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A. GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJH</td>
<td>Alianza Joven Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSI</td>
<td>Central American Regional Security Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPREV</td>
<td>Centro para Prevención de Violencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCA</td>
<td>Estrategia de Seguridad Centroamericana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>German International Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT</td>
<td>Gang Resistance Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MdM</td>
<td>Miles de Manos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASMO</td>
<td>Pan American Social Marketing Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREVENIR</td>
<td>Programa Regional Prevención de la Violencia Juvenil en Centro América</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPONTE</td>
<td>Programa de Prevención y Oportunidades Trabajando para el Entendimiento Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUENTES</td>
<td>Padres y Docentes Uniendo Esfuerzos por la Niñez a Través de Espacios Sociales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDUC</td>
<td>Secretary of Education of Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICA</td>
<td>Sistema de Integración Centroamericana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Funded by USAID, The PUENTES project piloted the German Cooperation Agency’s (GIZ) Miles de Manos (MdM) methodology in high-risk urban settings in Honduras in the cities of Tegucigalpa, San Pedro Sula, and La Ceiba from September 2015 to February 2017. The key stakeholders of the project included representatives of the Secretary of Education, teachers, parents, and counselors. The project benefited 36 schools, 2,269 families, and 265 teachers over the 18-month period.

The MdM Methodology consists of three components: Family, School, and Integration (Puente = Bridge). These are developed through a series of meetings or “sessions” containing a reflection methodology. In order to include a gender transformative approach, ChildFund integrated curriculum from the Violence Prevention Center’s (CEPREV) methodology and inserted a comprehensive gender approach in the methodology and materials, in addition to using the MdM methodology, which takes a comprehensive
approach to violence in order to address gender and the power dynamics related to masculinity that contribute to violence. PUENTES engaged mothers and fathers as MdM facilitators as a new approach for the family component to reduce the burden on teachers and to empower and encourage buy-in from parents.

The project’s objective was to strengthen families and schools in supporting children to stay in school and improve their behavior while facing daily life challenges. The expected outcomes of the project were the following:

1. Improved parenting skills to reduce high-risk behaviors in youth that can lead to violence in the school and family environment
2. Increased abilities of teachers to promote conditions that create resilient, peaceful, and democratic school environments
3. Strengthened relationships between schools and parents, and improved skills to identify and deal with risk factors that can lead to violence in school and family environments
4. Reliable data and analysis of this pilot project, and recommendations to expand the implementation of violence prevention programs based in urban public schools

The PUENTES project also developed guidance on child protection to enhance violence prevention efforts and ensure that school staff had access to procedures, referral mechanisms, and connections to service and response systems. Three documents about child protection designed for schools were utilized and shared amongst school directors, teachers, and parent facilitators: 1) Operational guide for the care and referral of cases of child abuse; 2) Route - What to do in situations of violence against children found in schools; and 3) Mapping child protection networks, services, and agencies.

A quasi-experimental design in 72 schools (36 pilot and 36 control) was used to evaluate the effect of the MdM methodology on the prevention of violence in high-risk areas. The project included a baseline assessment, a mid-term evaluation, and a final evaluation. The final evaluation was conducted using a mixed methods approach. Quantitative data was collected in the three cities based on questionnaires completed by 4th, 5th, and 6th grade students and their respective teachers, and parents. Qualitative information was collected through interviews with students and teacher/parent facilitators, as well as focus groups with mothers/fathers who attended the sessions, fathers who did not attend the sessions but whose spouses did, and teachers and students.

Key results found from the evaluation were the following:

**Table of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Type of Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the implementation of Miles de Manos increased the factors of protection for 4th, 5th, and 6th grade children in the target communities?</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td><strong>Increased positive communication in the home:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Build relations of trust, affection, and mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Recognize and encourage positive behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Increased show of concern for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Communication between parents and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Increased positive discipline at home:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Control emotions when facing a wrong-doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Establish clear rules for behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Discipline without use of physical and psychological violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Explanation of Findings

The results showed a positive impact on pilot schools when compared to the control schools: an increase in parents who report using protective actions and monitoring their children. This was affirmed by parents (and children), who stressed the improvement of the following: 1) Problem solving skills; 2) Involvement in the school life of their children; 3) Adult supervision; and 4) Recognition and positive reinforcement.

Comparison between the baseline and final evaluation showed positive changes on several indicators as a result of the MdM methodology, despite the short time of intervention. These changes, such as increased child perception of safety at school and at home, decreased violent acts, and indiscipline in the schools show that the MdM intervention can influence changes in attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions related to violence.

### Key recommendations:

1. MdM methodology must be implemented for a longer time in order to study its effect on a whole cohort of children from 4th to 6th grade. It would benefit from a longer-term study (2-3 years) with multiple years of intervention and monitoring of behavioral change.
2. While MdM is an effective and proven methodology in preventing school-based violence focused on key actors in the child's life, it can be complemented by other strategies and interventions, such as:
   - More secondary and tertiary individualized prevention based on the issues and needs of children, families, and schools that are already experiencing violence
   - Psychological assistance and socio-emotional care
   - School staff training on working with and responding to the needs of children in a violent environment
   - Interventions that enhance the role and active participation of children in their own daily experiences
   - Improving infrastructure for the implementation of methodologies such as MdM in schools that have adequate space for group meetings
   - Interventions designed specifically for a community approach to preventing violence that includes community stakeholders, such as churches, police, and child protection agencies, among others.
   - Interventions designed specifically to work on gender-based violence, new masculine roles, and active participation of males in the life of their children.
   - Interventions focused specifically on the issue of sexual and reproductive health

3. It is necessary to motivate and seek strategies for male parent participation in school-based violence prevention programs. Moreover, research must be done on the number of households that are headed by single mothers or other caregivers with the absence of the father figure.

4. The Secretary of Education (SEDUC) should consider certification or accreditation of facilitator leaders on subjects of violence prevention, in order to encourage professional development of teachers in schools. Departmental, district, and municipal education directorates should develop strategies to reach out to other schools, using current staff and partners who are trained in MdM, and forming support teams, which could contribute to quality implementation and sustainability at the school level.

C. BACKGROUND

ChildFund Honduras is a non-governmental, non-profit development organization and member of ChildFund International, a development and child protection organization operating in 29 countries. It began operations in Honduras in 1982 to help children and youth living in poverty or conditions of exclusion and vulnerability to become young adults, parents, and leaders who bring lasting and positive change to their communities.

Miles de Manos Methodology

The Miles de Manos methodology is part of PREVENIR, a regional technical cooperation program whose political head is the General Secretariat of the Central American Integration System (SICA) and is developed within the framework of the Strategy of Central American Security (ESCA).

In order to develop the Miles de Manos methodology, the PREVENIR program conducted a comprehensive analysis of existing prevention experiences in the context of education, for which it established a partnership with the University of Oregon and coordinated the work of a team of Central American experts, who adapted the methodology to the context of the region.

The name Miles de Manos (“Thousands of Hands”) was adopted to demonstrate that, in order to break the spiral of violence, a joint effort is required by the main actors in the lives of children in order to
strengthen and unify families and schools, and to help children and youth effectively address the challenges of everyday life. Curriculum and teaching strategies are geared towards reducing violent behaviors, and are focused on the adults who interact with children to improve home and school environments through workshops aimed at building learning and acquiring new knowledge. Based on the experiences and life-lessons of teachers and parents, the workshops develop strategies to guide children and youth towards achieving a healthy life, within an environment of effective communication, peace, harmony and peaceful coexistence. This includes using tools and means to address and overcome conflicts when they arise, as well as promoting learning and teaching of social capacities for coexistence.

Target Groups

Methodological Strategies

A series of sessions are held, guided by a facilitator team, which is tasked with creating an atmosphere of trust and cooperation. In this environment, participants should feel free to share difficult experiences with children during their upbringing or education, and to analyze them together. While profound reflections are made, what really makes the difference is that participants are willing to try new ways to manage child behavior. This means challenging traditional ways of upbringing and education, and taking a more deliberate role in the lives of children. At the end of one of the pilot sessions, one teacher put it this way: "Little by little we learn from the different examples and experiences. I understood my strengths and weaknesses; one must remove the 'culture of no' and implement a positive approach."

Methodology Components

The Miles de Manos Methodology consists of three components, two main ones (Family and School) and one of integration (Puente =Bridge), which are developed through a series of meetings with a reflexive methodology, which MdM calls ‘sessions.’ The three components complement each other in subject content and take place in a parallel manner.

The School Component

Ten sessions of three hours each are directed at teaching staff and school principals. The sessions can be held according to the time available to school staff, but are recommended to take place every two weeks for four months to allow sufficient practice application time between sessions. The intended
result of these sessions is to establish a school coexistence plan with the participation of the entire education community and to create conditions for learning amongst students through the development of social and life skills.

The Family Component

Sessions with parents or caregivers are designed and developed by the school. This includes eight sessions (two hours each) organized weekly for about two months, or every two weeks for four months. The overall objective of the family component is to improve parenting skills by utilizing practices that have been scientifically demonstrated to reduce risk behaviors that can lead to violence in family and school environments.

The Integration Component

Four "bridge" sessions are planned, in addition to program launching and closing activities, as joint meetings between school staff and participating families. The overall objective of the integration component is to unite mothers and fathers with teachers in the effort to mentor children and adolescents. Their collaboration and cooperation is encouraged in order to achieve common goals related to the positive behavior of their children and students.

