

Pan African Organisation for Research and Protection of Violence on Women and Children (PAORP-VWC)



P O Box 2153TL Tamale
Northern Region Ghana
Tel: +233(0) 543 305 470
Email: paorp.vwc@gmail.com
<http://www.panafrican-paorp.org>
<http://www.developmentradio.com>

Endline Evaluation

Strengthening the Protective Environment of the child through positive parenting and Education for Non-Violence (REPEPEN)

**for the period
1st October 2022 - 30th September 2025**

Implementing Organisation:

Pan African Organisation for Research and Protection of Violence on Women and Children
(PAORP-VWC)

PAORP -Ghana – September 2025

Project: strengthening the protective environment of the child through positive parenting and education in non-violence (REPEPPEN)

Implementing Partner: PAORP-VWC

Country: Ghana

Zones/Districts: Gushegu, Tatale, Zabzugu

Evaluation Dates: July 15–17, 2025

Evaluation Team: Nsiah F. Matilda, Zofoa Melanie, Tampuri Hakeem, Muma Bili

Methodology: Questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions (students, parents/families, traditional and religious leaders)

Report Date: September 12, 2025

Table of content

Tables.....	5
List of abbreviations	5
Executive Summary	6
Introduction.....	8
1.1 Subject of the evaluation.....	8
1.2 Reason for and objective of the evaluation – Rationale and Aim; central evaluation questions	8
1.3 Evaluation mission – Period and procedure; Evaluation team; External factors	9
2. Methodology and Sampling.....	9
2.1 Evaluation methodology and Sampling.....	9
Methodological approach and design	9
Instruments	9
Sampling and recruitment	10
Data collection procedures.....	10
Ethical safeguards and safeguarding pathway	10
2.2 Critical assessment of the methodology	10
2.2.1 Suitability of the methodological approach	10
2.2.2 Limitations and their mitigation	10
3. Framework Conditions (Endline)	12
3.1 General conditions, problems and potential at the start—and important changes over time	12
3.2 Presence and contributions of other stakeholders (Endline snapshot)	12
4. Evolution of the performance of the project executing agency and the implementing partners (Endline).....	13
Qualification of the project team	13
Role of implementing partners.....	13
5. Developmental effectiveness	13
5.1 Relevance.....	13
5.2 Coherence (Consistency)	14
5.3. Effectiveness.....	14
5.3.1 Parents who renounce psychological violence (GEN RECAP).....	17
5.3.2: Parents applying ≥ 2 positive parenting practices (GEN RECAP).....	18
5.3.3: Parents who abandoned corporal punishment (GEN RECAP).....	18
5.3.4: Children reporting caring/non-violent education (GEN RECAP)	18
5.3.5: Student – life-skills knowledge and behaviors (FGDs).....	19
5.3.6. Student sentiment toward competence pool (FGDs; n=45)	19
5.3.7: Traditional/Religious Leaders – knowledge of good practices (FGDs)	19
5.3.8: Families – attitude toward the project (FGDs)	20
5.3.9. Parents – could mention ≥ 3 PP modules (FGDs).....	20
5.4 Efficiency.....	21
5.5 Overarching developmental impact	21

5.5.2 Model character, structure-building and broad impact.....	22
5.5.3 Other (possibly negative) effects and persistent challenges.....	22
5.6 Sustainability	22
5.6.1. Durability of the positive effects	23
5.6.2. Risks and potential for sustainable effectiveness	23
6. Cross-cutting issues	23
6.1. Gender perspective	23
6.2. Inclusion & equity of access	24
6.3. Contribution to organizational goals.....	24
7. Conclusions and recommendations	24
7.1 Conclusions.....	24
7.2 Recommendations.....	24
Annexes	26
Annex 1: Comparison between Midterm evaluation findings and final evaluation figures.....	26

Tables

- Table 1.** Sampling summary by district (with Sampling & recruitment)
- Table 2.** Sampling summary by sex (with Sampling & recruitment)
- Table 3.** Parents who renounce psychological violence (GEN RECAP)
- Table 4.** Parents applying ≥ 2 positive parenting practices (GEN RECAP)
- Table 5.** Parents who abandoned corporal punishment (GEN RECAP)
- Table 6.** Children reporting caring/non-violent education (GEN RECAP)
- Table 7.** Student – life-skills knowledge and behaviours (FGDs)
- Table 8.** Student sentiment toward competence pool (FGDs; n=45)
- Table 9.** Traditional/Religious Leaders – knowledge of good practices by zone (FGDs)
- Table 10.** Families – attitude to the project (FGDs)
- Table 11.** Families – could mention ≥ 3 PP modules (FGDs)
- Table 12.** Impact of the project

List of abbreviations

- **CI** – Confidence Interval
- **CSO** – Civil Society Organisation
- **DAC** – Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
- **DOVVSU** – Domestic Violence and Victim Support Unit (Ghana Police Service)
- **FGD / FGDs** – Focus Group Discussion(s)
- **GBV** – Gender-Based Violence
- **GES** – Ghana Education Service
- **GHS** – Ghana Health Service
- **KiRA** – Donor name as recorded in project accounts (Kinderrechte Afrika e. V.)
- **M&E** – Monitoring and Evaluation
- **MHPSS** – Mental Health and Psychosocial Support
- **MoU** – Memorandum of Understanding
- **NGO** – Non-Governmental Organisation
- **NVE** – Non-Violent Education
- **OECD-DAC** – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
- **PAORP-VWC** – Pan African Organisation for Research and Protection of Violence on Women and Children
- **PP** – Positive Parenting
- **PTA** – Parent–Teacher Association
- **QA** – Quality Assurance
- **REPEPPEN** – Strengthening the Protective Environment of the Child through Positive Parenting and Education for Non-Violence
- **SMC** – School Management Committee
- **SMS** – Short Message Service (text messaging)
- **SOP / SOPs** – Standard Operating Procedure(s)
- **SWD** – Social Welfare Department (Ghana)
- **VAC** – Violence Against Children
- **n / N** – Count of observed cases (n) / total sample size (N)
- **pp** – Percentage points (used for absolute changes in percentages)

Executive Summary

This endline evaluation assesses the results of the REPEPPEN project “*Strengthening the Protective Environment of the Child through Positive Parenting and Education for Non-Violence*” implemented by PAORP-VWC in Gushegu, Tatale, and Zabzugu (Ghana). Guided by the OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability), the evaluation combines quantitative surveys with qualitative focus group discussions to judge progress since the midterm (May 2024), identify remaining gaps, and outline practical next steps for consolidation and scale-up.

Methods and sample: Fieldwork took place 15–17 July 2025. Structured questionnaires reached parents (n=180) and children (n=180) evenly across the three districts. Qualitative data came from FGDs with sensitized students (n=45), families (n=45), and traditional/religious leaders (n=30). Ethical procedures (informed consent/assent, confidentiality, do-no-harm) were applied, and midterm constructs were retained to enable comparison.

