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1. Overview

Despite the growing number of interventions related to violence against women and girls (VAWG) during recent years, to date, few rigorous evaluations have been carried out of related programmes (Haider 2009; McLoughlin 2011; McAslan Fraser 2011). Dina Deligiorgis (Knowledge Management Specialist for the Ending Violence against Women team at UN Women) has stated ‘there are very few rigorous evaluations on VAW’\(^1\) and this has been echoed by others in the field (Tina Wallace 2008; Fogelsong 2012). The quality of existing evaluations is also variable. Mary Ellsberg (formerly Vice President of the International Center

for Research on Women (ICRW), currently director of George Washington University’s Global Women’s Institute) observes that while there have been a large volume of innovative efforts to address violence against women in recent years, ‘they tend to be small scale, under-funded and often poorly evaluated’ (ICRW 2011). Fogelson (2012) suggests that ‘Defining and measuring progress on this issue is especially difficult – the appropriate measures themselves [are] elusive and the process of defining progress nettlesome.’

Many of the evaluations that do exist tend to evaluate specific projects rather than wider programmes (Haider 2009). This report aims to identify some of the key organisations and individuals that have been involved in carrying out evaluations. It mainly focuses on identifying key organisations and individuals that have extensive experience in conducting evaluations or interventions related to VAWG rather than those that have conducted one-off evaluations. Nevertheless, a list of additional evaluations is provided in Section 4 on ‘Additional relevant individuals and organisations’.

Two of the key organisations identified in this report are the Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit (CWASU) at London Metropolitan University and the Centre for Gender and Violence Research at the University of Bristol. Although many (but not all) of their evaluations have been carried out in the UK, each organisation also has experience working on interventions related to VAWG in the international, and developing, context. For example, CWASU was commissioned by UN Women to develop online guidance on the principles and process of coordinating responses to address violence against women and girls. This drew on practices from around the globe, and included case studies from Europe, UK, Africa and the US. Additionally CWASU is a partner on the EU-funded Daphne Programme to prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women. Similarly, although the evaluations carried out by the Centre for Gender and Violence Research have been mainly in the UK, the centre has research experience on issues related to violence against women in countries including, for example, India and Uganda.

Overall, there seems to be growing consensus on the need for more rigorous evaluations of interventions related to VAWG. Mary Ellsberg (ICRW 2011) has argued ‘We need to invest in rigorous evaluations, so that we can find out what works and what doesn’t, and make sure that our investments are achieving results.’ USAID has identified gaps in existing knowledge around GBV and pledged to ‘prioritize monitoring and evaluation of United States Government programmes on gender based violence prevention’ (USAID 2010)

---

2. Key organisations and evaluations

**Centre for Gender and Violence Research**

[http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/research/centres/genderviolence/](http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/research/centres/genderviolence/)

The Centre for Gender and Violence Research, based at the University of Bristol, is a key UK site for the study of gender-based violence. Incorporating the Violence against Women Research Group (VAWRG), the Centre has a long history of researching violence against women and gender based violence, feeding this into policy and practice nationally, internationally and at a local level.
The Centre has been commissioned to carry out evaluations on a number of interventions to address violence against women and children. Some of the key evaluations are outlined below.

**Williamson, E. and Abrahams, H., 2011, ‘Evaluation of the Phoenix programme’, University of Bristol, Bristol**
The aim of this evaluation was to examine the effectiveness of the Phoenix programme provided by the North Somerset Against Domestic Abuse (NADA). The evaluation involved collecting quantitative data from service users who volunteered to take part in the research. Service users were asked to complete an initial survey, after which they were contacted by the research team to complete a post survey (if they had completed the course). The Phoenix programme runs two levels of courses, therefore, it was possible to collect further data from women who took part in the second stage course. The data was entered into a statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) database and analysed using that software. Additional material was gathered by the research team through informal discussions with women attending the courses and from further written feedback voluntarily provided by participants.

This evaluation aimed to examine the effectiveness of the Freedom Programme as provided by the Bristol Freedom Programme Network. The evaluation involved collecting quantitative data from service users who volunteered to take part in the research. Service users were asked to complete an initial survey and were contacted by the research team at a later date to complete either a post survey (if they had completed the course) or an exit survey (if they dropped out). The data was entered into a statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) database and analysed using that software.

