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ABSTRACT

The Passages project aims to address a broad range of social norms, at scale, to achieve sustained improvements in family planning and reproductive health. A four-person team conducted an externally-led evaluation to determine the achievements of the project and inform future investments around social norms. Evaluation questions looked at generating new research, building capacity, global technical leadership, value-added, and implications for future investments.

Passages is conducting two research studies in the Democratic Republic of Congo, one focused on gender-role equality among youth and one working with faith communities to transform masculinities. The research has included an explicit focus on shifting social norms and scale-up. The project has built capacity among partners, partly through implementing realist evaluations to better understand mechanisms of change. Partners talk about gaining increased expertise on social norms and sharing and using this learning within their organizations. Important global technical leadership, primarily through the Learning Collaborative to Advance Normative Change, has helped bring a fragmented community together to gain greater consensus around definitions and measurement of social norms and produce a number of guidance documents. Passages made valuable contributions to work on gender, youth—particularly very young adolescents (ages 10-14)—and cross-sectoral discussions. The project has also leveraged significant support—more than $18 million—from other sections of USAID and other donors.

While there has been significant progress, there is still much to be done. A major recurring theme was the need to clearly frame social norms as part of social and behavior change. In addition, it will be important to provide continued support to synthesize information and disseminate it effectively, encourage utilization of lessons, and conduct research to address knowledge gaps.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>Association de Santé Familiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRH</td>
<td>Adolescent and youth reproductive health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Breakthrough Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Community of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>Église du Christ au Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGC</td>
<td>Female genital cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>Female genital mutilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Family Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Global Affairs Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAS</td>
<td>Global Early Adolescent Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenDev</td>
<td>Office of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHD</td>
<td>Girls Holistic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHPRO</td>
<td>Global Health Program Cycle Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>Grandmother Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT</td>
<td>Gender Roles, Equality and Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUG!</td>
<td>Growing Up Great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Intermediate Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRH</td>
<td>Institute for Reproductive Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Learning Collaborative to Advance Normative Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFF</td>
<td>Masculinite Famille et Foi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSI</td>
<td>Norms Shifting Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRH</td>
<td>Office of Population and Reproductive Health (USAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Population Services International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Randomized control trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>reproductive health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>Social and Behavior Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Social Ecological Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNET</td>
<td>Social Norms Exploration Guide and Toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SongES</td>
<td>Association d'Appui aux ONG de Sud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Trafficking in Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>Tekponon Jikuagou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Transforming Masculinities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>United States Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VYA</td>
<td>Very Young Adolescents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The global development community is increasingly referring to the importance of addressing social norms in order to achieve health and development goals, but there are still many unanswered questions about how to do this effectively. The Passages project aims to address a broad range of social norms, at scale, to achieve sustained improvements in family planning (FP) and reproductive health (RH) and address some of the gaps in knowledge and awareness around social norms. Launched July 1, 2015 as a five-year project, with a no-cost extension to September 2021, the project is implemented by a consortium led by the Institute for Reproductive Health (IRH) and including FHI 360, Save the Children, Tearfund, Global Early Adolescent Study (GEAS), and Population Services International (PSI) (until 2017).

EVALUATION PURPOSE, QUESTIONS, AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was conducted by an externally-led four-person team between June and October 2019 and had two objectives: 1) determine the achievements of the Passages project, and 2) inform PRH’s future investments in the technical areas supported through Passages. The team sought to answer five evaluation questions:

1. In terms of generating new research results, what are the contributions that the Passages project has made, and is on track to make, by the end of the project?

2. To what extent, and how, has Passages helped build the capacity of organizations with which they have worked in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Niger, Senegal, and elsewhere to increase the effectiveness and scale of community-level interventions that include a norm-shifting component?

3. How has the Passages project demonstrated global technical leadership with regard to the knowledge base related to norm-shifting interventions, at scale?

4. What has been the working relationship and the value added of the Passages project (regarding social norm development and transformation, at scale), relative to other USAID projects and efforts supported by other donors?

5. What are the implications for future USAID investments in research and research utilization related to social norm transformation at scale?

Sources of data included: 1) a social norms literature review; 2) a desk review of Passages project documents; 3) key informant interviews with 61 individuals representing project staff, partners, donors, and social norms experts; and 4) attendance at Passages dissemination event and annual partners meeting. Limitations to the evaluation include the lack of travel to DRC and the fact that research is still ongoing and so only some preliminary findings were available at the time of the evaluation.
FINDINGS

Evaluation Question 1: Generating new research

Due to a more limited budget than planned, Passages focused its research efforts on two studies in the DRC: Growing Up Great! (GUG) and Masculinité Famille et Foi/ Masculinity Family and Faith (MFF), an adaptation of the Transforming Masculinities (TM) approach. In discussing what was new about this research, key informants emphasized the explicit focus on shifting norms, giving partners a language and conceptual framework for social norms, and the focus on scale-up. Passages also made important contributions around very young adolescents (VYAs), both through the impact of the interventions and through youth engagement in data collection: “It’s important to put your money where your mouth is about meaningful youth participation.”

GUG! adapted the Gender Roles, Equality and Transformation (GREAT) project, initially implemented in Uganda, for an urban context to address gender role equality through school-based clubs and family engagement, and added a component for parents and included an explicit focus on social norms. Key informants praised the important partnership with GEAS in collecting data. Preliminary findings indicate more impact with the youngest group and out-of-school youth. Effective leveraging of the USAID investment led to over $13 million of support from other donors: the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) for implementation and institutionalizing through the ministries of health and education, and Global Affairs Canada to scale up to new areas and to a new cohort of older adolescents.

TM/MFF seeks to transform masculinities and promote FP through religious leaders and faith communities, working with the Protestant church partner, Église du Christ au Congo (ECC). Key informants see this work as an important contribution to the literature in learning more about working with religious leaders in norms shifting. There was strong local interest to scale up the project due to the buy-in by ECC, but this is now challenging due to U.S. government Trafficking in Persons policy restrictions on funding in DRC. High rates of exposure in control groups have made interpretation of preliminary results challenging.

Facilitating factors for the research included increased interest in addressing social norms, a truly collaborative approach by the project, buy-in from local partners, and building on existing interventions rather than starting from scratch. In particular, key informants highlighted the collaborative style and tone set by Rebecka Lundgren, the project director, a model that other projects could learn from. The research also faced a number of challenges, such as funding, perceptions that outsiders wanted to change local culture, methodological issues, staff turnover, language, and political issues.

Evaluation Question 2: Capacity building

Passages used realist evaluations to build capacity of partners and provide valuable information on mechanisms of change in order to facilitate replication and scale-up. This approach does not only ask “does it work?” but rather investigates “what works, for whom, in what contexts?” Two projects were selected in a consultative process: Husbands’ Schools in Niger and Girls Holistic Development/Grandmother Project in Senegal. Some key informants found the approach really important, leading to people making connections they had not made before. However, while people generally liked and appreciated the concept of the realist evaluation, the terminology has caused some confusion.

Partners talked about changes to their organization in terms of appreciation of social norms, capacity for social norms programming, and use of tools developed through Passages. This included local partners,
such as ECC, and global partners such as Save the Children and Tearfund, with the latter explaining: “This work brought the language of social norms to our work. It changed the way we approached things, the way we defined things and how we think about intervention models and processes as an organization.”

FHI 360 developed a costing primer, which serves as a guide to activity-based costing in the context of social norms and will be supplemented with case studies. FHI 360 worked closely with Save the Children and Tearfund to implement the costing studies for the activities in the DRC, building capacity in the process through mentoring and interactive assistance. Many key informants praised the project and USAID for including costing. “Costing is still often an afterthought. It was really forward looking of USAID to have this interest in trying to document and understand costs.” The partners who implemented the costing work said that the important lesson was that if you want to include costing, you need time and resources and staff to do it right.

Evaluation Question 3: Global technical leadership

The Passages project has emphasized making connections, attending technical meetings, joining working groups, and presenting at conferences, thereby creating a strong global presence.

The Learning Collaborative to Advance Normative Change (LC) was established as a networking platform to bring together individuals and organizations from different sectors working on adolescent and youth reproductive health (AYRH) and social norms in order to arrive at consensus on definitions and tools. Support from BMGF complemented the USAID support to Passages for the LC. The overall consensus was that the LC had been very successful while at the same time there was much more work to be done. With over 370 members from 108 organizations, the LC increased connections and led to important learning and publications in three areas: theory, measurement, and scale-up. Respondents mentioned the publication of a special supplement of the Journal of Adolescent Health in 2019 on AYRH as an important contribution. Many highlighted the importance of the lack of organizational branding in LC work: “The fact that it wasn’t tied to one organization or project in its branding allowed a larger number of groups to take things up. It was a general public good.” The LC faced challenges in being dominated at times by a small group of experts, not prioritizing or tracking use of documents it produced, and dealing with ongoing tensions between the academic and programmatic worlds.

The Office of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GenDev) assisted with support to Passages to develop two regional communities of practice CoPs to help move the conversation and sharing on social norms from the global level to regional levels. While the CoP in South Asia never gained traction, a CoP in Francophone Africa has 100 members engaged in online discussions and sharing.

Evaluation Question 4: Value added and working relationships of Passages project

The Passages Project made important contributions to many areas, including social and behavior change, gender, youth, and cross sectoral and donor engagement.

Value add for SBC. Some SBC experts were uncomfortable with the impression that addressing social norms was a brand new focus in SBC programming as they regard it as work they’ve been doing. On the other hand, some practitioners focused on social norms felt that social norms were often not explicitly addressed in SBC work and there was a lack of consensus on definitions and measurements. Future work must bridge this communication gap and concentrate on applying and integrating learnings, tools, and approaches on social norms within existing SBC work. For multiple project partners, this engagement has sparked internal organizational reflection about how they could approach this work. As
a result, some partners plan to or have incorporated a social norms lens in their SBC frameworks. There are, however, varying levels of engagement of traditional SBC practitioners in these social norms discussions. A suggestion is to develop a practical adaptation of the Gender Integration Continuum tool that has been useful in framing the work on gender integration. This adaptation to social norms programming would help implementers assess the extent to which interventions address social norms: “We think about the gender continuum—you could do that for social norms—blind, aware, transformative. A lot of work that says it deals with social norms has been blind, maybe aware, but not transformative. So we needed Passages to advance this theory and practice and make it something that couldn’t be ignored.”

Value-add for gender. The TM/MFF and GUG! interventions were seen as highly valuable for demonstrating how to use gender transformative approaches that engage communities in taboo subjects for improved FP/RH outcomes. According to respondents, these interventions worked intentionally and rigorously to affect not only FP/RH outcomes, but gender-based violence and gender equality outcomes, which other SBC mechanisms have not been funded to do. These interventions were also valued as critically needed gender transformative work with men and boys.

Value-add for youth. To many, the value add of Passages is its intergenerational outlook, its gender transformative approach to working with youth and parenting, and its holistic engagement with the environment within which VYAs and other youth formulate healthy and equitable attitudes and behaviors that will serve them across the life course.

Cross-sectoral engagement and breaking siloes. Passages’ work to examine social norms across sectors widened the opportunity to break down the siloes among FP, gender, education, food security, agriculture, nutrition, WASH, and conflict efforts. Respondents felt that Passages work sits at the intersection of multiple issues (gender, youth, GBV, SBC, FP, etc.) and learnings from addressing social norms at this intersection could produce vital lessons for programming and leveraging funding across/between disciplines and sectors. The cross-sectoral landscaping review of social norms in non-health sectors was seen as an important contribution to cross-sectoral work and respondents also appreciated that Passages went beyond health behaviors to look at social changes and framed people’s lives holistically. Some noted that using a social norms approach could be very useful to answer challenges in areas where multiple approaches have been tried but development outcomes have stalled.

Leveraging donor engagement. The Passages project has been able to leverage donor interest that resulted in $18.07 million in funding from multiple donors—including BMGF, Global Affairs Canada, and the John Templeton Foundation—to implement work linked to Passages. This level of donor interest speaks to the interest in social norms work by these donors. Respondents also attribute this to the power of the professional networks, technical leadership, dedication, and advocacy of the project management teams at USAID and Passages.

Evaluation Question 5: Implications for future USAID investments

USAID has been an important leader in work around social norms. Much has been learned, but a common theme from experts was that in many ways the field is still nascent. There is a risk of losing momentum without continued support, and this is an important time to synthesize existing information, identify cross-cutting themes, and ensure use of existing learnings, as well as continuing to advance global learning. One partner summed up these sentiments: “It is still necessary to have some dedicated investment…You risk backsliding and reinvention of wheels if you stop having some focused support. It’s been a true contribution and visionary for USAID.” Key implications for future investments are described below.
A recurrent theme in the evaluation was the need to more clearly frame social norms as a fundamental part of SBC. In deciding on how to support this work, USAID should consider pros and cons of a project focused primarily on social norms. Whether there are separate projects or one unified project, either way there is a need for clearer linkages. It will also be important to plan future related efforts collaboratively within USAID—cross-divisions in PRH and cross-sectors in bureau/agency—and between USAID and other donors.

A focus of support should be sharing evidence, ensuring its use, and continuing learning. “We need to apply this,” explained key informants. “The onus is on the donors to reinforce existing tools, resources, and research and make sure we’re almost requiring that it’s not about IRH or a particular project but in general, as a sector we need to move away from brands and think of long-term goals.” Passages has identified four legacy areas: advancing overarching understanding of social norms, implementing norms-shifting approaches, evaluating norms-shifting approaches, and scaling norms-shifting approaches. It will be important to prioritize the production of useful materials and give this the needed time and resources. While all agree that there are unanswered questions, some argue for more rigorous research while others feel that “robust monitoring” would be a better approach.

Build capacity at the country and regional levels and increase field engagement at global level, both within USAID in terms of Mission collaboration and in the LC with more country-level active involvement.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Passages project is on track to make significant progress in generating new research findings, building capacity of partners to undertake work addressing social norms, and contributing to global technical leadership. It will be important to provide continued support to synthesize information, disseminate effectively, encourage utilization of lessons, and conduct research to address knowledge gaps. Recommendations for the Passages project are given below:

- Develop synthesis materials
- Produce a lexicon of social norms terminology
- Publish results in peer-reviewed journals to add to global evidence base
- Finalize and implement strategic communications plan
- Focus on dissemination through existing networks
- Produce short digestible messages about key project learnings
- Develop a plan with USAID for strategic dissemination within USAID
- Increase country-level participation in next phase of LC
- Continue to build capacity for programs to be intentional about norms
- Document lessons learned about challenges in social norms work
- Develop costing brief using primer and case studies
- Validate the Social Norms Exploration Tool
- Develop a social norms monitoring tool
I. INTRODUCTION

The global development community is increasingly referring to the importance of addressing social norms in order to achieve health and development goals. But what exactly is meant by social norms? What kinds of interventions are effective? How can we measure impact? Is it feasible to scale up community-based efforts addressing social norms? What are the ethical issues around implementing these interventions?

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has supported this type of work for many years through its social and behavior change (SBC) programs and behavioral science projects. In 2015, in recognition of the need for clarification and consensus around terms and measurement, as well as to increase understanding about the effectiveness of social norm transformation to achieve family planning/reproductive health (FP/RH) outcomes, USAID supported the Passages project to generate new research results, build capacity and provide technical assistance (TA), and support global technical leadership around social norms, in part through an innovative Learning Collaborative to Advance Normative Change (LC).

This report documents the achievements of the Passages project up to now, provides suggestions on where the project should focus for its remaining time, and gives guidance to USAID on support for social norms investment in the future. As the quote below illustrates, shifting social norms is an important way to shift behavior.

‘If the rhythm changes, the dance also has to change’

—Hausa saying
II. PROJECT BACKGROUND

Passages was launched July 1, 2015 as a five-year project and received a no-cost extension to September 2021. The project is implemented by a consortium led by the Institute for Reproductive Health (IRH) that aims to address social norms transformation at scale (see results framework below). Project partners include: FHI 360, Save the Children, Tearfund, Global Early Adolescent Study (GEAS—a partnership between Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and the World Health Organization [WHO]), and Population Services International (PSI) (until 2017). The total estimated ceiling was $30 million. As of June 2019, only $13.2 million had been obligated, including $11.6 million from the Office of Population and Reproductive Health (PRH) Core, $1.3 million from USAID’s Office of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GenDev), and $0.3 million from field support in Burundi.

Passages Results Framework

The Passages project aims to address a broad range of social norms, at scale, to achieve sustained improvements in FP and RH. This research project is designed to build the evidence base and contribute to the capacity of the global community to strengthen normative environments that support RH, especially among very young adolescents, newly married youth, and first-time parents. Passages capitalizes on these formative life course transitions to test and scale up interventions that promote collective change and foster an enabling environment for healthy timing and spacing of pregnancies and voluntary, informed FP use. Two research activities are being implemented in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)—one with 10-14 year old adolescents in-school and out-of-school and one with young couples in faith communities.

Passages also provides TA, input, and capacity building to organizations that seek to increase the effectiveness and scale of community-level interventions that include activities focused on normative transformation. This support is being provided to an organization supporting grandmothers clubs in Senegal and an organization implementing husbands’ schools in Niger. Passages also provides TA in order to adapt and integrate a social network approach in existing nongovernmental organization (NGO) work in Mali and to evaluate Commitments, a teacher-focused intervention to improve adolescent and youth reproductive health (AYRH) in Uganda.
Passages provides global technical leadership, including through the establishment of the Global LC to Advance Normative Change. The LC is also supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and consists of technical communities that focus on social norm theory, measurement, and scale.

Passages also advances the practice of normative interventions through a regional Francophone Community of Practice (CoP), through development and testing of a Social Norms Exploration Guide and Toolkit (SNET), and through advancing cross-sectoral social norms work.
III. EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The evaluation/assessment had two objectives:

1) Determine the achievements of the Passages project (evaluation)

2) Inform PRH’s future investments in the technical areas supported through Passages (assessment)

The primary audience of the Passages evaluation is the Office of Population and Reproductive Health and Passages’ prime partner, and the IRH at Georgetown University. Secondary audience includes USAID’s Office of GenDev, USAID missions in DRC, Senegal, and Niger, and other missions interested in norm-shifting interventions; sub-partners on Passages, including FHI 360, Johns Hopkins GEAS, PSI (for the first two years), Save the Children, and Tearfund; and other projects working on SBC and interventions focused on social norms, adolescents, and scale-up. The parts of the evaluation and assessment that are procurement sensitive—including specific recommendations for USAID—will be delivered in an internal memo to USAID.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

1. In terms of generating new research results, what are the contributions that the Passages project has made, and is on track to make, by the end of the project?

2. To what extent, and how, has Passages helped build the capacity of organizations with which they have worked in DRC, Niger, Senegal, and elsewhere to increase the effectiveness and scale of community level interventions that include a norm-shifting component?

3. How has the Passages project demonstrated global technical leadership with regard to the knowledge base related to norm-shifting interventions, at scale?

4. What has been the working relationship and the value added of the Passages project (regarding social norm development and transformation, at scale), relative to other USAID projects and efforts supported by other donors?

5. What are the implications for future USAID investments in research and research utilization related to social norm transformation at scale?

The evaluation was conducted by a four-person team between June and October 2019. The team included two external members and two USAID staff members who do not work directly with the Passages project.

Methods

1. Social Norms literature review (summary in report, see Annex IV for the full review)

2. Passages project documents desk review (see Annex V for list of documents)

3. Key informant interviews with 61 individuals (see Annex III), representing project staff, partners, donors, and social norms experts. Interviews were conducted between June and October 2019.
Data Analysis

The data from the key informant interviews and the desk review was organized by evaluation question to facilitate analysis of key themes. The team developed a preliminary list of themes from the data and used this at a two-day team data analysis meeting. The team used the data from evaluation questions 1-4 to help answer question 5 regarding implications for future programming, as well as asking key informants for their perspectives on the future. In should be noted that in presenting findings, we put quotations from key informants in italics, while sections of documents are put in quotes but not italicized. Due to confidentiality, we do not attribute quotations to specific individuals, and so we use the terms “key informant,” “respondent,” and “interviewee” interchangeably rather than using just one of them to make the text less repetitive.

LIMITATIONS

Qualitative data is always subject to the bias of the informants, but a large number of key informants as well as extensive background document review minimized this bias. Due to US government policy restrictions related to the DRC, the team was not able to visit projects in the field and directly speak with project beneficiaries. However, the team was able to meet with and interview some field staff in Washington, DC, at the July 8th project dissemination event and the annual project partners meeting on July 9-11. When necessary, these interviews were conducted in French, which the key informants appreciated.

Another important limitation is that data collection and/or analysis is ongoing in most of the studies being conducted by Passages, so, in many cases, the evaluation team cannot formulate clear conclusions on how valuable the information will be. In addition, this meant that many key informants did not know about specific study results or recommendations. However, we are able to discuss the extensive work done to date and give input on areas to emphasize going forward.
IV. FINDINGS

SOCIAL NORMS: A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Social norms are the unspoken rules in society that can determine behavior. Academic debates on the measurement and definitions of social norms have been ongoing for several decades in the fields of sociology, psychology, anthropology, communications, economics, public health, philosophy, and law. There is increasing interest among policy-makers and practitioners to adopt a social norms approach to social and behavior change programming. Defining social norms and their relationship to individual behaviors can be complex, as not every behavior is determined by social norms, and norms often work in combination with other socio-economic factors and limitations. Additionally, any causal relationship between social norms and behaviors is difficult to measure.

Several theorists have designed visual frameworks for practitioners to translate normative constructs within practical, cross-sector models depicting the dynamics at play in social and behavior change interventions. Some models focus exclusively on norms and their relationship with social and behavior change. Others mention social norms as part of a broader social ecological model with multiple factors at different levels resulting in change. As an example, a recent framework, referred to as the “Flower Framework,” highlights gender norms, emphasizes the multiple relationships between the four domains identified in Cislaghi and Heise’s previous 2018 framework, and places power at the center, as power determines whether or not people decide to comply with social norms around them (Pulerwitz et al. 2019).
A literature review in 2016—an early activity by the Passages project—identified 303 projects which have worked on normative transformation for AYRH, 42 of which were scaled up beyond a pilot. Most projects were community-based (83 percent) and used social mobilization approaches. Those that had measured success in shifting normative environments used community-centered SBC approaches, though many interventions had trouble accurately measuring social norms and shifts over time, especially after the interventions had ended.

Since the advent of Passages, there have been a large number of publications on social norms theory, measurement, and practice, much of it directed or produced by members of the LC. Initial gaps in research and questions on social norms transformation identified in 2015-16 have been addressed by publications in recent years, and there is increasing recognition of the critical role of social norms in promoting and sustaining positive health outcomes. The publication of a special supplement of the Journal of Adolescent Health in 2019 on AYRH noted how far the discourse has come but identified further gaps and areas for research to bring the field of social norms transformation to greater scale and maturity. Logic models and theories of change are still often unclear on how an intervention will work to address social norms, which norms will be addressed, which behaviors will ultimately be changed, and how normative transformation will facilitate this change (Bingenheimer 2019).

CONTRIBUTIONS OF PASSAGES PROJECT TO PRH RESULTS

The following list of selected results from the Passages Project put together for PRH’s results reviews highlights the contribution to the office’s Intermediate Results (IRs). These achievements are described in detail in the rest of the report.

- **PRH IR1: Global leadership demonstrated in FP/RH policy, advocacy, and services**
  - Increased global capacity to design, evaluate, and scale up effective social norms programs to support voluntary adolescent FP use, particularly through the LC.
  - Global Stakeholder Analysis on normative change for AYRH provides a roadmap for advancing research to practice.
  - Two regional CoPs established to strengthen initiatives to address at scale the social norms influencing adolescent FP and RH.
  - Successfully scaled, integrated, and sustained a violence prevention and FP program for young fathers.
  - Male engagement knowledge advanced and resources shared.
  - Youth-led evaluation demonstrates the feasibility of engaging early adolescents in research and offers evidence of intervention success.
  - Advances in guidance to assess costs of social norms interventions.

- **PRH IR2: Knowledge generated, organized, and disseminated in response to program needs**
A global review of AYRH normative change interventions going to scale affirmed that such interventions are not often expanded, and when scaled, processes are not well documented, including specification of norms targeted by the intervention.

