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Executive Summary

**School-Related, Gender-based Violence (SRGBV)** consists of “acts or threats of sexual, physical, or psychological violence occurring in and around schools, perpetrated by children and/or adults as a result of gender norms and stereotypes and enforced by unequal power dynamics between girls and boys, women and men”. When SRGBV occurs, children’s rights are violated and children’s learning and development suffer. A Whole School Approach (WSA) to Prevent School-Related Gender-Based Violence: Minimum Standards and Monitoring Framework developed by the Global Working Group to End SRGBV and the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) outlines a framework identifying the five major forms of SRGBV (bullying, corporal punishment, sexual violence and child sexual abuse, sexual harassment, intimate partner violence). The WSA document also identifies drivers of SRGBV, and it outlines eight key elements or domains for a comprehensive WSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of SRGBV</th>
<th>Eight key elements or domains of a WSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Normalization of violence against children through social norms that justify</td>
<td>1. Effective school leadership and community engagement to create safe, gender-sensitive learning environments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence;</td>
<td>2. Establishing and implementing a code of conduct;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Silence around violence against women and girls;</td>
<td>3. Capacity building of teachers and educational staff;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rigid gender roles;</td>
<td>4. Empowering children on child rights, participation, and gender equality;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stereotypes of masculinity and femininity;</td>
<td>5. Improving reporting, monitoring, and accountability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inequality and discrimination;</td>
<td>6. Addressing incidents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weak implementation of institutional frameworks, laws, and policies. ii</td>
<td>7. Strengthening physical learning environments; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Engaging parents. iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theory of change of the WSA:** If the drivers of SRGBV are identified and used to design a variety of interventions that encompasses the WSA, then the WSA interventions will help prevent and respond to SRGBV.

1 Note: In lieu of sending the complete report, which FAWEZI indicated is not customary for projects in Zimbabwe, the Executive Summary will be submitted to MoPSE. Pseudonyms replace the actual names of the schools.
The pilot: From July 2018–December 2020, a pilot project was launched in three primary and two secondary schools in Shamva District, and two primary and three secondary schools in Chitungwiza District, Zimbabwe. The Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (MOPSE) identified the two districts because they both had a large number of SRGBV incidences according to MOPSE records at that time. The District Schools Inspectors and local stakeholders then identified the pilot schools. The Forum for African Women Educationalists Zimbabwe Chapter (FAWEZI) was the implementing partner and Miske Witt & Associates International (MWAI) was the Learning and Evaluation partner for this pilot project.

Pilot activities: Together, MWAI and FAWEZI conducted a Situational Analysis to review existing documents and data to understand SRGBV in these districts. Baseline data were then collected (July and September 2019) to understand knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors prior to the intervention. FAWEZI conducted over 30 workshops to educate school staff, community members, parents, and learners about SRGBV and about how to create and implement a WSA to prevent SRGBV (October 2019–October 2020). FAWEZI helped the schools strengthen partnerships with local civil society organizations and government departments, and it held workshops to review policies and codes of conduct. FAWEZI also worked with schools to strengthen their response and monitoring of SRGBV and to teach about child rights and positive discipline. MWAI and FAWEZI monitored activities at all the schools, but COVID-19 school closures delayed and prevented some programming. Endline data were collected at four schools at the end of the project (November 2020).

Methodology: School observations, as well as survey, interview, and focus group data were gathered from stakeholders (school staff, community members, ministry and district officials, parents, and learners) to understand attitudes and beliefs related to the drivers and domains of a WSA. The results here in blue and green highlight areas where schools are meeting the minimum standards and where stakeholders have more equitable or safer views. Findings in red and orange highlight areas for improvement, where stakeholders’ views about women and men and/or girls and boys are not equitable and can lead to ongoing violence.

Findings related to the drivers of SRGBV

(1) What is the status of stakeholders’ knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the underlying drivers of SRGBV at the endline? Whether and how do knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers shift or change over time (i.e., from baseline to endline)?
Stakeholder views showed positive attitudes and beliefs on some drivers of SRGBV. Over 75% of stakeholders at the baseline and the endline agreed that they were able to name Zimbabwean **laws and policies** that protect girls and women. This is an important first step, since laws must be widely known in order to prevent SRGBV. Stakeholders also reported greater beliefs that there should be a law forbidding teachers to hit students (46% at the baseline, compared to 61% at the endline). Yet other drivers, such as **rigid gender roles** and **stereotyped constructions of femininity and masculinity** were still evident at the endline. While stakeholder attitudes related to women's gender roles were more equitable over time (see, for instance, Figure 1), attitudes normalizing traditional gender roles for men persisted at the endline (see, for instance, Figure 2).

![Figure 1: Stakeholder agreement that "A woman’s role is taking care of her home and family" over time](image1)

![Figure 2: Stakeholder agreement that a man’s role is earning money for the family](image2)

At the endline, 20% of stakeholders agreed that wives should not report being beaten by husbands for the sake of their family, thus reinforcing **silence around violence against women and girls**. In addition, at both the baseline and endline, stakeholders agreed that **violence against children was normalized** and occurred.

**Power dynamics at home favored boys and men, and supported violence against women and girls**

**Traditional gender roles for men were still normalized**

**Majority of surveyed stakeholders could name Zimbabwean laws protecting girls and women**

**Increased support for laws against corporal punishment**

**Shifting attitudes towards more equal roles for women**

![Chart showing equity levels](chart)

(2) **Whether and how do endline knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers differ by gender, age, and school level?**

At endline, there were no significant differences in stakeholder knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs related to the drivers when comparing girls and women to boys and men, or when comparing primary learners to secondary learners. There were important differences between adults and learners: **adults** held more equitable views regarding gender roles,
while learners held stronger views that violence against children was normalized and necessary.

**Findings related to the domains and Minimum Standards of a WSA**

(3) Whether and how do the pilot schools align with the eight domains of a WSA at endline? Whether and how does school alignment with the WSA domains shift or change over time as stakeholders participate in SRGBV programming (i.e., from baseline to endline)?

The endline data showed that stakeholders’ knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the three domains of school leadership and community engagement; parent engagement; and child rights, participation, and gender equality closely aligned with a WSA in a variety of ways. At several schools, head teachers and other school staff strengthened partnerships with community organizations and parents, who, in turn, volunteered to strengthen codes of conduct and school infrastructure in some schools. In addition, learners served in leadership positions at schools, and SRGBV clubs were created to educate others on school rules and SRGBV reporting processes.

Yet both baseline and endline data showed that stakeholders disagreed on the definition and forms of SRGBV, and how often SRGBV occurred. Teachers and some learners felt that SRGBV was decreasing because of the school’s work with FAWEZI, while other learners described bullying, sexual harassment, and sexual violence as common occurrences in their schools. While school staff discussed SRGBV in terms of learner-to-learner violence, focus group discussions with learners made it clear that teacher-to-learner violence also occurred in these schools. While reporting methods increased over the course of the project (e.g., suggestion boxes were reinstated at schools), stakeholders described feeling hesitant to report SRGBV because processes were not always confidential. In particular, learners were scared to report since they were often blamed for the abuse; some feared additional abuse for reporting; and others felt that nothing would come of the report. Although WSA standards include the establishment of a school-level review committee structure to improve monitoring and accountability, since MOEST circulars do not mention this kind of structure, no school had a review committee or organization in place to improve monitoring and accountability at either baseline or endline.