Relevance and coherence: REPEPPEN remained well-aligned to baseline and midterm priorities, reducing corporal and psychological violence and strengthening child–adult communication, through an integrated package of Positive Parenting (PP), Non-Violent Education (NVE), and school life-skills. Activities complemented national child-protection expectations via Ghana Education Service engagement and leveraged credible local messengers (traditional and religious leaders). Community demand for replication to harder-to-reach areas was evident.

Key endline results (with counts and percentages).

- Renouncing psychological violence (parents): 114/180 (63%) overall; women 62/87 (71%), men 52/93 (56%).
- Applying ≥ 2 PP practices (parents): 143/180 (79%); women 67/84 (80%), men 76/96 (79%).
- Abandoning corporal punishment (parents): 131/180 (73%); women 62/88 (70%), men 69/92 (75%).
- Children reporting a caring/non-violent education: 130/180 (72%); girls 77/103 (75%), boys 53/77 (69%).
- Students’ life-skills knowledge (FGDs): heard of life-skills 45/45 (100%); know the school competence pool 37/45 (82%); can name ≥ 3 life-skills 34/45 (76%); if victim, can list ≥ 3 positive responses 36/45 (80%); can list ≥ 5 positive behaviours 45/45 (100%).
- Traditional and religious leaders’ knowledge on positive parenting and non-violent education (FGDs): can list ≥ 5 good practices 28/30 (93%); by zone—Gushegu 8/10 (80%), Zabzugu 10/10 (100%), Tatale 10/10 (100%).
- Families’ attitude towards their children (FGDs): positive/mostly positive 40/45 (89%); negative 5/45 (11%).

Trend since midterm: The share of children reporting a caring, non-violent education rose from about 59% at midterm to 130/180 (72%) at endline. Corporal punishment shows sustained decline: midterm’s proxy (114/147; 78% not hitting in past six months) transitions at endline to a stricter construct (“abandoned corporal punishment”) with 131/180 (73%). While psychological aggression remains a focus area, the endline findings show that 63% of respondents explicitly renounced such behaviours.

Effectiveness and impact: Evidence points to normalized PP routines (active listening, calm reasoning, consistent rules), calmer school climates, and norm diffusion via leader sermons, community forums, and school clubs. Children report more supportive interactions and clearer, non-violent boundaries at home and in class. Qualitative accounts describe reductions in late-coming and fighting, improved communication, and constructive responses to poor performance.

Efficiency: Despite inflation and transport costs, PAORP-VWC and partners delivered a tightly scheduled three-day round, leveraging shared logistics, standardized tools, and district champions (teachers, leaders) to keep costs and time burdens low while maintaining data quality.

Sustainability: Prospects are good: behaviours are embedded (e.g., 79% applying PP; 73% abandoning corporal punishment), leaders' knowledge is near-universal (93%), and families are overwhelmingly supportive (89%). Durable, low-cost structures—PP manuals/image charts, school clubs, leader platforms, and community radio—anchor continued diffusion. Remaining risks include economic stress, uneven referral follow-through, and a modest boy–girl gap in caring experiences (69% vs. 75%).

Limitations: Self-report may under-estimate violence; FGDs used purposive sampling; some parent denominators vary slightly by module. These are mitigated by transparent reporting of n/N, triangulation, and consistent constructs across time.

Priority recommendations:

1. **Quarterly booster micro-sessions** for caregivers and teachers on psychological non-violence, emotion regulation, and adolescent communication (with a male-caregiver track).
2. **Institutionalize PP/NVE** in school routines (in-service, assemblies, club calendars; anti-corporal clauses in PTAs/SMCs).
3. **Tighten referral follow-through** via simple case logs, visible posters, and quarterly inter-agency huddles (Social Welfare/Police/GHS/GES).
4. **Sustain low-cost diffusion** (monthly radio, WhatsApp/SMS nudges, leader job-aids) and extend to hard-to-reach communities.
5. **Light M&E scorecard** each term (5 indicators) to trigger targeted refreshers and track the girl–boy gap.

Bottom line: REPEPEN met its child-level objective ($\geq 70\%$ of children experiencing caring, non-violent education) and consolidated household and school practice change. With light, recurring supports and institutional anchoring, gains are well-positioned to persist and deepen beyond the project cycle.

Introduction

1.1 Subject of the evaluation

The Final (Endline) Evaluation of the project “**Strengthening the Protective Environment of the Child through Positive Parenting and Education for Non-Violence (REPEPPEN)**” assesses the extent to which the intervention has improved parenting practices, school climate, and child well-being in three districts of Ghana (Gushegu, Tatale, and Zabzugu). Implemented in Ghana by PAORP-VWC, the development measure combined community and school-based interventions to reduce corporal and psychological violence and to normalize caring, rights-respecting relationships. Core activities included: caregiver training on PP and non-violent discipline; school life-skills clubs and child-friendly classroom practices; community sensitization led by traditional and religious leaders; diffusion via peer groups, forums, and local media; and basic referral/linkage to child protection services. Target groups were parents/caregivers, children, teachers/school leadership, and traditional and religious leaders, with deliberate attention to gender and age dynamics. REPEPPEN set out to reduce violent discipline and strengthen caring, rights-respecting relationships across homes, schools, and communities in contexts where corporal punishment, psychological violence, child labour, and early/forced marriage have historically undermined children’s safety, learning, and development. This endline assesses how far these combined actions have strengthened the child’s protective environment and whether changes observed at midterm have been consolidated, expanded, or diversified by project close. In doing so it builds on the midterm assessment (May 2024) and provides a summative account of results, learning, and remaining gaps to inform sustainability and potential scale-up.

1.2 Reason for and objective of the evaluation – Rationale and Aim; central evaluation questions

Rationale and Aim. As the project cycle reaches completion, the endline evaluation provides accountability to stakeholders and evidence for decision-making on scale-up and sustainability. It takes stock of outcomes against the OECD-DAC criteria—relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability—and explicitly compares endline findings with those from the midterm (May 2024) to judge progress, course corrections, and residual gaps. Practically, the evaluation asks whether PP/NVE practices have moved from awareness to consistent adoption in homes and schools, whether children’s lived experience has improved, and whether enabling systems and norms have strengthened enough to last.

Central evaluation questions (integrated in narrative form). To what extent did REPEPPEN address the priority needs identified at design and remain aligned with local and national child-protection policies (**relevance/coherence**)? How far did planned outputs translate into measurable outcomes for parents, children, schools, and community leaders (**effectiveness**)? Were resources, partnerships, and delivery modalities used in a timely and cost-conscious manner (**efficiency**)? What significant positive or negative effects, intended or unintended, were observed at household, school, and community levels (**impact**)? And, finally, which factors (tools, leadership, norms, institutions) are in place to maintain and expand results beyond the project timeframe (**sustainability**)?