SNET was developed to guide a participatory community-based approach to identifying the social norms that drive behaviors undermining healthy timing and spacing of pregnancies. It has now been applied in multiple countries and projects.

The Growing Up GREAT! (GUG!)/Bien Grandir! Intervention, a hybrid of two proven gender equity interventions for early adolescents adapted for evaluation in urban Kinshasa.

Transforming Masculinities(TM)/Masculinité, Famille et Foi (MFF) intervention for newly married couples and first time parents adapted to include FP for implementation in Kinshasa, DRC

- **PRH IR3: Support provided to the field to implement effective and sustainable FP/RH programs**
  - Applying a realist evaluation approach to TA on scale-up is addressing knowledge gaps about how normative change interventions work.
  - More than $12 million leveraged to increase local capacity in DRC to strengthen adolescent RH.
  - Multi-country, multi-donor learning initiative established to expand “Masculinité, Famille et Foi” in DRC and Nigeria.
  - Evidence generated that the Niger Husbands Schools are gender-transformative, shifting social norms to increase women’s health service uptake.
  - Strengthened capacity in Francophone Africa to address social norms at scale.

In talking about project success, many key informants qualified their responses by noting how limited funding led to a reduced project scope. In a 2017 management review, IRH describes the shift as follows: “As a result, our project scope is primarily focused on the DRC, and we are no longer able to generate and synthesize data to address a broader research agenda. In response, we have shifted our focus towards global leadership, playing an important convening and coordinating role.”

**EVALUATION QUESTION 1. GENERATING NEW RESEARCH**

In terms of generating new research results, what are the contributions that the Passages project has made, and is on track to make, by the end of the project?

**NEW RESEARCH**

Due to reduced funding in the initial two years, the Passages project chose to focus on generating new research results through two studies in the DRC: GUG! and MFF, an adaptation of the TM approach. This decision was made based on the presence of a number of partners in the country as well as the idea of leveraging technical and financial resources based on having both studies in one country.

When asked what was new and innovative about this research, those directly involved highlighted the explicit focus on shifting social norms compared with other work: “Even though we worked with [norms] before, we didn’t explicitly look at norms the way we are with Passages—as a factor we can influence. That’s a huge difference.” A partner in the DRC explained: “It’s very innovative—we don’t just see one behavior, we have to change something below that, that affects many behaviors. It’s an extraordinary approach.” Several key informants talked about how Passages research had given them a language and conceptual framework to something they were “feeling their way toward” before. Another field partner mentioned social norms
language as well as the scale-up focus: “The social norms language elements like diffusion came through the Passages model... This was the unique addition for us. And the scale-up thinking is new. Part of their exploration was to think if this model can be scaled up. Not every model can be scaled up. The rigorous focus on these two aspects (social norms and scale-up) are key things we wanted to try to work towards and improve our knowledge in this area.” A donor who knew about the two projects described them as “well-designed with good evaluation design” and felt that the longitudinal data from GEAS as part of GUG! “is going to be an important contribution to the field... IRH continues to do a good job evaluating interventions and working on scale up- to me that is their core business.”

Many key informants who were not directly involved with Passages were unclear about what was a Passages study and what was being done by other parts of IRH. This is partly because the studies are still ongoing and so there have been limited findings to share to date. IRH explained that they hope to have more compelling data after they finish analyzing the recently collected endline data. That said, in this evaluation, we discuss some of the interesting findings to date, as well as challenges faced by the projects.

**GROWING UP GREAT!**

The Gender Roles, Equality and Transformation (GREAT) Project was implemented by Save the Children, Pathfinder and IRH in Uganda from 2010-2017. GREAT aimed to promote gender-equitable attitudes and behaviors among adolescents (ages 10-19) and their communities with the goal of reducing gender-based violence (GBV) and improving RH outcomes in post-conflict communities in northern Uganda. The project became highly popular, as explained by an implementer: “The program design was relatively effective but more importantly, people loved it. It was so sticky. Everyone wanted to do it and scale it, and it has been adopted by a large number of partners, including FHI, Pathfinder, and others who took it up and adapted it... People liked the name, they liked the toolkit, the games, and there was no organizational branding—just the name, GREAT.” However, while this enthusiasm was being expressed, there was still a need for additional evidence on the effectiveness of the approach and how to scale it up. Under GREAT, one of the weaknesses identified was the lack of a parent component. And while social norms were discussed, GREAT had not explicitly addressed norms in a rigorous way.

Under Passages, GREAT was adapted for an urban context and renamed GUG! to address gender role equality through school-based clubs and family engagement. GUG! applied lessons from GREAT by adding a component for parents and including an explicit focus on social norms. In addition, there was greater attention paid to scale-up: “What is unique is scalability, such as using lighter training—do as much as we can within what is scalable. Also integrate the GUG! work into existing, ongoing systems so we involved the government.” An implementer described how it fit into and helped existing government efforts and plans: “In 2015, there was a national program on RH for adolescents in school, but there weren’t any didactic materials for the teachers, so [GUG!] brought necessary tools to help with this initiative—so there was already some foundation there to facilitate the implementation.”

A number of respondents pointed out the big value add in collaborating with GEAS, a global study in 10 sites looking at social norms among very young adolescents (VYAs). At the same time, there were challenges to this collaboration in terms of timelines and meeting both global and local needs. The timeline of GEAS caused delays in implementing GUG! as the project could not start activities until the baseline was conducted and the baseline timing was impacted by the needs of a global project. However, this led to an unanticipated benefit as the project came up with the idea of conducting a learning lab during that period. The learning lab involved a condensed pilot with a mini-evaluation to provide
feedback on implementation. This led to some important changes in the intervention and also allowed them to rapidly roll out the elements of the intervention once they could start. IRH has now adopted this learning lab approach elsewhere, for example, in Nigeria for an adaptation of the TM intervention with Templeton Foundation funding.

Project staff in DRC described issues that can make addressing social norms difficult. For example, there was resistance and misunderstanding at first, particularly around ideas about FP and RH education for adolescents. But in addition, “parents found it hard to make connections between all the various concepts—norms, behaviors, gender roles—and had to be guided in discussion.” It is also not a simple, straightforward effort to adapt an approach from Uganda to the DRC: “The first year really was not easy—we had to adapt materials from Uganda to DRC, and had to change many things to make it more useful, more relevant to DRC context.”

Data collection for GUG! is not yet completed, and at this point, GUG! has not yet shown concrete normative shift. An implementer explained this but also showed the continuing blurring between attitudes, behaviors, and norms: “We can’t say the norms have changed with [GUG!], but the behaviors have begun to change—the task-sharing in household has changed.” Attitudes toward task-sharing have changed, but it is not clear that behaviors or norms have actually changed. Researchers noted during dissemination that shifting social and gender norms is a long-term investment that requires consistent engagement with families and communities.

**Selected preliminary findings to date:**

Positive changes in some areas, while others show little change
(from Passages dissemination meeting on July 8, 2019)

- Greater acceptance of household chore-sharing, e.g., among out-of-school youth, the proportion endorsing gender-equal responsibility for household chores increased in the intervention group from 61 to 83 percent while the control group decreased slightly from 66 to 64 percent. However, there was no overall change in the perceptions of gender stereotypical roles and traits.
- Little effect on discussions about puberty and body comfort during pubertal development, with similar changes in intervention and control groups.
- GUG! improved communication, which results in increased RH and HIV knowledge and access.
- Despite greater knowledge, misperceptions about FP were widespread with no difference between intervention and controls.
- GUG! appears to be more impactful among the youngest group and the out-of-school group, indicating potential to reduce social inequalities.

GUG! has greatly benefited from effective leveraging of the USAID investment to bring in other donors. This includes support from the BMGF for GUG Way Forward, which focuses on institutionalizing through the ministries of health and education, and support from Global Affairs Canada (GAC) for GUG+ to scale up to new areas and to a new cohort of older adolescents. Local partners emphasize that this support is thanks to the initial USAID support: “We were able to secure this funding because of our capacity to conduct [GUG!] and the training and experience we got from Passages on quasi-experimental research, scale-up, theories of scale-up, adaptation, and how do you even plan and design an intervention with a view to scale-up... it’s thanks to initial USAID support that we can do this work and scale up and work with other donors.”
MASCU LINITÉ, FAMILLE, ET FOI/TRANSFORMING MASCULINITIES

Locally referred to as MFF, this activity was adapted from the TM approach and seeks to transform masculinities and promote FP through religious leaders and faith communities, working with the protestant church partner, Église du Christ au Congo (ECC). A partner explained the important potential for scale with ECC: “ECC has such huge and scalable potential—they have millions of people in their network and hundreds of thousands of congregations.” For Tearfund, who was implementing TM in many countries, the addition of FP in the DRC project was a new component. The focus on working with faith-based communities was seen by key informants as an important area to explore in social norms research:

“The intersection of faith-based and norms is a great contribution.”

“The idea of evaluating [TM] is an important contribution to the literature. We make a lot of assumptions about working with religious leaders—can we get them on board and does that result in norms shifting?”

Similar to some of the issues faced by GUG!, there was initially some hesitancy to implement the project, especially among the religious leaders and men, who thought that this was their culture, and did not dare to “change culture” and move in a different way than before. Specific to TM, the term “masculinity” was very new and not well understood at first. A local project leader, who had the confidence and trust of the church members and community, was able to explain what everything meant, and emphasized “the final ‘F’ [‘foi’ or ‘faith,’] that this was actually rooted in the Bible, and wouldn’t be anything radical.” Another challenge mentioned by project partners was making the intervention work at many different levels, given the huge differences between beneficiaries’ education levels—from no schooling to a university education.

From early on, there was extensive interest to scale up the project due to the buy-in by ECC and the positive response once the early resistance was addressed. However, a change in policy affecting USAID funding in DRC has put this scale-up in doubt, much to the disappointment of local communities: “Now we have no more support, no more financing—our church is poor, we have no capacity, and now cut off from USAID, we can’t scale up. The demand is there from the church, from potential beneficiaries, but the support from donors isn’t there anymore—and there is so much confusion and frustration.”

The preliminary research results presented at the July 2019 dissemination were somewhat confusing. The high rates of exposure in control sites make interpretation challenging: 94.8 percent of individuals in the control group had any exposure to the program, compared with 93.9 percent in the intervention group. What is encouraging is that when the research team analyzed by exposure, the data show that exposed individuals are showing trends in the right direction regarding perceptions around gender equity, intimate partner violence (IPV), and FP. As the presenters noted in one slide, “clearly there is something about exposure that is important and confusing.” This brings up issues of how to measure exposure, and also creates problems due to the congregations included in the study being close together. There had been plans to conduct additional qualitative research that could have shed some light on the confusing findings, but unfortunately this was eliminated due to USAID funding restrictions in the DRC. Analysis is still ongoing, and so there will likely be more clarity in future presentations and publications.
Facilitating Factors

Increased interest in the topic/approach. Key informants spoke of their excitement around the social norms approach, with several noting that it met needs they had even if they hadn’t identified those needs as specifically being social norms. “I love this approach. It’s a very useful approach…I realized this is what I had been thinking of and what I was looking for! I was looking for a project based in this kind of approach.” Another explained: “At first I didn’t quite understand, but after working with Passages I realized that this social norms approach would help with the work I had been doing for a long time with GBV, FP, RH.” This enthusiasm also was clearly evident among the beneficiaries of the project, according to project reports and interviews with partners from DRC. “There was a lot of excitement to work on the social norms underlying the various problems with adolescent health.”

Careful and collaborative start-up. The project staff took the time to make sure the work would truly be collaborative: “The field visits that were done when the project was starting up were intensive—not just one person going out because we knew this was something that was new for people. So we built in a plan to have all the people who were needed in the room and different groups of people to develop the environment in which the project could be successful. We spent time and resources on that—took time and patience and planning and listening—not a didactic approach, it was collaborative learning. That was on purpose and it worked well.”

Buy-in from government and local partners. As a result of the collaborative approach, there was buy-in from local community groups and government and other partners from the beginning. This was essential for this type of work, and critical for scale-up.

Looking at existing interventions rather than starting from scratch. All of the interventions tested by Passages were adaptations of existing programs that had showed positive results elsewhere. Most informants saw this as a good approach, with researchers noting that these would likely be stronger interventions than ones developed by researchers: “When researchers develop interventions, they probably aren’t the best interventions.” The downside was that from a research perspective, it could make some documentation difficult or could lead to some deviations from what might be considered a rigorous research process.

Collaborative management style of Passages. In particular, key informants highlighted the collaborative style and tone set by Rebecka Lundgren, the project director. This issue came up in almost every interview with an interviewee who had interacted with Passages. A partner summed up how this style had a strong, positive influence on the work: “I was nervous at the beginning of the project that implementation would be secondary to research, but it has been a nice dynamic. Definitely when we meet together, there is a real sense of shared respect and mutual listening.” A donor also highlighted this aspect of how the project is run, admiring how IRH has been able to pull together different partners and share joint learning and how they are trying to copy that model with some of their other investments.

Challenges

Funding. In discussions about challenges, funding was almost always mentioned first. This impacted the project overall, and restrictions in funding in DRC related to Trafficking in Persons (TIP) policies had a dramatic impact. A local partner in DRC spoke passionately about this: “TIP is a huge challenge—we will be cut off—we want to share the program with other religious leaders, and scale up, but now we are cut off, and they ask us why, why? And what can we tell them? We have nothing to do with trafficking—how do we explain this? This makes the community lose confidence in the project… Why is it always us who are penalized? It really
makes us upset—this is a problem of the government, who we don’t know—why don’t they suffer? It’s us who suffer, it is us who are abandoned.”

Initial perceptions that outsiders are coming to change local culture. A donor noted that the whole idea of social norm change is contentious: “People equate it to culture change from the outside, so it’s dicey.” As mentioned earlier, there was initial reluctance from some communities regarding ideas like masculinity and gender norms and the perception of pushing a foreign agenda. As one person explained, “We thought maybe it was going to be about homosexuality—but then saw it was about respect between husbands and wives, then it was enormously popular.” When people saw the value in improving relations in families and fostering respect and communication, there was so much passion for the approach and how it’s transformative in addressing these really painful things in the community. There was the “fear of you coming in and changing our culture—but then we saw it wasn’t changing culture but improving relations between people.” A midcourse correction taken by Passages staff to address these concerns was to move away from language about changing social norms to norm-shifting interventions or norms transformation.

Methodological issues. Data from key informants and documents mentioned methodological issues with the studies. For example, the issue of contamination between intervention and control groups was particularly relevant for TM where, as mentioned earlier, 94.8 percent of individuals in the control group had any exposure to the program (93.9 percent of intervention group), but also to a lesser extent with GUG! where two in 10 adolescents in the control group were exposed to GUG! This became a problem both in terms of acceptance by participants that only some would receive the intervention, and then had an impact on the data, making analysis more complicated: “We are getting some good results, but also spillover into controls—can’t we do some cleaner studies?” In addition, the studies faced issues around follow-up. This was particularly challenging for finding out-of-school children in the GUG! study. The project adjusted by having local groups help since it would be easier for schools and churches to find the children than the researchers.

Staff changes. In the DRC, both specifically and globally for the project, staff turnover created problems with implementation, particularly impacting timing and continuity: “The person who was in charge of this activity is no longer there, so you have to begin at zero, and you can lose a whole year to this.” The most dramatic example of staffing changes was the loss of PSI and its DRC affiliate Association de Santé Familiale (ASF) as partners on the project due to financial management issues unrelated to the Passages project.

Language. “Language is a huge issue,” explained one local partner noting the challenges between English and French speakers in particular. “We can’t speak directly to the donor, to many in the NGOs, because they don’t speak French—how can I lobby directly to them? Speak frankly to them?” While Passages has tried to address this, and was praised by partners for always including translators at partners meeting, it remains a challenge. For example, most documents, training, materials or websites are in English, and even if something is in French, even navigating a website to get there isn’t straightforward unless you speak some English. This limits the work on social norms—and evaluation innovations—from penetrating the Francophone world.

Political and security issues in DRC and Burundi. While there were good reasons to choose to have both major studies in one country, this became problematic due to the challenges in the DRC, particularly the impact of the TIP policy restrictions on USAID funding in DRC. Passages was also impacted by the political situation in Burundi. They planned to use field support for a study in Burundi, ‘Exploring social norms around reproductive health among adolescent girls and young women in
Burundi,’ and developed the protocol as well as accompanying interview guides and informed consent forms. However, there have been numerous delays primarily due to issues around the process of protocol development. As FHI 360 staff explain, “The issues were not the substance of the research, but political and logistical—lesson learned, if you violate the social norms around protocols you will pay for it.” This project has now received approval to begin.

**Cross-Cutting Themes**

**Very young adolescents.** There was a good deal of enthusiasm around lessons about VYAs, including both research findings and engaging with VYAs as data collectors. GUG! included a youth-led evaluation with VYAs, teamed with youth mentors who had previously been trained by DFID. The VYAs were engaged in setting evaluation questions, data collection and analysis, and sharing findings. While staff admit this might not be the first time such a thing was done, most involvement of youth in research is with older adolescents: “The ones we included were all between 10-14. It’s important to put your money where your mouth is about meaningful youth participation, and also have honest conversations about what was changing in their communities.” Staff from GUG! also noted that working with 10-14-year-olds was previously a gap, so it was exciting to work with that age group. One key informant told us about giving a talk focused on VYAs at Women Deliver as part of a panel on Building Resilience among Adolescents and all the examples used in that talk were from Passages.

**Impact on project implementers—“the resonance of the approach.”** Several key informants noted how the work on social norms impacted them on a personal level, leading to a personal journey of reflection on their own households and lives. One implementer talked about how even though he himself is not part of the intervention, it changed his own perspective and behavior within his household, with his children and the way he sees his role. He felt it had improved his communication style, and where he used to yell, now the family speaks more kindly to each other. As a member of Passages explained, “It can be very personal work to people – we ask partners and implementers how this work affects them personally – you understand how gender norms work in your own life. It shows the resonance of the approach.” A project partner noted that Passages work helped them explain social norms within their organization, and this was helped by the fact that “people recognize a lot of the ideas of what social norms are in their own lives and with others.”

**Scale-up and sustainability.** Scale-up has been a focus of the Passages project from the beginning. Reviews of project documents and discussions with project staff does highlight that an impressive amount of attention has been given to the issue of scale. A key informant noted the following keys to scale-up efforts by Passages: “They have documented from the start, started with scale-up in mind and kept things relatively simple. Additionally, there is TA to other organizations to help them use the information. This constellation of things seems to be working.” The balancing of complexity and scalability remains an ongoing challenge, as one partner describes the difficulty of “creating an intervention and implementing a multi-level multi-component intervention according the theory of change that will lead to shifts in norms but also simple enough to be scalable.”

In key informant interviews and discussions at the Passages partners meeting, several people brought up that fact that scale is not the same as sustainability. As one partner stated, “If you can create sustainable scale, even better…Vertical scale—institutionalizing—we made a strategic decision to scale that way.” Some participants at the partners meeting talked about the sustainable nature of social norms work once the norm has shifted and so interventions would not be needed after that point, and social norm work is
probably essential for sustainable change: “If we want to help on that journey to self-reliance, if we want to achieve sustainable change… then sustainable outcomes require changing norms.”

However, there are mixed responses about the evidence to date around scale-up and mixed feelings about whether the idea of scale for norms-shifting interventions makes sense, given how context-specific norms are. The quotes below highlight some of the differing opinions around scale-up under Passages:

“Their success lies in their work being picked up by governments, others donors, civil society. This is remarkable and really important. Great as proof of concept but better if things can be scaled up, which is what they have done. We should be doing more norms and SBC work and to do it at scale is impressive.”

“I would say we’ve explored some interesting scale up pathways for community norms-shifting interventions. We know how to scale up in health systems, but how do you scale up without an obvious platform? We’ve identified some interesting possible platforms.”

“A lot more documentation is needed. It’s a missing piece still.”

“The purpose of this project was to take interventions to scale. There is not much information on the scaling up aspect of their work, they have not published on the scaling aspect. Scale is important but context is also important, so scale is not necessarily possible with normative focused work.”

MAIN POINTS FOR EVALUATION QUESTION 1

- Aspects to research considered new and innovative included the explicit focus on 1) influencing social norms and 2) developing scalable interventions.

- “The resonance of the approach” led to enthusiasm and a personal impact for participants, whether they were implementers or beneficiaries.

- Analysis is ongoing and it will be important to clearly and concretely measure and describe any social norm change, as this evidence is still needed.

- Facilitating factors included increased interest in addressing social norms, a truly collaborative approach, buy-in from local partners, and building on existing interventions rather than starting from scratch.

- Challenges included funding, perceptions that outsiders wanted to change local culture, methodological issues, staff turnover, language and political issues.

- The challenges encountered in this research, such as community concerns and contamination between intervention and control sites, provide important lessons for conducting future research around social norms.

- The Learning Lab was a creative approach to turning a negative delay into a positive process and has since been used in other settings.

- Engagement of VYAs in research and the data gathered to learn more about VYAs are important contributions of Passages, and GUG!’s greater impact on younger adolescents indicates the importance of interventions with VYAs.

Have we really changed norms? Some questioned whether Passages research has really shown changes in social norms. One donor pointed out the problem in only funding in three to five-year periods, which does not allow us to see true community-level change. As a result, researchers are often still measuring and reporting on changes in attitudes or specific practices but not necessarily able to document whether there has been a change in the norms that underlie those practices. Some researchers working on Passages also note the ongoing challenge of clearly measuring this change: “Some
of these interventions seem to be having an effect, but what is our measure of this has changed, and these things change over a long period of time. I don’t think we’ve clearly identified our measure of success.”

EVALUATION QUESTION 2. CAPACITY BUILDING

To what extent, and how, has Passages helped build the capacity of organizations with which they have worked in DRC, Niger, Senegal, and elsewhere to increase the effectiveness and scale of community level interventions that include a norm-shifting component?

REALIST EVALUATIONS

A realist evaluation uses a cyclical learning-and-acting process of reviewing existing data and new study data that builds the evidence base for an intervention’s mechanisms of change. This approach does not only ask “does it work?” but rather investigates “what works, for whom, in what contexts?” The Passages TA model for this process includes creating a program change theory, examining existing evidence and undertaking new research to address key gaps, and, at the same time, building capacity to prepare for scale-up or manage existing scale-up processes. While many evaluations are primarily focused on outcomes, this approach gives more information about how you got there. Many referred to this as the “black box”—visualizing and diagramming the theory and change pathways—and see it as information that is critical for replication and scaling up.

The Passages project undertook realist evaluations to better understand existing norms-shifting interventions. As IRH staff explain, “There is a lot of cool stuff that no one hears about because they aren’t funded by global funds, so let’s learn from them.” The Passages project convened a Technical Expert Group in 2016, which included 42 people from 18 organizations, to help identify possible interventions that would benefit from realist evaluations. The group considered 10 normative interventions for potential support. After discussion, participants were given two stickers to vote for the interventions that Passages should prioritize. The group selected the Husbands’ Schools in Niger and the Girls Holistic Development Project in Senegal because they provided the opportunity to inform ongoing scale-up, yield information on the degree to which the interventions are gender-transformative, and examine the potential of scaling an intervention which is strongly embedded in cultural context.

The approach has resonated with some audiences and not with others: “If people are fixated on classic evaluation, this is a strange animal to them,” a Passages staff member explained. In general, people who have worked directly with the approach like it and appreciate its value: “People make connections they didn’t make before.” According to Passages staff, program staff tend to really like it and the biggest skeptics are donors. While one donor the team spoke with considered them “really important,” another questioned whether the data they are collecting matches their questions and another felt that the realist evaluations were less rigorous than the other Passages research. One key informant who is not part of the Passages project saw the realist evaluations as a key piece of Passages work and felt that it should be done in all programming to look at “what is the input that we’ve been giving and how will it get the output we want?” Some explained how realist evaluations were particularly useful for challenging assumptions: “It’s not what you don’t know that gets to you, it’s what you know for sure that turns out not to be true. There have been a lot of assumption that x, y, z has been working, but is it really? The realist evaluations are challenging some assumptions.” Based on the continuing confusion around the terms, some feel it is better to explain what it is but not use the term “realist evaluation.” In fact, some USAID staff have shifted to this
approach since the term confused people, but the idea behind the approach is appealing and using examples helps people understand it better.