Details on sessions for the three components are presented below:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY COMPONENT</th>
<th>BRIDGE COMPONENT</th>
<th>SCHOOL COMPONENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allies in children’s learning</td>
<td>0. Launch</td>
<td>1. School and family united in coexistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How to grow in communication?</td>
<td>2. Forge new learning expectations in school and at home</td>
<td>3. Establishing shared expectations for coexistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How to encourage our children?</td>
<td>4. Evaluating our actions and planning the future of Miles de Manos</td>
<td>5. Positive recognition, how to foster coexistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How to manage our emotions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Finding solutions for better coexistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Follow-up to coexistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Planning coexistence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. ACTIVITIES SUMMARY

Preparation Activities

The recruitment and competitive hiring process of the project’s technical team was completed. The profiles and terms of reference for the coordinator, monitoring and evaluation specialist, and technical facilitators were elaborated, the positions were published, and potential candidates were identified. Subsequently, interviews with potential candidates for the positions were held and the selected candidates hired. The facilitators for Tegucigalpa and La Ceiba were hired first and, after receiving approval from USAID, the Project Coordinator was hired. Finally, the facilitators for the city of San Pedro Sula were hired, with the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist represented the last hire in January 2016.

1.1 The project’s detailed implementation plan was prepared, describing the monthly activities along with the expected outcomes according to the project proposal. This plan was supported by a narrative description of the activities, which was discussed and presented to USAID for revision. The plan was formally approved on January 20, 2016. The implementation plan was revised on a monthly basis to make time and funding adjustments in the implementation of activities. Finally, a closing plan and schedule was prepared containing the project, administrative, and financial tasks to be completed, along with the assigned timeline.

1.2 The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan was designed and submitted to USAID. The plan was revised and formally approved in February 2016. The M&E plan was completed based on the PMP presented in the initial proposal. Specific indicators for each of the project outcomes were created and instruments for information collection were designed. Weight was assigned to each indicator and associated with the evaluation instruments. The indicators measured changes in knowledge, perceptions, behaviors, and practices related to the prevention of violence in groups of fathers/mothers, teachers, and students from high-risk urban areas in Honduras. Adjustments were made to the project’s M&E plan to incorporate two gender indicators aligned with the project’s gender strategy, as well as an indicator referring to the violence reported by students over the last six months. ChildFund revised each one of the M&E tools that were used according to the project’s M&E plan, assuring modifications in some questions from the questionnaires and adding necessary data to collect for the project’s objective. The tools designed or revised consisted of the following:

a) Community Assessment Tool
b) Student Survey
c) Parent Survey
d) Teacher Survey
e) Training Process Checklist
f) Workshop Appreciation Tool (Family, School, and Bridge sessions)
g) Violent Acts and Indiscipline Report Log
h) Checklist of the expected outcomes in the project’s practical implementation
i) Communication Log between teachers, parents, and/or caregivers

There were also monitoring tools for the project’s technical staff:

j) School Visit Log
k) Workshop Monitoring Tool
l) Supervision Monitoring Tool
1.3 The consultancy for the evaluation of the project was designed, terms of reference were created and published, the proposals were received, and the best candidate was identified. The consultancy company for the community assessment and the baseline evaluation of the project was hired.

1.4 The terms of reference were prepared for the Systematization and Documentation consultancy. A consultant was identified and hired to conduct this activity from July to October 2016. This document explains the process followed in the implementation of the pilot project and the MdM methodology. This includes an analysis of the experiences, starting with the design, implementation, and main lessons learned during the project. The document is complemented by a video featuring testimonial of the principals, as well as teacher and parent facilitators.

1.5 The team coordinated with the Department of Educational Services in the Ministry of Education (SEduc) at a national level in order to socialize the project’s objective and show how it is beneficial to school-based violence prevention through teacher and parent engagement. SEDUC’s project liaison supported the selection process of the schools that participated in the project and convened meetings with the different levels of the SEDUC and technical staff from other institutions using the MdM methodology to ensure proper inter-institutional coordination.

The PUENTES project was socialized in the three intervention cities of Tegucigalpa, San Pedro Sula, and La Ceiba with the school principals and the municipal, district, and departmental directors of the selected schools. The school officials received the project positively and agreed upon the importance of addressing violence prevention due to the prevalence of violence.

A constant practice of the project was coordinating with different levels of authority from the SEDUC. Through the Departmental Directors, liaisons were assigned for each city. SEDUC’s representatives carried out joint visits with project staff to support school principals and teachers.

1.6 ChildFund signed a mutual cooperation agreement with the SEDUC and launched the PUENTES project on Monday, March 14th, 2016. It was inaugurated in the San Miguel de Heredia School located in Brisas del Valle, Tegucigalpa. The attendees included the Education representative from USAID, representatives of SEDUC, ChildFund’s Director, and the school director.

1.7 The gender strategy of PUENTES was presented to USAID and revised to ensure that gender focus priorities were included in the strategy. The team included the themes of gender roles and prevention of gender-based violence in the strategy. Once defined, the themes were incorporated as questions in the data collection instruments and assigned to the corresponding sessions in the methodology. After that, the revision of the training manuals was carried out to ensure that an operational guide was prepared to incorporate the gender approach in MdM and to allow technicians and facilitators to address three major topics (sex/ gender difference, gender roles and stereotypes, and gender-based violence prevention) in response to the three gender indicators of the PUENTES Project. Gender-based violence prevention support material includes the “Violent-meter” sticker and the “No more Violence” brochure. A gender awareness training was held for the PUENTES project’s teacher and parent facilitators on the newly-contextualized gender focus in the curriculum of the sessions. Learning from these trainings was replicated in schools using the reflection exercises with the participants.

1.8 The PUENTES team organized and held initial meetings in Tegucigalpa, San Pedro Sula, and La Ceiba among the project’s technical staff and departmental, district, and municipal directors of education to agree on the preliminary selection of the 72 pilot and control schools. The preliminary selection of the education centers considered the criteria defined in the project’s proposal:

1. Principals and teachers willing and committed to participate in the project’s actions
2. Geographical location in areas of high-risk of violence
3. Safety and security risk for personnel
4. Logistical feasibility of implementation
5. Population of students enrolled in the school
6. Similar socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of pilot and control schools

Second meetings were held in each department in order to formally socialize the objectives and activities of the PUENTES project, as well as to request accompaniment and support in the selected schools. Contextual information utilizing the school principal interview instrument and the community assessment instrument was gathered. The first tool was applied to a group of principals in pilot and control schools in Tegucigalpa, San Pedro Sula, and La Ceiba. The second instrument, the community assessment, was applied during the baseline collection of the project for only pilot schools.

1.9 The first training on the MdM methodology was facilitated by the GIZ for six PUENTES project technicians and 15 district directors of education or their representatives (one from San Pedro Sula, two from La Ceiba, and 12 from Tegucigalpa). The first session focused on learning about the theoretical foundations of MdM, facilitation techniques, and measurement instruments, for which a set of MdM manuals was provided to each participant. The second session lasted for two days and was held only with the technical team of the PUENTES project in order to practice the facilitation of the MdM modules and give feedback on techniques, appropriate materials, sequence of the activities, development of the activities, peer and facilitator observations, note taking, and more.

1.10 The PUENTES project team received training on the Violence Prevention Center’s (CEPREV) model to address violence. This model is based on a comprehensive approach to violence that addresses its multiple causes and consequences in their complex interaction, pointing to the democratic transformation of family relationships and the transformation of gender relations, with emphasis on the construction of masculinity detached from violence.

The PUENTES technical team used this information to enrich their training skills and to design methodological guidelines on the topic of roots of violence at the end of the MdM workshops. Once the methodological guide was ready, the training session for facilitator teachers and fathers/mothers from pilot schools in the three cities was programmed and carried out for the education centers. By the end of the training, each school prepared its calendar to replicate the sessions with teachers and fathers/mothers participating in the MdM workshops. It was agreed upon that it would be a session similar to the bridge component in the MdM program, and 36 sessions were held on the subject of family in the context of violence prevention. The sessions utilized complementary material from the CEPREV methodology to support teachers and parents in the implementation of MdM, and to allow time for personal reflection on how patriarchal society had personally shaped belief and value systems regarding violence and masculinity.

**Result 1:** Improved parenting skills that employ practices that reduce youth’s high-risk behaviors that can lead to violence in the school and family environments.

2.1 The project’s technical team designed the profile for parent and teacher facilitators by identifying the selection criteria to participate in the training process proposed by the PUENTES project. Training dates were scheduled and socialized with the Ministry of Education’s central administration in order to formally convene the participants through a notice addressed to departmental directors from Francisco Morazán, Cortés, and Atlántida. The departmental directors, in turn, convened the district directors whose schools are part of the PUENTES Project intervention by notifying them of the program training sessions with the PUENTES project/ChildFund.

The experience of engaging father and mother facilitators and assuring their participation was a challenge during the implementation of PUENTES, which required additional support from the project technicians.
to ensure parents understood the structure of the methodology and content of the manuals. Nevertheless, some fathers/mothers found that they had hidden skills for facilitating sessions, some being very dynamic and even modulating their voices so as to motivate their peers to participate through dialogue, reflection, and session attendance. Many parents said they identified with their facilitators because they shared similar experiences in raising their children.

Of the total 111 parent facilitators (91 women and 20 men) (Annex 2, Table 1) in the pilot schools, inconsistent participation was observed as the family sessions progressed. This was due to the time required by volunteer parent facilitators to carry out their role, which requires volunteers to study the manual, as well as plan and prepare material for facilitating the sessions with their peers. To support the facilitation of parent sessions, at least one teacher was present during the family sessions to support the parents in reinforcement of methodological techniques and subject material. In most schools there was some turnover of parent facilitators during the course of the project, and thus substitutions were made.

