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Indashyikirwa Overview

- A collaboration from 2014-2018 between CARE Rwanda, Rwanda Men’s Resource Centre (RWAMREC) and the Rwanda Women’s Network (RWN), funded by FCDO (formerly DFID).

- Implemented in seven districts of Rwanda among predominantly rural, widely-dispersed communities.

- **REDUCED IPV BY 55%**

- Evaluated through a community-level randomized controlled trial by LSHTM and the South African Medical Research Council under What Works to Prevent VAWG, and further research by the Prevention Collaborative.

- Adaptations in **Rwanda, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, DRC and Kenya.**
Indashyikirwa’s Four Components

- Couples’ Curriculum
- Community Mobilization
- Training & Engagement of Opinion Leaders
- Women’s Safe Spaces
Impact of Indashyikirwa

Women who participated in the Couple’s Curriculum reported a 55% reduction in the odds of experiencing physical and/or sexual IPV compared to VSLA alone.

* Estimate derived from a multilevel logistic regression

Women who participated in the Couple’s Curriculum reported a 61% reduction in the odds of experiencing physical IPV compared to VSLA alone.

* Estimate derived from a multilevel logistic regression

*Graphs present descriptive data (unadjusted absolute percentages)
Impact of Indashyikirwa

**Women who participated in the Couple’s Curriculum reported a 50% reduction in the odds of experiencing sexual IPV compared to VSLA alone.**

* Estimate derived from a multilevel logistic regression

**Men who participated in the Couple’s Curriculum reported a 47% reduction in the odds of having perpetrated physical and/or sexual IPV compared to VSLA alone.**

* Estimate derived from a multilevel logistic regression
MIGEPROF/WB Adaptation: 2017 - 2018

• Significant leadership shown by the Government of Rwanda (GoR), supported by the World Bank (WB), to fund and implement the Indashyikirwa adaptation

• Adaptation built on experience, skills, materials and relationships of Indashyikirwa’s implementing partners

• Adaptation reflects a shared commitment by GoR, World Bank and implementing partners to learn how best to scale IPV interventions

  ▪ Differed from Indashyikirwa in project design, management, implementation approaches, geographical scope, project duration, pre-testing of materials, group size, competencies and training of staff, etc.

  ▪ Implemented only 3 out of 4 core components of Indashyikirwa – couple’s curriculum, training and engagement of opinion leaders and women’s safe spaces.

  ▪ Evaluated through a randomized controlled trial by the Gender Innovation Lab of the World Bank.
Adaptation’s Impact

- Impact evaluation - very different findings from the original Indashyikirwa program.

- The adaptation resulted in increased women's self-reported experience of IPV – even greater increase for ‘spillover’ couples.

- The program also worsened the wellbeing of couples.

- Differences in project design, duration, management and implementation largely accounted for differential outcomes.
Comparative Review: Purpose & Methods

- **Goal:** contribute to a shared understanding of differential outcomes between Indashyikirwa and MIGEPROF/WB project.

- **Methodology:**
  - Authored by two external consultants
  - Key informant interviews with 37 project staff and participants
  - A review of key documents of both projects including CVs of staff, project activities and materials, etc.
  - A review of the impact evaluation reports by two separate research team – What Works and WB's GIL.

- **Limitations & constraints** - Delay between project and review, time constraints and COVID-19 restrictions limited the scope of the review.
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# Overall comparison: Indashyikirwa & MIGEPROF/WB Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>INDASHYIKIRWA</th>
<th>MIGEPROF/WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>15 couples (30 individuals)</td>
<td>20-25 couples (50 individuals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators' experience and recruitment</td>
<td>90% had prior experience and training on gender transformative work</td>
<td>33% had no prior experience/training on gender transformative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator's training</td>
<td>10 days training by an external, experienced facilitator</td>
<td>10 days training by staff implementing Indashyikirwa project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators' practice</td>
<td>1 month of practice sessions during the pre-test phase</td>
<td>No practice sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators' mentorship and support</td>
<td>1:7 ratio of supervisors to facilitators with monthly debriefs</td>
<td>1:16 ratio of supervisors to facilitators without monthly debriefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Oversight</td>
<td>CARE had a lead coordination role</td>
<td>No central coordinator- 3 organizations contracted independently by MIGEPROF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial training</td>
<td>Training on psychosocial support, and handling disclosures and backlash</td>
<td>No training on psychosocial support, disclosures or backlash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison: Couples’ curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDAHYIKIRWA</th>
<th>MIGEPROF/WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>November 2015 – May 2016</td>
<td>March to August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>21 sessions including 2 sessions on managing triggers of IPV</td>
<td>22 sessions: 2 sessions on triggers replaced with 2 new sessions on parenting and activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>840 couples</td>
<td>640 couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Size</strong></td>
<td>15 couples per class (max 30 people) with 2 facilitators</td>
<td>20-25 couples (max 50 people) with 2 facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stipend</strong></td>
<td>Each participant received 2000 RWF – approx. $2.50 USD</td>
<td>Each participant received 2500 RWF – approx. $3.00 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
<td>99% retention of the couples</td>
<td>95% retention of the couples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duration of Indashyikirwa vs MIGEPROF/WB Adaptation

