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1. Executive Summary

The Youth Living Peace Project is an initiative managed by Promundo-US internationally, and nationally implemented and managed by Instituto Promundo in Brazil and HEAL Africa in DRC.

The project aimed to facilitate the prevention of violence, advancement of gender equality, improvement of service delivery and capacity building of stakeholders including government officials. It was developed and delivered over three years beginning on 01/01/2015 and ending on 31/12/2017. In order to bridge individual, community and institutional spheres, the program was delivered in community school contexts. The Youth Living Peace Project materials and strategy were developed and customized for these contexts and delivered through group interventions (education, support, counseling), individual counseling, planned workshops, educational materials, staff training, and engagement with stakeholders at local government level.

The project was implemented in the DRC (Goma and Sake), managed by HEAL Africa, and in Brazil (Rio de Janeiro), managed by Instituto Promundo. In both these contexts Violence Amongst Women and Girls is considered a significant problem for the target population, adolescent girls aged 13-19 and the secondary beneficiaries and stakeholders (adolescent boys, educational professionals, community members and actors in the educational and social sphere such as local government).

In Brazil, adolescent girls are amongst the higher risk groups in both public and private arenas and a lack of recognition of non-physical forms of violence is prominent in urban settings. Simultaneously, gender is currently a highly sensitive and contentious topic within Brazilian society and the school is one of the central arenas for the manifestation and materialization of this polemic.

In 2015, DRC was ranked 176 out of 188 countries in the Human Development Index (HDI) and 153 out of 159 counties in the Gender Inequality Index (GII), making it an extremely challenging context for women and girls. High rates of sexual violence have been well documented, however, there is a lack of acknowledgement of the other types of violence the women and girls in DRC experience. Despite the creation of legislation to protect women, laws are inadequately enforced and mostly unknown to the population.

Having reached the end of the project’s delivery cycles this external evaluation seeks to compile, consolidate, analyze and synthesize existing and new program data in order to assess the efficacy of the Youth Living Peace Methodology in delivering the outputs and achieving the desired outcomes. The evaluation is summative in its examination of the efficacy of the program and its attainment of outcomes and formative in the production of knowledge the strategic implications this carries for future iterations of the program. It considers the program’s effectiveness framed within the other evaluation criteria - the program’s impact, relevance, efficiency sustainability and knowledge generated through its development and delivery.

The evaluation will be used by Promundo (and Implementing Partners) for periodic learning and strategic planning, as well as for supporting their advocacy activities in the domain of GBV prevention (in particular, in relation to VAWG). The evaluation also provides a resource for CSOs and organizations interested in implementing evidence based interventions in similar contexts and for key stakeholders in the public and private sectors to advocate for programming and policy changes. The results may also be used by UNTF to inform decisions about funding similar prevention projects in the future.

The methodology was designed according to a pre-test/post-test approach with no control group. The evaluation considered secondary pre-test data (collected by the delivery partners as part of their internal M&E) and secondary and primary post-test data (collected by both the delivery partners as part of their internal M&E and the evaluation team who collected primary data at both project sites within the parameters and thematic focus of the evaluation criteria). The beneficiary and stakeholder groups who formed the ‘respondent’ group for the evaluators’ data collection have all engaged in the program. Secondary data was obtained from planning/strategy documents, external and internal reports and qualitative and quantitative data collected by onsite staff for internal program planning, monitoring and evaluation. Primary data was collected by the external evaluators through a series of key informant interviews and focus groups. Guided discussions and an assessment of change questionnaire were also carried out as part of the evaluation data collection in the DRC (these were planned for both sites but were not implemented in Rio de Janeiro owing to limitations, which are outlined in the report). The qualitative data was analyzed thematically and the quantitative data underwent descriptive analysis and subsequent summarization and comparison.
Respondents were selected through a combination of purposive and convenience sampling. The limitations in the Rio de Janeiro context were linked to challenges with accessing respondents due to the socio-political context regarding the issues the project seeks to address, in practice this resulted in only carrying out focus groups in one of the 6 schools. Speaking to parents and other community stakeholders was considered to be a potential threat to the work within the school owing to the sensitivity of the subject matter and therefore it was not possible for the external evaluation team to engage with these stakeholders. There was also a lack of responses for the assessment of change questionnaire issued to stakeholders. In DRC, there were limitations related to accessing secondary data due to data storage and management issues as well as some concerns around the quality of the secondary data available. However, despite these limitations, the data allowed for sufficient external evaluation, specifically given the diversity of informants (beneficiaries and stakeholders) consulted during the primary data collection in both contexts, and the number of informants consulted in DRC that facilitated the comparison and verification of the data.

Overall, the findings suggest that the results of the implementation of the Youth Living Peace Methodology across both sites points to its efficacy and appropriateness for addressing experiences, knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and responses related to VAWG for participants as well as positively impacting a broader group of stakeholders. The key findings from the report were as follows:

**Instituto Promundo led Implementation in Rio de Janeiro**

The main impact on primary beneficiaries related to changes in attitudes and behaviors and an increase in knowledge and the ability to navigate issues related to gender. These areas were mostly evidenced through qualitative data. Primary data collected from participants and teachers (in one of the schools) suggested an increase in empathy and non-violent communication amongst participants. Whilst the primary data was only collected from a small subset of participants on one site, complementary findings emerged within the secondary qualitative data. However it should be noted that findings which exclusively emerged from focus groups run by the evaluator can only be assumed to apply to the schools where these were run.

There was consistent reference, from various respondent types (participants, teachers, stakeholders) and data sources regarding participants’ increase in knowledge and awareness of issues relating to gender and the confidence and ability to articulate, debate and advocate for them. This central finding was summarized by one of the teachers during a focus group, “The students who participate in the project are of a very different mind...its startling in the classroom when you bring up one of these issues, the way they conceptualize it, they have a certain ease in stating their case, in defending the issue. It’s impressive.” One of the most frequently cited aims of the program (by staff in the informant interviews) was to activate, open up, facilitate and strengthen the debate on issues of gender. The results from the group which was accessible in the primary data collection were consistent with the expectations and aims cited by staff and present areas for potential further evaluation in the other school settings.

In terms of the experience of violence, the most significant change during the program related to verbal and psychological violence (in 2017 there was a 28% decrease in female participants reporting that they had been insulted or humiliated in the last three months and a 36.7% decrease in the experience of verbal and psychological violence amongst male participants).

Primary and secondary qualitative data suggested that the project was successful in changing attitudes, awareness and behaviors amongst Educational Staff and partners from local government (NIAP - Interdisciplinary Centre for the Support for Schools). Educational staff provided accounts of their own development and deconstruction of gender norms and identification of non-equitable attitudes and behaviors. Furthermore, there was indication of an increased responsiveness from the quantitative data. Whilst the pre-tests showed an already high proportion of teachers (88.24%) would report a case of abuse to the appropriate external bodies (child protection unit/social services), it is notable that this rose to 100% at post test.

Key success factors for the efficacy, efficiency and sustainability of the program included the multidisciplinary and participatory approach to the development and delivery of the project and a focus on the long-term integration of the project materials into the curriculum through creating a flexible toolkit which is accessible, relevant and flexible.

**HEAL Africa led Implementation in Goma and Sake, DRC**

The primary beneficiaries’ social environment was understood to be more gender equitable through an observed improvement in the perception of women and girls’ sociocultural status and capacities. In terms of personal development, the primary data suggested an increase in self-confidence, self esteem and self efficacy. Specifically,
there was evidence from the focus groups on adolescents changing the way they thought about themselves and about their ability to gain control over and improve their lives.

The teachers interviewed all recognized positive changes in individual students’ attitudes, behaviors and school performance after joining the project. They observed that students were denouncing acts of violence and taking action to prevent it. Furthermore there was evidence for increased cohesion and social support through solidarity with each other, access to wider community and confidence in the power of a group action.

There was evidence that the project facilitated the access to knowledge, including topics that participants had little opportunity to learn about elsewhere. During the primary data collection, participants identified the content relating to relationships as highly relevant and useful, stating that they helped to improve their relationships with families, peers and others in the community. Specifically, notions of consent, mutual responsibility, equality and protection were identified as key areas of awareness and knowledge development.

There was a notable change in boys’ attitudes regarding these areas as illustrated by this participant’s self-report, “Before I didn’t respect women and girls, I was considering them as things, that have little value that should serve us men- at home doing the work and as sexual partners. Now I have seen that they are people just like men and boys and that they can achieve things in their lives. That they can do everything that men can do, they can manage others and their work. I really didn’t think about women this way before, but now I think very differently.”

The findings indicated that the impact of the project extended beyond the parameters of the intervention to the home. Both participants and parents attested to an increase in gender equality in the home (for instance through boys participating in household tasks). Furthermore, the primary data affirmed that participants were mobilising to create their own groups and initiatives beyond the project in the schools and at community level. As one participant explained, “We have gained a lot of knowledge but without practice it is nothing, it will go away, we will forget. So we started getting together to talk to our friends in the community and to share what we have learned with others... The respect that the others show us in the community helps us to continue work for the peace.” This notion of sharing of knowledge and skills gained was confirmed by the community members.

According to HEAL Africa’s analysis of their data at the end of a first cycle, a majority of participants attending the group sessions expressed that they were able to identify and seek support in the event of violence or abuse of power. Secondary data indicated that 26 adolescents received individual counseling based on the cognitive and behavioral approach that integrated the systemic family approach and that a further 15 girls benefited from trauma counseling in 2017. The girls and boys benefited from 3 to 10 weeks of therapy as a result of the referral to counseling.

A government representative praised the project, saying, “People in the community have seen that psychological trauma can be cured by activities like this session, this increased their support and the way they encouraged the children and also how they started changing their behavior.” The program provided a case study for the efficacy and impact of a psychosocial approach. The respondents highlighted that there is a need to recognize psychological needs of the population in the same way that medical needs are recognized.

Promising practices were identified across various aspects of the program including group therapy, confidential reporting mechanisms, clinical supervision, partnering with stakeholders from multidisciplinary backgrounds and a proactive focus on sustainability.

Key challenges identified included:

- The development of a formal prevention and response to violence within the schools (which was not completed in both contexts due a focus on piloting the project approach, ensuring its adequacy and utility within the contexts, and the need for external intervention in this process due to local processes and regulations)
- Enduring violence in public and private spaces beyond the project reach
- Challenges related to the visibility of the program (in DRC this was considered an important next step whereas in Brazil the socio-political context has required that the visibility and promotion of the project remain limited)
- Working in the specific school contexts generated some challenges relating to scheduling and planning for both programs. In Brazil, there were challenges related to some teachers’ acceptance of the program (whilst others embraced it and facilitated its successful delivery). In DRC, there was a lack of female teachers, which affected the dynamic. There were also limited reports of non-equitable and even violent behavior amongst some teachers. Whenever HEAL Africa staff were aware of this they addressed it with school leadership
who reprimanded the teacher. However not all cases were reported to HEAL Africa which highlights the need for more formalized evaluation system of the teachers through the project.

The key recommendations emerging from the evaluation are:

- The addition of extra materials (the project toolkit) to provide additional stimulus for peer-to-peer discussion and increase the visibility of the work
- The addition of further modules of the curriculum (on the intersectional themes of Race and Religion) as sought by the program staff in Rio de Janeiro
- The revision of data collection tools (questionnaires) for relevance and reliability in both contexts and specific to DRC, capacity building in order to systematize their data collection and management. The introduction of an evaluation system for the selection of ‘focal points’ (teachers) within the program
- That the program teams carry out follow-up activities with participants and stakeholders who are mobilizing and continue the work begun by the project.
- That stakeholders across the project come together to articulate, define and align the norms, standards, expectations and definitions of forms of gender equality and nonviolence. This is particularly important given the diversity of the contexts in which the project was delivered and to ensure there is representation from any future potential delivery contexts.

2. Context of the Project

Gender Based Violence and Violence against Women and Girls

Gender-based violence refers to “any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person’s will, and that is based on socially ascribed (gender) differences between males and females”\(^\text{ii}\). Under this thematic umbrella, this project deals primarily with Violence against Women and Girls. Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) is a type of gender based violence which has been defined by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) as “violence that is directed against a woman because she is a woman or that affects women disproportionately”\(^\text{iii}\). VAWG occurs at both interpersonal and structural levels. Types of interpersonal violence include physical violence, verbal violence, psychological violence, sexual violence and emotional violence. Types of structural violence include social and economic exclusion and forms of institutional violence (or otherwise) that prevent individuals or groups accessing provisions, resources or services to meet their needs. These forms of violence are often interconnected and overlapping.

The Special Rapporteur on violence against women outlines the UN understanding and approach to VAWG as founded on three tenets\(^\text{iv}\):

- Addressing the issue as a matter of equality and non-discrimination between women and men
- Recognizing that multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination increase the risk of experiencing gender based discrimination
- Addressing the multifaceted causes of violence against women is an expression of the interdependence of human rights.

As such, in terms of programmatic intervention, GBV (including VAWG) must be understood within its context, considering the contributing intersecting and multifaceted factors. The following sections outline the socio-cultural, socio-political and socio-historical contexts in which the Youth Living Peace program, the subject of this evaluation, is set.

Violence against Women and Girls in the DRC

Armed conflict and insecurity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo have created one of the world’s most protracted and complex humanitarian crises. In 2016, 7.3 million people were affected by regional and local armed conflict, especially in the mineral-rich eastern part of the country. Insecurity is now mounting in the Kasai and Tanganyika provinces, affecting hundreds of thousands of people, and leading to fears of further displacement.\(^\text{v}\)

Centuries of oppression, abuse and war resulted in the country’s low ranking in Human Development Index (HDI)- in 2015 DRC was at 176 out of 188 countries as well as in the Gender Inequality Index (GII)- DRC ranks 153 out of 159 counties\(^\text{vi}\) making it one of the most challenging countries in the world for women and girls. Although the constitution
(article 14) guarantees gender equality and the DRC has a legal framework protecting women (laws No 06/018 and No 06/019 adopted in 2006), neither is adequately enforced and they are mostly unknown to the population. The political uncertainty with overdue election makes it challenging for sustainable and durable solutions to be developed and the question of gender equality and situation of women are not at the top of the priority list for the national or provincial governments.

Naming DRC “the rape capital of the world”\textsuperscript{vi}, recognizing the use of sexual violence as a weapon of war and the scale of sexual violence in DRC\textsuperscript{vii}, had significant benefits to the women and girls in DRC in terms of funding made available and coordinated efforts to establish services for survivors of sexual violence. However, the focus on sexual violence meant that there has been insufficient acknowledgement of the other types of violence the women and girls in DRC experience, especially intimate partner violence including marital rape\textsuperscript{x}. It also meant that women and girls in DRC have been often viewed as poor, rural, ‘vulnerable’ (i.e. passive) and a noted tendency “to place the blame for gender inequality implicitly on women, either as the (moral) educators of children, or because they show insufficient ‘solidarity’ with other women, or because they are ‘too ignorant’ to access their rights.”\textsuperscript{viii} and a lack of recognition of the need for societal, systemic and political change.

One of the recommendations of the 2014 Gender Profile was to help publicize the range of women’s positive roles in DRC and to (re)design ‘gender’ policies to adopt a broader approach to women beyond their role as ‘mother.’ This is in line with the feelings of local activists such as Justine Masika Bihamba who said, “we do not see ourselves as the ‘rape capital of the world’. Instead, I agree with Liberia’s Nobel Prize laureate Leymah Gbowee, who called my nation ‘the world capital of sisterhood and solidarity’. We have few resources but we have an enormous amount of know-how and we are changing this country from within.”\textsuperscript{ix}

It should also be noted that, on one hand, given that the project is set against the backdrop of a lack of wider acknowledgement and provision for girls and women who have experienced different forms of violence, there is a possibility that the desire for the continuation of the services and activities may contribute to the accuracy of the evaluation (potentially generating a positive bias in some cases amongst direct beneficiaries). On the other hand, the evaluation is useful in demonstrating a need and appetite for such programming and its potential for highlighting alternative approaches. For instance, the Youth Living Peace Project’s psychosocial approach is targeted at addressing the issue, in a more holistic way, understanding of the efficacy of this approach is important in the assessment of its potential utility in other interventions within comparable political, demographic and institutional contexts.

Violence against Women and Girls in Brazil

Violence against Women and Girls is a serious problem in Brazil as shown in a study carried out by the Brazilian Forum of Public Security (2016). Of those who participated in the study\textsuperscript{xii}:

- 66% of Brazilians have witnessed verbal or physical abuse of a woman
- 503 women per hour were victims of physical aggression
- 61% of victims of violence know their aggressor
- 43% of victims suffered their most serious instance of violence at home, whilst 39% experienced it ‘on the street’

Children and adolescent girls are amongst the higher risk groups in both public and private arenas, for instance (in the aforementioned study), 68% of adolescents (16-24) reported verbal violence on the street, 17% experienced physical aggression on public transport, and, between 2011 and 2014, 70% of rape victims were minors\textsuperscript{xii}. A study by Promundo \textsuperscript{xx} demonstrated that, in Brazilian urban settings, young people fail to recognize and identify non-physical forms of violence in intimate contexts. This has been associated with inequitable gender norms, lack of safe spaces, limited access to support and information, power dynamics, lack of intervention (from external actors), high instance of reciprocal violence and intervening socio-demographic factors (such as educational attainment, economic inclusion and substance use).

Gender is currently a highly sensitive and contentious topic within Brazilian society and the school is one of the central arenas for the manifestation and materialization of this polemic. For instance, during 2017, the Ministry of Education revised the National Curriculum and removed the terms ‘sexual orientation’ and ‘gender identity.’ The current debate sits at the intersection between politics, religion and education which has been brought to the forefront of political discourse through the emergence of political figures (notably the Mayor of Rio de Janeiro) who hold leading roles in religious institutions, “Brazil is once again experiencing heightened debates and antagonisms concerning, on the one hand, the constitutionally guaranteed inclusion of religious education in public schools and,
on the other, the controversial inclusion of gender and sexual diversity issues in the regulatory framework, standards, policies, and the everyday life of public education. Education is one particular space where the moral disputes that signals the tensions between politics and religion, arising from different understandings and appropriations of the secularization process, and different views on secularism in a democratic State (Casanova, 1994), are most acute, producing panics and mobilizations all over the country. “” (Carvalho and Sivori, 2017)

As such, the timing of the evaluation has coincided with a growing polarization on issues of gender and increasing social tension in relation to many of the debates that the program aims to encourage. Carrying out the evaluation within this socio-political context meant that an additional degree of sensitivity and cautious, careful enquiry was necessary. This generated certain challenges in terms of access to a diverse group of representative informants for the primary data collection (a challenge discussed in the Evaluation Methodology of this report), inevitably having an impact on the extent to which findings could be generalized and validated. However, the evaluation also presented an important opportunity for capturing discourse and interventions and their efficacy and impact within this context.

3. Description of the Project

The Youth Living Peace Project is an initiative managed internationally by Promundo-US and nationally implemented and managed by HEAL Africa and Instituto Promundo. Promundo US is a non-governmental organization, and member of the Promundo Global Consortium, that works toward gender equality and the prevention of gender-based violence, with an emphasis on engaging men and boys as partners with women and girls. In alignment with this mission, this project is targeted towards gender justice and freedom from violence for adolescent girls (primarily those who have been victims of or witnessed VAWG), with the aim of breaking intergenerational cycles of violence. The project was designed to generate impact at individual, community and institutional levels through direct service provision, awareness raising and modeling the practical application of GBV (primarily, though not exclusively, related to VAWG), prevention and response.

Areas of intervention

The project was targeted towards four impact areas:

1. Prevention of violence and advancement of gender equality by means of group education as well as public outreach, awareness raising campaigns, to change individual and community knowledge/attitudes;
2. Improving service delivery by promoting and providing referral to services (such as psychosocial counseling, medical services, shelters, etc.);
3. Strengthening institutional response by enhancing capacities of government officials and decision-makers;

The project also targeted the following outcomes:

- Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in the project improve their attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality and nonviolence in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.
- Schools where the project is implemented create more supportive environments to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.

Forms and Manifestations of Violence

The project addresses interpersonal and structural violence. As described above, the delivery contexts are very different in their geographic, demographic, socio-cultural, political and socio-historical contexts. As such, the forms and manifestations of violence covered across the program are diverse. The project has focused on the identification, prevention and response to violence, whilst all areas were covered to some extent across both delivery contexts, this was to different extents according to the needs assessed in the formative research and development of the methodology.

Key Assumptions

The evaluation team identified the following key assumptions that underpin the project strategy and design:
An intersectional approach is required to address issues of gender with the target beneficiary groups.

A psychosocial approach is an effective method for supporting victims of violence (specifically in the DRC context).

A focus on both male and female participants is fundamental to addressing the issue of VAWG.

The school context is a suitable space for delivering the program and provides a productive space for participants to identify, discuss and respond to issues and experiences of violence across public and private spaces.

Description of Beneficiaries, Implementation Partners, and Key Stakeholders

**Primary Beneficiaries** – 713 Adolescent girls/women (the initial target group were those aged 13-19, however an opportunity to work with an adult education group emerged in one school in Rio de Janeiro, which meant there was a small group who were outside of this age range).

These beneficiaries are from communities that experience high levels of urban conflict and violence. One of the underpinning concepts that influenced the selection of this group is the ‘transmission of violence’, which has been researched and documented by a number of agencies and institutions working on issues surrounding gender and GBV. In terms of VAWG, this refers to a correlation between the witnessing of violence at a young age (often witnessing violence against a mother) and the experience of violence in a later intimate relationship. For men and boys, there is also a correlation between witnessing violence and the use of violence in relationships. Adolescents are therefore understood to be at an intersection between past experience and future risk of violence.

**Secondary Beneficiaries** - 444 Adolescent boys/men aged 13-19 (as above there were some participants who were part of the adult education group in Brazil who were older); 8961 members of CSOs and community members; 125 Educational Professionals.

**Key stakeholders** - Facilitators, educational staff and school representatives; gender, youth, education and health policy professionals, other school representatives, community representatives, parents and wider family local government. Further identification of specific stakeholders can be found in the description of each delivery partner below.

**Implementation partners** – **HEAL Africa** is an NGO based in Goma, DRC, working in the Maniema, North Kivu, and South Kivu regions “HEAL” represents their focal areas - healthcare, education, community action, and leadership development. They work to foster health, empower women, cultivate community and promote education. HEAL Africa was responsible for the delivery of the program in the DRC. **Instituto Promundo** is a member of the Promundo Global Consortium, based in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (where Promundo was founded in 1997). As part of the Consortium they work to promote gender justice in high-violence settings with a focus on facilitating gender discourse amongst youth, engaging men and boys as allies and beneficiaries in the transformation of gender norms and power dynamics.

**Program Delivery**

The project was delivered over three years beginning on 01/01/2015 and ending in 31/12/2017 with a total project budget of $737,821, in Goma and Sake (DRC) and Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), implemented by delivery partners HEAL Africa and Instituto Promundo (respectively). In order to bridge individual, community and institutional spheres, the program was implemented in community school contexts. The programs were delivered through group interventions (education, support, counseling), individual counseling, planned workshops, creation of educational materials, staff training, and policy briefing seminars. At an organizational and strategic level, the effectiveness of Promundo’s programming overall is conceptualized according to their Theory of Change with the long term impact goal of ‘changing the landscape of violence against adolescent girls’ promoting gender equality, attitude and behavior change, and facilitating the prevention of violence against women and girls. Promoting gender equality, attitude and behavior change, and facilitating the prevention of violence against women and girls. Promundo’s three-pronged approach uses (1) formative research and rigorous evaluation, (2) evidence-based programs, and (3) targeted advocacy efforts strives to create change at multiple levels: with individuals through high-impact gender-transformative interventions and programs, with communities through campaigns and local activism, and with institutions and governments through advocacy efforts aimed to influence policies and institutionalize approaches.
At the individual level, this is understood to result in the attainment of the following interrelated outcomes:

1. Learn through questioning and critical reflection about gender norms
2. Rehearse equitable and non-violent attitudes and behaviors in a comfortable space,
3. Internalize these new gender attitudes and norms, applying them in their own relationships and lives.

Underpinned by this approach, in order to attain the goal set for this project: to attain greater gender equality and freedom from violence for the adolescent girls who participate in the project in school intervention sites – especially those previously exposed to violence – by 2018 in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) and in Goma and Sake City (DRC).

The program strategy is defined within the results chain:

| Outcome 1: | Output 1.1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in group education sessions and/or individual counseling demonstrate increased skills and knowledge on topics related to gender equality and nonviolence. | Activity 1.1.1: Conduct group education sessions with adolescent girls and boys. |
| Outcome 1: | | Activity 1.1.2: Conduct individual counseling with adolescent girls and boys. |
| Outcome 2: | Output 1.2: New educational and counseling resources become available for promoting gender equality and nonviolence, adapted for use in DRC and Brazil. | Activity 1.2.1: Create manuals, key materials, film, protocols and training of trainer materials. |
| Outcome 2: | Output 2.1: Schools where the project is implemented adopt a resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated action plan for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys. | Activity 2.1.1: Conduct planning workshops to develop guidelines, resources framework and implementation plans with the Steering Committee, implementing organizations and staff from the school intervention sites. |
| Outcome 2: | Output 2.2: School staff where the project is implemented have knowledge of their schools’ resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated skills for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys. | Activity 2.2.1: Conduct training sessions with school staff, where the project is implemented, on their schools’ resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and on strategies and skills for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys. |
| Outcome 2: | Output 2.3: Key secondary beneficiaries (which can include school staff, students, parents and guardians, and community members) in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC have knowledge of reporting mechanisms for adolescent girls and boys who have been exposed to violence, and report a greater willingness to intervene. | Activity 2.3.1: Conduct school-based campaigns/activities to sensitize and inform school and community members. |

HEAL Africa - Vijana Wa Amani

In DRC, the program was delivered in 11 schools in Goma and 3 schools in Sake, in the North Kivu province of DRC. Three cycles of the program were implemented. The interventions (outputs) for each cycle were:

- 15 sessions of group therapy using a curriculum, which has been adapted to the DRC context (split into 4 themes - learn to know each other and identify problems; girls/ boys’ issues; integrating new ideas and building new relationships; and consolidation and dissemination in the community)
- Ad hoc counseling available to all participants at the hospital run by HEAL Africa
- Awareness raising activities organized by the program staff and participants at the beginning and end of each cycle which included the participation of educational staff, families and community members
- An invitation for parents to attend the launch, the 11th session, and the 15th closing or celebration session
The manuals used in the program implementation were developed in partnership with ISL and reviewed by various stakeholders, including the Secondary and Vocational Education Division and other government divisions, as well as other organizations and practitioners who participated in the Technical Advisory Group.

**Instituto Promundo - Jovens Pelo Fim da Violência**

In Brazil, the program was implemented by Instituto Promundo in the Urban Southern Zone of Rio de Janeiro. The program was conceptualized, designed, reviewed and delivered with active participation from, and in close partnership with, the local Education Secretariat and Victims Support Unit. Instituto Promundo selected a variety of school settings and profiles, including both student groups within a conventional educational format and an evening adult education group (to engage those who have left formal education). The project material, a kit of 5 booklets with suggested content and activities, focused on themes which intersect with gender issues: “Building Links”; “What they expect from us”; “Diversities”; “Power, Relationships and Violence”, and; “Communication and Relationships”. The methodology is currently under further review with the participation of NIAP, school staff and the Instituto Promundo team. The delivery was carried out in 3-month cycles (across 6 schools), totaling 3 cycles across two years of implementation (with the first project year dedicated to project development). The program intervention consisted of:

- 13 Workshops (per cycle) with students using the material to address one of the 5 aforementioned themes
- 13 Workshops with teachers (per cycle) to discuss key issues of gender and train those who wanted to use the materials
- 1 campaign in each school at the end of each cycle which varied according to the context from participation in a pre-existing school event (with a stand and the distribution of educational materials), awareness raising in local community and participant-led campaigning activities within the school (using placards and performance)
- Monthly training sessions held by facilitators with teachers

**4. Purpose of the Evaluation**

The external evaluation seeks to compile, consolidate, analyze and synthesize existing and new program data in order to deepen the understanding of the effectiveness of the Youth Living Peace Methodology in delivering the outputs and achieving the desired outcomes.