The aims of the evaluation were to: (1) examine data on the number of women using the Bristol Night Service for Women across the duration of the six month pilot project; (2) identify the specific and complex needs of this client group, and how these can be met; (3) identify the role of other service providers and what Pathways are needed to facilitate multi-agency working; (4) assess the effectiveness of the service in enabling the target group to engage in services and achieve positive outcomes; (5) consider the wider impact of the service on other statutory and third sector organisations, including how agencies can work together to provide coordinated support packages; and (6) identify options for future provision to inform Bristol’s Pathways work.
The evaluation involved additional interviews and fieldwork relating specifically to the night service alongside the wider mapping study. The research team used service user interviews, stakeholder interviews and analysis of quantitative data to conduct the evaluation. The research team visited the shelter being evaluated on six occasions from January to April 2010. In terms of evaluating whether the night service was successful or not, the project was evaluated both in terms of standard measures of use and satisfaction, alongside objectives identified by stakeholders and the service users themselves. By using a variety of sources of information, evaluators aimed to consider the ability of the services to meet the needs of service users, funders, service providers and staff.

This project evaluated the South Tyneside Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programme (STDAPP). This included: analysis of relevant documentary evidence; conducting interviews with key stakeholders and practitioners; interviews with male clients/perpetrators; interviews with (ex-)partners; and analysing monitoring/output data (various sources) and outcome data from the police.

Information about additional evaluations carried out by the Centre for Gender and Violence Research can be found here: http://www.bris.ac.uk/sps/research/centres/genderviolence/projects/

Contact details:
Dr. Hilary Abrahams, Hilary.Abrahams@bristol.ac.uk
Dr. Emma Williamson, Tel: +44 (0)117 954 6788, e.williamson@bristol.ac.uk

Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit http://www.cwasu.org/

Established in 1987, the Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, based at London Metropolitan University, has conducted independent feminist research for policy makers, practitioners, survivors, supporters and activists for more than two decades. CWASU is the only research unit in Europe that integrates a focus on all forms of violence against women and child abuse.

In addition to the specific evaluations outlined below, CWASU has also developed online guidance on the principles and process of coordinating responses to violence against women and girls for UN Women, drawing on practices from around the globe and included case studies from Europe, UK, Africa and the US. Additionally, CWASU is a partner on the EU-funded Daphne Programme to prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women. The organisation is also currently working on a process and outcome evaluation and impact study of domestic violence protection orders (DVPOs) pilot, together with the Forensic Psychological Services at Middlesex University (outlined at the end of Section 2 in this report).
CWASU has carried out several evaluations of programmes, projects and legislation related to violence against women and girls, predominantly in the UK. A number of these are outlined below:

This report presents findings from an evaluation of four Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy (IDVA) schemes in London, each based in a different setting: a police station; hospital A&E department; a community based domestic violence project; and a women-only violence against women (VAW) organisation. The specific aims of the evaluation were to: (1) assess the outcomes and impact of the work; (2) assess the merits of each IDVA model and suggest improvements as appropriate; (3) contribute to an evidence-base on IDVAs; (4) identify the lessons learnt from the implementation of these projects; (5) identify best practice for wider dissemination.

This report evaluates a sexual exploitation prevention programme. There were five core strands of data collection: an online survey of professionals who attended the training; interviews with young trainers who co-delivered the training for professionals; interviews with Nia staff who delivered the training and the sessions with young people; interviews with advisory group members; and focus groups with young people. In addition, the ongoing practice logs kept by project workers were analysed using NVIVO to identify core themes.

This evaluation was commissioned to explore both processes and outcomes of the Jacana pilot programme, developed and delivered in partnership between the Nia project and Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DVIP) to support parents affected by current and historic domestic violence (DV) in Hackney, London. The evaluation used a bespoke multi-methodological approach. There were six strands of data collection: pre and post programme questionnaires for women and men; focus groups with women and men towards the end of the programme; questionnaires to referral agencies; interviews with developers and deliverers of the materials at the beginning and end of the programme; non-participant observation of group sessions; and analysis of data supplied by the Nia project and DVIP on referrals. Individual telephone interviews with programme participants were subsequently added, as questionnaires and focus groups yielded low responses.
This report comprises an 'after the fact' evaluation of the Nordic Baltic Pilot Project for the Support, Protection, Safe Return and Rehabilitation of Women Victims of Trafficking for Sexual Exploitation. The overall aim of the evaluation was to review the project’s activities, assess the extent to which it achieved its objectives and, within this, to determine how effective the structures and mechanisms have been, taking account of the fact that the project is one of several initiatives in the region. The evaluators were also tasked to provide guidance for future developments. The methodological approach comprised four phases – project familiarisation, semi-structured interviews, an online survey and participation in a project meeting – to be completed over an initial period of 5 months, although this time frame was extended to increase participation rates.

