



Final Independent Evaluation Report of the Project

**“Creating a coordinated response
mechanism to prevent and combat
domestic violence in Armenia”**

Evaluation done for the period of

1/2016 – 1/2018, Armenia

Hasmik TAMAMYAN

February 2018

Table of Contents

- I. LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 5
- II. TERMINOLOGY 6
- III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 8
- IV. INTRODUCTION 11
 - IV.1. Background and Context of the Project 11
 - IV.2. Description of the Project and Project Overview 14
- V. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION 16
 - V.1. Purpose of the Evaluation 16
 - V.2. Scope of the Evaluation 16
- VI. METHODOLOGY 17
 - VI.1. Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions 17
 - VI.2. Data Sources and Data Collection Methods 19
 - VI.3. Data Analysis 20
 - VI.4. Limitations to the Evaluation 22
 - VI.5. Stakeholder involvement, quality control, ethical considerations, and conflict of interest 23
 - VI.6. Evaluation Matrix 24
- VII. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS 29
 - VII.1. Relevance 29
 - VII.2. Validity of design 31
 - VII.3. Added value 34
 - VII.4. Efficiency 36
 - VII.5. Effectiveness 38
 - VII.6. Impact Orientation 41
 - VII.7. Sustainability 44
 - VII.8. Knowledge generation 46
- VIII. CONCLUSION 48
- IX. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS 51

- X. ANNEXES 56
 - X.1. Final version of the Terms of Reference 56
 - X.2. Additional methodology-related documentation 56
 - X.3. KI In-depth Interview Guide 57
 - X.4. Group Interview and FG Discussion Guideline 60
 - X.5. List of persons and institutions interviewed and group discussion participants 62
 - X.6. Results Monitoring Plan with actual baseline and endline data compiled by the WSC 64
 - X.7. Beneficiary Data Sheet compiled by the WSC 68
 - X.8. List of supporting documents reviewed 70
 - X.9. CV of the external evaluator 71

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The evaluator is grateful for the extensive support she received from the WSC team for sharing their institutional knowledge about the Project and facilitating the evaluation process. Project donors, partners, and beneficiaries from Yerevan and regions were similarly open and helpful both through interviews and group discussions and their valuable insight and feedback is much appreciated.

I. LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------|---|
| DV | Domestic violence |
| ER1 | Expected Result 1 |
| ER2 | Expected Result 2 |
| EQ | Evaluation question |
| GBV | Gender-based violence |
| KI | Key informant |
| KII | Key informant interview |
| MLSA | Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs of the Republic of Armenia |
| NILSR | National Institute of Labor and Social Research (State non-profit organization to the MLSA) |
| PP | Project Proposal |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UNTF | United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women |
| WSC | Women’s Support Center |

II. TERMINOLOGY

To be consistent with the Project document and progress reports throughout this Evaluation report the following terms have been used as defined by the UNTF:

| Terms | Definition |
|--|--|
| Theory of Change | The “Theory of Change” for the project is derived from your analysis of the context, problem and intervention options. In essence it is the Project Narrative which should explain the proposed process of change by outlining causal linkages in an intervention, i.e., the different pathways or intervention strategies that can achieve shorter-term, intermediate, and longer-term results. There may be several different pathways or options for achieving the same Project Goal, but your organization has proposed to invest in the one described in the Results Chain. Please use the Project Narrative to explain why this pathway was selected and to describe the rationale and any risks and assumptions. |
| Results and Resources Framework (RRF) | The Results and Resources Framework (RRF) is a tool which enables you to plan how the Results Chain will be achieved through the inputs of the organization and implementing partners: specifically, the activities that will be completed (and when) to achieve the results and how much these will cost. It provides space to plan the results, activities and to allocate a budget. It also guides data collection, monitoring and evaluation by providing a tool to plan indicators, data collection methods and to set targets to represent and track the results you aim to achieve. |
| Project Goal | The highest result that the project aims to achieve by project end. Change at this level happens through the achievement of project outcomes and outputs <i>and the collective and sustained efforts of project partners and other actors</i> . The project goal may contribute to long-term change that continues after project ends. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Each project must have <u>one</u> project-specific goal. <input type="checkbox"/> A project goal refers to <u>the changes in the lives of women and girls (sometimes called <i>primary beneficiaries</i>)</u>. <input type="checkbox"/> Project goal needs to be monitored and reported by project staff throughout the project implementation, and it needs to be evaluated by an external final evaluation at the end of project. |
| Outcome | The intermediate results of a project which are achievable within the lifetime of the project, and which require the collective effort of partners. A combination of outputs is usually needed to produce an outcome. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> An outcome in a project can be (but is not limited to) <u>verifiable changes in the behavior, relationships, practices and actions of individuals, groups and institutions</u> that contribute to the project goal to change the lives of women and girls. <input type="checkbox"/> Change can occur among individuals, communities, institutions, systems or policies (sometimes called <u><i>secondary beneficiaries or change agents</i></u> and can include women and girls). <input type="checkbox"/> Each outcome needs to be monitored and reported by project staff throughout the project implementation, and it needs to be evaluated by an external final evaluation at the end of project. |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Output</p> | <p>The immediate results of the project which are achievable within the specific timeline of the project, resulting <u>directly from the completion of activities</u>. The project has full control over delivering the outputs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ These include concrete and measureable products, services and changes in skills and abilities that result from the project, such as increased skills and knowledge of people you have trained, increased availability or accessibility of services that your project is offering for a particular purpose, etc. □ Each output needs to be monitored and reported by project staff throughout the project implementation, and it needs to be evaluated by an external final evaluation at the end of project. <p>Outputs are <u>NOT</u> the completion of activities. Outputs are the concrete immediate results that are generated from activities. For instance, if one project activity is “Conduct a training for community leaders on ending violence against women and girls”, one expected output can be “Community leaders who have participated in the training have greater knowledge on ending violence against women and girls and better understanding on their roles to prevent such violence in their own communities.”</p> |
| <p>Activity</p> | <p>Actions, interventions and/or services that are directly implemented by the project.</p> |
| <p>Primary Beneficiaries</p> | <p>Primary beneficiaries are the individual women and/or girls who will directly benefit from projects funded by the UN Trust Fund whose lives are expected to change for the better as a result of this project. These beneficiaries are categorized by other economic and social factors as well, so that project plans can be specific about what groups will be targeted, such as: women and girls with disabilities; survivors of violence; lesbian and transgender women, etc. These target groups should be referred to in the Project Goal.</p> |
| <p>Secondary Beneficiaries</p> | <p>Secondary beneficiaries are those individuals the project will work with in order to change the lives of the primary beneficiaries. For example, those who act as change agents, enablers or service providers in order to achieve the project outcomes. Examples include: men and boys; Government officials; service provides; civil society members.</p> |

III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the final Independent Project Evaluation of the project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia” (the Project), financed by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women and implemented by the Women’s Support Center in Armenia. The Projects spanned for two years: from 1 January 2016 to 14 January 2018. This is a summative evaluation to assess internal processes as well as progress and performance of the Project focusing on the overall goal, results, outputs, and outcomes of the intervention. The evaluation is also intended to develop recommendations and lessons learned to inform potential future programming.

Domestic violence, especially intimate partner violence, is prevalent in Armenia. Women’s rights NGOs have been campaigning for the passage of a domestic violence preventive law for many years. The Armenian government acknowledges there is a problem and is working to develop a solution. After many years of negotiation, the government adopted the first ever domestic violence preventive law in December 2017. Currently, there is a need to develop related legal acts and establish mechanisms, so that the police can effectively investigate, rigorously collect data on incidents of domestic violence, prevent DV whenever possible, and protect DV survivors. However, the GBV and DV related topics and modules have never been appropriately integrated into the education curricula for police, social workers, and/or psychologists. The need for GBV and DV related training for service providers in Armenia is still likely to be great for the foreseeable future, especially right after the newly adopted Law entered into force in the end of January 2018. Developing the subsequent regulations for the Law and related enforcement mechanisms is one area where civil society can contribute its expertise to improve overall quality of services provided to DV survivors. Monitoring implementation of the newly adopted Law and ensuring government agencies fulfill their duties would be another key contribute civil society can provide.

The goal of the Project is to support and protect women and girls in 5 regions of Armenia against all forms of domestic violence by skilled service providers via a capable multi-agency response mechanism. The Project’s theory of change is that improving attitudes and sensitivities towards domestic violence amongst key decision-makers will enable them to better handle and refer domestic violence (DV) cases within a coordinated and sustainable response mechanism that will benefit the client. It also implies that creating a system-level change in addressing clients will result in a rights-based, multi-agency response to survivors of domestic violence and their families. The Project spanned two years and secondary beneficiaries including general and specialized service providers in 8 communities in Armenia (Gyumri, Vanadzor, Goris, Yerevan, Byureghavan, Medzamor, Charentsavan, and Baghramyan).

The two main Expected Results¹ were developed and implemented in the following areas: (1) provision of trainings on DV and related service standards to Service providers and police officers, (2) the development and publication of in-depth guidelines on shelter management and standard operating procedures for service providers. The specific objectives of the evaluation are to assess the Project on the criteria of relevance, validity of design, added value, efficiency, effectiveness, impact orientation, knowledge generation, and sustainability. The evaluation also has the objective of providing recommendations. The evaluator draws conclusions based on triangulation of evidence from different data collection methods and primary/secondary data sources. The methods of data collection are: desk review, individual in-depth interviews with key informants (KIs), group discussions with trained service providers and police officers. The evaluator conducted 12 KIs aimed at eliciting stakeholders’ opinions on the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the Project results as well as 3 group discussions with service providers and police to assess the effectiveness for and impact of the Project on the main group of people taking part in the Project activities.

Overall, the Project achieved its development objective and the stated Project goal, outcomes, and outputs, and was successful in increasing awareness on domestic violence situation in the country and GBV related issues. The UNTF expertise and funding was important to support the WSC to analyze the developments in the light of international standards, create a unique instrument for efficiently teaching DV and GBV related topics and initiate trainings to increase the quality of services provided to the DV survivor women and girls. The Project’s relevance to developing DV and GBV policies and improving related services is strongly satisfactory. It satisfactorily addressed the identified needs of government partners, other stakeholders and beneficiaries in line with the mandate of the WSC and the priority areas of the UNTF. Delivery of outputs and outcomes under the Expected Result 1 and 2 are assessed as strongly satisfactory.

The Evaluation identified a number of positive changes, which can be attributed to the Project’s intervention and causally linked to its impact orientation. Drawn from the KI interviews and group discussions, the Project impacted on the practices of Service providers and police officers by providing them with in-depth knowledge on the subject matter, improving their skills, and increasing their confidence to question existing response mechanisms. The WSC developed and published the Shelter Management Guideline and the Standard Operating Procedures for social workers, which can be widely used even after the end of the Project. Besides, the WSC has established good working relationships with government agencies in charge of the DV prevention reforms as well as the project’s other stakeholders both in Yerevan and Armenian regions. Through the UNTF funded program the WSC was able not only to develop good training modules, but also could obtain higher visibility and wider impact to raise awareness and sensitivity towards DV issues in Armenian society. Thanks to the outstanding quality of the project trainings, the WSC got an offer from World Vision, which works with a wider

¹ With Expected Result (ER) we refer to an aggregate of each Outcome and the Outputs and Activities under its umbrella. The term is introduced to avoid repeating “Outcomes, outputs, and activities” throughout the Evaluation Report. For instance, with ER2 we mean Outcome2, Outputs2.1-2.3, and related activities.

network of social workers and Armenian population at large, to work together and provide trainings to their audience as well.

Despite all this, there is still more work to be done continuously and on a regular basis to create the long-term impact for tangible and sustainable improvement in the field of DV and GBV in Armenia in line with the international treaties and the newly adopted Law on DV. The continuous long-term impact of the Project will be ensured with the WSC consultants being involved in the MLSA and the RA Police working groups developing the DV law enforcement mechanisms thanks to the efficient working relationships established throughout the Project cycle. To scale up the Project’s impact both the WSC and the project’s governmental partners acknowledge the need for continuous and regular trainings for service providers and police officers, given the complexity of domestic violence and constantly improving case study standards.

The primary recommendations for the WSC are to continue with the organization’s watchdog role to monitor the developments in the field and ongoing legislative reform as well as the provision of technical/expert support and evidence-based recommendations to partners from the RA government and civil society sector. Under the newly adopted DV law a Board composed of government and civil society representatives will be created to discuss gaps in the system and take necessary actions to improve the related services. This is where the WSC can most likely be involved to have its input and continuous contribution to the development of the field, as well as consult the government partners on the multi-sectoral approach and the need for evidence-based policy making. For the upcoming projects, strategies that will lead to sustainability of core project outcomes and outputs should be identified and implemented as early as possible in the project cycle to provide the beneficiaries and main stakeholders with skills and tools to carry on with the positive changes the intervention resulted. Continuous updating and promotion of the Guideline and the SOPs through new series of trainings and other activities can ensure sustainable transfer and exchange of the Project’s know-how to newer groups of stakeholders.

IV. INTRODUCTION

This is the final Independent Project Evaluation of the project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia” (the Project). The evaluation was initiated by the Women’s Support Center NGO (WSC) in line with Final External Project Evaluation Guidelines of the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UNTF), the project document and the Terms of References (ToR). This is a summative evaluation to assess internal processes as well as progress and performance of the Project focusing on the overall goal, results, outputs, and outcomes of the intervention. The evaluation is also intended to develop recommendations and lessons learned to inform potential future programming.

IV.1. Background and Context of the Project

Women’s rights NGOs have been campaigning for the passage of the domestic violence law for many years. As in the case of Gender Equality law, there had been intense and emotionally charged debates between the promoters of the DV Law and its critics. While the formers argued that the Law was needed to prevent abuse and protect the victims/survivors, the latter claimed that the adoption of such law would be an attempt to undermine Armenian family values and traditions. At the meantime, as fairly documented by the CEDAW observers, the Police of the Republic of Armenia had been focusing on taking actions for combating cases of domestic violence and “for that reason, on 16 February 2013, upon the Order of the Head of Police of the Republic of Armenia, for the first time, a separate subdivision, “Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence” was established, which dealt with issues of domestic violence and which was the first of its kind among the member states of the CIS.”²

Domestic violence, especially intimate partner violence, is prevalent in Armenia. In 2008, Amnesty International estimated that a quarter of Armenian women experience physical violence from a family member and two-thirds experience psychological abuse³. A 2011 study conducted by Proactive Society NGO found that 45.1% of victims of domestic violence did nothing to try to stop the abuse, highlighting the powerlessness of victims.⁴ Throughout the WSC Project cycle there has been no domestic violence law in Armenia, meaning that despite all the efforts by the specialized subdivision the police did not effectively investigate nor rigorously collect data on incidents of domestic violence. Further, it is considered shameful in Armenian culture to make public a familial issue, reducing the prevalence of victims reporting the abuse. At a societal level, this translates to few government officials outwardly condemning violence against women; a lack of proper legislation to prevent, address, and punish

² CEDAW/C/ARM/CO/5-6, 28 Apr. 2015, <file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/N1512178.pdf>

³ <https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/56000/eur540042008en.pdf>

⁴ www.osce.org/yerevan/88229?download=true

perpetrators; and no mechanisms for service providers, social work agencies, and police to protect victims.