Through this lens, the evaluation considers the program’s effectiveness with a focus on the interrelated issues of the program’s impact, relevance, sustainability and highlight knowledge generated through its development and delivery. The evaluation results are intended to be used by:

- Promundo-US, HEAL Africa and Instituto Promundo for their own periodic learning and strategic planning, as well as for supporting their advocacy activities in the domain of GBV prevention, specifically related to VAWG
- CSOs and organizations interested in implementing evidence based interventions to engage men and boys in the prevention of VAWG in these particular implementation context as well as elsewhere
- Key stakeholders in the public and private sectors to advocate for programming and policy changes

The evaluation may also be used by UNTF to inform decisions about funding similar prevention projects in the future.

**Evaluative Context**

The project inception involved the creation and implementation of a new methodology based on experience from pre-existing, tried and tested methodologies. During the initial development phases of the program, the development of the methods and tools was led by HEAL Africa and Instituto Promundo who engaged key stakeholders (listed in the sections below) in their conceptualization and review. Two versions of the toolkit were created and molded to the specific contexts of the implementation sites and subsequently delivered to a group of target beneficiaries. This Evaluation is set within the context of understanding the impact and outcomes of this process, including the efficacy of development and deployment of the tools and methodology in each delivery site.
5. Evaluation Objectives and Scope

Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are framed within the context of the delivery of a new and bespoke methodology (the Youth Living Peace methodology) in both Brazilian and Congolese contexts. The objectives include:

1. To evaluate the project’s processes and overall *effectiveness* in achieving the goal, outcomes and outputs at multiple beneficiary levels, including: changing participant attitudes and behaviors relating to gender norms, gender equality and GBV (with a focus on VAWG), changing community attitudes relating to gender norms, gender equality and GBV (with a focus on VAWG), and changing school staff/parents’/other secondary beneficiaries’ knowledge and skills in relation to adolescent GBV (with a focus on VAWG) prevention and response.

2. To assess the *relevance* of the project activities, goals and achieved results to the project’s beneficiary groups, and to contextualize the objectives of the project within the local and national requirements and priorities in the area of preventing VAWG among adolescents.

3. To understand the *impact* of the project, in proportion to the overall scale of the issue of violence-affected youth within each country context.

4. To *generate knowledge*, lessons learnt, and suggestions for improvements to more effectively adapt the Youth Living Peace methodology, for these particular contexts. This would include identifying promising practices that can be shared with other practitioners, and replicated in other contexts.

5. To document the *efficiency and timeliness* of project implementation and management.

6. To document plans for the *sustainability* of the project’s impact after the conclusion of the project.

Scope

The Evaluation considers data from all stages of the project development and delivery beginning with its inception and the development of the project materials in 2015 through the delivery of the methodology in 2016/2017 and finally to the project completion at the end of 2017 and plans for its sustainability. As such, the scope includes a focus on both the individual beneficiary/stakeholder level as well as the potential gains for wider society through the dissemination of best practice and wider application of aspects of the program/methodology. It is set across the context of three locations in two countries, Instituto Promundo’s implementation site in Rio de Janeiro, and HEAL Africa’s intervention sites in Goma (the DRC) and Sake (the DRC).

Limitations of the Evaluation Objectives and Scope

The following features of the evaluation context and scope are acknowledged as limitations of this evaluation:

- **Lack of control/comparison group** - Given the nature, setting and evaluative context of this project, a control group was not a feasible practice. Indeed the implementation of any intervention in a complex social setting that accounts for intersectionality does not necessarily facilitate comparative forms of evaluation. This was particularly the case with this evaluation as this is a new and customized methodology (each delivery site having its own version of the project materials) and there were limited cases for comparability.

- **Short Evaluation timescale / External Evaluation Team’s limited exposure to the project** - The timescale for the evaluation did not allow for evaluation staff’s significant exposure to the project and as such there was limited time to form an understanding of the project, build trust/rapport with respondents and observe the day-to-day implementation of each program. Furthermore the evaluators’ exposure to only the final stages of the project limits their insight of prior phases to the interpretation secondary data and conversations with stakeholders.
6. Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team consists of three senior consultants whose knowledge and experience have provided the foundational knowledge into the complexities of gender, conflict and youth engagement/empowerment from a variety of perspectives and contexts, providing a firm basis for analysis and evaluation (more details provided in the CVs in Annex 8).

The lead consultant for this project, Heather Baillie Ridout, has been responsible for project management of the evaluation, developing the evaluation design and methods, data collection and analysis in Brazil, overseeing the analysis and interpretation of findings across both sites and writing the final report. The second consultant, Monika Bakayoko-Topolska, has been responsible for primary data collection in DRC and supporting the analysis of the data collected through the field visit and the writing of the final report. The third consultant on the project, Tom Keyte, has been responsible for supporting the development of the evaluation design and methods, supporting the analysis and interpretation of findings, and the writing of the final report.

The evaluation process was split into three phases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception</strong></td>
<td>23/10/2017 - 24/11/2017</td>
<td>Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inception stage provided the opportunity for the Evaluation Team, Evaluation Task Manager and wider evaluation stakeholders, such as the grantee and commissioning organizations, to ensure that everyone involved in running the evaluation is ‘on the same page’ through the development of a detailed inception report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection and Analysis</strong></td>
<td>6/11/2017 - 8/12/2017</td>
<td>Periodic updates (unofficial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the data collection phase the Evaluation Team conducted primary data collection for the project. The stage involved primarily qualitative data collection to supplement the quantitative data that had already been collected and was split between desk research and in-country technical missions in DRC and Brazil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthesis and Reporting</strong></td>
<td>4/12/2017 - 12/02/2017</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the analysis, synthesis and reporting stage, the evaluation team analyzed the primary and secondary data available for the development of this report, which in its final form will be adjusted according to feedback from the key stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Evaluation Questions

The Evaluation has been structured around 6 evaluation criteria are outlined below:

Effectiveness refers to the extent of the projects’ achievement of results at multiple beneficiary levels, considering the suitability, adequacy and efficacy of the implementation process, facilitating and obstructing factors and the subsequent results of the program delivery. The key evaluation questions for this criterion are:

1. To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?
2. To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?
3. To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) women and girls, and boys and men in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those women and/or girls, and boys/men?
4. What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?
5. To what extent was the project successful in advocating for legal or policy change? If it was not successful, explain why.

Relevance refers to the suitability and ‘fit’ of the program to the context, needs and objectives of the program. The key evaluation questions for this criterion are:

1. To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?
2. To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?

Impact refers to any change or effect caused by the project for/on the target beneficiary group or any other stakeholder in the project. The key evaluation question for this criterion is:

1. What are the intended and unintended consequences (positive and negative) that resulted from the project?

Efficiency refers to the extent to which strategies and resources were well used and well-timed to achieve the goals of the program. The key evaluation questions for this criterion are:

1. How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?
2. Is the length of the program cycle (three years) sufficient to achieve the program outputs and outcomes?
3. What factors of the program facilitated the efficient development, delivery and impact of the program?
4. What factors obstructed the efficient development, delivery and impact of the program?

Sustainability refers to the longevity and continuity of the impact of the program. The key evaluation question for this criterion is:

1. How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of women and girls at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?

Knowledge generation refers to the application of learning obtained from the experience of the program delivery gained through monitoring and evaluation which can be applied for the improvement of the project itself or to in from wider programming/intervention. The key evaluation questions for this criterion are:

1. What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on ending violence against women and girls?
2. Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?
## 8. Evaluation Methodology

### Description of evaluation design

The Evaluation was designed according to a pre-test/post-test approach without comparison group. It considered secondary pre-test data (collected by the delivery partners) and secondary and primary post-test data (collected by both the delivery partners and evaluation team) framed within the parameters and thematic focus of the evaluation questions. The beneficiary and stakeholder groups who formed the ‘respondent’ group have all engaged in the program. The evaluation was timed to align with end of the final year of the current development and implementation period and bridges both summative and formative approaches through the evaluation questions listed above - being summative in its examination of the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, impact and sustainability and formative in the production of knowledge of the strategic implications and promising practices for future iterations of the program or programs operating in a similar context.

### Data sources

#### Key Informants

The following stakeholder types are considered key informants/ respondents for this evaluation:

- Primary/Direct Beneficiaries
- Secondary/Indirect Beneficiaries
- Other Stakeholders

#### Secondary data sources:

- Planning/Strategy Documents
- Internal, Mid Term and Annual Reports
- Transcriptions of Focus Groups
- Field Diaries

#### Primary data sources:

- Recordings and transcripts of focus groups, interviews, guided discussions
- Questionnaire responses

(Additional details can be found in annexes 6 and 7)

#### Description of Data Collection Methods

(Annex 2 details the evaluation criteria, questions and indicators which were targeted by each data collection method)

**Key Informant Interviews** (onsite and desk based): Key informant interviews were carried out with program staff, program facilitators, members of the steering group and development partners. Using open questions allowed for focused data collection in order to directly address issues related to performance and process as well as to identify social change observed/perceived. These interviews were conducted with the evaluator and recorded. All key informant interviews in DRC were conducted in person as planned - in total 18 people were interviewed: 4 HEAL Africa staff, 8 facilitators, 3 focal points/teachers and 3 from the Technical Advisory Group. In Brazil, 3 members of staff, 3 representatives from NIAP were interviewed in person. 2 facilitators were unavailable during the site visit to Instituto Promundo and were interviewed via Skype. [Interview Data Collection tool in Annex 5 this report]

**Guided Discussions:** This methodology involved prompted and stimulus-driven conversations and reflective exercises with indirect beneficiaries representing three different groups; community members, community leaders and parents. This methodology was carried out with HEAL Africa stakeholders - 8 parents of beneficiaries in Sake. However, owing to significant challenges in the Rio de Janeiro context including socio-political issues relating to discussing the program external to the school context this method was not deemed feasible without risking potential harm to relationships.
between schools and community members (further details of this limitation are discussed in the findings section of this report). [Guided Discussion Data Collection tool in Annex 5 of this report]

Self-administered “Assessment of change” questionnaire: A short questionnaire for staff (who were not interviewed) and delivery/development partners was administered to staff/stakeholders at HEAL Africa (14 people took the survey in paper form) and Instituto Promundo (online). This tool was focused on the factors affecting program delivery. Unfortunately, despite efforts from the core team, there were no responses from stakeholders in Rio de Janeiro (all core staff were interviewed). [Assessment of Change Questionnaire Data Collection tool in Annex 5 of this report]

Focus Groups: Focus groups were carried out with participants (male and female adolescents) and teachers to reflect on their experiences in the program. The evaluators used mapping techniques to structure the conversation, ensuring the content and focus was participant-led, seeking to reduce conversation bias and to facilitate the identification and exploration of personal and social change whilst gaining insight into the ‘experience’ of participants in the absence of the feasibility of longer term observational methods. In DRC 11 girls and 16 boys from 2 schools (one in Goma, one in Sake) took part in the focus groups. (Focus Group Data Collection tool in Annex 5 of this report). In Brazil, the focus groups included 1 group with 3 teachers and 1 group with 11 participants (both boys and girls) from 1 school.

Analysis
The table on the following page depicts the methods, participation of stakeholders, analytical approach and key considerations. A color-coding system is used to denote the perceived strength of the data considering various limitations or challenges that emerged during the data collection and analysis process. The following criteria were considered- reliability, representation, usability and accuracy. Green, amber, and red signify high, medium, and low rating respectively, with justification provided relating to issues and challenges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Analytical Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Sources</strong></td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Thematic analysis of recorded conversation through the identification of the emergence and repetition of experiences, perceptions, attitudes and feelings, subsequently clustered by topic/concept and categorized by evaluation criteria and questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis using an excel database for organizing (e.g. splitting by gender of respondent) and summarizing the data (through percentage calculations). Thematic analysis (as above) of qualitative data from open questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Group Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focal Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guided Discussion</td>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Assessment Questionnaire</td>
<td>Staff; Delivery and Development Partners</td>
<td>Thematic analysis (as above)</td>
<td>Some questions regarding the rigidity of the tool were raised by the evaluator during its analysis. The Focus Group Guide that was shared with the evaluator was more similar in format to a questionnaire, raising questions on how the discussions were conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to challenges with data storage (in paper form) and management (lack of consolidation), access to the data (in particular post-test) was not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The data used to inform these reports includes the focus groups and questionnaires listed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Sources</strong></td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Thematic analysis (as above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data from pre-tests was analyzed for contextual purposes (as further analysis was not possible - see Analytical Considerations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E Report</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td>Document review to extract contextual information, themes and key data that aligned with themes emergent for comparison with both primary and secondary data sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Term and Annual Reports</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beneficiary and Common Results Report</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instituto Promundo</strong></td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Thematic analysis of recorded conversation or written narrative through the identification of the emergence and repetition of experiences, perceptions, attitudes and feelings, subsequently clustered by topic/concept and categorized by evaluation criteria and questions.</td>
<td>Issues regarding access to respondents (as described in the limitations section below) meant that there was only one focus group with teachers and one with a mixed (male and female) participant group. The profile of the group represented the wider-socio demographic aspects of the target group, however would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not be considered highly representative given the diverse settings in which the methodology was deployed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th>clustered by topic/concept and categorized by evaluation criteria and question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td>Development Delivery Partners - NIAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Diaries</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The secondary data from questionnaires was collected during 2 cycles of data collection with two separate beneficiary/teacher groups - 2016 baseline and endline 2017 baseline and endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Report</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td>Document review to extract contextual information, themes and key data that aligned with themes emergent for comparison with both primary and secondary data sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Term/Annual Report</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary and Common Results Report</td>
<td>Staff Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Description of sampling**

- **Area and population to be represented**
- **Rationale for selection**
- **Mechanics of selection limitations to sample**
- **Reference indicators and benchmarks/base line, where relevant (previous indicators, national statistics, human rights treaties, gender statistics, etc.)**

Given the evaluative nature of this research alongside other issues specific to the program context (outlined below), purposive and, to a certain extent, convenience sampling was deemed the most ethical, suitable and practical approach to yield robust, reliable and relevant data. Purposive sampling, in this case, is based on the assumption that onsite staff are key knowledge holders and thus will apply their judgment to the selection of appropriate informants (which was discussed with the onsite staff at Instituto Promundo and HEAL Africa prior to the trips). The number of participants for the focus groups was decided on as the appropriate number of participants for optimising the activities and discussions (6-10 individuals). The sample size anticipated was 4 groups of beneficiaries/site, one community group and one group of teachers/site (representing different schools). Unfortunately, in Brazil, only one group of participants and teachers was possible and no sample could be accessed from the community (as explained further in this section) making the actual sample smaller than anticipated. For data collection from staff/partners, the evaluators did not provide a fixed sample size as they were reliant on the onsite staff to provide access and identify key informants based on their experience, sensitivity to risk/restrictions and relationships built (within the time available), in fitting with the sampling approach described above. In DRC, the questionnaire was sent to any staff or partners who were identified but could not be interviewed due to availability/access/time constraints.

This approach has been undertaken for the following reasons:

**Additional Data Available:** The evaluation draws on both secondary and primary sources. An analysis of secondary sources (data collected by HEAL Africa and Instituto Promundo) provided the foundation for the development of the primary data collection plan, ensuring that priority was given to outcomes/indicators where there were gaps in the data available and to add depth where required through additional data collection. Appropriate to their M&E needs, Instituto Promundo’s data collection has been targeted towards primary and secondary beneficiaries (with the inclusion of some wider reflection from facilitators). As these participants had recently been surveyed using Instituto Promundo’s in-house data collection tools the use of focus groups was proposed as a way of generating additional qualitative data. In this context, as external researchers, the inFocus evaluation team was reliant on the school staff to authorize, invite and organize the participation of the students and teachers. As such, whilst the evaluation teams’ involvement in the sample selection would have been ideal, it was not feasible due to issues of access (further outlined below in the description of Limitations). In both contexts, in terms of gathering data targeted to respond to the other evaluation questions where there were more prevalent gaps in the secondary data (primarily as these are of a summative/formative evaluative nature), the key informants belonged to a far smaller population - team members and stakeholders who had engaged strategically with the project. In this case the primary data sources were limited and all ‘accessible’ team members within this group were interviewed and those deemed most ‘involved’ represented the strategic partnerships/stakeholder group.

**Access/ Selection limitations:** In terms of the beneficiaries (both primary and secondary), with no prior contact/relationship with the evaluation team, inviting potential informants to participate in the data collection was a task undertaken by stakeholders/partners who had already established trust/were ‘known’ to the informants. These relationships have been built over a significant amount of time and interaction. As such, it was felt that this approach was important to reduce misunderstanding of the data collection process through unfamiliarity, detachment or, even mistrust felt towards an external researcher which could have implications for the quality of the data collected.

In terms of other key informants (team members and strategic/delivery partners), as this was a relatively small group, inFocus relied on the contextual insight of the
program coordinators/stakeholders to judge who the relevant respondents would be - i.e. those who could adopt a subject-led approach on the basis of their prior knowledge and experience. The advantage of this approach is that it recognizes the knowledge and experience of key knowledge holders. Whilst the team recognizes the limitations of this approach, including the risk that certain voices may be prioritized over others presenting a possible bias, this was judged to be the most viable approach in the time available to ensure that informants possess the necessary depth of insight and experience of the project as well as ensuring a participatory approach to the evaluation.

**Sensitivities of Relationships/Participation:** In addition to the aforementioned benefits of knowledge holder led informant selection, there were issues of ethics and sensitivity to consider. In particular in the Rio de Janeiro context, where stakeholder buy-in has been a delicate and complex process (an issue which will be further elaborated in the report in the ‘Effectiveness’ findings section). The presence of an external evaluator was recognized as a potential risk and the team was highly conscious of the ethical responsibility of doing no harm to the relationships that had been carefully established over the course of the program.

**Timescale:** Finally, the sampling approach was adopted due to the timescale available for the primary data collection. Without being able to invest time in relationship building or contextual immersion this was deemed the most appropriate and practical solution. Whilst measures were planned and taken to gain as much insight into the context prior to and during the trip and to inform and reassure respondents in regard to the nature and purpose of the evaluation, reliance on those who had formed and maintained relationships on the ground was important for the aforementioned strategic and ethical considerations.

The central elements of the UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation were foundational principles for the evaluation process. Specifically, Independence, Transparency, Impartiality, Cultural Sensitivity, Integrity, Accuracy (and Credibility), Avoidance of Harm, Protection of Rights and Fair and Confidential Data Use and Storage were considered fundamental at all stages of data collection, analysis and reporting.

The following actions were taken to ensure the safety, protection, well-being and ethical treatment of the respondents:

**Ethics briefing:** To discuss practicalities and align logistics/processes for secure and confidential data collection (recording instruments, data storage, etc.). This was to ensure data was collected efficiently and securely (without loss). This briefing also included discussion on the protocol for dealing with any reports of violence which may arise during data collection, with a focus on due care. The decision was made to be led by the country teams, mirroring their policies (as long as these were understood by the evaluation team to comply with legal requirements and aligned with the inFocus ethical guidelines), addressing this issue during introductory meetings on site to ensure that our approach would not contradict the project standard. In practice this included discussing the referral system to local support in the case that this was necessary (there were no referrals necessary during the evaluation). Finally, the team was briefed on the use of consent forms and verbal introductions to ensure confidentiality and informed consent and participation.

**Use of consent forms:** All data collection was preceded with the issuing and signing of a consent form. This was presented to participants with a verbal introduction and explanation of the project. Voluntary participation was given additional emphasis to ensure all participants were aware that they were under no obligation to participate. Prior to going into the field, the translated versions of the consent forms were presented to the delivery teams onsite to check its contextual appropriateness.
### Data protection standards and regulations:
The evaluation team reviewed current legislation and best practice regarding data protection and security for application during all stages of data collection. These included informed consent prior to the data collection including the clear explanation of the nature and format of third party disclosure (reported anonymously); ensuring the fundamental rights and freedoms of respondents including their right to privacy and well-being during each stage of the data collection; the fair and accurate analysis and usage of the data to maintain its integrity; the structured organizing and filing of the data once collected as well as restricted access of the data to the evaluation team during its analysis and storage.

### Limitations of the evaluation methodology used

**Time scale:** The evaluation was based on a combination of secondary and primary data, which was obtained over a short time period (one data collection trip of 5 days per delivery site). The primary data collection allows the evaluation team to ‘go deeper’ into some of the themes which emerge from the review of secondary sources. However, the data was collected in a single trip during which the evaluation team had limited time available to understand and experience the key aspects of the program. With more time available the evaluation team could have adopted a more in-depth and immersive methodology (involving qualitative methods such as ethnographic observation) that would allow for greater immersion and subsequently facilitate a more comprehensive and informed understanding overall. The methodology was designed for efficiency and efficacy given the time parameters and to enable the team to assess the performance and implementation of each program against the evaluation criteria despite the timescale.

**Access to participants:** Owing to time and resource constraints as well as contextual challenges the number of individuals engaged, the primary research was limited. Whilst the Evaluation Team endeavored to select the most appropriate sampling method for the context and purpose of the data collection, it is important to note that the experiences, opinions and contexts of the respondents may not be representative of the wider group they represent.

Specific to the Rio de Janeiro context, community members were deemed inaccessible according to Instituto Promundo’s own data collectors due to socio-political challenges around the issues the project seeks to address. Speaking to parents and other community stakeholders was considered to be a potential threat by the school leadership owing to the aforementioned sensitivities of the issues. As such there was a perceived risk to the relationships between the school and parents in having these discussions. Therefore was not possible also for the external evaluation team to approach these stakeholders.

**Bias:** The final limitation can be attributed to the social and cultural situation of the adolescents, educational staff, internal staff and wider stakeholders. The tendency towards social desirability response bias is commonplace to the ‘beneficiary’ context. This refers to a tendency to respond to questions in a way that paints the respondent in a positive light, especially when responding to questions about their own behaviors, thoughts, feelings or attitudes. Both instances of Social Desirability bias – MRT (Moralistic Response Tendencies), where the response is influenced by the moral norms and tendencies of the individual's context and ERT (Egoistic Response Tendencies), where the response is influenced by the individual’s desire to induce or trigger a positive judgment of themselves and their relationships - are possible within this context. This risk was mitigated through careful tool and process design and was taken into account when analyzing data and drawing conclusions.
9. Findings per Evaluation Question

9.1 Effectiveness Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question 1: To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Goal: To attain greater gender equality and freedom from violence for the adolescent girls who participate in the project in school intervention sites – especially those previously exposed to violence – by 2018 in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) and in Goma and Sake City (DRC)**

### Key Findings: HEAL Africa

- **Increased experience of gender equality in the home**
  - Improved communication skills resulting in improved relationships with family members.
  - There was evidence that girls have more opportunities to play active roles at school.

### Key Findings: Instituto Promundo

- **Overall, girls experienced greater gender equality within peer groups who participated in the program**
- **The extent to which the adolescent girls experience gender equality within the wider school context was inconclusive.**
- **There were enduring experiences of gender inequality and violence beyond the school intervention sites.**

### Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

**Increased experience of gender equality in the home:**

In all the focus groups and interviews conducted there was significant focus on the positive impact of the project on the relationships with families and the improved communication skills of the students. One of the respondents provided an example of a girl who could not talk with her mother before the sessions started. The mother reported, during the 11th session, that the girl is now talking to her about the problems and plans that she has for her future. The mother was extremely happy and grateful to the project for this transformation in her child. Another example was of a girl whose parents were separated and about to divorce, it was reported that they were not able to speak and listen to each other without quarrel and insults. The girl used some of the exercises conducted during sessions to talk with her parents to help them communicate and the girl felt that this was a factor in her parents deciding not to divorce and to continue to live together.

One of the facilitators said that, *“there was a significant positive change in the relationships of the students and their families. The sessions didn’t only change students perception about themselves, gender roles etc. but also served as relational therapy for them”*. Many girls highlighted the self-confidence that they have gained during the sessions (for more on this issue see outcome 1 examples) and how now they feel that they can contribute to conversations at home, to making decisions and finding solutions.

**The girls have more opportunities to play active roles at school:**

There was some evidence to suggest that the program changed the way some of the school personnel are viewing girls and their capacities. Apparently before the project started not only were girls exposed to violence and sexual harassment by teachers but they could not play a leading role in the school, such as being a class president. This has changed as during the project sessions girls started showing interest in leadership and were permitted to take on the role of school president. This was mentioned in one of the discussions with girls and also confirmed by the project staff, although there is no confirmation whether these opportunities are now open to girls in all targeted schools.

### Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo
Overall, girls experienced greater gender equality within peer groups who participated in the program: According to secondary data from the questionnaire, the most significant change in experience of violence was in verbal and psychological violence. In 2017, there was a 28% decrease in female participants reporting that they had been insulted or humiliated in the last three months and a 36.7% decrease in the experience of verbal and psychological violence amongst male participants.

There was evidence to suggest that female participants experienced greater gender equality within the program sessions and amongst their peers who participated in the program (compared with their experience outside of the project). For instance one field diary gave the example of a male participant self-checking/apologizing when using derogatory terms to describe women. This is in contrast to the experiences beyond the program (described below in this section).

The extent to which the adolescent girls experience gender equality within the wider school context was inconclusive: Whilst there was some suggestion from key informants that the project impact was not effectively disseminated beyond those directly reached by the program, it was suggested, through anecdotal evidence, that the school was becoming less violent through:

- Increased dialogue between teachers and students
- Decreased retaliation (responding to violence with violence)
- Greater empathy and understanding of girls’ and boys’ behavior on the part of the teachers

However, there were contrasting reports from both teachers and students that female experience of gender inequality continued to occur within the school (where the focus groups took place), reported to be perpetuated by those who had not participated in the project. One male adolescent cited a case of a male teacher who ‘befriended’ the boys but maintained a distance from the girls, to the extent of excluding them from certain activities. Teachers reported the use of sexist and homophobic language amongst staff and gave the example of a transgender girl being referred to in the masculine form by a teacher - when questioned by students, the teacher insisted that their identity was determined biologically at birth.

This finding relies solely on the primary data and as such, can only present a direction for further investigation across the wider scope of the project to see if these experiences were common to other contexts.

There were enduring experiences of gender inequality and violence beyond the intervention sites: Both primary and secondary data sources suggested the majority of female participants face ongoing, daily experiences of gender inequality in the form of exclusion, harassment and ostracism. Participants cited daily experiences of gender inequality during public transport use, where participants cited that women are excluded from social engagement through exclusively male-targeted conversation on buses and are subjected to psychological and physical harassment through being stared at or given priority in mototaxi queues because the driver seeks physical contact with the girl. This area was also considered unequal for LGBT individuals. One male participant reported he was required to pretend to be heterosexual in order to use mototaxis or cars. Interactions with the police were also cited as instances which illustrate the ongoing issue of social exclusion of girls/women, “It is always a male voice that dominates in a dialogue, for example when [names] are on the street, the policemen will speak to us...he will always speak to the man who is in the midst of the group.” However it is important to note that the community-facing outputs of the project were very limited so there was not any evident expectation that the program would have greatly impacted experiences of violence in public arenas. There were campaigns carried out in all of the schools, however only two of these were public facing, whilst in the other schools these were targeted towards parents/family of students as they were integrated into the school event calendar (for example setting up a providing information and educational materials during a parents evening). A final citation by respondents of violence in public places was a common occurrence of sexual harassment when girls were wearing their school uniforms due to a “uniform fetishism.” Teachers were aware of ongoing instances of both verbal and physical violence in this context.