The report is organized to mirror the midterm structure for comparability. It begins with context and methodology, then presents findings under each OECD-DAC criterion, followed by an impact matrix that contrasts midterm and endline results, and concludes with actionable recommendations to consolidate gains. While the design supports credible inferences about contribution, the evaluation recognizes limitations, including reliance on self-reported behaviours (potential social desirability bias), purposive participation in some FGDs, and varying denominators for certain parent indicators. These constraints are explicitly noted where relevant and do not detract from the overall picture of progress and the practical lessons identified for sustaining positive parenting and non-violent education beyond the project cycle

1.3 Evaluation mission – Period and procedure; Evaluation team; External factors

Period and procedure. Endline fieldwork took place 15–17 July 2025 across the three districts of intervention. The evaluation used a mixed-methods design and triangulated: (i) structured questionnaires with parents and children to quantify behaviour/practice change; and (ii) focus group discussions (FGDs) with 3 separate sensitized groups namely students, families, and traditional/religious leaders to interpret mechanisms of change, barriers, and enablers. Standard operating procedures covered sampling, team training, piloting tools, field supervision, data quality checks, confidentiality, and informed consent/assent. Analysis aligned to the OECD/DAC criteria and, where applicable, compared endline results with midterm values to describe direction and magnitude of change.

Evaluation team. The mission was led by PAORP-VWC staff with expertise in child protection, education, and community engagement, facilitating access to sites and documents, and coordinating logistics. Role separation (internal implementation vs. “external” review), documented decision trails, and data triangulation minimized bias and safeguarded the credibility of findings.

External factors. Field implementation and the evaluation were shaped by: (a) economic pressures (e.g., transport and commodity prices) that affected household stress and evaluation logistics; (b) cultural sensitivities around discipline and inter-generational authority that influenced both intervention uptake and respondent candor; and (c) operational constraints typical of dispersed rural settings (distance to hard-to-reach communities, competing seasonal/livelihood demands, school calendars). These constraints were mitigated through localized scheduling, engagement of traditional and religious leaders to build trust, and the use of plain-language, context-adapted tool

2. Methodology and Sampling

Mixed methods were used. Quantitative data came from structured questionnaires administered to parents and children. Qualitative data came from focus group discussions (FGDs) with sensitized students, families, and traditional and religious leaders. Sampling covered three districts (Gushegu, Tatale, Zabzugu).

2.1 Evaluation methodology and Sampling

Methodological approach and design

The evaluation employs a mixed-methods design aligned with OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability). Quantitative data were collected through structured questionnaires with parents (n=180) and children (n=180) across the three districts of the project. Qualitative insights were generated through focus group discussions (FGDs) separately with sensitized students (n=45), families (n=45), and traditional and religious leaders (n=30). Data collection took place from 15–17 July 2025, and triangulation was used to integrate numeric trends with lived experiences from households, schools, and community structures. Ethical procedures, including informed consent/assent, confidentiality safeguards, and the do-no-harm principle, were observed throughout.

Instruments

- **Structured questionnaires** (parents and children): closed and semi-closed items on discipline practices, communication, help-seeking/reporting, and PP/NVE exposure. Tools preserved midterm wording where feasible; minor clarifications were pilot-tested and annotated.
- **FGD guides** (sensitized students, families, traditional/religious leaders): thematic prompts on perceived changes, barriers, enabling factors, diffusion, and sustainability.
- **Light observation checklist** (context notes): school climate cues, club artifacts, PP job-aids, and referral signage; used only for contextualization (no scoring).
- **Language & adaptation:** English with **Dagbani**/local language facilitation as needed; **translation/back-translation** for new or revised prompts.

Sampling and recruitment

- **Parents (quantitative): N=180** (60 per district). Systematic/interval recruitment from session attendance lists and community clusters, balancing sex where feasible.
- **Children (quantitative): N=180** (60 per district). School-based stratified convenience sampling by grade/sex with assent and caregiver consent protocols.
- **Sensitized students (FGDs): N=45** (15 per district). Purposive selection from school clubs (girls=23; boys=22).
- **Traditional & religious leaders (FGDs): N=30** (10 per district; women=15; men=15). Purposive sampling via local councils/faith bodies.
- **Sensitized families (FGDs): N=45** (15 per district; women=23; men=22). Purposive from PP cohorts. With N=180 per survey group, the worst-case 95% margin of error for a proportion is $\sim\pm 7.3$ percentage points, adequate for district-pooled inference and midterm–endline comparison.

Data collection procedures

Enumerators received 1.5–2 days of training on ethics, tool navigation, probing, neutrality, and safeguarding. Tools were piloted in a non-sampled community and refined. Daily field debriefs addressed inconsistencies, and supervisors conducted spot checks/back-checks. Privacy was ensured by seating arrangement and staggered interviewing to reduce influence from peers/guardians.

Ethical safeguards and safeguarding pathway

- **Informed consent/assent:** adult consent; child assent plus **parent/guardian consent**. Participation was voluntary, with right to refuse/withdraw.
- **Confidentiality:** no names in datasets; unique IDs; secure storage; restricted access.
- **Do-no-harm & referrals:** any disclosure of abuse or acute distress triggered a **confidential referral** to local Social Welfare/Police/GHS per PAORP-VWC protocol, with immediate safety checks.
- **Cultural sensitivity:** local leaders briefed; gender-balanced facilitation; respectful scheduling around religious/market days.

2.2 Critical assessment of the methodology

2.2.1 Suitability of the methodological approach

A convergent mixed-methods design was well suited to REPEPPEN’s behavioural and norm-change goals. Standardized survey indicators quantified change, while FGDs explained how and why practices shifted (or stalled) in different settings. Retaining midterm constructs ensured time-series comparability, and stratification by district captured contextual variation.

2.2.2 Limitations and their mitigation

- **Self-report & social desirability bias:** Parents/children may under-report violence. *Mitigation:* private interviewing, neutral scripts, and indirect questioning; triangulation with FGD narratives.
- **Cross-sectional endline (no panel):** Causal attribution is limited. *Mitigation:* compare with midterm proportions and align findings with implementation intensity; avoid causal language beyond contribution.
- **Variable denominators:** Minor non-response led to sex-specific Ns on some parent indicators. *Mitigation:* always print n/N and interpret percentages cautiously.
- **Selection bias in FGDs:** purposive sampling may over-represent engaged participants. *Mitigation:* diversify recruitment sources and actively probe for negative/neutral cases.
- **Seasonality/logistics:** school calendars and livelihood cycles constrained availability. *Mitigation:* flexible scheduling, short sessions, and community liaison support.
- **Language/translation drift:** risk of meaning shifts. *Mitigation:* back-translation and spot audio checks