The primary barriers to implement the Project are a general lack of interest in government and traditionalists’ hostility towards gender issues and GBV. A worse barrier is that much of the Armenian populace is hostile to the promotion of gender equality. Armenia is a traditional culture, gender stereotypes are very strong and challenging them is forcefully met. In the end of 2017, there was a huge campaign against adopting the law for preventing domestic violence. The oppositionists claimed that women’s rights activists were trying to destroy the traditional Armenian family. Because of this very aggressive pushback, the RA Parliament renamed the law, replacing the phrase “domestic violence” with “violence in the family” and adding “restoring harmony in the family” into the new title, thus shifting the focus from protecting individuals and preventing crime to “reconciling the family”. This change is symbolically meaningful as it shows that Parliament is not willing to challenge the hostile anti-gender crowd.

The Armenian government acknowledges there is a problem and is working to develop a solution. After many years of negotiation, the government adopted the first ever domestic violence preventive law. Currently, there is a need to develop related legal acts and establish mechanisms, so that the police can effectively investigate, rigorously collect data on incidents of domestic violence, prevent DV whenever possible, and protect DV survivors. The Armenian government had been discussing the draft domestic violence law with the international audience since 2010⁵ and had formed a working group with women’s rights NGOs to create the final law. However, in October 2017 right before the adoption of the law a new version was presented for adoption, in a surprise even to members of that working group. As stated by the women’s rights activists⁶, the women’s organizations and DV survivors have been left on the periphery of a male-dominated circle, and the new version of the law had been artificially turned from a preventive and protective tool into a mechanism for family reconciliation between abusers and survivors.

The situation of DV related services in Armenia is similar to the discussion above - while dealing with DV cases police officers and service providers have usually been focusing on building peace in the family reconciliation rather than protecting individuals and preventing crime. The GBV and DV related topics and modules have never been appropriately integrated into the education curricula for police, social workers, and/or psychologists. The need for GBV and DV related training for service providers in Armenia is still likely to be great for the foreseeable future, especially right after the newly adopted Law entered into force in the end of January 2018. Developing the subsequent regulations for the Law and related enforcement mechanisms is one area where civil society can contribute its expertise to improve overall quality of services provided to DV survivors. Monitoring implementation of the newly adopted Law and ensuring government agencies fulfill their duties would be another key contribute civil society can provide.

⁵ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/AMSession8.aspx>

⁶ <https://www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/anna-nikoghosyan/paradox-of-armenia-s-domestic-violence-law>

Box 1: Excerpts from the 2016 Concluding Observation on Armenia by the Committee for the Elimination of Discrimination against Women⁷

Gender-based violence against women

16. The Committee notes the elaboration of a draft law in 2012 on domestic violence, as well as the establishment of an inter-ministerial Working Group in 2016 to develop a new draft on different forms of gender-based violence against women in the domestic sphere. The Committee also notes the recruitment of female police officers, the provision of training on gender based violence for civil servants, social workers and police recruits and the creation of a specialized police department to prevent and investigate cases of gender based violence. However, the Committee remains concerned about:

- (a) The delay in the adoption of a comprehensive law on the prevention, prohibition and prosecution of gender based violence against women;
- (b) Under-reporting of acts of gender based violence against women by victims and the resulting lack of data;
- (c) Persistent attitudes of police officers accepting and justifying gender based violence against women and perceptions that this type of violence, particularly in the domestic sphere, is a private matter;
- (d) Under-reporting of cases of femicide and lenience in the prosecution of perpetrators.

17. **In accordance with the Committee’s general recommendation No. 19 (1992) on violence against women, the Committee recommends that the State party:**

- (a) Expedite the adoption of a comprehensive law specifically criminalizing gender-based violence against women, including femicide and marital rape, in line with General Recommendation No. 19 (1992) on violence against women and with the Committee’s previous recommendations (CEDAW/C/ARM/CO/4, para. 23), which employs a victim-centred approach, provides for civil and criminal remedies, defines the body responsible for its implementation and guarantees access to immediate means of redress and protection, including protection orders;**
- (b) Ratify the Convention of the Council of Europe on preventing and combating gender based violence against women and gender-based violence against women in the domestic sphere;**
- (c) Ensure the availability of a sufficient number of adequate shelters in all regions of the State party and that victims receive counselling, rehabilitation and support services for their reintegration in society;**
- (d) Provide capacity building for the judiciary, the police and law enforcement personnel and health-service providers on a zero tolerance and gender-sensitive approach in dealing with cases of gender-based violence and providing assistance to victims;**
- (e) Allocate adequate human, technical and financial resources to the recently established special police division to address gender-based and sexual violence against women and children;**
- (f) Systematically collect statistical data on gender based violence disaggregated by sex, age, ethnic origin and relationship between the perpetrator and the victim and include such data in its next periodic report;**
- (g) Take effective measures to prevent gender based violence against women, such as femicide and marital rape, study the phenomenon and guarantee that criminal charges are brought against perpetrators.**

⁷ CEDAW/C/ARM/CO/5-6, 25 Nov. 2016.

IV.2. Description of the Project and Project Overview

The goal of the Project is to support and protect women and girls in 5 regions of Armenia against all forms of domestic violence by skilled service providers via a capable multi-agency response mechanism. The Project’s theory of change is that improving attitudes and sensitivities towards domestic violence amongst key decision-makers will enable them to better handle and refer domestic violence (DV) cases within a coordinated and sustainable response mechanism that will benefit the client. It also implies that creating a system-level change in addressing clients will result in a rights-based, multi-agency response to survivors of domestic violence and their families. The Project spanned two years and primary beneficiaries including general and specialized service providers in 8 communities in Armenia (Gyumri, Vanadzor, Goris, Yerevan, Byureghavan, Medzamor, Charentsavan, and Baghramyan).

The Project is designed to take place in five regions of Armenia, namely Yerevan, Shirak, Armavir, Lori, and Syunik. These regions have been selected based on need as well as the existence of partner organizations who can help assist and facilitate the program. The Project estimated the participation of 15 individuals representing 10 civil society organizations, 40 individuals from faith-based organizations, 5 government officials from the Ministry of Social Affairs, 40 government social workers, 50 university students, and 40 police officers (200 individuals total). Furthermore, the same government officials and the police officers who took part in the trainings were supposed to work with the Project team and the implementing partner organizations to create the internal best practices guidelines.

The primary beneficiaries of the Project are women and girls of all ages and backgrounds who have suffered from intimate partner/in-law abuse including minorities, such as women with disabilities, LGBT individuals, and women with HIV. The primary beneficiaries are survivors of physical, sexual, psychological/emotional, and economic violence. The secondary beneficiaries are the government officials, police officers, and other service providers who received comprehensive training on domestic violence and appropriate case management throughout the Project cycle and were assisted in creating an internal best practices guideline. The implemented activities aimed at allowing those service providers to drive institutional change and work within a more coordinated system to assist survivors. The Project Goal was that by December 2017 women and girls in 5 regions of Armenia were supported and protected against all forms of domestic violence. This overall objective of the Project has been divided into two expected results listed in Table 1.

Table 1: The Project’s Intended Outcomes and Outputs

| | Outcomes | Outputs |
|-----|---|---|
| ER1 | General and specialist Service providers have Improved attitudes and Sensitivity towards Domestic violence. | 1.1 General and specialist service providers who participate in trainings have improved knowledge & skills on how to prevent and address domestic violence. |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| | Outcomes | Outputs |
|-----|--|--|
| ER2 | General and specialist Service providers have new policies and plans to protect & provide services to survivors. | 2.1 General and specialist service providers have a Common understanding of Respective roles and responsibilities in protection of women survivors in their given sectors. |
| | | 2.2 General and specialist service providers show support for a multi-sectoral cooperation approach in providing services. |
| | | 2.3 General and specialist service providers show support for a multi-sectoral action plan to prevent and combat domestic violence. |

Table 2: The main partners of the Project are:

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Expected Result 1 | RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence; Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Republic of Armenia (MLSA), NILSR; MLSA regional offices; NGOs involved in Service provision |
| Expected Result 2 | RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence; Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Republic of Armenia (MLSA), Women’s Rights NGOs |

V. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

V.1. Purpose of the Evaluation

The objective of the end-of-project evaluation is to:

- assess the extent to which the project has attained its objectives based on indicators as defined in the Project Document and the ToR;
- evaluate the efficiency of the project management set-up, including monitoring and reporting systems;
- evaluate the relevance of the intervention and its activities to the DV related developments in Armenia;
- evaluate the added value and innovation of the Project compared to other national and international actors in the field in Armenia;
- assess the sustainability of the Project deliverables, as well as the implementation and follow-up of its recommendations by Armenian counterparts’ to-date;
- evaluate impact potential of the project, focusing on changes for beneficiaries and identifying best practices and lessons learned;
- assess knowledge generation, the lessons learned, and best practices; and
- recommend possible plan of action and further activities for future assistance and improved sustainability.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to assess the Project’s:

- **relevance** by examining the appropriateness of project design and its suitability with the overall reform process in Armenia, with the identified needs of beneficiaries of all project activities, and to the relevance of the WSC mission and priority areas of the Donor;
- **added value** and comparative advantage vis-à-vis other national/international actors and the areas in which the WSC can improve;
- **efficiency** in terms of whether the outputs achieved were reasonable for the resources spent;
- **effectiveness** in terms of achievement of expected results;
- **impact** in terms of positive and negative changes produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended;
- **sustainability** in terms of the possibility that the benefits of the intervention will continue after the end of the Project;
- **knowledge generation** in terms of lessons learned and best practices;
- provide **recommendations** to further improve the project methodology, structure and management set-up in the future as well as outline priority areas for possible continuation of the project.

V.2. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will cover the Project implementation since **January 1, 2016 until January 14, 2018**.

VI. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was carried out by Hasmik TAMAMYAN, an independent consultant. In planning and implementing this evaluation the Evaluator followed two guiding principles: triangulation and stakeholder consultation and engagement. The Evaluator worked with the WSC project team to build consensus around the evaluation’s scope and process. The Evaluation is conducted by post-test only design without comparison group.

VI.1. Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions

The evaluation was based on the criteria of *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, knowledge generation as well as added value and validity of design*. Based on the review of the proposed evaluation questions (EQs) listed in the ToR and the Inception Report, the final evaluation seeks to answer the following sets of questions.

| Evaluation questions | Criteria |
|---|--------------------|
| EQ1. To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of women and girls? | Relevance |
| EQ1.1 To what extent have the interventions been aligned and supportive of the overall reform and policy processes of Armenia in responding to the needs of women and girls? | |
| EQ1.2 To what extent do the intervention objectives address identified needs of the beneficiaries/stakeholders? | |
| EQ1.3 To what extent is the intervention design relevant to the mandate of the WSC and priority areas of the Donor? | |
| EQ2. To what extent was the project design logical and coherent? Were the objectives/outcomes, targets and timing clearly established and realistically set? | Validity of Design |
| EQ2.1 How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? Is the Project’s Results and Resource Framework and performance monitoring plan practical, useful, and sufficient for measuring progress toward achieving project objectives? How is the gathered data used? | |
| EQ2.2 Which risks and assumptions were identified and to what extent have they affected the Project? | |
| EQ3. To what extent has the WSC a clear comparative advantage vis-à-vis other local and international actors in terms of the implementation of the intervention? | Added Value |
| EQ3.1 In which areas can the WSC improve compared to other actors in the field? | |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| Evaluation questions | Criteria |
|---|----------------------|
| EQ4. What progress has been made towards the achievement of the Project goal, expected results, outputs and outcomes of the Project? | Effectiveness |
| EQ5. To what extent were the Project activities directly addressed to the targeted beneficiaries? | |
| EQ6. To what extent has the Project produced results with the potential of positive changes for the beneficiaries directly or indirectly improving their lives and the services provided to them? | |
| EQ7. What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of the expected results, outputs and outcomes of the Project? | |
| EQ8. How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document? | Efficiency |
| EQ8.1 Have the resources/inputs in terms of funds, expertise, time etc. been converted economically to results? | |
| EQ8.2 The extent to which management capacities and arrangements put in place to support the achievement of results? | |
| EQ8.3 Did the project governance and management facilitate good results and efficient implementation? Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? | |
| EQ8.4 To what extent is project reporting accurate, timely and satisfactory? | |
| EQ9. What are the short to medium term results produced by the project whether directly or indirectly intended or unintended, and positive or negative? | Impact |
| EQ10. Are there any noticeable or tangible benefits of the project to date? | |
| EQ11. What is the anticipated/possible long term impact of this project? | |
| EQ12. What is the likelihood that the benefits from the intervention, especially the positive changes generated by the Project in the lives of women and girls, will be sustained, when the Project ends? What are the most important factors? | Sustainability |
| EQ13. How likely is it that the prepared guidelines will be institutionalized and sustained? Were steps taken to ensure there will be the necessary human and financial resources and key stakeholder support to ensure the continuation of activities? | |
| EQ14. What are the main lessons learned and recommendations that can be shared, replicated, and multiplied in the future. | Knowledge Generation |

VI.2. Data Sources and Data Collection Methods

The Evaluation Framework below describes the data sources and data collection methods for each of the evaluation questions. The Evaluator drew conclusions based on triangulation of evidence from different data collection methods and primary/secondary data sources.

Data collection methods

The following data collection methods will be employed to conduct the evaluation:

1. **Desk Review/Document Analysis** of Project documents, including the main Project document, Working group minutes, activity plans/workplans, progress reports, trainings materials, stakeholders’ contact lists, and all related documents.
2. **Individual in-depth interviews** with selected key informants from the Project implementers; Project partners, including representatives from Government agencies; Service providers, donor and other stakeholders;
3. **Group discussions** with Project beneficiaries, who participated in Project’s activities (Social workers and police officers).

These methods are further described below:

1. Document Review

A thorough review and analysis of documents and Project records provides a wealth of evidence for this evaluation assignment. A list of such documents is located in Annex 10.8.

2. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

In-depth interviews were conducted to get comprehensive information and opinions about the Project; its success, strengths and weaknesses as well as define possible lines of action for future projects and interventions in the field.

The Evaluator conducted individual in-depth interviews (or group interviews, where appropriate) with selected key informants and stakeholders. The KIIs elicited stakeholders’ opinions on the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the Project results. The Evaluator developed a semi-structured interview guide (Annex 10.3) for KI interviews. On top of the main general questions sets of questions were developed and addressed only to a particular stakeholder groups depending on the scope and intensity of their involvement in the Project.

The semi-structured interview guide derived from the logic of the key evaluation questions and where appropriate responses were double-checked and document-verified.

12 face-to-face or Skype interviews (Annex 10.5) were conducted based on purposive sampling technique, where the key informants were selected based on the level of their expertise and involvement in project activities:

- Semi-structured interview with a lawyer specialized in DV cases (1-f)
- Semi-structured interviews with the representatives from the RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence (1-f/1m)

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

- Semi-structured interview with the MLSA representative (1-f)
- Semi-structured interview with the NILSR representative (1-f)
- Semi-structured interviews with the SOP development WG members (2-f)
- Semi-structured interviews with the UNTF representatives (2-f)
- Semi-structured interviews with the Project management team at the WSC (4-f)

3. Group discussions with Project stakeholders – Police officers; Service providers, and the YSU Social Work Students

Use of this method aims at assessing the effectiveness for and impact of the Project on the main group of people, who directly took part in the Project activities. The Evaluator explored and identified how the Project had contributed to any significant shifts/changes at an individual, institutional, and policy levels by moderating discussions among the WSC training participants. Group discussions (GD) Guideline is included in Annex 10.4. 8 out of 37 Service providers, 4 out of 21 Social Work students, and 10 out of 44 police officers that had been previously engaged in the Project trainings took part in the group discussions to ensure representativeness and diversity of opinions from organizations and regions the WSC has worked with (See Annex 10.7 for the Beneficiary Data Sheet).

Table 3: GD participants

| Place | Type of participants | Number of | Number of | Type of sampling | Details |
|------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|---------|
| WSC Office | Service Providers | 1 | 8 | Purposive sampling | 8-f |
| WSC Office | Social Work Students | 1 | 4 | Purposive sampling | 4-f |
| WSC Office | Police Officers | 1 | 10 | Purposive sampling | 4-f/6-m |

VI.3. Data Analysis

For a credible evaluation, a scoring rubric for making judgments about different levels of performance and relative success is essential and should be defined in advance. It is especially important when the project undergoing evaluation has multiple components and disparate interventions. The Evaluator came up with the following rubric to be employed for the assessment of various components of the evaluation.

Table 4. Performance scoring rubric with rating scale

| Scale | Relevance and Design | Effectiveness | Impact orientation | Sustainability |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 5- Strongly Satisfactory | Needs and policy linkages were properly identified and the design was clearly right to meet them | Outputs and outcomes were exceeded | Impact exceeded the expected results | Satisfactory level of positive changes in the field. There is no risk for sustainability. |
| 4- Satisfactory | Needs and policy linkages were properly identified and the design was basically right to meet them | Outputs and outcomes were achieved | Net positive impact equivalent to planned impact | Positive changes will be sustained. There is nevertheless slight risk that can affect sustainability. |
| 3- Moderately Satisfactory | Needs and policy linkages were properly identified, but not prioritized; and the design was basically right to meet them, but could have been improved | Outputs and outcomes were mostly achieved | Net positive impact in most areas | Positive changes are likely to be sustained with possible extra inputs. There are moderate risks affecting sustainability. |
| 2- Unsatisfactory | Needs and policy linkages were mentioned and the design would/did address them; but there is/was something wrong with the design or setting (e.g. resources, institutional setting, timing, political will) | Outputs and outcomes were more or less achieved | Some positive impact, but much less than planned in some areas; or some significant negative consequences as well | Positive changes might be sustained with modest effect in the environment. There are significant risks affecting sustainability. |
| 1-Strongly Unsatisfactory | Needs and policy linkages were low priority; the design was inappropriate; the setting was not right for an intervention at the time | Little or no outputs and outcomes were achieved | Little to no positive impact slightly outweighing negative impact | Most positive changes are unlikely to be sustained. There are severe risks affecting sustainability. |

VI.4. Limitations to the Evaluation

Every evaluation poses its own inherent limitations as to what can realistically be carried out within the scope of the assignment, and this one is no exception. Below are some of the issues that may affect the course of this evaluation assignment and its results:

- ✓ **Attribution of the Project’s results:** All of the outcomes and outputs of the Project are quite broad and the achievement of the Project goals is not solely the responsibility of the Project. In order to achieve many of its objectives the Project cooperates actively with other donor agencies present in the country, civil society partners and state authorities. Consequently, it is not possible to attribute results solely to the Project. At best, it is possible to point to Project’s contribution towards achieving the goals.
- ✓ **Limited Budget:** The Evaluator has to develop and suggest the data collection methodology and sources given in mid very limited Evaluation budget and strict deadlines. Unfortunately, no methodology can be applied to assess the changes at the Project goal level and collect data from the primary beneficiaries by using experimental/control design or longitudinal baseline/endline study.
- ✓ **Selection Bias:** Some key informants declined or were not available to be interviewed, which left a room for *selection* bias, i.e. opinions of respondents who agreed or disagreed to be interviewed might be different.
- ✓ **Recall Bias:** Since a number of questions raised during the interviews dealt with activities that had taken place in the last 2 years, *recall* bias had to be taken into account as well. Some respondents found it difficult to accurately compare situations before and after the Project.
- ✓ **Halo Bias:** There is a known tendency among respondents to under-report socially undesirable aspects/behaviors and alter their responses to approximate what they perceive as the social norm (*halo* bias). How honest and open a respondent is also depends on the respondent’s role, relationships, and status in the context of the issue in the subject matter. To mitigate this limitation the Evaluator provided the respondents with confidentiality guarantees and conducted the interviews in the settings where respondents felt comfortable. Group interviews/discussions were conducted among small peer groups to encourage free expression and exchange of ideas.

The evaluation methodology has been developed under the following assumptions:

- Full documentation is available to the Evaluator and is of appropriate quality to enable her to make objective assessments on the achievements of each of the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and added value);
- The Evaluator is able to interview a range of key stakeholders as outlined in the methodology section of this report. Key stakeholders give their consent to be interviewed and are willing to discuss sensitive evaluation issues;

- The Evaluator will have full freedom to conduct impartially the evaluation and will be able to freely express her opinion;
- The Project implementer, WSC, will provide the Evaluator with administrative assistance and support to smoothly and effectively carry out the evaluation assignment;
- The WSC and UNTF will provide a single set of consolidated comments (at a single point in time) on the draft evaluation report.

VI.5. Stakeholder involvement, quality control, ethical considerations, and conflict of interest

1. Stakeholder involvement

The Project stakeholders were provided with opportunities to participate meaningfully in the evaluation process. Partners and key stakeholders were involved at the data collection stage of the evaluation and were consulted throughout the evaluation process.

2. Quality control

Upon receipt of written comments from the WSC and UNTF about the draft evaluation report, the Evaluator will correct all documented factual errors and inaccuracies and make changes related to the report’s structure, consistency, analytical rigor, validity of evidence, and requirements in the ToR. After making the necessary changes, the Evaluator will submit a final evaluation report.

3. Ethical considerations

The following steps have been taken to ensure safe and ethical data collection and filed work:

The primary data collection was done in private and isolated rooms, where only the KIs and the Evaluator had access to during the interviews/group discussions.

Informed Consent Forms were presented to KIs and Group discussion participants to brief about the purpose of the Evaluation, data collection related details, and their rights throughout the interview/discussion sessions.

The reported information and raw data is solely handled and safely stored by the Evaluator.

4. Conflict of interest

The Evaluator has no known or potential conflicts of interest that would affect her judgment or ability to provide a credible and independent evaluation. The Evaluator is independent and has no prior involvement with the design or implementation of the Project.

VI.6. Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation methodology framework described in greater detail above was developed to address the issues and themes outlined in the ToR, based on the evaluation criteria. The evaluation matrix expands on the proposed evaluation questions (EQ) and subquestions, providing a wider examination and interpretation of the issues. The matrix also indicates the proposed data source (assuming this is available and accessible) and the specific evaluation methodologies (document review, key informant interview, group discussions) to address each evaluation question. Finally, the matrix attempts, where possible, to provide a set of measurable performance indicators/standards of performance/benchmarks against which the attainment of results will be assessed.

Table 5: Evaluation Matrix

| Criteria | Key evaluation questions | Sub-questions | Measures/Indicators | Data Sources | Data Collection Methods |
|------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Relevance | EQ1. To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of women and girls? | EQ1.1 To what extent have the interventions been aligned and supportive of the overall reform and policy processes of Armenia in responding to the needs of women and girls? | Degree of convergence (uniformity) of the Project design with the needs of women and girls in Armenia. Credibility of intervention logic. Degree of convergence of the Project design with country's priorities and policies. | Project documentation; Project Implementing agency/partners | Document review; Interviews/group interviews with the relevant ministries (MES and MLSA) and NILSR; Interviews/group interviews with the representatives from the WSC and the Donor organization; group discussions with the secondary beneficiaries |
| | | EQ1.2 To what extent do the intervention objectives address identified needs of the beneficiaries/stakeholders? | Degree of convergence of the Project with the needs of key stakeholders, primary and secondary beneficiaries (initial vs throughout project implementation) | | |
| | | EQ1.3 To what extent is the intervention design relevant to the mandate of the WSC and priority areas of the Donor? | Coherence between Project design and needs of the mandate of the WSC and priority areas of the Donor | | |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| Criteria | Key evaluation questions | Sub-questions | Measures/Indicators | Data Sources | Data Collection Methods |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Validity of design | EQ2. To what extent was the project design logical and coherent? Were the objectives/outcomes, targets and timing clearly established and realistically set? | EQ2.1 How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? Is the Project's Results and Resources Framework and performance monitoring plan practical, useful, and sufficient for measuring progress toward achieving project objectives? How is the gathered data used | Credibility of intervention logic. Congruence between the Project strategy and root causes. Time availability for implementation. Quality of indicators. Availability and quality of M&E system. | Project documentation; Project Implementing agency/partners; Donor | Document review; Interviews/group interviews with the WSC; Interviews/group interviews with the relevant ministries; Interviews/group interviews with representatives from the Donor organization |
| | | EQ2.2 Which risks and assumptions were identified and to what extent have they affected the project? | Existence of risk analysis in project design and implementation. | | |
| Added value | EQ3. To what extent has the WSC a clear comparative advantage vis-à-vis other local and international actors in terms of the implementation of the intervention? | EQ3.1: In which areas can the WSC improve compared to other actors in the field? | Analysis of stakeholder opinions on WSC comparative advantage and shortcomings compared to other implementers | Stakeholders at national and local (regional) levels; Donor; Project Implementing agency | Interviews/group interviews with the WSC; Interviews/group interviews with the relevant ministries and other project partners; Interviews/group interviews with the Donor; Group interviews discussions with the secondary beneficiaries. |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| Criteria | Key evaluation questions | Sub-questions | Measures/Indicators | Data Sources | Data Collection Methods |
|----------------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| Effectiveness | EQ4. What progress has been made towards the achievement of the Project goal, expected results, outputs, and outcomes of the Project? | | Level and quality of achievements against the targets outlined in the Project document. Contextual enabling factors and constraints affecting the Project achievement of set objectives. | Project documentation including Progress reports and publications; Project implementing agency/partners; Donor; Secondary beneficiaries. | Document review; Interviews/group interviews with the WSC; Interviews/group interviews with the relevant ministries and the NILSR; Interviews/group interviews with the Donor; Group discussions with the secondary beneficiaries |
| | EQ5. To what extent were the Project activities directly addressed to the targeted beneficiaries? | | | | |
| | EQ6. To what extent has the Project produced results with the potential of positive changes for the beneficiaries directly or indirectly improving their lives and the services provided to them? | | | | |
| | EQ7. What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of the expected results, outputs and outcomes of the Project? | | | | |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| Criteria | Key evaluation questions | Sub-questions | Measures/Indicators | Data Sources | Data Collection Methods |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Efficiency | EQ8. How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document? | EQ8.1 Have the resources/inputs in terms of funds, expertise, time etc. been converted economically to results? | Level of appropriateness of the Project expenditures. Timeliness of funds delivery and project implementation. | Project documentation; Project Budget; Financial Reports; Project implementing agency; Donor | Document review; Interviews/group interviews with the WSC; Interviews/group interviews with the Donor |
| | | EQ8.2 The extent to which management capacities and arrangements put in place to support the achievement of results? | Extent of resources used to achieve particular outputs/outcomes. | | |
| | | EQ8.3 Did the Project management facilitate good results and efficient implementation? | Level of appropriateness of the project management/execution structure. | | |
| | | EQ8.4: To what extent is project reporting accurate, timely and satisfactory? | Level of satisfaction with the Project's progress reporting by donor. | | |
| Impact orientation | EQ9. What are the short- to medium-term results produced by the Project whether directly or indirectly intended or unintended, and positive or negative? | | Documentation and analysis of stakeholder opinions on the Project's achievements, strengths, shortcomings, intended and unintended short-term and medium-term outcomes. | Project documentation; Project implementing agency/partners; Stakeholders | Document review; Interviews/group interviews with the WSC; Interviews/group interviews with the relevant ministries and the NILSR; Group discussions with the Secondary beneficiaries. |
| | EQ10. Are there any noticeable or tangible benefits of the Project to date? | | | | |
| | EQ11. What is the anticipated long-term impact of this Project? | Documentation and analysis of stakeholder opinions on the Project's possible long-term impact (positive or negative). | | | |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| Criteria | Key evaluation questions | Sub-questions | Measures/Indicators | Data Sources | Data Collection Methods |
|----------------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| Sustainability | EQ12. What is the likelihood that the benefits from the intervention especially the positive changes generated by the Project in the lives of women and girls, will be maintained after the project ends? What are the most important factors? | | Extent to which measures have been taken to build local ownership of the Project’s results. Availability of resources (human and financial) necessary for continued implementation of activities from national or international sources. | Project documentation; Project implementing agency/ partners; Stakeholders | Document review; Interviews/group interviews with the WSC; Interviews/group interviews with the relevant ministries and the NILSR; Group discussions with the secondary beneficiaries |
| | EQ13. How likely is it that the prepared guidelines will be institutionalized and sustained? Were steps taken to ensure there will be the necessary human and financial resources and key stakeholder support to ensure the continuation of activities? | | Documentation and analysis of the degree to which national stakeholders involved in the Project implementation/informed about the Project activities. Responsiveness of the Project team to stakeholders’ needs and requests. | | |
| Knowledge generation | EQ14. What are the main lessons learned and recommendations that can be shared, replicated, and multiplied in the future. | | Analysis of opinions and recommendations of the Project national stakeholders and those, who were directly involved in the Project activities | Project documentation; Project implementing agency/ partners; Stakeholders | Document review; Interviews/group interviews with the WSC; Interviews/group interviews with the relevant Ministries and the National institute of Labour and Social Research; Group discussions with the secondary beneficiaries |

VII. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

VII.1. Relevance

Relevance to policy development of Armenia

Domestic violence, especially intimate partner violence, is prevalent in Armenia. The Armenian government acknowledges there is a problem and has been working to develop a domestic violence prevention law for years. It was finally adopted in the end of 2017 setting up principles around which actions and services are to be developed to prevent domestic violence and protect DV survivors. However, there was not such law at the time of the development of the Project and throughout its lifespan. The trigger for the Project was when the WSC team realized that there is a huge need for professional development for police officers and service providers dealing with DV cases and that their small NGO staff can contribute with their unique expertise of running a women’s shelter and providing specialized services. On their side, the RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence and the MLSA department of Family, Women’s and Children’s Issues proved to be open for cooperation and exchange of experience. The initial training idea later defined the outputs and outcomes under the Expected result 1 of the Project and cooperation with the Government to develop and institutionalize the Shelter management guideline and the Standard Operating Procedures for social workers became Expected result 2. Governmental partners during the KI interviews acknowledged the expertise of the WSC as an organization that provides services to DV survivor women and girls and were greatly involved in Outcomes 1 and 2 of the Project aiming to reform relevant policies and improve the quality of services.

