ADP and Thaba-Nchu ADP.

The workshop started on time, all participants were already at the school when the Facilitators arrived. 69 Learners, 10 Educators, 6 Youth Facilitators, 1 Regional Coordinator, and 1 National Prevention Coordinator attended the trainings at the two venues. All the Educators that were present during the initial training came to the follow-up training. There were 4 peer educators less than the number initially trained. As during the initial training, Youth Facilitators provided most of the support to the learners during the training, it was evident that they were used to working together.

The agenda (appendix 1) for the training is attached. The same agenda was used for all the trainings.

### **Session 1: Getting Started**

Ground Rules were pre-written on flipchart and presented to the groups, they were given an opportunity to add to them, there were no additions. The following ground rules were adopted by both groups:

1. Respect
2. Active participation
3. Cellphones off
4. Be Punctual
5. Be honest
6. Team work
7. No side talks
8. No chewing

When asked what they had learned/ remember from the previous training, participants from Thaba-Nchu ADP came up with the following:

1. Facilitation
2. Asking good questions
3. Communication
4. Working as a group
5. Risky behaviours
6. Getting help
7. Sharing
8. Self-confidence
9. Learner behaviour
10. Decision-making

The Botshabelo group remembered/ learned the following at the previous training:

1. Risky behaviours – and we learnt about this so that as peer educators we can help
2. Listening skills and asking good questions
3. Roles of peer eds

4. Forms and M&E
5. Giving and receiving feedback
6. Plan/facilitate/debrief
7. Qualities of a peer educator

Participants were then assisted to complete the Participant Registration forms

After this participants were taken through the session on reflections.

### **Session 2: Reflecting on our Journey**

Questions were pre-prepared for this part of the workshop (Appendix 2: Framework for training); participants were expected to work in their school teams to respond to the questions. The different responses are presented below in tables and organised according to the two ADPs.



**Thaba-Nchu ADP**

**Name of School: Motlatla Intermediate School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

<b>School Structure</b>	<b>Scheduling</b>	<b>Peer Education Practice</b>	<b>Curriculum</b>	<b>Technical Assistance</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>
No. of active peer educators: 12; but only 8 were present for the training on Saturday and only 5 on Sunday.	It was decided that lessons would be conducted during exam time. Learners wrote exams in the morning and then facilitated lessons in the afternoon.	Planning and debriefing was done with the Supervisors and the Youth Facilitator a week before and then again an hour before the lesson.	They were taking 45 minutes to implement lessons	The training helped them gain confidence. It also helped them to be able to stand in front of other kids and facilitate and also give valuable advice.	The peer educators are responsible for the completion of forms.
No. of classes: Facilitation taking place in 3 different grades: Grade 7, Grade 8 and Grade 9.	They still need to re-work the schedule for this term. However, the school has been supportive of the programme, there are no challenges anticipated.	The grade 7 class responded well to the sessions and wanted to have the sessions more often. But the other two grades were very disruptive and did not listen. They made it difficult to facilitate.	The first lesson was the most difficult to implement because it was their first time facilitating.	Both the Educator and the Youth Facilitator are present for the sessions.	Only the Session Observation form has been used. The Summary Session Attendance Register has not been used. Only the WV attendance register has been used.
No. of kids per class: 18 (Gr. 7), 36 (Gr. 8), 23 (Gr. 9).	Lessons took place during exam time, so no classes were missed by peer educators.	Peer educators did most of the talking in the grade 8 and 9 class because they didn't listen. But the grade 7 class did most of the talking because they	The second lesson was much easier because they had learned from their mistakes. But it was still difficult in the grade 8 and 9 classes.	They need more time to plan because they feel they will do better if they spent more time doing planning.	They are still finding it difficult to complete the forms, so they would like more help.



		were participating.			
No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams responsible for each class.		They are finding it difficult to facilitate to grade 8 and 9 because they ask irrelevant questions and the session takes a different direction.	The kids learned about where to go for help, choosing friends and the importance of talking to someone you trust.		
No. of lessons implemented: 2		The same teams are working with same class each time.	They would like o have more lessons on HIV, nutrition, care and support.		
Code of conduct was not developed they use the school code of conduct. They've had to discipline some members for smoking and fighting. Some members not attending planning and debriefing meetings.					

**General Comments:**

- The Youth Facilitator reported that some parents had not allowed the kids to attend the workshop on Sunday even though they had signed consent forms for the whole weekend.
- There were some inconsistencies when the group reported back, i.e. they reported that the planning takes place twice a week before the session and then an hour before the session on the day. But when probed they reported that the planning only takes place once on a Saturday, long before the sessions are due to take place. The Youth Facilitator reported that not all of them attend these planning sessions, but want to facilitate, this is why they feel unprepared when they do the sessions.

- It was emphasised that the programme was designed for the grade 9s to work with the grade 7s, not to work across 3 grades. The challenges that are being experienced with the grade 8 and 9 classes were anticipated by CSPE when the programme was designed. They need to focus only on the grade 7s and they can see for themselves that the grade 7 class is getting more value from the programme than the grade 8 and 9.
- They also need to better organise their M&E. They were requested to bring their M&E to the workshop, but it was incomplete and they didn't know where the other forms were. It was recommended that they use a file to keep their forms.

**Name of School: Tlhabaki Intermediate School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 11; 1 has dropped out without explanation.	It was agreed with the school that sessions should take place during LO period. All classes in the school have LO at the same time.	Both the Youth Facilitator and Educator are always present for planning meetings on Monday afternoons.	They have managed to stick to the allocated time.	The training only helped some of the peer educators. Some still needed more practice before they went to class.	Peer educators are responsible for completing the forms. They had brought their M&E forms.
No. of classes: Facilitation taking place in 2 different grades: Grade 7 and Grade 8.	Peer eds only missing LO period.	The first lesson did not work well with the grade 8 class because they were disruptive.	They enjoyed the "Protection" lesson.	Both the Educator and the Youth Facilitator were present during the training.	Forms used: Session Observation form; Summary Session Attendance Register;
No. of kids per class: 40 (Gr. 7) and 24 (Gr. 8). The grade 7 class is broken into two groups of 20.	They make up for what they have missed during free periods. One of the Supervisors is an LO Educator and helps them catch-up.	The grade 8 class was difficult to work with in the beginning but by the 3 <sup>rd</sup> session they were listening to them and having the	The second lesson did not go well because they were not well-prepared for facilitation and had to repeat the lesson so	Most of the support has been received from the Youth Facilitator who provides lesson material, blank forms and help with planning	The Youth Facilitator has given them a lot of support with the forms.

		Supervisor in the room helped with participation.	that they get to the goal.	and practice.	
No. of peer educator teams: 4 rotating between classes. No repeated exposure, peer eds not working with the same classes.	The principal and the SMT have been very supportive of the programme and have given it time within the school timetable.	The peer educators have been able to stick with the plan, their only challenge is the noise in the grade 8 class.	They would the lesson time to be extended because the 35 minutes allocated is too short.	They feel they still need more information so that they can be able to answer questions when they come up.	They would like more support from the school.
No. of lessons implemented: 3		They need more support in asking questions in English.		It was also suggested that the programme be started earlier in the year to allow more time for implementation.	
Lessons taking place once a week.		They also need more support with the completion of the Session Observation Form. The information that is being captured now is not helpful to them.			
Code of conduct was not developed they use the school code of conduct. They haven't had to discipline anyone.					