**Codes of conduct** improved over the project, and FAWEZI was working with schools on their draft codes during the endline data collection. At the baseline, all codes were one-page documents with very basic notions of learner dress and behavior. At endline, codes were longer, more comprehensive, and all mentioned gender. And although FAWEZI presented this information in detail, none of the codes actually defined SRGBV; none

**We have teachers who drink alcohol, [and] they don't consider you a female student. They can be talking to you while they're touching you, they don't have boundaries as male teachers to female students (urban secondary girl).**
outlined all forms of SRGBV; and stakeholders were in greater disagreement at the endline that the codes had an unambiguous, zero-tolerance stance for SRGBV.

At endline, stakeholders reported greater agreement that teachers and educational staff worked to create positive, gender-responsive, and safe environments. Teachers felt that they gained new knowledge on positive discipline; yet learners still reported that corporal punishment was occurring, and 10% of stakeholders reported knowing a teacher who experienced sexual violence at their school. Learners also reported safety issues at school, and two-thirds of stakeholders disagreed that the school physical environment supported girls' health and menstruation. All of this suggests that ongoing and increased work is needed to improve safety at schools.

(4) Whether and how do knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the WSA domains at endline differ by gender, age, and school level?

At endline, girls and women were more likely to agree that there was gender equality in learner (student) leadership and in discipline compared to boys and men, and boys at the rural primary school specifically reported gendered disparities in discipline, stating that boys were punished more harshly than girls. Yet more girls reported being victims of SRGBV perpetrated by teachers, and girls reported sexual harassment from boys on their journeys to or from school. When compared to adults, learners reported stronger agreement that victim blaming occurred, that girls were scared to report SRGBV, and that codes of conduct did not clearly define SRGBV or take a zero-tolerance stance. Adults disagreed more strongly than learners that the school physical environment was safe and that schools were supportive of girls' health. Secondary learners (as compared to primary) disagreed more strongly that school staff exhibited safe, positive, and gender-responsive behaviors; and they discussed more incidences of SRGBV by school staff towards learners. Yet primary learners reported less awareness of school rules related to corporal punishment, less awareness of organizations working with their schools to prevent SRGBV, and less agreement that schools supported girls' health.

Recommendations: Despite the challenges of the global pandemic, these pilot schools made significant progress toward SRGBV prevention and response in 2020. Nevertheless, more work is needed to create sustained and meaningful change. The following are the pilot project partners' recommendations for schools and school stakeholders moving forward:

1. Continue integrating gender into everyday work and curricula (i.e., institutionalize by integrating in all curriculum activities), so that stakeholders have multiple opportunities to learn how gender is socially constructed, how power relates to gender norms, and how negative norms impact learners' safety in schools.
2. More work is needed in schools, and with learners, staff, parents, and community members to create a comprehensive definition of SRGBV (one that includes
corporal punishment and intimate partner violence), so that all stakeholders can recognize SRGBV when it occurs.

3. Continue revising the draft codes of conduct to ensure that the final version posted all around the school includes a comprehensive definition of SRGBV, outlaws victim blaming, and outlines reporting mechanisms and consequences for violating the school rules and the code of conduct. Create spaces and forums to educate new heads of schools, all teachers, all learners, parents, stakeholders, and community members on laws, circulars, and policies. Draw on available systems and structures to ensure they are functional and effective, including supporting the implementation of the laws, circulars, and policies (e.g., New Education Amendment Act). Work with schools to create linkages to child support systems and build SRGBV review organizations at each school.

4. Create safe spaces for learners, teachers, parents, and community members to process violence and incidences of SRGBV. Promote positive discipline to reduce the normalization of violence.
Introduction

The Whole School Approach (WSA)

School-Related Gender-Based Violence (SRGBV)\(^2\) violates children’s rights, harms learners’ development, and negatively affects their learning. A Whole School Approach (WSA) works with schools, communities, and families to improve school environments and education quality for learners by addressing and monitoring SRGBV. In 2018, the Global Working Group to End SRGBV and UNGEI together developed *A Whole School Approach to Prevent School-Related Gender-Based Violence: Minimum Standards and Monitoring Framework* to offer guidance to practitioners and policy makers working to end SRGBV. This conceptual framework identifies the following five major forms of SRGBV: bullying (including physical and verbal or psychological violence); corporal punishment; sexual violence and child sexual abuse; sexual harassment; and intimate partner violence (adolescent dating violence). Aligning with the holistic, socio-ecological model, the WSA addresses “drivers” (common practices that drive harmful actions) of SRGBV at the individual, family, school, community, and societal levels. The WSA seeks to address the following drivers of SRGBV:

1. normalization of violence against children through social norms that justify violence;
2. silence around violence against women and girls;
3. rigid gender roles;
4. stereotypes of masculinity and femininity;
5. inequality and discrimination; and
6. weak implementation of institutional frameworks, laws, and policies\(^v\).

The theory of change posits that once the drivers of SRGBV are identified and used to design a variety of interventions, which encompass the WSA (including ongoing monitoring and evaluation), then the WSA interventions will add to better response and prevention systems, less tolerance of violence in schools, and reduce prevalence of SRGBV in the long-term.\(^vi\)

There are eight key elements or domains of a WSA:

1. effective school leadership and community engagement to create safe, gender-sensitive learning environments;
2. establishing and implementing a code of conduct;
3. capacity building of teachers and educational staff;
4. empowering children on child rights, participation, and gender equality;

\(^2\) Defined here as “acts of threats of sexual, physical, or psychological violence occurring in and around schools, perpetrated by children and/or adults as a result of gender norms and stereotypes and enforced by unequal power dynamics between girls and boys, women and men” (adapted from UNGEI, 2018, p. 5)
5. improving reporting, monitoring, and accountability;
6. addressing incidents of SRGBV;
7. strengthening physical learning environments; and
8. engaging parents.\textsuperscript{vii}

The pilot

In October 2018, a pilot project was launched with learners, parents, community members, ministry officials, and educational staff to prevent and respond to SRGBV in Zimbabwe. To choose the schools to participate in the pilot, the Department of Learner Welfare Services in Zimbabwe’s Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (MOPSE) identified two districts, Chitungwiza and Shamva, both of which had a large number of learner welfare cases and/or incidents of SRGBV. District School Inspectors and local stakeholders then identified five schools within each of the two districts to serve as pilot schools. UNGEI chose the Forum for African Women Educationalists Zimbabwe Chapter (FAWEZI) as the implementing partner and Miske Witt & Associates International (MWAI) as the Learning and Evaluation partner for this pilot project.