According to teachers, another arena (which spans public and private) where adolescents experienced GBV was on social media, which provided an arena for bullying and gossip. They emphasized that the name-calling was often targeted at LGBT individuals and that girls were more targeted with comments related to their appearance. (Wider study would be required to understand the extent of this situation in other schools)

Outcome 1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in the project improve their attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality and nonviolence in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.
Key Findings: HEAL Africa

Improved perception of each other boys towards girls and vice versa but in particular of women and girls’ sociocultural status and capacities.

Improved self-confidence: there was evidence from the focus groups on adolescents changing the way they thought about themselves, about their ability to gain control over and improve their lives. This was a prominent response from the girls but was also recognized by the boys, who reported being able to exercise control over/prevent their own violent reactions.

Changes in attitudes towards gender roles within the home- especially for boys who started doing some household chores.

Recognition of the benefits of non-violent approaches to resolving problem.

Key Findings: Instituto Promundo

The recognition and deconstruction of ‘norms’ regarding masculinity (for instance the assumption that masculinity is expressed through aggression) and a subsequent shift away from perpetuating these norms.

A decrease in exclusion on the basis of sexuality.

Positive changes in attitudes and perceptions related to girls’ reproductive and sexual rights.

Instances of physical (peer to peer) violence between participants were reported to have decreased through the program through a decrease in responding to violence with further violence and an increase in empathy.

Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Outcome 1)

Improved perception of each other but in particular of women and girls’ sociocultural status and capacities:
In all groups students talked about how the program changed the way they treat each other at school. It was reported that before the project the girls used to see boys as ‘troublemakers’ and ‘unworthy,’ while the boys did not consider the girls as equal. One boy explained, “Before I didn’t respect women and girls, I was considering them as things, that have little value that should serve us men- at home doing the work and as sexual partners. Now I have seen that they are people just like men and boys and that they can achieve things in their lives. That they can do everything that men can do, they can manage others and their work. I really didn’t think about women this way before, but now I think very differently.”

Improved self-confidence: There is evidence from the focus groups on adolescents changing the way they thought about themselves, about their abilities to gain control over and improve their lives. This was highly pronounced amongst the girls but also by the boys who reported being able to prevent their own violent reactions.

One of the girls said, "I have confidence in myself now. I have seen that girls can do a lot of things. Having the facilitators and talking with others girls helped me to choose my goals, to choose my friends better- those who will be good influence for me and my future." Another girl mentioned, "I used to feel limited at home, I didn’t feel I could contribute my opinions or even take part in any discussions. Now I feel that I can speak out and give my opinion, my family listen to what I want to tell them and don’t get angry with me for speaking up."

As for boys, one of them explained, "We have learned a lot during the sessions. I used to be very ‘strict’ and not flexible. If someone made me angry and I said something to him, I would never go to that person to talk to them again. Now I have learned that we need to communicate and find an understanding. I have learned how to live with the others, how to talk about my problems with others who can help me find solution. I don’t feel like I am alone in this world and have to do/solve all by myself." Another boy added, "What helped me was the relationship with facilitators and the respect and confidence that they showed us. It was great to see someone who has studied a lot to be interested in our lives and problems."

Changes in the attitudes to the gender roles around the home, especially for boys who started doing some household chores:
Multiple parents gave testimonies about boys who used to refuse to take part in any household tasks viewing them as girls’/women’s work but who now go to fetch water, clean the house, do the dishes and laundry without having to be asked. The evidence collected during focus group confirmed this with one boy stating, “I never wanted to do any work at home, for me it was my sister who had to do all because she is a girl. Now I started sweeping the floor while she is doing the dishes, etc. I don’t see this as shame anymore"
Parents talked about changes that they saw not only in their own children but also in the children of neighbors who are friends of their children and who didn’t take part in the project. Their children started sharing what they have learned about how to build good relationships with parents and family members, how to do household tasks etc. with their friends who also adapted their behavior at home.

Recognition of benefits of non-violent problem resolutions:
There is evidence that the project increased the awareness of the negative consequences of violence on the individual, their family and community and there were some examples of changed behavior amongst the youth taking part in the project who were reported to make efforts to improve the communication at home to reduce conflict. There were also reports of those who have improved their ability to control their own emotions and not use violence. A boy illustrated this during the focus group: “Before when there was a quarrel in the neighborhood people would even go and pay some military to kill someone they had a disagreement with. Now we don’t have this attitude, we don’t want more violence, we want less. We help each other not to get so angry and to control ourselves.” Another boy added, “I used to get angry and violent very easily. When someone told me something I didn’t like or even looked at me in a way I didn’t appreciate I would get angry and violent. I couldn’t control myself. Now I don’t feel the same way. I’ve learned to let go of that angry feeling and not to act on it. I have realized that violence only encourages violence and I want to stop this, I don’t want to be this way anymore.”

The community members (parents and leaders) supported the project as they see the need for it and its benefits for their children. The community leader said, “Sake is at the crossroad, there is a lot of bad things that happened and still happen here. Our children were exposed to so much violence and aggression and we didn’t know how to help them not to follow those bad examples. This project gave the children the chance to learn and to change. Now the others see their changed behaviors and they start changing too, they are affecting the others. When people from other villages hear that in Sake people start living peacefully with each other, with those from other ethnic groups and they also start thinking that in their village it would be possible too.”

Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Outcome 1)

Deconstruction of masculinity norms and subsequent dissociation of violence with masculinity:
There was recognition of the prominence of norms and expectations masculinity throughout the field diaries and focus groups. One participant observed, “Men need to resolve things. They can’t step back or they are undermining what it means to be male.” In the reports of activities, words used to describe the construction of masculinity included “strong; aggressive; brutish; insensitive; macho”.
Observing a positive change within the group (shifting away from perpetuating these norms), one facilitator noted that during a session a boy spoke openly about his romantic relationship in a way that would usually have been met with jeering, but was instead listened to by the other members of the group.

In the GEM scale one of the phrases which suggested the ‘naturalization’ of the association of violence with men was ‘Women should endure violence from her partner to keep the family together.’ Whilst the majority of boys in 2016 and 2017 disagreed with this statement, for those who didn’t there was a slight improvement in 2016 (2%) while in 2017 there was a more notable with 17% of boys demonstrating a more gender equitable view about this particular attitude (bringing the total to 97% overall).

Decrease in exclusion on the basis of sexuality:
Teachers in the focus group noted that participants of the project demonstrated ‘healthier’ attitudes regarding homosexuality. This was confirmed in the quantitative data though it also suggested that that equitable attitudes were more prominent amongst girls than boys. In 2016 and 2017 there were differences between the responses of boys and girls to the statement ‘I would never have a gay or lesbian friend.’ In 2016 4% of boys and 5% of girls showed an improvement in equitable attitudes through disagreeing with this statement (total of 55% and 85% respectively in the post results). In 2017, with both 10% of boys and girls experiencing a change toward more gender equitable attitudes with regard to homosexuality post-intervention (with an overall of 77% of boys and 84% of girls), demonstrating gender equitable attitudes towards homosexuality post-intervention.

Some changes in attitudes and perceptions related to girls’ reproductive and sexual Rights and intimate partner violence over the course of the program:
The GEM Scale demonstrated conflicting results over the two year period with an overall trend of a greater decrease in non-equitable attitudes related to girls/women’s reproductive and sexual rights for both girls and boys in the first year of the program whilst many of the 2017 results did not sufficiently demonstrate a clear positive change overall.
In the 2016 post intervention data there was a 10% increase in gender equitable attitudes related to consent and sexual intercourse shown through an increased disagreement with the statement ‘It is the man who decides when (and how) a couple have sex’ however the total number of boys demonstrating gender equitable attitude in this area (49%) was significantly less than girls (88%). In 2017, while there was an overall shift towards more equitable attitudes, there was an increase both in the number of respondents more or less agreeing with the statement (from 10% to 47% for boys and from 11% to 21% for girls) and a decrease in those disagreeing with the statement (from 70% to 50% for boys and from 82% to 66% for girls) suggesting that there may have been some who held equitable attitudes which turned moderately inequitable. However there was no other data to confirm this from other sources.

Although there was of a spread of responses between completely agreeing, more or less agreeing or disagreeing, there was a general trend in both 2016 and 2017 of fewer individuals completely agreeing with the statement ‘Women should be the ones to make provisions for not getting pregnant’ (10% increase in gender equitable attitudes regarding birth control amongst boys in 2016 and 3% increase in 2017; 13% increase for girls in 2016, yet there was no improvement shown in 2017 amongst girls).

The teacher’s focus group provided accounts of significant change in attitudes towards girls’ reproductive and sexual rights and the roles and responsibilities of men. One teacher explained that the norm in the school was that boys did not feel ‘obliged’ to do anything and this attitude was present in their schoolwork, peer relations and sexual relations. They expressed that the participants had drastically changed in this respect, “The students who attend the project are starkly different. Including some students who used to be sexist...they have changed a lot. It’s the issue of rights and responsibilities of men and women; in this sense there is equality. It’s something we notice, that breaks through that thing of ‘this a girl’s obligation, this is girls’ thing - this isn’t something boys have to do because it is a girls’ obligation not theirs’...and we see a reduction in this.” (teacher)

Given conflicting quantitative and qualitative accounts, the questionnaire results for 2017 which do not show clear and conclusive positive change could be attributed to a number of factors:

- The challenges with M&E and the questionnaire application (outlined in the Evaluation Methodology Section of his report and in the ‘Timeliness and Efficiency” findings section) may have lead to the forms not being responded to with due care and attention. In this case the questionnaire data from both years may not be reliable or representative.
- There may have been data processing errors.
- The development of critical thinking observed by participants, teachers and stakeholders may not imply that the critical thinking led to more gender equitable attitudes. However there is evidence to the contrary (presented in the following section), which would suggest that this contradiction in the data could be attributable to the challenges related to the implementation of the questionnaire (identified in the Methodology section of this report).

Instances of physical (peer to peer) violence between participants were reported to have decreased through the program through a decrease in responding to violence with further violence and an increase in empathy:

The qualitative data suggested an increased in empathy and non-violent communication amongst participants. It was reported that at the start of the program, participants believed that the only way to deal with violence was with violence (source: field diaries and session reports). However, over the course of the project, there was a growing awareness that violence could be resolved in other ways and notably during an activity focused on various instances of violence against women, participants were able to give non-violent responses.

According to interviews with Instituto Promundo staff, one of the main aims of the program was to encourage and facilitate debate amongst primary and secondary beneficiaries. In the case of the adolescents, the focus group data illustrated a recognition of their personal growth in non-violent communication, emphasizing their ability to debate more peacefully and an increase in empathy. For example, one participant said her main takeaway from the program was, “before you speak, put yourself in the place of the person who will hear you.” One of the participants also illustrated this in her statement that she learnt “how to put yourself in someone else’s shoes” and mentioned the importance of not “making people feel bad” through the way they are spoken to. This theme also included aspects of self-control, one boy, for instance, stated that his main takeaway was the importance of “thinking before acting.”
Output 1.1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in group education sessions and/or individual counseling demonstrate increased skills and knowledge on topics related to gender equality and nonviolence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students are denouncing acts of violence and taking action to prevent it; they have a feeling of solidarity with each other, access to wider community and confidence in the power of a group action.</td>
<td>An increase in recognition, reflection, critical assessment of and discourse around previously ‘normalized’ forms of violence. Increase in knowledge and ability to navigate topics related to gender equality and nonviolence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Output 1.1)

The students are denouncing acts of violence and taking action to prevent it; they have a feeling of solidarity with each other, access to wider community and confidence in the power of a group action:

In all the focus groups, the students highlighted that they joined together to initiate actions at school or community level during and beyond the sessions. They indicated that the sessions gave them courage to denounce negative things that were taking place at school but also that they gained confidence in the teachers and started believing that they would be listened to. One girl explained, "At our school a teacher asked a girl who didn’t take part in the sessions to have sex with him to pass a test, the girl talked about it to her friend who was part of the project. The girl and others who took part in the project went to talk to the focal point trained by the project and raised this issue with the school director. They asked for his involvement to stop such practices. The director thanked them for their action and asked them to always come to him. He gave a warning to the teacher who apologized to the girl and have not harassed her since.”

In all focus groups the students also mentioned that they were sharing the information with others- at school, at home and in the neighborhood. One boy said, "We have gained a lot of knowledge but without practice it is nothing, it will go away, we will forget. So we started getting together to talk to our friends in the community and to share what we have learned with others...The respect that the others show us in the community helps us to continue work for the peace.”

Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Output 1.1)

An increase in recognition, reflection, critical assessment of and discourse around previously ‘normalized’ forms of violence:
According to members of the project team who were interviewed, the project’s role was to identify violence, develop their critical consciousness to deconstruct and widen the conversation around violence as “Violence is so normalized that it is experienced without being recognized”. One example of reconceptualizing a ‘normal’ situation as one of potential violence was cited by two stakeholders interviewed. They reported that girls felt empowered being let into ‘funk dances’ in the community for free, however it was subsequently deconstructed during the sessions as a form of disempowerment - once girls were let in free, they didn’t feel they could refuse if a male in a position of power (for instance, someone holding status in a drug trafficking gang) were to ask them to engage intimately or sexually with them. (Note: evidence for changed attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality explored in the next section are relevant to this area of change if it is assumed that an identification of inequality or violence within a certain normalized attitude or behavior is a trigger for change).

Increase in knowledge and ability to navigate topics related to gender equality and nonviolence:
One female participant stated that the impact the program had on her was to obtain more “knowledge” (rather than change the knowledge she already had). The recognition of ‘increased knowledge’ through the program was a strong theme and the most prevalent in the focus group during the discussion of most significant change/takeaway from the program (followed by empathy as the second most prevalent). Others mentioned the ‘ease’ with which they could discuss issues beyond the sessions, “We [those who participated in the project] are the ones who manage to deal with everything with a sense of naturalness”. Other participants referenced an ability to speak more openly and confidently about issues of gender and sexuality with family members after participating in the project.
Notably, one of the boys in the group stated that the program completely changed the way in which he thought as well as confirming that it had introduced him to new issues, “Before the program I thought differently...it completely changed the way I think... for me the project was a great way to hear about new things, new topics.” There was a sense of recognition, on the part of adolescent participants, that their attitudes toward gender were counter cultural and add odds with society. For instance, when asked what they would change about the project, one adolescent illustrated that they sensed that the outside world was not ready for their attitudes about gender equality, “The problem with the project is us. The teacher can’t let these ‘animals’ lose into the world, because it will be problematic... for the world.”

( Participant data was only representative of one school group however the various stakeholders interviewed - including facilitators who worked across all the contexts referenced the increase in debate and discourse through the program.)

**Output 1.2 : New educational and counseling resources become available for promoting gender equality and nonviolence, adapted for use in DRC and Brazil.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program developed a creative and dynamic curriculum that covered topics important to the girls and boys.</td>
<td>The program led to new educational resources which were used during the project (and are undergoing revision for ongoing use, further discussed in the Sustainability section of this chapter).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of counseling for adolescents experiencing violence / Importance of psychosocial component:</td>
<td>Counseling resources were not made available in the Brazilian context (for reasons discussed under output 2.1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Output 1.2)**

The program developed a creative and dynamic curriculum that covered topics important to the girls and boys: There was a consensus between the girls and boys who took part in the focus group of the relevance and usefulness of the curriculum that was developed for this project and used during sessions. The students mentioned the topics related to sexual education, the importance of healthy and nonviolent relationships amongst sessions that were most important to them. One of the factors reported to facilitate delivery and engagement was the creative/dynamic activities - those listed were theatre, games, poetry and songs.

**Availability of counseling for adolescents experiencing violence / Importance of psychosocial component:** Although the issue of counseling was not raised directly in any of the focus groups, all of the exchanges with project staff, facilitators and teachers recognized the importance of the availability of the psychologists to whom they could refer the students with high levels of trauma. One respondent said, “It was very relevant for our context, we have seen students who were raped or who had seen someone of their family raped in front of them, who were obliged to rape their own sisters, other who had seen people killed and couldn't sleep or eat meat after that.” Each of the facilitators interviewed by the researcher had at least one case that they needed to refer for counseling. As such, problems linked to war related trauma were quite common. Other problems linked to family, friends and relationships were managed by the facilitators.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Output 1.2)**

Teachers in the focus group reported that the materials provided through the program had benefited their work. They referred to the extent and breadth of the material and that they had not managed to use all of it yet but had plans to do so. There was a suggestion that ‘taster sessions’ should be offered to those who had not participated as it was seen as a valuable and useful asset. This was important as forms of violence considered in the materials were identified as taboo subjects that wouldn’t otherwise be discussed. This was illustrated in a conversation during a focus group, “Sexual violence is a taboo, you don’t touch it.” Another added, “Yes, I see this too, we know many stories but inside the classroom you don’t talk about it.”

**Outcome 2: Schools where the project is implemented create more supportive environments to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.**
Key Findings: HEAL Africa

**The sessions provided girls with safe space to express themselves and discuss notions and experiences of gender equality.**

*The presence of female facilitators provided a role model for girls to aspire to.*

Key Findings: Instituto Promundo

**Facilitating the development of gender equitable spaces – both within the program sessions and amongst their peers.**

**The workshops/sessions provided a safe space for girls to express themselves and discuss notions and experiences of gender equality and violence.**

*Case studies suggested girls were able to seek and access support for specific cases through the project although there was not a high occurrence of accessing this support.*

### Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Outcome 2)

**The sessions provided girls with safe space to express themselves and discuss notions and experiences of gender equality:**

The girls in both focus groups talked about the confidence and purpose that they have gained from the sessions. They explained that through the session the girls have seen that they are aspire to other things in life other then having sex with older men to get money or things, that girls now knew their own worth and gained knowledge about how to protect themselves from violence. The safe space of the sessions with the female facilitator was used not only to learn from the manual but also to discuss everyday problems they were facing. The facilitators provided evidence (in the interview but also in the reports after sessions) that students had a lot of questions about problems with family and intimate relationships; as well as problems relating to their sexuality which they cannot ask their parents about as sexuality is considered a taboo subject between parents and children.

Analysis of the secondary data (M&E report) did raise some questions regarding gender norms within the programmatic approach. Whilst it was not possible to decipher if these represented individual views or those of HEAL Africa, there were some criticisms of girls behavior that suggested underlying gender constructions that might be considered unequal. For instance, “They did not know how to submit, ask for forgiveness, were mean and suspicious. The sessions on gender equality and the power of equality have helped them to understand that we must ask for forgiveness, that we must submit and collaborate well with others.” “Their parents (especially mothers) love them now,” they say. This is a complex issue, it merges questions of cultural norms and definitions/expectations around gender equality and raises questions about how equality was defined in the DRC program setting and whether there was an alignment with the understanding at international level (i.e. with partners). This is further considered in the recommendations section of this report.

**The presence of female facilitators provided a role model for girls to aspire to:**

In the focus group, the girls said that before the project they would seek relationship with older men so the men would give them money (boys also referenced girls engaging in this practice). The girls reported that after the session they realised it was not good for them to be dependent on short term support of older men and that they should concentrate on their studies as an investment in their future.

They have mentioned various elements in the curriculum that affected them like sessions 4 (*how are your relationships with others*) and 8 (*how to create a healthy and non-violent relationship*). One of the girls, when talking about the factors that facilitated the process of her own change said, *“the example of the female facilitators who are studying to become psychologists helped me, it is good to have a role model”.*

Having the methodology delivered by a woman was a huge added value element as they don’t meet often with professional women especially given the lack of female teachers in the school (referenced later in this section).

These examples demonstrate a significant shift in the prevalent gender norms in DRC that girls can’t be independent and that they are dependent on men’s support. The evidence suggested that girls are now able to reject gender norms and think differently about themselves and their futures.
**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Outcome 2)**

**Facilitating the development of gender equitable spaces:**
The extent to which schools could be said to be more gender equitable varied. In one case a school introduced a dedicated “Gender and Diversity” class to their program. However, other instances listed above suggest that there were many intervening factors that determined the extent to which the school became a more gender equitable space (these factors are discussed later in this section).

However, there was evidence to suggest that, overall, the sessions and workshops created spaces where participants could experience gender equitable interactions. There was evidence that the friendship group formed through the project constituted a safe space for girls to express themselves freely and feel supported. In the focus groups, the girls referred to the ‘bond’ that had formed between them and the ‘effortlessness’ with which they could discuss issues. A boy referred to the group as a “free family,” whilst a girl cited “companionship” as one of her key takeaways from the program and a boy emphasized his recognition of the “union” the group had.

There were specific accounts of girls feeling confident and empowered to express themselves openly through activities in the project. The sessions appeared to provide a sense of safety and retreat for participants - in a field diary, one of the facilitators recorded a participant saying, “Do you know why we like you? Because you give us love that we don’t have at school or at home”. There was evidence to suggest that the spaces facilitated openness and trust such as the example (in the field diaries) of participants opening up about their sexual identity to the group who were previously unaware. In the focus group with participants one of the girls identified “being more open with everything” as the main impact of the program.

Case studies suggested girls were able to seek and access support for specific cases through the project although there was not a high occurrence of accessing this support:
There was one reported case of a participant speaking to one of the facilitators about the physical, psychological and verbal violence she had suffered from her intimate partner. The project staff followed the case through and provided support and referral. However Instituto Promundo Staff made clear that this was not one of the primary aims of the project as they recognized they did not have the appropriate capacity or the resources to deal with offer intervention or counseling to the necessary extent.

**Output 2.1: Schools where the project is implemented adopt a resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated action plan for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was an absence of formal prevention and response to violence within the schools</td>
<td>There was an absence of formal prevention and response to violence within the schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Output 2.1)**

**There was an absence of formal prevention and response to violence within the schools:**
Although there are various organizations implementing response and prevention projects in North Kivu it seems that there is absence of longer-term projects run at schools. Technical partners and school teachers interviewed identified some short-term awareness raising activities conducted at schools by other organizations but had no knowledge of initiatives that would engage students over a number of months in the way this project had.

All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the project had many positive effects and had seen its benefits on prevention and response to violence. HEAL Africa staff reported that during this pilot phase of the project their main focus was on testing if the project methodology worked and was adequate to the DRC context as well as on creating a base for expansion of the project and formalising the tested tools, guidelines and policies. The formalization process would be facilitated by the representatives of Ministry of Education and Ministry of Gender, with who the HEAL Africa team has built a very close professional relationship over the course of this project.
**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Output 2.1)**

*There was an absence of formal prevention and response to violence within the schools:*

Only one school was formally carrying out other activities (outside of the project) related to violence prevention (led by an external organization). The overall consensus from informants was that there was an absence of formal prevention and response within the schools.

Instituto Promundo staff expressed that the Youth Living Peace Project was not a direct response mechanism but instead was working indirectly to build safer, more equitable spaces for young people. An email address was set up for support/reporting, however there were no reports from the staff team of its use from the data collection.

One of the activities included mapping services with participants to raise their awareness of response services available and the project team met with different stakeholders to discuss the notification and protection services. However, the project did not offer direct response as it was not their focus. Furthermore, it was reported by the team that creating notification systems, psychological support or any other response system, inside public schools if that is not an initiative of the public child protection services would be illegal.

As such there was not a focus on particular school-based/initiated prevention policies and response mechanisms present in the data collected.

**Output 2.2: School staff where the project is implemented have knowledge of their schools’ resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated skills for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of teachers’ perception of girls abilities.</td>
<td>As mentioned above, there was not a focus on particular school-based/initiated prevention policies and response mechanisms, however teachers were engaged in awareness raising activities and there was evidence that they were aware of external response systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Output 2.2)**

*Change of teachers’ perception of girl’s abilities:*

The teachers interviewed all recognized positive changes in individual students’ attitudes and behavior and even in their school performance after joining the project. The teachers changed their perception of girls’ abilities, allowing those who showed interest in leadership to run for the position of class president. They also indicated that this pilot phase created a need for such programming amongst students that could not take part due to limited scope of the project.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Output 2.2)**

All teachers who responded to the questionnaire had heard of ECA (the Brazilian Child and Adolescent Rights act) and the Conselho Tutelar (Child Protection Services) prior to the intervention.

**Output 2.3: Key secondary beneficiaries (which can include school staff, students, parents and guardians, and community members) in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC have knowledge of reporting mechanisms for adolescent girls and boys who have been exposed to violence, and report a greater willingness to intervene.**
### Key Findings: HEAL Africa

| Participants had an awareness of and access to support services. |
| Stakeholder recognise the benefits of psychosocial programing. |

### Key Findings: Instituto Promundo

| There was some indication of a greater willingness amongst teachers to intervene |

### Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Output 2.3)

**Participants had an awareness of and access to support services:** According to HEAL Africa’s analysis of their data (collected via the satisfaction survey and reported in 2016), at the end of the first cycle, a majority of participants attending the group sessions expressed that they were able to identify and seek support in the event of violence or abuse of power. However, the instances amongst boys was significantly higher than among girls (71% and 51% respectively). The data for the post tests for 2017 was not available in order to track further progress.

The review of secondary data indicates that 26 adolescents who were part of the project (the proportions of male/female adolescents was not mentioned) received individual counseling based on the cognitive and behavioral approach that integrates the systemic family approach (from annual project reports for 2016) and that a further 15 girls benefited from trauma counseling in 2017 (from Common Result Reporting for 2017). In the interview with the project supervisor (who is also one of the psychologists providing individual counseling), he confirmed that 28 adolescents who took part in the project (16 boys and 12 girls) had been referred to him by the facilitators. The girls and boys benefited from 3 to 10 weeks of therapy as a result of the referral to counseling.

**Stakeholder recognize the benefits of psychosocial programing:** Although none of the students or parents referred to the session as therapy, the examples of how the project changed them, how it made them feel differently about themselves, their lives, their future and about what is happening around them indicate a strong therapeutic effect. The representative of Ministry of Education was more outspoken and praised the project, saying, “People in the community have seen that psychological trauma can be cured by activities like this session, this increased their support and the way they encouraged the children and also how they started changing their behavior.”

### Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Output 2.3)

There was data to suggest an increase in appropriate responses to violence. Whilst the pre tests demonstrated that the majority of teachers (88,24%) would report a case of abuse to the appropriate external bodies (child protection unit/social services), it is notable that this rose to 100% at post test.

**Output 2.4: Key stakeholders in education policy (in schools, government and civil society organizations) are aware of successful programming directions and policies to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.**

| Stakeholders in DRC asserted increase in understanding and recognition of the positive effects of this program. |
| Stakeholders affirmed that project filled a gap in provision and conceptualization of programming directions to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in the implementation sites in Brazil. |

### Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa (for Output 2.4)

All respondents mentioned the high need for sessions like this project in DRC and advocated for continuation with other students at their schools, with students at other schools, including those much younger or older- at University as well as with those out of school.
The partner from Ministry of Gender said that the children have seen so much violence that it became normalized, “The NK province experienced war during over 20 years. This armed conflict affected the community in general and lots of families. The violence became very common, so to kill someone, to rape a women it became trivial. This project came to respond to the need so the youth could take charge of breaking the cycle of violence.”

Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo (For Output 2.4)

The needs assessment demonstrated that teachers were overstretched and did not feel equipped or resourced to deal with the issue of violence though it was recognized as an issue.

According to a NIAP representative, the program catalyzed the treatment of the issue of GBV at an institutional level. They explained that violence was treated ‘anecdotally’ with a lack of conceptualization. As such, when Instituto Promundo proposed the project they were ready to work with a partner who could help them and reported having identified a ‘synthesis’ with Instituto Promundo on this.
Conclusions for evaluation question 1: To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?