**General Comments:**

The programme seems to be running well in the school and their M&E was up-to-date. They were using both WV and CSPE tools together. They were given scenarios to work with because there were no corrections to their forms.



**Name of School: Maserona Intermediate School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; all of them still active.	The programme has been given the LO period. LO takes place at the same time in the whole school.	The Youth Facilitator has been present for most of the planning except for planning for session 2 where peer eds had to plan on their own.	The sessions are taking an hour to implement because of the large number of learners.	The training did prepare them for implementation because they got the confidence to facilitate.	Peer educators complete the forms and the Youth Facilitator checks them. They had brought their completed forms.
No. of classes: Facilitation taking place in 2 different grades: Grade 7 and Grade 8.	The LO teacher is the Supervisor, so he also helps them catch-up on what they miss in LO.	Session 3 went better than all the other sessions. The kids seemed to enjoy talking about girlfriends and boyfriends.	Session 3 worked better than the other two sessions.	The Supervisor was there for only 1 lessons and Youth Facilitator has been there for 2 lessons. 1 lesson had no adult observer.	Forms used: Session Observation form; Face-to-Face Discussion form. Only used the World Vision attendance register.
No. of kids per class: 35 (Gr. 7) and 38 (Gr. 8). The kids are brought together in the hall and the peer educators facilitate to all 73 at the same time.	The free-period on Friday is used for peer educators to catch-up on school work.	The first two sessions did not go well because the class is very big, disruptive and the kids don't listen.	Lesson 1 and 2 did not go very well because peer educators did not have the confidence yet.	The Youth Facilitator has been very supportive and has provided them with materials and helps them prepare for sessions.	The Youth Facilitator has given them a lot of support with the forms. They struggle to complete the forms when the Youth Facilitator is not there.
No. of peer educator teams: a facilitation team is chosen during planning to facilitate a particular lesson. Some	Most of the support is received from the Youth Facilitator. The school is also supportive because	The peer eds were talking more than the kids because they were asking them a lot of questions.	The biggest challenge is the number of kids in the class.	They would like more time to prepare and practice.	They would like more support from the school in order to keep order in the classroom.

peer eds have not facilitated.	the principal is the LO Educator and also their Supervisor.				
No. of lessons implemented: 3		Time management is a challenge because the class is so big.	They would like more training so that they can have more information to share with the learners.		
Lessons taking place once a week.		There is repeated exposure because they are seeing the same group of 73 learners.	They have suggested that the class be broken into 4 groups with four teams to make it more manageable.		
They do not have a code of conduct and have not had discipline any peer educators.					

**General Comments:**

- One of the Supervisors that was trained is not active and the other one is the principal, so this makes it difficult for him to participate fully in the programme because he is busy with his duties as a principal and also as an LO Educator. The Youth Facilitator is the only one providing them with support this is why they have to bring the two classes together because the kids are very disruptive when there's no adult in the room. It has been difficult to get the other Educators involved because they are always busy with other things during the LO period.
- Their M&E was very well-organised although they had only used the WV attendance register. They were assisted to transfer the information onto the CSPE SSAR; a Site Summary Form was also completed for a FTFDF submitted by one of the peer educators. They were reminded about the importance of completing forms for both WV and CSPE so that the two organisations can have records of what is happening at the sites.

**Bartimea School for the Blind**

Two Educators were trained from this school during the initial training. One of the Educators came to the follow-up training but left during the opening session. So there is no feedback about the programme in this school.

**Botshabelo ADP**

**Name of School: Khuthatso Intermediate School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; but only 7 are active, the other 5 are not committed to the programme.		Planning done together with the Youth Facilitator and Educator.	It was taking them approximately 40 minutes to implement sessions.		
No. of classes: 4		The grade 8 class is very supportive and they participate during the sessions.	All the sessions went well especially the "Relationships" session.		
No. of kids per class: 37, 38, 38, 38.		The participants do most of the talking; not the peer educators.			
No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams of 4.		Anything unplanned: the group shared that during the relationships session, one girl shared that they didn't have any of the people mentioned in the circles, so she couldn't participate in the activity. She was taken aside by one of the peer educators after the session.			

No. of lessons implemented: 3		They would like more support with time management because sessions are taking too long.			
Frequency of lessons: 2 times a month.					
Code of conduct has been developed. Example of rules: if a peer educator misses more than 3 lessons then they are out of the programme.					

**General Comments:**

*Responses on technical assistance and M&E are in the "general observations" section of the report.*

**Name of School: Lenyora la Thuto Intermediate School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; but 3 had to attend extra lessons to catch-up on school work.	It was decided that lessons would be conducted during exam time. Learners wrote exams in the morning and then facilitated lessons in the afternoon.	Planning and debriefing was done on their own because the Youth Facilitator was not always there.	It was taking them about 60 minutes to implement a lesson.		
No. of classes: 17 grade 10 classes	They still need to re-work the schedule for this term. However, the school has been supportive of the programme, there are no challenges anticipated.	The classes are cooperative except for one class where the kids are much older, even older than the peer educators. They always argue with peer educators because they already know what they are going to tell them.	The one lesson that has been done went well because they had done it so many times.		
No. of kids per class: 31, 30, 45, 34, 36, 36, 26, 29, 39, 32, 45, 23, 40, 22, 31, 28 and 24.	Lessons took place during exam time, so no classes were missed by peer educators.	Peer educators did their best to follow the 80/20 rule. The participants did most of the talking.	All the classes enjoyed the lesson because they all participated.		
No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams working with 6 classes.			In some classrooms they had to do some energisers to get the		

			kids going because the sessions take place after school.		
No. of lessons implemented: 1 (each team has done lesson 1 6 times)			Anything unplanned: a learner being disruptive during the session because he was in love with the peer educator, he was trying to get her attention.		
Lessons taking place during study time in the morning or afternoon 3 times a week.					
A code of conduct was developed by Youth Facilitators not by peer educators. They have had to discipline a peer educator who was taking phone numbers from girls. So, they realised the need for their contribution to the development of a code of conduct.					

**General Comments:**

*Responses on technical assistance and M&E are in the "general observations" section of the report.*

**Name of School: Hohle Intermediate School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 0**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12		They planned with an Educator who was not trained. She had read the manual and was able to help them. Youth Facilitator was not present.	It takes around 45-60 minutes to implement lessons.		
No. of classes: Implementing across two grades, i.e. 4 grade 8 classes and 4 grade 9 classes.		The grade 8 learners seem to be finding the lessons difficult to understand because they don't participate. So, peer educators do most of the talking.	Lesson 2 worked best because they had learned from lesson 1.		
No. of kids per class: 36 on each grade 8 class.		Grade 9 classes are very active and ask a lot of questions, some of which peer eds are unable to answer.	Lesson 1 and lesson 4 did not work well. Lesson 1 because it was their first lesson. Lesson 4 because kids found it difficult to formulate questions from the answers. Language could have been a challenge.		
No. of peer educator teams: 4 teams working with each		The observer played his role and presented during debriefing.	Anything unexpected: at the end of the relationships sessions,		

class.			kids shared their own experiences of healthy and unhealthy relationships.		
No. of lessons implemented: 5					
Lessons taking place during study time in the morning or afternoon once a week. Sometimes during LO lessons. Started implementing before schools closed for Winter.					
Code of conduct has been developed and used to discipline a peer educator who was not attending meetings.					