Table 1: Sampling summary by target population and district

Target population / Instrument	Gushegu	Tatale	Zabzugu	Total (n)	Sampling & recruitment
Parents (Questionnaire)	60	60	60	180	Systematic/interval recruitment from session attendance lists and community clusters; balanced by sex where feasible.
Children (Questionnaire)	60	60	60	180	School-based stratified convenience by grade/sex with child assent and caregiver consent protocols.
Sensitized Students (FGDs)	15	15	15	45	Purposive selection from school clubs (girls = 23; boys = 22).
Traditional & Religious Leaders (FGDs)	10	10	10	30	Purposive via local councils/faith bodies (women = 15; men = 15).
Sensitized Families (FGDs)	15	15	15	45	Purposive from PP cohorts (women = 23; men = 22)

Table 2: Sampling summary by sex (where available)

Target population / Instrument	Female (Women/Girls)	Male (Men/Boys)	Total (n)	Sampling & recruitment
Parents (Questionnaire)	Varies by instrument (\approx 84–88)	Varies by instrument (\approx 92–96)	180	Systematic/interval from session lists & clusters; sex balance sought.
Children (Questionnaire)	103 (girls)	77 (boys)	180	School-based stratified convenience by grade/sex with assent + caregiver consent.
Sensitized Students (FGDs)	23 (girls)	22 (boys)	45	Purposive from school clubs.
Traditional & Religious Leaders (FGDs)	15 (women)	15 (men)	30	Purposive via local councils/faith bodies.
Sensitized Families (FGDs)	23 (women)	22 (men)	45	Purposive from PP cohorts.

* Parents' sex-specific counts vary slightly across modules due to minor non-response; total remains n = 180.

Note on precision: With N = 180 per survey group (parents; children), the worst-case 95% margin of error for a proportion is ± 7.3 percentage points, suitable for pooled district estimates and midterm–endline comparisons

3. Framework Conditions (Endline)

3.1 General conditions, problems and potential at the start—and important changes over time

Baseline–midterm context. At baseline, acceptance of corporal punishment and limited awareness of PP/NVE were common across Gushegu, Tatale, Zabzugu; midterm showed early attitudinal shifts but persistent communication gaps between parents and children.

Endline situation (what changed). By **July 2025**, community uptake had deepened:

- **Practice change at home:** 143/180 (79%) parents report applying positive parenting; 131/180 (73%) report abandoning corporal punishment; 114/180 (63%) renounce psychological violence.
- **Children’s experience:** 130/180 (72%) children report caring, non-violent education (vs. ~59% at midterm), indicating movement from awareness to routine practice.
- **School climate & norms:** Student clubs and teacher champions remain active; traditional/religious leaders continue to diffuse PP/NVE messages in sermons and community meetings.

Ongoing problems & risks:

- **Cultural resistance (minority):** A small share of caregivers (responsible for the upbringing of the child) and some gatekeepers (influential persons within the community) still defend “firm” discipline, especially verbal aggression.
- **Economic stress:** Inflation/transport costs increase household stress and occasionally limit participation.
- **Systemic gaps:** Reporting/referral pathways function unevenly across districts; follow-up capacity for cases remains constrained.

Potential: Still, trained champions (those trained during the project to promote Positive Parenting and Non-Violent Education), functioning school clubs, and widely used materials (manuals, visuals, radio) provide a solid platform for consolidation and scale-up.

3.2 Presence and contributions of other stakeholders (Endline snapshot)

- **Ghana Education Service (GES):** Continues to promote child-friendly practices; teachers host club activities and reinforce non-violent classroom management, though periodic refresher training is still needed.
- **Social Welfare Department:** Points of contact exist in all three districts; referrals occur but case load and transport limit timely follow-up—coordination remains essential.
- **Ghana Health Service:** Health talks and mental-health messaging complement PP/NVE; scope to formalize routine screening/referrals during child welfare clinics.
- **Police / DOVVSU:** Availability for serious cases has improved trust where joint forums were held; fear of formal reporting persists among some families.
- **Traditional & Religious Leaders:** High-leverage messengers sustaining norm change via sermons, festivals and community forums; request continued capacity-building and job-aids.
- **Women’s & Youth Groups / School clubs:** Drive peer learning, dramas and debates; effective for diffusion to hard-to-reach households with light mentorship.
- **Media (community radio):** Regular slots keep messages salient; expanding coverage/time slots would enhance reach.

Bottom line: Compared to baseline and midterm, stakeholder alignment is stronger and more coordinated, but sustained gains will depend on (i) keeping leaders and schools resourced with refresher inputs, (ii)

tightening referral follow-through, and (iii) buffering economic stressors that undermine consistent PP/NVE practices.

4. Evolution of the performance of the project executing agency and the implementing partners (Endline)

Qualification of the project team

PAORP-VWC core team. The endline confirms a stable and competent team structure established at midterm and sustained through project close:

- **Administrative Director** provides strategic oversight, government/donor liaison, and quality assurance on safeguarding and compliance.
- **Project Coordinator** leads planning, field supervision, and partner coordination; maintained the midterm emphasis on fidelity to PP/NVE content and timely delivery across three districts.
- **Project Officer(s)** facilitate trainings, club support, community sensitization, and follow-ups; they also handled data collection logistics for parents (n=180) and children (n=180) and convened FGDs for students (n=45), families (n=45), and traditional/religious leaders (n=30).
- **Finance Officer** ensured budget control and compliant reporting despite inflationary pressures, supporting cost-effective routing and shared logistics.

Capacity updates since midterm. The team completed refresher sessions on safeguarding, consent/assent for minors, neutral interviewing, and data quality checks. The team has also learned to conduct an endline evaluation, analysing collected data and comprising those in an evaluation report.

Role of implementing partners

- **GES/Schools:** Hosted life-skills clubs and supported non-violent classroom practices; teachers acted as focal points for scheduling and child protection messaging.
- **Traditional/Religious leaders:** Continued diffusion of PP/NVE through sermons and community events; co-mobilized FGD participants and reinforced norms change.
- **Social Welfare/Police/GHS:** Remained available for referral guidance; coordination improved but follow-up capacity still varies by district.

5. Developmental effectiveness

5.1 Relevance

Relevance is judged by the fit between REPEPPEN's objectives, beneficiary needs, and donor/implementer priorities. Endline evidence confirms strong alignment. The project continued to target baseline problems—corporal and psychological violence and weak child–adult communication—through a combined package of Positive Parenting (PP), Non-Violent Education (NVE), and school life-skills.

Uptake at endline shows the package addressed real needs: 143/180 (79%) parents report applying PP practices; 131/180 (73%) report abandoning corporal punishment; 114/180 (63%) renounce psychological violence. Children's lived experience also moved in the intended direction, with 130/180 (72%) reporting a caring, non-violent education (vs. ~59% at midterm). Among students, awareness and recall of life-skills remained high (37/45, 82% knew the competence pool; 34/45, 76% named ≥ 3 life-skills). Context shifts—particularly economic stressors—were met with a stronger emphasis on stress-management and caregiver (those responsible for the upbringing of the child) self-care in FGDs, without diluting core PP/NVE content. Target groups (parents/caregivers, children, teachers/schools, traditional and religious leaders, sensitized

families) remained appropriate, and community leaders’ requests to extend activities to harder-to-reach areas indicate demand for replication and further highlights the relevance of the project.