**Husbands’ Schools, Niger**

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and L'Association d’Appui aux ONG de Sud (SongES) developed the concepts and interventions of the Husbands’ School in Niger. The Husbands’ Schools consist of 8-10 “Model Husbands” per school trained in leadership, communication, and FP/RH, to improve FP/RH, with husbands’ activities leading to increased use of women’s FP/RH services.

Intervention components include: 1) outreach by model husbands to support other husbands and their communities, 2) home visits to recalcitrant men who are opposed to new ideas, and 3) linking schools to services—model husbands support health centers with their NGO coach. Husbands’ Schools already scaled in 75 percent of provinces in Niger with scale-up beginning in some other West Africa countries.

When asked why this approach was being adopted by many others, a key informant thought that “it must have resonated with people and their own culture… there are dozens of interventions but this one sparked interest.” While evidence of effective outcomes—increases in women’s use of RH services—was established in 2012, the change pathways and diffusion were poorly understood.

Passages has completed three rounds of TA, but there have been delays due to staff changes at partner organizations. The evaluation was able to use UNFPA monitoring data to learn how the schools have functioned over time in terms of how long husbands participate and the fidelity of implementation. A qualitative gender study looked at the direction of gender shifts in attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors by Model Husbands and their wives as well as men and women in the larger community. This will strengthen understanding of this gender pathway, which will be important as the approach is already being scaled up in other countries. The project is using SongES monitoring data to create profiles of Model Husbands and analyze the types of activities done by husbands over time to help understand who is participating and to also inform the gender study. When asked about realist evaluations, a key informant said “it would be so valuable—especially with Husbands’ Schools—everyone wants to replicate it but we’re not sure it works or how it works. We need to understand which normative interventions are effective and how to replicate. We too often reinvent the wheel.”

At the July 2019 dissemination meeting, Passages staff reported that: 1) Model Husbands are respected by health centers and accepted by the community as social change agents; and 2) gender-equitable changes occur between most Model Husbands and their wives in terms of sharing RH information, substantive couple dialogue, greater male empathy towards wives, and women having more RH-related decision-making power. Interestingly, women and men not directly engaged are similarly affected in gender-equity domains and RH services attitudes, indicating some diffusion of new ideas (see box below). The evaluation also showed that the model is working well in regions outside the pilot, that similar activities are taking place, and that the Model Husbands’ role as social change agents remains intact in both pilot and expansion regions.

---

1 For example, a paper presented at Women Deliver in 2016 noted that use of FP services has tripled in communities where the schools operate [https://womendeliver.org/2016/husband-school-teaches-importance-contraception-niger/](https://womendeliver.org/2016/husband-school-teaches-importance-contraception-niger/).
Diffusion of new ideas through Husbands’ Schools

“The mentality of my husband has changed, especially in relation to FP. Being a Marabout, before he did not accept that I use FP. He thought that I didn’t want any more children. But since he started attending Husbands’ School session, he has changed.”
—Wife of a man who is not a Model Husband

“This change we have seen concerns us, the village population. Because before we used an old logic, that really placed us behind (the times). The Hausa have a saying, ‘If the rhythm changes, the dance also has to change.’ Thus we also have to change our behavior, we should not keep the same behaviors of the people before us.”
—Man who is not a Model Husband

Girls’ Holistic Development: the Grandmother project, Senegal

Developed by the Grandmother Project (GMP) NGO in Senegal, Girls’ Holistic Development (GHD) is an intergenerational community-based intervention to strengthen social infrastructure of communities and use of positive cultural roles and traditions to reduce occurrence of child marriage, female genital mutilation (FGM) and teenage pregnancy, and improve girls’ school attendance. Grandmothers are empowered to challenge existing social and gender norms that are harmful to adolescent girls (10-16 years) with girls, families, and community. Scale-up of the GHD approach had not been successful and other efforts to train other organizations in the GMP approach had not led to much integration in practice. Therefore, the idea was that a realist evaluation could help develop a “how-to” guide for the approach and build understanding for successful scale-up.

Four rounds of TA have been completed. Program change theory informed the evaluation focus and programming directions. Passages provided TA to develop a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and core indicators to track implementation fidelity and supported the hiring of an M&E officer to monitor activity implementation, conduct small action-research studies, and conduct a situation analysis of the scale-up area to understand who benefits, how the program functions, and new scale-up contexts. In addition, the evaluation included the following studies to collect new data: 1) a meta-review of eight qualitative studies, which affirmed the change theory and raised new questions on change mechanisms; 2) four learning studies to assess the effect of different strategies of the GHD intervention to see if the change theory needed adjusting: stories without an end, grandmother leader training, intergenerational dialogues, community shifts in perceptions of age of child marriage; 3) a quasi-experimental qualitative study on processes and impact; and 4) a quasi-experimental effectiveness/quantitative study on behavioral and normative shifts. While they began a study of secondary school and health services data in intervention/comparison districts to compare changes in girl retention in schools and adolescent pregnancy consultations, this was later dropped due to not obtaining data, showing some of the challenges in measuring impact.
The project developed a how-to-guide with the help of a consultant who worked with program staff to document the “how,” drawing content from different GMP guides that were more about the “why.” The guide is ready to be shared in French and will later be translated into English. The project also developed a summary of social change agent aptitudes, attitudes, and competencies for testing, which is included in the LC’s Scale-up considerations document. Preliminary findings were presented at a dissemination meeting in July 2019 (see box below).

The local partner on the project spoke highly about Passages, which helped them to collect much better, higher quality data and evidence on the results of their approach. There was extensive discussion between the researchers and the operational staff and debates regarding identifying salient social norms and clarifying a real theory of change. This partner viewed this debate as a useful way to promote self-reflection and improvement of programming. As they scale up the approach in other villages, the results from the evaluation will help in the process. “Passages helped give us a chance to prove the importance of this work—gave us the evidence with the Realist Evaluation… Passages gave us considerable capacity for evaluation, orientation, how we can do research on our projects… This work with Passages also helped reinforce our own critical thinking, our own self-reflection as an organization.”

As with the Passages studies in DRC, participants liked the social norms approach and thought that it should be used in all countries and could really contribute to changing communities. Local staff noted that participants stayed for the whole event in June in Dakar where they shared findings with the community, something that is challenging. Participants particularly appreciated the idea of working broadly rather than only focusing on one group: “There is a cultural reality within this collectivist society—and if you work on an intervention, and reinforce the capacity of young girls, but forget young boys, parents etc., there will be negative consequences, there will be a confrontation between those whose capacity you’ve reinforced, and others.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected key findings to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greater VYA girl involvement in decision-making and support to delay marriage: those exposed to the intervention were significantly more likely than those not exposed to say their family would ask their opinion about marriage and believed their opinion would be listened to, with far fewer believing that nobody would support them to marry at the age they wanted (27 vs. 68 percent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater VYA girl involvement in decision-making to stay in school: girls exposed to the intervention were significantly more likely than those not exposed to believe that their opinion will be considered when making a decision about leaving school (86 vs. 62 percent) and more believed they will stay in school as long as they want (79 vs. 63 percent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater perceived community support for VYA girls delaying pregnancy: Over twice as many VYA girls in interventions sites (32 percent) as compared with control sites (15 percent) expect most community members to support a girl’s husband or in-laws’ agreement to delay pregnancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced incidence of female genital cutting (FGC): Fewer daughters in the intervention group (26.3 percent) compared with the control group (56 percent) have had FGC performed on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grandmothers in intervention sites were significantly more likely to feel like valued parts of the community and to be providers of advice and support to VYAs and their caregivers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The local partner on the project spoke highly about Passages, which helped them to collect much better, higher quality data and evidence on the results of their approach. There was extensive discussion between the researchers and the operational staff and debates regarding identifying salient social norms and clarifying a real theory of change. This partner viewed this debate as a useful way to promote self-reflection and improvement of programming. As they scale up the approach in other villages, the results from the evaluation will help in the process. “Passages helped give us a chance to prove the importance of this work—gave us the evidence with the Realist Evaluation… Passages gave us considerable capacity for evaluation, orientation, how we can do research on our projects… This work with Passages also helped reinforce our own critical thinking, our own self-reflection as an organization.”

As with the Passages studies in DRC, participants liked the social norms approach and thought that it should be used in all countries and could really contribute to changing communities. Local staff noted that participants stayed for the whole event in June in Dakar where they shared findings with the community, something that is challenging. Participants particularly appreciated the idea of working broadly rather than only focusing on one group: “There is a cultural reality within this collectivist society—and if you work on an intervention, and reinforce the capacity of young girls, but forget young boys, parents etc., there will be negative consequences, there will be a confrontation between those whose capacity you’ve reinforced, and others.”
Building Capacity of Partners

Building the capacity of partners in social norms work has been an important route for spreading lessons and shows the importance of partnering with implementers. This has led to increasing general knowledge of social norms programming as well as adapting specific programs. The project partners in Passages talked about the changes to their organization in terms of appreciation of social norms, capacity for social norms programming, and use of tools developed through Passages, both at headquarters and country office levels, as described in the examples below. While there were many positive comments about capacity building, there were also suggestions on how this aspect could be further strengthened by including even more intentional learning for partners: “There could have been a space to have an ongoing engagement around some of these bigger topics. But it’s hard when you’re involved in a project and the details of the budget and troubleshooting to raise your head above to look at conceptual articles and interesting discussions…there could have been some ongoing learning because I’m sure there was heaps going on within IRH to advance their own learning.”

Save the Children. “Internally we have made tremendous efforts to create a common definition of what we mean, how we incorporate into our SBC frameworks and how we identify and measure social norms. We’ve had meetings and webinars to bring together people working on norms across sectors—education, SBC teams, etc. This is not Passages work per se, but we’ve only done that because of work with Passages. We have used those materials to inform those conversations… it’s given us tools and vocabulary to have a common understanding of what we’re doing. This at US level, and also in some countries—DRC and Nigeria—they’ve reached out to us saying, we’ve been hearing about norms, our donors are talking about it, we need to understand more… if Save alone continues getting this (Passage products) used and we have 120 country offices—that alone makes a huge impact. There are some really great opportunities. It was really good for IRH to bring on implementing partners.”

ECC. “The project did build up our capacity—there were many trainings—we learned how to facilitate this kind of project, how to collect data, how to conduct evaluations. We worked with the Francophone Chief of Party—they asked for our expertise and we were able to share our experience. We had lots of exchanges with other groups, and our capacity for research, evaluation, norms were all built up.”

FHI 360. “We’ve made connections, been part of think pieces, used SNET in Uganda, and advocated for use of SNET in bilaterals—e.g., in Zimbabwe. When we win a bilateral we put it in.”

GEAS. GEAS has used Passages materials to help with other intervention evaluation studies. “They provide great resources for other entities.” GEAS staff also talk about how Passages has worked closely with the Kinshasa School of Public Health team on the ground in DRC. “They are excellent about including them in dissemination, for example through conferences. Involving them in different aspects of research and GEAS in particular. Having worked with different implementation partners on the GEAS, especially where GEAS is doing intervention evaluation, my sense is that they are very good at collaboration, for example, with Save the Children.”

Tearfund. “This work brought the language of social norms to our work. It changed the way we approached things, the way we defined things and how we think about intervention models and processes as an organization.” Staff also talked about how part of this capacity building involves self-reflection and personal transformation to bring about broader change around them: “Before we even start the training at the community level, we need to train our staff because there are points that people haven’t reflected on themselves… it’s important for staff to go through this reflective process.”
Reaching groups through networks. Passages staff have also worked with the CORE group to promote thinking about social norms programmatically and in terms of evaluation. For example, they did a one-day training in May 2019 and found that “people are super interested and hungry on how to do it programmatically.”

Specific adaptations. In addition to building capacity around norms, several organizations talked about adapting specific programs and approaches. Save the Children is adapting Real Fathers, a mentoring and community-based intervention designed to address IPV and build positive parenting practices, in Malawi and Cambodia. In Malawi, staff from a Save education project adapted Real Fathers because they were looking for things to achieve real change.

Other adaptation and scaling efforts. Passages is providing support to expand a social network innovation to reduce social barriers to unmet need for family planning. The expansion of Tekponon Jikuagou (TJ) in Mali aims to test the scalability of the package with up to 10 NGOs in six regions of the country. Findings are not yet available for this work.

Costing Primer

FHI 360 developed a guide to activity-based costing in the context of social norms. When asked how this differed from other costing guides, they explained that here the interventions tend to be more multi-dimensional, with lots of moving pieces and multiple partners involved. This creates challenges from a data standpoint. What was important about the costing work under Passages was that it also included capacity building through mentoring and interactive assistance. FHI 360 worked closely with staff from Save the Children and Tearfund to implement the costing studies for the activities in the DRC. FHI 360 staff explained that “having me provide more interactive, on-demand help was very effective, as well as having the primer as a resource, and a recorded webinar talking about the primer that they could go back and reference. They could get TA from me. They never felt they were alone or trapped or stuck, they had a helpline.”

In a session on costing at the 2019 Passages Partners meeting, staff from Save the Children and Tearfund talked about their experience with the costing primer as challenging but an important learning experience. They also appreciated that the primer was a practical guide “something that anyone can pick up.” FHI 360 staff spoke highly of the hard work of partners: “The commitment that they made was really critical—this would not have gone as well if someone didn’t own it like they did. To their credit, this was not something they had planned on or had resources set aside for but they still took it on. They saw it as an opportunity to learn, they also saw the value of not just learning how it’s done but also seeing what they could learn.” The project is currently finalizing case studies that will be included with the primer to make it even more useful.

Many key informants praised the project and USAID for including costing. “Costing is still often an afterthought. It was really forward-looking of USAID to have this interest in trying to document and understand costs.” A project partner echoed this idea, while also noting the need for capacity building around conducting costing analyses: “I also appreciated the focus on costing—there is a report on how to do costing—that is needed, but probably also need more training on top of that. That would help people understand elements going in to costing. That thought leadership is really important.” The partners who implemented the costing work said that the important lesson was that if you want to include costing, you need time and resources and staff to do it right.

The costing work is highly relevant to considering implementation at scale; it was mentioned by several key informants and seen as an important contribution to the sector. A key informant noted the
importance of costing work as we look at sustainability, which is highly relevant to scaling-up discussions: “I am hesitant to look at scaling up without thinking about sustainability. This is where costing is important. Costing provides a reality check; can the local Ministry afford to continue the project after the implementation partner pulls out?” The issue of cost-effectiveness came up at the 2019 Passages Partners meeting. It is important to note that cost-effectiveness would not be appropriate for most social norms work given the multiple levels of activities and the near-impossibility of a clear effectiveness measure that could be used to compare different interventions.

### MAIN POINTS FOR EVALUATION QUESTION 2

- When people take part in realist evaluations, they like what they learn and see them as helpful in explaining the black box of how change happens and the process is useful in challenging assumptions.
- People generally like the concept of realist evaluations but the terminology remains confusing to many.
- Realist evaluations of Husbands’ Schools and the Grandmothers Project provide useful information on how these approaches work and these findings are important to share with groups that are already or are planning to replicate the approaches.
- There has been significant spread of knowledge on social norms throughout partner organizations, which can lead to much wider use of tools and lessons, showing the importance of partnering with implementing agencies—Save the Children alone has 120 country offices.
- One aspect of capacity building was the personal transformation among staff working on the various projects as the preparation for social norms work led to self-reflection which could bring about broader change.
- The costing primer is seen as a valuable resource, but it requires TA to implement and there is a need to plan from the beginning to undertake cost analysis for more efficient data collection and provide adequate capacity building and support.

### EVALUATION QUESTION 3. GLOBAL TECHNICAL LEADERSHIP

How has the Passages project demonstrated global technical leadership with regard to the knowledge base related to norm-shifting interventions, at scale?

The Passages project has played a key role in global technical leadership, specifically through a global presence at conferences and in publications, through IRH’s management role in the LC, and the launch of Regional communities of practice on the scale-up of AYRH normative change interventions in Francophone Africa and South Asia.
A Global Presence

The Passages project has emphasized making connections, attending technical meetings, joining working groups, and presenting at conferences. At the July 2019 partners meeting, there was an interactive session to put together a roadmap of the Passages project, including placing stars to show participation at events (see photo). The Passages team was actually surprised to see the large number of stars. With a fairly small number of core staff at IRH, this again shows the importance of the partners on the project in expanding the impact.

In spite of the limited number of staff and the limited funding, Passages has been able to play an important role in the world of social norms. Limited funding led to a situation where Passages staff had to spend a good deal of time on outreach and trying to raise funds from other sources. The 2017 project management review noted that while this had a downside in terms of cutting into time that could have been spent on technical guidance, the outreach did contribute to more people knowing about the project. A key informant not directly involved with Passages stated. “I never know of any other social norms project that I can call off the top of my head. They’ve done a great marketing job. It’s not an easy story.” Another interviewee noted the importance of Passages, even though her own interaction with the project had been limited: “It is one of the most prominent projects working on social norms at scale or scalable. The discourse on social norms has improved over time…from what I can tell they have had good findings and impact.”

The LC

The LC was established as a “networking” platform to bring together individuals and organizations from different sectors working on AYRH and social norms. There was a surge of interest in social norms when Passages started but theorizing and research around social norms was fragmented and what people meant by social norm change was not clear. To arrive at a consensus on definitions and tools, USAID consulted with other donors, including BMGF for additional funding to complement the work that Passages was doing. Many interviewees expressed the view that the LC would not have achieved all that it was able to without Passages.

The overall consensus was that the LC has been very successful while at the same time there was much more work to be done. As noted in an editorial in the Journal of Adolescent Health supplement—a deliverable of the LC—“The LC has served a valuable function in sparking a more integrative discussion than has existed in the past about what social norms are; how they arise, are maintained, and change; how they relate to other aspects of social organization and to purely individual-level attitudes and beliefs; what types of interventions, under what conditions, may be effective in changing social norms and improving AYRH; and how those interventions can be scaled up. But clearly that discussion is far from over.”

Successes/Facilitating Factors

Large membership. The inclusion of 370 members from 108 organizations with many showing great commitment to donating their time and expertise indicates that the LC filled a void by highlighting
theory, measurement, and scale-up of interventions designed to address social norms. The broad interest highlights how important understanding social norms is to practitioners and researchers alike.

More connections. A noted success was the LC’s role in improving professional networks among members. A survey of 74 people from 43 organizations found that interpersonal connections more than doubled (from four to nine average connections per organization, or a total of 208 to 457 reported connections), the most common types of new connections were: 1) actively shared or promoted each other’s work; 2) invited to meeting; 3) reviewed or provided feedback or shared resources for presentations, proposals, hiring recommendations, etc.

Creating a truly collaborative forum for learning. The LC was reported to have done a stellar job of living up to its name. Interviewees used words like collaborative, inclusive, and participatory. Some respondents noted that it was not at all top-down and peoples’ ideas were heard. As one interviewee noted, it was “motivational to be part of a consortium group that’s non-competitive” and another mentioned “it’s called a Learning Collaborative rather than a Community of Practice. It creates opportunities to support each other in a learning agenda rather than say how great our activities are, which is often how a CoP works. It’s very much a sharing kind of thing.” Several interviewees highlighted the importance of the minimal branding: “the fact that it wasn’t tied to one organization or project in its branding allowed a larger number of groups to take things up. It was a general public good.” While the LC was generally praised for the lack of branding, some respondents did feel that some documents were still branded as IRH products. In addition, some individuals felt that they had not received adequate acknowledgment and credit after providing information that was requested by the LC.

The face-to-face meetings organized through the LC were very valuable. Key informants noted the costs associated with meeting in person, but also saw this as important to the success of the LC: “Face-to-face is important. It is expensive and funders are resistant to provide dollars but annual meetings are critical.” Interviewees noted that they often worked in silos and the ability to mix and mingle with a variety of experts opened up channels of communication for future collaborations among different members. In the words of one interviewee “It was interesting to see so many major social norms thinkers to see in the same room—together, working in collaboration! Lots of people walked away with concrete things from these meetings.”

A specific benefit of face-to-face interactions was their ability to foster multidisciplinary learning, and collaboration across sectors was a particular strength of the LC. According to one interviewee, “I think it’s been exceptional with a lot to show for it. Most importantly the team was really able to make people collaborate and that is something which isn’t easy. Another interviewee noted: “LC has been responsible for marshalling a great range of people from different organizations. I now see many people referring to what the LC has done in multiple fields not just reproductive health.” One interviewee described this by saying: “A convening where like minds of the social norms world get together to discuss this idea would be really interesting because naturally donors come to this work with an interest in specific outcomes and it would be great if somehow people could join forces. Like you could have dual funding for something with one donor very interested in the family planning outcome and the other donor really interested in the child health or schooling aspect. This would be amazing.”

Funding from multiple donors. Related to the point above, the importance of multi-donor funding was also mentioned as a strength, as well. In the words of one key informant, “An impressive number of products that came out compared with other TWGs—partly because of the funding—and sometimes you don’t have that.” And another mentioned, “The fact that Gates is involved gives it credibility.” At the same time the
fact that some individuals and organizations had funding to undertake LC-related activities while others were expected to devote their time pro bono was mentioned by a handful of interviewees as being problematic. Specifically, it made these few individuals feel that their expertise was being “undervalued” in comparison to others.

**Focused learning.** Interviewees mostly praised the organization of the LC into three communities, namely theory, measurement, and scale-up. This division was broadly supported by interviewees, who felt it allowed them to be engaged in work that was directly relevant or interesting to them. Some, however, felt there could have been better linkages among the three groups and others proposed the need for additional groups for focused interactions, for example a donor learning community, for donors to organize funding in order to promote meaningful social norms change and a learning community devoted to ethical issues in social norms work.

**Importance of having concrete documents to work on.** Key informants felt that having concrete documents to work on was an important factor in keeping the group focused and productive. All interviewees noted that the most useful LC contribution is the numerous technical documents developed by the group, as illustrated in the quote below:

“I think the LC was hugely important to Passages success. I reference the tools they developed all the time. Really practical, concrete simple things you can pick up without a social norms background and integrate into your program. What the LC put out is so useful for implementers, especially those who don’t do much around social norms and want to do more. One of the unique things that made it work, they purposively sought out a balance of researchers and implementers, a range of perspectives spanning the research to practice spectrum—they translated the research into guidance useful to implementers instead of just putting out research documents.”

When asked to name the most useful technical documents interviewees mentioned: the Top 20 Social Norms resources, Applying Theory to Practice document, and the Social Norms Background Reader. Individuals who were intimately familiar with Passages and the LC referenced the SNET as another valuable tool. Another publication considered to be impressive was the recent issue of the *Journal of Adolescent Health*, as one interviewee noted, “This is not easy to do and having an LC is what made it possible.”

All the technical documents from the LC are currently on Align Platform’s website ([https://www.alignplatform.org/learning-collaborative](https://www.alignplatform.org/learning-collaborative)) and those who are aware of the website praised it, calling it a great resource that highlights the work done and deliverables produced. The Align platform includes an interactive map of where social norms projects have taken place around the world, and case studies for some of them. There are also 18 technical documents, ranging from briefs to toolkits to journal articles as outlined in Figure 1.
Despite its many successes, the LC has faced several challenges, detailed below.

**LC meetings dominated by small set of experts.** Interviewees mentioned that LC meetings had often been dominated over time by a specific set of experts reporting the same information over time. Hence, some felt that the LC failed to incorporate enough different viewpoints to represent the breadth of the field. Others suggested the inclusion of additional academic fields, such as economics, law, anthropology, and sociology, or recommended specific global scholars to help broaden the horizon of the LC. In addition, several respondents pointed out the limited involvement of country-level individuals and organizations. Some examples of this sentiment are provided below:
“At the end of the day there are four to five players repeatedly featured in their work and that is somewhat myopic. There are different parts of the world where scholars are studying norms and there is social norms work happening in many different disciplines, this is not incorporated within the LC.

“Even the special issue of the Journal of Adolescent Health on social norms, it lacks diversity. There are a dozen people mentioned everywhere but the field is much larger.”