**General Comments:**

*Responses on technical assistance and M&E are in the "general observations" section of the report.*



### **Session 3: Lesson Preparation**

In the afternoon participants were taken through the planning form and told to use it as a guide to help them prepare for facilitation. There were only 3 lessons to facilitate; the schools would have to prepare as a big group and then select a team to facilitate.

*The day ended at 17:00*

### **Day 2: Sunday, 18 July**

The second day started with tea because the kids had travelled very early to get to the school.

#### **Session 1: M&E**

The M&E questions were given on flipchart for the participants to respond to. (*Responses in the tables for Thaba-Nchu ADP*). The responses from Botshabelo ADP were summarised as follows:

Each group responded that the peer educators needed to fill in the forms – only Hohle indicated that the supervisors needed to fill in the site summary form. All of the three schools had used the summary session attendance registers, and only one peer educator from Hohle had used a face-to-face form. Khuthatso had used the community event form as they had organised an awareness event – they run a youth club and the club had organised an event. The form had not been brought to the training with the other forms.

The kids from Lenyora la Thuto said that they found the forms easy to fill in but “they are tricky so you need to concentrate”. Their supervisors helped them fill in the forms. They also said that they wanted more support from the principal at their school and that the youth facilitator needs to be there more regularly.

The kids from Khothatso said that their youth facilitator had helped them with their forms and they found them “a little bit difficult but helpful”. They found it difficult to complete the forms on their own.

The kids at Hohle said that the youth facilitator and supervisor had photocopied forms for them, but they said they needed all of the educators of LO to be more supportive.

The schools in Thaba-Nchu ADP had only completed the Attendance Register given to them by World Vision and did not use the Summary Session Attendance Register (SSAR) provided by CSPE, except for Thlabaki who had used both. The two schools were assisted with transferring information from the WV forms to CSPE forms. Motlatla was also assisted with completing the Session Observation Form.

Only Thlabaki from Thaba-Nchu was given scenarios to practice completing the forms. The Botshabelo group all worked on the scenarios.

#### **Session 2: Lesson Facilitation**

There were no lessons facilitated with participants from Botshabelo ADP due to time constraints. Lesson facilitation highlights from the Thaba-Nchu ADP were as follows:

- Peer educators are still having challenges following the instructions and thus missing the goals and confusing the learners.
- They need to learn to use additional /probing questions.
- The planning form should be used and be followed so that their lessons could have a flow.
- They need more skill on encouraging participation and this links in with the need to learn to use probing questions.
- They seemed to be struggling with understanding the lesson on Multiple and Concurrent Partners, maybe the lesson could be simplified.

### Way Forward and Closure

Theo and Tanja with the Botshabelo ADP schools facilitated a session where they asked each school about their way forward, the responses were as follows:

**Khuthatso:** Finish all sessions, improve M&E forms and find out how to get them properly submitted and participate in youth clubs and do more community events.

**Hohle:** Community event at the site. The Protection Helpers lesson will be repeated with one group who did not understand it. The educator said she would like to see other schools in the Free State benefiting from the programme and perhaps they can use these peer educators as role models, she would also like to see Grade 7s benefiting from the programme.

**Lenyora la Thuto:** Proceed with lessons – might only be able to do two more with 17 classes, organise a community event.

Participants were asked if they would like to continue with the programme next year and they responded as follows:

**Hohle** – we enjoyed discussing and sharing info with our peers – yes, we want to help other peers – but want to know how? The only challenge is that they are in Grade 9 and will be moving to another school next year.

**Lenyora la Thuto:** yes, because we will like to be the change we want to see. They will still be at the same school so will be continuing next year

**Khuthatso:** yes because we can see we are making a difference, but the problem is that they are in Grade 9 and will be going to another school next year.

### Closure

- Participants were thanked for attending the workshop especially the Educators who had availed themselves for the weekend.
- A formal closing of the workshop was then facilitated.

The workshop ended at 12:00

## General Observations:

### Technical Assistance Feedback

When asked the question: Did the training prepare you for implementation? Participants responded as follows:

- Got confidence to stand in front of a group of people and facilitate
- Learnt what facilitation is
- Able to separate “work”-related issues from personal ones
- More aware of issues that youth face
- CSPE modelled how to do facilitation during training
- Able to listen to other people’s ideas
- Because of training I now know what to do as a peer educator
- I have been on other trainings and this one was the best
- I am able to manage time better

When asked: What do you think can be done to make implementation easier for you? Participants responded as follows:

- Have extra lessons for peer educators to practice – maybe even Saturdays
- Maximum participation from learners
- WV to help with material on time
- Sweets to make lessons more fun – “Love Candy”
- Support from principals and educators e.g. during assembly
- Photocopies

The programme in the Free State is structured slightly differently from programmes in the other provinces where you have grade 10 learners targeting grade 8 learners. In the Free State 5 out of the 6 schools are Intermediate Schools, the highest grade in the school is grade 9 and the one school has grade 10 as the lowest grade. In the Intermediate schools, grade 9 learners are supposed to target grade 7 learners; however, as discovered in the follow-up trainings this is not the case in some schools. Grade 9s work with grade 7, 8 and sometimes grade 9 classes. This is not ideal, as they have seen for themselves that the best classes to work with are grade 7 classes.

The children seemed very different from the initial training. They seemed more confident and understood the programme better. It was clear that they had done a lot of work with the Youth Facilitators when they got back to their schools.

Although the peer educators stated that they would like to continue with the programme, it is not possible because in the Intermediate Schools grade 9 is the last grade in the school and in the one high school, peer educators are from grade 11 and cannot participate in the programme next year when they are in matric.

In general, the programme is going well in all the schools. It is not expected that the schools will be at 100% implementation in the first year, however, the schools are doing their best and the programme is bound to improve and do well if the schools and World Vision decide to continue with it next year. New peer educators in the second year would have to be cautioned against including grade 8 and 9 in the programme because the lessons are designed for certain age-groups and grade 7 will give them more respect than the grades that are closer to them in age.

## Final Evaluation Summary:

### Evaluation forms received from 69 out of 76 participants that attended the training.

1. Opening and welcome
  - All the participants felt that the welcoming was done very well.
  - They all felt comfortable to ask questions during the workshop.
  - All enjoyed the facilitation and ice-breakers.
  
2. Facilitation
  - The presentations were clear to everyone.
  - Facilitators responded clearly to everyone's questions.
  - The facilitators were friendly and open.
  
3. What do you feel you still need more training/ information on?
  - Classroom management
  - Facilitation skills
  - The role of the observer
  - More information on HIV and AIDS
  - Information on how to deal with pregnant peer educators
  - Understanding lesson instructions
  - Using the planning tool as a guide
  
4. What was most enjoyable?
  - Using scenarios to fill-in the forms
  - Sharing experiences amongst schools
  - Talking about how we can improve the programme
  - Learning more ice-breakers
  - Participating
  - Learning from their mistakes
  - Presenting our challenges on flipchart
  - Team-work
  - Getting an opportunity to speak
  - Responding to questions that were given by facilitators
  - Lesson Preparation
  
5. General Comments
  - All participants were pleased with the facilitation.
  - They would like to get t-shirts from CSPE and certificates.
  - Everyone agreed that they enjoyed the training.
  - Do follow-up trainings every 6 months

## Eastern Cape

31 July- 01 August 2010

Seymour ADP: Savoy Hotel, Fort Beaufort

Mpofu ADP: Royal Hotel, Matatiele

### **Facilitators**

#### *Seymour ADP:*

1. Theo Sesinyi
2. Busisiwe Baloyi

#### *WV Representatives:*

1. Buyiswa Qobo, Regional Programme Manager, Eastern Cape
2. Permly Kapindula, Programme Manager, Seymour ADP
3. Bathini Nombila, KFC Programme Facilitator.