Goal: To attain greater gender equality and freedom from violence for the adolescent girls who participate in the project in school intervention sites – especially those previously exposed to violence – by 2018 in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) and in Goma and Sake City (DRC)

Girls in both contexts experienced greater gender equality and freedom from violence, though to varying extents. In both contexts, this occurred within the delivery setting, in the DRC in the wider context of the school and in Brazil amongst peers who participated in the program. In the DRC, girls experienced this change at goal level beyond the school setting of the program. Specifically, the home was identified as an arena for improved gender equity and relationships between family members.

Outcome 1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in the project improve their attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality and nonviolence in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.

More equitable attitudes and behaviours were noted amongst participants in both contexts, this included a more equitable view of the sociocultural status, norms and rights of women and men (through a deconstruction of masculinity norms). An increase in employing non-violent approaches to problem resolution was common to both programs. In both delivery contexts there was evidence for participants’ increased knowledge, awareness, articulation and confidence in the discussion, debate and advocacy of gender equality and issues of GBV. In the DRC there were clear reports of students denouncing acts of violence and taking action to prevent it, which was catalysed through a feeling of solidarity with each other, access to wider community and confidence in the power of a group action. In Brazil, there was an increase in recognition, reflection, critical assessment of and discourse around previously ‘normalized’ forms of violence and improved ability to navigate topics related to gender equality and nonviolence.

Outcome 2: Schools where the project is implemented create more supportive environments to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.

There was a strong case for the project’s positive contribution to the primary beneficiaries’ experience of gender equality and their ability to express themselves safely and seek support (notably through access to counseling and legal support in the DRC context). Schools were reported to be more gender equitable spaces to varying degrees. In the DRC context, girls were granted more equal opportunities and status, in the Brazil context, though changes in attitudes amongst educational staff and the formation of peer groups as a result of the project who advocated for greater gender equality, this only represented the partial fulfillment of the outcome as there was a lack of formal response system to deal with violence was noted in both delivery contexts. However teachers were engaged in awareness raising activities and there was evidence that they were aware of external response systems. Both projects successfully
**Beneficiary Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary Group</th>
<th>Total numbers of beneficiaries reached&lt;sup&gt;xvii&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the project goal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEAL Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous women/ from ethnic groups</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, bisexual, transgender</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women and girls in general</strong></td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Beneficiary Total</td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based groups/members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Professionals (i.e. teachers/educators)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Faith Based Organizations</td>
<td>Number of individuals reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Officials (i.e. decision makers, policy implementers)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and/or boys</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Welfare workers</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed personnel (i.e. police, military, peacekeeping)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of adolescents</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Beneficiary Total</td>
<td><strong>5221</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**evaluation Question 2:** To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?

**Key Findings:**

**HEAL Africa**

The following positive changes in the lives of adolescent boys and girls were evidenced in the data:

- Increased knowledge and awareness of issues relating to gender and the ability to articulate, debate and advocate for them

**Instituto Promundo**

Given the effectiveness in the areas discussed in evaluation question 1 of this criteria, the following were identified as associated positive changes in the lives of adolescent boys and girls:
A decrease in the escalation of violence (and increase in non-violent communication)
- An increase in self-confidence and well-being of girls and boys
- An increase in understanding and recognizing the positive effects of therapy on traumatized individuals

Increased knowledge and awareness of issues relating to gender and the ability to articulate, debate and advocate for them

And in the lives of men and women:
- Changes in attitudes, awareness and behaviors amongst educational staff related to their critical deconstruction and conceptualization of gender

### Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

**Increased knowledge and awareness of issues relating to gender and the ability to articulate, debate and advocate for them:**

There was strong evidence of knowledge and awareness gained through this project. All the girls and boys taking part in the focus group discussions stated that they have learned a lot during the sessions. Respondents cited a variety of areas including knowledge on topics that they have little opportunity to learn about elsewhere. The sessions on changes in girls'/boys' bodies and sexual education were mentioned by multiple students as important because this is not a subject that is discussed at school or home. The students felt that they had learned a lot about their own body and the body of the opposite sex and this knowledge was useful for them and friends who they could share the knowledge with.

Multiple students across the focus groups mentioned the content of sessions 4 (how are your relationships with others) and 8 (how to create a healthy and non-violent relationship). There were many testimonies linked to how the sessions helped students to improve their relationship with families, peers and others in the community. This included the example of students changing their approach to sex, specifically no longer looking for short-term sexual partners who they would pay or by whom they would be paid. The notions of consent, mutual responsibility, equality and protection from session 8 seemed to be very new but very important for many students who said it was this session that helped them most to change.

There is also evidence that participants felt a strong need to spread the message either in one-to-one interactions with peers or in more organized fashion to promote group awareness raising at schools and communities. Students mentioned that having knowledge on issues that are not widely known and discussed, they felt responsible to share with others so they “don’t stay ignorant”. In most of the schools students continued to meet informally after the cycle ended in order to stay connected and strong in sustaining the change in their attitude and behavior but also to try to apply what they have learned in practice.

This notion of sharing of knowledge and skills gained was confirmed by the community members. Parents talked about changes they saw not only in their own children but also in the children of neighbors who are friends of their children and who didn’t take part in the project, “Our children started sharing what they have learned about how to build good relationships with parents and family members, how to do household tasks etc. with their friends who also adapted their behaviors at home.”

There was also an unintended positive effect of the project on general school performance of the participating girls and boys. Parents talked about children who improved their school performance since they started to take part in the sessions. This was also mentioned by the teachers, who also pointed out to the therapeutic role that the sessions played for the students involved (see below).

**A decrease in the escalation of violence (and increase in non-violent communication):**

There is some evidence of a decrease of violence used by the teachers at schools. There were a few examples of denunciation of violence that was taking place at school and advocacy for action by the school director. The students indicated that the position of girls at schools has changed for the better since the project started. Girls felt that they were respected more by teachers and peers, they were given the possibility to try to become class president and in some instances won. However HEAL Africa’s evaluation of their own data collection (in the 2017 report) found that there were still enduring reports of marginalization in schools, although significant progress appears to have been made.
There was strong evidence that the project helped students to increase non-violent communication and problem solving. There were examples mentioned in the sections above of girls and boys who developed self-control regarding their emotions and anger (to not revert to violence). Many indicted how the project group served as support, "We help each other not to get so angry and to control ourselves".

An increase in self-confidence and well-being of girls and boys:
Testimonies provided by the students, parents, facilitators and teachers showed that the project sessions had a significant impact on students’ confidence in their own ability to “achieve something in life” to take control over their future and the feeling of well-being associated with that confidence. As one of the girls said, “I have confidence in myself now. I have seen that girls can do a lot of things ...” or “I used to feel limited at home, I didn't feel I could contribute my opinions or even take part in any discussions. Now I feel that I can speak out ...” The facilitators provided evidence of parents who approached them to thank them and the project for transforming their child into someone who communicates with the family, now have plans for the future and is making efforts to carry them out.

An increase in understanding and recognition of the positive effects of therapy on traumatized individuals:
Although none of the students or parents referred to the session as therapy, the examples of how the project changed them, how it made them feel differently about themselves, their lives, their future and about what is happening around them indicate a strong therapeutic effect. All respondents mentioned the high need for sessions like this in DRC and advocated for continuation with other students at their schools, with students at other schools, including those much younger or older - at University as well as with those out of school.

Partners of the project like those from the Ministry of Education were more outspoken. The partner from Ministry of Gender said that the children have seen so much violence that it became normalized, “The NK province experienced war during over 20 years. This armed conflict affected the community in general and lots of families. The violence became very common, so to kill someone, to rape a woman it became trivial. This project came to respond to the need so the youth could take charge of breaking the cycle of violence.”

Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo

Increased knowledge and awareness of issues relating to gender and increased confidence and ability to articulate, debate and advocate for them:
One of the most frequently cited aims of the program (by staff in the informant interviews) was to activate, open up, facilitate and strengthen the debate on issues of gender.

The data showed that participants were both equipped with knowledge and the skills to successfully participate in this debate. In the youth focus group widening their “knowledge” was cited by two of the participants as their main takeaway from the program, whilst another cited “wisdom.”

During the teacher focus groups, informants attested that there was a clear difference in the knowledge and understanding of gender issues amongst participants. As one stated, “The students who participate in the project are of a very different mind...it’s startling in the classroom when you bring up one of these issues, the way they conceptualize it, they have a certain ease in stating their case, in defending the issue. It’s impressive.” They added, “In the classroom they become a voice which is able to assert itself... sometimes it is hard to know how to assert yourself, not fighting, arguing, lowering the tone of the conversation, but rather having a theoretical discussion. It’s really interesting.”

There was evidence of the potential widening of these debates. For instance, during a campaign activity when a woman wouldn’t receive a condom because of fear of repercussion at home (mentioning that her husband would deem it suspicious) the (female) student replied that marriage and condom use were not mutually exclusive and explained to the woman that it was important that she protect herself.

There was also some evidence to suggest that girls felt more empowered to discuss issues of gender and sexuality at home. For instance, female students from one of the schools reported that they had started discussing their sexuality with their parents. This was seen firstly as indicating more open expression in the home environment and secondly as an indicator of the project as a safe space for girls to discuss how they were expressing themselves. However, as detailed in the next section, there were examples of girls facing a hostile environment in the home in response.
Conclusions, evaluation question 3: To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) women and girls, and boys and men in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those women and/or girls, and men and/or boys?

In both delivery contexts, the positive changes in the lives of boys and girls included increased knowledge, awareness, articulation and (most notably in the DRC context) confidence in the discussion, debate and advocacy of gender equality and issues of GBV (in particular VAWG). The evidence pointed to a decrease in the escalation of violence with participants of the program demonstrating an ability to exercise non-violent communication and conflict resolution. In the DRC, the participants benefited with increased personal well-being attributed to the therapeutic approach which, through recognition of its efficacy has potential to benefit other actors in this arena to have wider social impact for those who have suffered GBV. In the Brazil context, teachers were also beneficiaries of the program in terms of their own development of knowledge and awareness and their increased access to resources and materials to enable and empower them to integrate the focal issues covered by the project into their everyday delivery of educational materials and lessons.
Evaluation Question 4: What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?

### Key Findings: HEAL Africa

**Internal Strengths**
- The facilitators as motivators and role models
- The creative and dynamic aspect of the methodology
- Multiple-response facilities which allowed a more holistic response

**Internal Challenges**
- Publicity and Visibility of the project
- Lack of female focal points
- Lack of systems to evaluate the work of focal points (teachers)

**Positive External Factors**
- Support from parents, community and peers
- School environment

**External Challenges**
- Lack of support from wider family
- Socio-economic and socio-political issues
- Socio-cultural and Ideological issues

### Key Findings: Instituto Promundo

**Internal Strengths**
- Expertise and relevant background of facilitators
- Multidisciplinary and participatory construction of the materials

**Internal Challenges**
- Relationships with teachers/buy in

**External Challenges**
- Socio-economic and Socio-Political Context
- The stigma of violence - schools not wanting to be identified as sites of violence
- Non-voluntary participation/forced Participation of participants
- Enduring violence/contradictory messaging from parents

### Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

**The facilitators as motivators and role models:**
During interviews, key informants highlighted that in schools where active and motivated facilitators were selected, the program delivery was more effective. Facilitators were also viewed as role models, as one female student in the focus group expressed, “The example of the facilitators who are studying to become psychologists, it helped to have a role model.” In all focus groups, the children mentioned the facilitators and how they impacted them. One of the boys said, “What helped me was the relationship with facilitators and the respect and confidence that they showed us. It was great to see someone who has studied a lot to be interested in our lives and problems.”

**The creative and dynamic aspect of the methodology:**
One of the factors reported to facilitate delivery and engagement was the creative/dynamic activities - those listed were theatre, games, poetry and songs.

**Multiple-response facilities which allowed a more holistic response:**
Staff and stakeholders reported that fact that HEAL Africa runs a hospital where medical, psychological and legal services are available for survivors of sexual violence facilitated the referrals for counseling, medical and legal services when they were needed. The medical and legal services were funded by another GBV project that HEAL Africa is implementing in Goma. The follow up of the referred students was well streamlined as the assistance was provided within the same organization.

**Internal Challenges**

**Publicity and Visibility of the Project:**
The self-administered “assessment of change” questionnaire with facilitators and key partners also revealed that staff faced challenges with promoting the program and making sure it was visible for participants.

**Lack of female focal points:**
Facilitators reported that there were schools with no female teachers, meaning there were no female focal points there, which made it harder for girls to approach and open up to focal points about sensitive subjects.
Lack of systems to evaluate the work of focal points (teachers):
There were reports from the facilitators that some focal points didn’t play their role in the correct way and by their behaviors jeopardized the positive implementation of the project. Although it was reported that the examples were rare and most of the focal points were very beneficial to the project, there were some who continued to use physical violence at school throughout the project and had little consideration for comments from the director or who referred to the students taking part in the project as “traumatized,” stigmatizing them. The staff of the project recognized that the lack of system to evaluate the work of the focal point and possibility to replace them on the basis of low performance as well as the limited amount of training they have received should be revised in the next phase of the project.

Positive External Factors
Support from family and community and peers:
The majority of questionnaire respondents identified the parents’ attitudes and behavior as having a positive influence on the implementation of the program (with only one disagreement). Specifically, respondents identified that the parents’ approval and interest encouraged their children to join activities and to engage more fully. However, data from interviews suggested that this was not the case in all areas and was influenced by parents’ experience of war, violence and difficulties. The data revealed that parental understanding and support for the program highly facilitated delivery in places like Sake or the outskirts of Goma where the population had experienced more violence. In these locations, they were more supportive of the project and more involved than those in the center of Goma who didn’t have the same direct experience of war, displacement and poverty.

The support (and approval) for the project at community level was understood to be a key factor in encouraging students and their ongoing participation within the program. A female student identified, “The encouragement that we have seen in the communities” as beneficial and explained, “It really helped to change my behavior, when I saw that the community members were happy with it.” Traditionally it is the youth who are required to show respect to those around them and the fact that they are seeing respect for their own actions was a new but very important feeling that the students embraced. Community institutions and their consistency with the project messaging was also identified by a male participant in the focus group, “The things we have learned during sessions are very similar to what I am learning at my church - the non-violence, respect. It was very helpful to see the messages were very similar, it helped me to accept it.”

Evidence for strong community support was also presented in the guided discussions with community members, one of whom said, “Sake is at a crossroads there’s a lot of bad things that happened and still happen here. Our children were exposed to much violence and aggression and we don’t know how to help them not follow those bad examples. The project gave the children the chance to learn and change. Now others see their changed behavior and they start changing too - they are affecting the others. When people from other villages hear that in Sake people start living peacefully with each other, with those from other ethnic groups, they start thinking that in their village it would be possible too.”

Peers appeared to play an important role in the continuation of the project outcomes. This was evidenced in the questionnaire where the exchange of experiences between boys and girls was cited as positively influencing the program

School Environment:
Respondents of the questionnaire identified the school environment as a positive factor in the delivery of the project (12 respondents, or 92%, as a positive influence). They identified that it provided a ‘calm’ and ‘fresh’ climate/environment and contributed to implementation, as it was already where activities for the young people took place. The findings from the questionnaire suggested that, the integration of the concept of violence into different classes was a positive factor and for the most part attitudes and behaviors of staff within the school also helped facilitate the delivery and impact of the program, with 9/69% agreeing that they had a positive influence. However there were a few conflicting reports that some staff members negatively affected the program through “marginalizing the students with lower intelligence.”

External Challenges
Lack of support from wider family:
Whilst parents were identified as having an overall positive contributions, the questionnaire results suggested that wider family members’ support not always beneficial - 5/45% of respondents identified this group as having a positive influence whilst 3/27% disagreed, stating they had experience of family members negative influencing the program. Finally 3/27% stated that they had no influence. Those who cited that wider family members had negatively influenced the program implementation gave examples of lack of consideration towards the children and conflicts within the families. There was a further example of this cited during a focus group in Goma when a male student stated that, “the reaction of some family members and friends when they see me do household tasks. It was not easy to continue when they were making fun of me but I received support from others in the group and managed to not pay attention from those who were trying to
stop me from changing. When they saw that their comments don’t have any affect on me and what I do they have stopped now.”. This also reinforces the above notion that peer support was a key facilitating factor in maintaining the project’s goals and outcomes.

There were reports that some students had to drop out because parents didn’t like them spending long intervals at school after classes. However in most cases they managed to talk to parents and convince them to let their children attend.

There were also reports of enduring norms around responses to sexual violence. For instance, according to HEAL Africa’s interviews with female participants, 66% reported that a girl who get pregnant is immediately sent to the father of the baby, even in cases of rape.

**Socio-economic and socio political issues:**
There were reports from staff and facilitators that socio-economic and economic factors negatively impacted the delivery of the program and some participants’ attendance. Specifically, teachers’ strikes were reported to have obstruct the session scheduling. Participants’ attendance was also affected by delays in payment for transport and students’ lack of financial resource to pay for school (when this occurred they were sent home and couldn’t attend the sessions)

**Sociocultural and Ideological issues:**
According to program staff interviewed, some of the schools are run by religious institutions (mosques and churches). Whilst, overall, they were accepting of the project overall certain issues/topics addressed within the project were not met with full support, for instance gender equality and sexual education.
Informants also cited the wider socio-historical and socio-cultural context as obstacle to the acceptance of prioritizing gender equality due to their personal experiences of living in inequitable households. However staff observed a tendency towards accepting the need for gender equality and the importance of its application (for example, in the home or education system).

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

**Expertise and relevant background of facilitators:**
Interviews with the program staff revealed that the expertise of the facilitators was a key strength of the program. Those facilitating were from relevant academic areas of study meaning that they would be familiar with the nuances of the topic.
This was especially important as the project was being delivered in an educational setting and this was also reported to be important for teachers’ buy-in to the project.

**Multidisciplinary and participatory construction of the materials:**
According to one member of core staff, this helped the material to be both grounded academic expertise whilst practical at the same time. This also facilitated a sense of ownership of the project beyond Instituto Promundo (an aspect that will be discussed in more detail in the sustainability section). There was an associated challenge with this, which emerged in the data - as mentioned above. Instituto Promundo carefully selected the facilitators for their fit to the role, however on certain occasions, partners wanted to be present to observe the activities they had contributed to in the construction of the materials. Facilitators reported a sense of ‘awkwardness’ amongst participants in the classroom during these sessions, which they felt may have affected their experience of the session. Furthermore, key informants highlighted that whilst bringing multiple perspectives together enriched the process it also presented an obstacle at times as it was challenging to bring different perspectives and approaches together. However, this was seen as a necessary part of the process.

**Relationships with educational staff/buy in:**
At the start of the project there was evident resistance from many teachers. According to the field diaries teachers complained that they didn’t have dedicated time allocated to the sessions. One member of the team observed that there were ‘fatalistic’ attitudes and some facilitators suggested that the program was met with suspicion and teachers asked questions about how the program was being funded.
Another pertinent example of the resistance/negative attitudes towards the project was recorded by one facilitator who described an occasion when the participants were let out early and there was a group of adolescents waiting outside the school to “recruit” them for criminal activity. They called the police and whilst they waited for them to arrive some of the staff jeered them, saying, “Ah but isn’t the school marvelous? But don’t the projects work? Are you afraid?”

**External Challenges**
**Socio-Political and Socio-Economic Context:**
Politically, the issue of gender and education is controversial and there are growing tensions with increasing polarization of ideological approaches to gender and its discussion and debate in schools. (as discussed in the context section of this report). This made it difficult for leadership to embrace the project and generated fear of backlash from with parents/community around the issue. Firstly from a legal standpoint as one teacher stated, “We are not going to be able to have this conversation here, in this space for example these questions you are asking [ref. Focus group questions re gender]. We won’t be able to respond to in this space, and asking the students? Don’t even think about it” and another added “Next year you may be forbidden to develop these questions, we don’t know what tomorrow looks like” and secondly, due to ideological hegemonies and misconceptions such as with the following example of a misconception about discussing gender held by parents, “People put it into others’ heads that [discussing] issues of gender means you are obliging their child to be homosexual.” However, despite this challenge, teachers from the school where the focus group took place reported that they hadn’t had complaints but attributed this to a general absence of parents in life of the school. However a teacher mentioned that there was “a polarization in the classroom” due to religious diversity within the student group.

There were various responses to the socio-political challenges program from reports of schools not wanting to discuss gender to a teacher stating her understanding of the school as the backdrop for exploring gender and sexual identity (in the teachers focus group) and another referring to the project as a space for ‘resistance’, “I think this is a space of resistance, and it has to be, we are going to have meeting to look at a political-educational project in the face of all the politics happening in Brazil, especially in the Rio Municipality, this shall be a space for resistance” - a polarization within the education system (and not just the classroom was clear).

Other political and socio-economic factors were also attributed to an escalation in violence in communities, with key informants citing frequent strikes, political uncertainty, a reduction in police presence (particularly the Pacification Units), increased armed conflicts and prolific drug trafficking leading to increased recruitment of young people (meaning more children and young people are armed).

Rio de Janeiro has faced economic difficulty with its recent financial breakdown amidst arrests of public officials over corruption. With many public salaries paid late (including some teachers’ salaries) and a climate of fear, the schools were already seen to be overstretched and tense. Bringing in a new project was seen by some as adding to this burden. This was seen in some of the focus groups with teachers where a facilitator recounted, “One of the teachers said that they felt demotivated to deal with certain situations because they felt like they were alone, swimming against the tide.”

The stigma of violence - schools not wanting to be identified as sites of violence : This was illustrated when a teacher told the implementation team, “There are lots of schools in violent communities, you should go there.” In another case a teacher suggested that there was a wrong assumption that whilst there were students from the ‘communities’ there was no violence in the school, whilst another suggested that the violence at their school was ‘less serious.’ However this varied as other teachers expressed enthusiasm for the project and confirmed its need.

Non voluntary participation/forced participation of participants:
In some cases, the school staff had communicated to students that that the sessions were compulsory, despite requests that the voluntary nature be made clear. In some reported cases, when told they were voluntary, large numbers of students left, causing disruption. In these cases facilitators stated that they had felt they had not had sufficient opportunity to publicize or introduce the project. The fact that some felt ‘forced’ to be there was also said to have created a negative environment that was not conducive to the workshops. Furthermore, the ‘voluntary nature’ of the workshops was cited by a facilitator as an important aspect of the program, as the students were not used to having the choice to participate and this was seen as empowering.

Enduring violence/ contradictory messaging from parents:
Despite the aforementioned increased openness from female participants to express themselves in the home environment, teachers in the focus group cited examples that suggest that the levels of receptiveness were not equal to the levels of openness. There were examples cited of verbal confrontation, which included the threat of physical violence when girls challenged gender norms and roles within the home.

Overall, teachers reported prolific violence beyond the school within the homes and communities - as one teacher stated during a focus group, “The problem is so often they are treated violently, not just by the police but by everyone, by the police, criminals, those who raise them, those who live with them... the student is inside the school for 4-5 hours, the day has 24 hours right? They spend 4 hours at school and 20 in that place, 20 in the violent space where they live.”
Conclusions, evaluation question 4: What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs?

The effectiveness of the project, in both instances, was facilitated through internal strengths. The facilitators were identified as key assets in both contexts, for their motivational and inspirational role in the DRC and their background and expertise in Brazil. The materials were also considered fundamental factors in the success of the program across both delivery sites, with specific reference to their appropriateness and multidisciplinary foundation (in Brazil) and the dynamic and creative aspects of the activities (in the DRC). Challenges in both sites were related to the delivery of the materials in the school contexts, in the DRC a lack of female focal points and system for the overall evaluation of focal points’ performance was cited as a hindrance. In Brazil, the process of building relationships and buy-in from school staff was a significant obstacle; this was related to issues in scheduling and forced/non-voluntary participation, which was disruptive to the project delivery. In contrast, the school environment was considered a beneficial factor in the DRC. External support from family, community and peers was also cited as an enabling factor in this delivery context. Both delivery contexts were negatively impacted by socio-economic, ideological and socio-political factors that manifest in the school setting.

Evaluation Question 5: To what extent was the project successful in advocating for legal or policy change? If it was not successful, explain why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Although advocacy for legal and policy changes was not the focus of the activities implemented by the HEAL Africa team, the project did undertake some specific and localized advocacy with the school authorities and provincial directory of the Primary and Secondary Education (EPSP) within the Ministry of Education. The program staff was very successful in creating and maintaining a close relationship with multiple stakeholders thought the project, both those within the Technical Advisory Group of the project and other actors taking part in the Education, Health and Protection Cluster that the project staff attended regularly.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instituto Promundo delivery of the Youth Living Peace Project was not directly targeted at legal or policy change. The project was, however, successful in engaging at the local government level with potential influencers through their partnership with Interdisciplinary Centre for the Support for Schools (NIAP) within the Ministry for Education. This partnership between the NIAP and Instituto Promundo was the first of its kind.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

The localized and specific advocacy efforts covered issues such as:

- Advocacy with school authorities to allow school attendance to students even if the payment of their school fees was delayed
- Advocacy with school authorities for change of venue for the project sessions if the one provided was not appropriate
- Advocacy with Ministry of Education for the recruitment of female teachers

The regular and active participation in the coordination groups (Technical Advisory Group and the Clusters) and sharing of the project activities, its successes and challenges bolstered advocacy efforts of other partners taking place in DRC and specifically in North Kivu. During the interviews, the representative of the Ministry Of Gender (who is a member of the Technical Advisory Group) mentioned advocacy that took place for the creation and roll out of a Code of Conduct for
teachers to all the schools in North Kivu. They also said that he started advocating with the national level Ministry of Gender to introduce a curriculum like the one used by the project in the teachers’ training schools. Other stakeholders (from the National Police) highlighted the role this project played in information sharing within communities on GBV and the existing policies and legal documents (like the one on sexual violence) that are still widely unknown.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

One of the staff members highlighted the importance of the partnership with NIAP as a form of advocacy through “putting the case for debate forward,” however this process was described as highly delicate and sensitive owing to the political climate. In one of the key stakeholder interviews, a representative from Instituto Promundo highlighted the fact that NIAP had maintained the partnership during a time of political upheaval and difficulty could be seen as an ‘act of resistance’ in the face of complex political negotiation.

Interviews with NIAP representatives revealed that the project had positively impacted them at the various stages of its development. They complemented the Instituto Promundo approach to beginning with a ‘conversation’ rather than a proposal which was well received and ‘inspired’ them to grow the partnership. Beyond this there were reports from these interviews that the program had encouraged them to take a more strategic approach (in contrast to being merely responsive), and inspired them to focus on processes of ‘learning’ and ‘understanding.’ A representative confirmed that the project had helped to ‘inspire other initiatives.’

**Conclusions, Evaluation Question 5: To what extent was the project successful in advocating for legal or policy change?**

Both programs successfully engaged key stakeholders and influencers at a local level and the data pointed to enduring relationships and a recognition of the quality and benefit of both programs and the gap in provision they were providing. Whilst there were no direct outputs targeted toward policy or legal change, the impact of these relationships and their potential for future change and influence beyond the program reach and duration is significant.

9.2 **Relevance Findings**

**Evaluation Question: To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The program was understood by stakeholders as relevant for the following reasons:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The program was understood by stakeholders as relevant for the following reasons:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Gender equality and VAWG were recognized as critical social problems with deep and widespread impact on women and girls</td>
<td>▶ The thematic focus was relevant to the experiences of target beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The project addressed taboo issues, filling a gap in provision for the discussion of and exposure to new concepts</td>
<td>▶ The location and methodology were appropriate for the program context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The project appealed to young people as it considered them agents of change</td>
<td>Over the course of the project, two areas of intersectionality were discovered which are planned to be incorporated in future - race and religion. This will further increase the relevance of the material. Further</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

Gender equality and VAWG were recognized as critical social problems with deep and widespread impact on women and girls:

The thematic focus of the project - gender inequality and VAWG - was recognized as significant problems by stakeholders at all levels. In the questionnaire, 11 of the 13 respondents (85%) felt that gender inequality was ‘a big problem’ in their area, with the remaining 2 respondents (15%) identifying gender inequality as ‘a bit of a problem.’ In regard to violence against women, 11 (85%) identified that violence against girls/women was ‘a big problem’ in their area, 1 respondent (8%) identified that it was ‘a fair problem’ and only 1 respondent (8%) stated that it was ‘a bit of a problem.’