Several people stated that some still came to LC meetings convinced that their approach is the best and many academic interviewees felt that the LC needed to look at sociological factors and examine systems. One interviewee described this as “navel-gazing.” Another felt that social norms were being equated to social determinants without adequate attention to address systemic and intersectional deprivations, i.e., “The focus on norms is good. It is important to consider how to address social norms but also look at the bigger factor, change in social determinants.”

Scale-up still requires more attention. At the same time, while specifically praising the costing guidelines, interviewees simultaneously noted that the scale-up component needed more attention. Some interviewees questioned the very definition of scale-up as defined by the LC, while others raised concerns about the motivation and need for scale-up of community-based interventions that were necessarily context-specific. Overall, interviewees felt that there needed to be consistent focus on measuring effectiveness, what works, for whom and under what conditions, rather than on scale-up. Some examples from the interviewees illustrating this challenge are provided below:

“The Passages project does not seem to be measuring scaling up. This has to be at least zonal or national not small.”

“I am hesitant to look at scaling up without thinking about sustainability.”

“The state of the field is that there isn’t that much to say about it in terms of scaling up.”

Challenges of promoting and tracking use of documents and tools. Producing documents and being a repository of information is not the endgame for the LC, as many key informants pointed out, but several respondents felt that there was no process for keeping track of who is using what. Most interviewees reported familiarity with them, and while some mentioned that they had read and utilized the documents themselves, the full extent of use is not clear. Some interviewees noted that there were too many documents to go through and a lack of prioritization to facilitate use. Some interviewees felt that the LC had cast a wide net for recording existing resources but been less successful in ranking the information based on stringent quality criteria. The LC has “been unable to create boundary conditions. This was not effectively done. When social norms are everything, it ends up being nothing. The difficult part is to say, ‘this is not what we need.’ This is not social norms. This approach is exclusionary so people are reluctant to do that. So, what does it do to the field of norms, its becomes muddled?” Additionally, interviewees questioned how cohesively Passages and the Align platform had worked together to host LC technical documents.

Tensions between academic and programmatic worlds. The Passages project and the LC are operating in a complicated space, trying to address the complexity of social norms in a way that is both acceptable to the academic community and useful and understandable to programs and implementers. The LC did impressive work in bridging these worlds by bringing people together. However, these tensions continue with some feeling that the terminology and documents were too confusing, still too academic, while some felt like the research being reported through the LC is not rigorous enough. As noted by one interviewee: “I feel like the tension is strong and the project is falling more on the research nerdy
end of things,” while another said, “we need more rigor, we cannot do without the experts, the field is still nascent and there is much confusion around social norms concepts and how to measure change in social norms.”

The complexity of the theories of change. Interviewees felt that the well-articulated theory of change was too complex and had not been tested in the field. As noted by one interviewee: “the social norms theorizing needs synthesis. I don’t mean it needs to be simplified to one or two variables but there are inherent contradictions that need to be resolved. We get hung up on concepts.” A participant at the July partners meeting noted the confusion over the theories of change during an interactive session, where “the staff wanted to go back to a more simplified theory of change even knowing that the details weren’t necessarily captured there.”

Lack of clearly articulated linkages between LC and SBC. A final set of challenges impacting the membership of the LC was linked to one of the major themes of the Passages evaluation and assessment—the need for a clear articulation of social norms as part of SBC. Interviewees felt that the LC should more purposively include broader representation from the SBC world and the language in LC documents should clearly articulate social norms as part of SBC. As the following quotes illustrate:

“There is also confusion around what is social norms work vs. what is SBC, what is interplay between the two. Passages has done a great deal to bring it more into the vernacular, but I think one thing that’s still really challenging—and it’s central.”

“Social norms approach can help SBC work in general—to help with community discussions, make this work more acceptable—community can reject quickly SBC interventions with a strong message, but the social norms approach can make things more collaborative, community-driven, and acceptable.”

The need for the LC to clarify the connections and distinctions between gender norms and social norms was also raised by some interviewees as a concern, although everyone interviewed reported that gender norms were a part of social norms. As noted by one interviewee: “Endless debates on what is gender norms what is social norms. Of course, these discussions should happen at the academic level and they are happening there. But for practice we have to move on!”

Regional Communities of Practice

The regional CoPs are another example of the global technical leadership provided by the Passages project. GenDev gave support to the project to help move the conversation and sharing on social norms from the global level to regional levels. To this end, two regional CoPs were developed under the Passages project for capacity building and advancing knowledge sharing, collaboration, practice, and advocacy for transforming social norms that influence adolescents so they can reach their full potential. The South Asian CoP was hosted by Save the Children in Nepal and the Francophone Africa CoP is hosted by ASF, the former PSI-affiliate in DRC. The CoPs were intended for collaboration between individuals, researchers, organizations, and donors working on normative change interventions to foster a supportive professional network. Passages envisioned an engaging online community with long-distance mentoring where participants would be provided tools and resources. In July 2018, a midway survey was conducted with both CoPs to assess online engagement and solicit feedback. The 34 responses from the Francophone Africa group had generally positive feedback. Responses led to improvements in email communication and member support. Only five individuals responded from the South Asia CoP, so there was not enough information to make any changes.
More engagement in Francophone Africa than South Asia. While CoPs for both regions launched successfully, the CoP in Francophone Africa showed more engagement and overall success. From the beginning, the CoP in Francophone Africa had more members and consistent virtual discussions. About 100 members engaged in online discussions regularly by the third year of Passages. In 2019, Passages supported 12 individuals to travel and join 40 CoP members for a sustainability planning workshop during the Francophone African Social and Behavior Change Summit in Cote d'Ivoire. Members created an action plan and designated active members to be responsible for local meetings and workshops to increase capacity and implement interventions (including an M&E plan), and fundraising for sustainability. Decentralization of leadership was more successful in Francophone Africa than in South Asia.

The South Asian CoP met with significantly more challenges. When initially identifying members, the Francophone Africa CoP had a response rate of 170, while only 20 people responded for the South Asia CoP. The Francophone group also had responses from diverse organizations, including civil society organizations, while the South Asian responses were mostly donors. Three discussion attempts were made by the third year of Passages. At the midway survey, only five individuals responded and indicated that while there is need and interest in a CoP, however, there was not enough time and incentive to actively join in. This led the Passages team to consider remodeling the structure of the CoP and they had a preliminary conversation with Save the Children to identify areas of overlapping interests to provide additional guidance. By Year 4, however, the Passages USAID management team decided to focus their efforts and funds to support the Francophone Africa CoP.

Language a challenge for Francophone group. Despite the success in Francophone Africa, the CoPs faced many challenges. In Francophone Africa, the biggest challenge was the language barrier, as English-to-French translation was unavailable. The platform required major improvements to usability, accessibility, and overall user experience. Instead, team members have used WhatsApp to communicate, as that was a platform that everyone knew how to use and was easily accessible.

The CoPs are not widely known. Despite successes in Francophone Africa, many interviewees had not heard of regional CoPs and even if they had, they knew very little about them. Those who did noted that CoPs are useful for capacity building, but there is much work to be done. They provided recommendations on future directions: how to measure effectiveness and hold people accountable to show true capacity building. Another suggestion is to set a desired result of the collaboration beyond just sharing knowledge so that the field can advance, and the involved parties can work together toward the same goal.

“The LC could be a project in its own right that brings the social norms CoP together and have the plan to do this virtually and face to face to develop and disseminate tools and manuals. Digital resources are the future.”

“[Interviewee] thinks the CoPs need to exist and are absolutely essential. Doesn’t know what the measurement of effectiveness is and maybe that’s part of the problem and we don’t define what success looks like. So, we create these CoPs and the info sharing is fantastic. Heard from their team that there was good dialogue in the last meeting of the LC. All of this is a step in the right direction. The next step is what does effective look like, how do we measure it and how do we hold ourselves accountable to it. What does true capacity building look like.”
As mentioned above, the Francophone Africa team struggled with the lack of user-friendliness of the Springboard platform and language barriers, so they decided to move their communications to WhatsApp. “People say Francophone is important, but everything is in English—even the discussion board Springboard, it’s all in English—hard to get people to participate—you need a certain level of English even to navigate the websites to find the French source—so trying to use WhatsApp instead, it’s easy to use, everyone knows how to use, they have it already.” While this may have been a successful short-term solution, it is informal, and there needs to be a formalized way for resource-sharing and inviting others who are interested in joining in.

There used to be websites for both the Francophone Africa CoP and the South Asian CoP; however, they are not available anymore. It is recommended in the future to create an official online resource so more people can be aware of the work the CoPs are doing, as the interviews showed people’s significant lack of familiarity with them.

For sustainability, Passages has invested substantially in Francophone Africa, especially after efforts were re-focused onto Francophone Africa with the challenges of the South Asian CoP. The Francophone Africa CoP has received seed grants to help cover the initial cost of work and more fund-seeking. However, the Passages team has been described as “pretty hands off” and “minimally engaged” in terms of coaching. In the future, more coaching or even minimal “check-ins” by the Passages team may help steer the CoP to set goals.

**MAIN POINTS FOR EVALUATION QUESTION 3**

- Passages has developed a prominent global presence in the realm of social norms through collaborative connections, such as through the LC and sharing resources and tools through workshops, webinars, social media, publications and other documentation, and presenting at conferences.
- The overall consensus was that the LC had been very successful while at the same time there was much more work to be done.
- Factors to LC success: creating a collaborative space for learning, focused learning with three groups, having concrete documents to work on, face-to-face meetings, and funding from multiple donors.
- Challenges for LC: dominated by a small set of experts, promoting and tracking use of tools, tensions between academic and programmatic worlds, and the lack of full engagement of the SBC community.
- Regional CoPs set up in Francophone Africa and South Asia, but only the former has been active.
- Challenges for CoPs include the limited availability of resources in French and lack of a mechanism to provide more streamlined technical guidance.
EVALUATION QUESTION 4. VALUE ADDED OF THE PASSAGES PROJECT

What has been the working relationship and the value added of the Passages project (regarding social norm development and transformation, at scale), relative to other USAID projects and efforts supported by other donors?

The Passages Project made important contributions to the areas of social and behavior change, gender, youth, faith-based engagement, work with adolescents, and cross-sectoral and donor engagement. Much of the value add stems from lessons learned from research and implementation and from the discourse among SBC, social norms, youth, gender, FP/RH, and cross-sectoral stakeholders about what social norms work is, how it is implemented and measured, who should do it, and the benefits and challenges to addressing social norms across multiple disciplines and contexts. While some respondents questioned the relevance and rigor of Passages, most acknowledged the need for this work and for continued work on understanding and measuring social norms in the context of health and development.

Value Add for Social and Behavior Change

Most respondents regarded social norms as part of SBC, but also acknowledge a complicated relationship and tensions within donor and implementer spaces in the community of practice. Informants who considered themselves to be SBC experts were very uncomfortable with the impression that addressing social norms was a brand new focus in SBC programming but regarded it as work they've been doing. Many acknowledged that addressing social norms in SBC has been an evolving aspect in SBC work and that it has been done using different approaches (community mobilization, community engagement, mass media, entertainment education, etc.) albeit with varying levels of quality and understanding. Among practitioners who consider themselves focused on social norms, some perceived that social norms were not explicitly addressed, that many programs were conflating norms with attitudes, and that there was and continues to be a need for consensus on definitions, measurement, and scale-up of social norms programming. The disconnect that has emerged in reaction to the existence of the Passages project has contributed in both constructive and challenging ways around defining SBC and social norms and surfacing gaps in understanding of these concepts in the community of practice. Passages has also reinforced the centrality of ethics and culture in SBC work, questioned assumptions in faith-based work, and highlighted the critical need for resources and approaches designed for/with Francophone settings.

Defining SBC and social norms and their relationship. In the initial phases of the project, a disconnect in understanding how social norms and SBC fit together conceptually and programmatically created a level of tension between those focusing on social norms and those rooted in broader SBC practice. Nevertheless, respondents unanimously agreed that social norms is an element of SBC and that there is a need to be clear about how we define both SBC and social norms. In It Takes A Village: A Shared Agenda for Social and Behavior Change in Family Planning, a 2019 document developed by USAID’s global SBC flagship project Breakthrough Action, SBC is defined as “a discipline which uses deep understanding of human and societal behavior and evidence-based interventions to increase the adoption of healthy behaviors by individuals, and influence the gender and social norms that underpin those behaviors.” In the LC’s 2016 Social Norms Background Reader, social norms are defined as “the often unspoken rules that govern behavior.” Despite these definitions, informants generally felt like more work needed to be done to define SBC and social norms and, for a few respondents, to answer a

perennial question: Which comes first: does social norms lead to behavior change or do changes in behavior lead to social norm change? For many others, social norms approaches were seen as part of the “toolbox” of SBC and should be used if determinants of behaviors are normative and/or multiple tools are needed to change behaviors:

“Social norms is a piece of SBC. Pull from it when relevant and don’t when not. It’s part of the toolbox. The social ecological model is everywhere.”

“Passages work is SBC work. That’s it…Passages is also looking at knowledge and attitudes (not just social norms), they might do more to diagnose and measure social norms [than other SBC projects].”

“If we think about SBC more broadly, social norms becomes a piece of it, and you pull from it when relevant, or not when not relevant. Bad to continue down the path of two separate worlds…it’s a piece of the larger picture.”

This tension in the discourse on the relationship between social norms and SBC has also contributed to confusion among those who are on the outskirts of the conversation. Many felt that the tension and arguing is unnecessary, counterproductive, and deflective:

“For those of us not in the thick of it, why is there this separation of SBC and social norms? We don’t want to take sides. I need help.”

Essentially, informants reinforced that it’s not a matter of SBC or social norms programming, it’s a matter of using the right tools from SBC to address multiple overlaying factors to address health challenges. Many also agreed that the starting point should be developing the capacity to know when social norms are a factor and when they are not and subsequently implementing interventions along a social norms continuum.

Identifying gaps in understanding of SBC. Although informants generally agreed that social norms were part and parcel of SBC, it was apparent that there were gaps in understanding of social and behavior change across implementers as well as donors. “There is a misperception that SBC has been mainly individually focused and mass media driven. It depends on the determinants; once we know what the determinants are, we can identify the best approaches and social norms may very well be one important determinant. But there are other factors at play. Normative change programming goes beyond community engagement.” These misperceptions surfaced in many respondents’ understanding of how social norms are addressed in SBC programming. Other respondents more steeped in the SBC field acknowledged the growth of the field from being focused on the individual to a field of practice that includes a broad array of approaches. These informants stressed that it is necessary to understand that not all behaviors have normative determinants so social norms should not always be the starting point of analysis. Informants also emphasized that addressing social norms should not be framed as a new field or a new approach that has never been done before; however, if SBC efforts are done right, they utilize the social ecological model holistically and address social norms as necessary.

Contributions to work on social norms and SBC. Within this complicated conversation, Passages has contributed to work on social norms, and more broadly, social and behavior change. Most respondents felt that Passages’ work amplified the fact that although many efforts address social norms, many of these efforts were not measuring social norms and/or they did not refer to their work as “social norms” work. Passages reinforced the need to “take social norms seriously” and can help SBC practitioners become more fluent in diagnosing and measuring norms. Passages also helped concretize
what is and what isn’t a social norm and helped move people away from defining norms as attitudes or aggregated attitudes. By making the link between SBC more explicit, some organizations (e.g., FHI 360, Save the Children, PSI, Tearfund, and Population Council) have begun to explore how to merge the work into their existing SBC programming.

Passages staff acknowledged that the correct framing of work on social norms is critical to the uptake of their work. For example, initially, the phrase “social norms interventions” was used to refer to the different Passages interventions. However, confusion about what a social norms intervention is versus an intervention that addresses social norms contributed to their exploration around how these interventions fit into the broader SBC context. Engaging in the International Social and Behavior Change Communication Summit and other conferences helped Passages staff improve their understanding of SBC work; what Passages could contribute to those efforts and how it can make the social norms work, tools, approaches, and products more ready for uptake by SBC efforts. A potentially useful contribution to this discussion surfaced at the partners’ meeting on July 9 as well as from key informants:

“What we want is “norms-aware programming”—strategies that are normative. [Quoting from Vincent Petit, UNICEF at the May 2019 Learning Collaborative Summit]: “Not social norms, but SBC with proper consideration of normative elements. Our focus on social norms is counterproductive and untrue to the nature of behaviors and what is needed to change them.”

This shift from “social norms change interventions” to “social norms shifting interventions” or “social norms-aware interventions” attempted to respond to the idea that 1) it is difficult to change or transform norms, and 2) categorization of these interventions was less about being a “social norms” intervention and more about how interventions addressed social norms in design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. This perspective was reinforced by another informant who offered a practical adaptation of a tool from best practices in gender integration—the Gender Integration Continuum3—to help implementers understand how to assess the different levels of social norms “awareness” of their interventions:

“We think about the gender continuum—you could do that for social norms—blind, aware, transformative. A lot of work that says it deals with social norms has been blind, maybe aware, but not transformative. So we needed Passages to advance this theory and practice and make it something that couldn’t be ignored.”

This practical adaptation of the gender integration continuum would entail plotting interventions on a continuum of how they address social norms in their programming. The checklist/tool would ask: Has a program diagnosed the norms that operate on the program’s particular health objectives? And if so, is the program social norms-aware? Has it diagnosed the norms that operate on the program’s particular health objectives? Is it working to shift social norms? Transform social norms? Is the program measuring social norms? And how? Such a checklist for programmers was envisioned as a part of an SBC practitioners box of tools and resources that could help integrate an explicit social norms approach after analysis confirms normative determinants of behavior and after diagnosis of particular social norms associated with that behavior(s).

Another contribution was a deeper conversation in the LC about what the “S” in social and behavior change means. Although many informants appreciated the need to focus more on the “S” through

normative work (when necessary), some reinforced the idea that social change is not achieved by only addressing norms, but also structural dynamics:

“We still don’t understand structural social change—defined as “a change in access to resources—education, media, power. So, if you don’t change access to resources and people’s control of decision making, you may have social normative change but not social change.”

This perspective resonated with some Passages staff who understood that although the Passages model focused on the community level, the approach was one of many and change happens at different interrelated levels and through different complementary approaches.

Informants also appreciated Passages as a platform for moving the academic and research discussion on social norms into the practice space. They also simultaneously affirmed the need to simplify and continue working on concretizing the continuously complex discourse on social norms. Almost unanimously, informants found that Passages’ focus on measurement and theory was critical for both research and practice but that future work must concentrate on applying and integrating learnings, tools, and approaches on social norms within existing SBC work and scaling it up. For multiple project partners, this engagement has sparked internal organizational reflection about how they could approach this work. As a result, some partners plan to or have incorporated a social norms lens in their SBC frameworks.

There are, however, varying levels of engagement of traditional SBC practitioners in these social norms discussions. Some feel engaged, some don’t, and some are on the periphery of the discussion within and outside their own organizations. Respondents also cautioned about expectations of the use of Passages tools and resources by other entities without the mandate of donors. Bringing these SBC practitioners more centrally into the discussion would help Passages tailor its products and resources to this key group. Additionally, framing and disseminating the tools and resources in ways that 1) are not complex or overwhelming, 2) that incorporate feedback loops to better understand how the resources are being used and adapted, and 3) that clarify utility for SBC and gender practitioners could promote uptake among these stakeholders.

The role of ethics and the impact on culture. Passages staff are concerned about the ethics of social norms change and have engaged a small group to explore ethics around inclusion, participation, and power in norms shifting work. Some staff feel these discussions have reinforced the need to talk about ethics, to be conscious and knowledgeable that the work is being done correctly, to understand how local communities may respond to norms shifting work, and the potential impact SBC work has on culture. Since these issues are not new to the field of SBC, lessons learned from SBC programming could be applied to this exploration.

Other ethical questions around how changing norms ultimately changes culture are also being questioned in this space. As noted in the section on Passages research, implementers (local and global) often grapple with perceptions that social norms work can’t be done because traditions and norms are sacrosanct and/or are difficult to change. They are also often faced with communities or individuals who want to change certain aspects of culture to improve well-being in their communities. That being said, local staff who were interviewed felt that Passages’ value add was that the approaches enabled staff to address challenges they’ve been grappling with through a community oriented, inclusive, and participatory way:
“Social norms approach can help SBC work in general—to help with community …[the] community can reject quickly SBC interventions with a strong message, but the social norms approach can make things more collaborative, community-driven, and acceptable.”

“Before, we’ve worked on these linear SBC projects that work on specific behaviors, but it’s the ‘S’ that is missing—it’s that where we have more work to be done…There is a cultural reality within this collectivist society—and if you…reinforce the capacity of young girls, but forget young boys, parents etc., there will be negative consequences, there will be a confrontation between those whose capacity you’ve reinforced, and others—if you can work together, and create an equilibrium to work together.”

Staff appreciated this approach as one that would help them work on the “origins of the problem to get to the solution” or the “root of the issues which are social norms that are taboos across behaviors.” Staff also appreciated the opportunity to share experiences from other countries grappling with similar issues and the use of tools (in French!) that facilitated discussion and implementation. As noted earlier, engagement on Passages also impacted on the personal lives of some staff and encouraged a level of self-reflection that implementers often expect program participants to engage in. Ultimately, the experience with Passages enabled a more realistic, participatory, and inclusive approach that resonated with local staff and reinforced that collectively, people need to be in the driver’s seat in efforts to affect social and behavior change in their communities:

“Passages has helped us define these concepts, but the work itself is still complex and difficult—and it’s up to the communities to decide if they are going to shift norms, change behaviors—we have to foster dialogue within the community, do everything together—decide, reflect, and change all together—it has to be a group decision from the beginning.”

Contributions to Francophone SBC work. As mentioned earlier, language remains a huge issue and French-speaking staff struggle with the hegemony of English in donor engagement, program design, implementation, and research spaces and the lack of resources for French-speaking practitioners. Local staff feel distant from engagement with donor representatives who do not speak French and feel that they are limited in being able to explain and advocate for their activities in these spaces.

Although there is a lot more to do, Passages’ dedication to ensuring key tools and resources are available in French, and that French speaking staff can listen, participate, and engage with their English-speaking colleagues in key partner meetings has enabled better internalization of concepts by French speakers and allowed them to engage in these discussions, debates, and discourse around social norms. This has enhanced implementation of the activities in the DRC, Senegal and Niger and has contributed to the availability of resources on key SBC-related topics to Francophone countries that are grappling with normative barriers to health in their communities.

Contributions to working with faith-based groups. The Passages project joins a large swath of community-based SBC programming that engages with faith groups to improve FP/RH outcomes. It faces similar challenges that these programs face, such as concerns from religious leaders about culture changing, the alignment of health messaging and activities with scripture, and the acceptability of talking about taboo topics with faith-based groups. Findings from this evaluation showed that the value add of Passages include the participatory element of the tested interventions, which enables discussion of new and/or taboo concepts and the importance of consistently positioning of concepts within a religious world view:
“Religious leaders wrote out attributes of men vs. women—and we say, the Bible says men and women are equal, but our society is not equal, and then when they see this all together they begin to understand where the problem lies, but it’s a slow process of understanding via discussion.”

From a programmatic standpoint, use of the SNET was a key contribution to faith-based work in the DRC. Partner staff indicated that the SNET enabled the project to validate assumptions about religious leaders as influential reference groups for men and women. This work revealed that both faith leaders and family members operated as reference groups at varying levels. Respondents felt the tools and approaches brought clarity, understanding, and a language with which to speak about social norms and represented “something tangible that makes sense to people without going down the rabbit hole of different research papers.” Having practical tools like the SNET also enabled partner staff to diagnose social norms in other work (FGM, women’s empowerment, etc.). Lastly, although respondents felt that this work was exploring assumptions about religions leaders and could contribute to the evidence around norms shifting work in faith-based settings, it remains unclear how much evidence the project will be able to contribute given the current USAID restrictions on program implementation in the DRC.

Value Add for the Gender Field

In addition to those working in the SBC space, informants working from a gender perspective also generally felt that Passages had added value to their work. Key areas of contribution centered around the project reinforcing linkages between social norms and gender, concretizing the relationship between social norms and gender norms, contributing to the evidence base for gender transformative work with different audiences, and providing the opportunity for more intentional work around power dynamics.