#### *Mpofu ADP:*

1. Tholakele Zulu
2. Thabile Shange

#### *WV Representatives:*

1. Kediemetse Sekhabisa
2. Ntombi Mvinjelwa

## **Day 1: Saturday, 31 July**

The workshop was conducted at two venues, i.e. for Mpofu ADP the workshop was conducted at the Royal Hotel in Matatiela and for Seymour ADP; the workshop was conducted at the Savoy Hotel in Fort Beaufort. Due to the long distances that kids would have travel, the workshop was residential, World Vision had arranged for them to stay over on Saturday night.

The workshop started on time in the Seymour ADP; however, there were challenges at the Mpofu ADP due to the long distances kids had to travel in the morning, the workshop started late. 63 Learners, 9 Educators, 6 Youth Facilitators, 1 Regional Coordinator, 3 Representatives (1 Mpofu, 2 Seymour) from the two ADP offices and 1 National Prevention Coordinator attended the trainings at the two venues. Only one of the Educators that were present during the initial training did not come to the follow-up training. There were 9 peer educators less than the number initially trained. As during the initial training, Youth Facilitators provided most of the support to the learners during the training; the two Educators that were present at the Savoy Hotel also showed a better understanding of the programme and provided the necessary support to the peer educators. The representatives from the ADP offices provided support to peer educator teams who had no Educators present at the training. Two of the representatives were school-based, so they were used to working with the learners and they worked well together.

The agenda (appendix 1) for the training is attached. The same agenda was used for all the trainings.

### **Session 1: Getting Started**

Ground Rules were pre-written on flipchart and presented to the groups, they were given an opportunity to add to them, there were no additions. The following ground rules were adopted by both groups:

- 1 Respect
- 2 Active participation
- 3 Cellphones off
- 4 Be Punctual
- 5 Be honest
- 6 Team work
- 7 No side talks
- 8 No chewing

When asked what they had learned/ remember from the previous training, participants from Mpofu ADP came up with the following:

- 1 Facilitation
- 2 Confidence
- 3 Lesson presentation
- 4 Keeping to time
- 5 Concentration
- 6 Respecting each other's view as a team
- 7 Planning for lessons

The Seymour group remembered/ learned the following at the previous training:

- 1 Risky behaviours
- 2 Facilitation skills
- 3 Roles of peer educators
- 4 M&E
- 5 Communication skills
- 6 Observation skills

## 7 Punctuality

Participants were then assisted to complete the Participant Registration forms

After this participants were taken through the session on reflections.

### **Session 2: Reflecting on our Journey**

Questions were pre-prepared for this part of the workshop (Appendix 2: Framework for training); participants were expected to work in their school teams to respond to the questions. Participants were reminded about how feedback should be given and that they need to stick to the task and not point fingers at each other for things that did not get done.

The different responses are presented below in tables and organised according to the two ADPs.

**Mpofu ADP**

**Name of School: Khorong Senior Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 11; 1 dropped out because his friends did not think it was cool to be a peer educator.	Peer education has been allocated grade 10 LO lessons on Fridays from 11:45-12:30.	Peer Educators planned together with Supervisors for 4 days, they meet for 30 minutes on each day of the week and then facilitate on Friday.	The first lesson took longer to implement, i.e. 45 minutes instead of 35 minutes.	Peer educators felt that the training prepared the sufficiently for the work, but it was too long and some sessions were done when they were tired, like M&E.	Peer educators were responsible for completing the forms.
No. of grade 10 classes: 3	Peer educators have missed English and Agriculture.	The class was great even though some learners were disrespectful because they were the same age as the peer educators.	The lessons on protection and relationships worked well.	They get a lot of support from the school, the Youth Facilitators has only been present at 1 of the 3 sessions that have been implemented.	Forms completed: Session Observation Form; Face-to-face Discussion Form.
No. of kids per class: 56, 30 and 58.	Educators have been willing to help them with notes information. They have received help from classmates.	The class was doing most of the talking because they were participating.	The session on decision-making did not work well. The ice-breaker was a bit complicated for both peer educators and participants to do.	They would like more material like kokis, flipchart and DVDs to help with lesson preparation.	They got support from the Youth Facilitator and the Educators to complete the forms.

No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams	They get a lot of support from the SMT, e.g. the principal has observed one of the sessions.	The lessons go over time because there are a lot of questions and a lot of discussion.	The kids learned about where to get help and how to realise when they are in a healthy or unhealthy relationship.		They were struggling to complete the forms because they did not understand the instructions.
No. of lessons implemented: 3		Peer educators are still struggling with classroom management and control.	They suggested that the ice-breaker for session 2 be changed.		They still need some more training on how to fill in the forms. They also need support from WV youth facilitator, they want him to attend all the lessons and all the planning meetings and to provide them with material for lessons.
Lessons taking place every other week before the June exams.		There has not been repeated exposure because the teams rotate between the different classes because they wanted to be known by all the classes that they were peer educators so that kids can come to any of them for help.			
Code of conduct has not been, but they use					



the school code of conduct. They have had problems with peer educators not coming to meetings and being disrespectful to each other. Supervisors were not aware of this and were only made aware at the training.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

**Name of School: Moiketsi Graves Senior Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; 1 was absent at the training because he was not at the pick-up point.	Sessions taking place during grade 10 LO period and also when Educators are in a meeting, peer educators are asked to take over the classes.	Peer educators meet the day before the sessions to plan. They meet for 1 hour but stayed longer for lesson 2 which they found challenging.	On average the lessons take 55 minutes to implement.	The peer educators felt that the training had prepared them sufficiently for lesson delivery.	The Observer for the day completes the forms.
No. of grade 10 classes: 3	Classmates helped peer educators catch-up on the classes that they missed. They also get assistance from Educators who stay on the school premises.	The kids enjoyed all the sessions.	The first session went well.	They feel they would still need more training on facilitation skills.	Forms completed: Session Observation Form; Summary Session Attendance Register; Face-to-face Discussion Form.
No. of kids per class: 46, 80 and 67.	The SMT is very supportive of the programme and they are allowing peer educators to use the school hall for the sessions.	The beneficiaries did most of the talking. But in most cases they ask irrelevant questions.	The lesson on relationships did not work well because there was no Supervisor and the class of 147 kids was very chaotic.		They did not have any major problems with the forms. They would only need help if there are new forms introduced.
No. of peer educator teams: 2 teams. The group of 80 and 67 are combined into one class and a team of 6	There has not been much support from the Youth Facilitator; he has only been to the school once.	The biggest challenge has been noise control.	The noise levels were unexpectedly high and the kids asked silly questions which made the class laugh and		

peer educators facilitates to the group of 147 kids.			become disruptive.		
No. of lessons implemented: 3		The Observer has been doing their job and providing feedback to the peer educators.	Beneficiaries learned about the need for protection and how to make good decisions. This they learned from the first 2 sessions that the peer educators did well.		
Two lessons implemented in May and 1 lesson in June.		The teams are seeing the same kids all the time.	They suggested that more lessons should be added to the manual.		
Code of conduct has not been, but they use the school code of conduct. They have had problems with peer educators not coming to meetings due to transport problems. The Youth Facilitator has held meetings with them in an attempt to resolve these issues, but they still persist.					