**MIGEPROF/WB**

- Staff recruitment
- 10-day field staff training on curricula
- Pre-test couples curriculum
- Recruit couples participants
- Quantitative Baseline
- Implement couples curriculum

**INDASHYIKIRWA**

- Staff recruitment
- 10-day field staff training on curricula
- Pre-test couples curriculum
- Recruit couples participants
- Quantitative Baseline
- Implement couples curriculum

- Sep/2017-Dec/2017 Baseline collection
- Quantitative
- Pre-test (3 sessions)
- Recruit couples
- Train Opinion Leaders
- Jan/2018-Jun/2018 SF and opinion leaders implementation
- Adaptation of Couples Curriculum
- Midline Quantitative Interviews with Couples
- Midline Qualitative Interviews
- Couples activist training (10 day)
- Apr/2016-Mar/2018 WSF and Opinion Leaders begins
- Dec/2016-Jun/2018 Couples activism in communities
- Endline interviews with activists, opinion leaders and WSF
- Close out activities and meetings
Key Informants’ Feedback

- “At the Ministry, we had challenges with the timeline. [...] For me the scale-up was implemented in a kind of rush, it has taken so long, at the time it looked like we wanted to conclude this and get done.” - MIGEPROF key informant

- “One of the reasons was it was implemented in such a short time. They rushed through the entire thing. [...] They didn’t get deeper in these issues.” - CARE key informant

- “The women’s spaces started in January and only ran for 6 months. It was way too short.” - RWN key informant

- “In some of the Districts as I told you, after my colleague’s resignation [one out of the two field supervisors], that field was left alone. This could be a bit dangerous if they needed support.” - RWAMREC key informant

- “If you remove two sessions on triggers you are diluting the curriculum. There is something missing.” - RWAMREC key informant
## Comparison: Women's Safe Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDASHYIKIRWA</th>
<th>MIGEPROF/WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>14 safe spaces (1 per sector)</td>
<td>8 safe spaces (1 per sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>10 days training for the facilitators</td>
<td>10 days training for the facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>Open 3 times a week</td>
<td>Open less frequently than 3 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities included – handling disclosures, referrals and group reflection sessions</td>
<td>*same activities as Indashyikirwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>12 of the 14 active safe spaces *at the time of the review</td>
<td>1 of the 8 active safe spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison: Opinion leaders’ training and engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDASHYIKIRWA</th>
<th>MIGEPROF/WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>40 opinion leaders per sector (560 in total)</td>
<td>60 opinion leaders per sector (480 in total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>- 10 half-day sessions in 2015</td>
<td>- 10 half-day sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional 3 days training for 589 facilitators in 2016</td>
<td>- Disorganized with no preparation time for some facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A refresher training for all the leaders in 2016</td>
<td>- No follow-up/refresher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>Quarterly reflection meetings with trained leaders throughout project</td>
<td>1 quarterly meeting with the leaders during project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of key findings

- MIGEPROF/WB project staff had less prior experience and received inadequate training and supervision.

- Backlash by men to gender equality messaging were not as well managed compared to Indashyikirwa.

- The adaptation dropped community activism and lacked a post-curriculum phase to support diffusion and reinforcement of messages.

- Other Indashyikirwa components were not well integrated by the MIGEPROF/WB project.

- Overall a lack of program fidelity, specifically differences in design and implementation, largely accounts for the differential outcomes.
Insights for adapting & implementing Indashyikirwa

**Design Phase**
- Maintain the Power Framework.
- Conduct intensive work with couples.
- Maintain entire curriculum, particularly content on sexuality, consent and managing backlash.
- Prioritize learning, practice and application of Skills.
- Have an explicit next step for couples after completing the curriculum.
- Build in rigorous M&E methods from the start.

**Implementation Phase**
- Ensure adequate duration to allow for the journey of change.
- Recruit experienced facilitators, provide a high-quality training of trainers, and build in mechanisms for on-going support.
- Support and monitor the safety of couples.
- Pre-test/pilot any adaptations.
- Build in strategies to minimize backlash, resistance to messages or actual violence.
# Recommendations for adapting & implementing Indashyikirwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESIGN</strong></th>
<th><strong>STAFF</strong></th>
<th><strong>IMPLEMENTATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain <strong>fidelity to key principles</strong> of the model throughout adaptation and implementation.</td>
<td>Recruit <strong>experienced and skilled staff</strong> as gender transformative group education requires skilled facilitation.</td>
<td>Develop a <strong>post-curriculum phase</strong> for message diffusion and reinforcement through community activism and engagement of opinion leaders (also important for sustainability).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop additional project <strong>strategies to mitigate backlash</strong> during implementation.</td>
<td>Provide <strong>intensive training to staff</strong>, with sufficient time for practice.</td>
<td>Build in processes of providing <strong>regular feedback</strong> and <strong>iterative learning</strong> throughout project cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide <strong>regular supervision, mentorship and support</strong> to staff and community-based structures.</td>
<td>Ensure <strong>strong implementation quality</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Want to learn more?

- **Session 4.3 Wednesday 11:30-13:00**
  "Unintended impacts of an IPV prevention program: evidence from Rwanda" - Julia Vaillant, World Bank

- **Session 7.1 Thursday 11:30-13:00**
  "The prevention triad model for understanding what works to prevent violence against women and girls" - Lori Heise, Prevention Collaborative
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