When describing the nature of the problem of gender inequality and violence, reports included examples many different forms of violence including institutional violence, structural violence, physical violence and sexual violence including rape, marginalization, isolation, neglect, exclusion/removal from school on the basis of domestic responsibilities/pregnancy, exclusion from financial resources (e.g. inheritance), the exchange of sex for employment, stigmatization of rape victims. In Sake, parents identified the project as highly relevant because of their children’s exposure to violence and their repetition of this violence in the home and community. Given the diverse and widespread experience of violence, girls in the focus group emphasized that the project was relevant not just within the school context but for those who are not at school and called for the work to be extended and more widely publicized.

The data from pre-tests confirmed the presence of non-equitable attitudes and behaviors as well as those associated with various forms of violence, amongst participants at the start of the program. For example:

- The statement “in the absence of a father a mother must consult her son for any decision” 52% of respondents strongly agreed and only 14.4% disagreed
- 74% of participants agrees that “the girl must tolerate the violence she experienced no matter what its type”
- 84.3% of participants agreed that “being raped, the girl should be kicked out of the house”
- 71% of participants (representing 48% of female participants) agreed that “when a boy gives a girl a present, she has to accept that she will have sex with the boy”

The intersection of VAWG with other issues - specifically interracial and tribal conflict, cultural/religious practice and poverty - were also cited, including armed groups in the region believing that raping women and young girls would protect them from bullets during the war and the belief that sexual intercourse with a virgin would bring good luck. Parents identified ethnic violence and the subsequent social division as a critical problem and cited the program as relevant in providing the opportunity to consider peaceful co-existence.

The project addressed taboo issues, filling a gap in provision for the discussion of and exposure to new concepts:

According to reports from focus groups, the session on changes in girls’/boys’ bodies and the one on sexual education were mentioned by multiple students as important because these are not subjects discussed at school or home and are considered taboo. The students felt that they had learned a lot about their own body and others’ bodies and this knowledge was useful for them and friends who they could share it with. The notion of consent, mutual responsibility, equality and protection seemed to be very new but very important for many students who said it was this session that helped them most to change. Facilitators noted that the project responded to the need of the adolescent to have a place to open up and discuss these issues. They also reported that participants provided feedback that they were pleased with the project because they had needed a place where they could talk to each other.

The project appealed to young people as it considered them agents of change:

In a context where young people (especially boys) were consistently identified as ‘aggressors’ (present in the data from various respondents), the project was seen to re-define the role of young people as agents for change. A boy in Goma said that the name of the project, "Vijana wa amani," was very relevant as young people wanted to be considered part of the solution and not part of the problem.

Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo
The thematic focus was relevant to the experiences of target beneficiaries:
There was clear evidence that VAWG was a problem faced by the target beneficiary group from both internal and external sources (already discussed in this report in the section on context). Violence faced by adolescents was considered by many as an urgent issue, by both staff, (“You can see how the issue of violence is so normal amongst them. Many of them speak openly about the violence they suffered on a daily basis. Maybe that’s why they aren’t able to find a way to change the realities in which they live. They all say that it’s not possible to change all this violence, they don’t believe it can actually change”) and students (“The violence on the hills is something that not even the police or the government can put a stop to. Thousands of young people have died from entering into a life of crime, but most of society doesn’t connect with this minority which lives on the hills. The upper class is not bothered with the poor, they only look after themselves and their money. The violence must stop, we have to find a solution”) (student’s fanzine exercise).

One of the stakeholder representatives confirmed the timing of the project was relevant as there had been beginnings of debates and discussions at different levels and the project marked a “bringing together of different pathways”. It was therefore seen as an approach that both complemented and advanced the discussions already underway.

However, as mentioned in the Effectiveness section, there were contradictory reports of teachers suggesting that the program was more ‘relevant’ and ‘fitting’ to schools that were considered ‘more violent.’ Nevertheless, evidence from field diaries would suggest that participants across the schools where the program was delivered were experiencing violence (even if not to the same extent) and the ‘invisibility’ of certain forms of VAWG was an important factor to consider when assessing these claims.

Furthermore, the thematic approach was customized to fit the specific needs and contexts of violence identified in the different implementation sites. For instance, one of the schools which had a lower instance of physical violence had a higher instance of teenage pregnancy, in this school the material was more focused on themes such as female sexual and reproductive rights in intimate relationships. In another school it became clear that racism was a central intersectional factor in violence and in one field diary a facilitator mentioned that it was through integrating the issue of race into the material that the sessions were ‘taken more seriously.’

Gender was described by a stakeholder as “the Hot Topic.” However, it was not an ‘active’ topic. For instance, during the needs assessment a teacher stated, “They have never participated in any initiative in the school environment centered around violence, but are keen to discuss the issue.”

The location and methodology were appropriate and strategic for the context, intervening within the school context: The needs assessment revealed the following perceptions and issues (raised by staff and students in schools) that demonstrated the need for the project within the school context and aligned with the content and approach.

Students:

- Experience of violence within the school and at the school gates
- Aggressive responses to violence (from staff)
- A belief that students are aggressors without recognition of the role of family/educators
- A lack of understanding about contraception
- A lack of recognition of violence against girls in the school
- An appetite to debate violence against women, teenage pregnancy, racism and social inequality and class

Teachers:

- A sense of ‘overwhelm’ with issues the school is not managing to deal with to the extent it would like (violence being one of them)
- An identification of key issues of violence in the family, poverty in communities, drugs and addiction
- A lack of flexibility when having to deliver the curriculum and lesson content

However, in terms of relevance, the project delivery context did present some limitations when considering the scope of VAWG reported. The home and public spaces were reported to be sites of recurring violence, therefore parents and community members were highly relevant stakeholders. Through the campaigns, the project did seek to engage these stakeholders and whilst every school had a campaign, various factors (including the participants not being able to leave the school grounds, under attendance and a decision to adopt a more integrated approach into the schools’ events, participating in pre-existing events such as parents evenings rather than running an independent campaign within the
Conclusions for Evaluation Question: To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?

In both delivery contexts, the thematic focus was seen to be highly relevant to the critical social problems faced by the target beneficiary group. The school setting was considered appropriate to the context and nature of the methodology and the program was seen to fill a gap in provision due to the ‘taboo’ nature in the DRC and the lack of resource and capacity felt by teachers to address the issue in Brazil. Furthermore, the timing of the project was deemed opportune in Brazil as it coincided with and apparently consolidated and catalyzed pre-existing debates around gender issues. The relevance of the project was felt at all participant and stakeholder levels.

Nonetheless, a stakeholder representative highlighted the appropriateness of the school context in this respect as a site of daily intersection between the individual, family and wider society.

Evaluation Question: To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?

Given that there was no data collected with past participants and the project was still underway at the time of it’s evaluation, this question has been addressed in terms of the understanding of long term change that underpinned the program design. This would be a useful next stage to test the assumptions and hypothesis of the Theory of Change.

As such, there are no key findings to add (below) at this stage in the program evaluation and the continued relevance of the achieved results can, at this stage, only be understood in the context of the program’s Theory of Change. The results achieved by the project align with the changes and preconditions for longer term change for the participants. However, given the scale of the issue it was recognized by various stakeholders that the expansion of the material (and subsequent dissemination to a wider group of participants) is a fundamental step for ensuring that results are enduring.

The program’s theory of change model presents the following pathway:

- **Learn through questioning and critical reflection about gender norms** → rehearse equitable and non-violent attitudes and behaviors in a comfortable space → internalize these new gender attitudes and norms, applying them in their own relationships and lives → Supporting institutions and structures will reinforce these gender equitable norms and messages and provide the individual and organizations involved with tools to become agents of change for gender justice and social justice.

- **Ultimately, this process will contribute to gender equity, attitude and behavior change, and the prevention of violence against women and girls.**

**Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa**

There was evidence to suggest that participants were **internalizing new gender attitudes and norms, applying them in their own relationships and lives.** In all focus groups, the students mentioned that they were sharing the information with others— at school, at home and in the neighborhood. A stakeholder also commented that the fact of being perceived as a role model enabled the participants to maintain the changes they had made.
Multiple students in all focus groups mentioned the content of the sessions related to relationship building and cited it as an important area of long term change. There were many testimonies of how the sessions helped participants to improve their relationship with sexual partners, families, peers and others in the community.

The project has been seen as responding to a significant need for a space where adolescents could gain knowledge about rights, gender equality and violence prevention, where they could discuss their problems, ways in which to protect themselves from violence and ways in which they could use the power they have to change their lives.

Whilst there were reports of changes which would suggest the long-lasting nature of the results, facilitators highlighted the issue of a lack of follow up beyond the cycle, as such, they didn’t have the means to measure or monitor this. They highlighted the personal challenges that many girls faced beyond the project cycle. In the interviews, they suggested that support groups beyond the program would be important for continuing to discuss the issues dealt with in the program and also enable greater awareness raising within the communities.

However, reports of participants creating their own groups with peers suggest that there are structures being built to maintain the changes that the participants have experienced. Furthermore, the reports on advocacy suggest that there is progression being made to build more supportive institutions and structures.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

The results outlined in the Effectiveness section suggest that participants were engaged in questioning and critical reflection and were able to rehearse equitable and non-violent behaviors during the sessions. The internalization of this was observed amongst participants in terms of their attitudes and behaviors. There was limited data to demonstrate the application of these attitudes and norms beyond the school context though some cases were presented.

The changes in attitudes and behaviors noted by teachers who participated in the program and the development of the issues at the local government level (NIAP) suggest that there are those within educational institutions who will reinforce these norms and messages, however the data suggests that there is still a prevalence of non-equitable norms within educational institutions.

As such, the project outcomes are on course to achieve the longer-term goal and as such continue to be relevant. Continued intervention within the school sites to maintain this progression is paramount to achieve the institutional change and further develop structures that can support men/boys and women/girls who have been impacted by the program. This is the next step beyond the revision of the project materials - their distribution with the objective of deeper integration and wider dissemination.

**Conclusions, Evaluation Question: To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?**

The data from both program sites suggested that, through the lens of the Promundo Theory of Change, significant progression had been made towards long-term impact. There was strong evidence that participants obtained knowledge about, critically reflected on and rehearsed equitable and non-violent norms and behaviors. There was some evidence to suggest that this had been internalized by participants and was being applied in their daily lives. However, in both cases the importance of follow-up, continued provision and the further development of more supportive spaces and institutions are considered paramount for ensuring enduring, lasting, long term impact.

**9.3 Timeliness and Efficiency Findings**

**Evaluation Question: Is the length of the program cycle (three years) sufficient to achieve the program outputs and outcomes?**
Conclusions for Evaluation Question: Is the length of the program cycle (three years) sufficient to achieve the program outputs and outcomes?

In both contexts there was evidence that the project made significant progress in achieving outputs and outcomes (see effectiveness section). However, respondents from both delivery sites expressed an appetite for continued provision to both deepen the impact with participants and broaden the extent of the impact to a wider population. In the DRC context, there was a suggestion that targeting the participants at a younger age would have facilitated greater continuity between the cycles and potentially facilitated greater impact in the timescale available. In Brazil, plans are underway for a wider distribution of the materials in order to continue access to the materials (see the ‘sustainability’ section of this chapter for further details).
Evaluation Question: What factors of the program facilitated the efficient development, delivery and impact of the program?

### Key Findings: HEAL Africa

The following factors were considered to be beneficial in facilitating the efficient delivery of the program:

- Technical Advisory Group Meetings
- The Group Therapy methodology
- Adept ‘Focal Points’ (teachers)
- Psychology students as facilitators

### Key Findings: Instituto Promundo

The following factors were considered to be beneficial in facilitating the efficient delivery of the program:

- Strong internal management systems
- The use of technology in M&E
- Regular meetings
- Commitment from stakeholders

### Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

**Technical Advisory Group Meetings:**

In the stakeholder interviews, Technical Advisory Group Meetings were identified as important for strategy and planning and also for discussing problems and challenges faced within the program.

**The Group Therapy methodology:**

Group Therapy was identified in the questionnaire as a highly efficient activity as it was understood to allow HEAL Africa to reach a maximum of people by just exchanging with a small targeted group through the subsequent experience sharing that it appeared to prompt. Respondents observed that exchange in the group appeared to prepare and motivate participants to share their experiences more widely in contrast to one on one interviews, where it was felt that information wouldn’t be shared where it is needed fast enough.

**Adept ‘Focal Points’:**

There was a group of able and willing Focal Points who were active and respected by the students. This significantly facilitated delivery, especially at the beginning of the sessions when students need to be identified and mobilized.

**Psychology students as facilitators:**

The decision to use psychology students as facilitators contributed to efficient delivery of the project. Not only there were beneficial to the communication with students and provision of the immediate psychological support described below in the knowledge generating section but also there were reports on the very high motivation of the facilitators to ensure a success of the project.

### Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo

**Strong internal management systems:**

Communication and clear division of work within the team were identified as strengths during the interviews with core staff.

**The use of technology in M&E:**

A representative of the core team reported that the use of tablets in administering questionnaires had drastically improved the efficiency of the data collection process, as well as the subsequent management and analysis of the data.

**Commitment from stakeholders and teachers:**

This process was deemed efficient by representatives of each organization and the zeal with which both sides engaged was cited by a number of informants. Teachers’ involvement in the program was voluntary. This was important due to the aforementioned buy-in issues but it could also be seen as beneficial in terms of the teachers feeling a sense of ownership of the project and the materials through their personal investment of time and capacity.
Conclusions, Evaluation question: What factors of the program facilitated the efficient development, delivery and impact of the program?

The factor identified in both contexts that facilitated the efficient development and delivery of the program was the positive engagement from delivery/development partners. In the data relating to the DRC context, this was manifested in regular steering group meetings and the commitment (and competence) of focal points, in Brazil, the benefits of teachers (who did buy into the program) engaging voluntarily and stakeholder enthusiasm on the efficient delivery were emergent from the data. Factors specific to the DRC project delivery included the use of Group Therapy to reach a wider participant group and encourage sharing beyond the sessions and the benefits of psychology students as facilitators through the rapport they built with participants and their ability to provide relevant support and expertise. In the Brazil context, strong internal management systems were cited as important in ensuring streamlined project delivery, the use of technology in data collection was also referenced, this is a promising practice given the aforementioned challenges relating to data collection with participants in the effectiveness section of the findings.

Evaluation Question: What factors obstructed the efficient development, delivery and impact of the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A number of factors were identified which obstructed the efficient delivery of the program. These were:</td>
<td>Whilst overall the program was viewed to be efficient, there was a combination of external and internal factors that did influence the efficacy of delivery at certain stages. These were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Delays in receiving funding</td>
<td>External factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Issues with scheduling misalignment with the school year</td>
<td>▶ Issues with scheduling including school closure due to Olympics, Elections and Violence, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Lack of access to materials beyond the sessions</td>
<td>▶ Insufficient facilities/resources within the schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Challenges related to M&amp;E resourcing and implementation</td>
<td>Internal factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ The quantitative data collection process with participants (pre and post questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

Delays in receiving funding/distributing funds:
In the key informant interviews respondents reported that there had been delays in the release of funds that affected some payments. Facilitators mentioned that there were also delays linked to HEAL Africa’s financial procedures, for instance money needed for purchasing materials, facilitators stipend and transportation of students was not always ready on time creating some delays (1-2 weeks at times). The HEAL Africa staff also noted that the annual financial reporting schedule of the project also created difficulties as at the beginning of a new year the funding was not available until the reports were finalized.

Issues with scheduling misalignment with the school year:
One of the facilitators noted that it had been difficult adjusting the program of the sessions to the school year. Another affirmed this and pointed out the challenges of exams and school holidays disrupting the flow of the project. They suggested
more alignment with the school scheduling, proposing that there should not be multiple cycles run during a single school year.

**Lack of access to materials beyond the sessions:**
The students did not receive the manual or notebooks, which made it hard for them to remember all the details of the sessions and to do their homework (they would do it on sheets of paper and sometimes lose it). This made it necessary to repeat some of previous sessions. The students also indicated that if they had a manual it would have been much easier for them to hold community and school awareness raising activities once they ended the sessions.

**Challenges related to M&E resourcing and implementation:**
The primary and secondary findings revealed significant issues related to the tools and resources available for monitoring and evaluation. Specifically, there were reports that the pre/post test was too long and that respondents were not filling it in correctly, for example selecting responses without considering the question (evidenced, for instance, by boys responding to questions about pregnancy). Literacy levels were probably a key factor as the students read slowly (the evaluator observed this when they were reading the consent forms before focus groups). However the main factor was the length of the questionnaire (9 pages with over 115 questions) and the context - questionnaires applied after school when they were tired and ready to go home contributing to students frustration- so it seems at least some ticked the answers without reading the question. Furthermore the processing of this data was not being carried out in a way that enabled the project to ascertain and use the results. This was attributed to a lack of human resource. A need to review and revise the M&E process was evident.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

**Issues with scheduling including school closure due to the Olympics, Elections and Violence, etc.:**
The project suffered various delays because its implementation coincided with the Olympics (where new public holidays were put in place), the elections (as the school was used as a polling station) and teacher/student absence was noted for school events such as tests. One member of the core team noted that there was pressure on schools to ‘catch up’ after these closures and this added further difficulty to scheduling.

Community level violence also impacted the sessions, one report mentioned a “climate of crossfire and conflict from the surrounding communities” and stated that there was absence at the school that might become permanent as people’s houses had been burned/destroyed during the conflict.

Another issue with scheduling was the sessions clashing with classes - for instance in one case the session was scheduled during a PE class, and in another during a math class, meaning participants were missing out on the class if they attended. There were reports from facilitators that the students were frustrated by this and that it had an impact on their participation and engagement. However, this issue was promptly dealt with by facilitators who directed the issue to the relevant school staff and rectified the situation.

**Insufficient facilities/resources within the schools:**
There were some reports in the field diaries that the spaces where the workshops were delivered were not fit-for-for purpose, for instance not having space to run an activity.

**The quantitative data collection process with participants (pre and post questionnaire):**
According to reports in field diaries, the questionnaire process was identified by facilitators as inefficient and arduous. There were reports that the students found the questionnaires too long, with one report suggesting that the application of the questionnaire took up the entirety of the session. There were cases of students struggling with the personal nature of some of the questions. During a rating activity at the end of the term, the participants complained about the questionnaire, comparing it to an exam.
Conclusions, Evaluation Question; What factors obstructed the efficient development, delivery and impact of the program?

In terms of factors that obstructed program delivery, a number of areas commonality between the delivery sites was related to implementation in schools, however the challenges manifest in different ways. In DRC, the nature of the challenge was related to strategic planning and the misalignment of the program delivery cycles with the school year. In the Brazil context, the challenges were external to the program context with scheduling issues resulting from social, political and regional events including violence in communities, elections and general closures and holidays during the Olympics. Both contexts faced challenges with resources - in the DRC this was a lack of program resources for the participants beyond the sessions, whereas in Brazil this related to the school facilities and their adequacy for program delivery (e.g. not having sufficient space).

There were issues relating to the efficiency of the data collection process cited in both cases. However, this was significantly more challenging in the DRC context where issues were reported at the collection, management and reporting phases, whereas in Brazil the only challenge cited was the dissatisfaction the participants felt with questionnaire process. Furthermore, measures have already been taken in the Brazil context to improve the

Evaluation Question: How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the project document?

Indicator 1: Extent to which activities were implemented in accordance with projected timelines and delivery strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project implementation was reported to involve some divergence from the timeline projected. This included:</td>
<td>The project planning and development did occur in accordance with the projected timeline. Direct interventions with primary and secondary beneficiaries did not occur in accordance with the original projected timeline (in the proposal - which projected beginning work within the schools in Q1 of 2016) as it became clear in the initial stages that there were issues with the suitability of the material. The project timeline was negotiated in order to create space for the redevelopment of the material to ensure its contextualization and utility. Activities within the schools, with primary and secondary beneficiaries commenced in Q3 of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A longer preparation/lead in period prior to commencing activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delays in starting cycles due to financial reporting schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changes in scheduling to align with the school calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

A longer preparation/lead in period prior to commencing activities:
The preparation period before the first cycle tool took longer than initially anticipated. This shifted the time period for the delivery of the cycle back meaning it ended during school holidays rather than with the end of term.

Delays in starting cycles due to financial reporting schedules:
The way the project was divided in calendar years with financial reports and the need to close each financial year separately created some delays in the start of activities in the first quarter of the year.

Changes in scheduling to align with the school calendar:
There were reports that delays in implementation in relation to the initial plan took place as the plan didn’t take into account the school year calendar. The first cycle started very late into the school year (April) and ended after the school year was over (August 2016), the second cycle didn’t start until February 2017, the third cycle was better prepared (initial lists of interested children created before the school year ended in June 2017 for the activities to start in September 2017).

Initially, the first cycle was delayed as the initial stage of the project (planning, curriculum development, training of focal points and facilitators). However, it seems that at the initial planning stage the team was not fully conscious of how long it would take to prepare the project cycle students’ selection with the interviews, etc., and this took longer than anticipated. The last cycle incorporated this learning with the lists of interested students collected before the holiday for activities that were to start during next school year.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

**Redevelopment of the project material:**
During the initial briefing, the project staff team explained that the material to be used was met with criticism by NIAP. They explained that teachers were tired of receiving materials and as such, there had to be a focus on contextual relevance, utility and flexibility, which they felt was missing. The decision was made to delay the implementation phase and reallocate the time to co-developing these tools in order to initiate delivery in 2016. This process was clearly beneficial to the efficacy and sustainability of the project as outlined in the relevant sections of this chapter.

It is also important to reiterate the external factors (referenced above) that had an impact on scheduling and caused delays beyond the team’s control. There were multiple issues out of the team’s control that had an influence on the timely delivery and completion of the program.

**Delivery Strategies**
One of the planned project outputs was the development of a resources framework and action plan within the schools for preventing, dealing with and responding to cases of violence. There was not evidence to suggest this had been achieved. The reasons for this are understood to be a combination of internal factors:

- Time (the project delivery time was significantly decreased)
- Allocation of resource (prioritizing the training and application of the methodology)
- External factors (outlined in the effectiveness section which included challenges with buy-in in the schools)

The legal issues related to response mechanisms in public schools (outlined in the effectiveness section)

### Indicator 2: Extent to which activities were appropriately resourced (i.e. did/did not require additional resourcing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were various challenges faced by HEAL Africa relating to resourcing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Cessation of some activities/renegotiation of contracts due to lack of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Access to committed resources (see section on delayed payments above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Insufficient resource to attend to the demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one area of additional resourcing was highlighted during the data collection:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource for adding new volumes to the materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa**

*Cessation of some activities/renegotiation of contracts due to lack of resource:*
One example of an activity that ended due to a lack of resource was a clinical supervision with an ISL psychologist that took place during 1st and 2nd cycle but stopped in the 3rd cycle. HEAL Africa Supervisors had to change contracts from staff to
volunteers in July 2017 as the budget for their staff contracts ended due to the delays in the implementation of the session cycles (the initial plan was to end of sessions by the end of July 2017 and to use the remaining months for evaluations, report writing, etc.).

**Insufficient resource to attend to the demand:**
Lack of resources was cited as an issue by program staff. Specifically, there were reports that more youth wanted to take part in the project (and more parents wanting to enroll their children) but were turned down due to limited resources.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

**Resource for adding to the materials:**
The delivery of the program appeared appropriately resourced overall. Whilst it could be argued that additional resource could have enabled the project to expand implementation, the core team was keen that the initial ‘pilot’ implementation would take place in a small sample of schools.

Interviews with the core team revealed that they were keen to add a volume on race and religion to the materials having discovered that these were key gaps in the material’s content.

Informants cited insufficient resource to develop, design and produce additional volumes. However, it was understood that this was beyond the initial scope and strategy and as such would not seem to be an indication of under-resourcing but rather the identification of an area for future resourcing.

**Conclusions, evaluation question; How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the project document?**

Both projects diverged from the delivery timeline to varying extents and for different reasons. In the DRC, a longer lead-in period and changes in scheduling occurred due to alignment issues with financial reporting and school calendars. In the Brazil context, there was an intentional re-negotiation and re-organization of the timeline in order to facilitate the re-development of the project materials to ensure their utility and relevance to the delivery context.

Resourcing challenges were more prominent in the DRC data. Specifically, certain activities were discontinued due to a lack of resources/delay in receiving resources. There was a strong feeling that there was insufficient resource to meet the demand. In Brazil, the program delivery revealed additional intersectional themes, which are believed to be important in adding to the materials to increase their efficacy and relevance to participants (Race and Religion). There was insufficient resource to develop these, however it was also understood that this would be a next step beyond the closure of the pilot implementation.

9.4 Impact Findings

**Evaluation Question: What are the intended and unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project?**

**Intended Impact**
This question will be answered through a comparison of the project’s key outcomes with their related findings already discussed in the Effectiveness section.

1. Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in the project improve their attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality and nonviolence:

The findings suggested that this was a positive (intentional) consequence of the project as:

- In both contexts, participants and stakeholders were **engaged** in discussion surrounding GBV (including VAWG)
- In both contexts, participants and stakeholders were **equipped** to continue and deepen debates and interventions surrounding GBV and its intersections
- In both contexts, participants have **access** to peer networks which were seen to be safer more gender equitable groups

2. Schools where the project is implemented create more supportive environments to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC:

- School environments were considered more **supportive** due to the efficacy of the program in building teachers’ knowledge and increasing gender equitable attitudes and behaviors
- Evidence suggested an increase in the knowledge of external referral services to improve **responsiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unintended Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unintended Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Consequences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive Consequences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive changes in relationships at family level</td>
<td>Changes in attitudes/deconstruction of norms related to gender at partner/stakeholder level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved school performance</td>
<td>Negative Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Consequences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative Consequences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Rejection Exclusion and Jealousy amongst those who were not selected to participate</td>
<td>It could be argued that the scheduling conflict between the project workshops and other lessons had some negative effect on participants, however this was a short-term issue that was promptly resolved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers (focal points) not all being suitable (to the extent of verbal and physical violence) | Negative responses from family members

**Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa**

**Changes in relationships at family level:**
According to facilitators, one of the positive, unexpected impacts of the projects was the increased proximity between parents and children. During the interviews, they reported that parents have much closer relationship with the children. This was seen in an increase in children opening up and expressing their worries and thoughts to their parents. A respondent added that the sessions didn't only change students’ perception about themselves and topics such as gender roles, but also served as relational therapy for them.

Facilitators also mentioned that these relationships improved because the family members and friends were learning about equality from the students who took part in the sessions. Further evidence of this came from parents who talked about changes that happened not only in their own children but also in the children of neighbors (friends of their children and who didn’t take part in the project). It was reported that their children started sharing what they have learned about how to build good relationships, such as how to do household tasks, with parents and family members, and with their friends who also adapted their attitudes at home.

All students that took part in the focus group mentioned the improvement of their relationships with family or friends/neighbors. The reasons for that change were varied, some felt more confident as a result of the sessions (mainly girls), some had better understanding on the gender roles and made conscious efforts to change them (boys), some were
making efforts to speak to family members who they didn’t communicate with before because they wanted to live in peace (both girls and boys).

