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Introduction

Background

• The 2016 Uganda Violence Against Children Survey (VACS) showed high prevalence of sexual violence against girls at 35% and boys at 17%.

• The U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) program initiated sexual violence prevention programs in response to these results including the No Means No Worldwide intervention “No Means No”
The Intervention

- No Means No is a 12-hour empowerment self-defense program to teach female youth age 10-19 mental, verbal, and physical skills to prevent sexual violence, paired with referrals to services for survivors
  - Includes: training, network referral system and the Survivors in Recovery Anonymous (SIRA) support groups

- Evidence-based program, researched in Kenya and Malawi with an average 47% decrease in the incidence of rape

- Piloted in Uganda for the first time in 2019 with 5 implementing partners across 4 districts of Uganda, February – September 2019

The Evaluation

- Process evaluation conducted by CDC HQ and CDC Uganda, USAID Uganda, No Means No Worldwide, and Makerere University, along with three implementing partners – Infectious Disease Institute, Catholic Relief Services, World Education
Process Evaluation Objectives

Feasibility

1. Determine **feasibility** and **acceptability** of No Means No in Uganda
   - How are No Means No components being implemented across the Uganda sites?
   - What is the completion rate (“graduation”) of the participants?
   - What is the retention rate of the Instructors?
   - How many participants disclose violence?
   - How does the program support service-seeking behavior?
   - To what extent are Instructors able to manage classes, conduct the classes using the correct processes, and manage time and materials?
   - What improvements and efficiencies can be made to make the program function better?

Fidelity

2. To assess **fidelity** of the intervention by measuring **change in knowledge and attitudes**
   - To what extent are the participants gaining self-efficacy, skills and knowledge to protect themselves from sexual assault from the program?
   - What impact does the implementation model have on the outcomes (2-hour or 3-hour classes)?

Cost

3. Analyze the **cost** of implementation
   - What are the costs to implement the program in Uganda?
**Evaluation Methods**

**Participant Attendance Lists:**
Collects information on how the program was implemented, where, and how many girls completed it.

**Pre- and post-questionnaires:**
14 Likert + 8 multiple choice administered immediately before and after the intervention to measure knowledge and attitudes.

**Partner Reporting Form:**
Quarterly narrative updates from implementing partners.

**Key Informant Interviews & Focus Group Discussions:**
Youth, instructors, and community stakeholders on perceptions of the program and recommendations.

**Instructor Assessment Visits:**
Observation of Instructor facilitation to assess fidelity to the curriculum.

**Cost capture tool:**
Quantitative data on cost and qualitative on expectations and budget guidance.
# Process Evaluation Sample

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># girls participating in No Means No (Feb. – Sept. 2019)</td>
<td>25,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post Questionnaires</td>
<td>Pre: 21,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post: 20,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
<td>116 Instructors in 5 FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 Participants in 12 FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 Community Stakeholders in 11 FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td>3 Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 community stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 1. Determine **feasibility** and **acceptability** of No Means No in Uganda

**Successes**
- **124 female Instructors certified** to teach No Means No (85% certification rate)
- Program was able to reach **24,000+ girls**
- **96% of girls completed** the program
- **Positive feedback** on program from stakeholders – demand exists, and stakeholders were satisfied with the program overall
- Qualitative reports of **more disclosures** of sexual violence

**Challenges**
- Instructor **retention** (only 58% active at the end of the pilot)
- Opportunity to increase **Instructor Assessment Visits**
- Quantitative reports of voluntary **disclosures of sexual violence to Instructors** were **lower than expected** (442, or ~2% of program participants)
- Challenges **connecting girls to referral services** (66% referred)
- It took longer than expected to mobilize implementing partners and communities

"The program should continue because the defensive skills are very good. We have learnt we can do anything to free ourselves." – Girl participant
Objective 2. To assess fidelity of the intervention by measuring change in knowledge and attitudes

**Successes**
- Positive changes in knowledge and attitude observed from pre-post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% WITH DESIRED RESPONSE</td>
<td>% WITH DESIRED RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Girls participating in the 6 class x 2 hour model outperformed those in the 4 class x 3 hour model by 47%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELIVERY MODEL</th>
<th>% WITH DESIRED RESPONSE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four 3-Hour Classes</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six 2-Hour Classes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Girls reported confidence in defending against an attacker
- Girls reported using the skills in various situations
- Community stakeholders reported girls are more assertive, confident, independent, and more likely to disclose

**Challenges**
- Girls in the 4 class x 3 hour did not perform as well
- There were a few girls who misunderstood messages of the class

“I used my voice when I was in a taxi a man was trying to touch my thighs and I used my voice to shout and immediately he stopped touching me.” – Girl participant
Results

Objective 3. Analyze the cost of implementation

Successes
• The No Means No program cost $18 / graduate, with $10 from partners’ implementation and $8 from NMNW
• Most partners reported the program cost less or equal to their expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLEMENTING PARTNER</th>
<th>IP COST (ESTIMATE, USD)</th>
<th># NMN GRADUATES</th>
<th>COST PER GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP Cost</td>
<td>$249,262.15</td>
<td>24,824</td>
<td>$10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Means No Worldwide</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>24,824</td>
<td>$7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Cost</td>
<td>$443,262.15</td>
<td>24,824</td>
<td>$17.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges
• High cost for Instructor training (3-week residential training)
• Largest partner reported the program cost more than their expectations
• Higher than expected cost of materials (e.g., Instructor kits) and printing
Lessons Learned

• Improve Instructor retention: more Instructor Development Visits, clearer expectations, consistent pay, targeted recruitment

• Expand implementing partner and community mobilization prior to project launch to avoid delays

• Strengthen referral networks – include social workers earlier, more training for partners

• Provide Instructors with logistical support (finding safe venues, mobilizing and retaining girls, maintaining feasible class size)
Actions Taken after the Process Evaluation

- NMNW has invested in **partner onboarding** that covers program orientation, tools for implementation planning, how to manage disclosures and referrals, orientation for case workers, activities to support and supervise Instructors, and monitoring & evaluation.

- Ended the 3-hour classes model and **invested in the 2-hour model**; now including the option for 1-hour classes.

- Planning an **outcome evaluation** of Uganda program this year.
• **No Means No has expanded significantly in Uganda:**
  - Girls programming with 9 partners in 7 districts
  - Boys programming with 12 partners in 9 districts

• **In total, 97,000+ youth** have received No Means No in Uganda since 2019 launch
Impact of Process Evaluation: Global

• No Means No works with approximately **85 partners** in **10 countries** and has reached **257,256 youth** from 2019-2021

• **Used the lessons learned** from this process evaluation to **scale the program** and improve **technical assistance**
Questions?

For more information, please contact:
Division of Global HIV & TB/HIV Prevention Branch/Gender & Youth Team
Jennifer Hegle
jhegle@cdc.gov

No Means No Worldwide
Marissa Strniste
mstrniste@nmnw.org
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