Making the Grade is an assessment of the work of each of the Government Departments in Westminster in tackling violence against women. The assessment is based on the evidence provided by each Secretary of State in response to 12 standardised questions.

This report evaluates an experimental project in Islington, London, which aimed to provide support to victims of domestic violence at their most vulnerable point, enhance the response of the criminal justice system, and to secure better informed and coordinated responses by local agencies to the problem. The evaluation used a multi-method approach, including participant observation, in-depth interviewing, database creation and maintenance and questionnaires over a three year period. More information about this evaluation methodology can be found Section 2 of this report.

Additional evaluations carried out by CWASU include:

- **Evaluation of the London Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Project** (2009). This evaluation assessed process and outcomes of IDVAs (specific posts linked to DV courts or multi-agency risk assessment processes) alongside identifying promising practices across the projects;
• **Evaluation of the Operation and Effectiveness of the Pilot Rape and Sexual Assault Referral Centre in Glasgow (2009)** This study was an outcome and process evaluation to assess the operation and effectiveness of the first SARC in Scotland, and will contribute to ongoing development of responses to sexual violence across Scotland;

• **Evaluation of Portsmouth Sexual Assault Referral Centre (2007)**. This assessed service user profiles, case profiles, criminal justice outcomes and service user satisfaction using quantitative and qualitative methods.

Detail on these and other relevant CWASU evaluations can be found here: [http://www.cwasu.org/project_display.asp?type=11&pageid=PROJECTS&pagekey=55](http://www.cwasu.org/project_display.asp?type=11&pageid=PROJECTS&pagekey=55)

**CWASU contact information:**
Tel: +44 (0)20 7133 5014

---

**International Center for Research on Women**

The International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) is a global research institute with headquarters in Washington, D.C., and additional offices in Nairobi, New Delhi and Mumbai. ICRW is comprised of social scientists, economists, public health specialists and demographers, all of whom are experts in gender relations. Violence against women is a core area of ICRW’s work. The institute employs a multifaceted approach to reducing violence against women, including empirical research to better understand the incidence of violence, costs associated with it and factors that lead to it.

ICRW has worked with grantees of the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UNTF) to improve their ability to implement and evaluate interventions that aim to reduce violence against women. ICRW has also partnered with several organisations to educate members of the United States Congress to increase resources for research, monitoring and evaluation of programs to reduce violence, so that the effectiveness of programs is documented.

ICRW work on evaluating programmes related to VAWG includes the following.


This document sets out a strategic framework to assess the impact of UN Women’s Safe Cities Free of Violence against Women and Girls Global Programme (SC GP) (2010-2015) and to inform formulation of a model (or models) for reducing violence against women and girls (VAWG), particularly sexual violence (SV), in urban public spaces.

Characteristics of the strategy include: incorporation of women’s rights approaches; use of participatory research techniques; application of quantitative and qualitative methods (i.e. mixed-methods approach); construction of counterfactuals to help
assess impact attribution at intervention sites in some of the cities where feasible and desirable; conduction of ex-ante (baseline), mid-term, endline and ideally ex-post (after projects end) assessments accompanied by ongoing process monitoring.


In 2011, AusAID commissioned the International Center for Research on Women to follow-up on research undertaken in 2008 to assess approaches to addressing VAWG in Fiji, Papa New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Timor-Leste. This 2011 study looks at what has happened with regard to three key strategies for advancing the violence against women agenda: (1) increasing access to justice for survivors of violence; (2) improving access and quality of support services for survivors; and (3) promoting violence prevention. The study also investigates a fourth strategy: strengthening the enabling environment for ending violence against women. The report presents research findings on progress made since the ODE report in these four thematic areas in the same five countries.

The study methodology consisted of a desk review, an online questionnaire and key informant interviews. The resulting data showcase successes and lessons learned as well as gaps and shortcomings that need renewed commitment by a broad range of stakeholders.