Information gleaned from the desk review documents and interviews with project partners confirm that the Project is fully in line with the national priorities of the Government of Armenia on development and enforcement of DV preventive mechanisms. The project is in support of the government actions undertaken to improve the DV addressing mechanisms through (a) drafting a law on domestic violence; (b) increasing the scope and quality of service delivery; (c) developing preventive mechanisms and protection schemes for DV victims; (d) providing training to all specialists dealing with DV cases. The relevance of the project was further cemented by the signature of the “RA Law on Prevention of Violence within the Family, Protection of Victims of Violence within the Family, and Restoration of Peace within the Family” on 30 December 2017 adopted by the National Assembly of Armenia on 13 December 2017.

Due to ongoing process of DV prevention reform in Armenia, the WSC Project provided training and capacity building support. In overall context of poor service provision system or even its complete absence, the WSC was one of a few organizations that had and could share their expertise in working with the DV survivor women and girls. The development and publication of the sets of standards for shelter management and operating procedures as well as integrating related modules into the higher education and vocational training curricula for Police officers and service providers has a potential for continuous impact and capacity building in the field as stated by the KIs.

The Project’s relevance to developing DV and GBV prevention policies in Armenia is strongly satisfactory. The Project was highly aligned with the overall policy development of Armenia. The high-level structure of the Project was developed around Armenia’s ongoing efforts to combat gender-based violence, and relevant governmental stakeholders and service providers gained knowledge on DV and GBV that can help them develop effective policies and practices.

Relevance to beneficiaries and stakeholders

The Project satisfactorily addressed the identified needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries as the content of the training module and the Guidelines, the Outcome 2 publications, came from a list of recommendations generated with stakeholder involvement. The main format and content of the Project’s publications and trainings stem from the WSC’s previous projects and experience derived particularly from the work with DV survivors living in the Organization’s shelter. Based on interviews and group discussions with the Project’s secondary beneficiaries, the trainings were designed to fully address their education needs as they had little if any knowledge on different types of violence and complicated nature of DV cases and development stages. Gleaned from the KI interviews and group discussions, the knowledge and skills they obtained has a potential to directly affect the quality of services provided to DV survivors and bring positive changes in the quality of their lives. Conducting Gender and GBV related trainings is always challenging for training providers in Armenia, given the widespread gender stereotypes and very traditional gender roles. What is known is that the training participants expressed satisfaction with the theoretical knowledge and practical exercises provided for them during the Project activities.

Ideally, input from the primary beneficiaries, women and girls, would have also been included in the project design process and baseline study. Their input would help ensure that the intervention and related knowledge and skills incorporated into the main publications and trainings were relevant to their lives. However, as far as the Evaluator is aware, there was no baseline study or any research with DV survivor women and girls has not been conducted neither within the Framework of the Project nor in Armenia in general. The WSC did a desk review and gleaned information from their database, which was comprehensive and covered their work with DV survivor women over a number of years. However, the Project did not allocate any budget for an additional baseline study to measure the quality of services in the 5 Armenian regions subject to the intervention and the perceptions of the primary beneficiaries based on the indicators fixed in the Results and Resources Framework, which could serve as comparison data later on for the end-of-project evaluation.

Relevance to the Donor and Implementer

The Project relevance to the mandate of the WSC and the priority areas of UNTF is strongly satisfactory.

The Project is fully consistent with the WSC priorities specified in their mission statement and reiterated during the in-depth interviews with the WSC Project staff. The mandate of the WSC is assessed from their mission statement and their ongoing work to prevent domestic violence through the protection and empowerment of the victim, rehabilitation of family members; challenge systems and institutions so that they respond more effectively to the needs of battered women and their children. The Project is

based around DV related education with a goal of improving services provided to DV survivor women and girls, thus adhering to the mission statement and the day-to-day work of the WSC.

The Project’s main donor is the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UNTF). The 2015-2020 UNTF Strategic Plan⁸ is grounded in a “theory of change” that defines the building blocks required to fulfil women’s and girls’ human rights through the reduction of violence against women and girls and outlines the ongoing global work under three pillars: giving grants, collecting and collating evidence and results, and global advocacy to end violence against women. Through the strategy of the Donor it is clear how this project was of direct support. As one of the KIs mentioned the UNTF had been working with Armenian civil society sector for the last years and among the others the WSC project had a unique say on how the system should be responding to the needs of DV survivor women and girls in the country. The Donor’s priority areas are assessed through the call for proposals, which provides an objective method to determine the Donor’s priority areas and assess how closely the Project matches them. The three priority programmatic areas of the UNTF are:

(1) Improving access for women and girls to essential, safe and adequate multi-sectoral services to end violence against women and girls;

(2) Increasing effectiveness of legislation, policies, national action plans and accountability systems to prevent and end violence against women and girls; and

(3) Improving prevention of violence against women and girls through changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices.⁹

The Project could qualify under each of the above-mentioned clauses. Educating police officers and service providers on GBV and DV and providing them with skills to efficiently identify and address the DV cases will result in changes not only in knowledge, but also in attitude and practices and will eventually possess great potential for improving the quality of services provided to DV victim women and girls.

VII.2. Validity of design

In the framework of the Project the Women’s Support Center NGO intended to cooperate with relevant government agencies and officials in charge of the implementation of the DV prevention policies to improve the quality of services provided to the DV survivor women and girls. The theory of change of the Project is self-explanatory – improving attitudes and sensitivities towards domestic violence amongst key decision-makers will enable them to better handle and refer DV cases within a coordinated

⁸ <http://www.unwomen.org/www2.unwomen.org/~media/headquarters/attachments/sections/trust%20funds/untrustfundevaw/untf%20strategic%20plan%202015%202020%20designed.pdf?v=1&d=20160329T155828>

⁹ Language taken from 2016 UNTF call for proposals. From a KII, we have been told that the 2016 call is effectively the same as when WSC applied.

and sustainable response mechanism that will benefit the client. It also implies that creating a system-level change in addressing clients will result in a rights-based, multi-agency response to survivors of domestic violence and their families.

Overall, the Project Proposal (PP) contained strong analysis of the national context in which the project intended to operate. It clearly elaborated on the main Project goal and objectives and provided sufficient justification for the intervention with properly identified needs and linkages to the ongoing reform. The outcomes were clearly defined and the planned activities were by and large relevant for the fulfillment of the stated objectives and expected results. As for the main goal of the Project – by the end of December 2017 supporting and protecting women and girls in 5 regions of Armenia against all forms of domestic violence by skilled service providers via a capable multi-agency response mechanism – both the Project implementers and other stakeholders acknowledge that it could not be achieved through a single intervention with the duration of 2 years. Given also that the grant was intended to small civil society organizations with limited staff, capacities, and presence in regions, from the very beginning of the Project cycle there was no expectation for a large-scale immediate impact. However big, challenging, and unrealistic the goal may be, this is by no means to say that no steps had been taken by the grantee to establish good partnership with the governmental and regional agencies and move further towards their targets through day-to-day hard work and dedication. During the 2-years Project cycle they had closely collaborated with key decision-makers in the government, police force, social work, and civil society across five regions of Armenia to better equip them to handle DV cases and influence others to improve the multi-agency response to protect women and support survivors.

The project work plan to meet the outputs and outcomes was relevant, logical, cohesive, and practical. The strength of the Project was the deliberative approach to engage main stakeholders, experts, and actors from state agencies and civil society into the development of the main instrument, the Standard Operating Procedures, which will be largely used by service providers and policy-makers as assured by the interviewed KIs and the secondary beneficiaries, who took part in the discussions. Moreover, since the new law has a provision of opening state-run shelters and given that the WSC was the only agency among the Project stakeholders to have a long-term experience in running a shelter, the WSC put together a Shelter Management Guideline to enhance the capacity building of both state and non-state actors to efficiently establish new shelters after the end of the Project. As stated in the Community Action Plan¹⁰ developed and signed by the representatives of WSC and Project partners from the government and academia, to address the issues in the field of DV related services it is necessary to use and disseminate the materials that were prepared with the assistance of the UNTF, i.e. the SOP for Social Workers and the Shelter Guidelines. The Project also benefited from the pre- and post-test design planned for some of the training activities implemented mainly during the first year of the Project.

Assumptions and risks were thoroughly described in the Project Proposal with detailed explanation of steps to be taken and the contingency plan to ensure smooth implementation of the project activities while risks might still be there. The main risks identified were (1) overall stereotypical attitude of

10 Community Action Plan, signed 25 December 2017 by Maro MATOSIAN (WSC), Eleonora VIRAPYAN (MLSA), Mariam MARTIKYAN (NILSR), and Mira ANTONYAN (YSU and FAR)

secondary beneficiaries involved in trainings and low level of interest amongst them to take an extra workload to learn and practice new concepts and approaches or to get involved in the trainings at all; (2) the low speed of DV related reforms and lack of interest for government agencies and public officials to be accountable for and more transparent about their commitment to adopt the DV Law and relevant service mechanisms; (3) the so called “Anti-gender” activists and campaigns spreading hate messages and taking actions to prevent any project related to women’s rights from achieving its full set of objectives/expected results in time.

The project Proposal outlined a well-developed Results Chain of the Project providing details on the Project goals, expected results, and activities along with the timeline and budget to sum up the sequence and work plan of the Project. However, the project design suffered from some shortcomings:

1. Primary beneficiaries and secondary beneficiaries are vaguely defined. According to the PP and the Beneficiary Data Sheet (Annex 10.7), the primary beneficiaries of the Project are women in general (including female refugees; female sex workers; women/girls with disabilities, etc.) with total number of 902 at the Project goal level, which have not been subject to any direct intervention in the framework of the Project. As stated further in the same documents, the secondary beneficiaries at the outcome level are Social workers (N=37), Uniformed personnel (N=44), and University students (N=21), representing the main group immediately targeted by the Project and involved in the core project activities/trainings, which makes this group the only group of direct beneficiaries of the Project. The Evaluator acknowledges and is mindful of the overall framework and requirements for projects to target women in general at the national/local level to be consistent and coherent with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (Especially SDG 5) and the UNTF Strategic plan 2015-2020. However, calling the Project’s direct beneficiaries “secondary beneficiaries” and vice-a-versa the Project’s indirect beneficiaries “primary beneficiaries” makes a lot of confusion at the Project implementation and monitoring stages, as confirmed by the interviewed KIs, as well as the End-of-Project evaluation, mainly because overseeing, measuring, and concentrating more on changes occurred in lives of so called “primary beneficiaries” is even harder in the absence of direct intervention and the results can never be attributed solely to the Project.
2. Lack of an efficient Monitoring plan to be carried out throughout the Project cycle. The Project Proposal outlined specific Outcomes, Outputs, and Activities, however there is no baseline evidence with all indicators specific to each outcome/output, against which it would be possible to measure changes that occurred in a result of the intervention on a regular basis throughout the Project cycle. This refers first of all to the main project goal related indicator - perspectives of survivors on quality of received services.
3. One of the main deliverables under the Expected Result 2 – the Standard Operating Procedures for Social Workers – was developed at later stages of the Project and there is little evidence of synergy between this and other components of the Project (trainings). Having the SOPs published at the final stage of the Project allowed less time for the Project team to make best use of the tool as stated by the KIs during the interviews.

VII.3. Added value

The WSC contributes to Armenian women’s rights NGO community by bringing women’s shelter management expertise, know-how and proficiency on complexities of domestic violence cases, experienced advocacy for DV victims, and a sense of pragmatism. The WSC hotline is a good source of information and further analysis on DV and GBV cases and most importantly, it provides the WSC staff with an opportunity to quickly react and offer advice, shelter, specialized services, and protection to the victim. Besides victim Services and Counselling, the WSC has been greatly involved in public education and campaigning by raising awareness on the situation and prevalence of DV in Armenia, actively advocating for legislation reforms in the field, and training different professional groups dealing with and reporting on DV cases.

There are a number of women’s rights NGOs in Armenia, with a number of them doing good work to make change on the ground. Seven NGOs, including the WSC, have joined to form the Coalition to Stop Violence against Women with another two NGOs joining them later on. 4 out of those 9 NGOs have implemented projects financed by the UNTF at some point. The Coalition is the most significant entity combating gender-based violence and advocating for better quality services to DV survivors, however, none of the seven members of the Coalition can quite compare to the WSC in terms of the practical work they have been doing since their establishment. Information gleaned from document analysis and KI interviews proves that none of the other organizations in the Coalition possess the same mix of expertise in working with DV cases and collaborating with governmental agencies to improve the related policies and the quality of services provided to the DV survivor women and girls. In terms of this specific project, it requires reiteration that no other NGO active in the field in Armenia has done a project similar to this before. It is obvious that no other Armenian organization could have achieved Expected Results 1 and 2 by involving governmental agencies in trainings and SOP/Guideline development with a high level of diplomacy of cooperating with the government while challenging it.