In the Learning Collaborative’s efforts to select a conceptual framework for norms shifting interventions, the group proposed the Flower for Sustained Health: An integrated, socio-ecological framework for normative influence and change. The framework reinforced strong linkages with gender by centering the role of power as underlying gender and social norms at the individual, social, resource, and institutional level. Respondents appreciated that this framework gave much-needed prominence to gender and power dynamics and how these concepts affect change. In addition to the framework, gender practitioners also felt that Passages’ work helped remind them that not all social norms are gender norms and that other social norms could explain certain behaviors. Additionally, the social norms defining and diagnosis tools and resources were seen as extremely useful not only to address the incorrect assumption that norms are aggregates of attitudes and beliefs but to also help researchers reexamine how they've been using existing gender norm scales as measurements of norms.

The TM and GUG! interventions were seen as highly valuable for demonstrating how to use gender transformative approaches that engage communities in sensitive and taboo subjects for improved FP/RH outcomes. According to respondents, these interventions worked intentionally and rigorously to affect not only FP/RH outcomes, but GBV and gender equality outcomes, which other SBC mechanisms have not been funded to do:

“They consistently address gender norms and inequalities in their work and [are] doing fairly rigorous evaluations of these activities…There is intentionality and rigor.”

Respondents emphasized that these interventions responded to the need to not only be gender “intentional” but to prioritize transforming inequitable gender norms in FP/RH across multiple societal levels.

These interventions were also valued as critically needed gender transformative work with men and boys. For example, the Align platform, which mainly curates work on gender norms, appreciated Passages’ work with fathers and included this work in a convening on gender norms and fatherhood. Respondents are looking forward to lessons learned that will contribute to building evidence and programming around masculinity, fatherhood, positive parenting, male engagement in FP, men’s needs across the life course, and preventing intimate partner violence. Furthermore, these approaches are viewed as opportunities to address power dynamics in a more intentional way and to inform SBC work at multiple levels:

“Focus on gender norms is so important to everything we do. If you want to change behavior you have to address gender norms because that’s where the power is…It’s become clear to me that it’s all about power dynamics and that largely sits with gender norms.”

“Working with power at a community level—it’s bigger because you’re confronting people with their own tacit power. What makes it unique, when you understand that, what does that mean for scaling it up.”

“This is where the gender norms piece comes in here. Have been talking a lot about how are we looking at integrated [SBC] programming and unintended consequences of programs, how do we measure them, who the information is being provided to, how does this play out within the household for those who don’t have decision making power. Some of the gender norms pieces around power within the household are being looked at whether it be within the nuclear family or the more community structured one.”

Respondents also perceive that power dynamics are being addressed at varying levels across Passages’ interventions and stressed the need to hone in on how interventions apply approaches to tackle power dynamics, women’s agency, and GBV in the context of working with men and other power holders (e.g., grandmothers).

**Contribution to Work with Youth**

The Passages project aims to increase the use of voluntary modern FP and improve healthy timing and spacing of pregnancies among youth, newly married, and first-time parents and aims to lay the groundwork for positive RH outcomes among very young adolescents (10-14-year-olds) by engaging their reference groups, including their families, and their communities. The project took a socio-ecological approach to addressing social norms at multiple levels that impact on FP/RH outcomes among these populations. Respondents pointed to unique contributions of Passages to work with youth with respect to programming, research and evidence, and adaptability.

Key informants appreciated that Passages’ interventions focused on very young adolescents, an important population that is not included in research enough given the critical timing of the formation of social and gender norms at this life stage and the lack of evidence on what works for this population. Respondents reaffirmed the significance of Passages’ life stage approach and starting early to address these norms through engaging influencers or reference groups (e.g., parents, peers, communities, others) of VYAs, newly married youth, and first-time parents:

“The work has evolved and gotten more nuanced and intentional in what they’ve learned and focusing specifically on normative change and using the socio-ecological model—you have to involve everybody.”
To many, the value add of Passages is its intergenerational outlook, gender transformative approach to working with youth and parenting, and its holistic engagement with the environment within which VYAs and other youth formulate healthy and equitable attitudes and behaviors that will serve them across the life course. Respondents acknowledge the complexity of working with this age group and valued the focus on body literacy, fertility awareness, and gender norms as a pathway to improving RH among youth. Additionally, the partnership with the GEAS was seen as key contribution to knowledge on social and gender norms among VYAs. Given limitations in this type of data, respondents appreciated GEAS’ role, the rigorous nature of the research and the opportunity to evaluate RH work on youth in these particular life stages. Respondents also saw Passages work as contributing to closing the gap on evidence-based AYRH programming and stressed the potential value of the intervention and results for cross-sectoral work with youth.

In this respect, learnings and approaches to working with youth are being taken up and adapted by other efforts. Many respondents considered the tools and approaches with youth very adaptable and some referred specifically to how they were adapting these learnings:

“The work on how it [Passages] described taking ages and stages and gender transformative work is really useful. Parenting for positive youth development, social norms is key. I always point to Passages as the model for those things…I’ve included [it] in our [positive youth development] trainings [and] promoted through our newsletters. [I’m also] working to apply some of the principles into new behavior change effort we’re doing on youth.”

The use of project tools, resources and learnings in USAID’s positive youth development work has the potential to address social norms across multiple youth-related development outcomes and potentially amplify these outcomes. An additional specific adaptation includes a horizontal scale-up of GUG! with a new cohort of older adolescents funded by GAC. General references were made by other organizations on plans to incorporate social norms learning into their work with youth.

Cross-sectoral Engagement and Working Relationships

Cross-sectoral engagement and breaking siloes. Passages’ work to examine social norms across sectors widened the opportunity to break down the siloes among FP; gender education; food security; agriculture; nutrition; water, sanitation and hygiene; and conflict efforts. Respondents felt that Passages work sits at the intersection of multiple issues (gender, youth, GBV, SBC, FP, etc.) and learnings from addressing social and gender norms at this intersection could produce vital lessons for programming and leveraging funding across/between disciplines and sectors:

“It’s important to move beyond FP—when designing new programs and work plans for implementation, for example, some health offices are struggling to incorporate youth FP programming into their work. So, it’s important to design and implement cross-sectoral projects, for example with the democracy & governance or education. Also, humanitarian settings, fragile settings, non-permissive environments, opportunities to work within humanitarian setting. We need to figure out how to work with the other sectors, opportunities to integrate with them, for example, integrating with the Food for Peace countries.”

The cross-sectoral landscaping review of social norms in non-health sectors was seen as an important contribution to cross-sectoral work and respondents also appreciated that Passages went beyond health behaviors to look at social changes and framed people’s lives holistically. A key perspective pointed out that using a social norms approach could be very useful to answer challenges in areas where multiple approaches have been tried but development outcomes have stalled. Interviewees felt that social norms
were important across a variety of cross-cutting issues and the LC could serve as a focal point for social norms work as a whole. For example, “It is important to increase the multidisciplinary of the work. And provide clear and convincing evidence on how social norms makes a difference across fields.”

**Working Relationships and Leveraging Other USAID Efforts.** Respondents both internal and external to the Passages Project referenced the collaborative and inclusive nature of the project across multiple levels of interaction. Respondents valued the adaptive management approach utilized by project leadership in dealing with programmatic, technical, implementation, and funding challenges. Respondents overwhelmingly praised the project—and project leadership in particular—as inclusive, flexible, easy to work with, and exemplary. Other key descriptive words about the project the team heard from many respondents are illustrated in this word cloud:

Additionally, the existence of large-scale implementers as project partners (e.g., Save the Children, Tearfund, FHI 360) and partnerships with other SBC projects also facilitated integration of tools, approaches, and learnings. Examples of concerted efforts to engage with Passages include adapting REAL Fathers to the Indian context and the cross-sectoral landscaping review for USAID’s GenDev office, introduction of social norms learnings at USAID’s co-creation workshop for PRH’s new service delivery design MOMENTUM, FHI 360’s work in Zimbabwe on FP and home births, the Advancing Partners and Communities project in Uganda, adaptation of Transforming Masculinities in Nigeria, five to six organizations working on the ground with Save the Children, and concerted efforts to integrate social norms learnings into the work of PRH’s other SBC research mechanism, Breakthrough Research. There is also some level of engagement between PRH’s SBC flagship implementation mechanism Breakthrough Action (BA) and Passages, however it is unclear how deeply these two projects have been interacting. BA has been invited to the LC meetings and Passages has attended SBCC Summits coordinated by BA. In September 2019, the LC announced plans to collaborate with BA on the development of a tool to help practitioners integrate social norms into their SBC programming. Through the development of this tool it is to be expected that cross-fertilization of learnings on social norms and SBC will increase between the two projects.
Leveraging Donor Engagement

The Passage Project has been able to leverage donor interest that resulted in $18.07 million in funding from multiple donors in excess of its original level to implement work linked to or adapted from Passages. This includes funding from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for:</th>
<th>USAID’s Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Office for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• GUG! Implementation ($1.5 million)</td>
<td>• Expansion of Realist Evaluations in Niger and Senegal and Global Technical Leadership for Regional Communities of Practice ($400,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LC ($1 million)</td>
<td>• Global Technical Leadership for Male Norms and Cross Sector and Scale up of Real Fathers in Uganda ($400,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GUG! expansion and scale up ($4.4 million)</td>
<td>• Real Fathers Adaptation in India ($200,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Templeton Foundation to:</th>
<th>• Global Affairs Canada for GUG+ (adaptation of GUG! for older adolescent girls and scale up) (IRH: $370,000; Save the Children: ~$7 million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Test and scale up Tekponon Jikuagou in Mali ($1 million)</td>
<td>• A USAID/Burundi buy-in ($300,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adapt Masculinite Famille et Foi in Nigeria ($1.5 million)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This level of donor interest speaks to the interest in social norms work by these donors and to their technical priorities (FP, gender, GBV, male engagement, VYAs, and faith-based engagement). Respondents also attribute this to the power of the professional networks, technical leadership, dedication, and advocacy of the project management teams at USAID and Passages. Respondents also lauded the engagement of USAID in supporting programming that focused more on proximate determinants that can potentially influence more than specific FP outcomes. This donor engagement also demonstrated the advantageous effects of leveraging funds and resources within and among donors and the potential for small investments to have larger and more meaningful results.

While many respondents supported these sentiments, some also expressed the importance of continuing to be creative and think strategically about these and future work. Respondents challenged donors to act on lessons learned for cross-sectoral efforts, to invest in multiple and mutually reinforcing mechanisms that focus on different aspects of the same problem, to develop creative examples of co-designed and co-funded investments that leverage the technical priorities of multiple donors, and to invest in long-term interventions necessary to examine and measure normative change:

“[The issue is] what is it that we are trying to achieve and...[what] are these investments inputs into that. So success is not Passages, it’s the input that Passages has been able to achieve against our broader ambition. There is a paradigm shift that needs to happen.”

Mission Outreach and Engagement

Except for USAID/Burundi, Passages has not been able to secure buy-ins from missions. Passages’ efforts to engage missions reinforced: 1) that the research is a hard sell to missions; 2) the need to frame work on social norms practically and in ways the missions value (e.g., as an approach to strengthen SBC investments or an approach to address GBV); and 3) the need to emphasize capacity building in addressing social norms in SBC work. Missions may not be as interested in supporting implementation of large-scale social norms studies. Given that missions want to implement to scale, they may not want to
fund what a respondent referred to as “hyper-intensive evaluations.” Missions generally want to know that their investments are not interventions being tested but work that can be taken to scale. The pitch should be different (programmatic vs. research) and clear. It should also fit into the current SBC work they’re doing. Additionally for global health, addressing norms that can affect multiple behaviors could prove fruitful for missions that invest in integrated health, integrated SBC, and/or cross-sectoral programming: “Other things Missions are facing are cross-sectoral. It’s not just integrated health, but across education, food for peace, etc. This really presents new frontiers to look at social norms. It’s important to link to a Mission’s specific issue and help work along with their bilateral mechanisms.”

**MAIN POINTS FOR EVALUATION QUESTION 4**

- Debate about the novelty of interventions that address social norms led to tension and confusion among SBC and social norms practitioners as well as those outside the debate.
- Discourse and work to define “social norms interventions” has improved understanding about the relationship between social norms and the broader field of social and behavior change. Project stakeholders have started to frame these interventions as being on a continuum that defines the extent to which social norms are addressed—“norms-aware” to “norms-shifting.”
- Passages helped to concretize social norms and is contributing to helping SBC and gender practitioners become more fluent in diagnosing and measuring norms.
- Although Passages is valued for providing a platform for moving academic and research discourse on social norms into programming and practice, there is still a need to simplify tools and resources and incorporate these and other learnings into scale-up.
- Social norms-shifting interventions implemented at the community level hold unique value with local implementers as it provides an opportunity to address local challenges in a community oriented, inclusive, participatory and holistic way.
- The project’s investment in French translation of tools and resources and simultaneous translation at all partner meetings has contributed to a deeper engagement by French speaking staff managing interventions in Francophone settings.
- Passages is contributing to building evidence for gender transformative work with faith-based groups, men, very young adolescents, and first-time parents and their reference groups.
- Passages’ work sits at the intersection of multiple technical areas (GBV, gender, FP) and learnings from this can be applied to cross-sectoral work on social norms.
- Passages has leveraged $18.07 million in funds to implement or adapt different approaches for four different donors. This is in large part due to the professional networks, technical leadership, dedication, and advocacy of the USAID and Passages project management teams.

**EVALUATION QUESTION 5. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE USAID INVESTMENTS**

What are the implications for future USAID investments in research and research utilization related to social norm transformation at scale?

USAID has been an important leader in work around social norms, described by some key informants as visionary. Much has been learned, but a common theme from experts was that in many ways the field is
still nascent. There is a risk of losing momentum without continued support, and this is now an important time to synthesize existing information, identify cross-cutting themes, and ensure use of existing learnings, as well as continuing to advance global learning. One partner summed up these sentiments: “It is still necessary to have some dedicated investment—still a nascent area—you risk backsliding and reinvention of wheels if you stop having some focused support. It’s been a true contribution and visionary for USAID.” In this section, we describe implications for future USAID investments based on synthesizing the data from the other four evaluation questions as well as suggestions from key informants for the future.

**Better integration with SBC and consider pros and cons of a specific social norms project**

An overarching issue is the need for reframing of the discussion of social norms as part of SBC. Every key informant saw social norms as part of SBC, while acknowledging that sometimes it is not called that nor is it clearly measured. While it was useful and maybe necessary to separate out social norms for clarification and consensus-building, generally there is a feeling that it is now time to more clearly articulate and position social norms within SBC. The 2019 document on a shared agenda for SBC, *It Takes a Village: a shared agenda for social and behavior change in family planning*—identifies social change as one of the priority areas, which includes shifting social and gender norms and highlights the importance of incorporating lessons from Passages into shared and coordinated SBC efforts.

This better integration of social norms and SBC does not necessarily mean they have to be folded into only one project. In considering how best to support this work, USAID staff should look at the pros and cons of having another project focused on social norms, for example, some kind of Passages follow-on. As one key informant at USAID asked, “Are there good arguments on pulling these together? Do we need Passages and Breakthrough? What are overlaps, what are differences, pros and cons of a large consortium vs some options for Missions to choose from? What we need is a common understanding of what we are talking about. For example, the SBC folks do not necessarily see the priority of the work that Passages do as SBC priorities.” The table below shows some thoughts synthesized from the evaluation team’s various data sources.

### Pros and cons of a project focused on social norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Allows for focus on social norms, which might get lost if included in a larger project</td>
<td>• Potential to be siloed from SBC world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps to ensure a focus on answering unanswered questions re: social norms</td>
<td>• Risk of seeing social norms as a magic bullet instead of being a part of a bigger system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides options for Missions</td>
<td>• Having to justify use of core for specific social norms project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows for focused TA to build capacity</td>
<td>• Missions like to limit the number of implementing mechanisms they manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Space for global technical leadership</td>
<td>• If framed as research project, can be a difficult sell to Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthens other SBC work if it’s well integrated at mission level work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some arguments from key informants for continuing to have something separate. Common themes include the idea that there is still more to learn, the need for better linkages with SBC, concern about reinventing the wheel, and the need to continue with global technical leadership.

“It makes sense to have something separate if possible and have clearer linkages between this and the SBC investments—we need more time and more examples and people are not as comfortable going along this
way as they should be because it’s just so new. It would be good if there were separate investments but with
direct linkages to mechanisms like Breakthrough.”

“There should be a concentrated package of technical expertise that a future USAID project could continue
to offer so missions, bilaterals or global awards could tap into dedicated pot of technical expertise in social
norms. If you integrate it into something bigger… you don’t want to lose it, also don’t want to reinvent the
wheel—we all tend to start again and frame it ourselves.”

“If USAID decided to integrate various research questions into various bilaterals it could lose coordination
and thought leadership that is still needed around this area… it’s enough to stand alone as a project.”

Others argue that it makes more sense to bring the two together, arguing that these pieces need to fit
together rather than being separate.

“I don’t want to see SBC and social norms as separate but want to see them as one feeding into the other
(and they do). Social norms is a key part of social and behavior change and there are other pieces to SBC in
addition to social norms because you’re also looking at what are the types of behavior you’re trying to
change, what are the common attributes, etc. And the pieces should fit together rather than be two separate
things in the ideal world and in the world we’re trying to have.”

“Social norms need to be more embedded within SBC team.”

“I would lean towards integrating social norms into SBC flagship to ensure there is a link between learning
on social norms and what they are implementing.”

Whether there are separate projects or one unified project, there is a need for clearer linkages, as
mentioned in some of the quotes above. “It’s ok to have two different ways of going about this. How do we
share learning and cross-fertilize within our own office between the different projects that are doing this? There is
important value add from these different projects.” In talking about the pressure to fold into one project,
some pointed out that in other areas there was greater acceptance of multiple mechanisms: “We’re ok
with SDI [PRH’s Service Delivery Improvement Division] having these different mechanisms. Why is it a problem
to have different SBC mechanisms?”

Share what we’ve learned with a focus on utilization: “We need to apply this”

“We need to apply this. It’s all about application,” explained one key informant. Given all the work done by
Passages and all the tools and learning from the LC, it is essential now to effectively share information
and try to document how it is used. This should include follow-up with Passages partners and LC
members to see what they are using and how they are using those materials and approaches.

What people really want is program guidance and how-to guides in clear language that synthesizes
information into something usable for programming. Related to this would be a good legacy piece of a
lexicon that clearly defines terms.

“So, I think the challenge is to be able to do this intricate, scientific research and get it to a point where it is
understandable for a less technical audience. I think that to me is a very big challenge to the project. A lot is
still difficult for a general development person to understand.”

“We are getting there to be away from the academic debates…we want to move beyond that idea that this
is very complicated and we need experts to do it…Idea that we should write everything from LC for 6th
graders—simplify, streamline. We still get pushback that LC work, social norms shouldn’t shy away from the complication of this work though.”

The important use by partners in Passages highlights the effectiveness of partnering with implementers. One key informant pointed out how this can inform the future: “Design so there is more up-front partnerships. Save has been tremendous—but we need more of the Saves who are doing the interventions and supported by other donors and then we can do more research.”

There were some specific recommendations for the LC regarding utilization that are relevant for Passages more broadly. An important step is ensuring French translations: “if the document is in English, it’s difficult, and the French versions are often pilots, and we’re still waiting for the final tools translated into French.” Further, interviewees recommended ways to promote utilization of LC materials. “This is a good follow-on activity: to try to socialize tools and advantage of using them and see the same way they tried to socialize conceptualization and measurement because what it comes down to is when people go about doing their own funded activity, they’re are busy and they may or may not know these tools out there and they may or may not apply them directly and they may want to have their own stamp on them.” One recommendation to foster utilization was that: “there needs to be a feedback mechanism about how are people doing program strategies differently, how are they using data to inform their program strategies. All of these things could be accessible in short case studies or briefs.”

Several people talked about increasing use of a norms-aware approach within USAID and by partners by making it mandatory: “It has to come from the top levels. Any country with behavior change work, they have to incorporate this.” Donors outside USAID raised the same idea that donors have a key role to play: “One of the things that happens is that donors don’t require grantees to use resources, data and/or evidence that’s been generated. The onus is on the donors to reinforce existing tools, resources, and research and make sure we’re almost requiring that it’s not about IRH or a particular project but in general, as a sector we need to move away from brands and think of long-term goals.”

Passages has identified four legacy areas, and at the 2019 partners meeting participants undertook a group prioritization process for each area, which helps identify priorities for dissemination and utilization. There was interesting disagreement about the #1 priority in legacy area 1—three of the four groups saw this fundamental question of “do social norms matter?” as a top priority, while the other group saw it as of the lowest importance, feeling like this is already an accepted fact. There was also debate about the relative importance of peer-reviewed publications and how-to-guidance documents. It was noted by some that “people wanted to stick to peer review articles because it’s their comfort zone, but we need to publish products that would make research more accessible to a wider audience.” Others pointed out the pushback on publications, which remain fundamentally important for scale-up and adaptation of evidence-based approaches: “You have to have the research as the starting point. It’s interesting to see the pushback on publications—especially when we rely so heavily on them. HIPs [High Impact Practices] for example are based [in part] on evidence from peer-reviewed literature.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy Area 1: Advancing overarching understanding of social norms</th>
<th>Legacy Area 2: Implementing norms shifting approaches</th>
<th>Legacy Area 3: Evaluating norms shifting approaches</th>
<th>Legacy Area 4: Scaling norms shifting approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Do social norms matter? (e.g., are they linked to behavior? Synthesis of evidence across studies)</td>
<td>Overarching “How-To” learnings from implementing across programs</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of social norms measures</td>
<td>Evidence of scalability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How social norms shift behavior (cross-cutting lessons re: pathways of change)</td>
<td>Comparative evidence on what works to shift norms among VYA (GUG, GHD)</td>
<td>Validity of SNET for accurately assessing social norms</td>
<td>Comparative learning across social norms-shifting interventions (processes, change mechanisms, outcomes, scalability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Common social norms language and relationship to SBC (lexicon)—how do we talk about social norms?</td>
<td>Comparative evidence on what works to shift norms among young men (REAL, TM, HS/FHC)</td>
<td>Good measures of social norms from Passages research/monitoring social norms interventions (iterative learning approaches)</td>
<td>Theory-based monitoring, learning, and evaluation for effective norms-shifting interventions (application of Realist Evaluation to NSI projects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly both types of resources—peer-reviewed publications and practical guides—are important. Among key informants, the team heard calls for both. It will be important to prioritize the production of useful materials and give it the needed time and resources. A key informant noted that “writing retreats should be built in going forward. We have all this info and ideas and data but we need to take the time to get it out there. It should be an explicit priority.” In addition, PRB is currently assisting Passages in developing a strategic communications plan, which can help guide materials development and sharing.

Discussion of social norms is still often very academic, and key informants saw the need for clearer, shorter and more compelling messages and stories that can speak to non-academics and non-researchers. “Your job is to say we know these big issues: scale and systems, return on investment, building capacity, and commitment for self-reliance. Take those concepts and tell a story that makes it explicit how this works—what happens when you actually design for it. Show what happens when you design it properly. Then your last piece—we are ready and can help on a dime, here is the mechanism, here is how we can help, and work with missions. No one has time for anything more complicated than that…and market to Missions.”

A couple of key informants noted the theme of family in work by Passages and suggested pitching this work as an investment in family. “People care about families—own the family space. Say we have a project that strengthens parenting…here is an investment on family strengthening.” Another key informant highlighted the idea of family and talked about the importance of intergenerational dialogue.

Some pointed out the need for funding and support to ensure use of lessons. “They need a continued funding stream to keep moving the innovation into practice. That’s the only way to get that done. You can’t just hand tools to people and expect that they will be used.” Some see the next iteration of the LC as potentially playing a role in providing the TA to continue learning and put it to use: “Want to use the LC 2.0 as a launching point for a network of technical experts who are experts in developing and providing a menu of options for the process of measuring social norms. Want to make it easily available to large/small orgs working on social norms.”
Continue learning, but there is some debate about how best to do this

Most key informants felt that there was still a lot to learn: “It still needs to grow—not just promoting what we’ve done. We’re ready to teach but still need to keep learning—the work is not done.” However, reflecting the tensions between the academic and programmatic worlds discussed earlier in the report, there is also disagreement about the need for more rigorous research versus less rigorous ways of collecting data through what some refer to as “robust monitoring.” As one key informant asked, “How can we use robust monitoring as a proxy for more rigorous evaluation?” The following quotes show these divergent views on the need for more rigorous research versus other means of gathering data, with some arguing for more research while others call for less resource-intensive approaches.