Contact information:
Tel: +1 (202) 797 0007

Forensic Psychological Services

Middlesex University’s Forensic Psychological Services is currently involved in a three-year research and development initiative coordinated by AVA’s Stella Project (set up in 2002 and to improve the way services are delivered to survivors, their children and perpetrators of domestic and sexual violence affected by problematic substance use). This involves three phases: research; practice; and evaluation. The evaluation phase of this project (to be undertaken in 2013) will involve an online questionnaire with frontline staff in the agencies, an analysis of policies and procedures from participating agencies and strategic documents produced by local borough strategic partnerships, and a one-month routine enquiry period that captures referral data on dual issues of substance misuse and domestic and sexual violence from each agency.

Middlesex University’s research team is led by Dr Miranda Horvath, with Dr Joanna Adler and Dr Susan Hansen. Dr Miranda Horvath is a Senior Lecturer in Psychology and associate of FPS, with extensive experience in applied quantitative research methods. She has conducted evaluation and consultancies in a range of applied forensic and community settings, including projects with a focus on women and children who have experienced sexual and domestic violence. Dr Joanna Adler is an HPC registered forensic psychologist and the director of FPS. She has conducted multiple research projects and led evaluations within prisons,
probation and police services and for a number of charities and voluntary agencies. **Dr Susan Hansen** is a Senior Lecturer in Psychology and associate of FPS, with extensive experience in applied qualitative research methods, including action research methods.

More information about this can be found at [http://www.avaproject.org.uk/media/44103/young%20women%20%20sm-dv%20project%20outline.pdf](http://www.avaproject.org.uk/media/44103/young%20women%20%20sm-dv%20project%20outline.pdf)

Contact details:
**Professor Miranda Horvath**, Tel: +44 (0)20 8411 4532, m.horvath@mdx.ac.uk
**Dr. Joanna Adler** Tel: +44 (0)20 8411 2669, j.adler@mdx.ac.uk

### 3. Key individuals

**Mary Ellsberg** (Tel: +1 (202) 994 7177)

Mary Ellsberg is currently Director of the Global Women’s Institute at George Washington University (GWU), in Washington D.C. She has more than 30 years experience conducting international gender and development research, including on gender-based violence (GBV). Before joining GWU, Dr. Ellsberg served as vice president for research and programmes at the International Center for Research on Women. Previously, she held the position of senior advisor for gender, violence and human rights at the Program for Appropriate Technology in Health. Prior to that, Dr. Ellsberg lived in Nicaragua for nearly 20 years and worked on public health and women’s rights advocacy. Her expertise in this area has given her a high profile with regards to these issues. For example, in August 2012, she served on a White House Panel on ending global violence against women.

In addition to being involved in the ICRW evaluations outlined above, she has also carried out the following reviews of GBV interventions:

  This paper reviews international evidence of the effectiveness of three types of interventions to prevent and respond to GBV: (1) increasing access to justice for survivors of gender-based violence; (2) providing support to women who have been affected by violence; and (3) preventing GBV.

  This working paper reviews good practice interventions to prevent GBV and offer services to survivors and perpetrators, in the areas of justice, health, education and multi-sectoral approaches.
Nicole Westmarland  (Tel: +44 (0) 191 33 46833, nicole.westmarland@durham.ac.uk)
Nicole Westmarland is a Senior Lecturer in Criminology in the School of Applied Social Sciences at Durham University. She has a background in Psychology and Women's Studies, as well as a PhD in Social Policy and Social Work. At Durham University, Nicole co-convenes the Crime, Violence and Abuse research group and holds the position of 'impact champion' for the School, which focuses on maximising of research impact. Further details about her research and grassroots work on violence against women can be found here: http://www.dur.ac.uk/sass/staff/profile/?id=4290

Her work on assessing domestic violence interventions includes:

This research review was commissioned as part of the Stern Review of responses by public bodies to rape. The terms of reference included a series of 31 questions about the extent to which there was research evidence on key policy issues, including evidence of the effectiveness of recent legislative and practice changes in England and Wales. The timescale precluded a full systematic literature review and so an adapted Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA) methodology was utilised following the guidance provided in the Government Social Research Unit’s REA toolkit.

In July 2000, the Home Office funded 34 pilot projects that aimed to develop and implement local strategies to reduce domestic violence, rape and sexual assault. Of these 34 projects, 27 focused on domestic violence and seven on rape and sexual assault. The 27 domestic violence projects were split into seven packages according to their main interventions (criminal and civil justice; protection and prevention; black and other ethnic minorities; health; multi-service; education; and rural work) and were evaluated by teams based at the University of Bristol (with Nottingham, Sunderland and Warwick), University of East London and London South Bank University (both the Criminal Policy Research Unit and the Faculty of Health and Social Care). This report is an overview of the material from all the evaluations is used to present the main findings from the 27 CRP domestic violence projects.