2.2 In preparation for the nine training sessions, each team of parents established the commitment of scheduling workshops that would be carried out in their schools under the coordination of teachers trained by the PUENTES project and following the MdM methodology implementation outline.

The preparation and facilitation of workshops were done by parent facilitators with support from teachers who were trained as facilitators. They received support from MdM manuals and didactic material delivered by the project in order to prepare each workshop by following the established steps.

The activities to convene the Family Component sessions started verbally in most schools. The student was in charge of telling his/her parents or caregivers about the activity. However, after two sessions, on average, and as an initiative of school principals, a formal sealed and signed notice with the date of the session was sent to parents and established as the mechanism for convening parents. By sending this formal notice, parents’ participation was maintained or increased.

2.3 The pilot schools were grouped in two cohorts according to the training date. The first cohort started implementing the MdM program in April 2016 and the second cohort started in May 2016. After training, the team of teacher and parent facilitators met with school directors to prepare the MdM session’s calendar for the three components: school, family, and bridge. Support from the PUENTES project technicians during the development of sessions included review of implementation and reinforcement of key concepts and conclusions of the session’s topic. At the end of the sessions, the technicians talked with the team of parent facilitators to evaluate the participation of parents, how to support teachers and principals, logistic support required for the next workshop, and any other issues.

2.4 After each family session, parents meet to talk about the session and complete the M&E tool called the "Workshop Appreciation Report." Project technicians sought to attend as many sessions as possible and completed the monitoring tool to assist in giving feedback to the facilitation teams.

The scheduling of the eight family sessions took into consideration the schools’ needs and parents’ availability. There were times when other academic activities interfered with the schedule and sessions were reprogrammed. At the end of the MdM implementation, 288 family sessions were completed; 56 in La Ceiba, 112 in San Pedro Sula, and 120 in Tegucigalpa.

**Result 2:** Increased teacher skills to promote conditions that generate resilient, peaceful, and democratic school environments through the development of student’s social and life skills.

3.1 The teacher facilitators were selected according to the requirements of the profile designed by the PUENTES team. This profile was socialized with school directors, who identified two
candidates/teachers to participate in the intervention. Facilitator teachers, along with the three facilitator parents, were in charge of preparing the schedule for the sessions or workshops to implement the MdM methodology in their schools. However, in those schools that have a high enrollment and/or utilize a double school shift, it was necessary to incorporate more teachers as MdM facilitators. This led to additional training sessions to increase the number of teacher facilitators in schools.

3.2 There were a total of 94 (75 women and 19 men) MdM trained teacher facilitators, (Annex 2, Table 2) in the PUENTES project. Unlike the father/mother facilitators, the teachers were more stable in fulfilling their role as facilitators, to the extent that the implementation of MdM increased and teachers that were not originally included became involved. Some schools engaged other teachers with help from the school principal in order to expand the facilitation of sessions, meaning that the activities were not always carried out by the same two teachers trained directly by the PUENTES project. This strategy of strengthening the team of teacher facilitators was used in large schools where there were several sections of 4th, 5th, and 6th grade. Teachers who joined the implementation process without receiving prior training used the MdM manuals and were supported by formally trained teachers. Appraisal reports of sessions from the PUENTES technicians documented that this action was easily assimilated by teachers and therefore very practical to apply.

3.3 The teacher facilitators, in agreement with school principals, scheduled the ten school component sessions for MdM. This scheduling was socialized with the education authorities at the municipal, departmental, and central levels. From the Directorate of Educational Services from the SEDUC, an official notification was issued to the Education Departmental Directorates to endorse the implementation of MdM with the PUENTES project. Teachers developed their sessions according to instructions and activities included in the MdM manuals. Finally, the project reached 100% of the projected sessions in the implementation of MdM, with a total of 360 teacher sessions in the 36 schools included in the PUENTES intervention.

3.4 At the end of each session, the teacher facilitators met to review how the activity was performed in terms of participation and interest of their fellow teachers, and they completed an M&E “Workshop Appreciation” tool. At first, they did not complete the tool, stating that they did not have time or that they would complete it afterwards. However, little by little, the project technicians raised awareness in order for them to see the importance of documenting their experience after each session to better inform the next sessions on improvements and successes.

3.5 During implementation, the PUENTES project technicians collected the “Violence and Indiscipline Acts Log” that teachers used to record indiscipline and violent acts in each pilot school. At the moment of arriving at the school, some principals had them completed, others needed help to consolidate the information, and others did not have them completed. Therefore, additional time was needed to deliver this requirement.

3.6 The MdM Leadership Committee at each school was made up of trained and committed facilitators and those who had the support from the school principal. The implementation experience reflects that those pilot schools where the principal was the leader and where they were aware of issues related to violence and best suited for the MdM methodology, showing their commitment of support to their team of teachers and facilitator mothers/fathers.

Result 3: Relationships between schools and parents are strengthened and their abilities improved to identify and deal with risk factors that can lead to violence in the school and family environments.
4.1 The MdM implementation included four sessions for the “bridge” component and a preparation session called the “launch.” This component was aimed at improving school coexistence, communication between parents and teachers, and parent/teacher relationships with their children or students. At the end of the MdM implementation, 180 bridge sessions were carried out: 35 in La Ceiba, 70 in San Pedro Sula, and 75 in Tegucigalpa.

4.2 The PUENTES project included an additional session, preparing the methodological guide based on the CEPREV methodology approach. This required the review of the material in its entirety and selection of material regarding the issues that were considered relevant and complementary to the subjects covered in MdM. The CEPREV session was structured in the same format as the original MdM sessions to ensure familiarization and similar structure when sharing it with teacher and parent facilitators.

Subsequently, training sessions were held for the facilitators with the prepared CEPREV material. Copies of supporting material (guide and workbook sheets) were provided, as well as a preliminary schedule for replicating it in their schools. Finally, each school held its CEPREV session as planned.

Result 4: Reliable data and analysis from this pilot program and recommendations for scaling up implementation of school-based violence prevention programs in urban public schools.

5.1 The community assessment and the identification of risk and protective factors were completed. The tool proposed by GIZ in the MdM methodology was adapted to the needs of the project, focusing on the risk and protective factors. The adaptation was focused on contextualizing the questions for the urban context and incorporating a section in regards to risk and protective factors obtained through focus groups with teachers and parents in the neighborhoods where the project’s intervention schools were located.

5.2 Three documents on child protection for use in schools were designed under the PUENTES project: 1) Operational guide for the care and referral of cases of child abuse; 2) Route - What to do in situations of violence against children found in schools; and 3) Mapping child protection networks, services and agencies, which were socialized and shared with principals, teachers, and parent facilitators. These were created for use and reference by school facilitators, personnel, and families participating in the project, as well as in future school settings to ensure awareness and use of child protection reporting, mechanisms, and connections to service and response systems at the community and municipal levels. The materials were well received at the school level and many facilitators and school directors commented regarding the usefulness and frequency in which they referred to these resources to provide guidance in ensuring the protection of the children at the school.

Closing Activities

At the culmination of the project, a series of closing activities were completed. There was an inter-institutional workshop held in February to present preliminary results, and several analysis workshops were held to ensure that the analysis of the project and evaluation results and conclusions were constructed collaboratively. Closing activities concentrated on completing the closing and dissemination events in each city in February 2017. These were organized in conjunction with the national SEDUC office to ensure support in convening school and family attendees. The purpose of these events was to share the project and evaluation results with pilot and control school directors, teacher and parent facilitators, local authorities, donors, Honduran government officials from the SEDUC and the Ministry of Security, DINAF, and other civil society organizations working in violence prevention.

Forty-six people attended in La Ceiba, 111 in San Pedro Sula, and 169 in Tegucigalpa. The event program included protocols and a panel of adults and children who participated in the PUENTES project during
2016. Many participants were interested to know how the project would move forward in schools, as there was much enthusiasm to continue.

Another large closing task was the preparation, editing, and printing of materials for the Executive Summary document that was disseminated at the closing events.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Following the approval of the M&E plan, an adjustment was made to the participant count. The amount of participants of the PUENTES Project (teachers, parents, and students) was updated in the month of March 2016, showing a reduction in the amount of beneficiaries in regards to what was originally established. Such variance in the amount of participants is associated with the fact that the largest schools were planned for the intervention. However, after several reviews by the SEDUC, ChildFund, and USAID, many of these schools had to be replaced, mostly due to the presence of overlapping interventions. The selection criteria for schools were based on: the size of the school, levels of violence, security, logistic feasibility, presence of complementary interventions of USAID, and willingness to work with the project.

Teacher and parent facilitators were given a set of monitoring tools, including the workshop appreciation report, indiscipline and violent acts log, training process checklist, and communications log. The technicians conducted consistent reviews of the M&E tools with the facilitators to explain how to fill them out and how to use them in the process to continuously improve and inform project implementation.

The baseline data collection was completed by a consulting company, utilizing the data collection tools that were designed and adjusted by the PUENTES project to ensure that the questions were aligned with the indicators necessary to measure the results of the school based interventions. Data for the baseline was processed, reviewed, and analyzed in order to be useful to make adjustments and complete the final indicator evaluation.

The mid-term qualitative evaluation for the PUENTES project was conducted, which involved the participation of the entire technical staff from the PUENTES project and specialists from ChildFund Honduras’ National Office. Qualitative information was collected in three schools in San Pedro Sula, three in Tegucigalpa, and two in La Ceiba. A total of eight focus groups were conducted with students from 4th, 5th, and 6th grade (69 participants), as well as eight interviews with principals, ten with teacher facilitators, and ten with parent facilitators. Likewise, digital information was registered, with recordings of 90% of the interactions to facilitate the analysis on behalf of the consultant. Mid-term qualitative data was processed and analyzed.