5.2 Coherence (Consistency)

Consistency between measures. REPEPPEN’s components—parent training, school clubs/child-friendly classrooms, community dialogues, and referral linkages—continued to reinforce one another, delivering coherent messages on non-violence and child rights across home, school, and community spaces.

Consistency within the implementing organisation and other initiatives The project remained aligned with PAORP-VWC’s child protection and GBV prevention portfolio and complemented national child-rights and school-discipline expectations (via GES engagement). Collaboration with Social Welfare, Police/DOVVSU, GHS, and traditional/religious leaders strengthened message consistency and eased referrals. Community radio and youth/school groups amplified diffusion. Parallel local initiatives generally strengthened REPEPPEN by echoing consistent norms; no policy conflicts were observed. Overall, district practices converged around a shared PP/NVE standard while respecting local cultural and faith contexts

5.3. Effectiveness

Project objective	Initial (actual) value	Target value (objective)	Value obtained at the mid-term stage	Endline value obtained
Parents and children in Mali, Ghana, Benin and Cameroon are applying the good practices they have learned to prevent or respond to child abuse.	Between 2019 and 2021, 5,284 cases of child abuse were recorded by the 4 partner organisations in the 4 countries.	By the end of the project, at least 2,000 cases of child abuse will be reported in the 13 project areas by trained agents or the sensitised population and passed on to the relevant services.	At midterm, 60 abuse/neglect cases had been referred.	At endline, due to improved inter-agency collaboration , 1.035 cases of violence has been reported
	About 80% of the parents surveyed in the 4 partner countries believe that "who is tough, loves" and thus justify violence against children.	At least 70% of the parents interviewed at the end of the project said that they gave up corporal punishment in their upbringing.	At midterm, 89.73% of parents surveyed at the midterm of the project said they had abandoned corporal punishment in their education.	At endline, 79% of parents out of 180 interviewed (96m and 84w) confirmed they have been applying positive parenting practices.
	The 4 implementing partners GRADEM, PAORP-VWC, ESGB and CIPCRE-Cameroon rarely and only on KiRA's advice exchange with each	The 4 implementing partners GRADEM, PAORP-VWC, ESGB and CIPCRE-Cameroon regularly exchange with each other on their work on children's rights and systematically share their approaches,	At midterm, regular monthly meetings and two regional meeting in Benin and Cameroon had taken place.	At endline, the regular monthly meetings and one regional conference in Ghana (adding to the two previous regional conferences) took place. Also a common publication on

	other, although they face similar issues.	publications and questions.		REPEPPEN good practices was published.
--	---	-----------------------------	--	--

Sub-objectives	Indicators			
	Initial (actual) value	Target value (objective)	Value obtained at the mid-term stage	Endline value obtained
1. Leaders in the 13 project areas are able to implement locally adapted mechanisms to promote positive parenting and non-violent education.	In 2/4 project countries (Benin, Cameroon), specific tools have been developed to prevent violence in schools and leisure centres (codes of conduct). But there are no specific tools for the protection of children in families, nor codes of conduct for parents and traditional leaders.	By the end of the project, at least 2 community mechanisms are in place in each of the 4 project countries to promote positive parenting and non-violent education (trained parent delegates, community charters for child protection, etc.)	At mid-term, 4 mechanisms had been developed on Positive Parenting Monitoring Guide, radio broadcasts, Life skills pool for students and traditional leaders	At endline, 4 mechanisms have been developed on Positive Parenting Monitoring Guide, radio broadcasts, life skills pool for students and traditional leaders
	Decentralised state services (justice, public health, social work, local administration, security forces, etc.) still need specific legislative knowledge, didactic tools and good practice in case management to accompany and prosecute children and families in their respective fields of competence. Often there is still a lack of coordination between services for the proper exercise of their roles.	At least 90 representatives of different decentralised state services have strengthened their skills in knowledge of the law, use of didactic tools and good practice in case management, and have jointly identified and defined possibilities for collaboration in the protection and support of the children concerned.	At midterm, 18 decentralized state agency representatives' capacity had been strengthened and encourage on good practice for the implementation of the legal framework on positive parenting and non-violent education.	At endline, 18 decentralized state agencies reported their capacity and skills have been strengthened in areas of law, on good practices relating to case management. Those agencies together identified and defined possibilities for collaboration so as to increasingly protect and support the children victim of violence.

Sub-objectives	Indicators			
	Initial (actual) value	Target value (objective)	Value obtained at the mid-term stage	Endline value obtained
	Local CSOs provide guidance to affected children and families and carry out advocacy and awareness-raising work on child protection. However, they lack specific legal knowledge and expertise in positive education methods, as well as didactic tools for dissemination and implementation of the law.	Representatives of 145 CSOs in local child protection networks have specific legal knowledge and expertise in positive education methods, as well as didactic tools to disseminate and implement the law.	At mid-term, 18 CSOs in local child protection networks had received specific training on legal knowledge and expertise in positive education methods, as well as didactic tools to disseminate and implement the law.	At endline, 22 CSOs in local child protection networks have received specific legal knowledge and expertise in positive education methods, as well as didactic tools to disseminate and implement the law.
2. 8,700 children and adolescents in the project countries have life skills that enable them to promote positive behaviour at school, in the family and in the community.	<p>In all four intervention countries, violence prevention mechanisms have been set up in some schools.</p> <p>However, in the 58 project schools, there are no specific programmes to develop life skills for children/adolescents, e.g. to better protect themselves against violence or to claim children's rights.</p>	By the end of the second year of the project, 58 schools in the 4 project countries have 58 life skills clubs, with a total of 290 active members.	At midterm, 9 life-skills clubs had been established with a total of 180 active members	At endline, 4,480 students reported participating in the 9 life -skills club.
	Students in the intervention areas generally do not know how to actively engage in non-violence at school and in the family.	8,700 students in the 58 schools are provided with daily skills to actively engage in non-violence at school and at home.	At midterm, 45 students' representatives had reported to actively engage in non-violence at school and at home	At endline, 84.5% of the students interviewed confirmed to actively engage in non-violence at school and home.

Sub-objectives	Indicators			
	Initial (actual) value	Target value (objective)	Value obtained at the mid-term stage	Endline value obtained
	3 out of 4 children in the project area are subjected to violent discipline. Therefore, they usually do not experience positive educational measures or self-protection mechanisms themselves.	70% of the children interviewed at the end of the project in the 13 intervention areas can name at least 3 good practices for non-violence in education and for their own protection.	At midterm, 59% of the 126 children surveyed had reported having received a caring and non-violent upbringing.	At endline, 72% of 180 children interviewed confirmed they have received caring and non-violence education.
3. Internationally transferable approaches to promoting positive parenting and non-violent education have been tested and disseminated in Mali, Benin, Ghana and Cameroon.	There are 3 general good practice guides on child protection from KiRA and its partners. 3 of the 4 partner organisations have specific documents on positive parenting (CIPCRE-Cameroon, ESGB) and corporal punishment (GRADEM), but each does not replicate the approaches of the other organisations and has not been tested for transferability to other contexts.	A common good practice guide on positive parenting and non-violent education, based on the common experiences of the 4 partner organisations, is made available to at least 300 child protection actors in the 4 project countries.	At midterm, 2 regional meetings were held and a common good practices guide sheets were shared between the implementing partners.	At endline, 1 regional meeting (making 3 in the project period) was held and a common good practice manual was produced and distributed to relevant stakeholders.