The key aim of the evaluations of the CRP domestic violence projects was to identify ‘what worked’ to support victims and tackle domestic violence via an assessment of project design, implementation, delivery, outputs, impact and cost. The evaluation teams used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods, which included: 518 interviews with project staff and partner agencies; 174 interviews with domestic violence victims/survivors; 22 focus groups; and 2,935 questionnaires. Quantitative data (gathered mostly through the police) were collected on 80,350 domestic violence
victims/survivors, 35,349 domestic violence perpetrators, and 5,687 children living in domestic violence situations.

Westmarland has also been involved in an assessment of the UK’s Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004:

http://dro.dur.ac.uk/5093/
This study was commissioned to provide an early evaluation of some of the measures of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims (DVCV) Act 2004. It aimed to: (1) establish baseline data against which to evaluate the implementation of the new measures; (2) provide an early snapshot of progress towards implementation; (3) identify emerging issues and offer recommendations for policy and (good) practice in relation to implementing the measures, and in relation to improvements that can be made to current data collection.

Ravi Thiara (Tel: +44 (0)24 7657 3771, R.K.Thiara@warwick.ac.uk)
Ravi Thiara is a Principal Research Fellow at the University of Warwick’s School of Health and Social Sciences. Her research focus includes domestic violence; ‘violence against women and ethnicity; children and domestic violence; child contact and post-separation violence. Alongside her research, she has been involved in policy and service development and provides training, evaluation and management support. Her past research includes: an evaluation for Association of Chief Police Officers of the SPECCS risk assessment model; an evaluation of the Multi-Service package funded by the Home Office Crime Reduction Programme - Violence Against Women initiative; an evaluation of a court based IDVA intervention; evaluations of interventions aimed at children affected by domestic violence; and an evaluation of a parenting programme for men and women.

She has conducted the following evaluations:

This evaluation aimed to assess the effectiveness of Refuge’s eastern European community outreach project (aimed at eastern European in experiencing domestic violence), through: assessing the achievements and impacts of the project; identifying key areas of learning; and making recommendations for the future. Several key methods of data collection were used: focus groups and interviews with service users; a survey of other professionals and agencies; and an examination of all project data in the Refuge database.

The main aims of the evaluation were to: (1) assess the impact and merits of the advocacy pilot, including the role and impact of the BME advocate as part of the wider intervention; (2) assess the effectiveness of multi-agency partnerships and any
lessons learnt; (3) contribute, through lessons learnt, to the development of national Refuge advocacy services; (4) contribute to an evidence-base of independent advocacy work and add to the debate in this area; and (5) identify good practice for wider dissemination.

The evaluation was conducted using a range of approaches drawing on both qualitative and quantitative methods. It incorporated local context, process and outputs data. Local context included the collation of information through interviews, discussions, documentary sources and a literature review on the local context in which the intervention was implemented, both in terms of the local community and the multi-agency context. The process information drew on both general information and data specific to the project to assess the operation of the intervention. Interviews and discussions were held with all strategic and operational project staff and other multi-agency players (n=15). Monthly project team meetings were also attended and notes taken. In order to make an assessment of the immediate and wider impact of the project and whether or not the intervention was meeting its stated aims (outputs), information from other agencies such as the police and the CPS, as well as data specific to the project (from Modus database), was gathered. In order to get feedback from service users on the service, a detailed feedback survey was devised and completed by 38 women.

Ravi Thiara was also involved in several of the CWASU evaluations already outlined in more detail above (Coy, Thiara and Kelly 2011; Coy et al 2011)

Tina Wallace (tinawallace11@aol.com)

Tina Wallace is based at the International Gender Studies Centre at University of Oxford. She is a teaching, research and development practitioner, currently working closely with several UK NGOs on issues of gender, strategic planning, evaluation and learning. She has worked in Ghana with Womankind and their key partner Gender Centre on violence against women, training community elected people to undergo training and then work on individual cases of domestic violence, as well as addressing wider attitudes and behaviour within the villages.