In short, the success and added value of the WSC project has its roots in (1) the WSC’s expertise in shelter management; (2) their know-how in quality service provision to the DV survivors; (3) their efficient collaboration style with the government and project partners; (4) their ability and expertise to put together operating tools and procedures for specialists dealing with DV cases; and (5) their long-term experience in providing public education and specialized training on DV and GBV cases. The interviewed government partners and trained social workers and police officers mentioned not once that they get back to the WSC as the only source of practical information about shelter management standards, peculiarities of services provided to the DV victims or most importantly to refer DV cases to them. The content of trainings and publications under the Expected results 1 and 2 is highly appropriate to the needs of service providers and speaks a million about the WSC’s unique niche in the field and their growing expertise. All interviewees during the consultations were asked to identify the comparative advantage of the WSC in implementing projects related to the DV prevention reforms in Armenia. There was clear recognition of the following in terms of the value of having the WSC playing a

role in this process: (1) *Technical expertise*; (2) *Partnership approach* of the WSC in collaborating with government agencies and other stakeholders; (3) *Engaging all stakeholders and creating platforms for communication and dialogue*; (4) *Peer-to-peer approach* to reinforce the network of peers working on DV cases.

Potential weaknesses of the WSC project

An arguable weakness of the WSC project was the staff’s lack of experience in dealing with police forces, but it’s unclear that a more sophisticated organization would have done better. One of the challenges the WSC faced was the change of the head of Goris police department and their changed priorities, due to which they were not able to fit into the WSC training schedule and declined to take part in the workshop. Also, in the initial Project proposal the WSC was planning to cooperate with the Armenian Church and provide trainings on DV and GBV to clergy as well, as the priests are dealing first-hand with a lot of DV cases especially in small communities. However, the WSC did not get consent to collaborate with the Church and the WSC’s pragmatic solution was to concentrate more on other secondary beneficiaries involved in the project. They were also quick enough to decide to engage educators/teachers in some of their trainings instead.

Another potential weakness of the WSC project is that there was a need to do more work on visibility. Like the issue stated above, this possible criticism is not likely apt vis-à-vis stated project outcomes. Again, due to the controversy of gender in Armenia, it’s quite possible that increasing visibility could have jeopardized the project. However, increasing visibility among the public, the NGO community, the government agencies, police, and service providers could have resulted in scaling-up the project’s outputs and outcomes and ensure further funding for continuous efforts.

VII.4. Efficiency

Resource efficiency

UNTF was the sole grantor for the Project, and the WSC the sole grantee. As shown in Table 6, UNTF provided \$86,281 and the WSC’s non-monetary contribution estimated around \$64000 over the span of the two-year project.

As confirmed by the UNTF representative, the WSC planned their budget very well. They did not use

their chance for budget revisions (the UNTF allows max 2 budget revisions throughout the project cycle). The WSC just requested minor budgetary reallocations, which wouldn’t require going through all the complicated procedures of budgetary revisions, and according to the Project managers from the UNTF side the reallocations they requested were totally justified and approved. The WSC requested a reallocation of funds they could save from the initially estimated transportation costs and distributed the extra funds on the Expected Result 2 publications. Note that the final expenditure rate of 98.7% includes this reallocation.

Further, all activities, outputs and outcomes were fully achieved. There is no reason to believe that the anticipated budget was inflated; the project design stage was multi-staged and thorough. The end-of-project expenditure rate is 98.7%.

Note that the Evaluator is limited in its ability to assess efficiency due to limited financial information for each project indicators. The design of the project did not include indicators with expected changes/shifts, baseline and endline data for each activity, output or outcome. This makes it impossible to complete a Results Monitoring Plan and to assess the cost-effectiveness of each output and outcome.

Table 6. Project budget information

| | Initial budget | Expenditures | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total |
| Expected Result 1 | \$46,408 | \$46,408 | \$0 | \$463,041 |
| Expected Result 2 | \$39,873 | \$0 | \$39,873 | \$42,127 |
| Total | \$86,281 | \$46,408 | \$39,873 | \$85,168 |
| Expenditure % (Expenditures vs Initial budget) | | 92.7% | 105.7% | 98.7% |
| Management costs in Total budget | \$46,795 | \$26,924 | \$19,871 | \$46,795 |
| Amount provided by UNTF | | | | \$86,281 |
| Amount provided by WSC* | | | | \$64000 |
| *Estimates of the non-monetary contributions by the WSC | | | | |

Project management and Communication with the Donor

The WSC, the grantee organization in Yerevan provided the overall coordination and implementation of the different components and facilitated communication with the main institutional partners, stakeholders and the Donor. On one hand, the Project strength is a strong project management team, which combined the expertise and skills necessary for effective project implementation. The project management team and project experts were perceived by all interviewed national counterparts as knowledgeable and highly experienced. On the other hand, administration of project and reporting the results to the Donor according to their financial and narrative report requirements created many challenges as stated by the KIs during the interviews, as both Donor and Grantee organizations have their own internal system of project administration and the expectations have not been clearly defined at the earliest stages of the Project implementation delaying feedbacks on and approvals of progress reports from the UNTF side. Quite often the WSC had to concentrate more on the administration and reporting tasks of the Project at the expense of their core activities according to the Project implementing staff.

Apart from getting UNTF’s feedback for the narrative and financial reports, there were no other delays due to communication. Overall, communication between UNTF and the WSC was prompt and constructive. Reports were submitted on time as fairly noted by the interviewed Project team members and their UNTF counterparts and UNTF staff has always been helpful in addressing the problems the Grantee organization has had throughout the Project cycle. Likewise, the WSC was accessible to project partners and provided insistence when needed.

Partnerships and Cooperation

The project demonstrated respect for the importance of stakeholder participation, and actively sought stakeholder input through structured periodic meetings and consultations. The WSC has been very successful in developing working partnership with both the government officials and the practitioners in the field. They secured the support and the active participation of the MLSA, the NILSR, and most importantly the RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence. The project established also cooperation with the other civil society actors and charities providing services to children and women and established a vivid network of professionals and practitioners in the field. The interviewed national counterparts confirmed that there was good coordination and collaboration with them throughout the project implementation.

Gleaned from interviews and focus group discussions with the project’s secondary beneficiaries, the Project established good coordination with all parties dealing with DV cases through engagement of different specialized groups, the service providers, the police inspectors, and newly trained social work students, in training activities. Furthermore, the WSC within the UNTF funded project ensured synergies with other projects that it leads in Armenia to better address the needs of their regional/local stakeholders. Evaluation feedback through interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries show that the cooperation overall was perceived as very good. Interviewed project partners appreciated the WSC’s responsiveness and action-orientation. This seems to form a solid basis for future project formulation, in which cooperation and coordination can be continued.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The WSC M&E Specialist was responsible for monitoring the results within the Project. Although the project did not have a separate joint M&E plan, in overall, it had a well-established Project record management and documentation system consisting of very detailed reports on each activity, output, and outcome. They also applied pre- and post-test to assess the learning outcomes for the training participants.

The quality of training activities has been monitored through the following tools: (1) Trainees Feedback at the End of Training, and (2) Pre- and post-testing before and after trainings sessions. However, neither under Outcome 1 nor under Outcome 2 the training needs assessments (TNA) have been conducted prior to the implementation of professional development and capacity building activities to identify the specific needs of trainees and offer a tailor-made training programme. The Project would have benefited also from an extra budget allocation and incorporation of a baseline study to measure the perceptions and experience of the Project primary beneficiaries (women and girls in the selected 5 regions) regarding the treatment and service they receive from Social workers and police officers to be able to further evaluate any changes in the quality of service occurred in a result of the WSC intervention. Although the Project was supposed to be implemented over 24 months, no independent mid-term evaluation has been required from the Donor and scheduled by the Grantee. The Project would greatly benefit from a mid-term evaluation aimed at measuring the project’s progress on the implementation phase and making all necessary adjustments to ensure achievement of set targets.

Furthermore, the UNTF New York based staff and the regional staff conducted project monitoring through annual on-site visits to Armenia for overseeing the project’s activities and related developments, as well as collecting feedback from project partners, experts and beneficiaries.

VII.5. Effectiveness

Based on the information collected from the KIs and project beneficiaries and the analysis of the triangulated data, the Project successfully completed most of the initially planned activities and carried out some additional activities throughout its 2-years lifespan. The Project adopted a cooperative strategy to facilitate the dialogue and ensure long-term partnership between its all stakeholders and partners.

Throughout the Project cycle under the Outcome 1 the following targets were achieved:

1. Conducted a series of 16 workshops on key terms and concepts as well as DV service provision for the Project’s secondary beneficiaries in Yerevan and 5 regions of Armenia;
2. Arranged formal meetings with the representatives from MLSA and NILSR to develop a strong partnership and ensure collaboration for an effective implementation of the Project;

3. Offered trainings to general (social protection, police, students) and specialist (women’s NGOs) service providers to improve their knowledge and skills on how to prevent and address DV;
4. Follow-up interviews/phone interviews were conducted to collect feedback from 7 women who received service from the police and/or service providers that had earlier taken part in the Project trainings.

Delivery of outputs and outcomes under the Expected Result 1 can be assessed as satisfactory. While in most cases outputs and outcomes were achieved as planned, in some cases they were even exceeded. For instance, at some point the WSC project staff realized that involving teachers in the Project’s trainings will add to its value, as teachers especially in regional cities are very well aware of DV cases mainly explained by their continuous communication with schoolchildren and their mothers. Same is true about the kindergarten nurses, who can see any changes in a kid's mood and physical state and quite often are the only members in a local community to see and communicate with the kid’s mother, given that traditionally taking kids from and to kindergarten is the only “acceptable reason for the abuser to allow his wife out of home.” Nevertheless, one of the most significant outcomes in terms of smooth implementation of the Project and the utmost and large-scale impact of the intervention and its sustainable future would be strong collaboration with the MLSA/NILSR and the RA Police colleagues in charge of the gender and GBV related policy development as agreed by the majority of the interviewed KIs. Mainly due to the political context and the slow development of the DV/GBV related reform in Armenia the collaboration aiming at creating sound response mechanisms and referral procedures could not be foreseen in the course of the Project implementation. However, from the beginning of the Project and till its end the WSC’s efforts to establish a sound cooperation with the RA government and police forces were successful enough to get the green light to incorporate the training module into the compulsory curricula of the Police academy as well as in the Social Work Department program at the Yerevan State University. The Evaluator acknowledges external factors causing delays and jeopardising the success of the Project and appreciates all continuous efforts the WSC put into building partnership and a more collaborative environment with the Project partners in the RA government.

Trainings delivered to the Project’s secondary beneficiaries were the first attempt to introduce them the complex structure and development stages of DV cases. The knowledge and detailed case studies presented during the trainings equip them with relevant skills on how best to use the available instrument in their day-to-day work. Group discussions with police officers and social workers showed a very high level of participants’ satisfaction and revealed high relevance of these trainings as they presented all the theoretical, legal, statistical, and practical aspects of GBV and combating DV. The interviewed participants of the trainings highlighted the high level of expertise of the Project team and trainers with whom they still stay in touch for further advice and exchange of information. A multi-agency network established among the training participants and other stakeholders is another important outcome of the Project that provides them with a good platform to collaborate with each other and improve their service provision by consulting with their counterparts even after the training. As reported by the police officers during the group discussions, the vast majority of them did not

participate in any other similar training before. They further underlined that the training they took part in was very useful to them in terms of getting basic knowledge on topics like types and forms of DV and gender based violence, different stages the DV case develops through, the reasons why the victim is not willing to report the case, as well as peculiarities of the services provided to a DV survivor women and women’s empowerment techniques. In addition, the interviewed KIs and consulted secondary beneficiaries underlined the need for continuous training on DV and GBV related content and preventive measures, which would help them more efficiently incorporate the knowledge and skills into their day-to-day work, when the newly adopted DV Law comes into force.

Under the Outcome 2 the following targets were achieved:

1. The DV sector main actors across government came together to set out rules outlining the roles and responsibilities of and appropriate practices for organizations while dealing with the DV survivors;
2. A Working group was established to engage representatives from MLSA, NILSR, the RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence, as well as charities/civil society organizations providing specialized services to contribute to the development of the Standard operating Procedures for Social Workers;
3. Engaged the above mentioned actors to develop and sign a Community Action Plan on 25 December 2017, which aimed at training and raising the awareness of general and specialized service providers about DV in order to combat domestic violence and protect victims;
4. Another round table with representatives from MES, MLSA, NIE, and local NGOs was organised to provide a platform for appreciation of gender and GBV content integration into classrooms and establish a Working group (WG);
5. The Shelter management guideline and the SOPs were developed, published¹¹, distributed, and made available online.
6. The publications under the Outcome 2 have been approved and suggested by the WG members as supporting training materials for social workers, police, and any other professionals dealing with DV cases.
7. General and specialized service providers who took part in the WSC trainings showed support in for a multi-sectoral cooperation approach in providing shelter and services to the DV survivors as well as a coordinated multi-sectoral action plan to combat DV.

Delivery of outputs under the Outcome 2 can be assessed as strongly satisfactory. The Project achieved all planned targets under this component by establishing a dynamic and efficient working group to

¹¹ The Guideline was published in 400 copies in Armenian and 100 copies in English, while the SOPs was published in 500 copies in Armenian and 100 copies in English.

develop the SOPs for social workers and integrate it as a supporting training material for their vocational education and professional development. Gleaned from the desk review documents and from the interviews with the Working group members, the WG activities were effectively coordinated by the WSC Project team enabling smooth exchange of information and open discussion on the content and structure of the module. The WG itself was a great success in terms of getting together at the same table a very diverse group of representatives from MLSA, NILSR, NGOs, experts and practitioners in the field to brainstorm and agree upon a document that could be further included into the Social workers and service providers’ professional development courses.

The Shelter Management Guidebook published during the Project is one of the most tangible and widely used outputs of the Project especially among the Project’s partner NGOs. Both the interviewed social workers and the Project partners familiar with the content of the Guidebook agreed that it was a well written teaching material covering conceptual and practical aspects of the subject matter and providing with detailed standards on how to establish and manage a women’s shelter and how to meet the DV survivor women’s and their children’s needs.