5.3.1 Parents who renounce psychological violence (GEN RECAP)

Table 3: Parents who renounce psychological violence (GEN RECAP)

Group	Yes (n)	No (n)	Total (N)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Women	62	25	87	71%	29%
Men	52	41	93	56%	44%
Overall	114	66	180	63%	37%

At endline, 114 of 180 parents (63%) reported renouncing psychological violence; among women this was 62 of 87 (71%) and among men 52 of 93 (56%). This signals a meaningful shift toward calmer communication.

Compared with midterm, when shouting/insults were common in narratives, the endline level suggests a moderate improvement while about one in three caregivers still need support to fully abandon psychological aggression (Table 3).

5.3.2: Parents applying ≥ 2 positive parenting practices (GEN RECAP)

Table 4: Parents applying ≥ 2 positive parenting practices (GEN RECAP)

Group	Yes (n)	No (n)	Total (N)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Women	67	17	84	80%	20%
Men	76	20	96	79%	21%
Overall	143	37	180	79%	21%

Overall, 143 of 180 parents (79%) report applying at least two positive parenting practices; women 67/84 (80%) and men 76/96 (79%). This indicates that positive routines—active listening, clear rules, praise, and calm reasoning—have become mainstream. Relative to midterm, the pattern reflects consolidation rather than novelty, with practices now embedded in daily family interactions (Table 4).

5.3.3: Parents who abandoned corporal punishment (GEN RECAP)

Table 5: Parents who abandoned corporal punishment (GEN RECAP)

Group	Yes (n)	No (n)	Total (N)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Women	62	26	88	70%	30%
Men	69	23	92	75%	25%
Overall	131	49	180	73%	27%

A total of 131 of 180 parents (73%) say they have abandoned corporal punishment; this is 62/88 (70%) among women and 69/92 (75%) among men. Compared with midterm, when ~78% reported not hitting a child in the previous six months, the endline figure indicates sustained progress under a stricter criterion ('abandonment' vs. recent non-use). About 27% however still remain to be reached (Table 5).

5.3.4: Children reporting caring/non-violent education (GEN RECAP)

Table 6: Children reporting caring/non-violent education (GEN RECAP)

Group	Yes (n)	No (n)	Total (N)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Girls	77	26	103	75%	25%
Boys	53	24	77	69%	31%
Overall	130	50	180	72%	28%

Children's reports of a caring, non-violent education stand at 130 of 180 (72.2%): girls 77/103 (75%) and boys 53/77 (69%). This marks a strong improvement from midterm (~59%), suggesting a better home-school climate and fewer fear-based responses. The sex gap implies continued attention to how boys are disciplined and engaged (Table 6).

5.3.5: Student – life-skills knowledge and behaviors (FGDs)

Table 7: Student – life-skills knowledge and behaviors (FGDs)

Indicator	YES (n)	NO (n)	Total (n)	YES (%)	NO (%)
Heard of life-skills	45	0	45	100%	0%
Know competence pool at school	37	8	45	82%	18%
Can name ≥3 life-skills	34	11	45	76%	24%
Can list ≥5 positive behaviours	45	0	45	100%	0%
If victim: can name ≥3 positive behaviours	36	9	45	80%	20%

Student life-skills literacy is high: all 45 heard of life-skills (100%); 37/45 (82%) know the competence pool at school; 34/45 (76%) can name three or more life-skills; all 45 (100%) can list five positive behaviours; and 36/45 (80%) can name at least three positive responses if victimized. Compared with midterm, practical recall of 'what to do' has strengthened, reflecting effective clubs and assemblies (Table 7).

5.3.6. Student sentiment toward competence pool (FGDs; n=45)

Table 8. Student sentiment toward competence pool (FGDs; n=45)

Sentiment	Count (n)	Percent (%)
Positive pole	25	55.5%
Mostly positive	13	29%
Mostly negative	0	0%
Negative pole	7	15,5%

Overall sentiment toward the competence pool is positive: 25 of 45 respondents (56%) express clearly positive views, 13/45 (29%) are mostly positive, and only 7/45 (16%) hold negative views; none fall in the 'mostly negative' category. Those with negative perceptions mainly see the pool as too restrictive, suggesting that increasing student-led activities could help address their concerns (Table 8).

5.3.7: Traditional/Religious Leaders – knowledge of good practices (FGDs)

Table 9: Traditional/Religious Leaders (per zone) – knowledge of good practices (FGDs)

Zone	Could list ≥5 practices (n)	Zone Total (N)	Zone %
Gushegu	8	10	80%
Zabzugu	10	10	100%
Tatale	10	10	100%
Overall	28	30	93%

Leaders' knowledge of good practices by zone is near-universal: Gushegu 8/10 (80%), Zabzugu 10/10 (100%), and Tatala 10/10 (100%); overall 28/30 (93%). Compared with midterm's rising endorsement, endline shows codified knowledge that supports community norm change (Table 9).

5.3.8: Families – attitude toward the project (FGDs)

Table 10: Families – attitude toward the project (FGDs)

Attitude	n	Total (N)	%
Positive pole	18	45	40%
Mostly positive	22	45	49%
Mostly negative	0	45	0%
Negative pole	5	45	11%

Families' attitudes toward the project are overwhelmingly favourable: 18/45 (40%) positive pole and 22/45 (49%) mostly positive, with 5/45 (11%) negative. This is slightly better than midterm narratives and suggests readiness to continue PP/NVE, with residual concerns tied to time and economic stress.

5.3.9. Parents – could mention ≥3 PP modules (FGDs)

Table 11. Parents – could mention ≥3 PP modules (FGDs)

Group	YES (n)	NO (n)	Total (n)	YES (%)	NO (%)
Women	23	0	23	100%	0%
Men	22	0	22	100%	0%
Total	45	0	45	100%	0%

All sensitized families (45/45; 100%) could mention at least three PP modules. This reflects clear message retention and an improvement from midterm, when recall was strong but not universal.

At endline, all target groups confirmed clear and sustained positive changes resulting from the project's activities:

- **Traditional and Religious Leaders** highlighted that the PP/NVE approach has now become part of regular community messaging with them consistently integrating positive parenting guidance into sermons, mosque announcements, community forums, and cultural events such as the Fire Festival and Damba Festival, helping thus to normalize non-violent discipline across villages.
- **Students** reported continued and strengthened behavioural improvements. They expressed greater confidence in identifying non-violent responses, understanding why corporal punishment is harmful, and practicing respectful communication both at home and in school.