**Improved school performance:**
Parents and teachers indicated that the students who took part in the project improved their school performance since they started attending the sessions. It was indirectly confirmed by the students themselves, who talked about increased confidence in their own abilities and the feeling of responsibility and control over their own lives and future coupled with the increased aspiration to “become somebody”.

**Feelings of rejection exclusion and jealousy amongst those who were not selected to participate:**
In one of the focus groups, the illustration was given that there was significant interest in the program, as a lot of children signed up, however only a small proportion were selected. Those who didn’t take part were jealous (they were reported to be understanding after a certain period). Similar information was provided in the focus group (teachers) and in the discussion with facilitators, who observed that they children who were not selected struggled to come to terms with it. One facilitator mentioned one boy that wasn’t selected for the group but had a lot of problems reached out to the facilitators for support and advice even though he was not part of the sessions.

Parents also cited the frustration that some children and their families felt because they didn’t take part in the project. They advocated for the continuation and expansion of the project in their town (Sake) and the region.

**Focal points (teachers) not all being suitable (to the extent of verbal and physical violence):**
Facilitators pointed out that owing to a lack of evaluation system for selecting focal points (teachers), there were instances where participants suffered forms of violence within the program. They were selected with support from the local Ministry of Education and it was hard to evaluate their work. Some of them created a lot of challenges. There were reports of some teachers coming to school drunk, some that hit the children and some publicly referred to the Vijana Wa Amani groups as “trauma groups,” creating stigmatization of those who took part. However, this was reported to be rare within the program.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

**Changes in attitudes/deconstruction of norms related to gender at partner/stakeholder level:**
The co-development of the materials with NIAP and the steering group provided an opportunity for the debate and deconstruction of gender norms within the group. One of the respondents from NIAP described the process as an intense period of ‘colliding ideas’ but one that was highly productive in reaching consensus and common ground in regard to standards and concepts of gender equality. Another representative of NIAP confirmed that they benefited from the process in terms of their own conceptualization of gender.

**Participants missing lessons:**
There were reports of students complaining about missing out on lessons to attend the sessions. The examples provided in the field diaries were PE and Math lessons. The facilitators concerned were responsive to this and organized rescheduling with the school coordination staff. As such, this only had a short-term impact on participants who only missed a few classes.

**Negative responses from family members:**
As mentioned in the Effectiveness section of this chapter, an increased openness from female participants to express themselves in the home environment was not always met with support. Teachers reported that some parents interpreted a challenge of norms with insubordination or rebellion. There were examples cited of verbal confrontation, which included the threat of physical violence when girls challenged gender norms and roles within the home. However, this was only one report from the teachers’ focus group so further research would be recommended to confirm this finding.
Conclusions, evaluation question; What are the intended and unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project?

Overall, there was evidence to suggest that both projects had a positive impact on participants in accordance with the project objectives. In terms of unintended impact, the data revealed unintended positive impact beyond the target beneficiary population both delivery sites, for parents who experienced improved relationships with participants (and, importantly, vice versa) in the DRC context and stakeholders in Brazil who underwent a process of conceptual deconstruction deepening their theoretical and social conceptualization of issues of gender through the development of the materials. In the DRC, a further unintended consequence was identified for participants who improved their school performance that was attributed to the increased confidence gained through the program.

Negative, unintended consequences also emerged from the data. In the DRC, these related to the aforementioned challenges in evaluating focal points, leading to some focal points behaving unsuitably and even violently towards participants, and a lack of resource which meant that members of the target beneficiary population were unable to participate. In Brazil, one of the negative

9.5 Sustainability Findings

Evaluation Question: How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of women and girls at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The following aspects/results of the program strategy and implementation are likely to be instrumental in sustaining the impact of the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-level stakeholder approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation of ‘Youth Living Peace clubs’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential for future advocacy through government partnerships formed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The centrality of sustainability within the project strategy was clear from the project documentation, outputs and conversations with key stakeholders. The approach consists of the following components:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on the integration and independent delivery of the materials in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-level stakeholder approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on ensuring usability and flexibility of the material to facilitate independent use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

**Multi-level stakeholder approach:**
HEAL Africa has been engaging various stakeholders to connect and activate a network that can build on the work of the project. The project’s Technical Advisory Group meetings engaged and involved various technical and strategic partners. Beyond this, HEAL Africa also participated in cluster/sector meetings with other key stakeholders in the province. Finally, holding events at schools allowed them to connect with local community members and leaders. As such, they have ensured that they have engaged with key stakeholders at different levels with different intersections with the issue of VAWG and their target beneficiary group.

**Creation of Youth Living Peace Clubs by the adolescents who took part in the project:**
As mentioned above, the participants have demonstrated a high level of self-management and initiative in setting up groups, which will continue beyond the project. However, a need for support and coordination of those self-initiated groups had been highlighted by all stakeholders (project staff, teachers and government representatives) to ensure a consistency in messaging and create wider impact.

**Potential for future advocacy:**
Having engaged the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Gender representatives in Goma, there is a potential for future advocacy for the issues dealt with by the program. These representatives can advocate for policy changes at national level. This looked promising as the Ministry of Education was clearly backing the project and believed in its methodology, impact and success. A representative praised the project, saying, “**People in the community have seen that psychological trauma can be cured by activities like this session, this increased their support and the way they encouraged the children and also how they started changing their behavior.**”

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

**Focus on the integration and independent delivery of the materials in schools:** It was very clear from interviews with the core team that the aim throughout the project was to activate and test a methodology that could be appropriated and delivered without the need for Instituto Promundo’s presence in delivery sites (schools). Activities against this objective were underway at the time of the evaluation. These include carrying out workshops with educational staff and stakeholders (NIAP and representatives from the PRONIAP initiative) and the revision of the materials. The latter has been focused on the usability of the materials (see below) and has included input at various levels.

A member of the core team illustrated that the project would have failed beyond this cycle of delivery by Promundo if the materials “sat in a library gathering dust.” As one teacher added, “**Without a shadow of a doubt, it is a program which needs to continue, the issues you bring, the approach to violence, the gender issue, it is so important to them.**” However, one representative of NIAP observed that the extent to the materials are adopted and integrated will depend on the characteristics and culture of the schools. This is beyond the reach of Instituto Promundo, however it is something which NIAP may be able to influence or intervene in highlighting the importance of a multi-level stakeholder approach for sustainability.

**Multi-level stakeholder approach:**
One member of staff described that future initiatives would be more sustainable through the existence of ‘ecosystem’ that had been constructed through the development and delivery process. Despite no longer having a role in the delivery of the materials, Instituto Promundo will continue to be part of this ecosystem as they have been invited by the Secretary of Education to be part of future meetings about violence in schools. Meetings are also taking place regarding future partnerships and avenues for related programming.

**Usability and Flexibility of the Material:**
According to members of the core team, the time and capacity dedicated to the development of the materials was an investment that aimed to ensure that the materials were flexible and usable - having a sequential logic to the volumes, whilst each could be used in isolation allowing teachers to plan recurring sessions or ‘dip in’ to the material depending on their context and time available. There was additional attention given to the language used to ensure that it was accessible to teachers from a variety of different disciplines and backgrounds. Project staff also emphasized the importance of the learning from testing the methodology in diverse educational contexts - across different age groups, formal and informal educational contexts and in different regions. Issues with the material or suggested activities are being addressed during the current revision to ensure the material is adaptable, practical, flexible and user-friendly.
Conclusion, evaluation question: How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of women and girls at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?

Both projects have taken measures to ensure that the changes generated by the project are sustained beyond the closure of the delivery cycles. In both contexts, adopting a multi-stakeholder approach has led to the creation of a wider ‘ecosystem’ beyond the project that can potentially continue the work in some form beyond the delivery partners intervention and partner on future, related initiatives. In the DRC, participants have mobilized beyond the project to form Youth Living Peace Clubs in order to sustain the impact and enthusiasm generated by the project. In Brazil, the materials are undergoing revision for the production of a new kit with updated volumes to increase flexibility and usability. Sustainability was a clear objective and focus in this context with notable thematic prominence in the data collected. The materials will be available to teachers for their independent integration into lessons and activities.

9.6 Knowledge Generation Findings

Evaluation Question: What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women and Girls?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The lessons emergent from the findings can be summarized as:</td>
<td>From reviewing the data and related findings, two key lessons stand out:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► The value of psychosocial approach in responding to VAWG</td>
<td>► The benefits of a multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder approach to bring together expertise and ownership at various levels and create an ‘ecosystem’ that can provide continuity and facilitate sustainability of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► The importance of an integrated, joined-up approach when engaging external partners in project delivery</td>
<td>► The importance of intersectionality within projects targeted towards the issue of VAWG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa

The value of psychosocial approach in responding to VAWG:
According to the facilitators, there is a significant need for psychological support in responding to cases of VAWG. The program provided a case study for its efficacy and impact. The respondents highlighted that there is a need to recognize psychological needs of the population in the same way that medical needs are recognized.

There was a recommendation of creating a solution that could have wider reach, for instance a mobile psychological clinic. This would involve a team of psychologists who would be available for students that are not part of the group but have difficulties and want to reach someone. There was a strong feeling that this was a need that was not being sufficiently addressed.

The importance of an integrated, joined-up approach when engaging external partners in project delivery:
Staff reported that the link between facilitators and focal point was not strong enough, which was unhelpful in the implementation. It was reported that the focal points didn’t understand the facilitators’ role and sometimes even what was
the aim of this project. In contrast, the HEAL Africa facilitators received technical supervision which helped them to evaluate their session and deal with any issues arising.

**Detailed Findings: Instituto Promundo**

The benefits of a multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder approach to bring together expertise and ownership at various levels and create an ‘ecosystem’ that can provide continuity and facilitate sustainability of impact:

As already discussed above, one of the key strengths of the program was its engagement with multilevel stakeholders from diverse disciplinary backgrounds (the NIAP team includes psychologists, teachers and project managers, the Instituto Promundo delivery team brought multi-disciplinary expertise from areas including economics, psychology and gender studies).

The re-planning of the delivery timeline highlighted the importance to recognize that this approach requires significant time investment and buy-in from stakeholders in order to be successful.

The importance of intersectionality within projects targeted towards the issue of VAWG:

In the context of the Instituto Promundo delivery, two key areas of intersectionality - race and religion - became apparent during the sessions. The field diaries demonstrated that conversations regarding experiences of violence could not exclude this issue. The complexities of a contextualized and relevant VAWG program require not only an awareness and understanding of these dynamics but their integration into the program design and content.

**Conclusion, evaluation question: What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women and Girls?**

The key lessons learned through the delivery of the program across the two sites share the common theme of the necessity of complexity and multifaceted approaches, strategies and partnerships. In the DRC, the value of a psychosocial approach was emphasized and represented a significant shift in programmatic response to violence. In both projects the creation of a robust network of stakeholders at different levels and from diverse disciplinary backgrounds was fundamental for successful project delivery. Specific to the findings of the Brazil context (though it would be interesting to explore in both contexts), adopting an intersectional approach and making this explicit within the methodology was one of the key strengths of the program.

**Evaluation Question: Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings: HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Key Findings: Instituto Promundo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group therapy as an effective methodology</td>
<td>Instituto Promundo’s approach to equipping key stakeholders who have daily contact with their target beneficiaries to decentralize delivery and promote independence from the program is considered a promising practice in terms of its potential for sustainability and continuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefit of partnering with University students (expertise and relatability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of clinical supervision for facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms for non-threatening, confidential reporting of violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed Findings: HEAL Africa**

*Group Therapy as an effective methodology:*
Conclusions, evaluation question: Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?

Promising practices were identified across various aspects of the program. In terms of methodological approaches, group therapy was reported to be effective and efficient, and the use of confidential mechanisms for non-threatening reporting of violence was a practice that could be rolled out in other contexts. In the DRC, providing clinical supervision for facilitators was important in ensuring both their effectiveness and well being within the program and their role. Partnering with psychology students also stood out as an applicable practice that could benefit similar initiatives. In Brazil, the focus on equipping teachers to deliver the methodology beyond the parameters of the program to ensure sustainability and expand the reach of the material has significant potential for the continuity and expansion of the impact of the program.
10. Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Overall, the findings suggest that the results of the implementation of the Youth Living Peace Methodology across both sites points to its efficacy and appropriacy for addressing experiences, knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and responses related to VAWG for participants as well as positively impacting a broader group of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Through the project, girls were found to have experienced greater gender equality and freedom from violence, though to varying extents. In both contexts, this occurred within the delivery setting, in the DRC in the wider context of the school and in Brazil amongst peers who participated in the program (though further research of this is recommended as the majority of the data which contributed to the finding was from focus groups which only took place in one school owing to access issues and can therefore only be attributed to this context). In the DRC, girls experienced this change at goal level beyond the school setting of the program. Specifically, the home was identified as an arena for improved gender equity and relationships between family members. The project facilitated and promoted beneficiaries’ experience of gender equality and their ability to express themselves safely and seek support. In both delivery contexts there was evidence for participant’s increased knowledge, awareness, articulation and confidence in the discussion, debate and advocacy of gender equality and issues of GBV. In the DRC, the participants benefited with increased personal well-being attributed to the therapeutic approach. In Brazil, there was an increase in recognition, reflection, critical assessment of and discourse around previously ‘normalized’ forms of violence and improved ability to navigate topics related to gender equality and nonviolence. The extent of the effectiveness on secondary beneficiaries and wider stakeholders was varied across the two contexts with notable changes in attitudes and behaviors amongst male participants (in both contexts), teachers (in the Brazilian delivery context) and parents (in the DRC delivery context) with strong evidence to suggest the deconstruction of social norms and behaviors relating to gender and GBV was taking place to some extent. The facilitators and the project materials were identified as strengths in both contexts. Challenges identified mainly related to the school contexts and relationships with external educational staff involved in the project. Both delivery contexts were negatively impacted by socio-economic, ideological and socio-political factors that manifest in the school setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>In both delivery contexts, the thematic focus, setting and timing of the project implementation was seen to be highly relevant to the critical social problems faced by the target beneficiary group. The relevance of the impact was assessed in terms of its longevity and continuity beyond the program and the evidence to suggest that this had been internalized by participants and was being applied in their daily lives. However, in both cases the importance of follow-up, continued provision and the further development of more supportive spaces and institutions are considered paramount for ensuring enduring, lasting, long-term impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>The efficient development and delivery of the program in both settings was facilitated through positive engagement from delivery/development partners. In the DRC, group therapy was identified as instrumental in reaching a wider participant group and psychology students played an effective role in efficient project delivery. In Brazil, strong internal management systems the use of technology in data collection facilitated efficiency. Program delivery was obstructed through internal and external scheduling issues related to the school context. In Brazil there were minor issues related to resources and facilitation,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
while in the DRC the challenges were more significant with activities discontinued due to resourcing issues and a strong feeling from staff that there was insufficient resource to meet the demand. There were issues relating to the efficiency of the data collection process cited in both cases though this was significantly more challenging in the DRC context which remains an issue to be addressed, whereas measures have already been taken in the Brazil context to improve the experience and efficiency through the use of technology. Both projects diverged from the delivery timeline to varying extents and for different reasons. In the DRC, a longer lead-in period and changes in scheduling occurred due to alignment issues with financial reporting and school calendars. In the Brazil, context there was an intentional renegotiation and reorganization of the timeline in order to facilitate the redevelopment of the project materials to ensure their utility and relevance to the delivery context.

Impact

Overall, it can be concluded that both projects had a positive impact on participants in accordance with the project objectives and beyond the target beneficiary population in both delivery sites, for parents who experienced improved relationships with participants in the DRC and stakeholders in Brazil who reported gains in their theoretical and social conceptualization of issues of gender through the development of the materials. In the DRC, a further unintended consequence was identified for participants who improved their school performance that was attributed to the increased confidence gained through the program. Unintended negative impact was identified with reports of educational staff in the DRC behaving unsuitably and even violently towards participants, and members of the target beneficiary population responding negatively to not being able to participate due to number limitations. In Brazil, participation impacted the participation in other classes and some participants’ expression of gender equitable attitudes triggered conflict at home.

Sustainability

Both projects have taken measures to ensure that the changes generated by the project are sustained beyond the closure of the delivery cycles. In both contexts, adopting a multi-stakeholder approach has led to the creation of a wider ‘ecosystem’ beyond the project that can continue the work beyond the delivery partners intervention and partner on future, related initiatives. In the DRC, participants have mobilized beyond the project to form Youth Living Peace Clubs in order to sustain the impact and enthusiasm generated by the project. In Brazil, the materials are undergoing revision for the production of a new kit with updated volumes to increase flexibility and usability. Sustainability was a clear objective and focus in this context with notable thematic prominence in the data collected. The materials will be available to teachers for their independent integration into lessons and activities.

Knowledge Generation

The key lessons learned through the delivery of the program across the two sites share the common theme of the necessity of complexity and multifaceted approaches, strategies and partnerships. In the DRC, the value of a psychosocial approach was emphasized and represented a significant shift in programmatic response to violence. In both program settings, the creation of a robust network of stakeholders at different levels and from diverse disciplinary backgrounds was fundamental for successful project delivery. Specific to the findings of the Brazil context (though it would be interesting to explore in both contexts), adopting an intersectional approach and making this explicit within the methodology was one of the key strengths of the program.

Promising practices were identified across various aspects of the program. In terms of methodological approaches, group therapy was reported to be effective and efficient, and the use of confidential mechanisms for non-threatening reporting of violence was a practice that could be rolled out in other contexts. In the DRC, providing clinical supervision for facilitators was important in ensuring both their effectiveness and well being within the program and their role. Partnering with psychology students also stood out as an applicable practice that could benefit similar initiatives. In Brazil, the focus on equipping teachers to deliver the methodology beyond the parameters of the program to ensure sustainability and expand the reach of the material has significant potential for the continuity and expansion of the impact of the program.
### 11. Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Relevant Stakeholders (Recommendation made to whom)</th>
<th>Suggested timeline (if relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Confidential Reporting Methodologies used in the DRC context (such as a box for asking questions or denouncing violence) might be a useful tool for other contexts including schools in Brazil who continue to use the materials. This would be a step forward in meeting the need of provision for dealing with reports of violence as well as a potential monitoring tool for schools to understand the forms and extent of violence taking place. It is recommended that schools in the DRC continue with this practice beyond the program for the same reasons.</td>
<td>Instituto Promundo NIAP HEAL Africa</td>
<td>This could be implemented in conjunction with the presentation of the new materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the suggestions from teachers during the focus group in Brazil was that the material contains flyers/posters/information that can be visible to a wider audience to complement the content that the teachers develop and facilitate peer-to-peer discussion through providing additional stimulus. This could be effective in both settings, provided the materials are contextualized.</td>
<td>Instituto Promundo HEAL Africa</td>
<td>If the new materials have not been finalized, it is recommended that this consideration be incorporated to the current round of revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findings from both contexts highlighted the need for a more intergenerational approach when working with young people. In the DRC, whilst the findings related to parental engagement were encouraging, wider family members were shown to be unsupportive. In Brazil, there were examples of violent responses to gender equitable discourse. It is recommended that this aspect be examined and considered in future iterations of the program.</td>
<td>Instituto Promundo HEAL Africa</td>
<td>Research, monitoring and evaluation would be important elements in this process. This could be integrated into a future iteration of the program and learning from these processes consolidated to form some strategic interventions in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Instituto Promundo - Having examined the data it is recommended that the additional volumes of the methodology (relating to race and religion) are added as sought by the program staff. These issues were pertinent and prominent in the evaluation data and would be useful resources for educational staff, especially given the current socio-political climate.</td>
<td>Instituto Promundo</td>
<td>It is recommended that this be implemented as soon as possible to account for this key gap in the materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is recommended that data collection tools (questionnaires) undergo revision for their relevance and reliability (for instance, the number of data collection tools, the extent to which these are analysed, repetition of measures and ensuring baseline and endline have the</td>
<td>Instituto Promundo HEAL Africa</td>
<td>This should be addressed as soon as possible as this data is the foundation for measuring,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>HEAL Africa - In future iterations of the project, or further interventions within the school contexts, it is recommended that the team target younger children who will be in the same school for at least 1-2 years after the end of the cycle so they can share the knowledge and skills within the school. Promoting this (organic) dissemination will increase the reach of the project content/focus beyond the direct participants. This might require a curriculum adaptation for early adolescents.</td>
<td>HEAL Africa</td>
<td>This is a programming direction which could be considered in future as an improvement and expansion of current programming, but is not considered urgent and would require significant planning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEAL Africa - Given the planning and delivery challenges identified relating to programming delays and scheduling it is recommended that HEAL Africa review the current project implementation plan/design to ensure alignment with the school setting in which it is being delivered and the financial cycles of the program.</td>
<td>HEAL Africa</td>
<td>This should be reviewed prior to any future cycle implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The M&amp;E challenges faced by both organizations (though already being addressed by Instituto Promundo) should be prioritized. There is a significant need for capacity and resource at HEAL Africa in order to systematize their data collection and management so they will be able to use their findings.</td>
<td>HEAL Africa</td>
<td>As above, this should be addressed as soon as possible as this data is the foundation for measuring, understanding, learning and improving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>HEAL Africa - Reports of the independent creation of clubs by participants are encouraging, however it is important to ensure consistency of messaging and also provide overall support to facilitate this initiative and ensure consistency in the quality of delivery. It is recommended that the project team engage with these clubs and co-develop strategies which enable them to run independently but have access to the necessary support and input. Having noted a lack of distribution of the materials during the implementation, perhaps a first step could be making materials available to members of these clubs.</td>
<td>HEAL Africa</td>
<td>This should occur as soon as possible to avoid losing contact or momentum with former participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>There appeared to be occasions of misalignment between different stakeholders (at an international level) regarding the norms, standards, expectations and definitions of forms of gender equality and nonviolence. The program is operating across very different socio-cultural and socio-historical contexts and it is therefore it is important that there is a shared understanding and awareness of the socio-cultural constructs of the ‘other.’ We recommend that a dedicated workshop take place with representation from each site to 1) articulate each actor’s understanding and conceptualization of these issues 2) discuss the extent to which the program seeks to align this understanding 3) come to a common consensus regarding a strategic approach that openly recognizes diversity of conceptualization where it is required and, likewise, areas of commonality. This should be written and available for funders or future partners who will also bring constructs from their own context.</td>
<td>HEAL Africa Institute Promundo</td>
<td>If the program is to be delivered in other contexts, this would be the opportune moment to bring the different representatives and stakeholders together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Generation</strong></td>
<td>HEAL Africa - to discuss with the Ministry of Primary, Secondary and Professional Education (EPSP) the possibility of an evaluation system for the focal points/teachers so the unsuitable behaviour could be detected and corrected earlier in the project. The EPSP already has a system of monitoring of the activities that the focal points were conducting as part of the project but it should be strengthened so the facilitators and possibly the youth taking part in the project could easily inform HEAL Africa or/and EPSP of misconduct.</td>
<td>HEAL Africa</td>
<td>It is understood that this would be an ongoing process which would likely yield results in the medium term. However, it is recommended that the work commence as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Generation</strong></td>
<td>HEAL Africa - Having demonstrated the efficacy of a psychosocial approach, it is recommended that HEAL Africa formalize/capture this through a written case study that can be used to disseminate this knowledge and experience to potential stakeholders and other local and regional actors in the sector.</td>
<td>HEAL Africa</td>
<td>It would be recommended that this take place after the organisation’s M&amp;E has undergone a full review to ensure that any case study is based on robust data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Final External Project Evaluation:
“Engaging Youth to End Violence Against Women and Girls in Brazil and Democratic Republic of Congo”
TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Background and Context

1.1 Description of the project that is being evaluated.

a. Name of the project and the organization

Promundo-US, a non-governmental civil society organization based in Washington DC, works internationally to engage men and boys to promote gender equality and end violence against women: transforming gender norms where they are constructed (e.g. in schools and workplaces), or in high urban violence and post-conflict settings; always promoting men’s involvement as gender equitable caregivers and involved fathers, as partners in women’s empowerment, and as advocates in preventing sexual exploitation and violence.

In line with its ethos, Promundo-US leads the project “Engaging Youth to End Violence Against Women and Girls in Brazil and Democratic Republic of Congo”, in close collaboration with its implementing partners: Heal Africa in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and Instituto Promundo, in Brazil.

b. Description of the specific forms of violence addressed by the project

Forms of violence addressed by the project: Violence in the family (specifically violence against the girl child); violence in the community (specifically sexual harassment, violence in public spaces and institutions, and violence in schools); and violence perpetrated or condoned by the State (specifically urban violence and violence in post-conflict settings)

c. Main objectives of the project

The goal of the project is to attain greater gender equality and freedom from violence for the adolescent girls who participate in the project in school intervention sites – especially those previously exposed to violence – by 2018 in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) and in Goma and Sake City (DRC)

The main strategies or areas of intervention for this project are:

(1) Prevention of violence by means of public outreach, awareness raising, and changing individual knowledge/attitudes;
(2) Improving service delivery by promoting and providing services (such as psychosocial counseling, medical services, shelters, etc.);
(3) Strengthening institutional response by enhancing capacities of government officials and decision-makers;
(4) Contribution to the implementation of laws N06/018 and N06.019 (2006) in the DRC, and No 11.340/2006 in Brazil, as well as of the National Strategy against Gender Based Violence (2009) in the DRC.
The project also intends to support the implementation of national and local laws, policies and action plans that address violence against women. The project also specifically intends to address the intersection of HIV/AIDS and violence against women.

d. Description of targeted primary and secondary beneficiaries

In both Brazil and the DRC, the direct beneficiaries are adolescent girls aged 10-19, with low SES, in urban and rural sites, who have witnessed or experienced violence at home, or via an intimate partner. These adolescent girls are identified via self-referral to the groups; faculty and trained organization staff also make referrals to facilitators directly.

Secondary beneficiaries include adolescent boys and men, civil society organizations (including NGOs), community-based groups/members, educational professionals (i.e. teachers and educators), and government officials (i.e. decision-makers and policy implementers).

e. Project duration, project start date and end date

Duration: 3 years
Start date: 01/01/2015
End date: 31/12/2017

f. Current project implementation status:

A detailed update on the current state of implementation and timeframe to complete the project will be provided in the 2017 mid-year report. This document will be made available to evaluation consultants/contractors before the planning stages of the final evaluation.

1.2 Strategy and theory of change (or results chain) of the project with the brief description of project goal, outcomes, outputs and key project activities.

Promundo-US’s Theory of Change hypothesizes, using an ecological model, how the project will attain its goal of changing the landscape of violence against adolescent girls. According to this model, through group education and individual counseling adolescent boys and girls will (1) learn through questioning and critical reflection about gender norms, (2) rehearse equitable and non-violent attitudes and behaviors in a comfortable space, and (3) internalize these new gender attitudes and norms, applying them in their own relationships and lives. Supporting institutions and structures will reinforce these gender equitable norms and messages and provide the individual and organizations involved with tools to become agents of change for gender justice and social justice. Ultimately, this process will contribute to gender equity, attitude and behavior change, and the prevention of violence against women and girls.

The intervention builds on Promundo’s and its implementing partner organizations’ experiences in the prevention of violence against girls via three evidence-based methodologies: group therapy (Heal Africa), group education (Instituto Promundo), and group support for boys and girls who have witnessed/experienced violence called “Expect Respect” (originally from SafePlace). The intervention will feature group therapy with individual counseling provided as needed, along with community and school-wide campaigns promoting respect and non-violence. All methodologies have been adapted, tested and are being implemented at scale in Brazil and the DRC, in both schools and communities.

By approaching this model through a programming perspective that targets youth directly, reinforcing it with community-campaigns, and further supporting through national-level advocacy, this intervention has the power to elicit change at all levels (individual, community and multiple institutional levels). Additionally, by
providing direct services and informing communities of their rights under national initiatives, both Brazil and DRC will come closer to closing the gap between GBV policies and their practical applications.