Together, MWAI, FAWEZI and UNGEI co-developed the Learning and Evaluation approach for this pilot project to answer the following evaluation questions:

1. What is the status of stakeholder knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the underlying drivers of SRGBV? Whether and how do knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers shift or change over time (from baseline to endline)?
2. Whether and how do endline knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers differ by gender, age, and school level?
3. Whether and how do the pilot schools align with the eight domains of a WSA at endline? Whether and how does school alignment with the WSA domains shift or change as schools participate in SRGBV programming (from baseline to endline)?
4. Whether and how do endline knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the domains of a WSA differ by gender, age, and school level?

MWAI and FAWEZI activities

MWAI began the pilot by conducting a thorough Situational Analysis (September 2018–February 2019) to review existing documents and data in order to understand the complexities of SRGBV in Zimbabwe and in the two project districts prior to designing the intervention. Baseline data were collected at both the School Visioning Workshops (July 2019) and at individual school visits (September 2019) to understand existing knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the underlying drivers of SRGBV and the eight domains of a WSA prior to the intervention. FAWEZI then created new teacher training materials in partnership with MWAI, and they drew on existing resources (e.g., FAWE’s Tuseme materials) as the basis for conducting various workshops with teachers, head teachers,
Ministry of Education officials, and learners about SRGBV and about how to implement the WSA (October 2019–October 2020). The workshops included feedback meetings to help schools start implementing their action plans; networking meetings for schools to create or strengthen partnerships with local community groups; workshops for heads of schools and Guidance and Counseling staff to review policies and increase response and monitoring of SRGBV; training sessions on child rights; and meetings to review draft codes of conduct at each school. MWAI partnered with FAWEZI to monitor activities at all 10 pilot schools (October 2019–March 2020), but COVID-19 and school closures delayed some programming and monitoring (e.g., learner clubs were unable to meet, school action plans could not be fully implemented, and stakeholder meetings could not be conducted again). FAWEZI creatively adapted its programming to work with schools virtually as much as possible (March 2019–November 2020). Endline data were collected November 16-20, 2020 at four schools; and a final report was completed in the beginning of 2021.
Baseline study findings

In July 2019 (at the Visioning Workshops) and September 2019 (during individual school visits), baseline survey, interview, focus group, and observation data were collected from learners, school staff, and ministry officials. These data revealed both equitable and inequitable views, and they outlined areas for attention and improvement for this pilot project.

Overall, stakeholders held more equitable views regarding educating both boys and girls and shared household chores for both boys and girls. Yet stakeholders also reported more traditional views regarding women’s and men’s roles in the family, and they said that violence against children was common (i.e., "normalized") in their households and schools. Girls and women held more equitable views regarding social norms, and they provided more comprehensive definitions of SRGBV than boys and men. Adults held more equitable views regarding social norms and provided more comprehensive definitions of SRGBV than learners. Adults reported stronger agreement that they were aware of community support toward SRGBV prevention than learners.

At all schools, stakeholders agreed that there was gender equality in learner (student) leadership and in discipline; and they further agreed that teachers and educational staff displayed safe, positive, and gender-equitable behaviors. All schools had participated in child-friendly or safe school training sessions, all reported teaching about gender norms, and nine of the 10 schools reported teaching about SRGBV. Stakeholders at all schools reported active School Development Committees (SDCs) working to prevent SRGBV.
Stakeholders agreed that their school rules included SRGBV, and that the physical environment in and around schools were safe. (Indeed, all the schools had fences and separate latrines for girls and boys.)

At the same time, stakeholders disagreed on the definition of SRGBV and how often it occurred in their schools; and none of the copies of the school rules obtained at baseline defined violence or SRGBV clearly, nor did they promote safe and positive schools. Stakeholders agreed that SRGBV reporting mechanisms were not clearly defined, were not confidential, and were not safe for learners. No school had a review organization for SRGBV records or cases. All schools reported that victim-blaming occurred (i.e., victims were asked what they had done to initiate the abuse), and learners agreed more strongly than adults that victims were blamed.

**Endline approach to data collection and evaluation**

Similar to the baseline, MWAI gathered data from multiple stakeholder groups at the endline, since the WSA involves the entire school community (learners, parents, teachers, school support staff, community members). Given the compressed timeline (due to COVID-19 halting activities in 2020) and limited funds, the project partners (UNGEI, MWAI, and FAWEZI) agreed to collect endline data at four schools (one primary and one secondary school in each district). Schools were selected that had implemented activities after the FAWEZI workshops that specifically focused on the definition of SRGBV, on school rules and codes of conduct, and on working with learners. Another criterion was to choose schools that had scored high on some scales or domains and lower on others at the baseline (i.e., with room to improve during implementation). Finally, for purposes of efficient and cost-effective data collection, schools were selected where participants were easily able to use tablets for baseline surveys.

**Methodology**

MWAI, FAWEZI, and UNGEI decided to collect endline data on the drivers and domains on which FAWEZI had delivered training and where there was evidence that teachers and learners who attended the trainings had taken it up and brought it back to share with additional teachers and learners at their schools. MWAI drew on baseline items and data to collect mixed methods data at the endline that focused on the drivers of social norms and on the domains of the WSA, asking specific questions about the trainings and workshops in the past year.

**Endline instruments**

The endline survey was very similar to the baseline survey. Some items (e.g., measuring domains that were not the foci of FAWEZI work, such as safe and secure physical
environments) were omitted at endline, so that survey items from the baseline Visioning Workshop and Stakeholder survey could be combined, thereby keeping the survey to a manageable timeframe. School observations made at the endline gathered data on codes of conduct at each school, and observed chores that learners were doing. Qualitative methods included individual interviews with school heads, Guidance and Counseling (G&C) teachers, and/or other teachers that participated in FAWEZI’s work. Learners were also grouped by gender for focus group discussions (FGDs). These discussions dealt with safety, learner leadership, SRGBV reporting, and incidence response at each school (see Appendix 9 for copies of the instruments). The survey was read aloud in Shona and was written in English and Shona on the tablets. The learner FGDs were conducted in Shona, and the teacher interviews were conducted in English. Data were collected inside when social distancing was possible and in schools with windows that provided air circulation and minimized heat; otherwise, data were collected outside.

Data analysis

Using the software package NVivo, qualitative data were analyzed across multiple instruments and across time for the content aligned with the SRGBV drivers and domains of the WSA. MWAI reviewed audio recordings of interviews and FGDs to clarify transcriptions and to capture direct quotes as needed. The quantitative data were cleaned in Excel and analyzed in SPSS. Similar to the baseline data, descriptive statistics were run on all survey items to assess differences between groups (i.e., girls and women compared to boys and men; learners and adults; and primary and secondary learners) and differences over time (baseline to endline). Because of the large differences in sample sizes, MWAI ran non-parametric tests for differences between groups and over time (i.e., Mann-Whitney [MW] tests, the non-parametric equivalent of the t-test). Also similar to the baseline, MWAI hypothesized that survey questions would be related to measure the WSA domains; thus, these items were summed to create scores for the constructs designed to measure knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes related to the WSA domains. The results of individual items and constructs are shown in this report according to the following general pattern:\(^3\)

Findings in **blue** and **green** highlight areas where schools are meeting the minimum standards and where stakeholders have more equitable or safer views. Findings in **red** and

---

\(^3\) Please note that blue and green indicate the **most equitable** viewpoints, which are the constructs where the group is meeting the standards. However, this does not always translate into “agree strongly,” since some items were framed negatively. For instance, for the item, “It’s not really pleasant, but parents have a duty to hit their children, if necessary,” an average of “strongly agree” is in **red**, since this indicates an inequitable view and does not meet the standard.
**orange** highlight areas for improvement, where stakeholders’ views about women and men and/or girls and boys are not equitable and can lead to ongoing violence.