Her evaluation work includes:


Due to the large scale of this review, a case study approach was adopted. Four case studies were chosen from the global South. The case studies were supported by interviews, questionnaires, attendance at key meetings in Europe, an active advisory group and reading a wide range of documents and reports. Many people – staff, partners and members – participated willingly and openly in the review. Some opted out or were hard to reach. One main challenge of the review was to engage staff and partners in a ‘participatory, collegiate process’.
http://www.steppingstonesfeedback.org/resources/7/SS_ActionAid_EvaluatingSteppingStones_TWallace_2006.pdf
This report was commissioned by ActionAid International (AAI) to review the existing publicly available M&E data on the Stepping Stones (SS) methodology. Through this report, AAI hoped to contribute to the understanding of what SS has and has not been able to achieve during the past ten years, in a wide variety of contexts, used by a wide range of different agencies. Second, this review was an opportunity to critique existing M&E documentation on SS and improve it in the future. The intention was to highlight the key issues emerging from SS evaluations – including how systematic and comprehensive the existing documents have been, the key processes and methodologies used, and the most significant overall findings – and to identify the gaps which need filling.

Judith McFarlane (Tel: +1 713 794 2138, jmcfarlane@mail.twu.edu)

Judith McFarlane is Professor of Health Promotion at Texas Woman’s University in Houston, Texas. Her research has focused on testing interventions to promote abused women’s safety and the growth and development of their children:

http://www.ajph.org/cgi/content/abstract/94/4/613
This study compared types and frequencies of intimate partner violence experienced by women before and after receipt of a two-year protection order. Participants included 150 urban English- and Spanish-speaking Black, Hispanic and White women who qualified for a two-year protection order against an intimate partner.

To evaluate the differential effectiveness of three levels of intervention in situations involving intimate partner violence (brief, counseling and outreach), a longitudinal study with repeated evaluation interviews at 2-, 6-, 12-, and 18-months post-delivery was completed at two urban public health prenatal clinics.

4. Additional relevant individuals and organisations

Charlotte Watts (Tel: +44 (0) 20 7636 8636)
Charlotte Watts is founding director of the Gender Violence and Health Centre at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (http://genderviolence.lshtm.ac.uk/). She has more than 15 years experience in HIV, gender and violence research, including impact evaluation.
She has been involved in the following evaluation.


This evaluation aimed to obtain evidence about the scope of women's empowerment and the mechanisms underlying the significant reduction in intimate partner violence documented by the Intervention with Microfinance for AIDS and Gender Equity (IMAGE) cluster-randomised trial in rural South Africa. The IMAGE intervention combined a microfinance programme with participatory training on understanding HIV infection, gender norms, domestic violence and sexuality. Outcome measures included past year's experience of intimate partner violence and nine indicators of women's empowerment. Qualitative data about changes occurring within intimate relationships, loan groups and the community were also collected.

Jeanne Ward (jeanne@swiftkenya.com)
Jeanne Ward is a gender-based violence consultant with a background in psychotherapy. She has extensive experience conducting research on gender-based violence for organisations including Reproductive Health for Refugees Consortium, UNICEF and USAID amongst others. She also provides technical leadership, training, assessment and monitoring support in developing and improving VAW-related research, policies, systems, programmes and community-based practices. She has also developed globally disseminated tools and guidelines for conflict-affected settings, most recently producing a GBV Coordination Handbook (2010) for the global GBV Area of Responsibility Working Group.

Examples of her work related to evaluating GBV interventions include the following.

This manual is one of several outcomes of a three-year global Gender-based Violence Initiative spearheaded by the Reproductive Health Response in Conflict (RHRC) Consortium and aimed at improving international and local capacity to address gender-based violence (GBV) in refugee, internally displaced and post-conflict settings. The tools have been formulated according to a multi-sectoral model of GBV programming that promotes action within and coordination between the constituent community, health and social services, and the legal and security sectors. The manual intended at humanitarian professionals who have experience with and are committed to GBV prevention and response.
The tools are divided into three major categories: assessment, programme design, and programme monitoring and evaluation. The assessment tools are designed to improve awareness of the nature and scope of GBV in a given setting, to assist in gathering information about local attitudes and behaviours related to GBV, and to identify existing GBV services and gaps in services within the community. The programme design tools may be used for designing and implementing projects whose outcomes meet intended goals, and for improving hiring practices within GBV.
programmes. The programme monitoring and evaluation tools assist in evaluating program effectiveness, as well as in recognising short- and long-term service utilisation and service delivery trends that may be used to adjust programming.