Field data for the final evaluation was gathered in all 72 schools (pilot and control). This was conducted by a team of external consultants in each city, who were supported by PUENTES technical facilitators, leadership, and SEDUC school officials to ensure the participation of parents, students, principals, and teachers in the evaluation process through focus groups and questionnaires. The consultants then completed the data processing, analysis of results and triangulation of information to inform the final evaluation report.

**E. ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Many accomplishments have been achieved in a very short period of time in the PUENTES project. The successful implementation of an extremely ambitious work plan and evaluation design are one of them, along with the large leaps made in developing stronger relationships and trust in the SEDUC at all levels, in families and teachers affecting children’s daily lives, and in relationships and key behaviors that are proven to reduce violence.
Between the baseline and final evaluation, positive changes were observed in the pilot schools, mainly those related to established non-violent behavior norms, daily coexistence and the security environment at school and at home that has been promoted with teachers, parents, and students. This has led to a greater number of children in 4th, 5th, and 6th grade reporting that they feel safe and secure in the classroom. Both quantitative and qualitative information support the evidence of the previous statement.

**Non-violent behavior norms**

Regarding school and family life, changes have been made in student behavior, according to the teachers' monthly reports, which show that emotional, psychological, and physical violence was substantially reduced in the classroom and within the school. This is a result of working with parents and teachers who have been making adjustments to the way they treat students, and of showing students non-violent ways of relating to one another.

The majority of teachers expressed that the main form of correction of misbehavior of their students is now through dialogue. Another form of correction sometimes used is a misbehavior log to take away certain rewards or privileges.

"Many times, they use violence among themselves, then what I do is, I go talk to them and tell them that that is not the correct way, it should be different" —Teacher Participant

"We admonish them and say that it is ok that they made a mistake, we talk about it and have them recognize what is wrong and there is no difference if it is a boy or a girl" —Teacher Participant

"In my case what I do is go over the rules with them, the rules are inside and outside of the classroom, and their behavior with teachers and with their classmates, and in my case I have a reward control system, they know that if they misbehaved, I will give them an unhappy face at the end of the day"

—Teacher Participant

Most teachers say they have the same expectations for the behavior of their male and female students. They emphasize the behavior of male students: they expect boys to respect girls and their teachers, to improve their conduct or behavior and be more responsible with their academic performance. They say they have the same ways of communicating their expectations to male and female students, and they do it through dialogue, counseling, and by respecting them.

"Letting the youth know what is the relationship with others ... boys and girls have to learn to coexist together. Boys say, I do not play with girls" —Teacher Participant

“[We have to] encourage them and show them the positive things in life and how special they are for society ” —Teacher Participant

It is worth noting that in the teacher reports, student misbehavior was reduced by half during implementation of MdM. However, this has likely been influenced by additional efforts outside of MdM, including individual school based efforts, campaigns against violence conducted by the SEDUC and the media.
Regarding the reduction of misbehavior and violence, the qualitative and quantitative evidence of this reduction has been found in homes, and is related to the type of discipline used by parents towards their children. Instead of violence as discipline, the percentage of students who report that their parents use positive discipline when they misbehave at home has increased. Parents who participated in the sessions now better understand the concept of the use of violence versus discipline at home. They initially thought that only corporal punishment was a form of violence, but now know violence can also be verbal (emotional abuse, shouting, teasing, etc.) These parents are therefore more accurate in evaluating the use of violence as discipline compared to those that did not participate in the sessions.

Positive recognition and reinforcement were other notable areas in which great strides have been made. Parents who attended the sessions recognize good behavior by: showing affection, verbal congratulations, or small rewards. Students agree that they receive positive recognition from their parents for their good behavior through rewards and verbal congratulations and showing affection as demonstrated below:

"[I reward my children through] complimenting, giving them something and showing them also that by behaving properly and continuing to show that behavior, they will earn one's confidence and trust" –Parent Participant

"They congratulate me and they give me things" –Student Participant

Daily coexistence

Parents and teachers report that the PUENTES project has helped to improve family relationships, it has improved communication and parents are more involved in school activities as demonstrated in the following examples from focus groups with parents:

"Yes, for example, before, I had no communication with my children. They used to say, Mom you pay more attention to other things, and I immediately put into practice what I had learned"
–Parent Participant

"Something that yes, is better regarding the relationship with parents, is they’ve been getting more involved, I had the opportunity to work with a mother who was helping me and it was really excellent" –Teacher Participant

Communication in school between students, teachers, and parents, as well as at home between parents and children, is addressed in MdM sessions with parents and teachers. This has created positive changes for students and teachers regarding clearer communication of expectations, rules, and consequences if students do not meet established standards, as well as better treatment that teachers are fostering with their students. Communication between teachers and parents has also improved in the pilot schools.

In households, communication between parents and children has improved according to the evidence found in the qualitative and quantitative analysis, with parents making an effort to provide words of encouragement and advice to children.

Secure and safe environment

Despite the atmosphere of insecurity in the neighborhoods, parents and teachers report that the PUENTES project has helped to create safer and more positive school environments for their children because dialogue has improved between teachers, parents and students, communication and family
relationships have improved, this has led to a change of attitude among teachers and parents, they are more committed to their children, and the behavior of children has improved. This is demonstrated in the following focus group testimonials from a parent and teacher:

“\textbf{Yes, he [the teacher] has changed, additionally children have changed with him, also with children, he a strict teacher, but a good teacher and the relationship with us is very good, he has never been out of line with me, he is always very calm and my daughter gets along with him really well, and when she does something wrong he tells me your daughter is failing, pay more attention to her.}” –\textit{Parent Participant}

“\textbf{By changing attitudes in students and parents, we as teachers also have to reflect and analyze our own actions in many cases}” –\textit{Teacher Participant}

Additionally students say they also perceive the feeling of improved safety and security in their homes as a result of the awareness raising and training for parents during the MdM sessions. Students say that their home is a safe place because their parents take care of them and protect them, and because they do not let them leave their homes. They feel insecure mainly because of the atmosphere of violence in the neighborhood as demonstrated below:

\textit{“I feel safe because my parents and my brothers are in my house and nothing is going to happen to me there”} –\textit{Student}

The concept of security and protection has also changed from a traditional approach of safety and security (higher walls, barred windows, etc.) focused on the external, physical, or police approach, to one that is more socio-emotional and based on emotional security, the type of communication used in relationships, and positive awareness. This is true for both the family and school context.

Finally, awareness has been raised regarding the varying aspects that comprise violence, and some indicators have shown an increase in reporting the use or perception of violence at school and at home. This is a huge accomplishment considering that to be able to change a behavior, one has to be aware of the behavior. The ability to determine what constitutes violence and its different forms makes it easier to change attitudes, practices and behaviors that could lead to violence in the future.

\section*{F. LESSONS LEARNED}

MdM development through the PUENTES project has enabled ChildFund to strengthen its experience in the adoption and application of innovative methodologies that promote child and youth protection in our country. There were many lessons learned throughout the project, which were emphasized in the systematization and documentation of the project.

The major lessons learned include the following: the value added to the technical expertise, advice and consistent communication that GIZ PREVENIR and the University of Oregon provided regarding the implementation of the methodology. There was a value added to the child protection resource tools that were produced for schools and MdM facilitators which proved to be useful in the daily attention given to these cases as they occurred in classrooms and throughout the MdM sessions.

The comprehensive training process of the methodology and of the facilitators proved to be important in ensuring the fidelity of the implementation. The school facilitator teams emphasized that advanced preparation with school principal and PUENTES technical facilitator support, along with the provision of adequate learning and support materials was also another key factor in ensuring successful implementation of the sessions.
Another positive lesson learned throughout the implementation of the project was that peer motivation between mothers was a strong motivation for consistent attendance; there was a high rate of participation of mothers in the sessions and both the participation of mothers and fathers increased throughout the life of the project. Finally the high level of commitment, buy-in and positive attitude from school principals and teachers was one of the most crucial elements to success in the project.

There were some lessons learned that imply necessary modifications for future implementation of MdM in similar urban areas. Violence in certain communities created a challenge to both maintain the safety of project staff and advance the project implementation. Future interventions should concentrate geographical influence to one sector of the cities to limit logistical and security difficulties. A common challenge throughout the project was the very short time period of the pilot study, as well as the pressure to schedule sessions and for proper planning and development of the methodology.

Another difficulty was in finding qualified staff and consultants, especially in the area of evaluation and with experience in quasi-experimental designs. In the future, school principals should be involved in the methodological training process of MdM to ensure proper understanding and involvement in the day to day technical accompaniment.

Another lesson learned is that parent sessions were typically too large for optimal methodological practices and should be maintained below 30 people in each session; there are several challenges in being able to do so given that in most schools the spaces were insufficient and unsuitable for group reflective work, especially when it was groups of 45 to 100 parents at a time, with an average of two or three parent facilitators per school.

The low level of participation of fathers, which ranged between five and about thirty percent in schools, was a challenge for proper engagement of them in the methodology. While this may seem low, schools recommend that in the future, interventions analyze the family composition to know how many households have fathers present; as they attested that the majority of students came from single mother or grandmother homes.

Furthermore, the gender approach to the methodology and the guides were difficult for parent and teacher facilitators to put into practice given the strong cultural norms, lack of comfort with the subject and lack of experience facilitating the subject. To facilitate understanding, preparation, and implementation of the approach of gender integration it should be incorporated explicitly in the training, implementation and monitoring of sessions. It should also be accompanied with continuous learning opportunities on the subject for project staff, school leadership and MdM facilitators to ensure comfort in facilitating the subject at all levels.