**Note on constructs:** For each construct, each individual item included in the construct had the response options of “NO!,” “no,” “yes,” and “YES!” (Response options of “I don't know” and “I prefer not to answer” were coded as missing data.) The strongest agreement with the *desired* response (response option of YES!) for each item was given a value of 4, while the strongest agreement with the *undesired* response (response option of NO!) was given a value of 1. Whenever possible, individual items and constructs are compared from baseline to endline (when the exact same item or construct was asked at both timepoints).

Detailed results for all instruments and constructs can be found in Appendices 2 through 8.

**Limitations**

Time, budget, and the global pandemic restricted the endline study in a few ways. First, MWAI was limited to collecting data using fewer instruments (i.e., using four instruments at endline compared to seven at the baseline). Second, since schools were reopening with more restrictions and fewer pupils and teachers, and since COVID-19 was still a threat at the time of endline data collection, MWAI collected data in four schools instead of all 10 that had participated in the baseline study, thus comparisons by district were not made (since there were only two schools per district). Learner comparisons were made, but they should be interpreted with caution because there were only two primary and two secondary schools in the endline sample. In addition, while comparisons over time were made, they should also be interpreted with caution because there were likely different stakeholders surveyed at baseline and endline. Finally, while FAWEZI had been in contact with MoPSE officials and with schools and requested that community members be at the four schools and available for data collection, teachers were on strike and learners had not been attending regularly. Therefore, gathering data from a wide variety of stakeholders was limited.

Despite the limitations and unique constraints posed by the global pandemic, MWAI was committed to delivering a high-quality and robust endline data collection report. The endline data were gathered from a purposive sample at the school level from both adults (community members, parents, and teachers) and learners in order to provide a holistic assessment as to whether and how the drivers shifted (or not), and the ways in which school alignment to the standards of SRGBV prevention had been addressed throughout the project.

**Endline demographics**
Endline data were collected at four schools the week of November 16, 2020; with one full day dedicated to data collection at each school. Overall, 242 school stakeholders were surveyed (60% females and 40% males). About one-half were learners, one-fourth were teachers or school heads, and one-fifth were parents (see Figure 4). Learners who participated in the surveys ranged in age from nine to 20 years old, and were on average 14 years old. Despite the limited number of learners available for data collection, data were gathered from girl and boy learners in Grades 5 through Form 6 (see Appendix 1 for details on participants per grade and gender). Few surveys were gathered from Ministry officials and from the community partners who were not parents due to the circumstances of COVID-19 and community members’ availability. (Many were working because they could not work during the COVID-19 lockdown.)

In addition to the survey data, two school staff interviews were conducted at each school—one with the school head if possible, and another with a teacher who participated in FAWEZI trainings and activities. Because teachers were striking during endline data collection, fewer teachers were available for the survey and interviews. In addition, because of these teacher strikes, since no instruction was taking place, all the learners who were at the schools were there for the specific reason of participating in the data collection. Learners traveled to school in groups for safety reasons, so it was challenging to select six to eight learners for the focus group discussions. Thus, all learners who were at schools participated in both the surveys and the focus groups, and this made the focus groups larger than anticipated. While it was challenging to have so many learners participate, data collectors intentionally asked quiet learners for their opinions during the focus groups; they asked for differing opinions throughout the conversation; and they paid attention to ensure that all learner voices were heard. Lastly, one data collector collected the school observation data, which consisted of obtaining copies of the school rules and codes of conduct (either acquiring a digital copy or taking photos of hard copies) and observing chores that girls and boys were doing at school.
Drivers of SRGBV at Endline at Four Pilot Schools

The WSA aims to disrupt the drivers of violence, and the norms and practices that promote violence and reinforce unequal power dynamics in schools. Documenting and evaluating the underlying drivers of SRGBV over time is important to understanding how each school may or may not be addressing the root causes of SRGBV and shifting practices accordingly.

The endline data collection instruments included both quantitative and qualitative measures of the six drivers of SRGBV. The next section outlines stakeholders’ knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to these drivers, with differentiation over time and by stakeholder group (gender, age, school level) whenever possible.

**Research Question (RQ) 1:** What is the status of stakeholders’ knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the underlying drivers of SRGBV at endline? Whether and how do knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers shift or change over time (i.e., from baseline to endline)?

**Research Question 2:** Whether and how do endline knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers differ by gender, age, and school level?

Endline data collection at four pilot schools showed that stakeholder knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers of SRGBV were varied and complex. They shifted in positive directions for some drivers, whereas for other drivers, they did not. More work is needed over more time for change to take place.

**RQ1: Endline results related to drivers and changes over time (from baseline to endline)**

**Positive endline findings and shifts over time**

At the endline, stakeholder views on some drivers of SRGBV showed positive shifts. For instance, at baseline and endline, three-fourths of stakeholders agreed that they were able to name Zimbabwean laws and policies that protect girls and women. FAWEZI trainings introduced stakeholders to the

"Physical punishment was there. We usually beat them . . . but now we are no longer applying that because of the Secretary’s Circular P35 of the MoPSE” (urban male secondary teacher).
1999 Circular, which may have influenced awareness of policies and circulars at endline. This is an important first step in preventing and responding to SRGBV, since laws must be widely known, and then implemented and enforced, in order for them to work effectively against SRGBV. Stakeholders also reported a significant increase from baseline to endline that there should be a law forbidding teachers to hit students (46% at the baseline to 61% at endline), which signals an important step in attitudes to eradicate corporal punishment at schools. Stakeholders reported shifts towards more equality regarding some rigid gender roles and social norms. For instance, attitudes related to women’s roles (i.e., taking care of the home and family) were more equitable at endline for this sample.

More work is needed

Other rigid gender roles, and stereotyped constructions of femininity and masculinity, were still evident at endline. Stakeholders still held beliefs normalizing traditional gender roles for men (i.e., earning money for the family). Similar to the baseline (72%), three-fourths of stakeholders at endline reported stereotypical views of how girls dressed as a factor in violence (e.g., girls wearing short skirts invites trouble). In addition, stakeholders described how power dynamics at home favored boys and men, supporting violence against women and girls. For instance, there were significant increases at endline in the beliefs that boys who help their mothers at home are sissies, and that it is acceptable for a husband to beat his wife if she disobeys him, reflecting a worldwide trend of increased time at home associated with increased domestic violence exacerbated by COVID-19 lockdowns. In addition, a troubling 20% of stakeholders at endline agreed that wives should not report being beaten by husbands for the sake of their family, reinforcing silence around violence against women and girls. Boys and men were significantly more likely than girls and women to agree to the survey question that wives should not report, showing how reporting is silenced when girls and women have less power in households. Stakeholders also agreed at the endline that violence against children occurred in schools and homes and was normalized.