Shelah S. Bloom (shelah_bloom@unc.edu)
Shelah Bloom is Assistant Research Professor of Maternal and Child Health at the Carolina Population Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In 2008, she collaborated an international panel of experts to write ‘Violence against women and girls (VAW/G): a compendium of monitoring and evaluation indicators’, which is now being used by VAW/G programmatic streams around the world funded by USAID, PEPFAR, and various UN organisations including WHO.

Bloom, S., 2008, ‘Violence against women and girls, a compendium of monitoring and evaluation indicators’, USAID
MEASURE Evaluation developed this compendium of indicators, which focuses on VAW/G programme monitoring and evaluation. Leading experts from around the world who work in the various fields of VAW/G represented in this guide were consulted during all stages of the development process.

Michaela Raab (m.raab@evalux.net)
Michaela Raab is a development, human rights and gender justice specialist focused on evaluation, monitoring systems and other forms of organisational learning. She has over 20 years of experience working in east and south Asia, Africa including north Africa, the Middle East and eastern Europe. Michaela Raab has worked for a range of international development organisations, including UNDP, UN WOMEN, GIZ, OXFAM, the Ford Foundation and their partner organisations in the global South.

Michaela wrote the following evaluation report for Oxfam in 2011.

This evaluation was commissioned by Oxfam Great Britain to cover the full seven-year period of the regional ‘We Can’ campaign. Launched in late 2004, with the goal of ‘reducing the social acceptance of violence against women’, the campaign started in six south Asian countries – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka – but has since spread to Indonesia, the Netherlands and British Colombia in Canada. A small, external team had a total of some 120 days spread over three months to address a complex set of evaluation questions. The conclusions presented are based on (somewhat incomplete) internal documentation and primary data gathered in key informant interviews, workshops and field research in India and Nepal. This evaluation centres on key aspects of the campaign identified with the users of this evaluation, to serve accountability and learning purposes.
Population Council
http://www.popcouncil.org/

Based in New York, Population Council carries out research and implements programmes related to health and development in more than 30 countries around the world. Population Council is currently working on a number of evaluations of projects related to VAWG. These include the following.

- A DFID funded evaluation of violence against women, in Bihar, India. This is evaluating the effectiveness of: (1) empowering women, breaking the social isolation of women and offering economic opportunities through self-help group participation; (2) changing notions of masculinity and modifying lifestyle factors among men; (3) changing adolescent attitudes and practices using sports and life skills education; (4) identifying, screening and referring women at risk of violence; (5) assessing available programmes to serve women in distress.
- An evaluation of the effectiveness of the comprehensive GBV prevention and response programme delivered at facility and community levels by national organisations supported through PEPFAR in Tanzania.
- An evaluation of the Growing Up Safe and Healthy (SAFE) project that provides context-specific strategies for vulnerable adolescents to build their social and health assets.
- A prospective evaluation of the effectiveness of the output-based aid voucher programme to increase uptake of gender-based violence recovery services in Kenya.

For more information on these evaluations, please contact Ian Askew iaskew@popcouncil.org

PATH
http://www.path.org/

PATH is a Seattle-based NGO working on issues related to global health in more than 70 countries. Together with Senegalese NGO Tostan, PATH is conducting a four-year evaluation of a community-based health and human rights awareness initiative in Senegal called the Community Empowerment Program. PATH is examining the programme’s impact on GBV – including intimate partner violence (IPV) – women’s empowerment and related health issues. The evaluation includes: (1) a community-level survey conducted at four points during programme implementation; (2) a survey with project participants (i.e. individuals participating directly in Tostan’s Community Empowerment Program); and (3) in-depth interviews with project participants, as well as their social contacts.

More information can be found here: http://sites.path.org/hivaidstanb/our-featured-projects/tostan-evaluation/

David Hampson (dhampson2001@yahoo.com)
Minority Rights Group International commissioned David Hampson to evaluate their violence against women programmes in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Rwanda and Uganda.
http://www.minorityrights.org/10789/evaluations/genderbased-discrimination-violence-against-women-%20vaw-evaluation-
This evaluation was carried out to assess the impact of Minority Rights Group International’s work to combat VAW in Burundi, DRC, Rwanda and Uganda. Multiple methods were used to collect data, including semi-structured interviews, stakeholder mapping, SWOC analysis, focus groups and observation.