Strong selection criteria for teacher and parent facilitators were important to ensuring the quality of the MdM implementation. In the project’s experience, while the school principals typically chose teachers that were leaders or had a positive attitude, they did not always fit the established profile criteria to be MdM facilitators. The process for teacher facilitators should ideally be carried out at a teacher assembly, which would prevent the school principal from unilaterally selecting the facilitators. The following criteria should be taken into consideration in the future for teacher facilitator selection: have time available to attend trainings, prepare and lead the sessions; high degree of responsibility; positive attitude, initiative, creativity and commitment to school based violence prevention; and demonstrated leader among their peer teachers.

One of the innovations of the PUENTES project was to utilize parent facilitators in the MdM methodology and it was proven that the selection criteria and process for parents is also critical to quality implementation. While parent facilitators are not used traditionally, the project considered it to be a way to allow peer to peer parent motivation, leadership and create buy-in amongst parents. This was a well-received addition to the facilitation methodology, while it was noted that there was a notable
difference in the disparity of competencies in parents and teachers. In the future this calls for more intensive training for facilitators in general facilitation skills and techniques, as well as individualized training unique to parent facilitators.

Again, in the experience of PUENTES and as with the teacher facilitators, the school principal chose the parent facilitators without a strong socialization of the criteria or why certain facilitators were chosen, which in the future should be done in a parent assembly. The following criteria should be taken into consideration in the future in parent facilitator selection: a parent that maintains consistent communication with the school; completion of 6th grade education, if possible, secondary or higher education; demonstrated communication skills; high commitment; willingness to volunteer; availability to attend trainings, prepare and lead the sessions; demonstrated leadership in the school or amongst other parents.

Many school participants were of the opinion that the experience should have been carried out at all levels of the school from first grade to sixth or ninth grade. Some principals and teachers said that in the first and second grades is where they have greater challenges in discipline, adaptation and emotional problems at school.

SEDUC officials, school authorities, teachers and parents expressed that the MdM methodology could be utilized in the “School for Parents” framework, others naturally implemented it in that framework in the PUENTES project. Some suggested that MdM techniques, methods and tools could even be used to adopt other subjects that the SEDUC is interested in that are not covered in the MdM curriculum.

While the monitoring tools were comprehensive, the habit of using monitoring tools during these sessions was difficult to instill in the facilitators to provide reliable and relevant information and to facilitate decision making regarding improvements and challenges throughout implementation, this would have to be reinforced in future training of MdM facilitators. Finally, beyond the scope of the PUENTES project, there is future potential to utilize the monitoring tools and data produced by the project at a school, district, department and national level for analysis and decision making regarding needs in the area of school based violence.
G. SUCCESS STORIES

"Father’s transformation from ogre to papa through MdM"

Alberto Hernández (52) lives in La Ceiba, Honduras. He has 14 children, but he mentions that he was never a real father until he participated in the MdM methodology through the PUENTES Project.

"After what I learned in the sessions, I have changed and now I feel really happy; my children went from calling me ogre to papa," Alberto recalls.

The school where his two younger children attend was selected by the PUENTES Project to pilot MdM, which aims to unite and strengthen families and schools in their efforts to help children to effectively face the challenges of daily life.

The approach consists in working with parents and teachers through a series of sessions to improve key abilities in discipline, communication, expression of emotions, and anger management, among other things that are essential in the journey of raising children.

Alberto participated actively in all the sessions and discovered his own value and what he represented in the life of his children. He mentions, "I never took care of my 12 older children, but after this project, my relationship with them has improved." Alberto goes on to emphasize the importance of his daily involvement in his children’s lives, "Now I speak with love to my children, I help them at home and even take them to school every day!"

The PUENTES project focused its intervention on parents and teachers for students in 4th, 5th and 6th grades, and successfully reached more than 20,000 participants. Among the main results are the improvements in students’ behavior, parents’ new found ability to use positive, non-violent discipline with their children and teachers improved communication and problem solving skills, along with joint efforts to build awareness regarding how to prevent violence in children from an early age.

Lourdes Cartagena, General Director of Educational Services in the Ministry of Education states that the PUENTES project has strengthened the violence prevention strategy in the “School for Parents” framework, and it will be a viable and effective example for how schools can build the bridge between teachers and parents in the future to prevent violence together. Alberto’s life was profoundly impacted by the project, but even more, the lives of his children were changed for the better when he decided to become a positive reflection of what he hoped his children would grow to be in the future.
Mother participates as an MdM facilitator to prevent violence in her child’s school

María del Carmen Hernández is a very dynamic person who loves to get involved in community activities that generate learning. She is very active in school initiatives and she enjoys sharing her knowledge and experiences with other families.

When she found out about the PUENTES Project she accepted the commitment to participate as a mother facilitator for the training process to other families. Since parents are very aware of the violence that affects society and their children, they often look for ways to be informed and learn how to prevent violence with their children.

María del Carmen mentions that before each meeting she met with her fellow parent facilitators to read the guides, then met with the teachers, reviewing together the theme of the session, divided the content and each one went home to prepare the materials and practice the section that they had to develop. Finally, before the session, they did a group rehearsal.

Maria del Carmen also comments that to invite the parents, she and her colleague facilitators designed and posted signs at the school gate announcing the meeting at least two days before the session and visited the classrooms asking the children to talk to their parents and to invite them for the sessions on Saturdays.

She mentions that "In the case of fathers most of them work and have almost no time to attend the sessions, but the mothers have more time to do this type of work. Fathers often consider that it is only the responsibility of the mother."

María del Carmen continues to be motivated by her participation as a facilitator of the MdM methodology with the PUENTES project, since she says that, "Several parents approached me to tell me that the project has helped them a lot with their children. They are calmer and now they use positive forms of discipline that do not include physical punishment."

The PUENTES project implemented the Miles de Manos methodology in 2016 in 14 schools located in high risk neighborhoods in San Pedro Sula. MdM was designed by the German Development Cooperation (GIZ), and promotes violence prevention through strengthening relationship building skills and enhancing the capacities of parents and teachers to make positive changes towards non-violence in everyday lives of children.
Parents and teachers join forces to combat violence and unite the school community

The Enmanuel School in the Canaín neighborhood was one of the schools participating in the PUENTES project, an intervention in which the Miles de Manos methodology was implemented in high-risk urban areas. Teacher, Isabel Martínez, mentions, “I was motivated to participate in the project because it was an opportunity to work together and train fathers, mothers and other teachers. The methodology also included very detailed manuals for both the school and the family component.”

She, together with her colleagues, trained for the implementation of MdM, advocated with the school principal and scheduled the sessions with teachers and families. The parent sessions were held on Saturdays under the framework of the SEDUC’s “School for Parents” initiative, which resulted in a very positive response and high participation of parents.

From Isabel’s point of view, teachers were very happy with the development of this project since they never imagined that it would have so much acceptance and success. “I remember that in the first teacher session, they were very serious and showed a lot of resistance, but after the third session everyone was excited and eagerly wanted to know when the next one would be because they liked it a lot.”

“I have enjoyed seeing the classrooms full of fathers and mothers again, since this has not happened for a long time…”

Among the positive experiences, Isabel shares a heartfelt anecdote from one of the last school sessions, where the topic was taking control of one’s emotions. “The other teachers were able to open themselves up with one another, many of them cried when telling stories about what had happened to them. It was very nice and impactful because I felt that in that meeting we were able to bond and leave behind the day to day work tension that is typical in the school.”

By holding the sessions on Saturdays, parents participated with genuine interest in the subjects, and while they were not told to take notes, they eagerly filled their notebooks, trying to capture every last ounce of learning. The school principal, Daysi Milla, said that, “I have enjoyed seeing the classrooms full of fathers and mothers again, since this has not happened for a long time; parents have approached the school, it has also improved the communication with teachers. Now we have a peaceful environment at work!”
H. RESULTS

The project evaluation was aimed at collecting reliable data and analysis to: evaluate the effectiveness of MdM methodology in an urban context of high risk and assess whether the methodology leads to positive results in the target schools; develop lessons learned that could be used for a new implementation; design recommendations for future expansion; to assess the impact and effectiveness of program approaches and of the methodologies used and contribute to improving the understanding of best practices in preventing violence in schools, for which the following research questions were identified:

1. To what extent has the implementation of Miles de Manos increased protection factors for children in 4th, 5th, 6th grade in the target communities?
2. To what extent has the Miles de Manos intervention contributed to the reduction of aggressive and violent behavior in students, teachers and parents?
3. To what extent has Miles de Manos reduced risk factors in target children?
4. To what extent has Miles de Manos contributed to an increased involvement of parents/teachers?
5. Is Gender-Based Violence (GBV) less acceptable after participating or being exposed to the MdM methodology?
6. Is the Miles de Manos methodology a replicable and effective methodology in urban communities in Honduras?
7. Are the schools, homes and communities safe for the beneficiaries?

A quasi-experimental design was used by the PUENTES project in 36 pilot intervention schools and 36 control schools. The baseline and final evaluation were carried out by consulting firms or groups of researchers, outside the ChildFund implementing organization. As shown in Annex Table 3, data was collected with surveys, structured interviews and focus groups applied to students, parents and teachers in both the baseline and in the final assessment.

In the baseline, the sample for collecting the quantitative data was calculated with a confidence level (NC) of 95% and a sampling error (EM) of 5% with representation by type of school. In the final evaluation, the sample was representative by type of school and city; such sampling reflects an equivalence of pilot and control schools including the number of schools, students, parents and teacher who were consulted.