“Research is a gap. There is a tendency to say we know everything and let’s just go do the work. Yes, we know a lot but let us assess as things are being rolled out—there is a need for strong implementation science on the social norms pieces...how projects are working in real world setting often at a fairly large scale—needs to look at the nitty gritty work of how these projects are changing and what the effect has been with the people on the ground.”

“Measurement is the biggest gap—it’s so complex to measure norms, it’s not at all self-evident—qualitative and quantitative measures are very hard to use—it’s gotten better—but how do you actually measure the connections between various norms, behaviors, attitudes, etc. How do you actually see what is pertinent and important to measure?”

“I would suggest doing [randomized control trials] RCTs. Any RCT should have three arms for example—control, intervention and intervention plus social norms. The need for robust and rigor in measurement.”

“I think we need to dig a little deeper in that area to really understand the mechanisms of change and how they are creating the social change we’re looking for—monitoring and also evaluation, maybe a dose-response type of analysis—can’t do an RCT but are there ways to get that kind of information.”

“We have not cracked the nut on what social norms interventions works best—maybe find lighter more nimble ways to get that data. Maybe not always rigorous studies—would be nice to keep replicating, adapting, iterating, and reaching more people. We absolutely need more research, but hoping more can be done on the fly.”

“We are talking about implementation and assessment, not research. That is my instinct—we need to apply, don’t need another 10 years of research, need to apply and learn from that. It’s all in the application—there needs to be broad learning with measurement as part of it but not leading it. Practical learning, not expensive evaluation necessarily. Responsive feedback, feedback loops, learn continually.”

Several people noted the need for putting research needs into the framework of a shared learning agenda. “The learning agenda is the biggest missing link so far from my perspective,” noted a key informant from USAID. In discussing this need, this respondent called for a discussion with everyone at the table, including people from other sectors, such as agriculture, who are also working on social norm change. “We’re investing in these different areas—what is social norms, what does it mean for USAID, and what can our learning agenda look like—it would be good to think that through for the next iteration of their work on social norms.”

A number of respondents noted the need to allow adequate timing to measure social change, suggesting doing away with five-year increments. “Very few projects have had enough time/reasonable amount of time to measure norm change to understand what we can tell from these measurement tools and evaluation projects.”
Others suggested there was untapped potential in learning about social norm change and scale up by going back to earlier work, such as GREAT in Uganda and TJ in Benin and see what happened. “Centrally, that is our job, the job of core funding, the job of research—to inform the world what is happening.”

**Build capacity at the country and regional levels and increase field engagement at the global level**

Many key informants called for increased efforts at building capacity at country and regional levels. In the words of one respondent, “To institutionalize the work at the country level, they have to keep building capacity of the local organizations they are working with. The journey to self-reliance is important. Local capacity to take it forward is something the agency is focused on.” This is particularly relevant for these types of interventions that have faced some initial concerns regarding the perception of outsiders pushing to change culture. As the social norms community grapples with ethics issues, it makes more sense to have this work more fully owned and run by local partners. Related to the debate around research mentioned above, some key informants emphasized the importance of capacity building more than research: “There is need for capacity strengthening and knowledge management more than more research. We know a lot and have some good tools. Make information available to the broadest range of partners and have them implement. Strengthen the local organizations, the smaller groups.”

At the same time, there is a need for the global view, which pulls together learning from around the world and shares it back with country and regional groups. “We need to figure out how to maintain momentum at global level—otherwise it’s gone so then what do you take down to regional level. Keep that ball moving forward, I keep hearing of new organizations interested in it.”

One suggestion to help with building capacity, promoting greater participation and dispersing ideas globally is to “include a subgranting mechanism [similar to Passages with TA accompaniment] that would help different groups and regions on different learning questions as opposed to everything coming out of Washington/the same people. Subgranting mechanism could get the locus of coordination and agenda-setting and decision-making on what the most practical thing people need in other locations and closer to people who are working on the issues.”

Another recommendation was for the LC to coordinate applied opportunities by putting together researchers, intervention specialists, and local collaborators, hence making “work in this area much more accessible to people.” One critical piece of putting this into practice requires focusing on ways to engage with the local community. “Do more training of local researchers at country level—if we had researchers closer to the project, we could better share, adopt, and use results immediately to adapt project and improve it—for now it’s IRH who leads the research, but would be better to have the research rooted locally.”

There is also a need for greater field engagement at the global level. For example, while there were many positive mentions around participation in the LC, there was a gap in engagement of partners from the field. In the words of the interviewees:

“Tostan was not a part of the LC and it could and should have been. We missed many smaller organizations.”

“The question is how does the LC bring researchers from low- and middle- income countries to work with them.”

“We also under-engaged in powerful community members and we have activists and young leaders and women’s groups that are completely under tapped and under-utilized in this work.”
This greater field engagement combined with global perspective is particularly relevant for the LC. Interviewees broadly agreed that the LC needed to retain its global presence while fostering regional and local engagement. “The LC has to be broader. A focus on specific countries is not the way to go. Lessons learned from one country are not going to be applicable. There needs to be global engagement. It’s good to have regional and country level involvement but without the global perspective one stands to lose a lot of the good thinking.”

Co-design within USAID and between USAID and other donors

Key informants emphasized the need for co-design in social norms work, for example, with other donors. In the words of one donor: “There are times when we are building out similar approaches and if we engage early on, we could think about potentially more of a complementary design approach.” Without the early co-design, there is a risk of less strategic and coordinated approaches: “If we come in at a stage when the problem we’re trying to solve and the concept has already been developed and you’re at the partnership level, it’s already too late for that type of strategic thinking and planning.” It is encouraging to see this co-design currently happening with USAID, BMGF, and the Hewlett Foundation for the follow-on to the LC.

In addition to co-designing projects, there was a call from several key informants for co-managing, particularly across divisions within PRH. Several respondents talked about the need for closer linkages between research and services, for example suggesting that services staff could become technical advisors on future social norms projects and be involved on a regular basis. The overarching question is how do you get more norms-aware programming? In the words of a key informant, “The challenge is also how to get it out to the Missions in a way that is useful and relevant to them? How do you do that so it’s in the RFAs and RFPs? Those are issues for USAID. It just stays within research as far as I can tell.”

**MAIN POINTS FOR EVALUATION QUESTION 5**

- Create better integration with SBC and consider pros and cons of a specific social norms project.
- Share what we’ve learned with a focus on utilization: “We need to apply this.”
- Continue learning, but there is some debate about how best to do this.
- Build capacity at the country and regional levels and increase field engagement at global level, both within USAID in terms of Mission collaboration and in the LC with more country-level active involvement.
- Consider how to plan future related efforts collaboratively within USAID—cross-divisions in PRH and cross-sectors in bureau/agency—and between USAID and other donors.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation Question 1: Generating new research

- Aspects of research considered new and innovative included the explicit focus on 1) influencing social norms and 2) developing scalable interventions.
- “The resonance of the approach” led to enthusiasm and a personal impact for participants, whether they were implementers or beneficiaries.
- Analysis is ongoing and it will be important to clearly and concretely measure and describe any social norm change, as this evidence is still needed.
- Facilitating factors included increased interest in addressing social norms, a truly collaborative approach, buy-in from local partners, and building on existing interventions rather than starting from scratch.
- Challenges included funding, perceptions that outsiders wanted to change local culture, methodological issues, staff turnover, language, and political issues.
- The challenges encountered in this research, such as community concerns and contamination between intervention and control sites, provide important lessons for conducting future research around social norms.
- The Learning Lab was a creative approach to turning a negative delay into a positive process and has since been used in other settings.
- Engagement of VYAs in research and the data gathered to learn more about VYAs are important contributions of Passages, and GUG!’s greater impact on younger adolescents indicates the importance of interventions with VYAs.

Evaluation Question 2: Capacity building/technical assistance

- When people take part in realist evaluations, they like what they learn and see them as helpful in explaining the black box of how change happens and the process is useful in challenging assumptions.
- People generally like the concept of realist evaluations but the terminology remains confusing to many.
- Realist evaluations of Husbands Schools and the Grandmothers’ Project provide useful information on how these approaches work and these findings are important to share with groups that are already—or are planning on—replicating the approaches.
- There has been significant spread of knowledge on social norms throughout partner organizations, which can lead to much wider use of tools and lessons, showing the importance of partnering with implementing agencies, e.g., Save the Children alone has 120 country offices.
- One aspect of capacity building was the personal transformation among staff working on the various projects as the preparation for social norms work led to self-reflection, which could bring about broader change.
• The costing primer is seen as a valuable resource, but it requires TA to implement and there is a need to plan from the beginning to undertake cost analysis for more efficient data collection and provide adequate capacity building and support.

Evaluation Question 3: Global technical leadership

• Passages has developed a prominent global presence in the realm of social norms through collaborative connections, such as through the LC and sharing resources and tools through workshops, webinars, social media, publications and other documentation, and presenting at conferences.
• The overall consensus was that the LC had been very successful while at the same time there was much more work to be done.
• Factors to LC success: creating a collaborative space for learning, focused learning with three groups, having concrete documents to work on, face-to-face meetings, and funding from multiple donors.
• Challenges for LC: dominated by a small set of experts, promoting and tracking use of tools, tensions between academic and programmatic worlds, and the lack of full engagement of the SBC community.
• Regional CoPs set up in Francophone Africa and South Asia, but only the former has been active.
• Challenges for CoPs include the limited availability of resources in French and lack of a mechanism to provide more streamlined technical guidance.

Evaluation Question 4: Value added of Passages project

• Debate about the novelty of interventions that address social norms led to tension and confusion among SBC and social norms practitioners as well as those outside the debate.
• Discourse and work to define “social norms interventions” has improved understanding about the relationship between social norms and the broader field of social and behavior change. Project stakeholders have started to frame these interventions as being on a continuum that defines the extent to which social norms are addressed, across a range from “norms-aware” to “norms-shifting” to “norms-transforming.”
• Passages helped to concretize social norms and is contributing to helping SBC and gender practitioners become more fluent in diagnosing and measuring norms.
• Although Passages is valued for providing a platform for moving academic and research discourse on social norms into programming and practice, there is still a need to simplify tools and resources and incorporate these and other learnings into scale-up.
• Social norms-shifting interventions implemented at the community level hold unique value with local implementers as it provides an opportunity to address local challenges in a community-oriented, inclusive, participatory, and holistic way.
• The project’s investment in French translation of tools and resources and simultaneous translation at all partner meetings has contributed to a deeper engagement by French-speaking staff managing interventions in Francophone settings.
• Passages is contributing to building evidence for gender transformative work with faith-based groups, men, VYAs and first-time parents and their reference groups.
• Passages’ work sits at the intersection of multiple technical areas (GBV, gender, FP) and learnings from this can be applied to cross sectoral work on social norms.

• Passages has leveraged $18.07 million in funds to implement or adapt different approaches for four different donors. This is in large part due to the professional networks, technical leadership, dedication, and advocacy of the USAID and Passages project management teams.

Evaluation Question 5: Implication for future USAID investments

• Create better integration with SBC and consider pros and cons of a specific social norms project.

• Share what we’ve learned with a focus on utilization: “We need to apply this.”

• Continue learning, but there is some debate about how best to do this.

• Build capacity at the country and regional levels and increase field engagement at global level, both within USAID in terms of Mission collaboration and in the LC with more country-level active involvement.

• Consider how to plan future related efforts collaboratively within USAID—cross-divisions in PRH and cross-sectors in bureau/agency—and between USAID and other donors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations for the Passages project in the remaining time on the project.

1. Develop synthesis materials in both English and French on lessons from the project, with a focus on: a) practical how-to guidance on implementing social norms interventions, b) synthesis of lessons around VYAs, and c) a brief synthesis that makes the case for why addressing social norms matters and how interventions focused on social norms make a concrete difference.

2. Produce a lexicon of social norms terminology in clear language with specific, practical examples for each term.

3. Publish results from each study in peer-reviewed publications to help add to the global evidence base.

4. Finalize a strategic communications plan with messages and materials tailored to relevant audiences.

5. Focus on dissemination and sharing lessons through existing networks (e.g. KSUCCESS, Align, IGWG, FP2020, Springboard, What Works, etc.), through presentations at conferences and through webinars.

6. Produce short messages—like the former contraceptive pearls—with key pieces of information for electronic/social media dissemination.

7. Develop a plan with USAID to disseminate the results strategically within USAID at headquarters level and with Mission staff, focusing on the synthesis documents and the cross-sectoral case studies.

8. Increase country and regional-level participation in the next phase of the LC.
9. Continue to build capacity for programs to be intentional about interventions and measurement around norms, particularly through the network of Passages’ project partners.

10. Document lessons from the challenges faced in implementing interventions focused on social norms and research and share through webinars and other approaches.

11. Use costing case studies in conjunction with the costing primer to develop a brief that shows the importance, usefulness, and feasibility of incorporating costing into interventions focused on social norms.

12. Validate the SNET in social norms focused interventions as well as SBC interventions that are not necessarily social norms-focused.

13. Develop a social norms monitoring tool for SBC program implementers.
ANNEX I. SCOPE OF WORK

Assignment #: 670 [assigned by GH Pro]

Global Health Program Cycle Improvement Project (GH Pro)
Contract No. AID-OAA-C-14-00067

EVALUATION OR ANALYTIC ACTIVITY STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW)
Date of Submission: 10-09-18
Last update: 9-19-19

Amendment 1

I. TITLE: Performance Evaluation of the Passages Project and Donor Assessment of Adolescent and Youth Reproductive Health (AYRH) and Social Norms Programming

II. Requester / Client

☐ USAID/Washington
Office/Division: PRH / RTU

III. Funding Account Source(s): (Click on box(es) to indicate source of payment for this assignment)

☐ 3.1.1 HIV  ☐ 3.1.4 PIOET  ☐ 3.1.7 FP/RH
☐ 3.1.2 TB  ☐ 3.1.5 Other public health threats  ☐ 3.1.8 WSSH
☐ 3.1.3 Malaria  ☐ 3.1.6 MCH  ☐ 3.1.9 Nutrition
☐ 3.2.0 Other (specify):

IV. Cost Estimate: Note: GH Pro will provide a cost estimate based on this SOW

V. Performance Period
Expected Start Date (on or about): June 3, 2019
Anticipated End Date (on or about): December 9, 2019

VI. Location(s) of Assignment: (Indicate where work will be performed)

Washington, DC
Remote (home base)
VII. Type of Analytic Activity (Check the box to indicate the type of analytic activity)

EVALUATION:

■ Performance Evaluation (Check timing of data collection)
  - Midterm
  - Endline
  - Other (specify): Evaluation at Year 4 of 5

Performance evaluations focus on descriptive and normative questions: what a particular project or program has achieved (either at an intermediate point in execution or at the conclusion of an implementation period); how it is being implemented; how it is perceived and valued; whether expected results are occurring; and other questions that are pertinent to program design, management and operational decision making. Performance evaluations often incorporate before-after comparisons, but generally lack a rigorously defined counterfactual.

□ Impact Evaluation (Check timing(s) of data collection)
  - Baseline
  - Midterm
  - Endline
  - Other (specify):

Impact evaluations measure the change in a development outcome that is attributable to a defined intervention; impact evaluations are based on models of cause and effect and require a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change. Impact evaluations in which comparisons are made between beneficiaries that are randomly assigned to either a treatment or a control group provide the strongest evidence of a relationship between the intervention under study and the outcome measured.

OTHER ANALYTIC ACTIVITIES

■ Assessment (sector context to inform future project design)
  Assessments are designed to examine country and/or sector context to inform project design, or as an informal review of projects.

□ Costing and/or Economic Analysis
  Costing and Economic Analysis can identify, measure, value and cost an intervention or program. It can be an assessment or evaluation, with or without a comparative intervention/program.

□ Other Analytic Activity (Specify)

PEPFAR EVALUATIONS (PEPFAR Evaluation Standards of Practice 2014)

Note: If PEPFAR funded, check the box for type of evaluation

■ Process Evaluation (Check timing of data collection)
  - Midterm
  - Endline
  - Other (specify): __________________________

Process Evaluation focuses on program or intervention implementation, including, but not limited to access to services, whether services reach the intended population, how services are delivered, client satisfaction and perceptions about needs and services, management practices. In addition, a process evaluation might provide an understanding of cultural, socio-political, legal, and economic context that affect implementation of the program or intervention. For example: Are activities delivered as intended, and are the right participants being reached? (PEPFAR Evaluation Standards of Practice 2014)

□ Outcome Evaluation
  Outcome Evaluation determines if and by how much, intervention activities or services achieved their intended outcomes. It focuses on outputs and outcomes (including unintended effects) to judge program effectiveness, but may also assess program process to understand how outcomes are produced. It is possible to use statistical techniques in some instances when control or comparison
groups are not available (e.g., for the evaluation of a national program). Example of question asked: To what extent are desired changes occurring due to the program, and who is benefiting? (PEPFAR Evaluation Standards of Practice 2014)

**Impact Evaluation** (Check timing(s) of data collection)
- Baseline
- Midterm
- Endline
- Other (specify):

Impact evaluations measure the change in an outcome that is attributable to a defined intervention by comparing actual impact to what would have happened in the absence of the intervention (the counterfactual scenario). IEs are based on models of cause and effect and require a rigorously defined counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change. There are a range of accepted approaches to applying a counterfactual analysis, though IEs in which comparisons are made between beneficiaries that are randomly assigned to either an intervention or a control group provide the strongest evidence of a relationship between the intervention under study and the outcome measured to demonstrate impact.

**Economic Evaluation** (PEPFAR)

Economic Evaluations identifies, measures, values and compares the costs and outcomes of alternative interventions. Economic evaluation is a systematic and transparent framework for assessing efficiency focusing on the economic costs and outcomes of alternative programs or interventions. This framework is based on a comparative analysis of both the costs (resources consumed) and outcomes (health, clinical, economic) of programs or interventions. Main types of economic evaluation are cost-minimization analysis (CMA), cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and cost-utility analysis (CUA). Example of question asked: What is the cost-effectiveness of this intervention in improving patient outcomes as compared to other treatment models?

### VIII. BACKGROUND

If an evaluation, Project/Program being evaluated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Activity Title:</th>
<th>Passages: Transforming Social Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award/Contract Number:</td>
<td>AID-OAA-A-15-00042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award/Contract Dates:</td>
<td>July 1, 2015 – September 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Activity Funding:</td>
<td>$30,082,695 (ceiling which includes core and field support funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Organization(s):</td>
<td>Institute for Reproductive Health, Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Activity AOR/COR:</td>
<td>Linda Sussman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background of project/program/intervention:

Passages project aims to address a broad range of social norms, at scale, to achieve sustained improvements in family planning and reproductive health. This research project is designed to build the evidence base and contribute to the capacity of the global community to strengthen normative environments that support reproductive health, especially among very young adolescents, newly married youth, and first-time parents. Passages capitalizes on these formative life course transitions to test and scale up interventions that promote collective change and foster an enabling environment for healthy timing and spacing of pregnancies and voluntary, informed family planning use. Two research activities are being implemented in Kinshasa, DRC – one with young adolescents in-school and out-of-school; and one with young couples in faith communities.

Passages also provides technical assistance, input and capacity building to organizations that seek to increase the effectiveness and scale of community-level interventions that include activities focused on normative transformation. This support is being provided to an organization supporting grandmothers clubs in Senegal and an organization implementing husbands’ schools in Niger. Passages also provides technical assistance in order to adapt and integrate a social network approach in existing NGO work in Mali; to adapt and integrate the REAL Fathers mentoring approach in a microfinance institute in eastern DRC; and to evaluate Commitments, a teacher-focused intervention to improve AYRH in Uganda.

Passages provides global technical leadership, including through the establishment of the Global Learning Collaborative to Advance Research and Practice for adolescent reproductive health and well-being. The
LC is supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and consists of technical communities that focus on social norm theory, measurement, and scale. Passages also advances the practice of normative interventions through a regional Francophone Community of Practice; through development and testing of a Social Norms Exploration Guide and Toolkit; and through advancing cross-sectoral social norms work.

Further information will be provided to the evaluation team and is also available on the Passages Project website: http://irh.org/projects/passages/.
Strategic or Results Framework for the project/program/intervention (paste framework below)

If project/program does not have a Strategic/Results Framework, describe the theory of change of the project/program/intervention.
What is the geographic coverage and/or the target groups for the project or program that is the subject of analysis?

Passages was designed to be a global research project, but the project is working in a limited number of countries. PRH-funded implementation research in DRC includes two research activities (one of which is co-funded with BMGF). The activities in Senegal and Niger receive both core PRH funds and GenDev funding provided to Passages to strengthen these activities. Passages has also received field support from USAID/Burundi to inform the mission and the government of Burundi on the effect of norms on family planning, especially among adolescents, though the work in Burundi has not yet begun. The evaluation team will collect information regarding activities conducted in DRC, Senegal, Niger, and other countries in which Passages is working through telephone and email interviews with key informants, in addition to document review. (note categories of key informants and purpose of inquiry on page 8).

**IX. SCOPE OF WORK**

A. **Purpose:** Why is this evaluation or analysis being conducted (purpose of analytic activity)? Provide the specific reason for this activity, linking it to future decisions to be made by USAID leadership, partner governments, and/or other key stakeholders.

The evaluation/assessment has two objectives: 1) Determine the achievements of the Passages project (evaluation), and 2) Inform PRH’s future investments in the technical areas supported through Passages (assessment).

B. **Audience:** Who is the intended audience for this analysis? Who will use the results? If listing multiple audiences, indicate which are most important.

The primary audience of the Passages evaluation (objective #1) is the Office of Population and Reproductive Health and Passages’ prime partner, the Institute for Reproductive Health at Georgetown University. Secondary audience includes USAID’s Office of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GenDev), USAID missions in DRC, Senegal, and Niger and other missions interested in norm-shifting interventions; sub-partners on Passages, including FHI 360, Johns Hopkins GEAS, PSI, Save the Children, and Tearfund; and other projects working on SBC and norm-shifting interventions, adolescents, and scale-up. The parts of the evaluation and assessment that are procurement sensitive will be delivered in an internal memo to USAID.

C. **Applications and use:** How will the findings be used? What future decisions will be made based on these findings?

Findings of the evaluation will be used to improve ongoing Passages activities. The input from the evaluation team for the remaining year of the project will primarily focus on strengthening documentation, dissemination, and other activities related to enhancing the legacy of the Project and its contribution to the global knowledge base. In addition, findings of both the evaluation and assessment will be used to inform future procurements in relevant technical areas, including recommendations to address ongoing gaps in research and capacity related to social norm interventions, especially those related to FP, youth, and gender.