**Name of School: Ralebitso Senior Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12; 1 left school and was replaced with another peer educator. The new peer educator does not facilitate.	The schools have allowed peer educators to use LO periods and free periods.	Peer educators planned together with Supervisors. The planning took 1.5 hours. They have not done any debriefing since their 1 session.	The lesson took 1 hour to implement because participants were asking a lot of questions.	The peer educators felt that the training had prepared them for facilitation.	Peer Educators were assisted by the Supervisor to complete the forms.
No. of grade 10 classes: 3	Peer educators did not miss any sessions because they have used the free period.	The class was very cooperative because the Educator was there.	The first session went well.	They would like to do sessions without the Educator in the room, however they were cautioned against doing this because classes can get very disruptive if there is no adult in the room.	Forms completed: Session Observation Form; Face-to-face Discussion Form.
No. of kids per class: 55, 27 and 19.	They get a lot of support from the SMT who have arranged to have an Educator present for sessions even though it's a free period.	The beneficiaries did most of the talking and asked a lot of questions.	They have not done any other sessions, so they cannot say which sessions did not work well.		The youth facilitator and the supervisor explained the forms before the lesson but peer educators still struggled with filling them in.
No. of peer educator		They did not have	They did not suggest		

teams: 3 teams.		difficulties during the sessions.	any changes.		
No. of lessons implemented: 1 in May.		They have only implemented one session and are planning to see the same group of kids.			
A code of conduct was developed using the CSPE code of conduct cards. There have not been any disciplinary measures taken against any of the peer educators.					

**Sive Special School:**

**This is a special school and the Educators were tasked with implementation as their learners cannot facilitate sessions.**

- 2 educators were trained
- This school has not implemented due to challenges that were experienced by the school and it was closed down for 3 months to reallocate to another site. Parents were not happy with the school and they collected their kids back home. The process started from 12 April- 09 June 2010.
- The Department of Education officials intervened and the school was relocated to Cederville.
- Yes, the school is still determined to implement the programme.
- Since the educators feel they have lost a lot of time, they are planning to implement the programme after school and on weekends now that the teachers are expected to work from 7:30- 18:00 during weekdays and are also expected to work on weekends.

**Seymour ADP**

**Name of School: Thobelani High School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 0**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 12	The school has allowed peer educators to use free periods.	Peer educators prepare with the Youth Facilitator for 45 minutes the day before the session.	The first session took 35 minutes but the others took 45 minutes because classes have to be divided first.	They felt that the training had prepared them sufficiently for implementation.	Peer educators are responsible for completing the forms.
No. of grade 8 classes: 2	Peer educators have been assisted by their Educators to catch up on missed classes by giving them notes of what they have missed.	The classes listen but they don't talk or respond to questions.	Lesson 1 worked well, the kids enjoyed it.	Only the Youth Facilitator has been present for the sessions because the school has not allocated an Educator to the programme.	Forms used: Session Observation Form.
No. of kids per class: 30 and 32.	The school does not have a trained Supervisor; however, the school has been very supportive to the programme, allowing peer educators to leave their own classes to go to grade 8 classes.	Peer educators end-up doing most of the talking because the kids seem shy.	Lesson 2 did not work well because the peer educators were not prepared. It had to be repeated.	The Youth Facilitator provides them with a lot of support.	They have not had any challenges with completing the forms because the Youth Facilitator explained the forms to them.
No. of peer educator		Unanticipated stuff: in	The kids learned a lot	They would like to	They need further

teams: 3 teams.		one of the sessions the observer had to take over the session because the facilitators were struggling. The session had to be repeated.	from both sessions.	extend the training so that they could have more information.	assistance with the completion of forms.
No. of lessons implemented: 2		Observers doing their job, giving feedback on areas of improvement.	There needs to be an ice-breaker for the HIV/AIDS session.		
A code of conduct was developed using the CSPE code of conduct cards. They've had to discipline some members for not attending meetings.		They need to improve voice projection and self-confidence as some of them speak softly and are sometimes shy.			

**General Comments:**

The peer educators had not used the Summary Session Attendance register and when probed they said they had forgotten that they had to complete an attendance register for CSPE as well; they had only completed a register for World Vision. They had not brought their forms to the training even though they were requested to bring them.

**Name of School: Siyabonga Senior Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 12**

**No. of Educators trained: 1**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 11; 1 peer educator dropped out for no reason and was replaced by another.	Lessons conducted during LO periods which take place 2 times a week.	Peer educators were planning together with Supervisors for 2 hours, 2 days before the session.	Lesson 1: 1 hour Lesson 2: 30 min Lesson 3: 45 min Lesson 4: 35 Min	The training prepared them for implementation but they still need more information in order for them to share with their classes.	Peer educators are responsible for completing the forms.
No. of grade 8 classes: 1	The school tried to match periods so that peer educators don't miss maths because the LO period in grade 8 was taking place during the grade 10 Maths period.	Their grade 8 class was open and participates even though some were disruptive at times.	Kids enjoyed the session on relationships. They started sharing their own experiences.	Both the Youth Facilitator and the Supervisor are always present for the lessons.	Forms used: Session Observation Form; Summary Session Attendance Register.
No. of kids per class: 40; divided into 2 groups of 20 during facilitation.	Peer educators attend afternoon classes when they have missed periods. Currently only missing English.	During the first session the peer educators did most of the talking because the kids were not participating. Even though this has improved, the peer educators still talk more than the kids.	The session on decision-making was the most challenging because peer educators didn't understand it themselves, so it was difficult for them to facilitate	They would like the Youth Facilitator to explain the lessons to them better and they also need material.	They found the forms easy to use.
No. of peer educator	Educators stay with the	Unanticipated stuff:	The kids learned about	They would like more	The Youth Facilitator

teams: 4 teams.	kids after schools to help them catch up on missed classes.	Nothing unanticipated.	where to go for help if they have problems. Peer educators shared that they are seeing a change amongst the kids during sessions, they are more open and don't misbehave as much anymore.	help with facilitation skills, i.e. get more practice.	had explained the forms to them very well.
No. of lessons implemented: 4	The Youth Facilitator reminds peer educators when it's time for the session and speaks to the grade 8 Educator before the peer educators come to the class.	They need to improve their communication skills.	They suggested that the manual should be written in simple English, because some of the words were difficult to understand, even for the Youth Facilitator.		The felt they did not need any assistance with the forms.
Lessons implemented 2 times a week		There is no repeated exposure because the teams take turns facilitating to the two groups.			
Code of conduct developed and used on the peer educator that has dropped out. But he still dropped out.					

**General Comments:**

The Educator that was present during the initial training was not there for the follow-up training, however, she has been providing support to the peer educators together with the Youth Facilitator. The peer educators still need more practice because they seem to still lack self-confidence. One peer

educator dropped out of the programme and was replaced with another one. They were cautioned against this, it was explained that it was for this reason that there are 4 peer educators in each team, so that if one drops out, then there is always a team of 3. The new peer educator has not been trained on facilitation skills; it is therefore not fair to have him in the team because he will always be an observer.