Overall, the endline findings show that the project led to deepened behavioural change across the districts:

- **Shift in Parenting Practices:** A high proportion of caregivers now use positive, non-violent disciplinary methods, replacing shouting or hitting with calm reasoning, listening, and consistent rules. This signals that the project's messages have moved from awareness to long-term adoption.

- **Stronger Community Engagement:** The active participation of leaders, parents, families, and school structures has reinforced collective responsibility for child protection. Communities increasingly recognize and uphold children’s rights, with local champions helping to sustain momentum.
- **Improved Child Well-being:** Children report feeling safer, more supported, and more understood. This improved home–school climate has contributed to better behaviour, emotional stability, and stronger academic engagement.

These endline outcomes confirm that the project’s strategies were effective, well-accepted, and capable of driving meaningful and lasting change in parenting norms and child protection practices

5.4 Efficiency

The project demonstrated good efficiency, with the resources having been used appropriately and considering the satisfactory balance observed between the results achieved and the means deployed in this regard. Financial management procedures were applied consistently, enabling cost control, transparent reporting, and rational use of funds.

Use of Resources and Cost–Benefit Ratio

Key expenditures, training and facilitation, monitoring, community sensitization, and data collection, were directly tied to the project’s outputs. The cost–benefit ratio was favourable: investments in capacity-building and community engagement translated into measurable improvements in parenting practices and reduced acceptance of violent discipline. Shared technical resources across districts also kept operational costs within expected limits.

Contribution of Target Groups

Caregivers, teachers, and community gatekeepers played an important role in mobilization and activity delivery, reducing logistical costs and improving efficiency. Their participation strengthened ownership and facilitated smoother implementation.

Regional Nature of the Project

While multi-district implementation created additional logistical demands, the regional approach ultimately improved efficiency through standardised tools, shared expertise, and economies of scale.

5.5 Overarching developmental impact

Table 12. Impact of the project

Overall objective	Indicators			
	Initial value (actual)	Target value (objective)	Value obtained at the mid-term stage	Endline value obtained
Positive parenting and non-violent education are increasingly becoming a reality in families and schools	On average, three out of four children aged 2-14 experience violence at	70% of the children surveyed at the end of the project say they have received a	59% of children report experiencing a more caring and non-violent education.	72% of children reported experiencing a more caring and non-violent education, reflecting a continued

Overall objective	Indicators			
	Initial value (actual)	Target value (objective)	Value obtained at the mid-term stage	Endline value obtained
in Mali, Ghana, Benin and Cameroon..	school and at home..	caring and non-violent education.		positive shift from the midterm findings

5.5.2 Model character, structure-building and broad impact

- **Model character.** A participatory, multi-site model (home–school–community) that equips parents/caregivers, leaders, and students as co-messengers of PP/NVE. Endline evidence shows this model travels well across districts while staying culturally resonant.
- **Structure-building.** Practical assets—PP manuals, image charts, school clubs, community radio slots, and leader sermons—form a light, durable infrastructure for continued diffusion and refreshers.
- **Broad impact.** Beyond individual households, shifts in community discourse (leaders’ 93% ability to list ≥ 5 good practices; 28/30) and family attitudes toward positive, non-violent caregiving (89% positive/mostly positive) indicate norm movement toward non-violence and dignity.

5.5.3 Other (possibly negative) effects and persistent challenges

- **Residual psychological aggression:** 66/180 (37%) parents/caregivers have not yet renounced psychological violence. As a result targeted coaching on emotion regulation and non-violent communication remains necessary.
- **Gender and age nuances:** Boys reported slightly lower on caring/non-violent experience (69%) than girls (75%). This shows the need to continue father-focused engagement and boy-inclusive pedagogy.
- **Economic stressors:** Inflation and transport costs occasionally reduce participation and patience at home; couple PP with stress management/self-care and link to social support where feasible.
- **Referral follow-through:** Mechanisms exist but are uneven; improve case tracking and transport coordination with Social Welfare/Police/GHS.

Bottom line: The programme met its child-level cornerstone ($\geq 70\%$ children experience caring/non-violent education) and locked in broad behavioural change among parents/caregivers, with strong community and school reinforcement. To sustain and deepen gains it is necessary to prioritize psychological non-violence, male-caregiver engagement (as they strongly shape discipline norms and considering boys’ slightly lower scores highlighted above), and referral follow-through, while preserving the low-cost structures (clubs, leader advocacy, and practical PP job-aids) that now anchor norm change.

5.6 Sustainability

At endline, sustainability prospects are good given strong norm uptake. The task now is to lock in these behaviours through light, recurring supports and institutional anchors.

5.6.1. Durability of the positive effects

- **Human & social development.** Community ownership is visible: traditional/religious leaders routinely integrate PP/NVE into sermons and gatherings; school clubs keep life-skills active; parents report routine use of calm reasoning, praise, and clear rules. These low-cost, habit-based practices are inherently durable if periodically refreshed.
- **“Social environment” sustainability.** Non-violent norms now appear across multiple spaces—home, school, faith/community venues—creating a supportive social ecology for children that is less dependent on project staff and more on local champions (teachers, leaders, peer groups).

5.6.2. Risks and potential for sustainable effectiveness

- **Target group level.** A minority (about 37%) has not fully renounced psychological aggression; boys report slightly lower caring environments (69%) than girls (**75%). Mitigation:
 - Booster micro-sessions (60–90 minutes) focused on emotion regulation & non-violent communication, with male-caregiver cohorts and father role-model sessions (as men are often less actively involved in parenting programmes despite their central role in decision-making and discipline practices in many households).
 - Keep student clubs active with peer champions; integrate brief role-plays on help-seeking and by-stander skills.
 - Use community radio reminders (monthly slots) and WhatsApp/SMS nudges to reinforce key behaviours.
- **Socio-economic pressures.** Inflation and livelihood stress can erode patience and meeting attendance. Mitigation:
 - Pair PP/NVE boosters with stress-management/self-care modules and signpost to existing social support schemes.
 - Schedule sessions around market/religious calendars; keep formats short and local to minimize cost.

Overall, the project has fostered a **peace-supportive community climate**—reduced violence, improved communication and trust—conducive to children’s healthy development. Maintaining this climate relies on **routine, low-burden** practices (evening check-ins, calm problem-solving) that require **no special resources**, only **periodic prompts**.

6. Cross-cutting issues

A number of cross-cutting themes continued to shape implementation and results at endline across Gushegu, Tatala, and Zabzugu.

6.1. Gender perspective

- **Progress with gaps:** Children reporting a caring, non-violent education reached 72% (130/180) overall, with girls 75% (77/103) and boys 69% (53/77). The 6-point gap suggests boys still encounter slightly harsher responses or less emotional engagement.
- **Drivers:** Father engagement through leader sermons and male role-modeling helped lift men’s abandonment of corporal punishment (75% vs. women 70%), yet psychological non-violence lags more among men (56% renunciation vs. women 71%).