D. **Evaluation/Analytic Questions & Matrix:**

a) Questions should be: a) aligned with the evaluation/analytic purpose and the expected use of findings; b) clearly defined to produce needed evidence and results; and c) answerable given the time and budget constraints. Include any disaggregation (e.g., sex, geographic locale, age, etc.),
they must be incorporated into the evaluation/analytic questions. **USAID policy suggests 3 to 5 evaluation/analytic questions.**

b) List the recommended methods that will be used to collect data to be used to answer each question.

c) State the application or use of the data elements towards answering the evaluation questions; for example, i) ratings of quality of services, ii) magnitude of a problem, iii) number of events/occurrences, iv) gender differentiation, v) etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested methods for answering this question</th>
<th>Sampling Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. In terms of **generating new research results**, what are the contributions that the Passages project has made, and is on track to make, by the end of the project? **Areas to include:**  
- Contributions to creating new evidence on strengthening norm-shifting interventions that support FP/RH  
- Factors – internal and external - that facilitated the project’s ability to make these contributions  
- Factors – internal and external - that presented challenges/barriers  |  
- Background literature on key themes  
- Passages activity reports and monitoring data, other documents, blogs, journal articles, and publications from prime and sub partners  
- Key informant interviews  |  
- Academic articles, grey literature, as identified in database searches and from technical experts  
- Documentation from Passages prime and sub partners  
- Interviews with persons who worked on Passages and/or youth programming/social norms among implementing partner organizations, GH/PRH, USAID missions, country Ministries, other donors (see key informant section) |
| 2. To what extent, and how, has Passages helped **build the capacity of organizations** with which they have worked in DRC, Niger, Senegal, and elsewhere to increase the effectiveness and scale of community level interventions that include a norm-shifting component? **Also include:**  
- Factors that have facilitated and impeded building the capacity of these organizations  
- Factors that facilitated and impeded identifying and working with and/or providing TA to other organizations, including USAID missions and bilateral projects.  |  
- Background literature on key themes  
- Passages activity reports and monitoring data, other documents, blogs, journal articles, and publications from prime and sub partners  
- Key informant interviews  |  
- Academic articles, grey literature, as identified in database searches and from technical experts  
- Documentation from Passages prime and sub partners  
- Interviews with persons who worked on Passages and/or youth programming/social norms among implementing partner organizations, GH/PRH, USAID missions, country Ministries, other donors (see key informant section) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested methods for answering this question</th>
<th>Sampling Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 How has the Passages project demonstrated **global technical leadership** \* with regard to the knowledge base related to community level norm-shifting interventions, at scale? *Also include:*  
  • Approaches that were successful  
  • Approaches that were less successful  
  • Factors that affected whether or not they were successful and Lessons Learned  
  • Implications of this leadership for future FP activities – both FP-specific and FP efforts that link with other-sector activities | - Background literature on key themes  
  - Passages activity reports and monitoring data, other documents, assessments, blogs, journal articles, and publications from prime and sub partners  
  - Key informant interviews | - Academic articles, grey literature, as identified in database searches and from technical experts  
  - Documentation from Passages prime and sub partners  
  - Interviews with persons who worked on Passages and/or youth programming/social norms among implementing partner organizations, GH/PRH, USAID’s GenDev office, USAID colleagues working on youth and gender, other donors, research and technical experts, Learning Collaborative participants (see key informant section) |
| 4 What has been the working relationship and the value added of the Passages project (regarding social norm development and transformation, at scale), relative to:  
  • Other USAID projects  
  • Efforts supported by other donors? | - Background literature on key themes  
  - Publications and reporting from PRH supported programming on relevant themes, both public and internal  
  - Other donor publications and reports that address social norms  
  - Key informant interviews with stakeholders, including GH, GenDev, and other USAID colleagues, members of the Learning Collaborative and advisory groups, other donors, USAID and nonUSAID project representatives, etc. (suggested list will be shared with the evaluation team) | - Documentation from Passages prime and sub partners, from relevant USAID projects and activities supported by other donors, and from the Learning Collaborative  
  - Interviews with persons who worked on Passages and/or youth programming/social norms among implementing partner organizations supported by USAID and those supported by other donors, representatives of other donors, GenDev office representatives (see key informant section) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested methods for answering this question</th>
<th>Sampling Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the implications for future USAID investments in research and research utilization related to social norm transformation at scale?</td>
<td>- The same Documents and interviews conducted to answer Questions 1-4 will be used to answer this question.</td>
<td>- The same document reviews and interviews conducted to answer Questions 1-4 will be used to answer this question. Especially important interviews will include those with USAID colleagues in PRH, including the front office, representatives of the GenDev office, and other USAID colleagues working with youth, gender, and/or social norms (the evaluation team may choose to limit portions of certain interviews to USAID team members only, depending on whether the information gathered during that portion of the interview might raise concerns among the respondent and/or the evaluation team as potentially procurement sensitive).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Questions [OPTIONAL]

(Note: Use this space only if necessary. Too many questions lead to an ineffective evaluation or analysis.)

*Our working definition of Global Technical Leadership: To Advance global knowledge and increase utilization of evidence [at a global level and/or across multiple contexts] by, for example, generating evidence to expand the knowledge base and facilitating delivery and use of information to strengthen funding, design, planning and implementation of policies, programs, and research efforts. Entities that are reached and affected by global technical leadership might include, for example: policymakers; donors; program design and program implementors; research organizations; and communities-of-practice.

E. Methods: Check and describe the recommended methods for this analytic activity. Selection of methods should be aligned with the evaluation/analytic questions and fit within the time and resources allotted for this analytic activity. Also, include the sample or sampling frame in the description of each method selected.

General Comments related to Methods:
### Document and Data Review (list of documents and data recommended for review)

This desk review will be used to provide background information on the project/program, and will also provide data for analysis for this evaluation. Documents and data to be reviewed include:

- RFA
- Cooperative Agreement
- Financial tracking documents and financial reports
- Project work plans
- Project Annual and Semi-annual Performance reports
- Passages Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Plan
- Project Technical Advisory Group (TAG) reports
- Management Review report
- Project-developed deliverables, including communication products, tools, presentations, reports and publications
- Publications and reporting from additional PRH projects that address youth programming, social and gender norms, SBC
- Publications and reporting from other donor projects that address youth programming, social and gender norms, SBC

(The USAID Passages Management team will provide an initial set of documents/literature, to be supplemented by evaluation team members input)

### Key Informant Interviews (list categories of key informants, and purpose of inquiry)

- Project management team at prime partner, IRH: assess barriers, enablers, and lessons learned, contributions, and remaining gaps in building evidence and capacity on supportive social norms while implementing Passages activities
- Primary project management team members at sub partners, FHI 360, Johns Hopkins GEAS, PSI, Save the Children, and Tearfund: assess barriers, enablers, and lessons learned, contributions, and remaining gaps in building evidence and capacity on supportive social norms while implementing Passages activities
- Mission colleagues (including at least the family panning advisor) and implementing partners in the DRC: determine familiarity with Passages activities, in addition to gaps, barriers, enablers and feasibility of scale-up of related youth programming and social norms activities
- Youth, gender, and social norm experts and practitioners in academia, donor agencies, UN agencies, implementing partners and other NGOs, members of the advisory groups/committees: determine contributions, gaps, barriers, enablers and feasibility of scale-up of related youth and social norms activities and to obtain feedback on Passages’ collaboration efforts and their added value in this technical area.
- USAID personnel, including staff from GH and PRH, GenDev representatives, and USAID’s youth and gender advisors: describe other youth/social norms/SBC projects, determine familiarity with Passages activities and provide input on contributions, gaps, barriers, enablers and feasibility of replication and scale-up of related youth and social norms activities within USAID/GH and PRH and in other parts of the Agency.

If **impact evaluation** –

Is technical assistance needed to develop full protocol and/or IRB submission?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
List or describe case and counterfactual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Counterfactual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**X. HUMAN SUBJECT PROTECTION**

The Analytic Team must develop protocols to insure privacy and confidentiality prior to any data collection. Primary data collection must include a consent process that contains the purpose of the evaluation, the risk and benefits to the respondents and community, the right to refuse to answer any question, and the right to refuse participation in the evaluation at any time without consequences. Only adults can consent as part of this evaluation. **Minors cannot be respondents** to any interview or survey, and cannot participate in a focus group discussion without going through an IRB. The only time minors can be observed as part of this evaluation is as part of a large community-wide public event, when they are part of family and community in the public setting. During the process of this evaluation, if data are abstracted from existing documents that include unique identifiers, data can only be abstracted without this identifying information.

An Informed Consent statement included in all data collection interactions must contain:
- Introduction of facilitator/note-taker
- Purpose of the evaluation/assessment
- Purpose of interview/discussion/survey
- Statement that all information provided is confidential and information provided will not be connected to the individual
- Right to refuse to answer questions or participate in interview/discussion/survey
- Request consent prior to initiating data collection (i.e., interview/discussion/survey)

**XI. ANALYTIC PLAN**

Describe how the quantitative and qualitative data will be analyzed. Include method or type of analyses, statistical tests, and what data it to be triangulated (if appropriate). For example, a thematic analysis of qualitative interview data, or a descriptive analysis of quantitative survey data.

All analyses will be geared to answer the evaluation and assessment questions. Additionally, the evaluation and assessment will review both qualitative and quantitative data related to the project/program’s achievements against its objectives.

If relevant, quantitative data will be analyzed primarily using descriptive statistics. Data will be stratified by demographic characteristics, such as sex, age, and location, whenever feasible. Other statistical tests of association (i.e., odds ratio) and correlations will be run as appropriate.

Thematic review of qualitative data will be performed, connecting the data to the evaluation questions, seeking relationships, context, interpretation, nuances and homogeneity and outliers to better explain what is happening and the perception of those involved. If relevant, qualitative data will be used to substantiate quantitative findings, provide more insights than quantitative data can provide, and answer questions where other data do not exist.

The Evaluation Report will describe analytic methods employed in this evaluation.
XII. ACTIVITIES
List the expected activities, such as Team Planning Meeting (TPM), briefings, verification workshop with IPs and stakeholders, etc. Activities and Deliverables may overlap. Give as much detail as possible.

**Background reading** – Documents are available for review for this evaluation/analytic activity. These include Passages Project-specific documents such as the proposal, annual work plans, M&E plans, quarterly progress reports, and routine reports of project performance indicator data, communication materials, reports, publications, and other deliverable documentation. Documents are also available that provide relevant background information on topics related to the work conducted by Passages. In addition, information will be available on other PRH and other donor projects focusing on key themes. This desk review will provide background information for the Evaluation Team, and will also be used as data input and evidence for the evaluation and for the assessment.

**Team Planning Meeting (TPM)** – Team planning will be held at the initiation of this assignment and before the data collection begins. Ideally, this will consist of 4-days and in-person meetings, but this will not be a requirement. During the initial planning period, team members will:
- Review and clarify any questions on the evaluation SOW
- Clarify team members’ roles and responsibilities
- Establish a team atmosphere, share individual working styles, and agree on procedures for resolving differences of opinion
- Review and finalize evaluation questions
- Review and finalize the assignment timeline
- Develop data collection methods, instruments, tools and guidelines
- Review and clarify any logistical and administrative procedures for the assignment
- Develop a data collection plan
- Draft the evaluation work plan for USAID’s approval
- Develop a preliminary draft outline of the team’s report
- Assign drafting/writing responsibilities for the final report

**Briefing and Debriefing Meetings** – Throughout the evaluation/assessment, the Team Lead will provide briefings to USAID. The In-Brief and Debrief are likely to include all Evaluation Team experts. These briefings are:
- Evaluation launch, a call/meeting among the USAID, GH Pro and the Team Lead to initiate the evaluation activity and review expectations. USAID will review the purpose, expectations, and agenda of the assignment. GH Pro will introduce the Team Lead, and review the initial schedule and review other management issues.
- In-brief with USAID, as part of the Team Planning. At the beginning of the Team Planning period, the Evaluation Team will meet with USAID to discuss expectations, review evaluation questions, and intended plans. The Team will also raise questions that they may have about the project/program and SOW resulting from their background document review. The time and place for this in-brief will be determined between the Team Lead and USAID prior to the Team Planning.
- Work plan and methodology review briefing. At the end of the Team Planning period, the Evaluation Team will meet with USAID to present an outline of the methods/protocols, timeline and data collection tools. Also, the format and content of the Evaluation/Assessment report(s) will be discussed.
- In-brief with project to review the evaluation plans and timeline, and for the project to give an overview of the project to the Evaluation Team.
- The Team Lead (TL) will brief USAID weekly to discuss progress on the evaluation. As
preliminary findings arise, the TL will share these during the routine briefing, and in an email.

- **A preliminary debrief** with USAID Passages Management Team and other USAID colleagues, as determined by the management team, will be held at the end of the evaluation to present preliminary findings to USAID. During this meeting a summary of the data will be presented, along with high level findings and draft recommendations. For the preliminary debrief, the Evaluation Team will prepare a **PowerPoint Presentation** of the key findings, issues, and recommendations. The evaluation team shall incorporate comments received from USAID during the preliminary debrief into the final debrief and evaluation report, as appropriate. *(Note: preliminary findings are not final and as more data sources are developed and analyzed these findings may change.)*

- Following submission of the first draft of the report, the Team will hold a **final debrief the USAID Passages Management team**, with a PowerPoint presentation, prior to the Final Debrief with USAID/PRH.

- A **final debrief** with USAID/PRH will be held at the end of the evaluation following the debrief with the USAID Passages Management Team. During this meeting a summary of the evaluation/assessment results will be presented, along with high level findings and draft recommendations. For the USAID/PRH final debrief, the Evaluation Team will prepare a **PowerPoint Presentation** of the key findings, issues, and recommendations. The evaluation team shall incorporate comments received from USAID during the debrief in the evaluation report.

- **IP and Stakeholders’ debrief/workshop** will be held with the project staff and other stakeholders identified by USAID. This will occur following the final debrief with USAID Passages Management team, and will not include any information that may be deemed procurement sensitive or not suitable by USAID.

**Fieldwork, Site Visits and Data Collection** – The evaluation team will conduct data collection in the US, with calls and emails to the field as needed. Selection of key informants will be finalized during initial planning period in consultation with USAID. The evaluation team will outline and schedule key meetings during the Team Planning period.

**Evaluation Report** – The Evaluation/Analytic Team under the leadership of the Team Lead will develop a report with findings and recommendations (see Analytic Report below). Report writing and submission will include the following steps:

1. Team Lead will submit draft evaluation report to GH Pro for review and formatting
2. GH Pro will submit the draft report to USAID
3. USAID will review the draft report in a timely manner, and send their comments and edits back to GH Pro
4. GH Pro will share USAID’s comments and edits with the Team Lead, who will then do final edits, as needed, and resubmit to GH Pro
5. GH Pro will review and reformat the final Evaluation/Analytic Report, as needed, and resubmit to USAID for approval.
6. Once Evaluation Report is approved, GH Pro will re-format it for 508-compliance and post it to the DEC.

The Evaluation Report **excludes** any procurement-sensitive and other sensitive but unclassified (SBU) information. This information will be submitted in a memo to USAID separate from the Evaluation Report.

**Data Submission** – All quantitative data will be submitted to GH Pro in a machine-readable format (CSV or XML). The datasets created as part of this evaluation must be accompanied by a data dictionary that includes a codebook and any other information needed for others to use these data. It is
essential that the datasets are stripped of all identifying information, as the data will be public once posted on USAID Development Data Library (DDL).

Where feasible, qualitative data that do not contain identifying information should also be submitted to GH Pro.

XIII. DELIVERABLES AND PRODUCTS
Select all deliverables and products required on this analytic activity. For those not listed, add rows as needed or enter them under “Other” in the table below. Provide timelines and deliverable deadlines for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable / Product</th>
<th>Timelines &amp; Deadlines (estimated) (This timeline will be updated during the TPM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Launch briefing</td>
<td>June 3, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ In-brief with USAID</td>
<td>June 11, 2019 [TPM June 10-13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Work plan and methodology review briefing</td>
<td>June 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Work plan with timeline, protocol and data collection tools due to USAID</td>
<td>June 27, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ In-brief with Passages project</td>
<td>July 1-3, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Partners Meeting</td>
<td>July 8-11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Routine briefings</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Preliminary debrief with USAID Passages management team and select PRH staff</td>
<td>August 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Draft report</td>
<td>Submit to USAID &amp; GH Pro: September 20, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Final Debrief internal to USAID Passages Management Team with Power Point presentation</td>
<td>TBD November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Debrief with Passages Project</td>
<td>TBD November, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Interactive debrief with USAID/PRH with Power Point presentation, focusing on the results of the assessment/memo</td>
<td>October 10, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Final report</td>
<td>Submit to USAID &amp; GH Pro: o/a October 24, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Internal USAID memo</td>
<td>Submit to USAID &amp; GH Pro: o/a October 24, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Raw data (cleaned datasets in CSV or XML with data dictionary)</td>
<td>October 31, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Report Posted to the DEC</td>
<td>December 9, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Holidays:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 27, 2019................. Memorial Day (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 4, 2019...................... Independence Day (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 2, 2019............. Labor Day (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 14, 2019................ Columbus Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated USAID review time
Average number of business days USAID will need to review deliverables requiring USAID review and/or approval? 10 Business days
TEAM COMPOSITION, SKILLS AND LEVEL OF EFFORT (LOE)

Team Qualifications: Please list technical areas of expertise required for this activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Team requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical consultants should have experience, as well as evaluation and/or research skills related to social norms transformation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Staff 1 Title: Evaluation Team Lead

Roles & Responsibilities: The evaluation team leader will be responsible for (1) providing team leadership; (2) managing the team’s activities, (3) leading the evaluation team planning meeting, including the development of the evaluation/assessment work plan and data collection tools, (4) ensuring that all deliverables are met in a timely manner, (5) leading data analysis and drafting of the evaluation/assessment report, and (6) leading briefings and presentations.

Qualifications:

- Extensive experience in leading health sector project/program evaluation/analytics, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods
- Excellent skills in planning, facilitation, and consensus building
- Expertise in fields of adolescent and youth sexual reproductive health, social norms, social and behavior change
- Excellent interpersonal skills, including experience successfully interacting with host government officials, civil society partners, and other stakeholders
- Experience in research project management
- Excellent organizational skills and ability to keep to a timeline
- Excellent writing skills, with extensive report writing experience
- An advanced degree in public health, evaluation or research or related field
- Proficient in English
- Familiarity with USAID and other donor agencies
- Familiarity with USAID policies and practices
  - Evaluation policy
  - Strategy development and Results frameworks
  - Performance monitoring plans

Key Staff 2 Title: Social Norms Transformation Specialist

Roles & Responsibilities: Serve as a member of the evaluation team, providing technical input and supporting the team lead in managing the evaluation and key outputs. Helps the team lead in designing the evaluation/assessment plan, conducting desk review, leading the stakeholder mapping, participating in key informant interviews, conducting data analysis, drafting key sections of the final evaluation/assessment report, and assisting in final presentation and dissemination of findings.

Qualifications:

- Experience in design and implementation of evaluations
- Knowledge, skills, and experience in qualitative evaluation tools
- Ability to review, interpret and analyze existing data pertinent to the evaluation
• Expertise in technical areas related to AYRH, and social and behavior change, especially social norm interventions
• An advanced degree in public health, evaluation or research or related field
• Proficient in English
• Good writing skills, including extensive report writing experience
• Advanced familiarity with donor-supported health programs/projects, especially those that include youth and social norms.

**Key Staff 4 Title:** Senior Research Advisor, USAID/GH/PRH/RTU

**Roles & Responsibilities:** Serve as a member of the evaluation team, providing quality assurance on evaluation/assessment issues, including methods, development of data collection instruments, protocols for data collection, data management and data analysis. S/He will participate in all aspects of the evaluation/assessment, from planning, data collection, data analysis to drafting sections of the report.

**Qualifications:**

• At least 10 years of experience in M&E procedures and implementation
• At least 5 years managing M&E, including evaluations
• Experience in design and implementation of evaluations
• Strong knowledge, skills, and experience in qualitative and quantitative evaluation tools
• Experience implementing and coordinating surveys, key informant interviews, focus groups, observations and other evaluation methods that assure reliability and validity of the data.
• Experience in data management
• Able to analyze qualitative data
• Experience using qualitative evaluation methodologies
• Ability to review, interpret and analyze existing data pertinent to the evaluation
• Expertise in fields of AYRH, social and behavior change, especially social norm interventions.
• An advanced degree in public health, evaluation or research or related field
• Familiarity with USAID health programs/projects, especially youth and social norms
• Familiarity with USAID M&E policies and practices
  – Evaluation policies
  – Results frameworks
  – Performance monitoring plans

**Key Staff 5 Title:** Gender Technical Specialist, USAID/GH/PRH/PEC

**Roles & Responsibilities:** Serve as a member of the evaluation team, providing quality assurance on evaluation issues, including methods, development of data collection instruments, protocols for data collection, data management and data analysis. S/He will participate in all aspects of the evaluation/assessment, from planning, data collection, data analysis to drafting sections of the report. S/He will provide technical input on social and behavior change issues, including normative issues such as gender and those related to life stage transitions affecting youth.

**Qualifications:**

• Experience in design and implementation of evaluations
• Strong knowledge, skills, and experience in qualitative tools
• Ability to review, interpret and analyze existing data pertinent to the evaluation
• Expertise in fields of youth, reproductive health, social norms, and social and behavior change
• An advanced degree in public health, evaluation or research or related field
• Advanced familiarity with USAID health programs/projects, especially youth, social norms, and SBC
• Advanced familiarity with USAID policies and practices, especially on M&E, research and procurement design
  – Evaluation policies
  – Results frameworks
  – Performance monitoring plans

Other Staff Titles with Roles & Responsibilities (include number of individuals needed):

| US-based Program Assistant | to work part time with the Evaluation Team to arrange interviews, meetings and logistics, and other support duties as needed by the Evaluation Team. S/He will assist the Evaluation Team to arrange interviews, meetings and logistics, and other support duties as needed by the Evaluation Team. S/He will conduct programmatic administrative and support tasks as assigned, and ensure the processes moves forward smoothly. Additionally, s/he will manage the uploading of the e-survey to the website (if part of the final methodology), and will routinely monitor it for response rates, as well as download the data as needed. |

Will USAID participate as an active team member or designate other key stakeholders to act as an active team member? This will require full time commitment during the evaluation or analytic activity, as feasible.

- [ ] Yes – If yes, specify who: Julianne Weis, Senior Research Advisor GH/PRH/RTU; Afeefa Abdur-Rahman, Gender Technical Specialist, GH/PRH/PEC
- [ ] Significant Involvement anticipated – If yes, specify who:
- [ ] No

Staffing Level of Effort (LOE) Matrix:

This optional LOE Matrix will help you estimate the LOE needed to implement this analytic activity. If you are unsure, GH Pro can assist you to complete this table.

a) For each column, replace the label "Position Title" with the actual position title of staff needed for this analytic activity.
b) Immediately below each staff title enter the anticipated number of people for each titled position.
c) Enter Row labels for each activity, task and deliverable needed to implement this analytic activity.
d) Then enter the LOE (estimated number of days) for each activity/task/deliverable corresponding to each titled position.
e) At the bottom of the table total the LOE days for each consultant title in the ‘Sub-Total’ cell, then multiply the subtotals in each column by the number of individuals that will hold this title.
Level of Effort in **days** for each Evaluation/Analytic Team member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Deliverable</th>
<th>Team Lead</th>
<th>Social Norms Specialist</th>
<th>Sr Research Advisor (USAID)</th>
<th>Gender Tech Specialist (USAID)</th>
<th>GH Pro-Program Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Launch Briefing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Desk review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Travel to/from DC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Team Planning Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 In-brief with USAID/Washington to discuss workplan and methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Briefing with Passages IP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Finalize Eval planning deliverables: 1) workplan with timeline analytic protocol (methods, sampling &amp; analytic plan); 2) data collection tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Data Collection DQA Workshop (protocol orientation/training for all data collectors)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Scheduling Interviews &amp; Meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Data Collection, US, remote</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Data cleaning and analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Initial preliminary debrief with USAID Passages Management team with prep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Final debrief with USAID Passages Management team with prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Debrief with USAID/PRH with prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 IP &amp; Stakeholder debrief workshop with prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Draft Evaluation/assessment Report/memo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 GH Pro Report QC Review &amp; Formatting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 USAID Report Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Revise report(s) per USAID comments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Finalize and submit report to USAID?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 USAID approves report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Final copy editing and formatting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 508 Compliance editing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Eval Report(s) to the DEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LOE per person</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If overseas, is a 6-day workweek permitted □ Yes □ No
Travel permitted on weekends, as needed □ Yes □ No

**Travel anticipated:** List international and local travel anticipated by what team members.

Domestic travel anticipated:
- Domestic travel (Team member residing outside Washington DC are):
  - Washington DC if Team Lead and/or Social Norms Specialist if based outside of the Washington DC area
  - Domestic travel for team members if deemed necessary, depending on location of key informants.

### XV. LOGISTICS

#### Visa Requirements

List any specific Visa requirements or considerations for entry to countries that will be visited by consultant(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Country</th>
<th>Type of Visa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List recommended/required type of Visa for entry into counties where consultant(s) will work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Country</th>
<th>Type of Visa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Clearances & Other Requirements

**Note:** Most Evaluation/Analytic Teams arrange their own work space, often in their hotels. However, if Facility Access is preferred GH Pro can request it.