**Name of School: Zanobuzwe Senior Secondary School**

**No. of peer educators trained: 10**

**No. of Educators trained: 2**

School Structure	Scheduling	Peer Education Practice	Curriculum	Technical Assistance	Monitoring and Evaluation
No. of active peer educators: 9; 1 peer educator dropped out of school because he didn't have school uniform and felt bad about it. The school has been trying to help him.	The school has agreed that the sessions should take place during grade 8 LO period on Tuesday and Friday.	Peer educators plan on weekends in addition to planning during the week, the day before the session. Debriefing taking place the day after the session.	Lesson 1: 40 min Lesson 2: 40 min Lesson 3: 1 hour	They felt that the training had prepared them for implementation.	Peer Educators are responsible for the completion of forms.
No. of grade 8 classes: 1	Peer Educators only missing one period on Tuesday, on Friday the grade 8 LO period corresponds with the grade 10 free period.	During the first lesson, the grade 8 class was naughty and noisy, they did not listen, but this improved in subsequent lessons.	The first 3 lessons worked well and the kids were participating.	Both the Educator and the Youth Facilitator were present during lessons. They reported that any teacher that was available at the time would sit in on sessions not just the trained Supervisors.	Forms used: Session Observation Form; Summary Session Attendance Register.
No. of kids per class: 26	Peer Educators make up for lessons on Wednesday before	Peer educators did most of the talking during the first lesson,	Lesson 4 did not work very well because peer educators were not	They get a lot of support from the Youth Facilitator who	They found the forms difficult to work with, and the Youth

	sport.	this has improved but they still talk more than the kids.	well-prepared for the session.	provides material for the lessons and assistance with facilitation.	Facilitator has to explain to them each time.
No. of peer educator teams: 3 teams.	The school has been very supportive to the programme, all Educators are involved in the programme.	Unanticipated stuff: None	The peer educators met the goals of the first 3 lessons but they were not sure that the kids learned anything from lesson 4, so they will repeat this session.	They would like some more time to practice.	Both the Youth Facilitator and the Educator support them with the completion of forms.
No. of lessons implemented: 4		The observer has been completing the observation form and giving feedback at the meetings to help them improve.	They suggested that the ice-breaker for lesson 1 be made shorter because it was too long and got confusing for the learners.		They need more explanation on the Session Observation form.
Lessons implemented 2 times a week		There is no repeated exposure because there is only one class and the teams take turns.			
Code of conduct developed and has not been used.					

**General Comments:**

Of the 3 schools that were in the Seymour ADP, this is the only school that reported to have structured debriefing sessions after each session. The other schools did not report any structured debriefing sessions, only planning sessions. The school management is providing a lot of support to the programme and has made other Educators available to be in the classroom when sessions are taking place. The only challenge is that there is only 1 grade 8 class in the school with a small number of learner, there is therefore no repeated exposure, the kids are not seeing the same peer educators over and over.



### **Session 3: Lesson Preparation**

#### **Seymour ADP**

In the afternoon participants were taken through the planning form and told to use it as a guide to help them prepare for facilitation. There were only 3 lessons to facilitate; the schools would have to prepare as a team and then select a team to facilitate. They were given an hour to plan, and then facilitation would begin later in the afternoon.

#### **Mpofu ADP**

Participants were also sent off to prepare for sessions to be facilitated on Sunday morning. There was no time to do any presentations on Saturday because the training had started late.

### **Session 4: Lesson Facilitation**

The participants made the same mistake that the other groups in other provinces made. They selected the facilitation teams before they planned and only the facilitation team was prepared for facilitation. Busi selected different people to facilitate the sessions. The first lesson did not go very well because the team selected to facilitate did not do very well and the session had to be stopped. Participants were reminded again about the importance of ensuring that every member of the team is prepared for facilitation because sometimes peer educators get sick and not come to school, a planned session should not be cancelled because one peer educator is absent. It was decided that the teams should be given more time to prepare and facilitation will be done on Sunday morning after the M&E session.

*The day ended at 16:30 in Seymour*

*The day ended at 20:00 in Mpofu*

### **Day 2: Sunday, 01 August**

The second day started on time in both areas..

#### **Session 1: M&E**

The M&E questions were given on flipchart for the participants to respond to. *(Responses are in the tables above).*

#### **Mpofu ADP**

The group were give scenarios to practice filling in forms. This was a challenge for all groups and it took a long time as all four schools were struggling to complete the forms. Thabile and Thola decided to spend more time taking them through the forms again than lesson presentations.

After the M&E session, participants were given more time to prepare sessions because they were not ready to facilitate.

#### **Seymour ADP**

None of the schools had brought their forms to the training even though they were requested to bring them. They were given scenarios to practice filling-in the forms. All the groups struggled to complete the forms. This is a concern because they are supposed to have a basic understanding of the forms as they have reported that they use them during sessions.

## **Session 2: Lesson Facilitation**

### **Mpofu ADP**

Only one lesson was presented.

#### *Lesson facilitation Highlights:*

- Peer educators not giving clear instructions.
- Have not understood the material themselves.
- Not asking good probing questions.
- Have not used the time appropriately, lesson rushed through.
- Team members were supportive when the person facilitating was not giving clear instructions another peer educator from the group would step in and explain. This showed that they know the importance of working as a team.

### **Seymour ADP**

All 3 sessions were facilitated.

#### *Lesson Facilitation Highlights:*

- Peer educators seemed to have improved their facilitation skills since the initial training.
- Busi selected facilitators who had not facilitated previously and they also showed great skills in facilitation.
- However, peer educators still attempt to facilitate sessions without fully understanding the goal of the session or the instructions.
- There are still challenges with getting the whole class involved in the session.

The sessions were all facilitated well, however, the peer educators need to work on their self confidence because even though they can facilitate, it seems like they can't because they don't have the confidence to stand in front of the class

## **Way Forward and Closure**

- It was explained to the participants that all activities need to come to an end on the 27<sup>th</sup> of August because the financial year ends at the end of September and the month of September will be used for reporting. All schools must have wrapped-up all 5 sessions by the end of August.
- They all reminded that they need to submit their Site Summary Forms to CSPE by the 15<sup>th</sup> of September so that the data can be captured and form part of the report at the end of September.
- The group from the Seymour ADP were all willing to continue with the programme next year. The Mpofu group however, are all in grade 11 and won't be able to continue next year even though they really wanted to.

The workshop ended at 13:00 at both venues.

## **General Observations**

In general, the programme seems to be going in the Eastern Cape schools, except for the school that has only implemented 1 lesson since the training. The schools' management seems to be very supportive of the programme in their schools and this is what is helping to move the programme forward.

Again, the placement of Youth Facilitators in the schools has played a major role in moving the programme forward. In schools where no Educators were trained, the Youth Facilitators have been providing the adult infrastructure in the school and they have been a source of support for the peer educators.

The schools are not at the same level of implementation and they are not expected to be at the highest level in the first year.