For the midterm qualitative assessment five different focus groups were structured as follows: fathers participating in sessions; mothers participating in sessions; fathers who do not participate in sessions but whose wives do; students; and teachers. In addition, three key informant interviews were completed with principals, teacher facilitators, and parent facilitators.

Quantitative analysis

The analysis of the quantitative information was preceded by the prior collection and processing of the data. Prior to the analysis of information, the students, fathers/mothers and teachers’ questionnaires were processed onto a template prepared for this purpose. The processing of the questionnaires was done through double digital entry, later the data was reviewed and refined and ready for analysis.
The multi-sourced data collection allowed for triangulation, comparing or supplementing the information received from the different actors.

The information in the reviewed files was re-codified based on a scale of zero (0) to one (1), according to the response given by the informant and then recalculated into new variables based on grouping several questions to relevant indicators of the PUENTES Project, as illustrated by the example below:

Indicator 1.1
Number of students who report that their parents use positive discipline
Questions and corresponding number in the student questionnaire related to the indicator
4. When I do something wrong my parents or guardian keep calm
5. When I do something wrong my parents or guardian do not yell at me, and talk to me about my misbehavior
6. When I misbehave my parents or guardian punish me, but without hitting
17. In my house, there are clear rules about what children can and cannot do

Calculation Form
This indicator was calculated by assigning a numerical value to each answer choice to questions four, five, six and seventeen of the student survey as detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options of responses</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Question 5</th>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Question 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not true</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat true</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite true</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally true</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once a value was assigned to each response option, a scale was defined that is the product of the sum of the four questions per student and detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than or equal to one</th>
<th>1. Students who report that their parents do not use positive discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More or equal to two</td>
<td>2. Students who report that their parents use positive discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion, the total of students who had greater or equal to 2, according to the above scale was added and then divided by the total survey sample. Following this the descriptive analysis was done, using frequency distributions presented in tables and graphs. The comparative analysis by type of school (pilot or control) and time of application (baseline and final evaluation) for each of the sources of information analysis was performed using the Chi square formula.

Qualitative analysis

The qualitative analysis was done as follows: processing of interviews and focus group data, creation of categorical matrix, criteria established for triangulation of responses; interpretations
were made for each category and sub category; triangulation of responses and opinions; cross-checking information and identification of outliers; general conclusions were drawn for each category; finally, the main conclusions of the study were established and prepared in written draft form and shared with the project team.

Below is the table of quantitative results that demonstrate the change in each indicator by comparing the baseline with the end-line data from students, parents and teachers in the pilot schools.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base Line</td>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td>Base Line</td>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Increase in target students who report that their parents use positive discipline</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Reduction of parents or guardians who report using violence as discipline in their homes</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Increase in parents or guardians who report using protective actions and monitoring of their children</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Increase in target students that know the expectations teachers have regarding their behavior and consequences</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Increase in target teachers who report that students demonstrate expected behavioral norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Increase in students that report that they feel safe and protected in their classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Rate of emotional and psychological violence in students reported by teachers</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in target schools, monthly average of reported acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Rate of sexual violence in students reported by teachers in target schools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monthly average of reported acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Rate of material violence in students reported by teachers in target schools</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monthly average of reported acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Rate of physical violence in students reported by teachers in target schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monthly average of reported acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Rate of vandalism and damage to property in students reported by teachers in</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>target schools, monthly average of reported acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Rate of indiscipline in the classroom in students reported by teachers in</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>target schools, monthly average of reported acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Reduction of students who report use of violence by teachers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Target schools that have established peace and safety plans that respond to</td>
<td>15/15 Tegucigalpa; 12/14 San Pedro Sula; 7/7 La Ceiba Total 34 plans of 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the school's needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Reduction of target students that report being victims of violence at school</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or around the school in the past 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase of target teachers that communicate regularly with parents/guardians</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Increase of target teachers and parents/guardians that make decisions together</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1</td>
<td>Ratio of target parents and teachers who report changes in perception of gender roles</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-2</td>
<td>Percentage of target parents and teachers who consider gender-based violence (GBV) as less acceptable after participating or being exposed to the MdM methodology</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant decrease between the comparison of the baseline and end-line of the average monthly in schools emotional violence 59%; sexual violence 50%; material violence 32%; physical violence 62%; vandalism 50%; and indiscipline in the classroom 55%; the average amount of aggressions in general were lowered by 56% from the beginning to the end, responding to one of the overall project results of decreasing violent behavior. The following graph demonstrates the decrease in each type of violence and indiscipline in a visual manner:
The table below is a key that explains the level of effect that the different indicators had on the evaluation questions in the pilot schools. The table of findings below is a snapshot of the effect and the level of the effect and is based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence and analysis.

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key for effect level in Pre and Post pilot schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Statistically significant increase, tested with chi square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Backing with qualitative evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Without statistically significant effect, with tendency to improvement, tested with chi square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Backing with qualitative evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ No quantitative or qualitative effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Statistically significant decrease, tested with chi square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5**

Table of Findings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Type of Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the implementation of Miles de Manos increased the factors of</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Increased positive communication in the home:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection for 4th, 5th, and 6th grade children in the target communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Build relations of trust, affection, and mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recognize and encourage positive behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased show of concern for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Communication between parents and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Increased positive discipline at home:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Control emotions when facing a wrong-doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish clear rules for behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Discipline without use of physical and psychological violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downward Effect</td>
<td>Establish clear rules for behavior at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Parents and Teachers make consulted decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in the perception of gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has Miles de Manos contributed to the reduction of aggressive and</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Decrease in frequency of indisclipline in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violent behavior of students, teachers and parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decreased emotional and psychological violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Decrease in use of violence to discipline in their homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decreased sexual violence in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decreased material violence in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decreased vandalism and material damage in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downward Effect</td>
<td>Teacher's use of corporal punishment in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has Miles de Manos reduced risk factor for target children?</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Increased feeling of safety at home reported by children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Decreased parent use of violence as discipline in the homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Victimization at or on the way to school and in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downward Effect</td>
<td>Teacher use of corporal punishment in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has Miles de Manos contributed to an increase in the voluntary</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Increased parent attendance at family and PUENTES sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement of fathers / mothers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Parents serving as volunteers to facilitate family component sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Increased parent attendance (especially fathers) at family component sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Findings**
There was one strongly statistically significant result that showed a positive impact on pilot schools when compared with the control schools in an increase of parents who reported the use of protective actions and supervision of their children.

This was affirmed by parents, as well as children, who stressed the improvement in the following areas: problem solving skills; involvement in the school life of their children; adult supervision; recognition and positive reinforcement.

As demonstrated in Table 5, the MdM methodology had an impact on some indicators, despite the short time of intervention, when making the comparison between the baseline and the final evaluation on several indicators some positive quantitative changes were found for pilot centers, although in some cases these are not statistically significant, they show a trend that establishes that the MdM intervention can influence changes in attitudes, behaviors and perceptions in parents, teachers and students who favor peace and coexistence in schools and homes.

By analyzing qualitative information, we can say that a major effect of the Project has been to increase understanding of the scope of violence by all participating parents, teachers and students. Awareness has gone from an understanding of physical violence to the other dimensions of violence, such as psychological violence.

Also to understand security not only looking at it from a physical or police point of view but to understand it from an emotional and holistic view. This process is evident in a more self-critical view regarding adults’ communication skills with their children or students in pilot schools.

**Is Gender-Based Violence (GBV) less acceptable after participating or being exposed to MdM methodology?**

The implementation of the MdM methodology in schools using a gender approach has the potential to address gender violence as a crosscutting issue in the implementation of the methodology in the urban area, however, it requires a longer period of time to see the effect it might have. Due to strong patriarchal cultural and social roots, it should always be accompanied by complementary interventions that are designed to address gender violence in the different environments in which children live. In addition, qualitative information shows that there is still a lot of sensitization and raising awareness needed among fathers, mothers and teachers regarding gender violence as well as children to detect and accurately measure the opinions and perceptions of the subject and better inform future interventions in a key area of violence prevention.

**Is Miles de Manos a replicable and effective methodology in urban communities in Honduras?**

The MdM methodology is definitely relevant and timely for use in urban areas and in areas of high rates of violence. Clearly there is receptivity in schools and the Ministry of Education to implement it in varying degrees, include more schools and ensure the inclusion of MdM as a methodology in the strategic framework of school for parents. To replicate the methodology, it would be necessary to maintain the adjustments and recommendations for urban areas and ensure the leadership of the actors in the educational context. There would need to be a mechanism of technical support and monitoring to maintain the faithfulness of the methodology, answer questions, encourage facilitators and make continuous method improvement for implementation. There is potential to empower facilitator leaders to train and accompany future schools considering that there are already people trained in schools, families and at different levels of SEDUC.
Are the schools, homes and communities safe for the beneficiaries?

Even when schools are located in neighborhoods with high social risk, in the final evaluation, parents and teachers consider them safe, and incorporate contextual factors to their assertion, expressing that security has improved in school because dialogue between teachers parents and students has improved; communication and family relationships have improved, it has led to a change of attitude among teachers and parents; they are more committed to children, and the behavior of children has improved.

In relation to households, parents say the PUENTES project has created more positive and safe environments at home: family relationships improved, communication has improved and parents have been involved in the school activities. Students report that they feel safe because their parents take care of them (protect them), and because they do not let them leave their homes. The main reason that children do not feel safe at home, is mainly due to the climate of insecurity in which they live in the neighborhoods.

