

Resource 2.2 Examples and cases of DRG Evaluations

How does DRG Evaluation work?

- Example 1:

Name of the Intervention	Constructing Coalitions to Reduce Human Rights Abuse by Security Forces in Northern Nigeria.
Context and description of the intervention	<p>- Escalating violence in Northern Nigeria has necessitated the deployment of a heightened security presence across the region. While security forces have a mandate to maintain peace, some of their officers have been implicated in human rights abuse against civilians which have eroded public confidence in the security sector.</p> <p>- In 2013, Search For Common Ground (SFCG) Nigeria received an 18 month grant from the US Department of State – Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) to carry out this project in Plateau and Bauchi state. In partnership with the Center for Advocacy, Justice and Rights (CAJR) and the Bauchi Human Rights Network (BAHRN), SFCG is working to strengthen engagement and advocacy processes to reduce human rights abuse by security forces in North East and North Central Nigeria.</p> <p>- One of the first activities conducted was a baseline evaluation, aimed at: (1) identifying key actors in Bauchi state and map out key regional parties; (2) determining the present levels of interaction, engagement, and capacity existing among regional NHRC staff, relevant CSOs, and judicial actors; and (3) informing project design.</p> <p>- More information available in this link.</p>
Evaluation Focus	Human Rights and democracy.
Evaluation approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mixed Methods (quantitative and qualitative) - Participatory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcomes Harvesting - Most Significant Change
Data Collection Instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -29 Key informants interviews, from key staff of higher-level partner organizations (the Judiciary, National Human Rights Commission and security services) - 9 focus groups of approximately 10-15 persons each collected data from participants in the project’s activities, such as the capacity-strengthening and coalition building/ strengthening/ supporting workshops and trainings - Survey collected data primarily to assess the project’s influence on the broader public, 460 responses in communities benefiting directly from the interventions and 400 observations in communities not benefiting directly - Project documentation - More information about the questionnaires in this document (Trujillo, 2018).
Types of Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative - Qualitative

<p>Examples of data collection questions and/or indicators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "How aware do you feel you are about services or agencies or other resources that protect you or are available for protecting you against human rights abuses?" - "Which specific situations do you fear put you in danger of being a victim of human rights abuses?"
<p>Results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The intervention has contributed successfully to a reduction in human rights abuses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improving awareness of human rights and actions to promote and protect human rights, - Improving collaboration among civil society organizations (CSOs), state human rights agencies and security forces for the purpose of improving awareness of human rights and actions to promote and protect human rights, - Improving the capacity of civil society organizations to raise awareness of human rights and actions to promote and protect human rights – but not identifiably increasing the capacity of government agencies responsible for the same.
<p>Lessons Learned in terms of data collection and analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical considerations to protect the victims from re-traumatization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the evaluation team repeatedly requested consent from the respondents to ensure they were informed of the content and able to withdraw their consent as they become more familiar with the survey. - Furthermore, given that the inclusion of questions that ask respondents to reflect on their awareness of victimization of themselves or of others can pose risks for re-traumatization the evaluation team decided to include these questions as the first questions in the survey in order to raise the issue quickly and provide the respondent with an opportunity to discontinue the survey if it prompts any sense of hesitancy of proceeding with responding to the survey. - It is worth noticing that Fifty-one (51) respondents refused consent after answering the initial questions of whether they were aware of persons experiencing human rights abuses or were afraid of being victims of human rights abuses. - Triangulation of findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to better approximate findings and avoiding errors the evaluation team used multiple methods of analysis and data collection as they found it particularly useful to evaluate interventions addressing complex social phenomena, such as influencing the behavior of military actors and their interaction with society as well as for the identification of the effects of interventions, in the measurement of these effects and in the validity of claims of attribution of these effects.

- Example 2:

Name of the Intervention	Combating Societal Discrimination and Strengthening LBT Organizations project.
Context and description of the intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A funding organization supports civil society organizations across continents where were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people (LGBTI) face institutional discrimination, sexual and gender-based violence, and barriers in accessing public services. Despite different contexts of the four project countries, LGBTI individuals experience some common challenges. Pervasive stigma and discrimination, coupled with limited legal recognition or access to legal recourse physical and social violence and attacks, further limit social and economic opportunities. - Groups that seek to engage them and provide support are under-resourced, and face additional organizational development barriers. Within the LGBTI community there are also divisions and competitions, with underrepresentation of LBT voices. This takes place within country contexts of precarious democratic processes, where operating space may be unpredictable. - The project funded activities related to its three objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To improve lesbian, bisexual, and trans (LBT1) access to justice; - To increase organizational capacity of LBT and allied organizations and networks, including improving awareness and adoption of security and risk-management practices; and - To integrate LBT rights organizations into the broader advocacy agendas of LGBT, human rights and feminist movements. - This was done through an external evaluation of work conducted with a grant from the United States Department of State Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL).
Evaluation Focus	Human Rights, democracy, specifically access to justice.
Evaluation approach	- Objectives-based approach
Data Collection Instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with individuals and organization representatives positioned to comment on issues prioritized in the evaluation - Focus groups with representatives of communities and constituencies. - Interim evaluation - Project documentation
Types of Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative - Qualitative
Examples data collection questions and indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Qualitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Has access to justice for LBT individuals or communities changed as a result of this grant?" - "What changes have there been in grantees' capacity to facilitate access to justice for LBT individuals or communities, particularly in terms of engaging underserved communities and broader human rights movements in [the specific country]?" - Quantitative

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of individuals/groups from low income or marginalized communities who received legal aid or victim’s assistance with USG support - Number of LBT human rights defenders trained and supported - Number of individuals from LGBT communities who received psychosocial, medical or other non-legal support services with Funding Organization support
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grantees demonstrate or express enhanced capabilities to engage their constituents and strengthen their space among civil society organizations and decision makers. - Access to Justice was enhanced through two channels: by directly providing some LGBTI community members with services and resources and by contributing to improvements in systems and processes, and engagement with individual actors that affect access to justice more broadly.
Lessons Learned in terms of data collection and analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical considerations to protect the security of the participants The evaluation team took extra care to protect the anonymity and security of the local organizations and individuals involved in implementing the DRL project and related work. - Outcome-related planning and evaluation The evaluators recommended that funder enhance participatory planning, learning and evaluation methods as well as outcome-related planning, based on challenges the evaluation encountered in identifying outcomes in the project documents. - Agile monitoring and evaluation The evaluators also recommended that the funding organization includes feedback loops with grantees and their communities to further enhance the funding organization’ understanding of grantee dynamics, support a sense by grantees of having a voice in organizations that funder supports, and serve as a source of information that is useful to funder’s programming. Feedback mechanisms can include anonymous surveys, third party interviews, community or grantee meetings and focus groups, or any format that facilitates open, honest, and frank critique about the role of funders. These activities would also model good program practice for some grantees, who may benefit from more systematic and/or inclusive approaches to engage their own constituencies.