One-third of stakeholders agreed at endline that families who cannot afford to send their children to their schools choose to send boys more often than girls. This shows again how girls have less power and lower social status, which may make them less valued and more susceptible to violence at school (since gender, poverty, and the normalization of violence intersect).

Figure 5: Summary of endline results related to the drivers of SRGBV and changes over time

| Power dynamics at home favored boys and men and supported | Traditional gender roles for men were still normalized | Majority of surveyed stakeholders could name | Increased support for laws against corporal punishment |

“If you are a girl and you look smart, you will be called a prostitute trying to seduce the male teachers here [at school]” (rural secondary girl).
| Violence against women and girls | One-fifth of surveyed stakeholders agreed that wives should not report domestic violence | Zimbabwean laws protecting girls and women | Shifting attitudes towards more equal roles for women |

Most inequitable (red)  | Inequitable (orange)  | Equitable (blue)  | Most equitable (green)  |
RQ2: Differences in endline results related to drivers by gender, age, and school level

There were no significant differences in endline results related to the drivers of SRGBV when comparing girls and women to boys and men, or when comparing primary learners to secondary learners for this sample. However, endline data did show important differences between adults and learners regarding the drivers of SRGBV. In general, adults held more equitable views regarding gender roles. They were more likely to disagree that chores at school were gendered, that the way girls dress invites violence, and that boys who help their mothers at home are sissies. This potentially suggests that adult beliefs are shifting faster than learners', or that adults are not aware of the realities learners face (e.g., boys being called names like “sissy” for helping at home), or may be related to response bias. In contrast, learners were significantly more likely than adults to agree that violence against children is normalized and necessary (see Figure 6), which may reflect learners' realities since violence is often perpetrated by adults (so adults may be less likely to admit that violence against children is normalized). Learners were also more likely to agree that it is okay for a husband to beat his wife if she disobeys him, possibly because learners witness such violence in their homes.

These data show that adults at endline held more equitable and safe attitudes, whereas learners were more likely to perceive violence as normal in their lives.

The WSA domains and minimum standards

A WSA involves multiple school stakeholder groups (including learners, school staff, local community, and government) in activities to make schools more child-friendly and safer. The eight elements of a WSA address the drivers of SRGBV in holistic and intersecting ways. The WSA framework provides a set of minimum standards for the eight elements outlined in the graphic below (see Figure 7).

4 Response bias refers to adults responding in ways they think are socially desirable (or ways they think the data collectors want to hear).
Research Question 3: Whether and how do the pilot schools align with the eight domains of a WSA at endline? Whether and how does school alignment with the WSA domains shift or change over time as stakeholders participate in SRGBV programming (i.e., from baseline to endline)?

Research Question 4: Whether and how do knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the domains at endline differ by gender, age, and school level?

Figure 7: WSA domains and minimum standards

RQ3: Endline results related to domains and changes over time (from baseline to endline)

Positive endline findings and shifts over time:

At the endline, school stakeholders reported alignment with the domains and related minimum standards of a WSA in a variety of ways, particularly related to school leadership and community engagement; parent engagement; and child rights, participation, and gender equality. For instance, staff at all schools reported working with community organizations at both the baseline and the endline, and about two-thirds of surveyed stakeholders reported that they were familiar with other organizations working with their schools to prevent SRGBV. Surveyed stakeholder perceptions of parent engagement increased over time (69% at the baseline, increased to 74% at endline), and some school stakeholders linked this increased engagement to FAWEZI school activities over the past
year. One teacher explained how parents at his school were cooperative: “For example, we had a workshop conducted by FAWEZI and the parents came and sponsored to rebuild our school durawall and repair the electricity . . . also they came and helped us [with] the code of conducts draft” (urban male secondary teacher). FAWEZI workshops helped connect parents to schools to support safety and to develop codes of conduct to prevent SRGBV.

The majority of surveyed stakeholders also agreed/strongly\(^5\) (74%) that there was gender equality in learner leadership and discipline at their schools. Learners reported opportunities to serve in leadership positions at all schools at the endline; and almost all learners felt that these leadership opportunities were equitable among girls and boys. After FAWEZI training, SRGBV learner clubs were formed at three of the four endline schools. These helped to educate learners and school staff about SRGBV, school rules, and reporting processes. In addition, FAWEZI training helped empower learners to lead activities to prevent and respond to SRGBV. One rural primary boy explained: “Before the prefects hadn’t been empowered . . . but from when the prefects were given empowerment by FAWEZI, learners were now heard when they report” (rural primary school boy). The learner clubs helped inform the participants on their rights and helped to increase knowledge of SRGBV and reporting.

**Further action needed:**

The endline data also indicated that **more work is needed** to meet the minimum standards of multiple domains in the WSA. Stakeholders did not agree on the definition and the prevalence of SRGBV. They also disagreed on their schools’ alignment to the following WSA domains:

- safe and child-friendly reporting, monitoring, accountability, and incidence response mechanisms;
- comprehensive and holistic codes of conduct;
- safe and gender-responsive attitudes and behaviors of teacher and educational support staff; and,
- physical environments in and around school.

**Reporting, monitoring, and accountability, and incident response**

**Definitions of SRGBV**

\(^5\) The report uses the term “agree/strongly” to indicate the aggregate proportion of the participants who agreed and strongly agreed with the statement.
Similar to the baseline, endline data showed disagreement on the definition of SRGBV and how often it occurs. At the endline, five survey questions were combined to create a construct that measured stakeholder’s understand of the forms and manifestations of SRGBV (i.e., ‘Bullying is one type of school-related, gender-based violence’). At the endline, on average, 80% of surveyed stakeholders agreed/strongly that the different forms and manifestations were indeed incidents of SRGBV (see Figure 8). Yet probing during interviews and focus group discussions showed that stakeholders’ own definitions and examples of SRGBV varied. Learners mentioned bullying and sexual harassment, drug abuse and stealing, but few included the gendered aspects of SRGBV in their definitions and examples. School staff offered more comprehensive definitions, but neither staff nor learners identified corporal punishment or intimate partner violence as examples of SRGBV when asked during interviews and focus group discussions.

Prevalence of SRGBV

Similar to the baseline, learners and teachers offered different accounts of how often SRGBV occurs in their schools. At endline, teachers from all four schools reported that school staff learned about positive discipline and counseling from FAWEZI trainings, which helped decrease the use of corporal punishment at their schools, although it has not been eradicated. Teachers reported that SRGBV occurred at their schools once every week or two (on average) at the endline compared to teacher reports of daily occurrences at the baseline. Some learners also felt that SRGBV cases were decreasing because of the focused work with FAWEZI. However, other learners described that SRGBV was a customary occurrence. They stated that bullying, sexual violence, sexual harassment, and corporal punishment were commonplace, with learners reporting that corporal punishment occurred several times a week. Learners also reported being victims of SRGBV perpetrated by teachers: “We have teachers who drink alcohol, [and] they don’t consider you a female student. They can be talking to you while they’re touching you, they don’t have boundaries as male teachers to female students” (urban secondary girl). While school staff discussed SRGBV in terms of learner-to-learner violence, focus group discussions with learners made it clear that teacher-to-learner violence also occurred in these schools.