Something that deserves a great attention is the WSC’s success in engaging the DV sector main actors at policy level in multi-agency collaboration and fostering the dialogue about improving the quality of services and efficiency of response mechanisms through joint efforts. At a lower service provision level the WSC trainings were an attempt to test a peer-to-peer approach in order to reinforce the network of professionals working on DV cases and allow them to directly interact with their counterparts from other organizations, regions, police departments, etc. As stated by the KIs, the major result of the Project is that they could bring all the stakeholders together and managed to do this also in local communities. The WSC could engage all the stakeholders into the modalities of how best to improve the service provision in the country, which is an important step forward and contribution to setting a better system that is more responsive to the needs of stakeholders. “As a success from what I can see, the WSC is becoming more recognized as a service provider, a stakeholder who has something to say on how the system should be responding to the needs of the DV survivors. The authority of their voice, their presence in the local scene is very well received,” assured one of the interviewed KIs.

VII.6. Impact Orientation

Based on the information collected from the KI and Service providers/Police as well as the analysis of the triangulated data, the Evaluator identified several positive changes, which can be attributed to the Project’s intervention and causally linked to its impact orientation.

Table 7: Impacts of the Expected Results at the individual, institutional and policy levels.

| ERs | Area | Individual level | Institutional level | Policy level |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Expected Result 1 | Trainings/Workshops | <p>Increased knowledge on DV and GBV related topics, provided with new service provision skills and techniques.</p> <p>Provided professional networking opportunities with counterparts and the WSC Project team</p> | <p>ToT Multiplier effect - trained service providers and police officers pass on the knowledge and skills they gained during the trainings onto their colleagues, thus somehow changing the institutional culture towards a more gender sensitive environment and a better quality services to the DV survivors.</p> | <p>With the adoption of the new DV Law and the increasing need to train more professionals and even establish a specialized police sub-division to combat DV, the WSC training module can be institutionalized to further educate next cohorts of uniformed personnel and social workers. Police academy and the YSU Social Work department have already integrated the WSC training module into their curricula.</p> |
| Expected Result 2 | Working Group | <p>Provided a platform to foster dialogue about GBV and DV and related services and established collaboration among public officials, experts, and practitioners in the field.</p> | <p>An exemplary cooperation between public officials, NGO representatives, and independent experts and strengthened institutional ties.</p> | <p>Promoted the idea of multi-sectoral approach in policy making to combat domestic violence and with the small Working Group model reiterated the growing need for different government agencies and civil society organizations to join their efforts for creating effective and coordinated response mechanisms.</p> |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| ERs | Area | Individual level | Institutional level | Policy level |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | Guideline and SOP development | <p>Exchanged state-of-the-art ideas and best practices with other agencies and experts in the field.</p> <p>A supplementary teaching toolkit that can be greatly used as a reference for DV and GBV related topics and related service standards by trainers, students, students, experts and practitioners in the field, as well as policy makers.</p> | <p>Some Partner NGOs and trained beneficiaries are using the Guideline and the SOPs in their day-to-day work and the Guideline/SOP topics and examples are incorporated into the professional development activates they arrange internally for their staff members.</p> | <p>The SOPs, a well-written supplementary teaching tool in Armenian recommended by the MLSA, NILSR and the RA Police for social workers, school psychologists, police officers, as well as teachers.</p> |
| Other intended and unintended results | Partnerships with the government agencies | <p>Exchanged ideas and practices with government agencies and state actors involved in the DV prevention reforms.</p> | <p>Established professional networks between the WSC and MLSA/RA Police personnel in charge of the DV prevention reform and bringing the new DV Law to life.</p> | <p>RA Police highly appreciated the WSC training for police officers provided in the framework of the Project as well as the WSC service to survivors in general. As a result the WSC have been solely selected from the NGO sector to help develop police mechanisms and protocols to implement the DV law. In addition, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs has asked the WSC to participate in the working group for developing mechanisms for social workers to implement the DV law.</p> |

However, there is still more work to do to create the long-term impact for visible and continuous improvement in the field of DV and GBV in Armenia in line with the international treaties and the national strategy adopted by the RA government and most importantly the newly adopted Law to prevent DV and protect the DV survivors. The main goal of the Project was to improve the quality of life of women and girls in 5 regions of to support them and protect against all forms of domestic violence by skilled service providers via a capable multi-agency mechanism. The improvement of the situation in Armenia is also sought by bringing together government agencies involved in DV related policy making and providing them with a platform to brainstorm and share with them the WSC’s technical expertise on

how best to address and prevent DV and protect the survivors. Activities implemented under the two outcomes significantly contributed to the creation and dissemination of the Shelter Management Guideline and were wrapped up with a signature of the Community Action Plan to continue with improving the response mechanism and training new cohorts of professionals through the multi-agency engagement and joint efforts of all government and civil society partners involved in the Project.

The Project impacted on the practices of Service providers and Police officers by providing them with in-depth knowledge on the subject matter, improving their attitudes towards anyone involved in a DV case and their skills. In a result of intensive trainings the participant police officers have become more aware of their roles and functions and strengthened their capacities to communicate with the DV survivors and their children. They now have better understanding of where their functions and their right to intervene start and where they stop. As reported by most of them during the group discussions, getting information about the Women’s shelter from firsthand accounts equipped them with more confidence to refer the women to specialized services and to the WSC women’s shelter in particular. The difference between the trained female and male police officers throughout the group discussion session was more than obvious. Women were more gender sensitive in their comment about the DV cases they have been dealing with and/or more understanding about the state and needs of a women going through domestic violence. Most of the male police officers expressed harsh attitudes towards both victims and abusers and were advocating for tougher methods of dealing with the abusers. Project activities and established partnerships resulted in the acknowledgment of the WSC’s expertise in the field and during the interviews with the RA police high-rank officials they mentioned that the police forces would benefit from the trainings in the future as well and would be willing to involve civil society and namely the WSC to run the the DV and Shelter management related trainings to be delivered along with the new DV Law coming into force this year. It is notable that the WSC was asked by the MSLA and the RA Police to work on mechanisms for the newly adopted DV law, which speaks a million about the efficient working relationships between the WSC and state agencies and the overall impact of the UNTF funded project. The Project impact can be scaled up due to the established network between the service providers/social workers/psychologists and police officers working in the field as well as public officials in charge of the related policy making, which was reinforced through their participation in the various activities of the Project, thus enabling peer exchanges, best practices and coordinated response solutions to common problems.

VII.7. Sustainability

Depending on the availability of financial and other resources, capacity and local ownership, the Project’s outcomes and outputs can be sustainable and lead to long-term changes in the future. Gleaned from the desk review of the project documents and from interviews with the project team and partners, the Project undertook all necessary steps, which are under its control and within its mandate to promote sustainable development and positive changes in the field and follow-up on the project’s outcomes. From the very beginning the Project team recognized the importance of ensuring national ownership and engaging government partners to achieve higher level of sustainability; therefore, most of its activities have been designed and/or coordinated in close cooperation with the state agencies.

The main practices and outputs resulted in the course of the Project that may be sustainable include:

| What | Why/How |
|---|---|
| The trainings module | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The topics and concepts from the Module have been incorporated into the Police academy compulsory courses and are affecting the final exam marks of graduating police officers. The YSU social Work department also integrated the training topics into the courses covering GBV and DV and related services. Moreover, the professional development course delivered by the NILSR on a regular basis will have a multiplier effect with each cohort of newly trained social worker and teacher. |
| Guideline and SOPs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This well-written and already widely appreciated instruments can be further used in different contexts and by a diverse group of experts/practitioners to promote the idea of multi-sectoral cooperation and offer measures to prevent GBV as well as institutionalize the shelter management standards along with the new DV law coming into force since the beginning of 2018. |
| Trained service providers, police officers, and other professionals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The 44 police officers, the 37 service providers, and the 21 social work students that took part in the trainings organized by the WSC have already obtained in-depth knowledge on DV and GBV as well as skills to efficiently use in their day-to day work and can further share the knowledge with their counterparts and through their professional networks. ▪ Trained teachers can pass on the knowledge gained in the Project to a wider group of stakeholders through their personal networks. |
| Professional networks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-formal networks of training participants can further collaborate to work out solutions to common problems in their day-to-day work with DV cases. ▪ The Working group can get back together to amend and edit the SOPs and other related standards in case of any significant changes related to its content (for instance, adoption of the new response mechanisms required by the new Law on Domestic violence, etc.). ▪ The trained beneficiaries and those who received and were using the Guideline and the SOPs will keep in touch with the Project team through all possible means for further advice and exchange of information. |

During the group interview, the WSC project team shared a success story about them getting invited to deliver similar trainings organized by World Vision Armenia right after and in a result of the training/workshop organized in Metsamor in the framework of the Project. They assure that the civil society community is heavily relying on their expertise in the field and that they would be open for collaborating in the future with anyone interested in improving the quality of services provided to the DV survivors. However, it remains a question whether the Project created a critical mass to ensure imparting of knowledge to its partners and beneficiaries and other interventions may be required to give impetus to the long-term creation of lasting improvement in the field of combatting domestic violence and empowering women and promoting multi-sectoral approach in policy making in Armenia.

VII.8. Knowledge generation

One of the main challenges of this project was to efficiently cooperate with a government quite often hostile to the project idea. Because of the anti-gender movement, governmental ministries have been avoiding the use of the term gender and domestic violence as much as possible. Luckily enough, the government agencies dealing with domestic violence issues, policies, and response mechanisms – the MLSA/NILSR and the RA police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence – were the initiators of the ongoing reforms and were open to collaborate with the WSC throughout the Project cycle.

The WSC had adopted the strategy of cooperating with the government while challenging it in general and during the Project implementation in particular. There is no one right way to approach for NGOs to interact with government however. On one extreme you have NGOs that primarily approach is to shame the failings of the government hoping that the government will change its policy to avoid future criticism. On the other extreme you have NGOs that are willing to patiently work with government to slowly turn the behemoth of government in a new direction. The problem with the former approach is that the government will never invite a purely critical NGO into the decision-making process nor listen intently to their statements. The problem with the latter is that the NGO cedes authority of the project to the government’s timetables and priorities. The Evaluator acknowledges the complexities of the context for the WSC for working with the government hand-in-hand in improving the quality of services by sharing their own expertise in shelter management and women’s empowerment. As discussed in the Added Value section, the WSC’s approach proved to be working and provides a model for future cooperation with the government. The WSC’s approach was to find partners interested in cooperating within key government agencies.

The success of this project comes in major part because the WSC reached out and developed a new set of regional/local partners: social workers and police officers working in regional cities rather than Yerevan. Armenian women’s rights NGOs face significant hostility to their work, making it that they often reach out to the same partners: similar NGOs and that have already demonstrated their open-

mindedness on gender and DV. In contrast, the WSC approached the situation thinking that they need to reach out to regional counterparts working far from the evolving political and social discourse on DV, to have a bigger coverage and greater impact in the Armenian regions. The WSC measured the trainees’ GBV/DV knowledge pre- and post-training and found an increase of 25% of those who believe that violence is prevalent in Armenia, along with a decrease of 29% among those who believe that it may be justified to use physical punishment against a spouse (Annex 10.6 for the actual Baseline and Endline data). This non-trivial changes in attitudes suggests the trainees were generally open minded.

The WSC was planning to involve the Church and clergy into their trainings of change makers in the field, however got rejected by them. Derived from the KI interviews, there was no official explanation for this, but most probably the WSC and their specific Project were seen in a broader context of civil society fighting for women’s and LGBTIQ rights, which the church did not want to be associated with. The Project team had difficulties collaborating with Goris police department and were not allowed to deliver trainings to Goris police inspectors despite the previously achieved agreement. This is explained mainly by the change of the head of Goris police department and their changed priorities, due to which they were not able to fit into the WSC training schedule and declined to take part in the workshop. The Project was a good context for the WSC to identify the individuals, professional groups, and communities open to collaborate hand-in-hand towards the common goal and not to waste scarce resources and time on “difficult” partners. After the rejections to cooperate the WSC came up with a contingency plan to include regional teachers in some trainings as well and the result was more than expected as stated by the Project team. They have also gained a better understanding on who they would be willing to work with in the future in the framework of similar projects. Kindergarten nurses, representatives of the Trustee and Guardian Councils, judges, attorneys, foster families are among those who should be included in the coming trainings as suggested by the majority of the interviewed stakeholders. While somewhat self-evident, the Project increased the WSC’s understanding on how to implement Multi-agency projects in cooperation with state institutions. As the WSC’s first education program that uses official channels to target trainees from police forces, it exposed the WSC to a new array of stakeholders, interests, and challenges.