I. REASONS RESULTS WERE NOT MET

The main objective of this project was not to demonstrate traditional project results; rather it was of inquiry nature to inform future school based violence prevention interventions. While there were many positive results, when making comparisons between pilot and control schools in the final evaluation, in the following indicators there was an improvement in favor of control centers: reduction of victimization in the last six months among students; reduction in the use of violence by teachers; parents and teachers reported changes in perception of gender roles.

There are several reasons that could explain why; there were interventions of projects such as GREAT, PROPONTE, CONVIVE, AJH, GLASSWING and PASMO, as a hypothesis we can say that the variety of interventions could have some effect on changing perceptions and behaviors of violence, although they were not primarily methodologies on prevention of school based violence.

As well, increased awareness and knowledge of the participating teachers, parents and children on the subjects could cause more self-criticism and ability to detect and distinguish, for example, “what is violence” or understand the complexity of the subjects and their own roles and the need to change behaviors.

Finally, overall quantitative information is not necessarily sufficient evidence alone to demonstrate the changes in this particular subject, one should compare that information with qualitative results, which, despite the quantitative results of these indicators in favor of the control schools, qualitative results show a marked difference in the three indicators in favor of pilot schools.

J. GENDER

The gender strategy of PUENTES project addressed two main topics in the project: gender roles and gender based violence. These topics were developed by the incorporation of gender focus activities during the MdM sessions.

First, a gender approach workshop to PUENTES technicians was programmed to reinforce basic concepts and the comprehension on the gender topics in line with the compliance of the project’s gender indicators:

- Target parent and teacher ratio who report changes in gender role perception
• Percentage of target parents and teachers that consider gender based violence as less acceptable after participating or being exposed to the MdM methodology

Second, a consultant helped on the revision of the MdM-GIZ manuals, the USAID Gender Strategy and the M&E plan from PUENTES Project and made the “incorporation of the gender approach in the content of the MdM modules.” A draft of the guide was presented to the PUENTES team to be revised.

Third, a replica script was prepared and socialized during 3 sessions on Gender Approach, one per city (San Pedro Sula, Tegucigalpa and La Ceiba), to strengthen knowledge and capacities in the group of teacher and parent facilitators from PUENTES Project in order to give greater emphasis on gender topics when conducting the MdM workshops (family, school and bridge).

In the pilot schools, major changes are not reported concerning the perception of gender roles in the mid-term evaluation or final evaluation because parents say stereotypes still prevail where women are relegated to household chores, the expectations they have of their daughters at home is for them to collaborate in the housework.

Most teachers say that acts of misbehavior and violence that happen in school are mainly caused by boys, since their behavior and games are more violent, the highest incidence is in the early grades, middle school tends to be more balanced; several teachers expressed that misbehavior and violence are caused by both boys and girls. Most boy students misbehave more, are more violent and like rough games; “Boys [are more violent] because they play rougher and believe they are stronger than girls” —Teacher Participant

In the final evaluation, some changes are reported related to gender-based violence (GBV), since most parents who attend the sessions say they do not react differently against the bad behavior of their daughters and sons, a few report being more severe with the boys. Students feel the same way saying their parents react differently now, and don’t punish based on gender.

Teachers in both the mid-term evaluation and the final evaluation report that when they react to misbehavior of girls and boys there is no difference. Reactions and penalties depend on the seriousness of the offense, regardless of who commits them.

Quantitative information, as can be seen in the table summary of outcomes by indicator, no positive changes were found but the two indicators considered in the question we are addressing slightly decreased, that is, indicator G-1 and Indicator G-2, which means that the gender component needs to be strengthened through the MdM methodology both in training and the implementation of various strategies and activities throughout the intervention.

In this sense it can be noted that according to qualitative information some positive changes were observed, but quantitative information was not so, thus one must be cautious and not assume that, with the short period of implementation, the MdM has generated considerable changes in reducing the number of parents and teachers stating in the baseline and final evaluation that gender-based violence (GBV) is less acceptable. But it is also important to clarify that the results from baseline of parents and teachers for whom GBV is not acceptable were already very high so it is much more difficult to observe changes.

**K. RECOMMENDATIONS**
Overall, this pilot project illustrated significant strides and success in indicating the potential future use of the MdM methodology in school based violence prevention. There are several valuable recommendations that can be taken in the future to build upon the foundation that was constructed in the PUENTES project.

First of all, the MdM methodology must be implemented for a longer time in order to study its effect on a whole cohort of children from 4th to 6th grade. Thus, the methodology would benefit from a longer term study (2-3 years) with multiple years of intervention and monitoring of behavioral change.

While MdM is an effective and proven methodology in preventing school-based violence focused on the key actors in the child’s life; the methodology has limitations for becoming the sole influence in preventing violence in the school, family and community environment. Therefore, it is recommended that the methodology be complemented by other strategies and interventions such as: more secondary and tertiary individualized prevention based on the issues and needs of children, families and schools that are already living with violence; psychological assistance and socio-emotional care; school staff training on working and responding in a violent environment to the needs of children; interventions that enhance the role and active participation of children in their own daily experience.

Furthermore, it is also recommended the improvement of school infrastructure for the implementation of methodologies such as MdM in schools that have adequate space for group meetings, etc.; interventions designed specifically for a community approach to preventing violence and involving stakeholders and local community outside of the school: churches, police, child protection agencies, etc.; interventions designed specifically to work particularly on gender and gender based violence, new masculine roles and active participation of the man and the child; interventions focused specifically on the issue of sexual and reproductive health with children and adults, with both parents and teachers.

MdM implementers must provide initial and continuous training for facilitators in facilitation skills before the training in the methodology. This is vital for both parents and teachers, given that parents don’t always have experience facilitating and teachers tend to Schools should involve as many teachers and school leadership as possible in training and facilitating the methodology as they typically

It is essential that teachers, fathers and mothers continue strengthening the skills they have developed with the MdM methodology through daily practice of the methodology for continuous improvement, since they are skills that are strengthened through use.

It is necessary to motivate and seek strategies for male parent participation in MdM sessions. Moreover, research must be done on the number of households that are headed by single mothers or other caregivers with the absence of the father figure. This is in order to plan an appropriate strategy of male parent involvement that addresses context reality

The time dedicated must be adapted in relation to the content of each session; typically in the practice there was not sufficient time to implement the sessions as designed. It is also necessary to have them spaced in 2-3 weeks intervals in order to allow sufficient time to implement the skills learned into their daily lives. Furthermore, the MdM methodology should be taught in all grades of basic education, from pre-primary to middle school.
Materials supporting the implementation of MdM can be enhanced with more illustrations and audiovisual support. It is suggested to analyze the possibility of designing a kit of audiovisual tools (posters, flip charts, videos on a CD or USB) since this would save them time and effort mainly in the preparation of teaching materials for each session for both teacher and parent facilitators.

The pilot schools must monitor the implementation and follow-up of the peace and safety plans prepared during the MdM methodology to ensure that they are utilized in practice and updated as needed; eventually it would be ideal to create spaces for working on the implementation of these plans with other key community actors and sharing with the district education level the progress and experience with the plans to build off of successes or challenges with other schools.

The SEDUC should consider certification or accreditation of facilitator leaders on subjects of violence prevention, in order to encourage professional development of teachers in schools. Departmental, district and municipal education directorates should develop strategies to reach out to other schools, using the valuable people trained in MdM, and forming support teams, which could contribute to quality implementation methodology and the sustainability at the school level.

There is a need to consider and look into training professionals in qualitative research, since there is a shortage of qualified technical resources at the national level, with expertise in the use of qualitative techniques and analysis, which is vital to researching best practices in violence prevention.

It is necessary to permit further adjustments to the MdM evaluation instruments and more qualitative and process oriented tools should be considered, including: structured and no structured observation (in different moments in the school environments), individual interviews and a larger scope of focus groups, as well as home visits to complement the information collected and observed in the schools.

### L. IMPACT AND SCALABILITY

As attested in the accomplishments and in the evidence from the end line results there are many illustrative examples of the positive effects of MdM in urban areas, especially in the areas of reducing violent behavior in students in school and increasing the protective factors for children in their homes. There was quantitative and qualitative evidence collected at various moments throughout the project that documented the impact had by the intervention. MdM has been particularly successful in increasing certain protective factors as explained above for children in the targeted communities.

The intervention has also proven to be extremely effective in contributing towards reducing aggressive and violent behaviors in target schools. The intervention, while not designed to reduce specific risky behaviors in target children, does inversely increase their protective factors which may have an impact on decreasing overall risky behavior. The methodology has served as a strong catalyst in increasing parental engagement in the daily lives of their children; it has been illustrated that parents also get more involved in the school community.

There is definite potential of scaling up the implementation of the MdM methodology in high-risk urban areas. It is adaptable and effective to decreasing violent behaviors in students and increasing protective factors for children in their homes. To be scalable there are many lessons learned and recommendations that would contribute to improving the methodology and the
feasibility of implementation, along with the ability to replicate it in similar contexts. The inclusion of community actors, such as the church, neighborhood committees, community education support organizations, the police, etc. is imperative to scaling up the intervention and making it more sustainable.

Another fundamental aspect to consider and that can achieve greater institutional strengthening in the adoption of MdM, is the design and development of a systematic and comprehensive process of training of facilitators who can be certified with a national or international partner, and which would contribute to the qualification and professionalization of key education or other personnel in the country that works in conjunction with schools, to address violence prevention in the education sector.