“From the time we started dealing with FAWEZI and [the school] rules, such as school children shouldn’t be beaten or given corporal punishment, there’s a lot of change taking place” (rural primary girl).

“Let’s say you are a girl, and you go to the office to report sexual abuse. You will be blamed to say you instigated it, maybe by the way you dress” (urban secondary girl).
Reporting processes and incident response

There were also conflicting reports as to whether schools' reporting, accountability, and incident response mechanisms aligned with the WSA and were safe and child-friendly. At endline, school staff and teachers reported improvements in reporting mechanisms for SRGBV, such as reinstating suggestion boxes (which were not used anymore at the baseline). Other processes for reporting included talking with prefects and teachers, and working with various committees (i.e., the Grievances Handling Committee, or the Disciplinary Committee) and outside organizations such as the police or Victim Friendly Unit to review cases and make recommendations. Similar to the baseline, no school staff member discussed whether and how their school established referral system was connected to the local child protection systems, and likewise no staff mentioned that their school had a school review committee or organization to improve monitoring and accountability of SRGBV.

At endline, school staff opined that learners were comfortable reporting SRGBV and felt the process was confidential in most cases. Yet overall, 41% of surveyed stakeholders agreed/strongly that girls at their schools were scared to report incidences of SRGBV, and 33% of stakeholders agreed/strongly that boys at their schools were scared to report incidences of SRGBV. When examining girls' comfort, learners were significantly more likely than adults to agree/strongly that girls are scared to report incidences of SRGBV (48% of learners agreed/strongly compared to 32% of adults, $p = .022$; see Figure 9). Learners described discomfort reporting, since they worried that their cases would not be kept confidential (based on others' past experiences). Also, they worried about getting bullied or beaten by other learners or teachers for reporting.

Many learners said that victims were blamed for reporting or often were not believed; or thought that nothing would come of their reporting. While there was a significant decrease in perceptions of victim blaming from the baseline to endline (70% agreed/strongly that learner victims were blamed at the baseline, and this decreased to 58% at endline, see Figure 10), it still remained an issue. Over 50% of surveyed stakeholders felt that victims were often blamed for the
incident. At the endline, learners were also significantly more likely than adults to report that victim-blaming occurs in their schools ($z = -4.041, p < .001$; see Figure 11).

**Figure 11: School stakeholder agreement at endline that victims are blamed for SRGBV**

Finally, learners also reported that, in some cases, being a victim of SRGBV led to additional physical abuse, emotional abuse, disconnection with school, and the inability to concentrate; and it had negative effects on their exam scores and overall schooling experiences.

**Figure 12: Summary of endline reporting, monitoring, and incident response findings**

Learners were not comfortable reporting SRGBV because:
- victims were blamed
- cases were not always confidential
- reporting led to additional abuse and negatively affected schooling

Significant decrease in victim blaming, but over 50% of surveyed stakeholders at endline agreed that victim blaming occurred

Stakeholders felt that the SRGBV reporting process was confidential in most cases

Reinstated suggestion boxes for reporting

Multiple reporting mechanisms at each school

Most inequitable (red) -------------------- Inequitable (orange) ------- Equitable (blue) ------ Most equitable (green)
**Code of conduct**

At baseline, all codes of conduct or school rules were one-page documents with very basic notions of learner dress and behavior (e.g., “pupils should respect one another, prefects, teachers, and visitors,” excerpt from a sample of rural secondary school rules). At endline, the draft school rules or codes were longer (ranging from three to 15 pages) and more holistic, and they all mentioned gender. In addition, at endline, about 85% of surveyed stakeholders agreed/strongly that their school rules or codes of conduct clearly defined violence and SRGBV. Also at the endline, about 80% of surveyed stakeholders agreed/strongly that staff at their schools worked to raise awareness of the code of conduct related to SRGBV.

Despite these perceptions, none of the endline codes of conduct drafts actually defined SRGBV. They did not outline the specific forms of SRGBV, and most did not recognize gender discriminatory behaviors, specify reporting mechanisms, or outline consequences for violation. There was a significant decrease from the baseline to endline in stakeholder agreement concerning whether their school rules explicitly stated that SRGBV was unacceptable and would not be tolerated. Possibly, as stakeholders learned more comprehensive definitions of SRGBV, they realized that their school rules did not include all forms of SRGBV (or, the decrease could be due to the fact that different stakeholders were likely surveyed at baseline and endline). In addition, there was a significant decrease from baseline to endline in stakeholders agreeing/strongly that they were aware of their school rules regarding corporal punishment (24% disagreed/strongly at the baseline, compared to 38% at the endline). Stakeholders may have been less aware of their school rules regarding corporal punishment at the endline since schools were working to update these rules; or this may be linked to uneven use of corporal punishment at these schools. In working to finalize the codes of conduct, stakeholder engagement was limited by school closures and bans on gatherings due to COVID-19.

*Figure 13: Summary of endline code of conduct findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>More work is needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Codes were longer and more comprehensive at endline than at baseline</em></td>
<td><em>Paper copies of codes in schools did not include definitions of SRGBV</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>85% of surveyed stakeholders at endline agreed/strongly that the codes clearly defined violence and SRGBV</em></td>
<td><em>Paper copies in schools did not outline all five forms of SRGBV</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Stakeholder awareness of school rules regarding corporal punishment decreased significantly</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers and Educational Staff Support

At the endline, 79% of surveyed stakeholders agreed/strongly that teachers and educational staff worked to create a positive, gender-responsive, safe school environment. This marked a significant increase in school stakeholder agreement from baseline to endline (39% strongly agreed and 32% agreed at the baseline, compared to 51% strongly agreeing and 28% agreeing at endline). Teachers at all four schools discussed how FAWEZI trainings on gender-responsive pedagogy and positive discipline helped to increase their knowledge and shift their behaviors. Yet learners reported that corporal punishment still occurred, daily in some schools, for reasons such as “not finishing assignments,” “not submitting your work,” “not doing corrections,” or “not wearing the proper uniform, even having the wrong haircut” (comments coming from rural, secondary school girls). At endline, 20% of stakeholders agreed/strongly that they knew teachers who experienced violence at this school, with more boys/men agreeing/strongly than girls/women, and more secondary learners agreeing/strongly than primary. In addition, 10% of surveyed stakeholders at endline also agreed/strongly that they knew teachers who experienced sexual violence at their school. Moreover, this did not differ by group, indicating that all stakeholder groups were aware that teachers were victims of SRGBV at their schools.

Safe and secure physical environments in and around school

At endline, roughly half of learners reported feeling safe on their journey to school, since they traveled in groups. But the other half of learners, particularly boys, mentioned such safety issues as traffic, dogs, and school leavers who bully them on their journeys. Once at school, some learners felt safe in the school yard, when they were with friends and near teachers or prefects to monitor activity. Others felt unsafe due to the physical environment (e.g., short fences surrounding the school), and girls specifically mentioned issues of SRGBV in the school yard as boys victimized them. Urban learners also described issues of drugs and bullying, specifically from outsiders entering the school yard. In addition, over one-third of surveyed stakeholders at endline disagreed/strongly that their schools had safe physical environments; and two-thirds of all surveyed stakeholders disagreed/strongly that the school environment supported girls’ health and needs related to menstruation.