VIII. CONCLUSION

| Evaluation Criteria | Conclusions |
|----------------------|--|
| Overall | <p>Overall, the Project achieved its development objective as well as its outcomes and outputs and was successful in increasing awareness on domestic violence situation in the country and GBV related issues. The UNTF expertise and funding was important to support the WSC to analyze the developments in the light of international standards, create a unique instrument for efficiently teaching DV and GBV related topics and initiate trainings to increase the quality of services provided to the DV survivor women and girls. The Project was very useful and in spite of the challenges and was successful in terms of carrying out a vast number of the planned activities, but it has not yet generated institutionalized models for replication under all Expected results and would tremendously benefit from a follow up cycle.</p> |
| Added Value | <p>The WSC provides a mix of DV expertise, experience in shelter management and advocacy for the DV survivors. No other NGO in Armenia possess all the above-mentioned attributes to successfully conclude such projects and make a step towards the multi-agency collaboration for the improved services.</p> <p>Possible weaknesses of the WSC Project is the lack of visibility. However, due to the hostile anti-gender environment, it is not absolutely clear whether those aspects negatively impacted the project.</p> |
| Effectiveness | <p>Delivery of outputs and outcomes under the Expected Result 1 can be assessed as strongly satisfactory.</p> <p>Delivery of outputs under the Expected Result 2 can be assessed as strongly satisfactory.</p> |
| Efficiency | <p>The WSC’s operational expenses were consistently underbudget due to accurate budget estimations and careful spending by the WSC.</p> <p>The worst inefficiency in the project’s implementation came from the sophisticated reporting system and the team quite often concentrating on the administration of the project at the expense of its core activities.</p> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Conclusions |
|---------------------------|--|
| Impact Orientation | <p>The Evaluation identified a number of positive changes, which can be attributed to the Project’s intervention and causally linked to its impact orientation.</p> |
| | <p>The Project impacted on the practices of Service providers and police officers by providing them with in-depth knowledge on the subject matter, improving their skills, and increasing their confidence to question existing response mechanisms.</p> |
| | <p>However, there is still more work to be done continuously and on a regular basis to create the long-term impact for visible and sustainable improvement in the field of DV and GBV in Armenia in line with the international treaties and the newly adopted Law on DV. The continuous long-term impact of the Project will be ensured with the WSC consultants being involved in the MLSA and the RA Police working groups developing the DV law enforcement mechanisms thanks to the good working relationships established throughout the Project cycle. To scale up with the Project impact both the WSC and the project’s governmental partners acknowledge the need for continuous and regular trainings for service providers and police officers, given the complexity of domestic violence and constantly improving case study standards.</p> |
| Relevance | <p>The Project’s relevance to developing DV and GBV policies and improving related services is strongly satisfactory.</p> |
| | <p>The Project satisfactorily addressed the identified needs of government partners, other stakeholders and beneficiaries.</p> |
| | <p>The Project relevance to the mandate of the WSC and the priority areas of UNTF is strongly satisfactory.</p> |
| Validity of design | <p>Overall, the Project Proposal (PP) contained strong analysis of the national context and ongoing reforms in which the project intended to operate.</p> |
| | <p>Assumptions and risks were thoroughly described in the Project Proposal with detailed explanation of steps to be taken and the contingency plan to ensure smooth implementation of the project activities while risks might still be there.</p> |
| | <p>There are a few short comings of: vaguely defined primary and secondary beneficiaries, lack of monitoring plan, and minimal synergy between the Expected Results.</p> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Conclusions |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Sustainability</p> | <p>The main practices and outputs resulted in the course of the Project that may be sustainable include: the training Module/topics and its incorporation into the service providers’ and police officers professional development; the Shelter Guideline and the SOPS; over 100 trained service providers/police officers/students, non-formal professional networks, and the multi-sectoral collaboration pilot model.</p> |
| | <p>However, it remains a question whether the Project created a critical mass to ensure imparting of knowledge to its partners and beneficiaries and other interventions may be required to give impetus to the long-term creation of lasting improvement in the field of DV and women’s empowerment and the related policy making in Armenia.</p> |
| <p>Knowledge Generation</p> | <p>The WSC’s pragmatic approach to engaging a government hostile to the concept of gender and finding the right partners among the government agencies provides a model for future cooperation.</p> |
| | <p>Engaging regional counterparts - a group not known to be particularly open minded and far from the central political discourse on DV - was an effective way to disseminate GBV and DV related knowledge. These overall positive results are likely reproducible with other categories of people (e.g. kindergarten nurses/school teachers; judges; attorneys; Trustees/Guardians/Foster Families, etc). Having a perception of officialdom is effective at ensuring the participation of these groups.</p> |
| | <p>The Project increased the WSC’s understanding on how to implement DV/GBV projects in cooperation with state institutions and which groups to make partnerships with.</p> |

IX. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

| Evaluation Criteria | Recommendations | Relevant Stakeholders/ Beneficiaries | Suggested timeline (short-term, medium-term, long-term/strategic) |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Overall | <p>Target public officials, experts and practitioners involved in the development of DV response mechanisms required by the new DV law coming into force in 2018. Target media outlets, journalists and editors as main change agents to make Armenian media speak more about the prevention and protection mechanism of offered by the new legislation to foster dialogue on DV and prevent GBV.</p> | <p>Public officials in charge of DV reforms, experts and practitioners in the field</p> <p>Media outlets, journalists, and editors</p> | <p>Medium-term/ Long-term</p> |
| | <p>Insist on the need for multi-sectoral approach and evidence-based policy making. Databases/analysis/statistics on the most prevalent types and scenarios of DV and data analysis targeted to possible solutions and preventive measures should go hand-in-hand with the unfolding legislative reform.</p> <p>Establishment of a training/research facility to coordinate both ongoing professional development for new cohorts of service providers and provision of evidence for a more informed policy making.</p> | <p>Government agencies, Academia, Think tanks, Civil society</p> | <p>Medium-term/ Long-term</p> |
| | <p>Continue with the organization’s watchdog role to monitor the developments in the field and ongoing legislative reform as well as the provision of technical/expert support and evidence-based recommendations to partners form the RA government and civil society sector.</p> | <p>The WSC partners in government agencies, civil society, and mass media</p> | <p>Long-term</p> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Recommendations | Relevant Stakeholders/ Beneficiaries | Suggested timeline (short-term, medium-term, long-term/strategic) |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Relevance | Assess the perceptions of the DV survivors as well as the service providers/police vis-à-vis good quality services and prevailing education needs. | The Project implementer, primary and secondary beneficiaries | Short-term |
| Design | Re-visit the project design phase in case of a follow-up project(s). To set realistic goals, targets, and expected results by taking into consideration the project duration and political/country context. To ensure greater involvement of national and local (community level) partners in the project planning and design to secure the national/local ownership of the project activities and the sustainability of the results and outcomes. | The Project implementer, government agencies and civil society, primary and secondary beneficiaries | Medium-term |
| | To come up with tailor-made solutions for each group of stakeholders/beneficiaries, the project team should allow more time for needs assessment. The Project design would benefit more, if a sound M&E plan and indicators were developed in the very initial stages of the Project supported by baseline and ongoing data to monitor the progress. | The Project stakeholders, the implementer and donor | Medium-term |
| Value Added | Consider developing and institutionalizing alternative methods that utilize the WSC’s advantages. For example, the WSC could establish mechanisms for closer monitoring of DV related services and standards via quality assurance/on-site-visits monitoring groups along with the ongoing legislative reforms and the development and establishment of enforcement mechanisms. | The WSC, DV experts, the Coalition and other civil society organisations | Medium-term Long-term |

| Evaluation Criteria | Recommendations | Relevant Stakeholders/ Beneficiaries | Suggested timeline (short-term, medium-term, long-term/strategic) |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Effectiveness | To foster better outcomes and maximize the effect of such projects, community-based intervention approaches can be used to address the issue from different angles and involve all relevant actors in the field/communities and agents of change. On top of the primary and secondary beneficiaries other professional groups, opinion leaders, and local institutions should be involved in further activities to ensure consistency and synergy of future interventions. | Community-based opinion leaders and change agents | Medium-term / Long-term |
| | Invest more time and human resources to identify, target, and cooperate with the WSC potential supporters in public offices, civil society, and mass media by sharing with the wealth of expertise the NGO already has and trying to involve them in designing and implementing future projects as well as public monitoring of the legislation reforms. | The WSC partners in government agencies, civil society, and mass media | Medium-term Long-term |
| Efficiency | Schedule activities that require governmental cooperation with sufficient lead time so that difficulties in establishing cooperation won't lead to implementation delays. | The Project implementer and partners | Short-term |
| | Minimize the burden of administrative/reporting activities by building internal capacity of the project implementation team and adjusting the Project progress report system to the benefit of the core/conceptual project activities | Project implementing agency, the Donor | Short-term / Medium-term |

| Evaluation Criteria | Recommendations | Relevant Stakeholders/ Beneficiaries | Suggested timeline (short-term, medium-term, long-term/strategic) |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Impact | The Project duration was quite short for leading to lasting impact and changes in culture and another project cycle will be required to ensure long-term impact of activities carried out by the intervention. More funds and more time should be allocated for greater impact and larger coverage. | The new DV law enforcement agencies and service providers as main beneficiaries | Medium-term |
| | The best practices of teaching DV and GBV related topics can be replicated in other regions of Armenia as well to ensure larger coverage and impact of the intervention. | The new DV law enforcement agencies and service providers as main beneficiaries | Medium-term |
| Sustainability | For the upcoming projects strategies that will lead to sustainability of core project outcomes and outputs should be identified and implemented as early as possible in the project cycle to provide the beneficiaries and main stakeholders with skills and tools to carry on with the positive changes the intervention resulted. | Project implementers and main beneficiaries | Medium-term |
| | Continuous updating and promotion of the Guidebook through new series of trainings and other activities can ensure sustainable transfer and exchange of the Project’s know-how to newer groups of stakeholders. | The WSC organizations and stakeholders of their ongoing and upcoming projects | Short-term |

| Evaluation Criteria | Recommendations | Relevant Stakeholders/ Beneficiaries | Suggested timeline (short-term, medium-term, long-term/strategic) |
|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Knowledge Generation | Assess whether a model of effective governmental cooperation as well as multi-agency response mechanism can be created from the Project’s successful conclusion. | The project implementers and partners | Short-term |
| | Consider other groups of professionals and community-based opinion leaders as high priority of beneficiary for the next cycle of project. | Community-based leaders; other professionals dealing with DV cases | Medium-term |
| | Assess the benefits and challenges to integrate the Shelter Guideline and the SOPs into the curriculum of all related vocational and higher education courses. | Education providers | Long-term |

X. ANNEXES

X.1. Final version of the Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference are included as a separate file.

X.2. Additional methodology-related documentation

Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

Interview Informed Consent Form

Respondent’s name, organization, and position

Tick the box, please

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------|
| 1 | <i>I confirm that I have been informed about the aim of the Evaluation Study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <i>I agree to take part in the Study/interview.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <i>I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 | <i>I agree to the interview being audio recorded. I know that the information I give is confidential and available only to the research team.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 | <i>I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in the Evaluation Report and/or the Project related publications and/or reports.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | |
|-------------------|------|-----------|
| Respondent’s name | Date | Signature |
|-------------------|------|-----------|

| | | |
|--------------------|------|-----------|
| Interviewer’s name | Date | Signature |
|--------------------|------|-----------|

X.3. KI In-depth Interview Guide

| | |
|--|--|
| Date: | |
| Name(s) and function(s) of interviewee(s) (for evaluation data analysis only): | |
| Gender (f/m): | |
| Organization: | |
| Type of interview (f-2-f/skype): | |

I. EFFECTIVENESS

Please describe your role in the Project

What is the Project history (only for the Project Implementers)?

Could you describe the main achievements of the Project during its implementation?

What factors were crucial for the achievements and/or failures?

In your opinion, which project’s line of action was the most successful? Please explain your response.

What are the major challenges and obstacles that the project encountered? Was the project able to cope with them or may they prevent the project from producing the intended results?

What aspect of this project/activity did you find to be most valuable? Least valuable?

In your opinion, how effective was your collaboration? What were the main issues you tackled during the collaboration (if any)? How you addressed them?

Are you satisfied with the level of collaboration and coordination between the project and your institution? Please elaborate.

What were the key mechanisms used for communication? Were you kept informed on project progress?

Were you properly informed of the developments of the project?

II. RELEVANCE

How relevant is the project from your point of view to the needs of (1) recipient government and (2) respective beneficiaries’ agencies?

Considering evolution of the context over time, to what extent did the project adapt to these changes?

III. ADDED VALUE

What, if any, was the competitive advantage/added value of the WSC in implementing the project in comparison with similar projects implemented by other donors and IOs in Armenia? (*only for Project implementer, implementing partners and donor*)

In which areas should the WSC improve if compared to other implementers?

IV. DESIGN (only for the WCS, the donor and the Project partners)

Was the project designed in a participatory manner? (Probe: How the needs of the target groups were assessed? Were needs assessment or diagnosis analysis conducted on the inception phase of the project?)

How was the Project Proposal developed/ revised?

In your opinion, is the Project’s theory of change clearly articulated?

To what extent are gender considerations included in the project development and implementation?

Are targets well specified in the Project Document, including clear and concise performance indicators?

Is there a clear and logical consistency between the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs in terms of quality, quantity, time-frame and cost-efficiency?

Are prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks) well-specified and met?

Is the managerial and institutional framework for implementation well defined?

Is the work plan practical, logical and cohesive?

Is the planned project duration realistic?

V. EFFICIENCY (Only for the WSC and/or the donor)

Is the management structure of the project enabling an efficient implementation of the project? Describe strengths and weaknesses.

In your opinion, how adequate is the funding allocated for the project compared with planned activities?

To what extent are you satisfied with reporting (progress and financial)? (*only for donor*)

What is the quality and timeliness of the monitoring, administrative and financial support provided by the Donor? (*only for the WSC*)

Were roles clearly defined?

Was communication/coordination within the WSC and with the Donor adequate?

Was project implementation sufficiently flexible to be able to deal with unforeseen events?

Were there any financial constraints (if any) in project implementation process?

Was the project budget under spent? If yes, please name the main reasons for that.

Describe the project monitoring plan and implementation, if any? How was it established? How was it used?

What tools did the Project use to collect information on its performance and outcomes?

What constraints did the project experience in tracking its performance (example, how did it track and verify how many/who was trained in various training programs?)

What constraints did the project experience in tracking/verifying its outcomes?

VI. IMPACT POTENTIAL

To what extent have the Project’s development objective been reached? Evidence for that?

Have there been unforeseen impacts?

What was the nature of commitments of your institution?

To what extent have project national stakeholders fulfilled the obligations/responsibilities agreed upon in providing support towards the implementation of the Project?

Which challenges have project national stakeholders experienced that have prevented them from fulfilling their obligations/responsibilities to provide support to the project?

VII. SUSTAINABILITY

Which project’s activities are most/least sustainable?

What plans has the WSC put in place to sustain the results of the project (i.e. exit strategy)?

What are potential risks/constraints to these (mechanisms, programs, reforms) being sustained?

VIII. LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICES

What were the key lessons from this project?

What ‘good practices’ could be applied to future WSC projects?

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS: Is there anything more you would like to add?

X.4. Group Interview and FG Discussion Guideline

“Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

Implementing Partner: Women’s Support Center NGO

Final Independent Evaluation of the Project

Check list

Materials and supplies for group discussions

- Sign-in sheet/consent form to be distributed, signed and collected back
 - Group Discussion Guide for Facilitator
 - 1 recording device
 - Batteries for recording device
 - Laptop for note-taking

INTRODUCTION

1. Names of the Evaluator and who is doing what during the Group discussion session.
2. The purpose of the discussion:

Your opinion and your experiences are of much importance to us and we would like you to be active and open during the session.

IX. GROUND RULES

1. This session will last about 2 hours.
2. This session is being audio recorded and thanks everyone for giving your written consent to do so.
3. There are no wrong answers in what we are about to discuss; we are looking for different points of view and I am sure each of you has something to add to the discussion. So, I would encourage everyone to talk, but you don’t have to answer each question.
4. Please talk one at a time and as clearly as possible, and please avoid side conversations. It is distracting to the group and I don’t want to miss any of your comments.
5. Exchange points of view with each other – you don’t need to address all answers to me.
6. Does anyone have any questions before we begin?
7. Last but not least, PLEASE turn off all mobile phones.

 **START audio recording**

X. BACKGROUND (10 minutes)

Please, each of you make a brief introduction of yourself and tell us who you are and in what capacity you have been involved in the Project.

1. How did you learn about the project?
2. Why did you decide to take part in the project?
3. How were you selected for participation?
4. In which activities you took part?
5. What is your current involvement?

