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Population and RH Program

**Demand**
- Improve education, health, and status of women and girls
- Women have autonomy, agency, and choices
- Smaller families are valued
- Marriage, childbearing is delayed

**Supply**
- Improve health service delivery systems
- Service delivery points accessible
- FP supplies available, affordable
- Providers are well-trained

**Strong Demand for FP services**

**Adequate Supply of FP services**

**Actual use of FP services**
- Lower fertility
- Slower population growth
- Improved RH & Rights
Why advancing girls’ education?

Girls’ Secondary Enrollment (Grades 9-12) is low

- 1st Cycle Boys
- 1st Cycle Girls
- 2nd Cycle Boys
- 2nd Cycle Girls

- 2005:
  - Girls: 19.8%
  - Boys: 34.6%
  - 1st Cycle Girls: 4.3%
  - 1st Cycle Boys: 24.5%
  - 2nd Cycle Boys: 7.3%
  - 2nd Cycle Girls: 1.7%

- 2006:
  - Girls: 24.5%
  - Boys: 41.6%
  - 1st Cycle Girls: 5.7%
  - 1st Cycle Boys: 24.5%
  - 2nd Cycle Boys: 7.3%
  - 2nd Cycle Girls: 2%

- 2007:
  - Girls: 45.7%
  - Boys: 45.7%
  - 1st Cycle Girls: 7.3%
  - 1st Cycle Boys: 28.6%
  - 2nd Cycle Boys: 3.7%
  - 2nd Cycle Girls: 2%

- 2008:
  - Girls: 44.4%
  - Boys: 44.4%
  - 1st Cycle Girls: 7.3%
  - 1st Cycle Boys: 29.6%
  - 2nd Cycle Boys: 3.8%
  - 2nd Cycle Girls: 2%

- 2009:
  - Girls: 43.7%
  - Boys: 32.4%
  - 1st Cycle Girls: 8.5%
  - 1st Cycle Boys: 32.4%
  - 2nd Cycle Boys: 3.5%
  - 2nd Cycle Girls: 3.5%
Why advancing girls’ education?

Unmet FP need of secondary school age girls is high

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Unmet Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why advancing girls’ education?
Barriers to Girls’ Education & RH Empowerment

• Low value attached to girls education and RH/FP empowerment in communities

• Limited knowledge and/or practice of girls on RH/FP

• Gender insensitive school environment

• Inability to afford the direct and opportunistic costs of education
Geographic Coverage:

Target area and groups

- Partners: 6
- Regions: 3
- Zones: 8
- Woredas: 48
- Schools: 471
- Young girls (10-24): 350,000
- Teachers: 3000
- Community Leaders: 5,760
Interventions & Outcomes

**GIRLS**
- Life skills development
- SRH BCC
- SRH services
- Tutorial support

**HH/COMMUNITIES**
- Community sensitization
- Leveraging resource
- Strengthen community support groups

**SCHOOLS**
- Teachers training
- Improving physical environment
- Supporting cubs

- Improved transition to and retention of girls in secondary school
- Improved access and utilization of RH/FP information and services
- Supportive environment for girls education and RH empowerment

Delaying marriage and first pregnancy
Improved SRH
Early marriages canceled and/or postponed

Early marriage is like “LELISA”
We denounce the practice!
7,450 Families
Saving for schooling
Increasing schools’ gender responsiveness
Access to RH/FP information and service
Girls participation in Secondary have been improved

Secondary enrollment and dropout

- **2008**: Enrollment 41.5%, Dropout 11%
- **2009**: Enrollment 48.7%, Dropout 8.3%
- **2010**: Enrollment 53.2%, Dropout 7.2%
Lessons learnt

• Barriers to girls education and RH empowerment varies from community to community.

• Community based associations with wide grassroots base facilitate expansion and replication.

• Continuous engagement of schools with community enhances capacity to respond to the needs of girls positively.

• Parents’ saving for schooling encourages girls to do better in their education.
Lessons learnt

• Life skills development and RH/FP information boost girls’ confidence

• Referral linkage between schools and service providers has improved young girls access to RH/FP services.

• Partnership with micro finance associations foster saving for schooling initiatives.

• Formation of a learning forum and common M&E framework helped to consolidate learning