RQ4: Differences in endline results related to domains by gender, age, and school level

Differences by gender

“These days we no longer physically punish children, but what we do is we take the child or the perpetrator, we sit down in the committees . . . and then we talk with the child. We try and guide the child rather than punishing the child” (urban male secondary school head).
At endline there were also important differences in stakeholder beliefs and attitudes by gender. Girls and women were more likely than boys and men to agree/strongly that there was gender equality in learner leadership and in discipline (78% of girls and women compared to 67% of boys and men). Boys from the rural primary schools in particular noted a gendered dynamic to discipline, inasmuch as they felt that girls were favored and boys were given harsher physical punishments for the same behaviors as girls.

Both boys and girls also described gendered safety issues. Boys felt unsafe traveling because older boys used their power and authority to bully them. In addition, boys in particular reported that they were hesitant to report an incident. Since many social and gender norms dictate that boys should appear powerful and aggressive, boys worried about being bullied or about being seen as weak if they reported victimization.

Some girls felt unsafe when traveling to school or in the school yard because of harassment from boys. One rural secondary girl said, “sometimes they [boy learners] touch our body parts.” At another school, girls reported multiple instances of male teachers perpetrating SRGBV against other girls, but the teachers faced no consequences after the learners made their report. When students confronted the school head about this, the head was not clear whether she would report the instances or not. Learners understood that their rights were being violated and they reported this as they had been told they should do. However, this alarming lack of school leadership and the lack of a response mechanism (i.e., a school committee or organization for accountability) shows how learner safety can still be jeopardized when leaders waiver on following the minimum standards – and the law.

“As men . . . if you are a boy and a girl harasses you, probably touches your private parts or sits on your lap, for you to report this?! Some boys will view you as a timid person” (urban secondary boy).

“As men . . . if you are a boy and a girl harasses you, probably touches your private parts or sits on your lap, for you to report this?! Some boys will view you as a timid person” (urban secondary boy).

“He [male teacher] would never teach his math subject . . . this other time he touched my friend inappropriately. When we reported at the office, we were told it would be fixed, but up to now it hasn’t” (urban secondary girl).

Girls—harassment from boys on the way to or from school, victims of SRGBV by teachers
Boys—harsher discipline from teachers, bullied while traveling to school, teased as “weak” for reporting SRGBV

Differences by age

Learners and adults also reported significantly different agreement on a variety of domains. For instance, regarding reporting mechanisms and incidence response, more learners than adults
agreed/strongly at the endline that learners who report SRGBV at these schools were often asked what they had done to initiate the abuse they had experienced (68% of learners agreed/strongly, compared to 45% of adults, see Figure 14). This trend is similar to baseline, where again more learners than adults agreed/strongly that learners who report SRGBV at these schools were often asked what they had done to initiate the abuse they experienced (88% of learners agreed/strongly at baseline, compared to 62% of adults). In addition, at endline, learners agreed/strongly that girls are scared to report incidences of SRGBV at these schools more than adults (48% of learners compared to 32% of adults); and learners were more likely to disagree/strongly than adults that their school’s code of conduct clearly defined SRGBV and that the code explicitly states that SRGBV is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Taken together, these results suggest that some learners do not agree that their codes of conduct take an unambiguous, zero-tolerance stance on SRGBV. Or, it is possible that learners may not be experiencing a zero-tolerance stance, even if it is stated in the rules. These data also suggest that schools’ reporting mechanisms and incidence response systems are not safe and child-friendly for some learners.

![Figure 14: Endline school stakeholder agreement that “Learners who report SRGBV at this school are often asked what they have done to initiate the abuse they experienced” by age](image)

More adults than learners strongly disagreed that their school physical environments were safe (17% of adults strongly disagreed compared to 8% of learners), and a much larger percentage of adults disagreed that the schools were supportive of girls’ health (42% of adults strongly disagreed compared to 30% of learners). This may suggest that adults are aware of those necessary resources that schools are not providing to their learners. Qualitative data suggested that some parents helped to improve the physical environment at one school by helping repair the school durawall and cover naked wires on the school grounds. Finally, adults had greater agreement than learners that parents were positively engaged in the safety of learners at the endline, perhaps because of volunteer support and increased parent involvement during FAWEZI-organized parent meetings early in 2020 (before in-person activities were halted due to COVID-19).

![Warning: Learners—stronger agreement victim blaming occurred, girls were scared to report SRGBV, and code of conduct did not clearly define SRGBV or take a zero-tolerance stance](image)

Adults—stronger disagreement that the school physical environment was safe and supportive of girls’ health
Differences by school level

Looking specifically at differences among school levels, primary learners reported significantly greater agreement than secondary learners that educational staff exhibited safe, positive, gender-responsive behaviors (89% of primary learners agreed/strongly, compared to 60% of secondary learners). Focus group data with learners revealed that, while SRGBV was an issue at all schools, secondary learners more often discussed victimization by school staff with minimal to no consequences for the perpetrators.

Secondary learners—less agreement educational staff exhibited safe, positive, gender-responsive behaviors; more discussion of SRGBV towards learners by school staff

More secondary than primary learners at the endline agreed/strongly that they were aware of their school rules regarding corporal punishment (79% of secondary compared to 46% of primary, see Figure 15). In addition, at the endline, secondary learners were significantly more likely to agree strongly that they were familiar with other organizations (besides FAWEZI and the police) that were working to prevent SRGBV at their schools (61% of secondary learners compared to 38% of primary).

Secondary school staff discussed how they worked with community organizations throughout the year, holding annual general meetings and receiving donations of sanitizer and uniforms. Secondary learners may have been more aware of organizations partnering with their schools in SRGBV prevention, since school staff described more tangible donations at secondary schools than at primary schools. More secondary than primary learners agreed/strongly that their school environments supported girls’ health (51% of secondary compared to 28% of primary), potentially indicating that more provision for girls’ menstruation is needed at primary schools.

Primary learners—less awareness of school rules regarding corporal punishment, less familiar with other organizations working to prevent SRGBV, less agreement school environments were supportive of girls’ health

Recommendations and Conclusion

The endline data showed that significant progress was made on some of the drivers of SRGBV and WSA domains from baseline to endline. School leaders participated in FAWEZI
trainings and workshops, thereby increasing their knowledge of SRGBV, SRGBV reporting processes, gender-responsive pedagogy, and positive discipline. Staff partnered with community organizations to prevent and respond to SRGBV, and about two-thirds of surveyed stakeholders knew of these other organizations working on SRGBV at their schools. Perceptions of parent engagement increased from baseline to endline, and learners felt empowered to work against SRGBV as they learned more about their rights and school rules, and as they participated in FAWEZI trainings and learners’ clubs at their schools. This multi-dimensional approach, involving multiple stakeholders is central to a WSA. As stakeholders increase their knowledge, gender norms such as attitudes related to women’s roles can shift; and girls and women can develop increased agency to work with others to create safer school environments.