See results chain below:

**Project Goal**

| Outcome 1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in the project improve their attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality and nonviolence in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC. | Output 1.1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in group education sessions and/or individual counseling demonstrate increased skills and knowledge on topics related to gender equality and nonviolence. | Activity 1.1.1: Conduct group education sessions with adolescent girls and boys.  
Activity 1.1.2: Conduct individual counseling with adolescent girls and boys. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2: New educational and counseling resources become available for promoting gender equality and nonviolence, adapted for use in DRC and Brazil.</td>
<td>Activity 1.2.1: Create manuals, key materials, film, protocols and training of trainer materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outcome 2: Schools where the project is implemented create more supportive environments to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC. | Output 2.1: Schools where the project is implemented adopt a resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated action plan for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys. | Activity 2.1.1: Conduct planning workshops to develop guidelines, resources framework and implementation plans with Steering Committee, implementing organizations and staff from the school intervention sites.  
Activity 2.2.1: Conduct training sessions with school staff, where the project is implemented, on their schools’ resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and on strategies and skills for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys. |
| Output 2.2: School staff where the project is implemented have knowledge of their schools’ resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated skills for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys. | Activity 2.3.1: Conduct school-based campaigns/activities to sensitize and inform school and community members. |
| Output 2.3: Key secondary beneficiaries (which can include school staff, students, parents and guardians, and community members) in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC have knowledge of reporting mechanisms for adolescent girls and boys who have been exposed to violence, and report a greater willingness to intervene. | Activity 2.4.1: Hold meetings and trainings with key stakeholders, in education policy (in schools, government and civil society organizations) throughout the program design and implementation.  
Activity 2.4.2: Hold policy briefing seminar of program results. |
| Output 2.4: Key stakeholders in education policy (in schools, government and civil society organizations) are aware of successful programming directions and policies to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC. | |

### 1.3 The geographic context, such as the region, country and landscape, and the geographical coverage of this project.

#### The Democratic Republic of Congo

The project is being implemented in the eastern part of DRC in Goma town and Sake city. With a population of more than 1,000,000 inhabitants, the city of Goma is situated in Eastern DRC. Goma and its surroundings have often been the scene of clashes between the Congolese army in national and international rebel groups, exposing adolescents in those settings to high rates of violence. A total of 30 schools were selected in the town of Goma.

The project is also being implemented in the town of Sake. In Sake, as in Goma, several types of violence have been documented and it is obvious that practically every adolescent girl and boy is either a direct victim of acts of violence or has witnessed some acts of violence in his/her life. The town of Sake is located
in Masisi and was the scene of clashes between the Congolese army and armed groups active in the territory of Masisi groups. It is also known for having been the place of passage of hundreds of thousands of Rwandan refugees and armed combatants of the former army of President Habyarimana in Rwanda, currently known as the FDLR. A total of 4 schools have been selected and trained for 8 youth groups.

Brazil
This project is taking place in urban Rio de Janeiro, in favela communities and 4-6 public schools in the south zone of the city (Zona Sul). Some of Rio’s most vulnerable neighborhoods – socially and economically - are those that are located next to the city’s wealthiest areas in the south zone. The physical and socio-economic divide between favelas and middle income neighborhoods accounts for social, economic and political exclusion and discrimination of dozens of communities. In the past, Promundo has identified these communities based on their openness to projects as well their isolation in regards to lacking government programs which are present in their community. Favelas in the south zone, while considered well located, experience high levels of violence and intense discrimination based on race and location.

The neighborhoods/schools identified as intervention sites have a present and strong civil society, community Residents Association and community leadership. Rio de Janeiro has 600+ favelas and there are dozens in the south zone alone, communities currently being considered are: Chapeu de Mangueira, Babilonia and Morro dos Prazeres. Instituto Promundo works with CREAS and CRAS to identify at risk youth, and is able to offer the necessary data/numbers of vulnerable children and family in south zone of the city.

1.4 Total resources allocated for the intervention, including human resources and budgets (budget need to be disaggregated by the amount funded by the UN Trust Fund and by other sources/donors).

Total project budget: $737,821 (including human resources)
Total amount contributed by UNTF: $722,821
Total amount contributed by Promundo-US: $15,000

Annual budget year 1: $165,636
Annual budget year 2: $238,694
Annual budget year 3: $318,491

Budget for evaluation: $37,000 USD total (inclusive of consultant fees and travel to Brazil and Democratic Republic of the Congo)

1.5 Key partners involved in the project, including the implementing partners and other key stakeholders.

Implementing partners: Heal Africa (the DRC), Instituto Promundo (Brazil)

Other key stakeholders: Key stakeholders in gender, education, youth and health policy, as well as school representatives, community representatives, local or state government officials, and more will be coordinated via a Steering Committee in Brazil and DRC, and involved in advocacy meetings throughout the project’s implementation to help frame the goals and key elements of the program, as well as to become more aware of the need for programs and policies that respond to and prevent violence against women and girls. .

In the DRC, local and national authorities in the North-Kivu province will be engaged as key stakeholders, as will the provincial Department of Education and its cultural office; provincial Children’s Parliament; the
cluster of protection (which includes representatives of NGOs and UN agencies under the supervision of UNHCR Goma); the ba of Goma (e.g. Public Prosecutor’s Department, courts); as well as church leaders.

In Brazil, the project will also feature workshops with key stakeholders engaged in ending IPV and dating violence in schools, such as the Secretary of Health, Department of Education and local universities, including the State University of Rio de Janeiro, which already has students who are working in this area of psychology/therapy, and local universities, which are some of the strongest in the country (UFRJ and UERJ).

2. Purpose of the evaluation

2.1 Why the evaluation needs to be done

While there have been many violence prevention programs that have been implemented and evaluated in Brazil, it is important to understand the unique value and impact that this particular program brings to this context. The Youth Living Peace methodology has been created and adapted from existing methodologies, but it is the first of its kind to be implemented in Brazil and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Youth Living Peace provides direct support for adolescents who have witnessed or experienced violence, while simultaneously working with parents, teachers, and the schools themselves to develop skills and strategies for recognizing, responding and supporting these students.

In Brazil, the existing methodologies were adapted through weekly meetings for a period of 7 weeks in partnership with NIAP and Municipal Education Secretary professionals. The methodology includes 5 booklets and the toolkit - designed jointly with a professional design company – this was printed and delivered to the schools during the workshops. The toolkit is divided into broad themes and contain a series of workshops and activities associated to each one. The themes are: “Building Links”; “What they expect from us”; “Diversities”; “Power, Relationships and Violence”, and; “Communication and Relationships”. Each of the booklets contains specific practical workshops on the topics as well as a step by step guide to producing fanzines and a puzzle related to discussion topics.

Suggestions from the Secretariat of Education, schools, professionals and students, as well as the facilitators working on the project are being collected on the methodology in order to revise the methodology during the second half of 2017. The revision will include participation of all the involved groups to ensure that it can be easily applied by the teachers who have been involved in the project for them to use with their classes.

In DRC, as part of the project, new educational and assistance resources are now available to promote gender equality and non-violence, adapted for use in DRC. The youth education manuals were adapted in collaboration with ISL, which is the technical support partner of the project. The manual for girls and boys has been validated by the Secondary and Vocational Education Division and other government service partners (Gender, Family and Children Division, Social Affairs Division) and other NGOs through the Technical Advisory Group (TAG).

Manuals for girls’ and for boys’ groups both include 15 sessions, with one session per week, and are divided into 4 phases (Phase 1: Learn to know each other and identify problems; Phase 2: Girls' / Boys' Issues and Issues; Phase 3: Integrating new ideas and building new relationships; and Phase 4: Consolidation and dissemination in the community). Each topic is discussed during a session lasting about two and a half hours. Each session is facilitated by 2 facilitators, boys 'groups are facilitated by male facilitators and girls' groups led by female facilitators for the first 11 sessions of the gender-segregated groups, while in the last 4 sessions, the groups are combined and led with 2 facilitators (1 woman and 1 man).

Parents are invited to take part in the following sessions: the launch, the 11th session, and the closing or celebration session (this is the 15th meeting). The peculiarity for the first cycle is that the 2nd session with the parents was held at the end of phase III and not at the beginning of phase II as foreseen in the
education manual (see Annex). Several assessment tools are provided for each session and are completed by the Living Peace youth (at the end of each session and every 15 sessions), facilitators (at the end of each session) and parents (at the end of the 11th meeting).

Given the novelty of the Youth Living Peace methodology to the Brazilian and Congolese contexts, an evaluation of its adaption and application is needed now to understand the effectiveness of this intervention modality in modifying the outcomes of interest. In this way, this evaluation will be addressing a gap in knowledge about the effectiveness of this intervention modality in strengthening GBV prevention among adolescents in these contexts. Specifically, we will be interested in learning about any changes in attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality and non-violence, and the creation of supportive environments to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil. Additionally, this evaluation will provide further input for effective adaptation, and suggestions for improvement, of the Youth Living Peace methodology for these particular contexts.

Lastly, this is a mandatory final project evaluation required by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women.

2.2 How the evaluation results will be used, by whom and when.

Evaluation results may be used by UNTF to inform decisions about funding similar prevention projects in the future. Evaluation results may also be used by CSOs and organizations interested in implementing evidence based interventions to engage men and boys in GBV prevention in these particular implementation contexts as well as elsewhere. Additionally, key stakeholders in the public and private sectors may use these evaluation results to advocate for programming and policy changes. Lastly, evaluations results may be used for Promundo’s and Implementing Partner’s own periodic learning and strategic planning, as well as for supporting advocacy activities in the domain of GBV prevention.

2.3 What decisions will be taken after the evaluation is completed

Promundo develops interventions, adapts these to different contexts and explores, along with Implementing Partners, the process and impacts of these adaptations. Lessons learned from the evaluation will be shared internally and externally for future learning and adaptations of the Youth Living Peace curriculum. Additional information and resources needed for the school will be shared by partners with relevant stakeholders.

3. Evaluation objectives and scope

3.1 Scope of Evaluation

- Timeframe: this evaluation needs to cover the entire project duration, from inception to completion in December 2017.
- Geographical Coverage: This evaluation will take place in intervention sites in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), Goma (the DRC) and Sake (the DRC).
- Target groups to be covered: this evaluation will cover the target primary and secondary beneficiaries (adolescent girls and boys enrolled in the program) as well as broader stakeholders, for example school personnel.

3.2 Objectives of Evaluation: What are the main objectives that this evaluation must achieve?

The overall objectives of the evaluation are to:
a. To evaluate the entire project in terms of effectiveness, both of the process and of the achievement of outcomes such as changing participant attitudes, changing community attitudes, changing school staff’s/parents'/other secondary beneficiaries’ knowledge and skills in relation to adolescent GBV prevention and response (i.e. resource frameworks, reporting mechanisms, prevention and response skills).

b. To assess the relevance of the project activities, goals and achieved results to its beneficiary groups, and to contextualize the objectives of the project within the local and national requirements and priorities in the area of GBV prevention among adolescents.

c. To understand the impact of the overall project in proportion to the overall situation of violence-affected youth by assessing existing data and by conducting interviews (as it relates to the different contexts of implementation), with a strong focus on assessing the results at the outcome and project goals.

d. To generate knowledge and key lessons, as well as to identify promising practices that can be shared with other practitioners, and replicated in other contexts.

e. To document the efficiency and timeliness of implementation and project management.

f. To document plans for sustainability of intervention effects after conclusion of the program.

4. Evaluation Questions

The key questions that need to be answered by this evaluation include the following divided into three categories of analysis. The three overall evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, and impact - will be applied for this evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Mandatory Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>1. To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) women and girls, and boys and men in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those women and/or girls, and boys/men? Please describe those changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative questions in case of project focusing at the policy level</strong></td>
<td>5. To what extent was the project successful in advocating for legal or policy change? If it was not successful, explain why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. In case the project was successful in setting up new policies and/or laws, is the legal or policy change likely to be institutionalized and sustained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>1. To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls, and men and boys?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>1. What are the intended and unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>1. How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>1. How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of women and girls at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women and Girls?
2. Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?

5. Evaluation Methodology

Overall, the external evaluator will be tasked with reviewing the evidence (mostly quantitative) that has already been generated by the project teams, as well as with conducting a mix of interviews and focus groups to complement the quantitative data already collected. We will be seeking input from the external evaluator on what additional data collection might be feasible within allocated budget, and on the review of collected data which may include the results of focus group discussions and surveys.

We tentatively propose the following methodologies (to be reviewed and adapted as needed):

1. Proposed evaluation design:
   a) Mixed methods design including integrated quantitative and qualitative research components (already existing and to-be-collected by evaluator) to evaluate extent to which the project achieved project goals:
      1. Indicator 1: % of adolescent girls and boy who participated in the program who experience gender equality
      2. Indicator 2: Perspective of adolescent girls on opportunities to express themselves safely, seek and access support, and experience freedom from violence in their school and home environments
   b) Mixed methods design including integrated quantitative and qualitative research components (already existing and to-be-collected by evaluator) to evaluate extent to which the project achieved desired outcomes:
      i. Outcome indicator 1.1: % of adolescents (girls and boys) participants who have specific attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality according to project evaluation
      ii. Outcome indicator 1.2: Perspectives of adolescents (boy and girl participants) about their own attitudes concerning gender equality and violence and associated behaviors
      iii. Outcome indicator 2.1: Perspectives of educational staff and students on the effectiveness (strengths and weaknesses) of and experiences with their school violence prevention policies and response mechanisms

2. Data sources:
   i. Data from pre- and post-test surveys of program participants [created from the Gender Equitable Men (GEM) Scale, Expect Respect, and Program M evaluation scales] at baseline and end-line for each group cycle, available as statistical databases;
   ii. In-depth semi-structured interviews with adolescent girls and boys at baseline and end-line for each group cycle;
   iii. In-depth semi-structured interviews with school leadership at baseline mid-term and end-line;
   iv. New topic guides and interview guides from in-depth interviews and focus group discussions designed and conducted by external evaluator, as needed.

3. Proposed additional data collection methods and analysis:
   1. Interviews with project staff and program facilitators
   2. Key informal interviews with community members, community leaders, school staff, parents, and other relevant stakeholders
a. Self-administered “Assessment of change” questionnaire with participants (post-intervention), as relevant
b. Focus group discussions with young women, young men, and school staff
c. Community testimonials or most Significant Change Stories from community members

4. Proposed sampling methods for new data collection (quantitative and qualitative)
   a. Convenience sample drawn from schools, possibly based on inputs from facilitators/project staff where a lot or little (or both) change has occurred

5. Field visits
   a. As needed to complete additional data collection

6. Evaluation Ethics

   The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ [http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines].

   It is imperative for the evaluator(s) to:
   - Guarantee the safety of respondents and the research team.
   - Apply protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of respondents.
   - Select and train the research team on ethical issues.
   - Provide referrals to local services and sources of support for women that might ask for them.
   - Ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and youth.
   - Store securely the collected information.

   The evaluator(s) must consult with the relevant documents as relevant prior to development and finalization of data collection methods and instruments. The key documents include (but not limited to) the following:

7. Key deliverables of evaluators and timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Description of Expected Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline of each deliverable (date/month/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Evaluation inception report**  
Language of report: English for Brazil, French or English (preferred) for DRC  
The inception report provides the grantee organization and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

An inception report must be prepared by the evaluators before going into the technical mission and full data collection stage. It must detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection/analysis procedures.

The inception report must include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.

The structure must be in line with the suggested structure of the annex of TOR.  
Nov. 23- 2017

2. **Draft evaluation report**  
Language of report: English for Brazil, French or English (preferred) for DRC  
Evaluators must submit draft report for review and comments by all parties involved. The report needs to meet the minimum requirements specified in the annex of TOR. Maximum length 40 pages.

The grantees and key stakeholders in the evaluation must review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.  
Jan. 22nd 2018

3. **Final evaluation report**  
Language of report: English for Brazil, French or English (preferred) for DRC  
Relevant comments from key stakeholders must be well integrated in the final version, and the final report must meet the minimum requirements specified in the annex of TOR. Maximum length 40 pages.

The final report must be disseminated widely to the relevant stakeholders and the general public.  
Feb. 13- 2018

---

**8. Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

**8.1 Evaluation Team Composition and Roles and Responsibilities**

We are seeking an international or national consultant(s) to conduct the final evaluation of the Youth Living Peace project implementation in Brazil and the DRC. Evaluator(s) will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish and for managing the evaluation team under the supervision of evaluation task manager from the grantee organization, for the data collection and analysis, as well as report drafting and finalization in English. Evaluator(s) must be proficient in English, French and Portuguese.

Application is open to individuals or teams.

The evaluator(s) must be independent from the program implementation and design to ensure that there is no conflict of interests and the highest degree of integrity is present.
8.2 Required Competencies

Senior Evaluator
- Evaluation experience at least 5 years in conducting external evaluations, with mixed-methods evaluation skills
- Expertise in gender and human-rights based approaches to evaluation and issues of violence against women and girls mandatory
- Experience with engaging men and boys in gender equality programs and/or research preferred.
- Specific evaluation experiences in the areas of ending violence against women and girls
- Experience in analysing secondary quantitative and qualitative data, and collecting primary qualitative and quantitative data
- In-depth knowledge of gender equality and women’s empowerment
- A strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e. credible evaluation and its report that can be used
- A strong team leadership and management track record, as well as interpersonal and communication skills to help ensure that the evaluation is understood and used
- Good communication skills and ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts
- Regional/Country experience and knowledge: in-depth knowledge of geo-political and social issues in Brazil and/or the DRC is required
- Language proficiency: fluency in English, French and Portuguese is mandatory

9. Management Arrangement of the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Group</th>
<th>Role and responsibilities</th>
<th>Actual name of staff responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>External evaluators/consultants to conduct an external evaluation based on the contractual agreement and the Terms of Reference, and under the day-to-day supervision of the Evaluation Task Manager.</td>
<td>External evaluators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Evaluation Task Manager | Someone from the grantee organization, such as project manager and/or M&E officer to manage the entire evaluation process under the overall guidance of the senior management, to:  
• lead the development and finalization of the evaluation TOR in consultation with key stakeholders and the senior management;  
• manage the recruitment of the external evaluators;  
• lead the collection of the key documents and data to be share with the evaluators at the beginning of the inception stage;  
• liaise and coordinate with the evaluation team, the reference group, the commissioning organization and the advisory group throughout the process to ensure effective communication and collaboration;  
• provide administrative and substantive technical support to the evaluation team and | M&E Officer or Project Manager of Grantee Organization Promundo-US  
  – Alexa Hassink/Kristina Vlahovicova |
- work closely with the evaluation team throughout the evaluation;
  - lead the dissemination of the report and follow-up activities after finalization of the report

### Commissioning Organization
Senior management of the organization who commissions the evaluation (grantee) – responsible for: 1) allocating adequate human and financial resources for the evaluation; 2) guiding the evaluation manager; 3) preparing responses to the recommendations generated by the evaluation.

Senior Management of Grantee Organization Promundo-US – Richard Boriskin/Alexa Hassink

### Reference Group
Include primary and secondary beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders of the project who provide necessary information to the evaluation team and to reviews the draft report for quality assurance.

Adolescent boys and girls
Secondary beneficiaries Project managers

### Advisory Group
Must include a focal point from the UN Women Regional Office and the UN Trust Fund Portfolio Manager to review and comment on the draft TOR and the draft report for quality assurance and provide technical support if needed.

UNW Focal Point and UN Trust Fund Portfolio Manager who support your project. – Anna Alaszewski [Programme Specialist, Africa and Arab States, UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women]
### 10. Timeline of the entire evaluation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Evaluation</th>
<th>Key Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Number of working days required</th>
<th>Timeframe (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation stage</strong></td>
<td>Prepare and finalize the TOR with key stakeholders</td>
<td>Commissioning organization and evaluation task manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Aug. 3rd - Aug. 25th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compiling key documents and existing data</td>
<td>Evaluation task manager, Evaluation Team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Aug. 25th - Sept. 8th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment of external evaluator(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Sept. 11th - Sept. 22nd 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception stage</strong></td>
<td>Briefings of evaluators to orient the evaluators</td>
<td>Evaluation task manager, Evaluation Team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Sept 25th - Sept. 29th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review of key documents</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Sept 25th - Sept. 29th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalizing the evaluation design and methods</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Sept 25th - Sept. 29th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing an <strong>inception report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Sept 25th - Nov 14th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Inception Report and provide feedback</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager, Reference Group and Advisory Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Nov 14th - Nov 21st 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submitting final version of <strong>inception report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Nov 21st - Nov 23rd 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection and analysis stage</strong></td>
<td>Desk research</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Nov 6th - Nov 25th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-country technical mission for data collection (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires, etc.)</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>10 (≈5 days per country)</td>
<td>(Nov. 27th - Dec 3rd 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthesis and reporting stage</strong></td>
<td>Analysis and interpretation of findings</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(Dec. 4th - Dec. 14th 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing a <strong>draft report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Dec. 18th - Jan 22nd 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible Body</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate comments from all the groups and submit the consolidated comments to evaluation team</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager</td>
<td>Jan. 29th – Feb. 2nd 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating comments and revising the evaluation report</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>Feb. 5th – Feb. 12th 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the final report</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>Feb. 13th 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final review and approval of report</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager, Reference Group, Commissioning Organization Senior Management, and Advisory Group</td>
<td>Feb. 14th – Feb. 28th 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing and distributing the final report</td>
<td>Commissioning organization led by evaluation manager</td>
<td>Mar. 12th – Mar. 30th 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare management responses to the key recommendations of the report</td>
<td>Senior Management of commissioning organization</td>
<td>Apr. 2nd – Apr. 4th 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize learning events (to discuss key findings and recommendations, use the finding for planning of following year, etc)</td>
<td>Commissioning organization</td>
<td>Apr. 9th – Apr. 27th 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. Budget**

The total budget for this evaluation is USD $37,000 (inclusive of consultant fees, travel to Brazil and Democratic Republic of the Congo, subsistence allowance, and any support/assistance needed in-country).
## II. Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Key Performance Measures</th>
<th>Self-Assessment of Change/Improvemen</th>
<th>Key Areas of Engagement</th>
<th>Power Group</th>
<th>Social Disconnect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aboriginal girls and boys who participated in the program who achieved greater equality and perspectives on aboriginal girls’ opportunities to participate in meaningful activities and experiences, and their overall reduction in isolation and exclusion.</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Secondary Data Collection Method</td>
<td>Primary Data Collection Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Extent of positive unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project?</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature/type of negative unintended consequences identified</td>
<td>Indirect Beneficiaries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of negative unintended consequences</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are the achieved results, intended for the project or in the lives of women and girls at the project goals, going to be sustained after the project ends?</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature/type of sustainability focused strategies</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature/type of sustainable focused activities</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature/type of stakeholders presence/influence beyond the project</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of awareness of/commitment with stakeholders</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of lessons learned regarding programme effectiveness</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of lessons learned regarding programme relevance</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of lessons learned regarding programme sustainability</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution of lessons learned regarding programme impact</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution of lessons learned regarding programme sustainable Practises</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of other lessons learned</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent to which lessons learned are applicable beyond the specific context</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of practices which increase women’s facilitation effectiveness</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of practices which increase women’s facilitation efficiency</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of practices which increase women’s facilitation impact</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of practices which increase women’s facilitation sustainability</td>
<td>Development/Delivery Partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Results Monitoring Plan with actual baseline and end-line data

NB: These results represent the findings from the M&E conducted during the final program cycle. The timelines for this data collection are being confirmed with the Program Staff from HEAL Africa and Instituto Promundo. Baseline and End-line data are combined in column F as per the final M&E reporting by the Program Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs</th>
<th>B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes and outputs</th>
<th>C. Data collection methods</th>
<th>D. Baseline Data</th>
<th>E. Timeline of baseline data collection</th>
<th>F. Endline Data</th>
<th>G. Timeline of endline data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Goal: Adolescent girls who participate in the project in school intervention sites - especially those previously exposed to violence - experience greater gender equality and increased freedom from violence by 2018 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and in Goma town and Sake city, Democratic Republic of Congo.</td>
<td>1% of adolescent girl and boy project participants who experience gender equality according to the project’s evaluation</td>
<td>Pre- and post- test surveys using ‘experience’ items [created from the Gender Equitable Men (GEM) Scale, Expect Respect, and Program M evaluations scales] at baseline and end-line for each group cycle</td>
<td>Please provide actual baseline data per indicator</td>
<td>For each indicator listed in column B, when was BASELINE data collected? Please specify month/year.</td>
<td>In the second half of 2017: DRC: 252 adolescents (126 girls / 126 boys) participated in the 3rd phase of group session; Brazil: 99 adolescents (64 girls / 35 boys) participated.</td>
<td>For each indicator listed in column B, when was end-line data collected? Please specify month/year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in the project improve their attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality</td>
<td>1% of adolescent girl and boy project participants who have specific attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality according to the</td>
<td>Pre- and post- test surveys using ‘attitude’ items [created from the Gender Equitable Men</td>
<td>DRC: (252 adolescents): Participants began to denounce violence and abuses of power at school and at home and reinforce a sense of self-efficacy for equitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 1: Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in the project improve their attitudes and behaviors related to gender equality.
behaviors related to gender equality and nonviolence in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project’s evaluation</th>
<th>(GEM) Scale, Expect Respect, and Program M evaluations scales at baseline and end-line for each group cycle</th>
<th>Relationships. Brazil: (99 adolescents): Pre-intervention, 33% agreed, “The most important job is to take care of the house and cook for the family,” post-, 10%.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2: Perspectives of adolescent boy and girl participants about their own attitudes concerning gender equality and violence and associated behaviors

| Semi-structured interviews with adolescent girls and boys at baseline and end-line for each group cycle | DRC (252 adolescents): During this period, at school, girls took on more responsibility, while boys undertook more housework. Brazil (99 adolescents): Pre-intervention, 18% of adolescents said they had threatened their partners with physical aggression, and 22% said they had beaten their partners. Post-intervention, these fell to 11% and 14%, respectively. |

Outcome 2: Schools where the project is implemented create more supportive environments to prevent and respond to violence against adolescent girls and boys in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC.

| Focus groups (with teachers and others with students) and in-depth semi-structured interviews with school leadership at baseline, mid-term and end-line | DRC: Teachers (24 reached in 2017) responded better to adolescents’ issues/development, motivating youth to participate. Brazil: 50% teachers (3 new in this period), pre-intervention, said no action was taken in response to teenage physical or verbal aggression, 0% post-intervention: consequences included suspension (78%); verbal reprimand (11%); and expulsion (11%). |

Output 1.1 Adolescent girls and boys who have participated in group education sessions and/or individual counseling demonstrate increased skills and knowledge on topics related to gender equality and nonviolence.

| Pre-test and post-test surveys | Q1 – Q2 INSTITUTO PROMUNDO: 211 (130 girls/81 boys). In pre-test, 14.7% agreed “a woman must hold on when she’s treated aggressively by her partner in order to keep the family together” (3% in post-test). HEAL AFRICA: 196 (98 girls/98 boys). Adolescents in 2nd cycle demonstrated more willingness to dismantle gender inequalities. Q3 – Q4 HEAL Africa: 252 (126 girls/126 boys): All boys changed their attitudes, acknowledging girls and boys are equal, also at work. Instituto |

<p>| 1% of adolescent girls and boys who demonstrate specific skills and knowledge on topics related to gender equality and nonviolence. | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.2</th>
<th>New educational and counseling resources become available for promoting gender equality and nonviolence, adapted for use in DRC and Brazil.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:</strong> Number of schools and organizations who have accessed or requested educational and counseling resources, produced for this project, to promote gender equality and nonviolence</td>
<td>Assessment of educational and counseling resources, produced for this project, which are accessed or requested. This number will be zero at baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1–Q2 INSTITUTO PROMUNDO: 7 schools total. We had very positive feedback from principals in the schools where the project was implemented. The Municipal Education Secretariat would like to extend the access to these tools to other schools as well. HEAL AFRICA: 6 schools: 1 in Sake; 5 in Goma. Q3 – Q4 HEAL Africa (14 schools / 8 in 2016; 6 in 2017, no new schools in this period), allowed youth to address responsible sexuality and sexual violence prevention. Holistic response and prevention mechanisms involved multiple actors. Instituto Promundo: the schools (2 new) continued to give positive feedback and continued interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.1</th>
<th>Schools where the project is implemented adopt a resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated action plan for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:</strong> Number of school intervention sites that adopt a resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys.</td>
<td>A review of existing policies will be conducted at baseline, and a review of the resources framework will be conducted upon its completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 – Q2 INSTITUTO PROMUNDO: 7 schools. There is also stronger connection with the Municipal Educational Secretariat department to promote projects that approach issues like race, violence and gender, in the entire network of public schools in Rio. HEAL AFRICA: 6 schools (5 in Goma and 1 at Sake). Q3 – Q4 HEAL Africa: 9 schools adopted guidelines during this reporting period (3 in Sake/ 6 in Goma) and support the response and prevention process. Instituto Promundo: (2 schools); the Education Secretary committed to continued use of Youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Living Peace, identifying particular schools ‘at risk’ of violence, in collaboration with Red Cross.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.2</th>
<th>School staff where the project is implemented have knowledge of their schools’ resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated skills for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys.</th>
<th>1: % of school staff surveyed, where the project is implemented, who demonstrate increased knowledge of their schools’ resources framework (policies, guidelines and tools) and associated skills for the prevention of and response to violence against adolescent girls and boys.</th>
<th>Pre-test and post-test surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 – Q2 INSTITUTO PROMUNDO: 50 (in addition to 53 reached in 2016). HEAL AFRICA: 24 (in addition to 16 reached in 2016). Q3-Q4 HEAL Africa (24 staff): The focal points listened more, taking more time to interact with the children, to understand their problems, and to try to find a solution together. Instituto Promundo (78 staff): School staff demonstrated a greater knowledge of policies and greater interest teaching these themes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.3</th>
<th>Key secondary beneficiaries (which can include school staff, students, parents and guardians, and community members) in implementation sites in Brazil and DRC have knowledge of reporting mechanisms for adolescent girls and boys who have been exposed to violence, and report a greater willingness to intervene.</th>
<th>1: Perspectives of secondary beneficiaries (which can include school staff, students, parents and guardians, and community members) in implementation sites about their knowledge of reporting mechanisms for adolescents who have been exposed to violence, and their willingness to intervene</th>
<th>Focus groups and semi-structured individual interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Number of secondary beneficiaries (which can include school staff, students, parents and guardians) who attend school-based campaigns/activities</td>
<td>Attendance monitoring sheets or mechanisms. Baseline will be zero.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1-Q2 INSTITUTO PROMUNDO: (4,338 total). Campaigns were carried out in participating schools reaching parents, caregivers and the wider communities. HEAL AFRICA: (1,865 total). The parents, teachers, representatives of parents’ committees, GTC Members, and other groups contributed to strengthen the response mechanisms, prevention and referral system in schools and within the communities. Q3-Q4 HEAL Africa: (3,305), Parents of students from 9 schools, teachers and students from 12 schools. Instituto Promundo (4,856): 3 campaigns were carried out in 2 schools. Q1 – Q2 INSTITUTO PROMUNDO: (4,338 total). Campaigns were carried out in participating schools reaching parents, caregivers and the wider communities. HEAL AFRICA: (1,865 total). The parents, teachers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
representatives of parents’ committees, GTC Members, and other groups contributed to strengthen the response mechanisms, prevention and referral system in schools and within the communities.