The peer educators have shown a vast improvement from the initial training, even though some of them need some more practice so that they gain some self-confidence when they facilitate. Most of the girls don't maintain eye-contact and they speak very softly, whilst the boys stand confidently in front of the class. It seems like the more confident peer educators are given more opportunity to facilitate than the less confident ones and this was observed when the schools had to choose teams to facilitate. The less confident kids who were chosen by the facilitators also facilitated very well, however, they needed more experience.

With progress that all the schools have made, the programme is bound to grow and make even better progress if it is continued into the second year.

## **Final Evaluation Summary:**

### **Evaluation forms received from 80 out of 83 participants that attended the training.**

1. Opening and welcome
  - All the participants felt that the welcoming was done very well.
  - They all felt comfortable to ask questions during the workshop.
  - All enjoyed the facilitation and ice-breakers.
  
2. Facilitation
  - The presentations were clear to everyone.
  - Facilitators responded clearly to everyone's questions.
  - The facilitators were friendly and open.
  
3. What do you feel you still need more training/ information on?
  - More information on drugs.
  - Understanding the forms to be filled in.
  - Facilitation skills
  - More information on HIV and AIDS
  
4. What was most enjoyable?
  - Participation in the training process
  - Talking about things they have done
  - Group-work
  - Lesson facilitation
  - Ice-breakers
  - Presenting responses on flip chart
  - The facilitation process
  - Learning from their mistakes
  - Everyone getting an opportunity to present
  
5. General Comments
  - All participants were pleased with the facilitation.
  - They would like to get t-shirts from CSPE and certificates.
  - Everyone agreed that they enjoyed the training.

**APPENDIX 1**

**Draft Programme  
World Vision Peer Educator Training**

**Day 1: Saturday**

Time	Session	Facilitator
<b>08h30- 09h00</b>	<b>Getting started</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and Introduction</li> <li>• Meeting each other</li> <li>• Overview of the workshop</li> <li>• Ground Rules and Expectations</li> <li>• Attendance register and participant registration sheet</li> </ul>	
<b>09h00-11h00</b>	<b>Reflecting on our journey</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Structure (a snapshot of what is happening at sites)</li> <li>• Scheduling</li> </ul>	
<b>11h00- 11h30</b>	<b>Tea</b>	
<b>11h30- 13h00</b>	<b>Reflections Cont...</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer Education Practice</li> <li>• Curriculum</li> </ul>	
<b>13h00- 14h00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
<b>14h00- 15h00</b>	<b>Reflections Cont...</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistance</li> </ul>	
<b>15h00-15h30</b>	<b>Tea</b>	
<b>15h30- 17h00</b>	<b>Let's do it again</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lesson Planning</b></li> <li>• <b>Lesson Facilitation</b></li> </ul>	
<b>17h00</b>	<b>Closure and homework</b>	

**Day 2: Sunday**

Time	Session	Facilitator
<b>08h00-08h15</b>	<b>Getting started</b>	All
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housekeeping</li> <li>• Hangovers</li> <li>• Overview of the day</li> </ul>	
<b>08h15- 10h15</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting system</li> <li>• Working with M&amp;E tools</li> </ul>	
<b>10h15- 10h45</b>	<b>Tea</b>	
<b>10h45- 12h30</b>	<b>Lesson Facilitation</b>	
<b>12h30- 13h00</b>	<b>Way Forward and closure</b>	

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Framework for Follow-up Trainings**

# WORLD VISION FOLLOW-UP TRAININGS

17-18 JULY, 24-25 JULY, 31 JULY- 1  
AUG



# Framework for Follow-up Training

- ✓ School Structure
- ✓ In-class Scheduling
- ✓ Peer education practice
- ✓ Curriculum
- ✓ Technical Assistance
- ✓ M&E
- ✓ Going forward: things to consider...  
*All activities will be done in school teams*





# For Each Component...

Responses should be given in terms of:

1. What worked well?
2. What did not work well, and why?
3. What changes do you suggest?





# Opening Question

1. Each school must discuss and agree on 3 things that they remember (learned) from the initial training.



# || School Structure

*Flip-charts will be pre-written for this activity, participants will go up to their schools flipchart and complete the following information:*

- No. of drop-outs. (Ask why people have dropped out)
- No. of grade 8 classes, no. of kids in each class
- No. of peer educator teams (to determine the division of the classes)
- How many lessons have been completed?
- How often do lessons take place? How many times a week/ month?
- Did you develop a code of conduct? (Find out how they developed the code)
- Have you had to discipline any peer educators since the start of the programme?



# || Scheduling

- How did the school go about arranging the peer education lessons?
- Were there any challenges with the schedule/ time-table? How did you resolve the challenges?
- How did the peer educators manage to make-up for missed classes?
- Tell us about the support you received from your school management and World Vision. (This is in terms of going to classes, e.g. is the school and Youth Facilitators assisting them to access learners after school, where the programme is being implemented after school?)



# Peer Education Practice

- Did the peer educators and supervisors plan as a team? (Get info on where , when and how long does it take for them to plan)
- How did planning and debriefing help you with facilitation?
- Tell us a little about your grade 8 class. (classroom management, were they welcoming, did they listen...)
- Who did most of the talking during the lessons?
- Did anything unplanned happen during your lessons? (was this discussed during debriefing)
- What was the most difficult facilitation skill to implement? (possible answers: asking questions, classroom management, time management)
- How helpful was the feedback from the observer? (ask when the feedback was given; emphasise the role of the observer)
- Ask about repeated exposure: are they seeing the same kids each time even if they have broken the class into 2 or 3 or 4 groups?



# Curriculum

- How long does it take you to implement a lesson? (get examples; emphasise that lessons shouldn't be longer than in the manual)
- Which lessons worked well?
- Which lessons did not work well? Why?
- Why do you think there were challenges with implementation of lessons?
- What did the kids learn from the lessons that have been implemented? (Ask about the goals of the lessons)
- What changes would you suggest to the curriculum or lessons?



## ■ Technical Assistance

- Did the training prepare you enough for the job?
- Who was in the room during facilitation? Youth Facilitator or Supervisor?
- Tell us about the support you get from the Youth Facilitators; i.e. what type of support did you need and what did you get?
- What do you think can be done to make implementation easier for you? (Wish list)



## ■ For schools that have not implemented...

- What have been the challenges that have prevented you from implementing the programme?
- What has been done in an attempt to address these challenges?
- Would you like to still implement the programme?
- How do you plan to implement in the time that is left?





# Closing Questions

How valuable has the peer education programme been to you as peer educators and Supervisors and to your school?

Do you feel that the effort is worth it?



## ■ M&E- Day 2

- Who is responsible for the completion of M&E forms?
- Which forms have you used? (Participants should give a step by step account of when and how the forms are being used and give info of any referrals they have made).
- How have you found using the forms? Has it been easy or difficult? Explain what has been the most difficult.
- What support has been given to you with the completion of forms?
- What support would you like to get? (Wish list)

*Use scenarios to practice filling-in forms*



# || Going Forward- Things to Consider...

- What do you think are your next steps as a school?
- How many of you (peer educators) will be continuing with the programme next year?

*Remember that:*

- Planning and debriefing with supervisors is crucial for the success of the programme.
- Peer educators should have all the material they need for their sessions.
- It is very important to consider when lessons should be implemented, especially because of time constraints during the remainder of the year.