However, more work is needed to create sustained and meaningful change in these schools. Stakeholders also reported shifts in some gender norms, such as attitudes related to women’s roles. Both boys and girls served as learner leaders in school, and teachers reported new considerations of gender in their teaching and discipline as a result of FAWEZI trainings. Yet other negative gender norms persisted, such as the majority of stakeholders agreeing with traditional gender roles for men, and some learners reporting gendered chores and discipline at school.

**Suggested recommendations:** Continue integrating gender into everyday work in school and curriculum activities. It is critical that all stakeholders (school staff, learners, community members, and parents) have the opportunity to learn the differences between sex and gender, and how social constructions and power are related to gender norms in society. Discussions at school, in parent and community meetings, in the classroom, and among school staff are an important first step in creating opportunities for learning, which may lead to gender norm change.

A common, shared understanding of what constitutes SRGBV is at the heart of a WSA. A comprehensive definition that is agreed upon and enforced by stakeholders is necessary for a WSA to succeed. Baseline and endline data both showed that stakeholders held varying definitions of SRGBV, and learners and school staff vastly differed in their reports of how often SRGBV (and corporal punishment in particular) occurred. While there have been some shifts in perceptions of violence and SRGBV, violence against children and girls continues to be normalized in many schools and communities at the endline. Victim blaming was a common occurrence, and attitudes towards gender intersected with violence to sustain SRGBV (e.g., girls who wear “provocative” clothing may “deserve” to be victimized).

**Suggested recommendations:** While the endline data showed greater progress toward a comprehensive understanding of SRGBV, more work is needed to unpack specifically the gendered dimension of SRGBV, as well as to help learners and school staff identify corporal punishment and intimate partner violence as forms of SRGBV. During the
project, FAWEZI worked to create consensus in workshops with community members, parents, and learners through more structured and regular meetings. Additional and sustained work (beyond the life of this project) is needed to create a shared understanding of SRGBV that is known widely among staff, learners, and community members. Also needed are strengthening referrals to services outside the school; and holding regular, structured meetings building partnerships with outside organizations (e.g., police, Victim Friendly Units, other organizations working with women and youth). The meetings may help inform stakeholders of the different forms of SRGBV and solidify a common understanding of SRGBV and how to prevent it; thus, contributing to a shift in discriminatory and harmful gender norms and practices.

Also foundational to a WSA is the development and implementation of a comprehensive code of conduct, which includes school rules and procedures related to SRGBV. A code of conduct that aligns with the WSA includes the shared definition and forms of SRGBV; it is developed in conversation with multiple stakeholders; and it includes positive behaviors that create a safe school environment. In addition, the code should align with national laws and policies. At the endline, school staff and stakeholders reported they were more knowledgeable about Zimbabwean laws that protect girls and women, and more stakeholders agreed that corporal punishment should be against the law. All of this is evidence of support for a more comprehensive code of conduct at these schools.

FAWEZI clearly has worked with multiple stakeholder groups over the past year, as school staff, learners, and parents and community members were all involved in updating the draft codes of conduct. The endline codes of conduct were longer, more holistic, and all mentioned gender. Yet few if any of the codes actually defined SRGBV or its different forms, gender discriminatory behaviors, reporting mechanisms, or the consequences for violation. Stakeholders also reported less awareness of the school rules related to a zero-tolerance stance on SRGBV and corporal punishment at endline.

The endline data also showed that more work is needed concerning reporting, monitoring, accountability, and incident response systems. There must be clear, safe, and child-friendly processes for reporting cases. Victims must be linked to supports (mental, physical, and child protection). And, there must be consistent consequences for perpetrators. Victim blaming and additional punishments for reporting continued to occur at endline. This violates learners' rights. Some learners stated that SRGBV was occurring at their schools; but they were afraid to report it because other attempts at reporting had led to additional physical abuse, emotional abuse, and negative effects on schooling. Other learners said stated that nothing happened to perpetrators when learners reported. While suggestion boxes were reinstated in schools, some learners reported that confidentiality was compromised, in some instances, even when they used these boxes.
**Suggested recommendations:** Since all of the codes of conduct were in draft form at the time of endline data collection, supervision is still needed to ensure that these updated codes are comprehensive, clearly include gender and power, and outline reporting mechanisms. Partnerships with outside organizations may help to obtain the resources and support needed to understand how to create child-friendly reporting mechanisms, decrease victim blaming, and institute consistent consequences for violations. Forums are needed for heads of schools, teachers, learners, parents, and stakeholders to educate on the laws, circulars, and policies, so that school codes align with these laws. Schools can work towards harmonizing their codes and learn from each other. Codes must be launched, popularized, and displayed in schools, and in the community. While FAWEZI helped link schools to community resources in meetings during the project, COVID-19 clearly limited in-person gatherings. Once these gatherings are deemed safe again, more in-person meetings with community organizations may help further to strengthen partnerships, create linkages to child support systems, and build support for SRGBV review organizations at each school.

Finally, stakeholders reported safety concerns related to both girls’ health and to issues that emerge en route to school and in the schoolyard (e.g., bullies, sexual harassment, and drugs). Violence was normalized in homes, schools, and the larger community; and learners in particular felt that violence was necessary and acceptable.

**Suggested recommendations:** More work is needed to create safe spaces to understand and to process lived experiences with violence. Continue to integrate guidance and counseling into learners’ daily schedules; and create spaces for teachers, parents, and community members to process violence and SRGVB. Work with parents and community members to promote positive discipline techniques.

**Conclusion**

The design of this pilot project implemented by FAWEZI with UNGEI support from July 2018–December 2020 was based on the frameworks and guidance provided in *A Whole School Approach to Prevent School-Related Gender-Based Violence: Minimum Standards and Monitoring Framework*. Through the collaborative partnership with UNGEI and FAWEZI, MWAI designed an evaluation related to that framework and specific to the 10 schools in Zimbabwe to answer these questions:

1. What is the status of stakeholder knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the underlying drivers of SRGBV? Whether and how do knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers shift or change over time (from baseline to endline)?
2. Whether and how do endline knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the drivers differ by gender, age, and school level?

3. Whether and how do the pilot schools align with the eight domains of a WSA at endline? Whether and how does school alignment with the WSA domains shift or change as schools participate in SRGBV programming (from baseline to endline)?

4. Whether and how do endline knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the domains of a WSA differ by gender, age, and school level?

The richly detailed findings of this endline study answered those four research questions in ways that demonstrate the enormous potential of the Whole School Approach to challenge and to change harmful, entrenched gender norms in the complex systems of school communities. The pilot project demonstrated that while the WSA may be implemented differently in rural and urban areas and in primary and secondary schools, and while its implementation may be disrupted by a global pandemic, where this holistic approach is introduced and where stakeholders are committed to its principles it is possible to address SRGBV over time in multifarious ways, and to work toward ensuring the right of all children to go to school and to learn in a safe, secure environment.
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