XI. Knowledge/skills gained as a result of participation in the Project (20 minutes)

1. What did you gain as a result of participation in this project/activity?
2. How have you used/do you anticipate using the knowledge/skills that you gained as a result of your participation in this project/activity in the future? Please describe.
3. How did you like the training materials and the Module in particular?

XII. Positive and Negative aspects of the Project (25-30 minutes)

1. What aspect of this Project/activity did you find to be most valuable? (Useful tools and approaches? Practices and behaviours?) Least valuable?
2. Thinking about your participation in the Project, what do you think are the most significant changes that may occur as a result of the Project at individual, institutional and policy levels? Please briefly list all the changes you know about.
3. Which if any best practices of your department/agency have been replicated by other relevant agencies? Please describe.
4. What, if any, negative changes occurred as a result of the Project? Please describe.
5. What if any, were the challenges to put into use the knowledge/skills you gained by participating in the Project activities?

XIII. Further Support after the training, professional networks, etc. (10-15 minutes)

1. Did you get any advice and/or support after the training from the Project implementing NGO?
2. What are the other channels to communicate the issues that may arise during your professional activities in regard to the topics/techniques you covered during the training?

XIV. Lessons Learned and Recommendations (25-30 minutes)

1. What suggestions do you have for improving this project/activity in the future?
2. Would you recommend this project/activity to others? Please explain your response.

XV. CLOSING REMARKS (5-10 minutes)

Many thanks for your time and active involvement. This has been a valuable session of brainstorming. Please, let me know, if you feel like adding anything relevant to what we have already discussed....Thank you again!

X.5. List of persons and institutions interviewed and group discussion participants

In-depth interviews with Key Informants

| Date | Position, Organization | Role in the Project (Expert; Project partner, etc.) |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 18.01.2018 | Women’s Support Center NGO | Project M&E Specialist |
| 18.01.2018 | Women’s Support Center NGO | Project Assistant, Trainer |
| 18.01.2018 | Women’s Support Center NGO | Project Administrator, Trainer |
| 22.01.2018 | Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs | Project Partner, SOP development WG member |
| 22.01.2018 | Director of “Shogh” day-care center NGO | Project Partner, SOP development WG member |
| 23.01.2018 | Women’s Support Center NGO | Lawyer |
| 24.01.2018 | Coordinator of Trainings at National Institute of Labor And Social Research | Project Partner |
| 26.01.2018 | Police Colonel, RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence | Project Partner |
| 26.01.2018 | Police Major, RA Police Department for the protection of rights of minors and fight against domestic violence | Project Parnter |
| 26.01.2018 | Women’s Support Center NGO, Executive Director | Project Manager |
| 26.01.2018 | UNTF | Portfolio Manager for Small Grants |
| 26.01.2018 | UNTF | Portfolio Manager for Small Grants |

Group discussions with the Project’s secondary beneficiaries

| NN | GD Participants | Organization | Position |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Group discussion with Service providers, 19 January 2018 | | | |
| 1 | Participant 1 | Child and family support Center | Social Worker |
| 2 | Participant 2 | SOS Children’s Village | Social Worker |
| 3 | Participant 3 | SOS Children’s Village | Social Worker |
| 4 | Participant 4 | Child and family support Center | Social Worker |
| 5 | Participant 5 | Child and family support Center | Social Worker |
| 6 | Participant 6 | Child and family support Center | Social Worker |
| 7 | Participant 7 | “Prkutyun” (Salvation) NGO | Coordinator |
| 8 | Participant 8 | SOS Children’s Village | Social Worker |
| Group discussion with Students, 22 January 2018 | | | |
| 1 | Participant 1 | YSU Social Work department | Student |
| 2 | Participant 2 | YSU Social Work department | Student |
| 3 | Participant 3 | YSU Social Work department | Student |
| 4 | Participant 4 | YSU Social Work department | Student |
| Group discussion with Police officers, 30 January 2018 | | | |
| 1 | Participant 1 | Metsamor Police department | Police Officer |
| 2 | Participant 2 | Armavir Police Department | Police Officer |
| 3 | Participant 3 | Baghramyan Police Department | Police Officer |
| 4 | Participant 4 | Armavir Police Department | Police Officer |
| 5 | Participant 5 | Vagharshapat Police Department | Police Officer |
| 6 | Participant 6 | Vagharshapat Police Department | Police Officer |
| 7 | Participant 7 | Metsamor Police Department | Police Officer |
| 8 | Participant 8 | Charentsavan Police Department | Police Officer |
| 9 | Participant 9 | Charentsavan Police Department | Police Officer |
| 10 | Participant 10 | Nairi Police Department | Police Officer |

X.6. Results Monitoring Plan with actual baseline and endline data compiled by the WSC

| A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes & Outputs | B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes & outputs | C. Data collection methods | D. Baseline Data | E. Timeline of baseline data collection | F. Endline data | G. Timeline of endline data collection |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Project Goal: By December 2017 women and girls in 5 regions of Armenia (Yerevan, Shirak, Armavir, Lori, and Syunik) are supported and protected against all forms of domestic violence by skilled service providers via a capable multi-agency response mechanism.</p> | <p>Perspectives of survivors on quality of received services from trainees within one year of trainees' completion of the training course.</p> | <p>Individual in-depth interviews with survivors</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>According to the interviews, women evaluated the service providers they worked with as "highly supportive" and the services received as "life-reassuring" and "life-saving".</p> | <p>PQ3</p> |
| <p>Outcome 1: General (social protection, police, students, church officials) and specialist (women's NGOs) service providers have improved attitudes & sensitivity towards domestic violence.</p> | <p>Indicator 1- Percentage of surveyed trainees who believe that it may be justified to use physical punishment against a spouse; Indicator 2- Percentage of surveyed trainees who believe that violence against women is prevalent in Armenia; Indicator 3- Percentage of surveyed trainees who believe that an abusive man cannot control his aggressions.</p> | <p>pre/post-test</p> | <p>Indicator 1- 34%; Indicator 2- 71%; Indicator 3- 69%</p> | <p>PQ1-2</p> | <p>Indicator 1- 5%; Indicator 2- 96%; Indicator 3- 42%</p> | <p>PQ1-2</p> |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes & Outputs | B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes & outputs | C. Data collection methods | D. Baseline Data | E. Timeline of baseline data collection | F. Endline data | G. Timeline of endline data collection |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Outcome 2: General (social protection, police, students, church officials) and specialist (women’s NGOs) service providers have new policies and plans to protect & provide services to survivors | Indicator 1- Status of policies and plans (preparation, adoption, implementation); Indicator 2- Perspectives of survivors who received services from trainees after the development of the action plan and new protocols/regulations. | Informal group discussions ; Semi-structured, in-depth interviews | N/A | N/A | Indicator 1- Policies and plans were prepared, adopted & implemented; Indicator 2- No data available, as not enough time has elapsed since the development of protocols and action plan | PQ4 |
| Output 1.1: General (social protection, police, students, church officials) and specialist (women’s NGOs) service providers who participate in trainings have improved knowledge & skills on how to prevent and address domestic violence. | Indicator 1- Percentage of trainees with low, moderate or high knowledge of key concepts in DV service provision; Indicator 2- Percentage of trainees demonstrating skills on providing quality services | Indicator 1- pre/post test; Indicator 2- role play facilitation | Indicator 1- 55% showed high knowledge; Indicator 2- N/A | PQ1-2 | Indicator 1- 78% of trainees showed high knowledge; Indicator 2- 100% of participants who took part in role play exercises were able to carry out certain actions with clients based on role play facilitation checklist | PQ1-2 |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes & Outputs | B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes & outputs | C. Data collection methods | D. Baseline Data | E. Timeline of baseline data collection | F. Endline data | G. Timeline of endline data collection |
|---|--|----------------------------|------------------|---|--|--|
| Output 2.1: General (social protection, police, students, church officials) and specialist (women’s NGOs) service providers have a common understanding of respective roles and responsibilities in protection of women survivors in their given sectors. | Presence of a drafted professional standards and codes of practice manual that outlines duties & responsibilities of each stakeholder and step-by-step procedures. | Informal group discussions | N/A | N/A | 5 officials at the Ministry of Social Affairs and 40 police officers have shown support for the guidelines and action plan. | PQ4 |
| Output 2.2: General (social protection, police, students, church officials) and specialist (women’s NGOs) service providers show support for a multisectoral cooperation approach in providing shelter services to survivors. | Perspectives of trainees (good or bad) on multisectoral cooperation approach drafted for use by general and specialist service providers when dealing with survivors of domestic violence. | Informal discussions | N/A | N/A | Through informal discussions and follow up, we have received positive feedback from various service providers, who have reported that they are using the guidelines as a reference and to compliment their trainings in the field. | PQ4 |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| A. Statement of Project Goal, Outcomes & Outputs | B. Indicators for measuring progress towards achieving the project goal, outcomes & outputs | C. Data collection methods | D. Baseline Data | E. Timeline of baseline data collection | F. Endline data | G. Timeline of endline data collection |
|--|---|----------------------------|------------------|---|--|--|
| Output 2.3: General (social protection, police, students, church officials) and specialist (women’s NGOs) service providers show support for a multi-sectoral action plan to prevent and combat domestic violence. | Perspectives of trainees (good or bad) on multisectoral action plan. | Informal discussions | N/A | N/A | Through informal discussions and follow up, we have received positive feedback from various actors, including representatives the Ministry of Social Affairs, who were very pleased to receive the guideline, as they are in the process of setting up state-run shelters. | PQ4 |

X.7. Beneficiary Data Sheet compiled by the WSC

| | | The number of beneficiaries reached | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Beneficiary group | | At the goal level | At the outcome level |
| Female domestic workers | | N/A | N/A |
| Female migrant workers | | N/A | N/A |
| Female political activists/human rights defenders | | N/A | N/A |
| Female sex workers | | 18 | N/A |
| Female refugees/internally displaced/asylum seekers | | 82 | N/A |
| Indigenous women/from ethnic groups | | N/A | N/A |
| Lesbian, bisexual, transgender | | 1 | N/A |
| Women and girls in general | | 134 | N/A |
| Women/girls with disabilities | | 29 | N/A |
| Women/girls living with HIV and AIDS | | N/A | N/A |
| Women/girls survivors of violence | | 568 | N/A |
| Women prisoners | | N/A | N/A |
| Others (specify) | | N/A | N/A |
| Primary Beneficiary Total | | 902 | |
| Civil society organizations (including NGOs) | Number of institutions reached | N/A | 26 |
| | Number of individuals reached | N/A | 70 |
| Community-based groups/members | Number of groups reached | N/A | N/A |
| | Number of individuals reached | N/A | N/A |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| | | The number of beneficiaries reached | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Beneficiary group | | At the goal level | At the outcome level |
| Educational professionals (i.e. teachers, educators) | | N/A | 14 |
| Faith-based organizations | Number of institutions reached | N/A | N/A |
| | Number of individuals reached | N/A | N/A |
| General public/community at large | | N/A | N/A |
| Government officials (i.e. decision makers, policy implementers) | Number of individuals reached | N/A | 56 |
| Journalists/Media | | N/A | N/A |
| Legal officers (i.e. lawyers, prosecutors, judges) | | N/A | N/A |
| Men and/or boys | | N/A | N/A |
| Parliamentarians | | N/A | N/A |
| Private sector employers | | N/A | N/A |
| Social/welfare workers | | N/A | 37 |
| Uniformed personnel (i.e. police, military, peace-keeping officers) | | N/A | 44 |
| Others (university students) | | N/A | 21 |
| Secondary Beneficiary Total | | | 242 |

X.8. List of supporting documents reviewed

| Title | Author | Publication date | Source / URL |
|--|----------------------|------------------|---|
| Guidelines for Baseline/Endline Data Collection and Final External Project Evaluations | UNTF | N/A | N/A |
| Terms of Reference for the External Evaluator | WSC | N/A | N/A |
| Full Fledged Proposal | WSC | 2015 | N/A |
| Progress Report 1 | WSC | 2016 | |
| Annual Narrative Report - Year 2 | WSC | 2016 | N/A |
| Progress Report 3 | WSC | 2017 | N/A |
| Community Action Plan | WSC/project partners | 2017 | |
| Ընտանեկան բռնությունից տուժածների օգնության ստանդարտ աշխատանքային ընթացակարգ (ՄՍԸ) | | 2017 | English version: http://www.womensupportcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/SOPS_ENG_SPREAD_05122017.pdf |
| Բռնությունից հեռու. Կանանց ապաստարաններ հիմնելու և ղեկավարելու ձեռնարկ | WSC | 2017 | English version: http://www.womensupportcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Shelter_Gudieline_ENG_SPREAD_05122017-ilovepdf-compressed.pdf |
| RA Law on Prevention of Violence within the Family, Protection of Victims of Violence within the Family, and Peace in the Family | | 2017 | Official version in Armenian: http://parliament.am/legislation.php?sel=show&ID=6056&lang=arm |
| UNTF Strategic Plan 2015-2020 | UNTF | 2016 | http://www.unwomen.org/www2.unwomen.org/~/_media/headquarters/attachments/sections/trust%20funds/untrustfundevaw/untf%20strategic%20plan%202015%202020%20designed.pdf?v=1&d=20160329T155828 |

EVALUATION REPORT: Final Independent Evaluation of the Project “Creating a coordinated response mechanism to prevent and combat domestic violence in Armenia”

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------|---|
| 2011-2015 Strategic Action Plan to Combat Gender-Based Violence | Republic of Armenia | Jun. 2011 | http://www.un.am/res/Gender%20TG%20docs/national/2011-2015_GBV_strategic_plan-Eng.pdf |
| Concluding Remarks of the fifth and sixth periodic reports of Armenia | CEDAW | Nov. 2016 | UN Symbol: CEDAW/C/ARM/CO/5-6 https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/861851/files/CEDAW_C_ARM_CO_5-6-EN.pdf |
| Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 18 of the Convention | CEDAW | Apr. 2015 | UN Symbol: CEDAW/C/ARM/CO/5-6 file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/N1512178.pdf |
| Հայաստանում ընտանեկան բռնությանը բազմաոլորտային արձագանքի տրամադրման առկա պրակտիկայի և նախաձեռնությունների արդյունավետության բարձրացմանն ուղղված | ICHD/UNFPA | 2017 | http://un.am/up/library/Perceptions-attitudes-and-practices-regarding-domestic-violence-in-Armenia_Reserach_Arm.pdf |

X.9. CV of the external evaluator

CV is included as a separate file.

Hasmik TAMAMYAN