

Evidence and Lessons from an Evaluation and Learning Unit on the Stopping Abuse and Female Exploitation (SAFE) programme

Tetra Tech leads the Zimbabwe SAFE Evaluation and Learning Unit (ELU) for the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO). We conduct research and evaluations that strengthen the evidence base for preventing and responding to violence against women and girls and measure the effectiveness and impact of SAFE's work.

The SAFE ELU supports the SAFE Communities part of the programme (led by Ecorys with technical support from Social Development Direct), which strengthens GBV prevention and response in three districts of Zimbabwe through a social and economic empowerment intervention called *Toose* ("Together" in Shona).

SAFE's intervention

Economic empowerment

Toose Internal Savings and Loans (TISAL) groups in all three districts, and WFP cash-based transfers in one district.

Community diffusio

Structured and unstructured diffusion of Toose messages and tools at community level, mainly by Toose peer facilitators.

Social empowerment

Eight-session gender transformative curriculum focused on gender equality, power and reduction of IPV.

GBV response

Development of and support to GBV Community-Based Clubs, and enhanced non-governmental services for survivors.

Our learning and adaptation approach

Implementing three cohorts with space in-between for evidence, reflection and adaptation cycles.

Using diverse evidence to design and test each cohort, including monitoring, research, evaluations and practice-based knowledge.

Reflecting through structured learning and adaptation workshops with partners to share lessons learned.

Adapting to enhance impact and effectiveness in subsequent cohorts, alongside IP training to support implementation.

Examples of using SAFE ELU evidence to inform adaptations

FORMATIVE LEARNING

Methods:

Baseline of longitudinal cohort study:

- 1245 surveys with women
- 132 IDIs with women
- 88 IDIs with men

Finding:

Strong correlation between men's frequent alcohol consumption and women's past year experience of IPV.

Adaptation:

 Content on alcohol in Toose social empowerment curriculum was strengthened in Cohort 2.

TESTING THEORY OF CHANGE



- Qualitative deep study dive
- 200 TISAL members and partners
- 26 Toose facilitators and TISAL leads

Finding:

 TISAL groups enabled members to practice the decision-making and visioning they learned through the social empowerment curriculum.

Adaptation:

'Visioning' was shifted forward to TISAL groups in Cohort 2 to strengthen the social and economic intervention components' complementarity.

MEASURING IMPACT

Methods:

- Endline qualitative longitudinal cohort study
- 138 women
- 85 men

Finding:

- Positive impacts included improved household food insecurity, stronger economic outcomes for women, less conflict in couples and reduction of IPV.
- Evidence found that some change has not been gender transformative.

Adaptation:

 Gender transformative programme content strengthened, including stronger content on power and IPV.

MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS



Methods:

- Qualitative process-level study
- 63 Klls
- 12 FGDs

Finding:

 Toose peer facilitators struggled to deliver messages in gendertransformative ways, particularly male facilitators.

Adaptation:

 Workshops carried out to better understand facilitator challenges and journeys of change.



Our recommendations

Building stronger and more consistent linkages between research and implementation partners is critical to building the evidence base on what works to prevent GBV. By accompanying partners throughout programmes, ELUs can support partners to adapt and test effectiveness and impact over time, building stronger evidence for what works to prevent violence.

Smaller qualitative studies can provide effectiveness insights throughout the programme



Trust and communication between ELUs and implementers supports the use and value of evidence



ELUs must be flexible and responsive to evolving learning needs of the programme

Maximising evaluation and learning partnerships

Triangulating ELU evidence, programme data and practice-based knowledge strengthens conclusions



Aligning timelines enables coordination of evidence generation and use

Internal vs. external **ELUs both have** benefits - easier coordination vs. credibility





Led by:



Supported by:





