External Evaluation of GOJoven Youth Leadership in Sexual and Reproductive Health Program

FINAL REPORT

by

J. Solomon Consulting, LLC

Authors:
Julie Solomon, Ph.D.
Kristin Bard
Jacqueline Berman, Ph.D.
Gwendolyn Smith, MPA

September 4, 2012

GOJoven Youth Leadership in Sexual and Reproductive Health Program

THE SUMMIT FOUNDATION

PUBLIC HEALTH INSTITUTE®

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements iii

List of Acronyms iv

I. Introduction 1

II. Study Design and Methodology 4

II.A. Research Questions 4

II.B. Use of In-Country Evaluation Consultants 5

II.C. Data Collection Methods 5

II.D. Data Analysis Methods 6

II.E. Principal Study Limitations 7

II.F. Protection of Confidentiality in the Report 7

III. Primary Findings: Outputs and Outcomes 8

III.A. Programming Outputs 8

III.B. Outcomes: Individual Level 10

III.B.1. Primary Outcomes 10

III.B.2. Moderating Factors 18

III.C. Outcomes: Organizational Level 19

III.C.1. Primary Outcomes 19

III.C.2. Moderating Factors 26

III.D. Outcomes: Community Level 26

III.D.1. Primary Outcomes 26

III.D.2. Moderating Factors 30

III.E. Outcomes: National and Regional Level 30

III.E.1. Primary Outcomes 30

III.E.2. Moderating Factors 32

III.F. Summary 32

IV. Promising Practices 35

V. Principal Challenges 39

VI. Recommendations 43

TABLE OF CONTENTS- *continued*

References..... 49

Appendices..... *

Appendix A. Maps Showing Locations of GOJoven Cohorts: 2004-2011..... *

Appendix B. GOJoven Logic Model (2010)..... *

Appendix C. Detailed Evaluation Methodology..... *

Appendix D. Alumni Survey (Spanish)..... *

Appendix E. Organizational Survey (Spanish)..... *

Appendix F. Organizational Survey (English)..... *

*** All appendices are provided in a separate document available at http://www.summitfdn.org.**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report would like to acknowledge the important contributions of multiple parties to the external evaluation, including: **additional external evaluation team members** Thomas Goldring and Alberto Colorado; **in-country evaluation consultants (GOJoven alumni)** Nancy Leiva (Belize), Esther Barajas (Guatemala), Ivonne Díaz del Valle Oliva (Honduras), and Justo Rojas López (Mexico); Lemuel Manases Mena Vega (GOJoven alumnus, Mexico), who provided assistance to Mr. Rojas López with several in-country evaluation consultant tasks; **GOJoven Country Representatives** Eva Burgos (Belize)**,** Rudy Felipe Pocop (Guatemala)**,** Claudia Vanessa Siliezar Turcios (Honduras), and Nayeli Karina de la Torre García (Mexico)**; additional in-country GOJoven staff** Gloria Avila (Belize), Omar Lucio Rodriguez (Belize), and José Arturo Patzán Tzay (Guatemala); **Public Health Institute (PHI) staff** Esther Tahrir, Josie Ramos, Denise Dunning, Anya Gutman, Marian Alonso, and Julia Zeuli; **Summit Foundation** Senior Program Officer Kathy Hall and Consultant Kathy Toner; and the **other GOJoven Fellows (alumni), representatives of GOJoven-affiliated organizations, and key opinion leaders/bellwether organizations in ASRHR** who participated in surveys, interviews, focus groups, and other evaluation activities.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ASRH	adolescent and youth sexual and reproductive health
ASRHR	adolescent and youth sexual and reproductive health and rights
BO	bellwether organization
ICC	in-country evaluation consultant
IS	Institutional Strengthening (used in the terms “IS Workshop” and “IS Project”)
KAS	knowledge, attitudes, and skills
KOL	key opinion leader
LAP	Leadership Action Plan
LGBT	lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
NGO	non-governmental organization
PHI	Public Health Institute
MSC	Most Significant Change (qualitative evaluation technique)
SMART	specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time-framed (used in the term “SMART objectives”)
SRH	sexual and reproductive health
TOT	Training of Trainers (GOJoven program component)

I. INTRODUCTION

In Mexico and Central America, adolescents face high risks of early pregnancy; sexually transmitted infections (STIs), including HIV; intimate partner violence; unsafe abortions; and poor birth outcomes (Remez et al., 2008; UNFPA & PRB, 2010). Since 2003, the Public Health Institute (PHI) in Oakland, California has responded to these challenges by implementing the GOJoven Youth Leadership in Sexual and Reproductive Health Program (hereafter GOJoven). Funded by the Summit Foundation since 2004, GOJoven supports the development of young leaders as catalysts for social change to improve and expand adolescent and youth sexual and reproductive health and rights (ASRHR) choices, programs, services, and policies in Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and Quintana Roo, Mexico. The program also seeks to strengthen the institutional enabling environment for the young leaders' work.

One of the central components of the program is the GOJoven Fellowship. On an annual basis, GOJoven selects teams of five to six young leaders (Fellows[1]) from each participating country. To be selected, Fellows must be between 18 and 30 years old; have a personal interest in and commitment to improving ASRHR; and have at least two years of professional experience in one or more of the following areas: sexual and reproductive health (SRH) and rights; youth development; gender and women's empowerment; sustainable development, environment, and conservation; community mobilization and development; and media. Since early in its history, the annual Fellow selection has targeted specific geographic areas within each focus country. Staff select each cohort of Fellows from just one or a few districts (Belize), departments[2] (Guatemala, Honduras), or municipalities (Quintana Roo, Mexico) in each respective country to help facilitate communication and collaboration among cohort members (see Appendix A).

The GOJoven Fellowship is a voluntary (i.e., unpaid) leadership development experience. During the Fellowship year, Fellows participate in a series of intensive training workshops, receive coaching, and have access to personal development funds. In addition, each country's cohort of Fellows assesses the ASRHR status in their country or local geographic area and designs a Leadership Action Plan (LAP) to improve ASRHR-related programs, services, or policies. Through the LAP, Fellows have the opportunity to apply knowledge and skills they have learned in GOJoven trainings in areas such as community needs and assets assessment, program planning, negotiation and conflict resolution, and building alliances and networks to advocate for change. GOJoven makes a small amount of funding available to each LAP team to cover project expenses. As alumni, Fellows implement their LAPs and are encouraged to remain active in GOJoven. They are afforded ongoing opportunities to engage in national and international training and networking activities as well as funding (scholarships) to support their formal education. Alumni are invited to help interview, select and orient new GOJoven Fellows; attend Training of Trainers (TOT) workshops; co-facilitate training sessions; and help plan national and regional[3] events. Through participation in GOJoven's network of emerging and established leaders in the region, Fellows support and strengthen their own and one another's capacity to create change in the area of ASRHR.

Another key component of GOJoven is Institutional Strengthening (IS). GOJoven provides Institutional Strengthening (IS) Workshops and one-year IS Project grants to increase local organizations' ASRHR-

[1] In this report, "Fellow" is used as a cover term that includes both: (a) young people who are in the Fellowship year ("current Fellows") and (b) those who have completed their Fellowship year and not dropped out of or been expelled from GOJoven ("alumni").
[2] In this report, the terms "department" and "departmental" are used to refer to a territorial unit in Guatemala and Honduras, not to a unit within an organization, unless otherwise indicated by a qualifier, such as in the phrase "government department."
[3] In this report, "regional" refers to the Mexico/Central America region as a whole.

related capacities and programming. Together, Fellows, their organizations, and other institutions work to effect positive change in ASRHR-related services and policies at the local, national, and regional levels.[4]

Through 2009, GOJoven was an exclusively Spanish-language program. In 2010, GOJoven continued their Spanish-language program in Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico only. In Belize, GOJoven planned an English-language pilot project, which PHI launched in 2011.

GOJoven has to date received Summit Foundation funding for three implementation phases: Phase I (2004-2006); Phase II (2007-2009); and Phase III (2010-2012). The World Bank provided additional funding for IS Workshop and IS Projects in three GOJoven countries (Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras) for 2011. Since 2004, PHI has conducted internal evaluation activities to track GOJoven's programmatic outputs and selected short-term outcomes focused largely on changes in Fellows' knowledge and skills. These have included surveys of and focus groups with Fellows, interviews with GOJoven-linked organizations, and participant-observation activities at GOJoven convenings.

In 2011, the Summit Foundation commissioned a nine-month external evaluation of GOJoven that had the following three objectives:

1) Increase understanding of outcomes associated with GOJoven at multiple levels (individual, organizational, community, and national/regional).
2) Inform the design and implementation of other multi-national ASRHR youth leadership development programs.
3) Support planning for GOJoven's fourth phase (to begin in 2013).

Summit selected J. Solomon Consulting, LLC to conduct the external evaluation. J. Solomon Consulting's key guiding principles for the evaluation included:

- Draw on diverse frameworks and approaches, including a *theory of change* approach (Gutiérrez & Tasse, 2007); elements of the *Most Significant Change (MSC)* technique, a qualitative, participatory evaluation approach that involves the collection of "stories of change" (Davies & Dart, 2005; Serrat, 2009); and an *open-systems perspective* that considers (to the extent permitted by the available data) how moderating factors, such as demographic characteristics, as well as structural, environmental, social, and cultural factors, may affect outcomes (Grove et al., 2007).
- Identify research questions and outcome indicators that reflected the GOJoven *logic model* developed by PHI in 2010 (see Appendix B) and to leverage other existing GOJoven evaluation-related resources, including *internal evaluation* data and analyses.
- To employ a *participatory process* (Cullen et al., 2011; Weaver & Cousins, 2004) in which PHI, Summit, GOJoven Fellows, and other stakeholders would have the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the planning and execution of the evaluation, while preserving the independent, external nature of the research process and products.
- To include a *gender focus*, including assessment of Fellow gender as a potential moderator of individual-level outcomes.

[4] For a more detailed description of GOJoven program components, see http://www.goven.org.

The purposes of this report are to (1) describe GOJoven's outcomes, based on a document review, interviews, surveys, MSC stories and discussion, and other methodologies, (2) identify GOJoven's major challenges, (3) suggest promising practices in the field of youth leadership development and ASRHR programming, and (4) offer a set of recommendations as inputs for GOJoven's next phase of work. The rest of this report is organized as follows: **Section II** provides a brief overview of the evaluation methodologies – data collected, analytical approaches, and study limitations – used to inform the findings and recommendations. **Section III** discusses the primary programming outputs and outcomes of GOJoven at the individual, organizational, community, and national/regional levels. **Section IV** and **Section V** summarize GOJoven's promising practices and key challenges, respectively. Finally, **Section VI** offers recommendations to Summit, PHI, and GOJoven designed to inform planning for GOJoven's next phase.

II. STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The external evaluation was carried out during the period late September 2011 to June 2012. It took a largely retrospective approach, focusing on the period 2004 to (February) 2012, and sought to reflect GOJoven's existing logic model, developed in 2010 (see Appendix B). The evaluation research questions, use of in-country consultants, data collection and analysis methods, and principal limitations are summarized briefly below. Further details are provided in a full methodological description in Appendix C.

II.A. Research Questions

J. Solomon Consulting developed the principal evaluation research questions (shown in Table 1, below), based on the Summit Foundation's request for proposals and subsequent input from Summit and PHI. The research questions reflect the three objectives of the evaluation (summarized above in Section I) and place particular focus on outcomes at the following levels:

- *Individual:* Fellows, both during the Fellowship year and subsequently as alumni.
- *Organizational:* In-country non-governmental organizations, government departments, schools, and other entities, particularly those where Fellows have studied or worked (for pay or as volunteers) and/or that have been affiliated with GOJoven through IS Projects, IS Workshops, and LAPs.
- *Community:* Youth, families, opinion leaders, media, political bodies, and other stakeholder groups in towns, municipalities, departments, districts, or other sub-national regions (sub-state regions, in the case of Quintana Roo) where Fellows live and/or work.
- *National/Regional:* Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and Quintana Roo (Mexico), and the Mexico/Central America region as a whole.

Table 1. Principal Evaluation Research Questions

Level	Principal Research Question
Individual	1. What knowledge, attitudes, and skills (KAS) have fellows gained through GOJoven? 2. How have alumni applied their knowledge, attitudes, and skills (KAS) to improve ASRHR?
Organizational	3. How has GOJoven affected the capacity of organizations to address ASRHR?
Community	4. How has GOJoven affected ASRHR at the community level?
National/Regional	5. How have alumni and GOJoven-linked organizations been involved in promoting ASRHR at the national or regional level?
Cross-Cutting	6. What are the key lessons learned (i.e., challenges and recommendations) for GOJoven and promising practices for the broader field?

It should be noted that the Summit Foundation also had interest to understand GOJoven's outcomes among Fellows' peers/family. While this level was not a principal focus of the evaluation, several of the data collection methodologies did include a focus on peer/family-related outcomes. Discussion of these outcomes has been grouped with the individual-level outcomes, since peer/family outcomes were mediated by and reported by Fellows.

GOJoven's logic model, which was created in 2010 by PHI (see Appendix B), was used as the basis for identifying sub-questions and associated indicator categories under each research question (see Appendix

C.) In brief, the model summarizes the principal problem that GOJoven is designed to address, the assumptions on which the program is based, the key contextual factors that are expected to influence program outputs and outcomes, and the program's guiding principles and overarching strategy. It also identifies key GOJoven activities and shows their linkages to desired short-term and intermediate outcomes at the individual and organizational levels, and long-term results and impact at the system (community and national/regional) levels.

II.B. Use of In-Country Evaluation Consultants

As was indicated above, four GOJoven alumni (one from each GOJoven country) served as in-country evaluation consultants (ICCs) to the external evaluation. The use of ICCs was designed to help ensure that: (a) validity of evaluation methods and instruments would be maximized; (b) participation of Fellows, organizations, and other in-country stakeholders in the evaluation would be maximized; (c) the evaluation-related experience, skills, and capacities of ICC alumni would be enhanced; and (d) data collection costs would be minimized, without compromising quality.

The ICCs developed maps that showed the territorial subdivisions that the 2004-2011 cohorts hailed from (see Appendix A) and assisted with many aspects of protocol and instrument development, data collection, and data entry. From the perspective of J. Solomon Consulting, ICC participation in the evaluation enhanced the evaluation processes and products as intended.

II.C. Data Collection Methods

As was noted above, the evaluation design employed a mix of quantitative, qualitative, and participatory data collection methods, including:

- *Systematic document review:* Review of 204 documents by the external evaluation team, including internal evaluation data (collected prospectively since GOJoven's inception), PHI annual and phase reports and newsletters, available media coverage, Leadership Action Plan (LAP) and Institutional Strengthening (IS) Project reports, and meeting minutes. PHI reviewed additional documents to provide input on programming output targets and accomplishments.
- *Spanish-language survey of alumni Fellows:* A pen-and-paper version for alumni (2004-2010 cohorts) who attended GOJoven National Meetings in early 2012 and a web-based version for alumni who did not attend the meetings (N=88, 77.9% response rate; see Appendix D for survey).
- *Spanish- and English-language survey of GOJoven-linked organizations:* A web-based survey of organizations affiliated with GOJoven—i.e., organizations that: (a) 2004-2010 cohort alumni have worked or studied at and/or (b) have implemented IS Projects, with 2006-2009 IS Project grants (N=53, 29.1% response rate; see Appendices E-F for surveys).
- *Interviews and focus group:* Interviews and focus groups in the four GOJoven countries with a total of five in-country GOJoven staff; four LAP teams; one to three beneficiaries of each of these LAPs; four organizational IS Project representatives; six GOJoven alumni Board members of the non-governmental organization (NGO) GOBelize, which has recently assumed management of GOJoven

Belize; and 29 key opinion leaders (KOLs) from ASRHR bellwether organizations (BOs)[5] in the GOJoven countries.

- *Collection of "Most Significant Change" (MSC) stories:* Fellows' written articulation (N=56) of the most significant changes they associated with GOJoven and facilitation of large-group discussions of these stories during the four GOJoven National Meetings in early 2012.

The director of the external evaluation spent over four weeks in GOJoven countries in early 2012, attending the four GOJoven National Meetings, conducting interviews and focus groups, and overseeing several ICC data collection activities.

As is noted above, the response rates for the alumni and organizational surveys were strikingly different: 77.9% for the former and 29.1% for the latter. Survey response rates have been shown to vary according to many factors, such as topic, medium of administration, whether potential respondents have prior knowledge that they will be contacted to participate in the survey, and numerous characteristics of the population being surveyed (Aday & Cornelius, 2006). Moreover, there is no overall consensus in the literature as to what constitutes an "acceptable" survey response rate (or even whether there should be a fixed "acceptable" response rate). Proposals concerning acceptable rates have varied according to factors such as study design and type of variables being investigated (Fewtrell et al., 2008). Given the context of the GOJoven external evaluation and the challenges inherent in trying to contact alumni who do not commonly participate in GOJoven activities, the external evaluation team would consider the alumni survey response rate to be very good. With respect to the organizational survey, while the external evaluation team would consider the response rate to be very low, it did exceed the expectation of at least one PHI evaluation stakeholder, who predicted a maximum 20% response rate, given such factors as organizational staff turnover, shut-down of some organizations, changes in organizational contact information, and limited contact by GOJoven staff with organizational leaders over time.

II.D. Data Analysis Methods

The evaluation team conducted a variety of types of analyses, according to the data sources. For the document review and MSC stories, the team used the qualitative software program NVivo to code the data and run analytic queries, from which themes and patterns were identified. The quantitative alumni and organizational survey data were analyzed using Excel. For the MSC group discussions, interviews, focus groups, and qualitative survey data, the external evaluation team developed a set of thematic matrices and manually coded the data to the matrix cells. The NVivo queries, Excel data tables, and thematic matrices were then used to develop thematic memos focused on the research questions. The memos triangulated multiple data sources to identify the principal findings best supported by the data; they also included author commentary, and specific examples, including quotes. At least two team members reviewed each memo independently, so that key patterns and themes could be identified iteratively, and differences of viewpoint among team members resolved. The memos served as the basis for the final report write-up.

[5] An *ASRHR bellwether organization* leads or influences trends in ASRHR policy and/or programming. ASRHR bellwether organizations in the four GOJoven countries were identified through discussions among GOJoven's Summit Foundation Program Officer, the GOJoven Director at PHI, and the GOJoven Country Representatives.

II.E. Principal Study Limitations

The principal limitations of the evaluation design and methods include: (1) the largely retrospective design, which precluded comprehensive pre/post assessments; (2) lack of a comparison group, which precluded systematic assessment of what changes might have occurred in the absence of GOJoven; and (3) convenience sampling for interviews and focus groups and the organizational survey's relatively low response rate, which precluded generalization of findings to the larger samples from which participants were drawn. For both the alumni and organizational surveys, it is important to bear in mind that respondents may have differed systematically from non-respondents with respect to their perceptions of the effects of GOJoven.

In spite of the limitations noted above (and others described in Appendix C), which are very common among "real world," retrospective evaluation studies, the available data yielded multiple robust findings concerning outcomes, challenges, and promising practices. In particular, the opportunity to draw on diverse quantitative and qualitative data sources and triangulate findings was a strength of the methodology.

II.F. Protection of Confidentiality in This Report

To ensure protection of individuals' and organizations' confidentiality, findings presented in this report are not associated with names of Fellows or organizations, or with other information that could uniquely identify Fellows or organizations, with three exceptions. The first exception applies to information that has already been made public through the mass media (radio, television, newspaper). The second exception is other information that is already a matter of public record, including job titles of several Fellows who have obtained official positions at the departmental, state, or national levels, and the fact that some alumni have founded NGOs in their countries. The third exception is instances in which permission has been obtained from the individual or organization to associate their name with the data in the report.

Due to application of this confidentiality policy, examples from open-ended alumni survey data and MSC stories and discussion are identified by country, but not by Fellow cohort or gender. However, the external evaluation team has confirmed that such examples—except where otherwise indicated—were generated by Fellows of diverse genders and cohorts.

III. PRIMARY FINDINGS

This section of the report describes GOJoven's outputs and the evaluation's findings regarding outcomes. It begins with a short discussion of GOJoven's primary programmatic outputs—the major GOJoven activities implemented and immediate beneficiaries reached—since its inception. It then presents the primary findings concerning GOJoven's outcomes at the individual (Fellow), organizational, community, and national/regional levels. Although investigation of outcomes at the peer/family level was not a priority of this evaluation, the alumni survey and MSC stories and discussions provided some related data. We present these findings along with the individual-level outcomes, as peer/family outcomes tended to be related to and were reported by Fellows.

III.A. Programming Outputs

Over time, GOJoven's program components and programmatic output targets (i.e., activities to be implemented and target populations or entities to be reached) have evolved in response to internal evaluation findings, stakeholder input, and available funding. Table 2 presents GOJoven's targeted and actual programmatic outputs achieved through December 2011 by phase.[6] For some components, PHI did not pre-define targets in Phase I or II; overall, the number of components for which targets were set increased over the three phases.

As is evidenced in Table 2, across its first three phases, GOJoven has trained nearly 150 GOJoven graduates, and reached hundreds of organizations. In Phase I (2004-2006), relatively few output targets were set, but those that were set were met or exceeded by the program. In Phase II (2007-2009), where output targets were set, actual outputs realized varied in relation to targets. While Phase III (2010-2012) is not yet complete, GOJoven had achieved considerable progress toward its targets, as of December 2011.

With respect to the Fellow training component, Table 2 shows that GOJoven has increased the number of targeted and actual graduates over the three phases. The actual number was slightly higher than the target number in Phase I but a bit lower than the target number in Phase II. With the 2010 and 2011 cohorts, GOJoven had achieved 59.3% of the targeted Spanish-speaking (i.e., Guatemalan, Honduran, and Mexican) graduates for Phase III, and 45.8% of the targeted English-speaking (i.e., Belizean) graduates for Phase III, with one additional cohort for each group (i.e., the 2012 cohort) yet to complete training. Table 2 also shows that with respect to LAPs, as of December 2011, 100% of Phase I LAPs had submitted final reports, while 66.7% of Phase II and 0 percent% of Phase III LAPs had submitted final reports.[7] With respect to IS Projects, for Phase II, the number of grants made was equal to the target (i.e., 15). For Phase III, the number of grants made exceeded the target, because Summit provided funding for one additional grant. In Phases I-II, at least two-thirds of organizations that received an IS Project grant submitted a final report (the majority of others submitted an interim report). In Phase III, the majority of IS grantees had submitted a final report by December 2011. Per the available reports, all projects appear to have been implemented, at least partially, except for one project in Mexico[8]. **Overall, the data suggest that GOJoven has implemented a robust range of components that for the most part have reached or are on the way to reaching the intended populations and entities.**

[6] Data sources include PHI's annual and phase reports to Summit and additional input from PHI staff.
[7] PHI has noted that LAPs commonly take up to two years to implement and are commonly given extensions.
[8] The project staff did considerable pre-work but never obtained access to the IS Project funds provided to their organization. and thus were unable to execute the project.

Table 2. Principal GOJoven Programming Outputs, 2004-2011

Output Type	Phase I (2004-2006)		Phase II (2007-2009)		Phase III (2010-2012)		Total Actuals as of Dec. 2011[a]
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual as of Dec. 2011	
a. One-year Fellow training (including workshops, personal development funds, and coaching)	48 graduates	49 graduates	60 graduates	56 graduates	54 Spanish-speaking grads 24 English-speaking grads	32 Spanish-speaking grads **(2010 & 2011 cohorts)**[b] 11 English-speaking grads **(2011 cohort)**[b]	2004-2011 cohorts[b]: 149 graduates; 142 non-expelled, living graduates still permanent residents of GOJoven countries
b. LAP implementation	12 LAPs implemented	12 final reports submitted	12 LAPs implemented	8 final reports submitted	15 LAPs implemented[c]	0 final reports submitted	20 final reports submitted
c. National & Regional GOJoven Meetings	Regional: No specific target	Regional: 2	Regional: 2	Regional: 1	National: 8 Regional: 1	National: 4[d] Regional: 1	National: 4[d] Regional: 4
d. Training of Trainers (TOT) for alumni[e]	No target	13 alumni	No target	6 alumni	15 Spanish-speaking 10 English-speaking	9 Spanish-speaking 6 English-speaking	34 alumni completed introductory TOT 25 of them completed advanced TOT
e. Alumni academic scholarships[f]	N/A	0	N/A	14 new awardees	No target	9 new awardees	23 alumni awardees
f. Alumni professional development funds[g]	No target	8 recipients	No target	12 recipients	15 recipients	17 recipients	37 recipients
g. Digital stories workshop (2010)[h]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8-10 alumni	8 alumni	8 alumni 6 stories on GOJoven website
h. IS Project grant awards	No target	18 grants 13 final reports	15 grants	15 grants 10 final reports	10[i] grants	11 grants 8 final reports	44 grants 31 final reports
i. IS Workshops	No target	19 workshops	24 workshops	35 workshops	6 workshops	3 workshops	56 workshops; over 1,100 participants from over 300 orgs.

[a] Because there are no targets for some activities, for some periods, no "Total Targets" column is included in this table.

[b] The 2011 cohorts from all four countries are included here, even though these Fellows graduated in spring 2012.

[c] Belize had no 2010 cohort, but in 2011 and 2012, each Belizean District represented in GOJoven (six total) was to implement its own LAP, thus a target of 15 Phase III LAPs (6 from Belize, 9 from the other countries).

[d] Four additional National Meetings (not included in the table cells) were held in January-February 2012.

[e] TOT has introductory and advanced training sessions. The numbers reported for Phases I-III refer to new TOTs, i.e., alumni who were targeted for or who actually completed the introductory training. The far right column indicates the total as of December 2011 who completed the introductory TOT, as well as the number who also completed the advanced TOT. "Spanish-speaking" and "English-speaking" in this row refer to the language of the TOT training.

[f] Alumni academic scholarships support fellows to pursue degree programs. The scholarship program is administered as a separate grant by Summit for the benefit of selected GOJoven alumni; awards do not correspond to calendar years or GOJoven phases, and thus no targets are listed in this row. However, the data indicate that all scholarship targets have been met or are on track to be met. Note that four additional awards were made in the first quarter of 2012.

[g] Professional development funds are available to alumni once they have been active in implementing their LAP.

[h] In 2010 GOJoven collaborated with the Center for Digital Storytelling to offer a four-day workshop for alumni on creation of digital (multimedia) stories (http://http://gojoven.org/fellows-stories/).

[i] The target for use of World Bank IS Project funds was ten grants. As is shown in the next column, this target was met, and an eleventh grant (supported by Summit funds) was also made.

III.B. Outcomes: Individual Level

This section discusses GOJoven's outcomes at the level of the individual Fellow, as well as outcomes that Fellows have reported among their family and peers. In addition, this section briefly discusses differences and similarities in individual-level outcomes based on moderating factors, including Fellow's country, cohort, and gender.

III.B.1. Primary Outcomes

a. GOJoven has had positive effects on Fellows' leadership- and ASRHR-related knowledge, attitudes, and skills.

Multiple data sources indicate that GOJoven has had positive effects on Fellows' leadership- and ASRHR-related knowledge, attitudes, and skills (KAS). In various data sources, Fellow trainings, IS Projects, LAPs, and TOTs all emerged as key activities through which these and other leadership- and ASRHR-related KAS have been acquired.

Overall, the data indicate particularly strong outcomes among Fellows with regard to:

1. Self-awareness
2. Acceptance of and respect for cultural and sexual diversity
3. Recognition of the important roles of gender and sexual diversity in ASRHR
4. Self-confidence in leadership skills
5. Skills to communicate with others (particularly youth) about—and build their capacity in—leadership and ASHRH
6. Technical knowledge of ASRHR (e.g., HIV, family planning)
7. Teamwork skills
8. Comfort with one's sexuality
9. Commitment to ASRHR work

As is shown in Table 3, for each of the first seven of these areas, over 90% of alumni survey respondents reported that GOJoven has had at least "some" positive influence on increasing their capacities. "Recognizing your own strengths and challenges as a leader," "valuing cultural and ethnic diversity," and "valuing sexual diversity" each received mean scores that were virtually at the ceiling of the scale (i.e., 3.9).

Table 3. Reported Influence of GOJoven on Increasing Selected Leadership Capacities and Knowledge and Skills in ASRHR (Alumni Survey, N=88 unless otherwise indicated)

Survey item (Original item letter/number in survey; Total N if different from 88)	N (%)*				Mean Score
	None 1	A Little 2	Some 3	A Lot 4	
1. Self-awareness					
a. Recognizing your own partialities and prejudices (question B1; N=87)	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.6%)	17 (19.5%)	66 (75.9%)	3.7
b. Recognizing your own strengths and challenges as a leader (question B2)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (8.0%)	81 (92.0%)	3.9
2. Acceptance of and respect for cultural and sexual diversity					
a. Valuing cultural and ethnic diversity (question B22)	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.5%)	2 (2.3%)	82 (93.2%)	3.9
b. Valuing sexual diversity (question B23; N=87)	1 (1.1%)	4 (4.6%)	2 (2.3%)	80 (92.0%)	3.9
3. Recognition of the important roles of gender and sexual diversity in ASRHR					
a. Recognizing the important role of gender in ASRHR (question C3)	0 (0.0%)	5 (5.7%)	6 (6.8%)	77 (87.5%)	3.8
b. Recognizing the importance of sexual diversity in ASRHR (question C4)	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.5%)	10 (11.4%)	74 (84.1%)	3.8
4. Self-confidence in leadership skills					
a. Having self-confidence in your abilities as a leader (question B3)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.4%)	13 (14.8%)	72 (81.8%)	3.8
5. Skills to communicate with others about and build their capacity in leadership and ASHRH					
a. Developing leadership in others (question B4)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.3%)	24 (27.3%)	62 (70.5%)	3.7
b. Communicate with confidence your vision of sexual and reproductive health and rights to young people (question C6; N=29**)	0 (0.0%)	2 (6.9%)	5 (17.2%)	22 (75.9%)	3.7
c. Communicate with confidence your vision of ASRHR to the directors of your organization (question C7)	0 (0.0%)	5 (5.7%)	21 (23.9%)	62 (70.5%)	3.6
6. Technical knowledge of ASRHR					
a. Having knowledge of technical aspects of ASRHR and family planning (question C1)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.3%)	14 (15.9%)	72 (81.8%)	3.8
7. Teamwork skills					
a. Forming teams (question B11)	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.4%)	16 (18.2%)	68 (77.3%)	3.7
b. Working in teams (question B12; N=87)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.4%)	16 (18.4%)	68 (78.2%)	3.7

* Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

** These are the web-based and emailed responses only (N=29); due to an error, the paper survey had a slightly different (and unintended) version of the item: "Communicate with confidence your vision of ASRHR." This item (N=59) also had a mean score of 3.7.

Fellows' narrative responses to open-ended alumni survey questions, MSC stories, MSC discussions, and LAP Reports further corroborated this positive influence, as is exemplified in the following quotes:

- "A new window was opened...upon seeing myself surrounded by different worlds, by those realities and experiences that contributed to my life a much more collective and appropriate vision of my reality." -Guatemalan MSC story
- "Now I am a better human being, more sensitive to themes of sexual diversity." -Honduran alumni survey
- "[GOJoven] increased my ability to promote leadership in others...." -Mexican alumni survey
- "...I know about SRH in greater depth [and] I put forth the knowledge I have learned in my working groups, local, municipal, and departmental, with my family, organization." -Honduran alumni survey

There is also strong evidence that GOJoven has helped Fellows to experience increased comfort with their sexuality (i.e., the eighth particularly strong Fellow KAS outcome): 94.3% of respondents agreed that GOJoven helped them feel more comfortable with their sexuality. As one Honduran Fellow explained in an MSC story, "Developing the topics without taboos and with appropriate methodology in each [GOJoven] training I received in SRH allowed me to enjoy my full sexuality from that point on... which in my community and for a Maya woman is very difficult, due to the lack of awareness and simply because the topics are taboo…."

Additionally, as is shown in Table 4, respondents usually exhibited, on average, between "a little" and "a lot" of agreement with positive statements about their commitment to ASRHR (i.e., the ninth particularly strong Fellow KAS outcome). They also tended to disagree with negative statements about their commitment to ASRHR. In the alumni survey, a Honduran Fellow summed up her commitment as follows: "The theme of right[s in] SRH has become a passion for me and I have committed myself much more to working on this theme." **Overall, the data suggest that Fellows have strong commitment to ASRHR.**

Fellows were not the only ones to report that they had experienced positive changes in leadership- and ASRH-related KAS. A number of organizational representatives also commented positively on Fellows' KAS in multiple data sources. In an internal evaluation interview, a Mexican Fellow's supervisor commented about a key change observed in a Fellow after her participation in GOJoven: "[She] improved her knowledge. Now she is more self-assured, and more capable of coordinating with schools and institutions. She increased her motivation and now she puts more passion and enthusiasm into her work."

The alumni survey findings also suggested some possible gaps in key leadership- and ASRHR-related KAS. Among alumni survey questions that asked about the influence of GOJoven on increasing leadership- and ASRHR-related KAS, those items that received the lowest mean scores (on a 1-4 scale in which 1 = no influence and 4 = a lot of influence) were "working with the mass media" (3.1) and "raising funds for projects" (3.2) (see also challenges #5 and #4, respectively, below). With respect to media skills, review of a convenience sample of media coverage of GOJoven further suggested that some GOJoven Fellows might benefit from additional training in how to frame ASRHR issues for the media (e.g., so as not to inadvertently reinforce common stereotypes or stigma). In addition, alumni survey respondents gave relatively low agreement scores (in relation to other survey questions) for positive statements about GOJoven's effects on their national and international advocacy work (see also Section III.E, below), suggesting that skills to engage in those activities might be improved.

Table 4. Reported Agreement or Disagreement with Statements about Commitment to ASRHR (Alumni Survey, N=88 unless otherwise indicated)

Survey item (Original item letter/number in survey; Total N if different from 88)	N (%)*					Mean Score
	A Lot in Disagreement 1	A Little in Disagreement 2	Neither in Agreement nor in Disagreement 3	A Little in Agreement 4	A lot in Agreement 5	
a. My work in ASRHR is motivated in part by my desire to give back to the community (question D1)	2 (2.3%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.4%)	14 (15.9%)	68 (77.3%)	4.6
b. Working in ASRHR inspires me to perform at my best (question D2; N=87)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.4%)	9 (10.3%)	22 (25.3%)	53 (60.9%)	4.4
*c. I feel little loyalty to ASRHR work** (question D3)*	*48 (54.5%)*	*9 (10.2%)*	*13 (14.8%)*	*10 (11.4%)*	*8 (9.1%)*	*2.1*
d. Although currently my work/studies in ASRHR is/are limited, I hope to focus more on ASRHR in the future*** (question D4; N=87)	10 (11.5%)	4 (4.6%)	7 (8.0%)	19 (21.8%)	47 (54.0%)	4.0
e. I understand how my work contributes to improving ASRHR in my country (question D5)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.4%)	6 (6.8%)	79 (89.8%)	4.9
*f. The decision to work in ASRHR was an error on my part** (question D6; N=87)*	*82 (94.3%)*	*1 (1.1%)*	*2 (2.3%)*	*0 (0.0%)*	*2 (2.3%)*	*1.1*
*g. There is not much to be gained by working in ASRHR during my whole career** (question D7; N=86)*	*67 (77.9%)*	*4 (4.7%)*	*3 (3.5%)*	*9 (10.5%)*	*3 (3.5%)*	*1.6*
h. For me it Is important to work in ASRHR, independently of my specific position or employer (question D8)	2 (2.3%)	2 (2.3%)	7 (8.0%)	14 (15.9%)	63 (71.6%)	4.5
i. Because of my experiences in GOJoven, I have decided to engage in studies related to ASRHR (question G16; N=85)	6 (7.1%)	1 (1.2%)	22 (25.9%)	23 (27.1%)	33 (38.8%)	3.9
*j. Because of my experiences in GOJoven, I have decided to explore occupational options that are not related to ASRHR** (question G17; N=87)*	*47 (54.0%)*	*4 (4.6%)*	*14 (16.1%)*	*10 (11.5%)*	*12 (13.8%)*	*2.3*
k. Because of GOJoven, I am more dedicated to ASRHR (question G18; N=86)	2 (2.3%)	1 (1.2%)	7 (8.1%)	22 (25.6%)	54 (62.8%)	4.5

* Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

** A low score is the desirable response.

*** A high score is particularly desirable for respondents not currently working for pay in job that is specifically ASHRH-focused. Among those 70 respondents, the mean score for this item was 4.1 (data not shown in table).

Several alumni survey respondents noted in response to open-ended questions that they recommend more training in fundraising, for themselves and their organizations. Additionally, many LAP reports noted common project challenges, such as coordinating team members' schedules and producing deliverables, which suggests that Fellows could benefit from more practical project management skills. Moreover, despite strong evidence of improvement in teamwork skills (cited above), teamwork was still reported to be a challenge among some Fellows and cohorts (external evaluation interviews). Collectively, these findings suggest some areas in which Fellows' KAS might be improved in future trainings.

Overall, the data provide strong evidence that GOJoven has had positive effects on Fellows' leadership- and ASRHR-related KAS. The data also suggest some KAS that might fruitfully be the subject of additional training for Fellows in the future.

b. Fellows have successfully applied their new knowledge, attitudes, and skills to address sexual and reproductive health and rights-related issues among their families and friends.

Alumni survey data, MSC stories and discussions, and internal evaluation data indicate that overall, Fellows have used their new KAS to improve SRHR-related knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors among family members, friends, partners, and even neighbors. As is shown in Table 5, alumni survey respondents reported, on average, between "a little" and "a lot" of agreement that applying GOJoven learnings has led to more frequent and more fruitful discussions with family and friends about ASRHR. They also report between "a little" and "a lot" of disagreement that applying GOJoven learnings has hurt relationships with these parties.[9] Related areas in which Fellows have reported particular successes include:

- *Providing SRH and/or rights-related education/counseling to relatives and friends.* For example, one Fellow stated: "For my part I would try to talk naturally about sexuality... and little by little, my parents, brothers, and sisters were asking me about topics related to sexual health that they never would have dared [to ask about] before" (Mexican MSC story). Another reported, ""I can be more open to my friend[s]...speaking to them about sexual and reproductive health" (Belizean alumni survey).
- *Communicating more effectively with a partner.* One Fellow indicated in the alumni survey, for example: "I know how to make my sexual and reproductive rights count, I can negotiate with my partner" (Guatemalan alumni survey).
- *Promoting less machismo and greater gender equity in their families.* In an MSC story, for example, a Honduran Fellow reported: "With family dialogue I have been able to reduce a bit the big problem of machismo in my family...thanks to my having been taught in GOJoven...to defend women's rights, and I have gotten my parents to have dialogue whenever they have a disagreement."
- *Assisting their own or other families to accept lesbian, gay, or bisexual family members.* One Honduran Fellow wrote in an MSC story, for example: "This whole process allowed me to talk openly in the heart of my family about my sexual orientation, achieving first my personal acceptance, strengthening family bonds through dialogue, mutual support, and respect."

A few Fellows also reported acting to protect family members from abuse by going to the authorities or accompanying the victim to speak with authorities.

[9] A few comments and examples in the alumni survey and MSC discussions indicated that GOJoven learnings led Fellows to end or take steps to end intimate partner relationships that were making Fellows unhappy. In those instances, although the relationships might be considered to have "worsened," Fellow reported that the effect on their own well-being was positive.

Table 5. Reported Agreement or Disagreement with Statements about Application of Knowledge and Skills to Family/Friends (Alumni Survey)

Survey item (Original item letter/number in survey; total N)	N (%)*					Mean Score
	A Lot in Disagreement 1	A Little in Disagreement 2	Neither in Agreement nor in Disagreement 3	A Little in Agreement 4	A lot in Agreement 5	
a. Due to GOJoven, I have dialogued with my family about ASRHR more often (question E1; N=86)	2 (2.3%)	1 (1.2%)	3 (3.5%)	17 (19.8%)	63 (73.3%)	4.6
b. Due to GOJoven, my dialogues with my family about ASRHR have been more fruitful (question E2 (N=87)	2 (2.3%)	2 (2.3%)	5 (5.7%)	16 (18.4%)	62 (71.3%)	4.5
*c. Because of applying what I have learned in GOJoven, my relationship with my parents, brothers/sisters, o grandparents has worsened ** (question E3; N=87)*	*70 (80.5%)*	*2 (2.3%)*	*4 (4.6%)*	*4 (4.6%)*	*7 (8.0%)*	*1.6*
d. Because of GOJoven, I have dialogued with my friends about ASRHR more often (question E4; N=86)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	11 (12.8%)	72 (83.7%)	4.8
e. Because of GOJoven, my dialogues with my friends about ASRHR have been more fruitful (question E5; N=85)	5 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	12 (14.1%)	67 (78.8%)	4.6
*f. Because of applying what I have learned in GOJoven, my relationships with my friends have worsened ** (question E6; N=86)*	*77 (89.5%)*	*2 (2.3%)*	*1 (1.2%)*	*1 (1.2%)*	*5 (5.5%)*	*1.3*
*g. Because of applying what I have learned in GOJoven, my relationship with my boyfriend/girlfriend or partner has gotten worse** (question E9; N=86)*	*76 (88.4%)*	*2 (2.3%)*	*3 (3.5%)*	*1 (1.2%)*	*4 (4.7%)*	*1.3*

* Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

** A low score is the desirable response.

c. A large majority of alumni are currently engaged in and/or are looking for work in ASRHR.

Of the 88 alumni who responded to the alumni survey, 85 (96.6%) reported that they were currently engaged in (n=81) and/or looking for paid or volunteer work (n=4) related to ASRHR. Thus, out of the entire population of living, non-expelled GOJoven alumni from the 2004-2010 cohorts (N=113), at least 75.2% are currently working, volunteering, looking for work, or actively interested to volunteer in ASRHR. Moreover, the latest GOJoven Fellows directory suggests that some additional alumni are also working in ASRHR-related positions or in other positions in which ASRHR-related activities may be incorporated.

d. GOJoven Fellows have applied their acquired ASRHR- and leadership-related knowledge, attitudes, and skills to diverse professional activities and have achieved greater recognition in their workplaces.

Multiple data sources indicate that through LAPs, IS Projects, TOT activities, and other paid and volunteer work, Fellows have applied the KAS they acquired in GOJoven to diverse professional activities. Some examples of KAS application include:

- *Training organizational staff, new Fellows, and local youth in leadership skills and ASRHR.* For example, 88.5% of alumni survey respondents reporting agreeing that because of opportunities afforded by GOJoven, they have built ASRHR capacity in others.
- *Working toward a greater focus on youth and on ASRHR in their organizations and communities.* In the alumni survey, 71.3% of respondents agreeing that due to GOJoven, they had advocated for policies favorable to ASRHR at the local level. For example, a Honduran fellow working at a religious school described in an MSC story speaking up during the development of leadership modules to request that the modules include content related to sexuality, which was ultimately implemented.
- *Participating in local networks or collaborations to promote ASRHR.* In particular, 92.0% of alumni survey respondents reported agreeing that due to GOJoven, they have participated in local networks or collaborations to promote ASRHR.
- *Promoting ASRHR in the mass media.* For example, 2004 Honduran Fellow Dunia Carola Orellana Guifarro is a journalist with the largest daily printed newspaper in Honduras, *La Prensa*. She has used her position to write articles about GOJoven and SRHR. Rodolfo Moo Chi, a 2006 Fellow from Mexico is a volunteer radio announcer in Felipe Carrillo Puerto who hosts a popular radio show on ASRHR. In August 2008, Honduran Fellows Gabriela Flores Rodríguez and Licda Nory Álvarez Betancourth (2006 cohort) promoted ASRHR while being interviewed on the national television program *Frente a Frente* (*Face to Face*) about the Ibero-American Convention on Young People's Rights. In November 2008 Ms. Flores Rodríguez participated in a follow-up debate on the radio show *Contra Punto* (*Counterpoint*), in which she advocated strongly for ASRHR. Overall, 63.2% of alumni survey respondents reporting being in agreement that because of GOJoven, they have promoted ASRHR with the mass media.
- *Founding new NGOs to address issues related to ASRHR.* Some examples of these NGOs are found in Table 6.

Table 6. Examples of NGOs Founded by GOJoven Alumni (Post-GOJoven Training)

Fellow Involvement	Cohort(s)	Country	Organization Name	Focus of Organization
Elisa Castellanos	2005	Belize	Tikkun Olam Belize	SRH education, STI/HIV testing and other services for sex workers in Orange Walk
Multiple Fellows	Multiple years	Belize	GOBelize	Assuming responsibility for management and implementation of GOJoven Belize
Saúl Paau Maaz	2006	Guatemala	Acción para una Vida Saludable	Leadership skills-building among Maya youth in Petén; collaboration with hospital to offer services to HIV-positive youth/adults
Multiple Fellows; founding was led by José Roberto Luna Manzaneros*	Multiple years	Guatemala	Incidejoven	Nationally-focused youth-led organization that promotes ASRHR through advocacy, training, and education
Planned by LAP team**; Director is Alex Eduardo Sorto Ortiz	2007	Honduras	Asociación Jóvenes en Movimiento	Youth leadership in ASRHR with a particular focus on LGBT youth; educational programming in schools in Tegucigalpa

* Mr. Luna Manzaneros is a 2006 Fellow. He initiated the founding of Incidejoven organization that year, with Glendis Marleny (Yenny) Gallardo Mendoza (also of the 2006 cohort) and Roberto Morales Coroxon and David Efrén López López (from the 2005 cohort).
** LAP team members included: Wendy Lizeth Aguilar Martínez, Israel Antonio Barahona Reyes, Ivonne Díaz del Valle Oliva, José Francisco Ponce Ramos, and Alex Eduardo Sorto Ortiz.

Other ways in which Fellows have reported applying their new KAS include writing funding proposals for ASRHR-related work, participating in local and national ASRHR-related committees, and serving as GOJoven Country Representatives, GOJoven Sustainability Committee members, and/or GOBelize Board officers or members.

In multiple data sources, Fellows reported that supervisors, co-workers, and/or clients have expressed confidence in or appreciation for their leadership abilities and/or ASRHR expertise. For example, a Belizean Fellow stated in an MSC story: “The skills I develop through the program I use at work and I can see my success rate increase... thru the comments made by my director and supervisors. My clients...have strong confidence in me as a result of the confidence I gain in myself.” Additionally, many organizational representatives reported that Fellows have successfully applied new KAS to the workplace. A Honduran supervisor commented in the organizational survey, for example: “The GOJoven Fellow in our organization has propelled all of the members of the team to strengthen our leadership spaces. In addition, she has been an example for us all to follow, in advancing the search for tools and content to achieve greater policy advocacy, which is one of the principle components of our organization.” Overall, the data show that not only Fellows, but also other stakeholders in their work environments, recognize and appreciate how Fellows are applying new KAS to improve ASRHR.

e. GOJoven Fellows have attained increasingly influential ASRHR-related leadership roles and responsibilities, and many attribute these advances (at least in part) to GOJoven.

Many GOJoven Fellows report having attained increasingly influential ASRHR-related leadership roles and responsibilities since becoming Fellows. These include increased responsibilities in their existing jobs,

promotions, and new ASRHR-related job opportunities. Several Fellows have attained high-level decision-making positions at the departmental, state, or national level. For example:

- María Manuela García Pú, a 2004 Fellow from Guatemala, is the Technical Secretary of the Observatorio en Salud Reproductiva (OSAR), Totonicapán Department, Guatemala.
- Marco Antonio Toh Euán, a 2005 Fellow from Mexico, is Director of Northern Quintana Roo's Human Rights Unit, under the State Attorney General.
- José Roberto Luna Manzanero, a 2006 Fellow from Guatemala, serves as the Education and Youth Officer for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in Guatemala.

In addition, as was noted above, since completing their Fellowship year, a number of Fellows have served as representatives on national ASRHR-related advisory committees or boards, and several Fellows have founded ASRHR-focused organizations (see Table 6, above).

Many Fellows attribute their workplace and career advances, at least in part, to the KAS and networking opportunities they acquired through GOJoven. For example, 69.8% of alumni survey respondents reported agreeing ("a little" or "a lot") that as a benefit of their participation in GOJoven, they have ascended to positions with greater influence or responsibility within an organization. In addition, 51.8% reported agreeing that as a benefit of their participation in GOJoven, they have obtained work in other organizations where they have been given positions with greater influence or responsibility. For example, a Guatemalan Fellow reported in an MSC story: "In my organization... when I returned [from the training] they started to say 'our sexologist is back'... but after a while, it became more formal and I currently advise all the SRH projects." A Honduran Fellow reported in the alumni survey: "I have experienced development as a leader in my community, as GOJoven has given me many tools, knowledge, contacts that have made me change my manner or thinking and work for the young people of my country." **Overall, the data provide compelling evidence that GOJoven has contributed to Fellows' professional advancement as leaders in ASRHR.**

III.B.2. Moderating Factors

Several key factors that might have moderated Fellows' outcomes include their country, GOJoven cohort, and gender. The evaluation team examined the alumni survey responses to determine whether any of these factors were statistically significant.[10] Significant differences in outcomes emerged for only a very small number of individual questions for country and cohort. Around gender, however, a clear pattern of difference emerged in the areas of commitment to ASRHR, dialogue with family about ASRHR, and comfort with their sexuality.

In the area of commitment to ASRHR, female respondents reported, on average significantly greater agreement than male respondents with statements that working in ASRHR inspires the best performance from them ($p=0.02$) and that it is important to them to work in ASRHR" ($p<0.01$). Female respondents also reported significantly greater disagreement than male respondents with statements that they feel little

[10] The alumni survey data were also analyzed for differences by survey medium (pen-and-paper vs. web-based). Statistically significant differences were identified for a very small number of questions, but no patterns of difference emerged.

loyalty to work in ASRHR (p=0.02) and that there is not much to gain from working in ASRHR during their whole career (p=0.04).[11]

In the area of dialogue with family about ASRHR, female respondents reported, on average, significantly greater agreement than male respondents with the statements that due to GOJoven, they have dialogued with their family about ASRHR more frequently (p<0.01) and more fruitfully (p=0.01). It is also worth noting that women's mean reported agreement score was significantly higher than that of men for a statement that due to GOJoven, they are more comfortable with their sexuality (p=0.04).

Overall, these data indicate that female alumni report stronger commitment to ASRHR than male alumni, as well as stronger positive effects of GOJoven on both dialogues with friends and family about ASRHR, and comfort with their sexuality.

III.C. Outcomes: Organizational Level

This section discusses GOJoven's outcomes among organizations that have been linked to GOJoven by having Fellows, participating in IS Workshops, and/or implementing GOJoven IS Projects. In addition, this section briefly considers whether outcomes have differed based on the moderating factors of country and type of organization.

III.C.1. Primary Outcomes

GOJoven has had diverse positive effects on the capacity of GOJoven-linked organizations.

Multiple data sources associate GOJoven with improving the capacity of GOJoven-linked organizations, particularly in the areas noted below:

- *A new or expanded youth and/or ASRHR focus.* One of the principal GOJoven-linked changes reported in these sources is a new or expanded youth and/or ASRHR focus in organizational missions, strategic plans, policies, and/or programming. For example, a Guatemalan organization reported that because of a GOJoven IS Project, "we have a plan that is based on the need to strengthen institutionally our work in sexual and reproductive health with youth" (IS Project grant report). A Belizean organization reported: "Through the ASRH training teachers saw how knowledge in these areas can help them take greater responsibility and concern in the lives of the students.... As a direct result of the project, teachers are now carrying out their own surveys for their classes wanting to know more about what students know about SRH; they are concerned with giving students more statistical information about SRH in Belize and they are willing and open to having more SRH activities during the school year" (IS Project report).

[11] It is possible that the greater reported commitment of female (vs. male) Fellows is related to the disproportionately negative impact of unplanned pregnancies, relationship violence, and other aspects of ASRHR on girls and women; however, the external evaluation data do not permit testing of this or other hypotheses about the cause(s) of the gender difference. Moreover, the available data do not permit an assessment of whether GOJoven had any influence on the gender difference.

Table 7. Reported Effects of GOJoven on Organization's Inclusion of Youth Perspectives and Support for Youth Leadership (Organizational Survey)

Survey measure	GOJoven component (original item letter/number in survey; total N)	N (%)*							Mean Score**
		Very Negative Effect 1	Somewhat Negative Effect 2	No Effect 3	Somewhat Positive Effect 4	Very Positive Effect 5	Don't Know	Not Relevant to Org Mission	
1. Inclusion of adolescent/youth perspectives in my organization's projects and programs	Effect of Fellow(s) (question B2d; N=43)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (9.3%)	9 (20.9%)	20 (46.5%)	6 (14.0%)	3 (7.0%)	4.4
	Effect of IS Workshop(s) (question C2d; N=29)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (6.9%)	6 (20.7%)	16 (55.2%)	3 (10.3%)	2 (6.9%)	4.6
	Effect of IS Project(s) (question D2d; N=17)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (82.4%)	2 (11.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4.9
2. Support for youth leadership within my organization	Effect of Fellow(s) (question B2e; N=43)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (11.6%)	8 (18.6%)	24 (55.8%)	3 (7.0%)	2 (4.7%)	4.4
	Effect of IS Workshop(s) (question C2e; N=29)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (6.9%)	6 (20.7%)	16 (55.2%)	3 (10.3%)	2 (6.9%)	4.6
	Effect of IS Project(s) (question D23; N=17)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)	14 (82.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	4.8

* Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

** Means were based on numeric responses (1-5). Responses of "don't know" and "not relevant to my organization's mission" were excluded from the calculations.

Table 8. Reported Effects of GOJoven on Organizational Knowledge and Abilities Concerning Youth Work, ASRHR, and Diversity (Organizational Survey)

Survey Measure	GOJoven component (original item letter/number in survey; total N)	N (%)*							Mean Score**
		Very Negative Effect 1	Somewhat Negative Effect 2	No Effect 3	Somewhat Positive Effect 4	Very Positive Effect 5	Don't Know	Not Relevant to Org Mission	
1. Knowledge in my organization of adolescent/youth sexual and reproductive health issues	Effect of Fellow(s) (question B2a; N=44)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.5%)	3 (6.8%)	7 (15.9%)	25 (68.8%)	2 (4.5%)	5 (11.4%)	4.5
	Effect of IS Workshop(s) (question C2a; N=29)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.4%)	1 (3.4%)	9 (31.0%)	15 (51.5%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (6.9%)	4.5
	Effect of IS Project(s) (question D2a; N=17)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	2 (11.8%)	13 (76.5%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	4.8
2. Knowledge in my organization of adolescent/youth sexual and reproductive rights issues	Effect of Fellow(s) (question B2b; N=44)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.5%)	3 (6.8%)	9 (20.5%)	23 (52.3%)	1 (2.3%)	6 (13.6%)	4.4
	Effect of IS Workshop(s) (question C2b; N=29)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (6.9%)	11 (37.9%)	11 (27.9%)	2 (6.9%)	2 (6.9%)	4.3
	Effect of IS Project(s) (question D2b; N=17)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	3 (17.6%)	12 (70.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	4.7
3. Ability of my organization to interact effectively with adolescents/ youth	Effect of Fellow(s) (question B2c; N=44)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (11.4%)	7 (15.9%)	25 (56.8%)	3 (6.8%)	3 (6.8%)	4.4
	Effect of IS Workshop(s) (question C2c; N=29)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (6.9%)	5 (17.2%)	16 (55.2%)	4 (13.8%)	2 (6.9%)	4.6
	Effect of IS Project(s) (question D2c; N=17)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (88.2%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	4.9
4. Ability of my organization to address diversity issues in programs and services	Effect of Fellow(s) (question B2g; N=45)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.9%)	10 (22.2%)	23 (51.1%)	4 (8.9%)	3 (6.7%)	4.4
	Effect of IS Workshop(s) (question C2g; N=29)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (6.9%)	7 (24.1%)	15 (51.7%)	4 (13.8%)	1 (3.4%)	4.5
	Effect of IS Project(s) (question D2g; N=17)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	3 (17.6%)	11 (64.7%)	2 (11.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4.7

* Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

** Means were based on numeric responses (1-5). Responses of "don't know" and "not relevant to my organization's mission" were excluded from the calculations.

Table 9. Reported Effects of GOJoven on Organizational Networking and Collaboration (Organizational Survey)

Survey Measure	GOJoven component (original item letter/number in survey; total N)	N (%)*							Mean Score**
		Very Negative Effect 1	Somewhat Negative Effect 2	No Effect 3	Somewhat Positive Effect 4	Very Positive Effect 5	Don't Know	Not Relevant to Org Mission	
Ability of my organization to network and collaborate with other organizations	Effect of Fellow(s) (question B2j; N=45)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (15.6%)	13 (28.9%)	20 (44.4%)	3 (6.7%)	1 (2.2%)	4.2
	Effect of IS Workshop(s) (question C2j; N=29)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.4%)	7 (24.1%)	15 (51.7%)	4 (13.8%)	2 (6.9%)	4.6
	Effect of IS Project(s) (question D2j; N=17)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	2 (11.8%)	13 (76.5%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	4.7

* Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

** Means were based on numeric responses (1-5). Responses of "don't know" and "not relevant to my organization' mission" were excluded from the calculations.

- *Increased representation of youth in organizational actions and/or programming.* Table 7 (above) shows positive associations among organizational survey respondents between GOJoven components (Fellows, IS Workshops, IS Projects) and increased organizational focus on adolescent/youth perspectives and youth leadership. On average, respondents reported between a "somewhat positive effect" and a "very positive effect" on all measures, for the three GOJoven components. The effects of IS Projects were reported to be particularly strong—nearly at the ceiling of a 5-point scale in which 1= very negative effect and 5 = very positive effect. The qualitative data support these findings. One GOJoven-linked organization commented regarding youth representation in the organization: "This [IS] project has demonstrated and confirmed the efficiency of the peer educator strategy, that the work of youth was more accepted by other youth" (Guatemalan IS Project report). It is worth noting that several Fellows and organizations reported increased representation of diverse gender and/or cultural groups in organizational work. For example, a Guatemalan Fellow reported in the alumni survey that because of GOJoven, the organization: "Implement[ed] equity in gender, ethnicity, and multiculturalism in institutional actions. Integrat[ed] members of the sexual diversity [community] in the work team to work with this population
- *Improved organizational knowledge and abilities concerning youth and ASRHR work.* Table 8 (above) shows organizational survey responses concerning the effects of GOJoven Fellows, IS Workshops, and IS Projects on knowledge of ASRHR in the organization, the ability of the organization to interact effectively with youth, and the ability of the organization to address diversity issues in programs and services. On average, respondents reported between a "somewhat positive" and a "very positive" effect for these capacity areas, for the three GOJoven components. The effects of IS Projects were reported to be particularly strong. The qualitative data support the overall finding concerning organizational knowledge and abilities. For example, a Honduran organizational survey respondent described: "The knowledge acquired by the Fellow in the area of youth leadership has been replicated with the rest of the staff in our organization, we have acquired new practices to improve the outreach work that our organization carried out with the community" (Honduran organizational survey).[12]
- *Increased collaboration with other organizations.* Table 9 (above) shows organizational survey responses concerning the effects of GOJoven Fellows, IS Workshops, and IS Projects on their organization's ability to network and collaborate with other organizations. On average, respondents reported between a "somewhat positive effect" and a "very positive effect" for these areas, for the three GOJoven components. The qualitative data support this finding. For example, a Honduran organizational representative said about the organization's Fellow: "[The Fellow] has affected positively the capacity to establish alliances with other organized groups to unite efforts in the fight to achieve advances in sexual and reproductive rights." A Belizean organization noted that through a collaboration with the National AIDS Commission that came about through GOJoven, they are now distributing condoms to the young people that they serve (IS Project report).
- *Increased visibility of the organization.* This is also an area in which effects of GOJoven were noted in multiple data sources. For example, one Mexican organization reported in an internal evaluation interview that they were able to use IS Project funds to send staff to a national SRH conference, which resulted in the organization's membership in a national federation and in the increased visibility of the organization among organizations working in SRH. Another Mexican organization described in an IS

[12] Only three IS Projects have conducted pre/post or post-only surveys to assess changes in staff knowledge and reported on their findings. These findings were generally positive. For example, a Guatemalan organization administered a pre/post survey to measure staff's knowledge before and after a series of trainings on ASRHR. The results suggested that staff increased their knowledge in areas including being able to identify and explain types of sexual rights, reproductive rights, and related laws (IS Project report).

Project report how their IS Project increased their visibility in the communities where they provided services: "Thanks to everyone's work, we were able to position the [name of organization] as an office that works for and cares about youth in the Mayan area, which was a comment we heard back from one of the school principals". A Guatemalan organization that received an IS Project grant similarly commented in their report that their project permitted them to reach out to a variety of constituents, including parents, community officials, young people, the Ministries of Health and Education, and the local municipal government. In short, the data indicate that organizations have experienced increased visibility in multiple contexts: among other organizations, community leaders, and community members.

Overall, the data provide robust evidence that through Fellows, IS Workshops, and particularly IS Projects, GOJoven has had positive effects on affiliated organizations' capacities and programming.

The two in-depth organizational examples in Tables 10-11 provide integrated pictures of several key GOJoven organizational outcomes noted above, as well as examples of other key outcomes. They serve to highlight what GOJoven-linked organizations can achieve through Fellows' work and IS efforts.

Table 10. In-Depth Organizational Example: Asociación de Jóvenes en Movimiento, Honduras*

Asociación Jóvenes en Movimiento (**AJEM**- Youth in Motion Association) is an NGO based in Tegucigalpa, Honduras that develops programs and projects to improve the conditions of young people through education on health, human rights, and civic participation. AJEM focuses specifically on sexual and reproductive health and rights, including (but not limited to) prevention of STIs/HIV/AIDS and respect for sexual diversity.

AJEM had its roots in a 2007 LAP called "Tú Eliges" ("You Choose"), which focused on STI/HIV/AIDS prevention and human rights. One of the LAP's activities was a collaboration with networks of organizations to implement two "megaforums" at the National Autonomous University of Honduras at which information on STIs, HIV, human rights, and condom use were distributed, as were male and female condoms.

Through a 2008 IS Project grant from Summit, AJEM became an officially registered Honduran NGO in May 2009, with Alex Eduardo Sorto Ortiz (2007 Fellow) as its Executive Director. The grant also permitted AJEM to develop a strategic plan, become installed in an office space, and build its current network of 60 volunteers who work with the organization to educate youth about ASRHR and engage in advocacy activities in Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela. AJEM's youth capacity-building activities employ an adapted version of GOJoven's capacity-building methodology.

Since receiving IS Project funds in 2008, AJEM has obtained funding from various other entities, such as:

- *Office of the First Lady of Honduras:* For office equipment.
- *The Global Fund for Women:* For Programa Amazonas, a sexual health and rights program for young women that is now in the process of forming its own NGO, Grupo Amazonas.
- *The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria:* For youth-focused STIs/HIV/AIDS educational programming.

The coup in Honduras in 2009 caused some setbacks for the organization. In particular, in the instability that followed the coup, staff and volunteers suffered threats and physical attacks. A number of funders were reluctant to make grants to AJEM and From its founding to February of 2012, AJEM grew from zero to ten paid staff members. AJEM collaborates with numerous other organizations and networks, has an annual budget of $250,000, and reports having reached 12,000 youth with its programming (as of February 2012).

All members of AJEM's Board of Directors and nearly all of its staff are under age 30. AJEM reports that it is the first SRHR-focused organization in Honduras that is not only for youth but also led by youth.

* Data sources: LAP report, IS Project application and report, other AJEM proposal submitted to PHI, and LAP team and beneficiary interviews.

Table 11. In-Depth Organizational Example: Centro Escolar México Junior College, Belize*

Centro Escolar Mexico Junior College (CEMJC) is a technical junior college funded by both the Belizean and Mexican governments. It is located in San Roman village in the Corozal District of Belize, where it shares a campus with a secondary school. Founded in 2007, the school population is approximately 177 students from ages 17-30, most of whom are from rural communities. The staff comprises 15 teachers, including the CEMJC Dean. Currently, CEMJC offers majors in Agriculture Business, Biology – Natural Resource Management, Information Technology, and Tourism Management.

CEMJC has two GOJoven Fellows: 2009 Fellow Nancy Leiva, a social sciences lecturer, and 2011 Fellow Iris Reyes, a lecturer in Agriculture Business. CEMJC received an IS Project grant funded by the World Bank in early 2011, directed by Ms. Leiva, to develop a strategic plan that would involve teachers in planning and implementation of ASRH education and activities. Specifically, under the IS Project, the teachers (including the Dean) participated in a series of three trainings, facilitated by GOJoven trainers, designed to: (a) develop a strategic plan for CEMJC for 2011-2013 that would incorporate ASRH, (b) increase teachers' knowledge of ASRH, and (c) strengthen teachers' teamwork skills. At each of the training sessions, between 11 and 13 teachers (of the 14 employed by CEMJC at the time) participated. The project also implemented a focus group with 20 students and a survey with 33 students (ages 16-25) to assess needs and interests related to ASRH. An in-country consultant subcontracted by PHI provided technical support to the CEMJC IS project. In addition, Ms. Leiva and the CEMJC Dean participated in a two-day World Bank-funded GOJoven IS Workshop on organizational development and ASRH best practices.

As a result of the project:

- CEMJC has built an ASRH focus into their strategic plan, trained their teachers in ASRH, and developed a teachers' guide that incorporates ASRH into the entire school curriculum.
- Not only are students taught directly about ASRH, but teachers integrate ASRH into other curricular topics through classroom examples, student research projects, and other classroom and homework activities.
- Teachers report being more comfortable with discussing and addressing ASRH, and they report that students are seeking ASRH-related advice from them. There is also a student club focused on ASRH.
- CEMJC staff and students have distributed SHR-related information to the local community through the school's annual open house and are planning a community health fair.
- CEMJC is distributing condoms to students, though a partnership with the National AIDS Commission.
- During 2011, school records indicate no drop-outs due to pregnancy—in contrast to previous years, in which an average of five students would leave the school each semester, temporarily or permanently, due to pregnancy.

CEMJC's GOJoven Fellows are also giving talks on ASRH at the secondary school with which CEMJC shares a campus.

As CEMJC stated in their IS Project report: "Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health education is a key developmental topic at a tertiary [education] level. The college environment offers the perfect space to impart knowledge on ASRH as well as offer[s] ways to promot[e] healthier lifestyles that go beyond the academic setting." Yet CEMJC's work in ASRH is unique in Belize. While one junior college in Belize City received funds from the U.S. Embassy in October 2011 to develop a pilot SRH course for students, CEMJC is the only junior college in Belize that comprehensively integrates ASRH education into their curriculum.

* Data sources: IS Project application and report, external evaluation interview, news media clip available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iExFwcOInJU.

This section has focused on organizational capacities that appear to have been notably strengthened by GOJoven. The one organizational capacity area that stands out as particularly in need of further improvement is fundraising. In the organizational survey, GOJoven's effect on the ability of the organization

to raise funds to support its projects and/or overall mission always received the lowest average rating—whether the effect of Fellows, IS Workshops, or IS Projects was being assessed. Funding challenges were also commonly noted in IS Project reports, where many organizations encouraged GOJoven to continue to provide them with support. In an internal evaluation interview, one organizational representative from Guatemala spoke of the challenge of maintaining momentum after receiving an IS Project grant, describing it as frustrating to lack funds for follow-up when communities develop an interest in ASRHR and request more trainings. The challenge of fundraising—and sustainability, more broadly—is addressed in further detail in Section IV, below.

III.C.2. Moderating Factors

Key factors that might have moderated organizations' outcomes include their country and type (e.g., NGO, school, governmental organization). IS Project reports indicate that a greater proportion of IS Projects in Belize and Guatemala, in contrast to Honduras and Mexico, have focused on strategic planning activities to expand their organizational mission and programming in ASRHR. The same is true of schools and government agencies, in contrast to NGOs, across the GOJoven countries. However, the available evidence does not suggest that any country or type of organization has, overall, been more or less successful than other countries or types of organizations in achieving the intended project-specific organizational outcomes.[13]

III.D. Outcomes: Community Level

This section discusses GOJoven's outcomes at the community level, including new activities and services that have been implemented and evidence for the effects of these activities and services. In addition, this section briefly considers whether community-level outcomes have differed based on the moderating factors of country or type of community.

III.D.1. Primary Outcomes

a. As a result of GOJoven, many new ASRHR-related activities and services have been implemented in local communities.

Fellows and GOJoven-linked organizations have implemented many ASRHR-related activities in their communities through LAPs and IS Projects, as well as Fellows' additional initiatives. Among the activities most commonly implemented are:

- *Training of peer educators.* At least 17 LAPs and 13 IS projects have trained groups of youth peer educators in ASRHR (see Tables 12-13), with the goal of these youth transferring their new KAS to others. For example, a Belizean LAP team trained and certified peer educators from two organizations in ASRHR topics as well as communication and outreach skills. These peer educators held regular after-school sessions with classmates, conducted community outreach activities, hosted a radio show, and helped coordinate a health fair (LAP report, PHI Phase I report).
- *Education of youth and other community members.* As Table 12 shows, at least nine LAPs have made educational presentations or offered workshops to youth in school contexts; smaller numbers of LAPs

[13] The organizational survey response rate and respondent sample size were too low to allow for valid statistical comparisons by country or type of organization.

have applied other youth and community education strategies. A Mexican LAP, for example, implemented eight "movie forums" involving educational films and a presentation on ASRHR to 250 junior and high school students in three communities (LAP report, PHI Phase II report). At least six IS Projects have also delivered community trainings or workshops on ASRHR (see Table 13). For example, a Guatemalan organization implemented an IS Project in which health promoters were newly trained in SRH topics and then transferred knowledge through trainings and workshops in 14 communities (IS Project report).

- *Development of new educational materials.* At least nine LAPs and at least nine IS Projects have developed educational materials, such as curricula, brochures, or videos (see Tables 12-13). For example, an organization in Honduras produced films on issues related to youth and sexual violence through a 2007 IS project (IS Project report).
- *Dissemination through mass media.* As was discussed in Section III.B, a number of Fellows have used the mass media to disseminate ASRHR-related information. For example, through her position as a television and radio correspondent, 2004 Belizean Fellow Dalila Ical has contributed stories related to GOJoven activities and ASRHR. The 2008 journalist Fellow Adriana Varillas in Mexico has published a number of articles in major news outlets on topics including SRH and the environment, teen pregnancy, and HIV/AIDS. In addition, at least four LAPs and at least four IS Projects have included mass media components (see Tables 12-13).

In addition to these community-level activities and services, in at least one instance, a LAP has created a new "youth-friendly" space. Specifically, a Mexican LAP has created a youth-focused space providing ASRHR workshops, information, and counseling to local youth (PHI report; MSC stories).

Table 12. Selected LAP Strategies (N=24)*

Strategy	N (%)
Peer (youth) educator training	17 (70.8%)
SRH presentations/ workshops for youth in school contexts	9 (37.5%)
SRH presentations/ workshops for youth outside school contexts	6 (25.0%)
SRH presentations/workshops for adult community members, organizational leaders, etc.	7 (29.2%)
Educational/entertainment events for youth and others (e.g., health fairs, sporting events, festivals)	6 (25.0%)
Development of educational materials (e.g., videos, brochures)	6 (25.0%)
Using mass media (e.g., radio)	4 (16.7%)
Founding an organization that engages in education and advocacy	1 (4.2%)

* Only LAPs that had submitted at least one report (interim or final) as of December 2011 are included in this table. Note that a single LAP could employ multiple strategies.

Table 13. Selected Community-Focused IS Project Strategies (N=36)*

Strategy	N (%)
Peer (youth) educator training	13 (36.1%)
Community training/workshops in ASRH and rights	5 (13.9%)
Development of educational materials related to ASRHR	7 (19.4%)
Using mass media (e.g., radio)	4 (11.1%)

* Only IS Projects that had submitted at least one report (interim or final) as of December 2011 are included in this table; the one project that was never implemented has been excluded. Note that a single project could employ multiple strategies, and that some projects implemented other strategies not included in this table.

b. Largely anecdotal or impressionistic data link GOJoven with positive changes in community members.

Many data sources report that GOJoven programming has led to positive changes in community members' KAS and/or behaviors, such as:

- *Improved ASRHR-related KAS among youth reached through GOJoven-linked activities.* For example, a Belizean alumni survey respondent wrote: "The youth I worked with gained knowledge on SRH and became more open-minded particularly to speaking about SRH."
- *More young people sharing ASRHR information with other young people.* For example, after training peer educators in ASRHR, a Honduran LAP team documented that seven educators implemented several workshops at schools, reaching a total of 260 youth (LAP report). An IS Project in Guatemala reported that seven of their 17 trained peer educators continued to disseminate ASRHR-related information in their communities, and four became integrated as volunteers in the organization (IS Project report).
- *Increased interest or openness among parents, community leaders, and other adults in the community to talk about and address ASRHR.* For example, one Belizean alumni survey respondent wrote: "Parents of the students that I worked with are now more open with their kids on SRH topics." In addition, a Mexican alumni survey respondent noted that because of GOJoven, there was greater openness to ASRHR community-wide: "These topics [ASRHR] are talked about in Maya communities, where there are still many taboos." A Belizean alumni survey respondent reported about his community leaders: "My village council has set aside a space for meetings with youth whenever needed."
- *Increased seeking of condoms or SRH services among Fellows' friends, family members, students, or other youth in the community.* For example, a Belizean Fellow wrote in the alumni survey: "My friends always ask me for condoms since they got more conscious of the many diseases they are at risk if they practice unprotected sex." A Mexican Fellow wrote in the survey: "My community knows about, uses, and requests contraceptives in the hospitals."

Additionally, when asked about the effects of GOJoven on their communities in the alumni surveys and in external evaluation interviews, a few Fellows and organizations reported *reduced teen pregnancy, birth, or STI rates*. For example, one Belizean school that received a 2011 IS Project Grant had previously experienced an average of five temporary or permanent female student drop-outs per semester due to

pregnancy. The school's Dean reported in an interview that there were no student pregnancies in 2011, based on drop-out records (see Table 11, above).

However, although many positive community outcomes have been reported, in relatively few instances have the reports been based on *systematic or formal evaluation data sources*, such as outcome surveys, clinic or condom distribution records, community participation logs, or national or local health surveillance statistics. In most cases, reported project outcomes appear to reflect: (a) the reporting party's impressions, based on observations of or interactions with several or many program youth; (b) informal comments made to the reporting party by others (e.g., school principals, parents, etc.); or (c) an implicit assumption that if the target population participated in an activity, the intended outcomes had also been achieved. In some cases, project reports do not indicate the data source for the stated outcomes.

As one example of (b), the Belizean Fellow quoted above who reported that parents were more open with their children about SRH as a result of GOJoven-related programming indicated that the evidence for this outcome was that "parents come to our school and they thank us." Similarly, the Mexican Fellow quoted above who indicated that the community was requesting contraceptives and using them indicated that the evidence for this outcome was that "classmates, students look for me for doubts or advice about [contraceptive] methods or SRHR." **While this does suggest that at least some parents and youth are applying new ASRHR-related KAS, it does not provide systematic documentation of changes in the frequency or quality of parent-child communication about ASRHR or use of contraception by young people.**

Similarly, 17 organizational survey respondents that reported that their organizations had had IS Projects responded to a question about IS Project effects on "healthy or safer sexual or reproductive health-related behaviors" among young people in their communities/target populations. Of these respondents, 13 reported a "somewhat positive" or "very positive" effect. Yet of all of the IS Project reports available as of December 2011, only two made any reference to healthy or safer sexual-related behavioral outcomes among young people reached through the IS Project; specifically, these projects reported that young people were communicating more and/or asking more questions about ASRHR. In all likelihood, the organizational survey findings for this item were based largely on anecdotal or impressionistic evidence.

There are some notable exceptions to the generalization that GOJoven community-level outcomes have not been formally evaluated. For example, of 24 LAPs for which interim or final reports were available, six (25%) reported conducting a pre/post assessment of workshop participants' knowledge, attitudes, and/or intentions. Two additional LAPs for which reports were available (8.3%) conducted post-only assessments that asked about workshop participants' learnings. All of these assessments were conducted with youth, and in two cases they were also conducted with parents or organizational staff who were participating in the workshops. A Mexican LAP, for example, conducted a pre/post assessment of high school youth's knowledge and attitudes after participating in a workshop on SRH. Findings in one of the communities where the workshop was implemented included increases in the participants' desired age to have children, and increased knowledge and awareness of contraceptive methods.

Although some formal evaluations have been conducted, in the case of reported LAP evaluation findings, the time period over which the outcomes were measured was always relatively short (e.g., from just before to the end of a workshop) and was therefore focused on ASRH-related knowledge and/or attitudes only, and not behaviors. Two LAPs reported planning to assess ASRH-related behavior change over longer time periods, but neither had reported on any findings as of December 2011.

In short, while there is considerable anecdotal and impressionistic evidence of community outcomes, and some systematic evidence of positive short-term changes in KAS among community youth, there are very few instances among GOJoven-linked interventions of systematic outcome evaluation over an extended period (i.e., at least several months beyond the end of the target population's participation for brief interventions, such as workshops; or ongoing outcome tracking with youth who participate in longer-term interventions, such as multicomponent school-based interventions, community organizing, or advocacy efforts). **GOJoven-linked outcomes pertaining to behaviors (e.g., youth sexual risk and protective behaviors, such as abstinence, use of condoms and other forms of contraception, treatment-seeking for STIs; parent-child communication about ASRHR; community members' actions to support ASRHR) and health status (e.g., pregnancy or birth rates, incidence and prevalence of STIs/HIV) at the community level remain largely unknown.**

III.D.2. Moderating Factors

Key factors that might have moderated community-level outcomes included country and type of community (for example, urban or rural). No notable variation emerged from the data across countries, with respect to reported outcomes of GOJoven at the community level. One challenge mentioned in multiple data sources (e.g., IS Project and LAP reports, MSC stories) was working in ASRHR in rural and/or indigenous communities, where the need for services and information is often greater, but the challenge of broaching the topic also greater, due to cultural taboos. Such comments were made most often by Guatemalan Fellows and organizational representatives, regarding Maya communities.

III.E. Outcomes: National and Regional Level

This section discusses GOJoven's outcomes at the national level (including the State level in Quintana Roo) and regional level (i.e., the Mexico/Central America region as a whole). In addition, this section briefly considers whether national outcomes have differed based on the moderating factors of country.

III.E.1. Primary Outcomes

There is ample evidence of the involvement of GOJoven Fellows in national and international activities. However, there is little evidence that GOJoven alumni or GOJoven-linked programs have—as a result of or through GOJoven—*achieved changes* in ASRHR-related policies, services, or health outcomes nationally or in the Mexico/Central America region as a whole.

a. Some GOJoven Fellows have had roles in national- and international-level ASRHR-related committees, conferences, and programming and advocacy efforts.

Multiple data sources indicate that some Fellows have been involved—since becoming Fellows—in national or international ASRHR-related program or policy initiatives through job and project responsibilities, advisory roles, strategic planning groups, advocacy groups, and conferences. Examples of the specific types of involvement include:

- *Delivering government-sponsored trainings in their own countries and "south-to-south" trainings in other Central American countries.* For example, a Honduran cohort of Fellows was invited by the National Congress to participate in government-sponsored youth trainings (PHI report). Another

Guatemalan fellow worked as a consultant with Family Health International to train Central and South American youth (PHI report).

- *Participating in advocacy activities targeting government officials or institutions.* A number of Fellows have participated in marches, letter-writing, and other lobbying actions. For example, Fellows in Mexico reported being involved in actions protesting the criminalization of abortion, including gathering signatures, helping form an advocacy group, and participating in a legislative meeting (MSC stories). A Fellow in Honduras was involved in producing an awareness video on transgender/transsexual individuals, in support of a legislative initiative to protect the right to sexual diversity (Sustainability Committee meeting minutes, media item). In the alumni survey, 47.7% of respondents reported agreeing that due to GOJoven, they have advocated for policies favorable to ASRHR at the national level. A smaller proportion, 36.1%, reported agreeing that due to GOJoven, they have advocated for policies favorable to ASRHR at the international level. It should be noted that overall, agreement with these statements about national and international advocacy was lower than agreement with other positive statements about GOJoven's effects on alumni Fellows' behaviors.
- *Serving on ASRHR-related national advisory committees.* For example, several Belizean Fellows serve on committees of the National AIDS Commission (KOL/BO interview). A Guatemalan Fellow was the youngest person to participate as a leader in developing the National Strategic Plan for Guatemala's National AIDS Program (PHI Phase I report). Additionally, a Honduran Fellow was involved in a national delegation working on issues related to SRH, through which he participated in the 2010 World Youth Conference in Guanajuato, Mexico (PHI 2010 annual report).
- *Presenting at national, regional, and international conferences or meetings on ASRHR topics, including (but not limited to) GOJoven-related work*. For example, several Mexican Fellows served as delegates at the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Cancún in 2010 (PHI 2010 annual report, Sustainability Committee meeting minutes). A Honduran Fellow presented audiovisual work created through an IS Project at a world youth festival in Cuba in 2009 (IS Project report). A Guatemalan Fellow gave a presentation on SRH in Cuenca, Ecuador at the Asamblea Mundial de la Salud los Pueblos (People's Health Assembly) in 2005 (internal evaluation interview). Some Fellows were invited to present their GOJoven work on Sierra Club tours in the United States during 2006-2010 (PHI Phase I-II reports, media items).

In addition, in the alumni survey, 77.4% of respondents reported agreeing that due to GOJoven, they have created new networks or collaborations among organizations at the national level to promote ASRHR. Over half of respondents (60.5%) reported agreeing that due to GOJoven, they have created new networks or collaborations among organizations at the international level to promote ASRHR. Collectively, these findings suggest many GOJoven Fellows are focusing at least some attention on national and/or regional ASRHR efforts, at least in part as a result of their participation in GOJoven, and that some are playing concrete roles on committees, in planning groups, and at conferences and trainings.

b. There is little evidence that GOJoven programming has achieved change in ASRHR-related policies, services, or health outcomes at the national or regional level.

Although some GOJoven Fellows have held jobs and/or served on committees, working groups, or coalitions/networks that are seeking to influence policies, services, and health outcomes at the national and regional level, to date there is little evidence that GOJoven alumni or GOJoven-linked projects have—as a result of or through GOJoven—*achieved changes* in ASRHR-related policies, services, or health outcomes

at the national or regional level. There were several anecdotal reports of the possible influence of GOJoven at the national level in Guatemala. Specifically, one key opinion leader (KOL) in ASRHR expressed the belief that advocacy work by GOJoven Fellows and staff had helped push through a new Ministerial Agreement in 2008 to keep beneficial adolescent/youth health policies in place. This and another Guatemalan KOL expressed the view that GOJoven's work had contributed to greater youth involvement in ASRHR work and greater visibility of ASRHR issues nationwide during the past decade. An additional Guatemalan interviewee reported that a Fellow was responsible for a SRH-related policy change in prisons (although the timeframe for this reported change was unclear). However, there is no systematic documentation of GOJoven's effects on policies, services, funding, or health outcomes nationally or regionally.

III.E.2. Moderating Factors

Overall, there was no systematic evidence for differences in national outcomes by GOJoven country. Moreover, across the GOJoven countries, KOL/BO interviewees commonly cited similar national- and regional-level assets for GOJoven and other ASRHR-focused work, including: (a) a generally greater awareness of and support for ASRHR issues among government, civil society, and young people than there was a decade ago; (b) a large youth population with energy and motivation to effect change; and (c) existing laws, policies, and regulations favorable to ASRHR that could be leveraged (e.g., see Section VI for a discussion of the Ministerial Declaration "Educating to Prevent," which has been signed by representatives of all four GOJoven countries). KOL/BO interviewees across the GOJoven countries also commonly cited similar national- and regional-level challenges to ASRHR work, including: (1) the power and influence of conservative religious groups (such as Opus Dei); (2) violence against girls and women and violence among youth as societal norms; (3) lack of access to comprehensive sex education and sexual and reproductive health medical services; and (4) lack of resources and widespread political will to improve ASRHR.

Some country-specific national-level challenges to improving ASRHR outcomes have also been noted. In multiple data sources, the coup in Honduras in 2009 and the resultant changes in the national government, political and ideological divisions among the Honduran people, and increases in violence were reported to have set back ASRHR at the local and national levels and adversely affected some GOJoven-linked projects and programs (KOL/BO and other external evaluation interviews; for example, see the case study in Table 12, above). In Guatemala, national government changes in 2008 and 2012 have led to (and continue to create) uncertainty around the direction of health and education policies, programs, and funding streams that are relevant for ASRHR work, including GOJoven efforts (internal evaluation interviews, KOL/BO and other external evaluation interviews). In Belize, a legal challenge to the country's anti-sodomy laws have resulted in other ASRHR efforts—including the work of GOJoven—being labeled and stigmatized as "promoting the LGBT agenda" in Belize (television news report; also referenced in KOL/BO and other external evaluation interviews).

III.F. Summary

Over its first three phases, GOJoven has implemented numerous activities that have resulted in nearly 150 GOJoven graduates, and that have reached hundreds of organizations, suggesting a robust set of outputs. In Phase I (2004-2006), relatively few output targets were set, but those that were set were met or exceeded by the program. In Phase II (2007-2009), where output targets were set, actual outputs realized

varied in relation to targets. While Phase III (2010-2012) is not yet complete, GOJoven had achieved considerable progress toward its targets, as of December 2011.

Many data sources collectively provide strong evidence that GOJoven has had positive effects on Fellows' leadership- and ASRHR-related KAS. There is also strong evidence that GOJoven has had positive effects on Fellows' application of these KAS in professional and personal contexts. In addition, compelling evidence shows that GOJoven alumni have achieved greater recognition as leaders and experts in ASRHR in the workplace since completing their Fellowship year, and increasingly influential leadership roles related to ASRHR. A small number of fellows have attained high-level decision-making positions at the departmental, state, or national level.

The data did not yield strong evidence of systematic differences in individual-level outcomes among Fellows based on moderating factors such as country or cohort. Several statistically significant differences did emerge, however, in relation to gender, with female respondents reporting greater commitment to ASRHR, dialogue with family about sexuality, and comfort with their own sexuality.

There is strong evidence that GOJoven Fellows, IS Projects, and IS Workshops have had positive effects on organizations, particularly with respect to youth and/or ASRHR focus, youth representation in organizational actions and/or programming, organizational knowledge and abilities concerning youth and/or ASRHR work, collaboration with other organizations, and visibility of the organization. Overall, GOJoven-linked organizations' ability to raise funds to support their missions and programming was reported to be a common area of challenge. The data indicate that a greater proportion of IS Projects in Belize and Guatemala, in contrast to Honduras and Mexico, have focused on strategic planning activities to expand the organizational mission and programming in ASRHR. The same is true of schools and government agencies, in contrast to NGOs, across the GOJoven countries. However, the available evidence does not suggest that any country or type of organization has, overall, been more or less successful than other countries or types of organizations in achieving their intended project-specific organizational outcomes.

There is robust evidence that because of GOJoven, many new ASRHR-related activities and services have been implemented in local communities. In several instances, "youth-friendly" spaces for ASHRH education have been established. However, most reports of the positive effects of GOJoven-linked activities and services on community members (e.g., ASRHR-related improved KAS, increased seeking of condoms or SRH services among young people) are based on anecdotal or impressionistic evidence (versus formal or systematic evaluation), and/or document only very short-term changes in KAS. GOJoven-linked projects' outcomes pertaining to participants' sexual risk and protective behavior (e.g., abstinence, use of condoms and other forms of contraception, treatment-seeking for STIs) and associated health status (e.g., pregnancy or birth rates; incidence and prevalence of STIs/HIV) remain largely unknown.

There is clear evidence that some GOJoven Fellows have participated in national- and international-level ASRHR-related committees, conferences, and programming and advocacy efforts, by delivering trainings, participating in lobbying activities, serving on national advisory committees, and making presentations. However, there is little evidence that GOJoven alumni or GOJoven-linked programs have—as a result of or through GOJoven—*achieved changes* in ASRHR-related policies, services, or health outcomes at the national or regional level. There were several anecdotal reports of the possible influence of GOJoven at the national level in Guatemala, but overall the evidence was weak. In Honduras and Guatemala, national-level ASRHR-related policies and programming since GOJoven's inception have been heavily influenced by changes in national governments. Overall, the four GOJoven countries have a number of common national-

level assets (such as a large, energetic youth population) and challenges (such as powerful conservative religious groups) that continue to affect the work of GOJoven and other ASRHR programs and projects.

Collectively, the evidence suggests that GOJoven has had robust outcomes at the individual and organizational levels, generated considerable new ASRHR-related activity at the community level, and contributed to some ASRHR-related programming and policy-related work at the national and regional level.

IV. PROMISING PRACTICES

As was discussed above in Section III, the strongest evidence of GOJoven's outcomes is found at the Fellow and organizational levels. In particular, GOJoven has provided Fellows with a rich array of experiences that Fellows and organizations report have benefitted their personal and professional development and enhanced their work in ASRHR. GOJoven has also facilitated the building of multiple organizational capacities that organizations report have increased and improved their ASRHR work. Overall, GOJoven Fellows, in-country staff, organizational stakeholders, and external beneficiaries have reported a deep enthusiasm for the program and for how it has affected them and/or their work. They have also identified—and our analysis has revealed—a number of promising practices suggestive for the fields of youth leadership development and ASRHR promotion. Building on definitions from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the IBP (Implementing Best Practices) in Reproductive Health Initiative, we define *promising practices* as activities or strategies that (a) show promise for achieving a long-term sustainable impact, based on evidence from successful use in at least one program, (b) are ethically sound, and (c) have the potential for replication and sustainability among other organizations (U.S. DHHS, 2010; IBP in Reproductive Health Initiative, n.d.).

In particular, the data suggest that GOJoven's most promising practices for achieving positive youth leadership and ASRHR outcomes, particularly at the individual and organizational levels, include: (1) a focus on Fellows' self-awareness and personal development; (2) fostering a sense of community within GOJoven; (3) use of a participatory, interactive training methodology; (4) provision of ongoing opportunities for Fellows to apply newly acquired KAS; and (5) institutional strengthening that includes Fellow involvement. These practices also strongly align with other recent research (e.g., Hofmann-Pinilla & Kallick Russell, 2011; Reinelt et al., 2005; Toner, 2012) that suggests that such practices are linked to positive leadership and (A)SRHR outcomes.

1. A focus on Fellows' self-awareness and personal development

An important attribute of GOJoven is the degree to which capacity-building activities focus not only on traditional leadership skills (such as negotiating conflicts, public speaking, and planning projects), but also on individual self-awareness and personal development. In particular, Fellows have reported that coming to understand their strengths, weaknesses, biases, and stereotypes and overcoming low self-esteem are highly transformative and promote development of other aspects of their leadership abilities. For example, a Belizean Fellow wrote in an MSC story: "GOJoven has taught me to recognize my wrongs and fears and to face them in order to overcome them…. Leadership starts with knowing myself, my emotions, my abilities and skills, my weakness and strengths before I seek to help others." Fellows have also reported that personal development, particularly goal-setting, creating a personal development plan to achieve their goals, and learning effective interpersonal communication styles have helped them to overcome personal and professional obstacles to leadership development, so that they can assume increasingly challenging ASRHR-related leadership roles in organizations and communities. In addition, Fellows report that activities focused on appreciating diversity help Fellows to be more comfortable and work more effectively as leaders in the midst of a diverse society. Moreover, the data suggest that GOJoven's skilled and compassionate training facilitators provide a safe and enabling environment for Fellows' development of self-awareness and other personal qualities and skills.

A recent evaluation study of the (adult-focused) Leadership Development for Mobilizing Sexual and Reproductive Health Program, implemented in Africa and Asia, similarly found that a focus on personal development led participants to improve other skills, which in turn improved their career, and thus leadership, opportunities (Hofmann-Pinilla & Kallick Russell, 2011). A recent scan of the leadership development literature suggests that helping participants develop the ability to understand, respect, and work with diversity is a key component of successful leadership development (Toner, 2012). **Together, the external evaluation findings and other research literature suggest that GOJoven's focus on personal growth and self-awareness complement a focus on more traditional leadership KAS, and result in more effective leaders.**

2. Fostering a sense of community and peer support within GOJoven

GOJoven has applied multiple strategies that foster a sense of community and peer support within the program. For example, during Fellowship year trainings, Fellows engage in group-based self-awareness, personal development, and peer trust activities. In addition, cohorts of Fellows from each country design and implement a LAP together, and during and after the Fellowship year, Fellows have opportunities to network with their peers through participation in GOJoven National and/or Regional Meetings. For alumni Fellows, there are also opportunities to collaborate in the selection, orientation, and training of new Fellows, and to make presentations with GOJoven peers on LAPs and other projects.

The sense of community and peer support that has been engendered among Fellows through these and other activities was evidenced at the four GOJoven National Meetings in early 2012. Many Fellows shared very personal and painful MSC stories with each other, in writing and in large-group discussions. This sharing demonstrated a high level of trust among group members. **The sense of community and peer support, in turn, has helped energize Fellows to continue to work as youth leaders in ASRHR, even in the face of personal and professional obstacles and challenges.**

Recent research on leadership development programs suggests that fostering a sense of community among program participants, as GOJoven does, can play key role in overcoming individual biases and strengthening individual skills (Hofmann-Pinilla & Kallick Russell, 2011), as well as help foster a sense of collective or shared leadership (Toner, 2012). The GOJoven data provide further support for these previous findings.

3. Use of a highly participatory, interactive training methodology

GOJoven staff employ highly participatory, interactive and hands-on training methodologies that appeal to multiple learning styles (visual, auditory, tactile). Fellows and KOLs/BOs have identified the use of these methodologies as crucial to development of Fellows' leadership- and ASRHR-related KAS. **In particular, Fellows have reported that the opportunity to practice skills during training and receive feedback on their performance has greatly facilitated their learning. Many Fellows have replicated the participatory, interactive training approach and have reported (in multiple data sources) receiving positive feedback from their training participants as well as requests to provide additional trainings.**

Use of participatory methods and "action learning" ("learning by doing") are promising practices in a variety of fields, including leadership development (Toner, 2012) and youth sex and HIV education (Kirby, 2007).

Both the GOJoven evaluation findings and the broader literature indicate that this methodology offers a potentially highly effective training method as a component of youth leadership development programs.[14]

* * *

Separately and together, the promising practices #1-3 (above) have helped to improve Fellows' leadership KAS, afford them increasingly influential leadership roles, and spark and amplify their desire to lead change in their communities. A Mexican Fellow touched upon these promising practices and outcomes in an MSC story: "[Through GOJoven] I realized that I had much potential and capacity to be able to learn from others and focus my life on something positive—my personal development, situation management, the leadership test [through a GOJoven leadership outing in] Tikal [Guatemala], and all of the experiences of my brothers and sisters and trainers in GOJoven were what gave me that inspiration to return and be able to contribute in my home, organization, friends, municipality, and state in sexual and reproductive health."

4. Provision of ongoing opportunities for Fellows to apply newly acquired knowledge, attitudes, and skills

In addition to providing hands-on learning activities during Fellowship year training sessions, GOJoven provides many on-going opportunities for Fellows to apply new KAS in a variety of real-world contexts. For example, LAPs require Fellows to call upon their newly acquired KAS to conceive of, conduct, and report on a specific ASRHR-related project in collaboration with other Fellows, organizations, and community members. Fellows design these projects to achieve specific outcomes at the organizational and/or community level, requiring them to conceptualize a theory of change, and allowing them to see leadership as linked to achieving results beyond the individual level. Additionally, GOJoven affords Fellows opportunities to help to select and train new cohorts of Fellows, become TOTs who deliver workshops to a variety of organizational and community audiences, make presentations at national and regional conferences and meetings, and further their formal studies with GOJoven academic scholarships. **Together, these opportunities increase the employability of Fellows and in turn afford them a broader range of professional opportunities related to youth leadership and ASRHR.**

Other research on SRHR and youth leadership development programs has found that providing participants with opportunities to practice and apply new KAS in an ongoing and sustained way plays an important role in expanding and deepening participant outcomes (Reinelt et al., 2005; Toner, 2012). In addition, research suggests that helping new leaders to connect their individual leadership development to other outcomes—for example, outcomes for organizations and communities—is an important aspect of leadership development (Toner, 2012).

5. Institutional strengthening with Fellow involvement

The vast majority of IS Project grants have been awarded to organizations that had at least one Fellow at the time of the award. For each such grant, the Fellow and the organizational director were expected to

[14] PHI has reported that from their perspective, the training methodology seems especially effective when employed in several, intensive trainings provided every three months or so, over the course of a year. PHI feels that this method and approach have led to stronger, more sustained outcomes for participants. One KOL/BO interviewee with an academic and professional background in training methodologies expressed a similar belief.

work together to develop the project, with the Fellow most commonly serving as project coordinator. [15] IS Projects afford benefits to both organizations and their Fellows. Organizations receive resources for strategic planning, staff training, and other activities that strengthen their capacity and ASRHR-related programming. Fellows apply and showcase their growing KAS in diverse professional settings, acquire new roles and responsibilities within the institution, and build networks with other organizations and/or community constituents with an interest in promoting ASRHR.

This individual-level enrichment, in turn, helps further build the capacities of Fellows' host institutions, such as staff skills, programming, and networks. As a Honduran organization indicated in an IS Project report: "Having the Institutional Strengthening fund allowed [us] to strengthen [our] youth program and foster our youth team. The success of the project is owed in large part to the work of the youth group and the direct participation of the Summit [GOJoven] Fellow in its implementation." An additional benefit of IS Projects with Fellow involvement appears to be mitigation of tensions related to time conflicts between Fellows' responsibilities within the institution and GOJoven activities (see also challenge #2 in Section V, below). This encourages organizations to further support Fellows' leadership- and ASRHR-related development and activities.

The multiple benefits of IS Projects reiterate findings of research on other leadership development programs (Hofmann-Pinilla & Kallick Russell, 2011; Reinelt et al., 2005), which highlights the ability of small grants, especially those focused on institutional strengthening, to increase capacities at the individual and organizational levels. Per the literature, these grants ultimately led to program participants generating and implementing new projects with goals similar to those of the leadership development program and the participating institution. **GOJoven's experience and that of the programs described in other research suggest the promising nature of institutionally-focused small grants, with program participant involvement, to build needed capacities at multiple levels.**

* * *

Separately and together, the promising practices described above have served to improve Fellows' leadership KAS, increase their employability and career options in youth leadership in ASRHR, afford them increasingly influential leadership roles, and spark and amplify their desire to lead change in ASRHR in their communities, countries, and the region. Through both IS Projects and Fellow involvement, organizations have improved their capacity to serve their communities and promote positive change in ASRHR outcomes at multiple levels.

[15] Of the 44 institutional strengthening project grants that have been awarded to date, only six have been made to organizations that did not have a Fellow. The data reviewed or generated in the external evaluation do not permit assessment of differences in organizational outcomes between IS Projects that involved Fellows and those that did not. In this section, we highlight the promising aspects of the projects that included Fellows.

V. PRINCIPAL CHALLENGES

Data sources suggest that GOJoven has experienced a number of challenges that have collectively limited the potential for achieving desired leadership- and ASRHR-related outcomes at multiple levels. The principal challenges that have emerged from the data are summarized below.

1. Some GOJoven Fellows have reported negative family and community reactions, particularly initially, to their ASRHR work.

Some Fellows have reported being viewed suspiciously or stigmatized within their families or communities for participating in an ASRHR-focused program and/or working to address ASRHR topics. For example, as one Guatemalan Fellow explained in an MSC story, "Each day is a struggle with some people, since when you defend the sexual and reproductive rights we have, they think you're gay, that you're a pervert or that nobody taught you that one should not talk about these topics."

In many instances, Fellows have reported that these negative reactions have disappeared or diminished over time. Some have even found that others in their networks increased respect for and appreciation of their new knowledge and skills. For example, a Mexican Fellow described in an MSC story that her highly religious family initially experienced discomfort with her discussing what she was learning in GOJoven, but over time came to be more comfortable with the material. She was eventually even invited to give SRH-related pre-matrimony talks at her parents' church. At the same time, it may be that Fellows who experienced ongoing negative reactions might have ceased to be active in GOJoven, and thus were less likely to have their experiences documented in the external evaluation. Overall, the available data indicate that Fellows experienced mixed initial reactions to their ASRHR work, but often these reactions transformed over time.

2. Some GOJoven Fellows and their supervisors have experienced workplace tensions or conflicts over GOJoven.

Some Fellows and supervisors of Fellows have reported workplace concerns or conflicts related to GOJoven. For example, some supervisors have reported:

- *Lack of knowledge of GOJoven's goals, activities, and accomplishments.* For example, one Guatemalan supervisor reported: "GOJoven does not tell me anything. For example, there is never information from organization to organization, you know? Such as 'we are doing this....' It could be short notes, like a bulletin, I mean about their accomplishments, [to] share their advances.... (external evaluation interview). A Belizean Fellow made a similar comment in the alumni survey: "GOJoven should have more communication with our bosses...."
- *Concern with time that Fellows spend on GOJoven activities versus their job responsibilities.* A Belizean supervisor reported: "A lot of his attention during this period has gone to [GOJoven] not the other responsibilities he has.... [I]t can take away from his other responsibilities "(internal evaluation interview). A Mexican supervisor commented that the negative aspect of GOJoven was "many absences and prolonged absences, which seriously affected the work of the organization, especially when (sometimes) trainings were confirmed with little advance notice" (organizational survey).
- *Lack of awareness of what Fellows have learned in GOJoven*. Several supervisors reported that they were unaware of what Fellows had learned in GOJoven because Fellows had not shared this

information with the organization. For example, a representative from a Guatemalan organization commented that she had no knowledge of the topics of the GOJoven training her Fellow was attending through GOJoven, adding that had she known, she could have provided more opportunities for the fellow to apply her new knowledge to her work (internal evaluation interview).

- *Fellows departing the organization shortly after being trained, resulting in no return on investment.* This was a concern reported by several organizations. For example one stated: "...[The Fellow] left and didn't leave anything with the organization, as a result of the [GOJoven] Fellowship, so what was learned only benefitted [him/her]." (Mexican organizational survey).

Some Fellows also have reported tensions in the workplace related to their GOJoven participation. According to Fellows, some of their supervisors did not appreciate the skills, empowerment, and new ideas they brought from GOJoven and/or felt threatened by Fellows' assertiveness. For example, a Honduran Fellow noted in the alumni survey that "...[D]ue to my empowerment as a leader at my previous job I was just seen as a rebel for giving my points of view on some things". In the alumni survey, Fellows were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement "for having applied what I have learned in GOJoven, my relationship with my (current or previous) boss has gotten worse." The majority of respondents disagreed with this statement, but nearly 10% agreed. Just over 8% agreed with a statement that for having applied what they had learned in GOJoven, they were let go from their job.

On the one hand, Fellows' increased assertiveness and movement to other organizations (e.g., to accept higher-level positions or to work in jobs more directly related to ASRHR) can be seen as positive outcomes of GOJoven. However, tensions between Fellows and supervisors also have the potential to limit Fellows' participation in GOJoven-linked activities and the interest of organizations to support their young staff members to become future Fellows. In addition, if supervisors are not aware of what Fellows are learning, opportunities for further transmission of new leadership- and ASRHR-related KAS can be missed, which limits the potential reach and impact of GOJoven.

3. LAPs have commonly experienced implementation and evaluation challenges.

Multiple data sources have documented a number of common challenges across LAPs. These have included a lack of team member commitment and engagement, difficulty coordinating team members' schedules, poor team dynamics, limited ability or inability to monitor and evaluate outcomes (due to lack of personnel, funding, and skills), and difficulty producing high-quality deliverables within the established timeframes. In a number of instances, teamwork challenges were reported to have improved over time, as Fellows gained practical experience working with other leaders. However, transportation and communication challenges (particularly for LAPs in which participants were geographically dispersed) and Fellows' busy schedules tended to be more intractable.

In some instances, LAP activities were reported to have been delayed or otherwise challenged by local community factors, such as youth, parental, or other community resistance to addressing ASRHR, or broader political, social, and environmental forces, such as the coup in Honduras, the H1N1 flu outbreak in Mexico, and severe weather patterns and loss of electricity (LAP reports, LAP team group interviews). However, these types of challenges were not reported as commonly as team process issues.

Collectively, the challenges discussed above have frequently resulted in project delays, and sometimes in projects not being implemented completely. In addition, only a relatively small proportion of LAPs have

been able to report systematic data demonstrating LAP effects on communities (see Section III.D above and challenge #6, below). Collectively, these challenges have limited the ability of LAPs to achieve and document community-level outcomes.

4. Some IS Projects have not led to sustained organizational change.

Although IS Projects involve one-time funding for finite project implementation periods (typically 12 months), the expectation of project stakeholders is that there will be some type of longer-term sustainability—with respect to program or service implementation, application of new skills and behaviors among staff, and/or maintenance of environments that facilitate communication, programming, and other activities related to ASRHR. The sustainability of services and outcomes initiated through IS Projects appears to have varied greatly, and in a number of cases, sustainability beyond the time that the final project report was submitted is unknown.

Lack of funding has commonly been reported to be a key factor in services or outcomes not being sustained. For example, one organizational survey respondent whose organization had implemented an IS Project stated: "Financing has been lacking to continue to provide education [as begun under] the GOJoven IS Project."

In a few cases, lack of political will and low prioritization of ASRHR at the local governmental level have been reported to have limited sustainability. For example, a Guatemalan organization indicated in an IS Project report that although it had completed a needs assessment on SRH and was dedicated to continuing to look for funds to provide related services, it faced the challenge that the local government was unlikely to support the work or make SRH a priority.

In addition, some in-country GOJoven staff and KOLs/BOs commented in interviews that projects that are narrowly focused on training a small group of youth have less potential for sustained outcomes than projects that seek to work with local communities and authorities to change policies, programming, and social norms. For example, a Mexican KOL/BO commented: "Going to a school and giving a talk is easy, but I think strategies in this sense haven't worked… I think you would have to join forces with youth that have a more political approach," such as volunteers in local government.

As noted above, several GOJoven alumni have founded NGOs that deliver ASRHR-related activities or services. Some have shown considerable success to date in securing funding for their work (e.g., see the example in Table 10 above). Longer-term sustainability (i.e., five years or more) is yet to be demonstrated for most of these organizations.

5. Many ASRHR organizations have limited awareness of GOJoven's goals, methods, Fellows, and accomplishments.

Some in-country GOJoven staff, the majority of KOLs/BOs, and some organizational survey respondents have reported limited awareness of GOJoven's goals, methods, Fellows, and accomplishments among ASRHR organizations (i.e., their own and/or others), particularly those operating at the national level. Factors contributing to this lack of awareness include:

- Limited outreach by GOJoven to ASRHR organizations, and failure of Fellows to share learnings with their supervisors and/or colleagues.

- Failure among many Fellows to explicitly identify themselves as affiliated with GOJoven in professional contexts, outside of GOJoven events.
- Limited resources to evaluate GOJoven and systematically document and disseminate its achievements at the organizational, community, and national/regional levels.
- Limited outreach to the media to promote and inform about GOJoven.

Limited awareness of GOJoven among ASRHR organizations makes it more difficult for Fellows and in-country GOJoven staff to establish alliances and collaborations to address ASRHR issues, particularly at the national and regional level. As one Belizean KOL/BO described it: "A lot of partners [i.e., ASRHR stakeholders nationwide] still aren't sure what GOJoven is up to, who is GOJoven, and because of that then you might be losing some opportunities for working together."[16]

6. There is little systematic evaluation data on community-level outcomes of GOJoven-linked efforts.

As was discussed above, most data on community-level outcomes of GOJoven-linked activities is anecdotal or impressionistic. Many data sources employed in the external evaluation have provided evidence that LAPs, IS Projects, organizations, and communities have limited capacity to carry out formal evaluations. For example, in a group interview, a LAP team reported that when they attempted to conduct a needs assessment of the community that was the focus of their LAP, they found that there was no documentation of how many people in the community were using the visiting nurse service. In addition, in interviews and IS Project reports, several organizations noted evaluation as an area in which they would like further technical assistance or resource support. The lack of systematic, community-level monitoring and evaluation data makes it difficult for the GOJoven community to know what has and has not been achieved, share successes with other ASRHR stakeholders, and make associated decisions about how to improve programming in the future.

7. Most Fellows are not in positions that make national- or regional-level policy, funding, and programming decisions on ASRHR issues.

Most Fellows do not have jobs in which they can make decisions that affect national- or regional-level ASRHR-related outcomes. Fellows are young (age 18-30) when they enter GOJoven, and usually in positions of very limited authority. As one Mexican KOL/BO commented: ""...[T]hose who are in the program are—also because of the stage of life they are in, they are younger—they are not in positions of power...." Since GOJoven's inception in 2004, some Fellows have served temporarily or periodically on ASRHR-related advisory boards or commissions that advise departmental-, state-, national-, or international-level authorities, as was noted above. However, very few have attained longer-term, high-level positions of authority that permit them to make policy, funding, or programming decisions that *directly* impact national- or regional-level ASRHR services or health outcomes. This in turn has limited the ability of GOJoven to achieve ASRHR outcomes at the national and regional level.

[16] Although this quote is from a Belizean KOL/BO, there is some evidence that GOJoven is better known among Belizean ASRHR organizations than among ASHRH organizations in other countries. This may be an artifact of the convenience sampling of KOLs/BOs and/or due to Belize's relatively small size, its strong national-level focus on matters pertaining to youth, and/or other factors; the available data do not provide evidence for choosing among the possible explanations.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations for Summit, PHI, and GOJoven to consider in the areas of programming and partnerships, communications, and evaluation respond to the challenges identified above and incorporate suggestions from Fellows, GOJoven-linked organizations, KOLs/BOs, and other stakeholders. In some cases, they address specific components of current GOJoven programming, which may or may not be sustained in GOJoven's next phase. In other cases, they address broader aspects of GOJoven's goals and strategies currently under discussion in GOJoven's ongoing sustainability planning process. Focusing resources on in-country GOJoven staff and/or consultants would be crucial to successful implementation of most of the recommendations. GOJoven alumni offer a rich source of potential personnel to carry out many of the activities referenced below.

Programming and Partnerships

1. Continue to support Fellows' personal development.

As was indicated in challenge #1 (Section V), some Fellows have faced challenges in their families, communities, and/or workplaces to applying the KAS they have learned in GOJoven. Study data suggest that in addition to building leadership skills, GOJoven's focus on personal development during the Fellowship year—including self-awareness, effective communication styles, self-esteem, personal goal-setting, and respect for diversity—is crucial to helping Fellows to weather these and other challenges. Continuing to promote a sense of community within GOJoven can also provide both current Fellows and alumni with a sense of personal support that can help them to advance as ASRHR leaders.

2. Provide more in-country support for LAP teams.

LAPs afford Fellows an important opportunity to apply new KAS in real-world contexts (see promising practice #4). However, as was discussed in challenges #3, LAP teams have reported various project implementation and evaluation challenges. LAP reports and LAP team group interview data suggest that the following strategies might help to address these challenges:

- Provide (additional) training in practical project management skills and handling team dynamics.
- Implement closer monitoring of LAPs by in-country GOJoven staff, and offer greater technical assistance from these staff and/or other local experts.

In relation to the second point, LAP teams have made specific suggestions for assistance. For example, one LAP team member said in an interview: "...I think that GOJoven should monitor all of the LAPs that are developed more closely.... I think that indeed things would have turned out a little differently [for our LAP] if there had been follow-up [from GOJoven] by writing, calling, perhaps asking for updates, and not waiting until the group wants to give a sign that they are working or already finishing their LAP." Participants from another LAP team recommended having an in-country expert in ASRHR review any educational materials produced by LAPs for technical correctness and local appropriateness. Participants in two LAP team group interviews recommended that GOJoven provide additional support for more extensive LAP evaluation.

Moreover, although the principal purpose of LAPs is to afford Fellows an opportunity to apply their new leadership and ASRHR skills to a real-world project, additional technical assistance could help to encourage design of LAPs that have greater potential to achieve sustainable community-level outcomes,

though strategies such as advocacy for local-level policy change (see also recommendation #4, below). This would require up-front guidance and technical assistance from in-country GOJoven staff or consultants early in the Fellowship year.

3. Apply additional strategies—beyond training in fundraising and grant-writing—to help Fellows and GOJoven-linked organizations address project and organizational sustainability challenges.

As was noted in challenge #4, many organizations have experienced challenges sustaining IS Project-linked services and outcomes once the IS Project period has ended. Other GOJoven-linked organizations have also experienced a range of sustainability challenges. Improving sustainability is especially difficult in GOJoven countries' low-resource climates. Possible strategies to bolster sustainability that emerge from the external evaluation data (and more general best practices) include providing additional Fellow training and IS Workshops on sustainability and considering how to involve the private, for-profit sector in GOJoven countries to provide more support for ASRHR.

With respect to the first strategy, organizations and Fellows have requested more training on how to acquire funding (internal evaluation interviews, alumni survey, organizational survey). In addition to knowledge and skills development in fundraising and grant-writing, however, the literature on sustainability of social and health programs indicates that it is important for organizations to be able to define and plan for sustainability at the outset of a project (e.g., Johnson et al., 2004; Weiss et al., 2002). In addition, planning for organizational sustainability requires close examination of an organization's overall institutional capacity and development of its ability to understand and respond in a timely fashion to changing contextual factors, implement a practical evaluation framework, and build alliances with other organizations across sectors (Abt Associates, n.d.; Guler, 2008).

With respect to the second strategy, in one Belizean KOL/BO interview it was noted that "business groups should take an active role [in addressing ASRHR]." Indeed, the business community has for years been recognized as having an important role in ASRHR in the U.S., as it can bring funding, in-kind contributions (e.g., donated supplies, volunteer time), leadership, and key stakeholder networks to the table. The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy[17], for example, devoted a chapter in its *Get Organized: A Guide to Preventing Teen Pregnancy* (1999) to discussing reasons, roles, and strategies for involving the business community in ASRH. Efforts to improve SRH in international (including developing country) contexts have also addressed the actual and potential roles of the private, for-profit sector (e.g., see Grierson, 2000; IAWG, 2007; Peters et al., 2004; UNFPA, 1999). For example, the for-profit sector can become involved in youth-focused enterprise and livelihoods initiatives that may reduce risky sexual behavior through a number of change pathways (Grierson, 2000). At the same time, it is important to note that some KOLs/BOs commented in interviews that political issues, conservative values concerning sex, and potential business ties to criminal activity present formidable challenges to successfully involving the private, for-profit sector in ASRHR in GOJoven countries.

[17] It is now The National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy.

4. Focus additional attention on linking alumni with municipal, state/departmental, national, and international platforms, committees, and networks addressing ASRHR.

Ultimately, sustaining ASRHR-related programs, services, and their positive health outcomes depends on achieving policy and funding change at local, national, and regional levels. As was noted above, there is little evidence that GOJoven has made a direct contribution to engendering such changes at the national or regional level. One key factor (noted in challenge #7) is that most GOJoven alumni are not (yet) in positions that permit them to make decisions that directly impact ASRHR outcomes at these levels. A related factor is that many GOJoven alumni have dedicated considerable time and energy to training small groups of youth in ASRHR, but not to participating in larger-scale advocacy efforts to change policies, programs, or services.

An example of a larger-scale effort that GOJoven Fellows and their organizations might collaborate on is the implementation and monitoring of the Ministerial Declaration "Educating to Prevent." Signed in Mexico City in 2008 by 30 Ministers of Health and 26 Ministers of Education, including the Ministers of Health and Education in all four GOJoven countries, the Ministerial Declaration seeks to strengthen HIV/AIDS prevention efforts in Latin America and the Caribbean by ensuring access to high-quality, comprehensive sexuality education and SRH services.[18] Several KOLs/BOs recommended that GOJoven be more involved in this effort. For example, a Mexican KOL stated in an interview: "...I think it is worth it...for GOJoven to be more involved in the Ministerial Declaration, which is the framework that is being supported now at the Central American level and in Mexico." Other KOLs/BOs recommended more linkages between GOJoven and their countries' Ministries of Health, Education, and Youth.

Helping alumni to become more involved in municipal, state/departmental, national, and international ASRHR-related platforms, committees, and networks—by further building their advocacy skills and by linking them with older, more established leaders—is an important GOJoven strategy because: (a) it promises to advance alumni's individual leadership trajectories, so that they can move into positions of greater decision-making authority concerning ASRHR-related policies, programs, and funding; and (b) it will increase the likelihood that—through leadership roles of greater authority and through collaborative action with others—alumni will have a direct impact on local, national, and regional ASRHR-related program, policy, and health outcomes.

Communications

5. Communicate annually with new and alumni Fellows' organizations and promote increased information-sharing.

The kinds of GOJoven-related workplace tensions reported by some Fellows and their supervisors (see challenge #2), as well as lack of knowledge about GOJoven among Fellows' supervisors (see challenge #5), suggest that GOJoven should implement strategies such as the following:

- *On an annual basis, provide organizations that host new Fellows and/or alumni with information about GOJoven, along with information about expected time commitments from Fellows/alumni.* Currently, the supervisor/director of each new Fellow signs a commitment letter that lays out time expectations for the Fellow during the Fellowship year and LAP implementation. However, no such letter is provided to

[18] For further information on the Ministerial Declaration, see http://unicef.org/spanish/media/media_50463_html.

organizations concerning alumni time commitments. Providing such a letter annually, and including information on GOJoven's mission, goals, recent activities, and results could help to build greater buy-in with supervisors to allow them to support participation by current and alumni Fellows in GOJoven-related activities.

- *Require that for Fellows to be accepted to GOJoven, they and their supervisors must agree in writing that the Fellow will make at least one presentation on their learnings to colleagues and supervisors, after attending each GOJoven training or National/Regional Meeting.* This can help to ensure that learnings from GOJoven are transferred to others and that supervisors are aware of the benefits to their organizations.
- *Encourage and assist Fellows to share written and electronic GOJoven materials with their supervisors and colleagues.* For example, a Honduran supervisor recommended that GOJoven provide an extra copy of GOJoven materials specifically for the Fellow's organization.
- *Consider collecting some (limited) data from Fellows and their organizations annually to monitor satisfaction and challenges.* This is discussed further in recommendation #8, below; in brief, collecting such information can facilitate monitoring of and rapid responses to challenges that arise concerning organizations' linkages to GOJoven.

6. Disseminate GOJoven information more systematically and assertively to local, national, and international ASRHR organizations and the public.

As was noted in the discussion of challenge #5, many ASRHR-related organizations that have not worked with—or not worked continuously with—GOJoven have limited knowledge of GOJoven's mission, goals, Fellows, activities, and outcomes. Multiple data sources suggest that the following strategies for marketing and disseminating information to these organizations could be useful:

- *Sending annual reports or newsletters via email to ASRHR- and youth-focused organizations in the GOJoven countries.* This would be a more active outreach strategy to complement posting of materials on GOJoven's website.
- *Conducting more media outreach via newspaper, radio, and television.* As was noted in challenge #5, KOL/BO interviewees commonly recommended that GOJoven engage in more media outreach to raise awareness of the program. As was noted in Section III.B.1, the outcomes of media outreach efforts might be enhanced through provision of further training to Fellows in how to communicate effectively with and through mass media to address ASRHR-related topics.
- *Encouraging Fellows to identify themselves with both their home organization and GOJoven.* For example, at meetings, in email footers, and on business cards, Fellows could reference both their organization and GOJoven.
- *Sending out lists of Fellows to ASRHR organizations in the GOJoven countries.* Fellow contact information and short biographies on ASRHR-related interests and expertise could be provided.
- *GOJoven's having a (greater) presence at events sponsored by other organizations*, such as health fairs run by Ministries of Health and activities sponsored by other government agencies, coalitions, and leading non-governmental ASRHR organizations.

- *Making GOJoven's training curriculum and tools, as well as educational resources developed by LAP teams, widely available* to Fellows, their organizations, and other ASRHR-linked organizations.[19]

Evaluation

7. Develop a logic model with specific and measurable outcome targets, a systematic monitoring and evaluation plan, and a budget for prospective evaluation of GOJoven's next phase, and work to build a culture of learning around evaluation.

As was detailed above (see challenges #3, #6), GOJoven has experienced some evaluation-related challenges, particularly with respect to documenting LAP effects and other community-level outcomes systematically and over mid- and long-term periods. GOJoven was initially a pilot project that focused on assessing process objectives (e.g., training a certain number of Fellows per year) and short-term, individual-level outcome objectives (e.g., improvements in Fellows' ASRHR- and leadership-related knowledge and skills). Over the years, the program has evolved, adding new components and developing a full draft logic model. With the growth of the program have come additional outcome evaluation expectations from the Summit Foundation and other stakeholders. At the current juncture, multiple stakeholders are interested to document GOJoven's outcomes more robustly and systematically, and in particular the program's impact on Fellows' longer-term leadership and career trajectories and ASRHR-related programs, policies, and funding streams at the community, district, departmental, state, national, and regional levels. To document such effects, it will be important to plan systematically and prospectively for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in GOJoven's next phase. This planning should include development of the following:

- A logic model that includes SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time-framed) outcome objectives.
- An M&E plan that identifies how each SMART objective will be systematically measured over time, including the methods and periodicity of data collection, analysis, and reporting back to stakeholders. The plan should ensure that data collection processes (i) yield sufficient, high-quality data to address key indicators, (ii) can be carried out within the available budget (see also below), and (iii) do not overburden participants or result in more data than can be analyzed and used.
- A set of strategies for furthering a culture of learning around M&E within GOJoven that can promote evaluation buy-in, participation, capacity-building, and use of findings. Sharing M&E findings with the GOJoven community on an ongoing basis is an example of one such strategy.
- A realistic evaluation budget that includes (but is not limited to) coverage for a local evaluation lead in each country who will be responsible for coordinating GOJoven M&E activities in that country.

Collecting data on a periodic, ongoing basis can be resource-intensive, particularly if the data must be collected from indirect GOJoven beneficiaries (such as youth, parents, or others who are not directly affiliated with GOJoven). When feasible and appropriate, leveraging existing datasets (e.g., clinic logs, government or NGO surveillance data) can help to minimize costs, as can involving current Fellows and alumni as M&E consultants (see also below).

[19] As of the time this report was being written, this was already part of the draft plan for GOJoven's Phase IV.

8. Consider implementing brief annual online surveys that systematically assess outcomes and challenges among Fellows, GOJoven-linked organizations, and their communities.

Depending on the SMART objectives established for GOJoven's next phase, implementation of *brief* annual online surveys with new and alumni Fellows and GOJoven-linked organizations could be one (of several) viable evaluation strategies. In particular, such surveys could facilitate: (a) systematic, ongoing assessment of Fellows' key behavioral outcomes and leadership trajectories, (b) monitoring of the sustainability of new organizational policies, programs, and practices put in place under GOJoven auspices, and (c) more systematic (if still impressionistic or anecdotal) collection of data on community-level outcomes. The surveys could also help to monitor GOJoven-related challenges that Fellows and organizations are facing in workplace, family, and/or community settings (per Section V, above). For organizations without Internet access, a faxed survey could be an option.

The external evaluation has shown that in-country consultants (alumni) can obtain high survey response rates from their peers. If GOJoven-linked organizations are sensitized *up front* to the importance of an annual survey, and know that the overall findings will be shared with them, they may also respond favorably to an annual survey request (Aday & Cornelius, 2006; Solomon, 2001). Using GOJoven alumni as paid consultants to facilitate data collection and dissemination of findings, and retaining local but non-GOJoven-affiliated consultants to conduct data analysis could keep annual survey costs relatively low. Contracting local consultants who are not affiliated with GOJoven to conduct data analysis would avoid confidentiality and bias concerns that would be associated with having otherwise qualified alumni conduct the analyses.

9. Consider devoting additional GOJoven resources to strengthening local monitoring and evaluation systems.

Also depending on the SMART objectives established for GOJoven's next phase, it may be useful for GOJoven to devote resources to strengthening local M&E systems. As was noted above (see challenge #6), organizations often lack the fiscal and human resources to engage in formal M&E. While a number of training sessions for Fellows and organizations have been devoted to evaluation methods, relatively few IS Project grants have focused on strengthening organizations' M&E systems. Greater investment in such systems could facilitate evaluation of GOJoven-related activities and monitoring of the trajectories of key community-level ASRHR indicators, help strengthen institutional learning and continuous program improvement, and permit dissemination of additional information about GOJoven's outcomes to diverse ASRHR stakeholders.

REFERENCES

Abt Associates Inc.. (n.d.). *Fundamentals of NGO Financial Sustainability.* Watertown, MA: Pathfinder International. Accessed July 1, 2012 at http://www2.pathfinder.org/site/PageServer?pagename=Pubs_ICB.

Aday LA, Cornelius LJ. *Designing and Conducting Health Surveys: A Comprehensive Guide, 3rd ed.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cullen AE, Coryn CLS, Rugh J. (2011). The politics and consequences of including stakeholders in international development evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 32*(3): 345-361.

Davies R, Dart J. (2005). *The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use, Version 1.0.* Melbourne, Australia: MandE.

Fewtrell MS, Kennedy K, Singhal A, Martin RM, Ness A, Hadders-Algra M, Koletzko B, Lucas A. (2008). How much loss to follow-up is acceptable in long-term randomised trials and prospective studies? *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 93*(6): 458-461.

Grierson J. (2000). Youth, enterprise, livelihoods and reproductive health: How can small enterprise and sustainable livelihoods help address the HIV/AIDS crisis in Africa? Report to the United States Agency for International Development. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre. Accessed June 25, 2012 at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACS790.pdf.

Grove JT, Kibel BM, Haas T. (2007). EvaluLEAD: an open-systems perspective on evaluating leadership development. In *The Handbook of Leadership Development Evaluation*, ed. by Hannum et al., pp. 71-110. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guler E. (2008). How to improve NGO effectiveness in development? A discussion of lessons learned. Accessed July 1, 2012 at http://www.ngomanager.org/dcd/2_Organisational_Development/Capacity_building/NGO_Efectiveness.pdf.

Gutiérrez M, Tasse T. (2007). Leading with theory: using a theory of change approach for leadership development evaluations. In *The Handbook of Leadership Development Evaluation*, ed. by Hannum et al., pp. 48-70. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hofmann-Pinilla A, Kallick Russell J. (2011). *Evaluation of the Leadership Development for Mobilizing Reproductive Health Program: Final Report Executive Summary.* NY: Research Center for Leadership in Action, New York University Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service.

The IBP (Implementing Best Practices) in Reproductive Health Initiative of USAID, UNFPA, and WHO. (n.d.). Best practices: what is a best practice? Accessed November 8, 2011 at http://www.ibpinitiative.org/best_practices.html.

Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG) on the Role of Community Involvement in ASRH. (2007). *Community Pathways to Improved Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health: A Conceptual Framework and Suggested Outcome Indicators*. December 2007. Washington, DC and New York, NY: Author. Accessed June 25, 2011 at http://www.unfpa.org/webdav/site/global/shared/documents/publications/2007/asrh_pathways.pdf.

Johnson K, Hays C, Center H, Daley C. (2004) Building capacity and sustainable prevention innovations: a sustainability planning model. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 27*: 135-149.

The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy. (1999). Chapter 8: Involving the business community in teen pregnancy prevention. *Get Organized: A Guide to Preventing Teen Pregnancy,* pp. 55-77. Washington, DC: Author [now The National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy].

Peters DH, Mirchandani GG, Hansen PM. (2004). Strategies for engaging the private sector in sexual and reproductive health: how effective are they? *Health Policy and Planning, 19*(Suppl. 1): i5-i21.

Reinelt C, Howard, KA, Meehan D, Putney P, Roddy C. (2005). *Leadership Matters: An Evaluation of Six Family Planning and Reproductive Health Leadership Programs.* Brookline, MA: Development Guild/DDI. Accessed July 27, 2012 at http:// http://leadershiplearning.org/leadership-resources/resources-and-publications/leadership-matters-evaluation-six-family-planning-an.

Remez L, Prada E, Singh S, Rosero Bixby L, Bankole A. (2008). *Asegurar una mañana más saludable en Centroamérica: proteger la salud sexual y reproductiva de la juventud de hoy.* New York: Guttmacher Institute.

Serrat O. (2009). *The Most Significant Change Technique.* Manila, Philippines: Asian Development Bank.

Solomon DJ. (2001). Conducting web-based surveys. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 7*(19). Accessed August 4, 2012 at http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=19.

Toner K. (2012). Emerging best practices in the field of leadership development. Unpublished manuscript.

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). (1999). *The UNFPA Private-Sector Initiative Exploring Ways to Facilitate Cooperation between Governments and the Commercial Sector to Expand Access to Reproductive Health Commodities.* Accessed August 22, 2012 at http://www.unfpa.org/upload/lib_pub_file/140_filename_privatesector99.doc.

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and Population Reference Bureau (PRB). (2010). *Country Profiles for Population and Reproductive Health: Policy Developments and Indicators 2009/2010.* NY and Washington, DC: [Authors]. Accessed August 22, 2012 at http://www.unfpa.org/public/countries.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). (2010; Sept. 10) Identifying and promoting best practices: Identifying and promoting promising practices overview. Accessed November 8, 2011 at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/ccf/about_ccf/gbk_bp/bp_gbk_ov.html)

Weaver L, Cousins JB. (2004). Unpacking the participatory process. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation, 1*(1): 19-40.

Weiss H, Coffman J, Bohan-Baker M. (2002). *Evaluation's Role in Supporting Initiative Sustainability.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project. Accessed April 10, 2012 at http://www.hfrp.org/content/download/1115/48620/file/evaluation_sustainability.pdf.