Specifically with this experience, there is an opportunity to take advantage of the trainers in the MdM and share their knowledge and experience through school exchanges, mentoring and development of clusters of violence prevention leaders at municipal and district education levels and address strategies for school based violence prevention in a systemic manner that uses its own resources at a school level that are already trained.

Finally, there needs to be a systemic adaptation of the methodology to be sustainable in the future. SEDUC officials have expressed and demonstrated their political willingness to continue supporting the development of the MdM methodology in the country and interest in establishing it as part of the “School for Parents” framework. In this regard, ChildFund Honduras, USAID and others should continue advocating to the SEDUC to adopt MdM as a permanent strategy to combat school based violence with its respective programmatic and budgetary resources, along with the necessary technical accompaniment, monitoring and continuous learning.

M. CONCLUSIONS

ChildFund has taken significant steps in this pilot project to demonstrate a commitment and responsibility with the protection of Honduran children and youth living in high risk urban communities, so that they can develop peaceful and safe environments and become citizens who contribute to the socio-economic development of the country.

With the PUENTES Project, the organization has generated experience and learning; which must be managed to continue advancing, evolving and achieving positioning and leadership in the adoption, experimentation and in the design and development of innovative methodologies that contribute to the strengthening of the protection of children and youth in Honduras.

MdM has begun to drive positive change, especially in creating an atmosphere of coexistence and perception of safety at school and at home, demonstrated with a greater number of children who report feeling safe and secure in the classroom.

There have been noticeable changes in student behavior: monthly reports from teachers show that emotional, psychological, physical violence and indiscipline have been substantially reduced within the classroom and throughout the school. This is a result of both working with parents as well as with teachers who are changing how they treat students and introducing them to the ways of relating to others non-violently. Another potential factor may be the simple matter of monitoring behavior, which produces a positive effect; for example, by monitoring and reporting
acts of violence, teachers and children are more aware of their actions and are controlling their behavior.

In the PUENTES project there has been an increase in awareness regarding the subject of violence, becoming evident in the increase in the reports on the perception of the use of violence in school and on the way to school, probably as a result of greater knowledge and awareness to detect and report this problem.

Mothers and fathers who attend the sessions now understand more precisely the concept of use of violence as well as discipline in the home; They feel that corporal punishment is a form of violence and that there are other facts which also are expressions of violence (verbal abuse, shouting, teasing etc.). Therefore, these parents are more aware at the time of evaluating the use of violence for discipline in the home, compared to parents who did not attend the meetings. One can also see that the concept of security and protection has changed from a traditional approach to safety and security (Higher walls, fences etc.), focusing on the external, physical or police, a social-type approach based on emotional security, communication styles and positive reinforcement. This is true for both the family and school context.

However, in the case of reduction of indiscipline and violence, it can be stated that qualitative and quantitative evidence of this reduction is also found in the home, and is related to the type of discipline used by parents with their children. Instead of discipline with violence, the percentage of students who report that their parents use positive discipline when students misbehave within households has increased.

As for communication within the school, MdM has generated positive changes: students and teachers communicate better, establish expectations, limits and consequences. Communication between teachers and parents has been positive in the pilot schools. The results indicate greater progress by parents regarding the need to communicate with their children’s teachers. In households communication between parents and children has improved according to the evidence found in the qualitative and quantitative information; parents are making efforts to encourage and advise their children.

Regarding gender, although indicators of gender equality and VBG between the baseline study and final evaluation are not favorable, we can assure that there is increased knowledge on this matter. Moreover, when analyzing other indicators separated by gender, it shows that there is a marked trend in the responses of men vs. women. Women tend to respond more positively questions about the perception of violence than do men. However, we can state that there still are challenges for girls and mothers to recognize the problem and are less afraid to talk about violence and gender discrimination as well as denounce acts of Gender-Based Violence.

In the case of parents and children, it is extremely important that they acquire a leading role in building gender roles that can transform cultural and social stereotypes. This involves an active participation of the male parent in the life of his son/daughter from an early age, both at home and at school. The teacher’s role is indispensable in building and strengthening positive and equitable gender roles and not perpetuating thoughts, attitudes and behaviors that may lead to GBV.
Furthermore, it is an issue whose complexity requires a longer period of time to observe its effect. In addition, due to strong cultural and social roots of a patriarchal culture, prevention of school violence should include interventions that are designed to address the issue of equity and GBV in the different environments in which the child lives.

Regarding the implementation of the MdM methodology one can highlight that in order to have successful sessions, all stakeholders needed to be engaged: the principals inviting participants, providing materials and adapting facilities; teachers and parents/facilitators being trained and conducting sessions; ChildFund technicians providing guides and manuals, giving reinforcement on the topics, and accompanying them in most sessions.

After the evaluation, the subjects that most interested the participants and where they hoped to see reinforcement were:

- The roles and gender stereotypes in the family
- Strategies to improve family relationships
- How to support male students vs. female students in social risk
- More positive discipline strategies for teachers with their students

The main strengths of the MdM methodology according to the qualitative analysis are the following: improved relationships and coexistence between parents, children/students and teachers; improved communication between parents with children and teachers; improved confidence among parents, children/students and teachers; parents are more involved in their children’s education and school life; the decline in violence among students; improvement in how teachers deal with students, giving them confidence, demonstrating more sympathy, and more concern; parents and teachers have changed their way of disciplining their children, as well as towards their students, they do so primarily through dialogue and awareness; they consider that it is through these factors they have improved student discipline.

On the other hand, the main weaknesses are: the low attendance and involvement of fathers in the sessions, since, in the Honduran school culture, mothers are responsible for the care and support of their children’s school activities; The time length of the sessions: participating parents and directors consider them to be very long, and teachers and parent/facilitators consider them to be very short.

According to the participants, the MdM methodology can be applied in other schools and urban communities across the country, it is functional and its implementation is needed in all communities as one of the mechanisms that contribute to the prevention of violence.

The support of SEDUC, in all operational levels, has been imperative to the implementation of the methodology, especially the school principal (coordination, programming, motivation, logistics and providing the necessary time). The support of the District Directorate and/or municipal support have also been important in providing permits for teachers to participate in the sessions.

The economic situation has also had a direct impact on both parents and teachers. As a result, directors, teacher and parent/facilitators have doubts about the sustainability of the implementation of MdM without outside support, and are unsure of their ability to carry it out without the technical and logistical support of the project.
However, they make the following suggestions or recommendations: the school must manage resources and establish partnerships with institutions who want to support them financially; involve and engage teachers and parents to participate in the fundraising required to reproduce materials. Finally, ideally, SEDUC should provide materials and perform monitoring and technical support of the sessions.

In measuring the impact of violence prevention interventions, quantitative data is not sufficient. It is critical to rely strongly on qualitative data as it shows more clearly the complexity and depth of the issues or situations. Also, methods are better culturally received by participants when they are done according to their context. MdM is one piece of the solution to the huge puzzle to prevent school-based violence. That is, the methodology alone cannot solve the complexity of violence in school; it must be complemented by other interventions in the context of schools, families and communities. The methodology has shown great strides in its potential and would be even more powerful in its impact and scope by combining forces with other proven best practices in school based violence prevention in Honduras.
I. Photos

Training for parent and teacher facilitators in MdM in San Pedro Sula
Training for parent and teacher facilitators in MdM in Tegucigalpa

Participants preparing to facilitate sessions
Parents and teachers facilitating a mock practice session during the MdM training

Delivery of diplomas to facilitators for completing 24 hours of training in the MdM methodology
Implementation of a teacher session in the San Miguel de Heredia school of Tegucigalpa

Implementation of a bridge session with parents and teachers in a La Ceiba school

Implementation of a bridge session with parents and teachers in a San Pedro Sula school
Training of parent and teacher facilitators in the CEPREV gender focus
2. Tables

Table 1: Father/mother facilitators trained by city:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Father/Mother facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegucigalpa</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro Sula</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Ceiba</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Teacher facilitators trained by city:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Teacher Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegucigalpa</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro Sula</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Ceiba</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Evaluation Process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation process</th>
<th>Base Line</th>
<th>Mid term Qualitative</th>
<th>Final Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community assessment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>826</th>
<th>1486</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents or guardians</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents or guardians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Planning**
   1. Branding & Marking Plan
   2. Gender Strategy
   3. M&E Plan

4. **Evaluation instruments**
   1. Student Questionnaire
   2. Questionnaire for mothers, fathers and other caregivers
   3. Teacher Questionnaire
   4. Principal Interview Tool
   5. Community Assessment
   6. Principal Survey
   7. Teacher Facilitator Survey
   8. Parent Facilitator Survey
   10. Students Focus Group
   11. Teachers Focus Group
   12. Parents Focus Group

5. **Monitoring Tools for the Implementation**
   13. Checklist of training processes.
   14. Checklist of expected results in the practical implementation of the project
   15. Workshop Appreciation Report of sessions
   16. Monitoring and Supervision MdM Implementation
   17. Monitoring and Evaluation of Sessions
   18. Log Visit to Schools
   19. Communication Log

6. **Facilitation guidelines**

21. Introduction and guidance for facilitation guides
22. Facilitation Guide Family component
23. Facilitation Guide School component
24. Notes and messages for parents
25. Support material and practical guide for teachers
26. Facilitation Guide Bridge component

7. **Products**
27. Directory of Child Protection Networks
28. Guide for care and referral of child abuse cases
29. Steps to report (Protection Networks)
30. Gender Violence Brochure
31. *Violentometer* Sticker
32. MdM Flipchart
33. Gender Guide
34. Systematization
35. Baseline
36. Mid-term evaluation
37. Final evaluation
38. Executive Summary
39. Video