Q3 – Q4 HEAL Africa: (3,305), Parents of students from 9 schools, teachers and students from 12 schools. Instituto Promundo (4,856): 3 campaigns were carried out in 2 schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.4</th>
<th>Monitoring Forms</th>
<th>Attendance Monitoring Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Number of key stakeholder groups in education policy (in schools, government and civil society organizations) represented in the Steering Committee</td>
<td>Q1-Q2 Representatives of education policy in Brazil (19) and in DRC (32) in 2016 met to inform the development of their methodologies and to monitor implementation. Q3–Q4 HEAL Africa (7): GTPP, SGTSM, GTAJ, Cluster Education, Cluster Santé, GTLCI, Cluster Protection, Global Task Force to Combat School Violence. Instituto Promundo (19): Representatives of education policy met to inform the development of methodologies and to monitor implementation, and also to plan next steps after the ending of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Number of key stakeholders in education policy (in schools, government and civil society organizations) who attend key meetings (including policy briefing)</td>
<td>Q1-Q2 Representatives of education policy in Brazil (19) and in DRC (32) in 2016 met to inform the development of the methodologies and to monitor implementation. Q3–Q4 -HEAL Africa (16): PSPEF, EPSP, Division de Genre-famille-enfant, UNHCR, PARDE, ISL, DIVJEUINE, UNICEF, ABA, MINIGENRE, MINIEDUC, Sous-Division Goma, Karisimbi, Nyiragongo, Masisi2, Coordination des comité des parents Nord-Kivu. Instituto Promundo (19): Representatives of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. Beneficiary Data Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Monitoring Forms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 – Q2</td>
<td>Representatives of education policy in Brazil (19) and in DRC (32) in 2016 met to inform the development of the methodologies and to monitor implementation. HEAL Africa (4): GTC members visited the intervention schools in December 2017. Instituto Promundo (19): Representatives of education policy met to inform the development of methodologies and to monitor implementation, and also to plan next steps after the ending of the project.</td>
<td>Attendance monitoring forms and follow-up monitoring forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Number of key stakeholders in education policy (in schools, government and civil society organizations) who attend key meetings or training and subsequently follow up

---

92
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary group</th>
<th>At the project goal level</th>
<th>At the outcome level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female domestic workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female migrant workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female political activists/human rights defenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female sex workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female refugees/internally displaced/asylum seekers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous women/from ethnic groups</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, bisexual, transgender</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and girls in general</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls living with HIV and AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls survivors of violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women prisoners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Beneficiary Total</strong></td>
<td>713</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations (including NGOs)</td>
<td>Number of institutions reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of individuals reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based groups/members</td>
<td>Number of groups reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of individuals reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational professionals (i.e. teachers, educators)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organizations</td>
<td>Number of institutions reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of individuals reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public/community at large</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government officials (i.e. decision makers, policy implementers)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professionals</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists/Media</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal officers (i.e. lawyers, prosecutors, judges)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and/or boys</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentarians</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/welfare workers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed personnel (i.e. police, military, peace-keeping officers)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify) (Parents of Beneficiaries)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Beneficiary Total</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Additional methodology-related documentation

Focus group Guide

Ice breaker activity
Ask each participant to draw picture of a girl and a picture of a boy (ensuring it won’t be evaluated)

Evaluative Activity

1. Put the portraits on the wall grouping the girls together and the boys together. Ask the participants to think about who the girl interacts with in her day to day and list these around the group of girls. Now ask how the girls relationships with these people was/was before the program (if necessary prompt re: family, peer relationships, intimate relationships)

2. Put the results on the wall and group any that are similar. Have a discussion about them

3. Repeat this process with the pictures of the boys.

4. Finally, discuss the differences between what has been discussed for the girls experience, compared with the boys experiences.

5. Ask the participants to think about any of those areas that changed in some way during their participation in the program (adding these changes to the display on the wall)

6. Put the results on the wall and group any that are similar. Have a discussion about them

7. Ask the participants how they think these changes came about (prompts - certain activities, relationships or aspects of or within the project. Were there any influencing factors outside the project?

Final Questions

- Is there anything in your life today that was influenced by your participation in the program?
- What did you dislike about the program?
- How would you have improved it?
Guided Discussion Outline

Facilitator's Introduction

Heal Africa/Instituto Promundo is undergoing an external evaluation of the Youth Living Peace Program. The aim of the study is to understand what went well and what can be learned. I am an external evaluator from inFocus. I will be speaking with/asking you some questions about how some different people are/were affected by the project. Please speak honestly and freely. This conversation will be recorded. Your conversation may be transcribed and included in the final report. Your name will not be used in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

Introductions

Please could you introduce yourself and in what way(s) you have connected or been involved with the Youth Living Peace Program or the organisations involved?

Guiding Questions

1. 'Does this community need the Youth Living peace programme?'
   (If yes/no) Why? (relevance)

2. Has the program affected you in any way?
   (If yes, how?)

3. 'Who else has the program affected?'
   How? (of only positive answers) Has the programme affected anyone negatively?
   'Who? How?' (consequences)

4. Do you think this community is a good place to run the program?
   (If yes/no) Why?

5. Is there anything that makes it difficult/easy to run here
   (external factors which enhance/facilitate)
Key Informant Interview Questions

(Note - not all questions are relevant to all stakeholders)

We are going to begin by talking, more generally, about you and the program...

Please tell me a little about your role within the Youth Living Peace Program in your own words, what is the purpose of the program? What do you think the short term effects of the program have been so far? What do you think the long term effects of the program have been so far?

Let's look a little more closely at your thoughts about the program's specific activities and interventions...

Do you think the program is aligned with the needs and context of the community in which it is being delivered? Thinking about the school context, prior to the program, did the school have any pre-defined processes or activities which were targeted at preventing or responding to violence?

How has the program influenced/affected the school's approach/policies/response to violence?

Thinking about the way in which the program has been rolled out...

To what extent has the program kept to its expected time frame? To what extent would you say the program is 'on track?' in terms of the delivery strategy? Has the delivery been efficient? (If yes - in what way, if no - why not?) (efficiency prompts - was the quality program delivery appropriate to the time/cost/resource invested in it?; were there moments/processes were time/cost/resource lost during the implementation?; how was time/cost/resource used well?) What would you say are the key success factors for reaching the program's goals and objectives? What are the key obstacles/challenges the program has faced in its delivery?

I am now going to ask some questions about advocacy and engagement at a policy level...

Have you been involved in any engagement with policy makers/influencers during the course of the program? If yes, which policy makers/influencers did you engage with and how? (If no, move to next section)
(if yes,) What has been the effect of these interventions? (prompt: What worked and what didn’t work?)
(re what worked) What do you think helped these interventions to be successful?
(re what didn’t work) Why do you think this intervention was not successful?
Have there been any other obstacles or challenges during the process of engaging with stakeholders at a policy level?

Finally, we are going to talk about the ongoing effects of the program (beyond delivery)

Are there any strategies or activities in place for maintaining/continuing the positive effects of the program beyond its closure?
Which stakeholders would be involved in this (and how)?
Has (Heal Africa/Instituto Promundo) engaged these stakeholders in any way? (if no, is there any strategy for engaging them)?

What are the key lessons you have learned during your involvement with the program which could help to improve or shape future iterations?
**Assessment of Change Questionnaire**

**Section 1: About you**
Please tell us a little about yourself and your role within the Youth Living Peace Program.

1. Which of the following best describes your involvement in the program?

- [ ] Educational Staff (e.g. teachers, school staff)
- [ ] Representatives from Partner Institution
- [ ] Instituto Promundo Staff/ HEAL Africa Staff
- [ ] Other
  
  Please specify your job title: __________________________

2. How long have you been involved in the program?

- [ ] Less than one year
- [ ] One to two years
- [ ] Two to three years
- [ ] More than three years

**Section 2: Your thoughts on the Youth Living Peace Program and its delivery.**

This section looks at factors which may have helped or hindered the delivery of the project and its results. We have included a few common factors however are keen to hear about any other factors you can think of.

3. Do you think any of the following factors influenced the process of implementing the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positively Influenced</th>
<th>Negatively Influenced</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Please use this space provide any comments or explanations related to your answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the school environment</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school’s curriculum</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies at the school(s)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents’ attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other family members’ attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community members’ attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and behaviours of staff at the school(s)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other NGO project Activities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships with decision makers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and behaviour of the girl and boy participants</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and behaviour of the girl and boy participants’ peers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government policy</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If there are other factors you thought might have influenced the process of implementing the program (either positively or negatively) please tell us about them in the space below.
5. Do you think any of the following factors influenced the results of the implementing of the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively Influenced</th>
<th>Negatively Influenced</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Please use this space provide any comments or explanations related to your answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the school environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school's curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies at the school(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents' attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other family members' attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community members' attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and behaviours of staff at the school(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other NGO project Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships with decision makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and behaviour of the girl and boy participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and behaviour of the girl and boy participants' peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. If there are other factors you thought might have influenced the results of implementing the program (either positively or negatively) please tell us about them in the space below.


7. To what extent do you think that violence against girls/women is a problem in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A big problem</th>
<th>A fair problem</th>
<th>A bit of a problem</th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered ‘a big problem’, ‘a fair problem’ or ‘a bit of a problem’ please complete the section below:

8. Please describe the problem in a few sentences in the space below


9. a. Please rate the extent to which you believe that the following activities that were carried out during the program were effective in addressing the issue of violence against girls/women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Some what effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>Please use this space provide any comments or explanations related to your answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting group education sessions in the schools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting group therapy sessions in the schools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting sessions with individuals in the schools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating materials and</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals which can be used by other agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting school-based campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with key stakeholders to align approaches and best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing learning and best practice with political influencers/stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. b. In relation to question 9 a. above, please tell us which activity was **most effective** and why

9. c. In relation to question 9 a. above, please tell us which activity was **least effective** and why

10. To what extent do you think that gender inequality (for example through social norms or exclusion) is a problem in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A big problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit of a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you answered 'a big problem', 'a fair problem' or 'a bit of a problem' please complete the section below:

11. Please describe the problem in a few sentences in the space below

12. Please rate the extent to which you believe that the following activities that were carried out during the program were effective in addressing the issue of gender inequality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Some what effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Please use this space provide any comments or explanations related to your answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting group education sessions in the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting group therapy sessions in the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting sessions with individuals in the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating materials and manuals which can be used by other agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting school-based campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with key stakeholders to align approaches and best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing learning and best practice with political influencers/stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. b. In relation to question 12 a. above please tell us which activity was **most effective** and why

12c. In relation to question 12 a. above, please tell us which activity was **least effective** and why

13. Are you aware of programming directions and policies beyond the Youth Living Peace Program (outside of your organisation) which are aimed at preventing and responding to violence against girls/women?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. If you answered ‘yes’ to question 13, please tell us which directions and policies

15. Are you aware of any policies or laws regarding violence against girls/women that have been created or changed recently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. If you answered 'yes' please tell us which law or laws?

17. Did the project influence the creation/adoption of this law in any way?

18. If you answered 'yes, it did' to question 17, please tell us how the project influenced the creation or adoption of the law.

Section 3: Finally, we would like to ask about your reflections of the program implementation and its impact so far.

19. Has anything positive resulted from the project that you did not expect at the outset?
20. Has anything negative resulted from the project that you did not expect at the outset?
VI. Lists of persons and institutions interviewed or consulted and sites visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HEAL Africa</th>
<th>Instituto Promundo</th>
<th>Type of consultation with stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>Adolescent girls</td>
<td>Adolescent girls</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>Adolescent boys</td>
<td>Adolescent boys</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational professionals (i.e. teachers and educators)</td>
<td>Educational professionals (i.e. teachers and educators)</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/Community Members</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guided Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development/Delivery Partners</strong></td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focal Points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of Change Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Advisory Group (local representatives of Ministry of Education, of Ministry of Gender)</td>
<td>NIAP (Interdisciplinary Center for Support to Schools)</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-site Staff</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VII. List of supporting documents reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Documents Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instituto Promundo</strong></td>
<td>Project Proposal&lt;br&gt;Baseline data of the project (i.e. Results Monitoring Plan and Baseline Report)&lt;br&gt;Data Collection Tools&lt;br&gt;Summary of monitoring data&lt;br&gt;Progress and annual reports of the project (annual and mid term reports)&lt;br&gt;Transcripts from focus groups with teachers&lt;br&gt;Formative research (Needs Assessment)&lt;br&gt;Facilitator reports and field diaries&lt;br&gt;Internal Reports&lt;br&gt;Methodology (Toolkit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEAL Africa</strong></td>
<td>Project Proposal&lt;br&gt;Formative research report&lt;br&gt;Monitoring data available in electronic version (i.e. some pre test data and some student satisfaction data, some counselling data)&lt;br&gt;Progress and annual reports of the project (annual, mid term and internal activity reports)&lt;br&gt;M&amp;E Report&lt;br&gt;Facilitator reports (paper form)&lt;br&gt;Monitoring tools&lt;br&gt;Methodology Toolkits (i.e. materials for girls and boys)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. CVs of evaluator(s) who conducted the evaluation

Heather Bailie Ridout
Lead Evaluator

PROFESSIONAL PROFILE
Heather Ridout is an inFocus Associate and Co-Founder of Beeconomics in Brazil. Her expertise is in the areas of youth empowerment and youth anti-violence initiatives. For inFocus, Heather provides evaluation, training and capacity building services, the aim of which is to improve the performance of social impact-based organisations. Beeconomics is focused on youth inclusion for marginalised young people who are high risk for involvement in illicit employment, which is a strong trigger for inter-youth violence. It provides training and transitional employment for marginalised and at-risk young people. Heather was previously a founding member and on the steering committee of ENOUGH!, a coalition which sought to respond to the overwhelming issue of youth violence in South London. Heather speaks English and Portuguese and holds an MA in applied linguistics. Her dissertation was about youth creativity and identity in grime music and slang, which is often associated with violence.

NATIONALITY British

LANGUAGES English (mother tongue), Portuguese (fluent)

COUNTRY Brazil, Senegal, UK

EXPERIENCE

EDUCATION
2009 MA Applied Linguistics (Distinction)  
Birkbeck College, University of London
2006 BSc (Hons) Applied Social Science (Anthropology) Upper 2.1  
Southampton University

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT
2012 - date Associate, inFocus Enterprises Ltd
2012 - date Co-founder, Beeconomics, Brazil

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE
2017 External Evaluation
Instituto Bola Pra Frente, Fundação Gol de Letra (Brazil), Spirit of 2012 (UK)
Lead Evaluator (Brazil Evaluations) Evaluation Team (UK)

2012 to date M&E Development
Instituto Bola Pra Frente, Rio de Janeiro (Brazil); YLC Kicks (USA); Commonwealth Games Canada (Canada), MYSA (Kenya), Girls on the Run (USA), Sport for Good Foundation (Global)
Lead Consultant

2012 to date Theory of Change Development
Laureus YES Programme (South Africa); ISCA MOVE Initiative - ADP (Albania); ASFAS (Serbia); Let’s Train Together (Slovenia); OKRA (Belgium)
Lead Consultant

2016  
**Theory of Change Training**  
DMFA Programme for Democratisation, Human Rights and Civil Society (Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus)

Consultant

2015 to date  
**Communities of Practice – Sport for Development and Gender**  
Laureus Sport for Good Foundation (Global)

Consultant

## PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Impact Hub Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Policy Assistant</td>
<td>CAFOD (Catholic Agency for Overseas Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>PA to Director</td>
<td>CAFOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Academies Administrator</td>
<td>Oasis Community Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VOLUNTARY EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>Youth worker</td>
<td>Oasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Steering Committee/Founding Member</td>
<td>ENOUGH!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

**Co-Author** - ‘**A Winning Team: Scholar-Practitioner Partnerships in Sport for Development**’ in Derek Van Rheenen and Jean Marie DeOrnellas (2017) *Scholar-Practitioner Collaborations as Communities of Practice*, Berkeley, University of California

**Co-Author** - *inFocus Seven Steps to Measuring Social Change Guide*  
[http://impactinfocus.com/resources/](http://impactinfocus.com/resources/)

Ethnographic fieldwork: slang, identity and creativity amongst adolescents participating in a youth training and empowerment programme in South London.

Ethnographic fieldwork: the use of dance in cross cultural communication - data collected in Portuguese from Brazilian informants living in Senegal

---

**Monika Bakayoko-Topilska**

Lead Consultant - DRC

## PROFESSIONAL PROFILE

Monika Bakayoko-Topilska is an independent educational psychologist with a wide range of experience in educational and social work with adults, youth and children, with focus on prevention and response to violence against women and girls. She has experience in conducting training, evaluations and capacity building and has strong analytical, design and problem-solving skills. Monika also has proven leadership skills through managing, developing and motivating teams to achieve their objectives. She holds an MA in Psychology and speaks fluent Polish and English and advanced French.
NATIONALITY: Polish

LANGUAGES: Polish (fluent), English (fluent), French (advanced), Portuguese (intermediate)

COUNTRY EXPERIENCE: Afghanistan, Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, India, Ivory Coast, Poland

EDUCATION

2010  Certificate in Development Management
      Open University, London

1998  MA Psychology
      University of Adam Mickiewicz in Poznan, Poland

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

2015 - Ongoing  Independent Consultant

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

2017 - Ongoing  Audit of GBVIE Readiness for UNFPA in the Arab States
      Lebanese American University, Institute for Women Studies in the Arab World
      Senior Researcher

2013-2015  Women Protection and Empowerment Program
      International Rescue Committee- Democratic Republic of Congo
      Women Protection and Empowerment Program Director/ Chief of Party of ESPOIR project

2006-2012  Gender-Based Violence Project
      International Rescue Committee- Cote d’Ivoire
      Gender Based Violence (GBV) Coordinator

2004-2006  Child Protection Programmes
      International Rescue Committee- Afghanistan
      Child Protection Manager in Herat

2001-2003  “Children’s Town” in Huambo
      ADPP – Angola
      Project Manager

2001  Consultancies
      ADPP – India
      Consultant

2011  “Children’s Town” project in Caxito
      ADPP -Angola
      Volunteer

1994-1998  Class for autistic children
      Special Needs School- Poland, Poznan
      Teacher of a class for autistic children
PUBLICATIONS AND REWARDS

- Gender norms and economic empowerment intervention to reduce intimate partner violence against women in rural Côte d’Ivoire: a randomized controlled pilot study - J Gupta, K Falb, D Kpebo, J Annan
- Study of Effectiveness of a Social-Economic Intervention for Sexual Violence Survivors in Eastern DRC - Judith Bass, Paul Bolton, Sarah Murray, Gabrielle Cole, Katie Robinette, Catherine Poulton, Tamah Murfet, Monika Bakayoko-Topolska, Daniela Greco, Karin Wachter, Dalita Cetinoglu, Jeannie Annan
- Cognitive Processing Therapy in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Moving From RCT to Implementation - Debra Kaysen, Cindy Stappenbeck, Monika Bakayoko-Topolska, Katie Robinette, Viviane Maroy, Paul Bolton, Judith Bass
- November 2012 - Recipient of Sarlo Foundation Award for Distinguished Humanitarian Service

TRAINING AND CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2014</td>
<td>Participation in Global GBV Conferences, International Rescue Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Coordination of Multi-Sectoral Response to Gender-Based Violence in Humanitarian Settings, United Nations Population Fund, New York and International Centre for Reproductive Health - Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Seminar: Rights to education - “Solution to all problems or problem without solution”, Institut international des Droits de l'Enfant (IDE), Sion, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Community support for people living with HIV, THT London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Implementing Sphere, RedR - London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Development work in Africa, Project management, Humana People to People - Denmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tom Keyte
Senior Consultant

PROFESSIONAL PROFILE

Tom Keyte is Co-founder and a Senior Consultant at inFocus. He has over 11 years of experience as an evaluator, trainer and consultant, supporting not-for-profit organisations with evaluation and learning solutions. Tom oversees and takes part in complex evaluations as part of the inFocus evaluation team and sets up and runs global communities of practice with organisations from around the world, in order to share learning. He develops consultancy, training and marketing resources for M&E and has run training and developed M&E solutions for not for profit organisations in over 30 countries, both in-person and remotely. Tom has worked at inFocus (previously Acumen Social Enterprises) since 2006.

NATIONALITY British
YEAR OF BIRTH 1981
LANGUAGES English (mother tongue), Spanish (working knowledge)
IN-COUNTRY EXPERIENCE

Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Honduras, India, Iceland, Kenya, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Rwanda, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK, USA. Zambia

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

2014 - current  Co-founder and Senior Consultant, inFocus

PROJECT EXPERIENCE

2014 - 2016  inFocus

Co-founder and Senior Consultant

• Setting up, running and supporting of global Sport for Development communities of practice with not for profit organisations from around the world in the topics of Sport and Gender Equality/Equity, Sport and Employment, Sport and Education and Sport and Disability.

• Working as a Senior Evaluator on the evaluation of the British Council and Premier League ‘Premier Skills’ programme, the 3-year evaluation of the Spirit of 2012 and supporting the Developmental Evaluation of the NOSCC Coalition in New Orleans for the Laureus Sport for Good Foundation USA.

• Leading the development of the ‘7 steps Programme’ monitoring and evaluation (M&E) training, both online and offline, to over 100 organisations around the world. This includes both the delivery of training directly to clients and delivering ‘training of trainer’ courses to staff and associates.

• The development and running of custom online training courses in M&E, theory of change, reporting and funding applications for British Council China, UNDP, International Sport and Culture Association (ISCA), the Royal Academy and the Royal Society of Engineering.

• Guiding the development of theories of change for not for profit organisations across a range of topics including Sport and Gender Equity (for Moving the Goalposts and Girls on the Run), Conflict Resolution (Pl4y International), Sport and Disability (Indiability) and technology (Comic Relief Tech for Good Programme -ongoing).

• Developing the evaluation capacity of not for profits through one to one consultancy, most recently for COPAB in Uganda, Mathare Youth Sports Association in Kenya, Indiability in India and Futeco in Mozambique.

2010 - 2014  inFocus (formerly Acumen Social Enterprises)

Operations Director
Voluntary Roles

1999 - 2016

- Acting as a trustee for the HIV/AIDS charity Tackle Africa on redesigning and integrating governance systems.
- Supporting start-up charities and social enterprises with developing strategies and monitoring and evaluation systems.
- Organising a range of local and international fundraising events for NGO’s such as CLIC, Care International and the British Red Cross.
- Working as a volunteer on short-term projects with Civil Service International (CSI) in Greece, Turkey, Iceland, Croatia, Sweden, Serbia, Czech Republic, Estonia and the Netherlands.
- Living and working as a voluntary English teacher with Project Trust for one year in Honduras.

2002 - 2006

British Red Cross/CARE International

*Fundraiser*

- Worked on a variety of local and national fundraising projects while working on voluntary initiatives.

2006 - 2010

Acumen Social Enterprises

*Senior M&E Consultant*

- Development of M&E solutions for key clients, including the BBC and FIFA, in North America, Europe and Africa, both in-person and online.

---


12 Forgotten Crisis to Remember (2017) UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Relief Web accessed at https://reliefweb.int/report/world/12-forgotten-crises-remember


Term used in 2010 by Margot Wallström, the UN’s special representative on sexual violence in conflict at the time

“At least 1.8 million Congolese women have been victims of rape within the past two decades” Investigating Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) rough Critical Discourse Analysis http://cupola.gettysburg.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1396&context=student_scholarship

The DHL data from 2013-2014 show that 57% have ever experienced spousal violence (emotional, physical or sexual) committed by their current or former husband/partner


The ‘rape capital of the world’? We women in Congo don’t see it that way Justine Masika Bihamba https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/oct/09/the-rape-capital-of-the-world-we-women-in-democratic-republic-congo-dont-see-it-that-way


Source: Beneficiaries and Common Results Reporting to UNTF (and additional communications with staff)

Source: Beneficiaries and Common Results Reporting to UNTF (and additional communications with staff)