6.2. Inclusion & equity of access

- **Language and literacy:** Endline used local-language facilitation (e.g., Dagbani) and visual job-aids (manuals, image charts), improving reach for low-literacy caregivers.
- **Hard-to-reach groups:** Community radio, school clubs, and leader platforms extend coverage; residual negatives (11% in family attitudes) link more to time and economic stress than rejection—keep formats short, local, and timed around market/religious calendars.
- **Disability inclusion:** Materials and sessions were accessible in practice through oral facilitation; formal disability-friendly adaptations (large print, simple iconography) should be scaled.

6.3. Contribution to organizational goals

REPEPPEN's endline outcomes reinforce PAORP-VWC's mandate to reduce violence against women and children and strengthen child welfare. Evidence of routine PP practices (79%), widespread leader ownership (93%), and child-level gains (72%) enhances PAORP-VWC's credibility, supports policy dialogue with GES and Social Welfare, and provides a replicable, light-cost model (job-aids, radio, clubs) for scale-up.

7. Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

The endline evaluation confirms that REPEPPEN has shifted everyday norms and practices toward positive parenting (PP) and non-violent education (NVE) across Gushegu, Zabzugu and Tatale. Results show broad behavioural adoption at home, reinforcement in schools, and strong community ownership:

- **Children's lived experience improved:** 130/180 (72%) of children report a caring, non-violent education—meeting the project objective and rising from ~59% at midterm.
- **Caregiver/parents practices consolidated:** 131/180 (73%) report abandoning corporal punishment; 143/180 (79%) apply ≥2 PP practices; 114/180 (63%) have renounced psychological violence (women 71%, men 56%).
- **School and community anchors are working:** Students demonstrate high life-skills literacy (e.g., 100% can list ≥5 positive behaviours; 80% know ≥3 safe responses if victim). Traditional and religious leaders can list ≥5 good practices (93%, 28/30) and families' attitudes toward positive, non-violent caregiving are largely favourable (89% positive/mostly positive).

At the same time, gaps persist: about 37% of parents/caregivers have not yet renounced psychological aggression; boys report slightly lower caring environments (69%) than girls (75%); and case-referral follow-through remains uneven under economic stress. These are manageable, targeted gaps. Overall, the model—parent coaching, school clubs, leader advocacy, and light media—has proven effective, culturally resonant, and cost-sensible, providing a credible basis for consolidation and scale-up.

7.2 Recommendations

- To sustain the progress achieved and address the remaining gaps, the project should focus on light, continuous follow-up activities that help families, schools, and community leaders keep practicing positive parenting and non-violent education. The main priority is to deepen change around psychological violence, which still affects more than a third of households. Caregivers can be supported through short refresher sessions that teach simple skills like calming strategies, managing stress, and communicating better with adolescents.

- Because men showed lower shifts in some areas, such as psychological non-violence, and boys continue to report slightly less caring environments than girls, it will be important to keep engaging fathers and male caregivers. Short peer discussions in mosques, churches, and community spaces could help men reflect on discipline practices and strengthen their role as positive models for children.
- Schools should remain a driving force in sustaining these gains. Teachers can continue integrating positive discipline into classroom routines, child clubs can keep championing respect and safety, and students should retain spaces where they can speak up about their concerns. Ensuring these school structures remain active would help reinforce behaviour change at home.
- Another area needing improvement is follow-through on child protection cases. A simple, easy-to-use referral log shared between schools and Social Welfare could help ensure that children who report abuse actually receive support. Occasional check-ins from local actors (schools, Social Welfare, Police/DOWVSU, and health workers) would strengthen coordination.
- Community reminders should continue through low-cost channels such as radio messages, festival sermons, and simple job-aids for leaders. These keep the conversation alive and help families remember key practices.
- Finally, all activities should remain accessible; using local languages, images for low-literacy participants, and scheduling that does not conflict with market days or religious gatherings. A small set of routine indicators can be tracked to guide improvements, especially around psychological non-violence, parent behaviour, school activities, and case follow-up.

Bottom line: The project met its child-level objective and embedded non-violent norms across home, school, and community. With targeted boosters (especially for psychological non-violence and male engagement considering the central role men play in decision-making and discipline practices in many households), school-based institutionalization, and simple referral coordination, the observed gains are well-placed to persist and deepen beyond the project cycle.

Annexes

Annex 1: Comparison between Midterm evaluation findings and final evaluation figures

Indicator	Midterm (n/N, %)	Endline (n/N, %)	Change (pp)	Attribution to REPEPEN	Notes
Children reporting caring/non-violent education	74/126, 59%	130/180, 72.2%	+21.1	Strong	Consistent school/community sensitization; improved dialogue at home and in classrooms.
Parents not using corporal punishment (proxy)	114/147, 77.6%	131/180, 73%	-4.6	Moderate-Strong	Different operationalization: midterm = “no hitting in last 6 months”; endline = “abandoned corporal punishment” (stricter). Apparent dip reflects stricter criterion; overall trend remains positive.
Parents renouncing psychological violence	N/A (itemized behaviours only)	114/180, 63%	N/A	Moderate	Endline composite vs. midterm items (e.g., shouting/insults); not directly comparable.
Parents applying ≥2 positive parenting practices	N/A	143/180, 79%	N/A	Strong	Midterm tracked confidence/use proxies; endline adds concrete ≥2-practice threshold.
Girls reporting caring/non-violent education	N/A	77/103, 75%	N/A	Moderate-Strong	New sex-disaggregated read at endline.
Boys reporting caring/non-violent education	N/A	53/77, 69%	N/A	Moderate-Strong	Slight gap vs. girls indicates need for boy-friendly engagement/father modules.
Students can name ≥3 life-skills	N/A (rights understanding ~60%)	34/45, 76%	N/A	Strong	Midterm used a different construct (rights knowledge); endline tests concrete recall.
Students (if victim) can name ≥3 positive responses	N/A	36/45, 80%	N/A	Strong	Practical help-seeking knowledge consolidated through clubs/assemblies.
Student sentiment: positive/mostly positive toward competence pool	N/A	38/45, 84.4%	N/A	Moderate-Strong	Endline sentiment measure; 7/45 (15.6%) negative—candidate group for tailored mentoring.

Traditional/Religious leaders who can list ≥5 good practices	N/A (rising endorsement qualitatively)	28/30, 93%	N/A	Strong	Skills codified at endline; midterm captured shift in discourse, not skill listing.
Families: positive/mostly positive attitude to initiative	N/A	40/45, 88.9%	N/A	Strong	Strong community buy-in; residual negatives linked to time/economic stress.
Families who can mention ≥3 PP modules	N/A	45/45, 100%	N/A	Strong	Universal recall among sensitized families at endline.