Jeffrey S. Weaner (+1 419 783 2559, jweaner@defiance.edu)
Jeffrey Weaner is a professor of social work and sociology at Defiance College’s Department of Social Work in Ohio, United States. Professor Weaner has over 30 years of experience in preparing baccalaureate social workers and specialises primarily in research and statistics. His most recent interests include international social work and development. In 2008 he consulted on programme evaluation and other administrative issues for the Cambodian Women’s Crisis Center in Phnom Penh, Cambodia (an evaluation funded by UNIFEM):

This report documents the efforts of the CWCC staff in the community organisation, monitoring and legal programmes to meet the objectives of this project in the targeted areas of Phnom Penh, Cambodia. The evaluation process took place over a period of 18 working days, during which both individual and group interviews were conducted with a variety of stakeholders, including national government, judicial and local authorities, police, management of CWCC, programme staff from all three programmes under review, volunteers and victims of violence, rape and human trafficking. Relevant documents, including the grant proposal, semi-annual and annual reports, were also reviewed.

MEASURE Evaluation and DevTech Systems Inc both carry out evaluation of VAWG programmes, however, they appear to work predominantly, if not exclusively, with USAID and its implementation partners. Their activities are outlined briefly below:

MEASURE Evaluation
http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure

MEASURE Evaluation conducts monitoring and evaluation for USAID’s Global Health Bureau. The organisation works in several areas to improve the monitoring and evaluation of violence against women and girls (VAW/G) so that countries will be able to more effectively prevent violence and reduce the harm that it causes. For example, MEASURE Evaluation also delivers ‘M&E of gender-based violence prevention and mitigation programs’, a training module on monitoring and evaluating gender-based violence prevention and mitigation programs.
This facilitator's guide provides essential information to organise and implement a one-and-a-half days training session on monitoring and evaluating gender-based violence prevention and mitigation programmes.

Bloom, S., 2008, ‘Violence against women and girls, a compendium of monitoring and evaluation indicators’, USAID
At the request of the USAID East Africa Regional Mission in collaboration with the Inter-agency Gender Working Group (USAID), MEASURE Evaluation developed this compendium on M&E indicators in the context of violence against women and girls.

DevTech Systems Inc
http://www.devtechsys.com/practices/gender/
DevTech conducts gender analysis, technical assistance and training to USAID and its implementing partners. The firm claims strong capacity in the following key areas: (1) gender analysis, monitoring and evaluation; (2) gender integration and training; and (3) gender focused programming. DevTech cites one specific evaluation on gender-based violence programming (see below), and has also carried out a number of other assessments and evaluations on gender-related issues (including gender-based violence in schools). More information can be found on the organisation’s website.

This report evaluates the Safe Schools programme, a five-year initiative (2003-2008) funded by USAID and implemented by DevTech Systems, Inc. The goal of Safe Schools was to reduce school-related gender-based violence in selected schools in Ghana and Malawi to support the longer-term goal of improving educational outcomes and reducing negative health outcomes for schoolchildren.

https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjIjRmLTlkNjk4NTcxMjM2NDNmY2Uy&rlID=MzE2NzY0
During May-June 2010, a team of five international development, gender, education, public health and evaluation experts conducted an evaluation of GBV-related USG activities with the overall purpose being to: (1) assess the ASAZA and CDC’s GBV programme (CSA centers) performance in accomplishing the terms and objectives of their respective agreements; and (2) utilise the information to assist USG/Zambia in formulating ideas regarding future GBV activities. The team utilised a victim-centered, culturally-responsive approach, using standard quantitative and qualitative evaluation methodology, including a desk-based review of 36 USAID and CDC monitoring and reporting documents; key informant interviews with 240 beneficiaries, stakeholders,
and ministry officials; 24 site visits/observations, including all eight of the CRC sites (Chipata, Kabwe, Kitwe, Burma, Livingstone, Mtendere, Mazabuka and Ndola), both CDC sites in Lusaka and Livingstone, the ZANELIC center, seven emergency shelters for women and children, and multiple hospitals and police station Victim Service Units (VSU). Recent service statistics were collected from each ASAZA CRC and CDC service site to compare project-specific GBV programme data with existing Zambia DHS 2007 (National) GBV prevalence data to identify and analyse current trends regarding GBV types and prevalence.

4. Additional information

The following GSDRC helpdesk reports may also be of interest:
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