## **APPENDIX 3**

### **Monitoring and Evaluation Forms**







**Face-to-face Discussion Form**

Form \_\_\_ of \_\_\_



Name of Peer Educator: \_\_\_\_\_

Reporting Month: \_\_\_\_\_

**Discussion Information**

**Discussion \_\_\_**

Date of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Time of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Place of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Topic of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gender:  Male  Female    Repeat:  Yes  No    Referral:  Yes  No  
 Age: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Referred to: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Additional Information: \_\_\_\_\_

**Discussion \_\_\_**

Date of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Time of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Place of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Topic of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gender:  Male  Female    Repeat:  Yes  No    Referral:  Yes  No  
 Age: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Referred to: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Additional Information: \_\_\_\_\_

**Discussion \_\_\_**

Date of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Time of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Place of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Topic of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gender:  Male  Female    Repeat:  Yes  No    Referral:  Yes  No  
 Age: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Referred to: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Additional Information: \_\_\_\_\_

**Discussion \_\_\_**

Date of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Time of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Place of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Topic of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gender:  Male  Female    Repeat:  Yes  No    Referral:  Yes  No  
 Age: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Referred to: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Additional Information: \_\_\_\_\_

**Discussion \_\_\_**

Date of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Time of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Place of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Topic of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gender:  Male  Female    Repeat:  Yes  No    Referral:  Yes  No  
 Age: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Referred to: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Additional Information: \_\_\_\_\_

**Discussion \_\_\_**

Date of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Time of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Place of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Topic of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gender:  Male  Female    Repeat:  Yes  No    Referral:  Yes  No  
 Age: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Referred to: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Additional Information: \_\_\_\_\_

Completed form to be submitted to the Peer Educator Supervisor on the 3rd day of the month

20-Apr-10  
FTFDF Form Ver 5



# Awareness Event Form



## Summary Information

1. Name of Peer Educators: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Organization/Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Date of Event: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Reporting Month: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Programme Focus:  OVC  PE  LS

6. Level of Event:  Site level  Organisation level

7. Topic/s addressed by community event: \_\_\_\_\_

17. Brief description of community event (goals, activities etc): \_\_\_\_\_

8. Type of community event/activity/initiative:

VCT drive  Candlelight

Music concert  Food drive

Soup kitchen  Drama

Award ceremony  Door to door

Vegetable garden launch  World AIDS day

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Location of community event: \_\_\_\_\_

10. Approximate number of attendees at community event: \_\_\_\_\_

11. Duration of community event:  
Days: \_\_\_\_\_ Hours: \_\_\_\_\_

12. Date/s of community event:  
Start: \_\_\_\_\_ End: \_\_\_\_\_

18. Briefly describe the successful parts of the community event: \_\_\_\_\_

19. Brief description of challenges experienced: \_\_\_\_\_

### Site Details

13. Site Name: \_\_\_\_\_

14. Province: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

16. Tel/Cell: \_\_\_\_\_

### Verification of Community Event - to be completed by person responsible for community event / venue

My signature confirms that this community event took place, and that the details supplied above are correct and true.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Tel/Cel: \_\_\_\_\_

### FOR OFFICE USE ONLY - Quality Control Information

Peer Educator

Peer Educator Supervisor/Collator

Name: _____	Name: _____
Sign: _____	Sign: _____
Date: _____	Date: _____

### Organisation

Completed form to be submitted to the Peer Educator Supervisor on the 3rd day of the month

20-Apr-10  
AEF Form Ver 5

1. Site Name: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Organisation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Form completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Position: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Contact number: \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Province: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Number of Peer Educators: \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Submission Date (dd/mm/yyyy): \_\_\_\_\_

9. Reporting Month: \_\_\_\_\_

**Table 1.**

**Peer Education Programme - Total Session Attendance Data**

Fill in the total number of males and females who have attended 3 or more Peer Education sessions for each age group below.

Gender	Males	Females	Total
Age Group			
10 - 13			
14 - 17			
18 - 24			
Adult			
<b>Totals (A)</b>			

**Table 2.**

**Life Skills Programme - Total Session Attendance Data**

Fill in the total number of males and females who have attended 3 or more Life Skills sessions for each age group below.

Gender	Males	Females
Age Group		
10 - 13		
14 - 17		
18 - 24		
Adult		
<b>Totals</b>		

**Table 3.**

**OVC - Total Session Attendance Data**

Fill in the total number of males and females who have attended 9 or more OVC sessions for each age group below.

Gender	Males	Females	Total
Age Group			
10 - 13			
14 - 17			
18 - 24			
<b>Totals (C)</b>			

**Table 4.**

**Summary Face-to-Face Discussion D**

Fill in the total number of discussions, repeats and referrals with peers below.

Gender	Total discussions	Number of Repeats
Males		
Females		
<b>Totals</b>		

**Table 5.**

**AB - Abstinence and Being faithful**

Fill in the total number of males and females who have been reached in each age group with AB messages.

Gender	Males	Females	Total
Age Group			
10 - 13			
14 - 17			
18 - 24			
Adult			
<b>Totals (X)</b>			

**Table 6.**

**ABC - Abstinence, Being faithful and Other**

Fill in the total number of males and females who have been reached in each age group with ABC messages.

Gender	Males	Females
Age Group		
10 - 13		
14 - 17		
18 - 24		
Adult		
<b>Totals</b>		

*Note: The sum of the totals of tables 1 (A), 2 (B) and 3 (C) must equal the sum of the totals of tables 5 (X) and 6 (Y).*

**5. Summary of Awareness Event Data**

Number of awareness events: \_\_\_\_\_ Number of events with other focus: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of events with OVC focus: \_\_\_\_\_ Number of attendees at awareness events: \_\_\_\_\_

**Organisation**

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY - Quality Control**

<b>Peer Educator Supervisor / Collator</b>	<b>Data Capturer</b>
Name: _____	Name: _____
Sign: _____	Sign: _____
Date: _____	Date: _____



### Session Observation Form DRAFT



Site Name: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Peer Educator Names: _____	4. Session Title & # : _____
2. PE Observer Name: _____	5. Session Date: _____
3. Staff Observer Name: _____	6. Session Time: _____
	7. Session Location: _____

Individual Group Member Behavior During Session		Notes on Facilitation: Were PEs prepared? Did PEs work as a team, ask good questions, observe session timing, respond to group members behavior? Were they patient?
Member Name	Notes: On individual behavior for referral or follow up by PE Supervisor or Counselor	

Rating Guide: 1 - Strongly agree, 2 - Agree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Disagree, 5 - Strongly disagree

Overall Session Observations		
Item	Rating	Notes: What made it successful / not successful? Recommendations for next session.
The opening was done well	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
The ice-breaker was a success	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
The re-cap was done well	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
The activity was done well	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
The activity was debriefed successfully	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
The session was closed successfully	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	

Group Behavior During Session		
Item	Rating	Notes: What worked particularly well / badly and why. Recommendations for next session
Group members were engaged during most of the session	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Group members enjoyed the session	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Group members shared their experiences, opinions and feelings	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Group members were respectful of one another	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Group members responded to one another as well as to PEs	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Group members learned / achieved the session objectives	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	

*My signature below indicates that I have read and acted appropriately on all observations made by the PEs as a result of the session detailed above.*

Peer Educator Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**This form is to be completed by the Peer Educator at each session and submitted to the Peer Educator Supervisor immediately for follow up.**

20-Apr-10

VSIF Form Ver 5