**GH Pro does not provide Security Clearances, but can request Facility Access.** Please note that Facility Access (FA) requests processed by USAID/GH (Washington, DC) can take 4-6 months to be granted. If you are in a Mission and the RSO can grant a temporary FA, this can expedite the process. If FA is granted through Washington, DC, the consultant must pick up his/her FA badge in person in Washington, DC, regardless of where the consultant resides or will work.

If **Electronic Country Clearance (eCC)** is required, the consultant is also required to complete the **High Threat Security Overseas Seminar (HTSOS).** HTSOS is an interactive e-Learning (online) course designed to provide participants with threat and situational awareness training against criminal and terrorist attacks while working in high threat regions. There is a small fee required to register for this course. [*Note: The course is not required for employees who have taken FACT training within the past five years or have taken HTSOS within the same calendar year.*]

If eCC is required, and the consultant is expected to work in country more than 45 consecutive days,
the consultant must complete the one-week Foreign Affairs Counter Threat (FACT) course offered by FSI in West Virginia. This course provides participants with the knowledge and skills to better prepare themselves for living and working in critical and high threat overseas environments. Registration for this course is complicated by high demand (must register approximately 3-4 months in advance). Additionally, there will be the cost for one week’s lodging and M&E to take this course.

Check all that the consultant will need to perform this assignment, including USAID Facility Access, GH Pro workspace and travel (other than to and from post).

☐ USAID Facility Access (FA)
   Specify who will require Facility Access: ________________________________

☐ Electronic County Clearance (ECC) (International travelers only)

☐ Foreign Affairs Counter Threat (FACT) (for consultants working on country more than 45 consecutive days)

☐ GH Pro workspace
   Specify who will require workspace at GH Pro: __________________________

☐ Other (specify): ________________________________

XVI. GH PRO ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
GH Pro will coordinate and manage the evaluation/analytic team and provide quality assurance oversight, including:

- Review SOW and recommend revisions as needed
- Provide technical assistance on methodology, as needed
- Provide support to arrange and confirm key informant interview sessions
- Develop budget for analytic activity
- Recruit and hire the evaluation/analytic team, with USAID POC approval
- Arrange international travel and lodging for international consultants
- Request for country clearance and/or facility access (if needed)
- Review methods, work plan, analytic instruments, reports and other deliverables as part of the quality assurance oversight
- Report production - If the report is public, then coordination of draft and finalization steps, editing/formatting, 508ing required in addition to and submission to the DEC and posting on GH Pro website. If the report is internal, then copy editing/formatting for internal distribution.

XVII. USAID ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Below is the standard list of USAID’s roles and responsibilities. Add other roles and responsibilities as appropriate.
**USAID Roles and Responsibilities**

**USAID** will provide overall technical leadership and direction for the analytic team throughout the assignment and will provide assistance with the following tasks:

**Before Field Work**
- **SOW.**
  - Develop SOW.
  - Peer Review SOW
  - Respond to queries about the SOW and/or the assignment at large.
- **Consultant Conflict of Interest (COI).** To avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of a COI, review previous employers listed on the CV’s for proposed consultants and provide additional information regarding potential COI with the project contractors evaluated/assessed and information regarding their affiliates.
- **Documents.** Identify and prioritize background materials for the consultants and provide them to GH Pro, preferably in electronic form, at least one week prior to the inception of the assignment.
- **Local Consultants.** Assist with identification of potential local consultants, including contact information.
- **Site Visit Preparations.** Provide a list of site visit locations, key contacts, and suggested length of visit for use in planning in-country travel and accurate estimation of country travel line items costs.
- **Lodgings and Travel.** Provide guidance on recommended secure hotels and methods of in-country travel (i.e., car rental companies and other means of transportation).

**During Field Work**
- **Mission Point of Contact.** Throughout the in-country work, ensure constant availability of the Point of Contact person and provide technical leadership and direction for the team’s work.
- **Meeting Space.** Provide guidance on the team’s selection of a meeting space for interviews and/or focus group discussions (i.e. USAID space if available, or other known office/hotel meeting space).
- **Meeting Arrangements.** Assist the team in arranging and coordinating meetings with stakeholders.
- **Facilitate Contact with Implementing Partners.** Introduce the analytic team to implementing partners and other stakeholders, and where applicable and appropriate prepare and send out an introduction letter for team’s arrival and/or anticipated meetings.

**After Field Work**
- **Timely Reviews.** Provide timely review of draft/final reports and approval of deliverables.

**XVIII. ANALYTIC REPORT**

Provide any desired guidance or specifications for Final Report. (See How-To Note: Preparing Evaluation Reports)

The **Evaluation Final Report** must follow USAID’s Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report (found in Appendix I of the USAID Evaluation Policy).
- The report must not exceed 40 pages (excluding executive summary, table of contents, acronym list and annexes).
- The structure of the report should follow the Evaluation Report template, including
branding found here or here.

- Draft reports must be provided electronically, in English, to GH Pro who will then submit it to USAID.
- For additional Guidance, please see the Evaluation Reports to the How-To Note on preparing Evaluation Draft Reports found here.

**USAID Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report** (USAID ADS 201):

- Evaluation reports should be readily understood and should identify key points clearly, distinctly, and succinctly.
- The Executive Summary of an evaluation report should present a concise and accurate statement of the most critical elements of the report.
- Evaluation reports should adequately address all evaluation questions included in the SOW, or the evaluation questions subsequently revised and documented in consultation and agreement with USAID.
- Evaluation methodology should be explained in detail and sources of information properly identified.
- Limitations to the evaluation should be adequately disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.).
- Evaluation findings should be presented as analyzed facts, evidence, and data and not based on anecdotes, hearsay, or simply the compilation of people’s opinions.
- Findings and conclusions should be specific, concise, and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence.
- If evaluation findings assess person-level outcomes or impact, they should also be separately assessed for both males and females.
- If recommendations are included, they should be supported by a specific set of findings and should be action-oriented, practical, and specific.

**Reporting Guidelines:** The draft report should be a comprehensive analytical evidence-based evaluation/analytic report. It should detail and describe results, effects, constraints, and lessons learned, and provide recommendations and identify key questions for future consideration. The report shall follow USAID branding procedures. The report will be edited/formatted and made 508 compliant as required by USAID for public reports and will be posted to the USAID/DEC.

The findings from the evaluation will be presented in a draft report at a full briefing with USAID and at a follow-up meeting with key stakeholders. The report should use the following format:

- Abstract: briefly describing what was evaluated, evaluation questions, methods, and key findings or conclusions (not more than 250 words)
- Executive Summary: concisely state the most salient findings, conclusions, and recommendations (not more than 4 pages);
- Table of Contents (1 page);
- Acronyms
- Evaluation/Analytic Purpose and Evaluation/Analytic Questions (1-2 pages)
- Project [or Program] Background (1-3 pages)
- Evaluation/Analytic Methods and Limitations (1-3 pages)
- Findings (organized by Evaluation/Analytic Questions)
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Annexes
The evaluation methodology and report will be compliant with the USAID Evaluation Policy and Checklist for Assessing USAID Evaluation Reports.

--------------------------------
The Evaluation Report should exclude any potentially procurement-sensitive information. As needed, any procurement sensitive information or other sensitive but unclassified (SBU) information will be submitted in a memo to USAID separate from the Evaluation Report.

--------------------------------
All data instruments, data sets (if appropriate), presentations, meeting notes and report for this evaluation/analysis will be submitted electronically to the GH Pro Program Manager. All datasets developed as part of this evaluation will be submitted to GH Pro in an unlocked machine-readable format (CSV or XML). The datasets must not include any identifying or confidential information. The datasets must also be accompanied by a data dictionary that includes a codebook and any other information needed for others to use these data. Qualitative data included in this submission should not contain identifying or confidential information. Category of respondent is acceptable, but names, addresses and other confidential information that can easily lead to identifying the respondent should not be included in any quantitative or qualitative data submitted.

**USAID CONTACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary Contact</th>
<th>Alternate Contact 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Linda Sussman</td>
<td>Caitlin Thistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong></td>
<td>Senior Program Research Advisor</td>
<td>FP/RH Research Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USAID Office</strong></td>
<td>PRH</td>
<td>PRH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsussman@usaid.gov">lsussman@usaid.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cthistle@usaid.gov">cthistle@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone:</strong></td>
<td>571-551-7058</td>
<td>571-551-7062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cell Phone:</strong></td>
<td>301-793-5971</td>
<td>571-218-0860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List other contacts who will be supporting the Requesting Team with technical support, such as reviewing SOW and Report (such as USAID/W GH Pro management team staff).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Support Contact 1</th>
<th>Technical Support Contact 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Amani Selim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Evaluation technical advisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Office: PRH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:aselim@usaid.gov">aselim@usaid.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 571 551 7528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone: 571 721 9577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX. OTHER REFERENCE MATERIALS
Documents and materials needed and/or useful for consultant assignment, that are not listed above

XXI. ADJUSTMENTS MADE IN CARRYING OUT THIS SOW AFTER APPROVAL OF THE SOW (To be completed after Assignment Implementation by GH Pro)

[Blank space]
ANNEX II. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

670 Passages Evaluation:
Data collection tool for key informant interviews

Introduction/Informed consent

Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today.

I am/we are part of the team conducting an evaluation of the Passages Project and an assessment of social norms research and programming for USAID’s Office of Population and Reproductive Health (PRH). This four-person team includes two external members and two staff from USAID. The purpose of this process is to better understand the achievements of the Passages Project and to help inform PRH’s future investments in social norms work.

You were suggested as a key person to inform this activity and we look forward to hearing your perspectives and experiences. Before we begin, I want to let you know that any information we gather during this interview will not be attributed to any specific person. You are also free to not respond to any of the questions or stop the interview at any time. The interview will take about one hour. [If you plan to record add: I would like to record this interview to ensure that I do not miss any important points]. Do I have your permission to begin?

Name ____________________  Organization ____________________

1. How have you been involved with the Passages Project (probe on knowledge of Passages research for Q1 questions)?

Evaluation Q1: Generating new research

[Ask these questions to respondents who are familiar with Passages research, including the two studies-Growing Up Great and Transforming Masculinities]

2. What was new/different about the research conducted by Passages (probe about the focus of the research and the methodology)?

3. What factors facilitated implementation (probe on internal as well as external factors for Passages project staff)?

4. What were the challenges in implementation? (probe on specifics around social norms, theory, measurement, and scale) How did the project adapt to these challenges?

5. How have research findings been shared? How were findings received by stakeholders?

6. Were there any unintended consequences- positive or negative- to the research implementation or results? If so, what were these consequences?

Evaluation Q2: Capacity building/technical assistance

7. [For project] What were your approaches to building capacity of partner organizations to increase effectiveness and scale of interventions with norm-shifting/changing components? Did the approach differ for different groups and if so how? [For partners] How has your partnership with Passages expanded your expertise with regard to social norms research and practice?

8. What has worked well in terms of capacity building efforts by the project (probe on effectiveness and scale)? What has impeded efforts?
9. What would you have done differently regarding capacity building?

10. [For project staff and USAID] As far as you know, how much was the project able to provide TA to other organizations, including USAID Missions and bilateral projects?

Evaluation Q3: Global technical leadership

11. In your opinion, how has the Passages project played a role in global technical leadership?
12. Are you familiar with the Learning Collaborative to Advance Normative Change? If yes, how effective has the Learning Collaborative been in its efforts to enhance collective efforts, build knowledge and develop shared tools? What made it work well? What would have made it work better?
13. Are you familiar with the Passages Regional Communities of Practice (COPs) on the scale-up of AYRH normative change interventions in Francophone Africa and South Asia? If yes, what have been the contributions of the regional COPs? What has enabled or inhibited success with these COPs?

Evaluation Q4: Value added of Passages project

14. How has Passages worked with other efforts, including USAID and others (probe on gender, youth, SBC)? What factors facilitated or hindered a productive working relationship?
15. [for non-Passages staff] Have you used any Passages tools or information? If yes, how and has it been helpful for your work?
16. How have Passages documents, tools and approaches added value to the field of social norms? Social and behavior change more broadly? Gender?

Evaluation Q5: Recommendations for future

17. What are the outstanding gaps or priorities in the social norms field (probe on theory, measurement, programs (scale-up and costing), any other areas)?
18. What needs to happen to address those gaps? What are the roles of USAID, other donors, implementing partners/other stakeholders?
19. Do you have any other suggestions/recommendations on ways to improve research and/or programs related to social norm transformation at scale?
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ANNEX IV: SOCIAL NORMS LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to social norms theory

Social norms are the unspoken rules in society that can determine behavior. Academic debates on the measurement and definitions of social norms have been ongoing for several decades in the fields of sociology, psychology, communications, economics, public health, philosophy and law, and there is increasing interest among policy makers and practitioners to adopt a social norms approach to social and behavior change programming. Defining social norms and their relationship to individual behaviors can be complex, as not every behavior is determined by social norms, and norms often work in combination with other socio-economic factors and limitations. This figure, from Mackie et al. (2015), helps clarify a framework for determining when individual behaviors are and are not determined by social norms:

Since the early 2000s, there has been an increasing number of publications exploring the constructs of social norms and their relation to human behavior. Table 1 summarizes some of the key constructs and their citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Theorists/Theoretical Model(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Norms/ Empirical Expectations</td>
<td>Beliefs about what other people do</td>
<td>Cialdini, Reno, &amp; Kallgren (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicchieri (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mackie, Moneti, Shakya, &amp; Denny (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctive Norms/ Subjective Norms/ Normative Expectations</td>
<td>Beliefs about what others approve of/think people should do</td>
<td>Cialdini, Reno, &amp; Kallgren (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ajzen &amp; Fishbein (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicchieri (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Expectancies: Benefits</td>
<td>Beliefs about the perceived benefits/rewards</td>
<td>Rosenstock, (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bandura (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rimal &amp; Real (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome Expectancies: Sanctions

Beliefs about the perceived sanctions/punishments

Bendor & Swistak (2001)
Rimal & Real (2005)
Rimal (2008)
Mackie et al. (2015)

These constructs are often overlapping and build upon each other, with a general consensus around the difference between injunctive norms (beliefs about what others think should be done) v. descriptive norms (beliefs about what others actually do), and collective norms (operate at a social systems level) v. perceived norms (operate at a psychological level) (Chung and Rimal 2016).

Developing a framework to transform social norms theory into practice

Given the complex, overlapping constructs of social norms theory, some have argued that when turning theory into practice, “there is no single theoretical perspective on norm maintenance and change that can capture all the processes and range of factors influencing norms,” and a combination of analyses and insights is necessary (Marcus and Harper 2014). Practitioners don’t need to have a single and harmonized definition of norms, so long as there is a coherent theory in programming, and that interventions are designed in a way that agency, power, and values are understood (Cislaghi 2017).

Several theorists have designed visual frameworks for practitioners to better translate normative constructs into practical, cross-sector models of the dynamics at play in social and behavior change.
interventions. The “Flower Framework” for reproductive health, pictured above, is a combination of earlier frameworks including the “Flower of Sustained Health” (IRH 2017) and the “Dynamic Framework for Social Change” (Cislaghi and Heise 2018). The Flower Framework highlights gender norms, emphasises the multiple relationships between the four domains identified in Cislaghi and Heise's previous framework, and places power at the center, as power determines whether or not people decide to comply with social norms around them (Pulerwitz et al. 2019). This expanded framework helps demonstrate both the pivotal role of norms while also acknowledging that structural factors are fundamental, especially in developing and maintaining power, shaping gender and other social dynamics, and influencing health outcomes.

**Design and implementation of social norms programming**

Converting social norms theory into development programming is still in many ways a nascent field, with ongoing conversations about the best methodology for measurement, design, and implementation of social norms interventions within the existing SBC landscape.

In the field of family planning and reproductive health, SBC programming has evolved from issues of service access to a broader understanding of the enabling environment, including social norms, that surround care-seeking and clinic environments and provider-side biases and beliefs (Kolundzija 2019). There has also been a more careful understanding of the complex relationship between norms and behaviors, including in arenas like child marriage, one of the first behaviors to be targeted in normative change programming (Steinhaus et al. 2018). Greene and Stiefvater (2019) argue that there is increasing consensus that child marriage is not a norm itself, but a behavior driven by indirect gender and other social norms.

There is broad consensus among stakeholders that formative research to identify both the social norms and behaviors that will be targeted by programming is crucial, though debates on methods for adequately and rapidly measuring social norms are ongoing. Bicchieri et al. (2014) have argued that measurement tools have typically lacked rigorous theoretical backing, and behaviors are explained by “culture, practice, custom, convention.” The traditional “Knowledge Attitudes and Practices (KAP)” survey does not elicit social expectations and norms. Bicchieri proposes instead a model to measure “preferences, options, and beliefs,” capturing the varied reasons for a behavior, which also interact with moral rules, personal normative beliefs, and rational responses.

Passages produced an overview of existing programming efforts to “diagnose” social norms (2017), describing several interventions that have worked to identify and measure social norms largely through vignettes and other qualitative exercises, quantitative surveys, or a combination.

UNICEF has produced their own tools for social norms measurement and programming, especially around gender norms and health behaviors. In 2016, UNICEF convened a meeting to discuss the measurement of social norms and develop a global monitoring and evaluation framework for social norms transformation, specifically centered around female genital cutting. A desk review from the meeting identified the “ACT” model for measuring social norms change: Ask what people know, feel and do; Ascertain “normative factors;” Consider context; Collect information on social networks; Track individual and social change; Test and retest.

Defining social norms and their relationship to behaviors can be fraught because the norms interact with other factors to determine the level of tolerance and obligation of certain behaviors: in Cameroon, Cislaghi et al. (2019) demonstrated that even in neighboring communities, social norms interact
differently with external factors and can influence behavior in varied ways. Distinguishing between non-social beliefs and social expectations was found to be crucial, and the authors propose using experiments and vignettes to understand the dynamics of social norms in target communities.

The use of vignettes as a measurement tool was first introduced by Bicchieri, and influenced Theresa Hwang and Leigh Stefanik’s development of the Social Norms Analysis Plot (SNAP) tool for CARE. SNAP identifies key components of a social norm and asks additional questions to develop vignettes to be used in programming. SNAP also identifies ways to measure changes in norms over time. In their programming, CARE has focused on detailed formative research to identify norms and reference groups, and then uses vignettes to stimulate guided conversation among participant groups.

Shell-Duncan et al. (2019) propose a factorial focus group analysis method for measuring the interconnectedness of various social norms on a given behavior. The focus group not only identifies norms, practices, and behaviors, but also helps name the reference group which holds power over decision-making, influencing norms and drives consequences for behaviors.

A key aspect then of measuring social norms is identifying the reference group, and recognizing that this group may not be geographically contained or immediately obvious. The reference group is also heavily dependent on which behavior an intervention is targeting. A study from Cameroon noted that the opinions of peers was not as highly valued as those of family members in relation to condom use (Van Rossem and Meekers 2011).

The Grandmother’s Project developed the “Focus on Families and Culture” guide (2015) on how to plan and carry out a rapid community assessment on family roles and influence, primarily related to reproductive, maternal and child health. The Grandmother’s Project has used this methodology in Senegal on a range of health behaviors and social norms, focusing on the importance of leveraging power relationships within influential reference groups.

More recently, both Passages and the Learning Collaborative developed the Social Norms Exploration Tool (SNET), a five-phase tool for programs to identify what, if any, social norms influence behavior, and how to define social norms in measurable terms so that change can be monitored. The pilot version of the tool was first developed in the Transforming Masculinities project in the DRC, and has since been adapted and revised and re-tested in over 12 projects globally.

How to transform social norms?: Successful case studies

The numerous publications and tools developed for social norms measurement demonstrates the need for critical formative research in designing a theory of change for social norms intervention. Once the norms and their relationship with behaviors have been identified, implementing a successful, transformative social norms program can be complex and is still being tested at various scales.

A literature review from the Institute of Reproductive Health (2016) identified 303 projects which have worked on normative transformation for adolescent and youth reproductive health, 42 of which were scaled up beyond a pilot. Most projects were community based (83%), and used social mobilization approaches. Those that had measured success in shifting normative environments used community-centered SBC approaches, though many interventions had trouble accurately measuring social norms and shifts over time, especially after the interventions had ended.

Vaitla et al. (2017) argue that while the link between social norms theory and practice is still nascent and developing, some key interventions, including Tostan and Abriendo Oportunidades, are successful cases
of using constructive community dialogue on the consequences of harmful norms to improve girls’
health and well-being. Creating safe spaces for whole networks of community members to discuss and
question norms, and reimagine existing relationships can drive social norms transformation and lead to
reduced harm and violence against girls and women.

Tekponon Jikuagou began as a pilot intervention tackling gender norms and health seeking behaviors
around family planning in Benin. Using a social network approach, the intervention used participatory
dialogue and reflection approaches within identified reference groups to bring new ideas and discussions
regarding gender and family planning. Women and men reached by TJ were 1.5 times more likely to use
modern contraception, as it was found that the perception that one’s networks support family planning
were positively and significantly linked to increased use of contraception and met need. TJ was then
scaled up throughout the country, and expanded to Mali, through different organizations.

The REAL Fathers Initiative in Uganda tackled norms around masculinity and interpersonal violence. The
intervention used a community-based mentoring model targeted at young, first time fathers aged 16-25
years. Communities would self select mentors, who would then lead sessions with young fathers to
discuss parenting attitudes, confidence in using nonviolent discipline, and encourage non-traditional
gender roles in parenting. After the intervention, participants were half as likely to report using IPV as a
control group, in addition to reporting improved couples communication and fathers’ participation in
household labor. After one year, the long term impacts of REAL were sustained and deepened, with
more participants reporting improved father-child interactions, diminished use of physical punishment,
and higher confidence in using nonviolent discipline.

The Voices for Change (V4C) intervention in Nigeria worked at scale to strengthen the enabling
environment for young women’s empowerment using a social norms marketing approach. V4C worked
in three domains: self, society, and institutions under a social ecological model. An Attitudes, Practices,
and Social Norms survey (APSN) accompanying the intervention found that after three years, 2.4 million
young people who were engaged in the intervention showed positive attitudes or behavior changes in
relation to gender, representing 89% of the target population in focal states. More change was found in
attitude shifts, especially in relation to violence against women and girls and women’s leadership, but
there were also sizeable improvements in violence behaviors as well (Denny and Hughes 2017).

**Outstanding questions and debates**

Since the advent of Passages, there have been a large number of publications on social norms theory and
practice, much of it directed or produced by members of the Learning Collaborative. Initial gaps in
research and questions on social norms transformation identified in 2015-6 have been addressed by
publications in recent years, and there is increasing recognition among practitioners that health
outcomes are affected by social norms. The publication of a special supplement of the Journal of
Adolescent Health in 2019 on adolescent and youth reproductive health noted how far the discourse
has come, but identified further gaps and areas for research to bring the field of social norms
transformation to greater scale and maturity. Logic models and theories of change are still often unclear
in how an intervention will work to address social norms, which norms, which behaviors will ultimately
be changed, and how normative transformation will facilitate this change (Bingenheimer 2019).

There is also a question of scale of interventions. Theorists have argued that norms are often maintained
by multiple sectors and factors, and that transforming norms can be messy, non-linear, and are prone to
backlash (Marcus and Harper 2014). In a literature review on the drivers of gender norms change,
Marcus et al. (2014) identify large-scale catalysts for change, including economics, education, communications, legal changes, but also project-based experiences largely at the community level. Processes of change in gender norms are typically driven by several factors simultaneously, and community-level exposure to new ideas with outlets for political and social mobilization are the most critical drivers of change. At the same time, norms are less likely to change when there are strong economic interests in the continuation of a practice, certain groups perceive their power and status to be directly undermined by change (Marcus and Harper 2014).

Malhotra et al. (2019) argue that to truly shift the power dynamics inherent in various social norms around gender, community-level interventions are insufficient and more attention needs to be paid to meso- and macro-level institutions as drivers of reform. A WHO report on gender norms from 2008 argues that in designing interventions to shift gender norms, “outcomes are dependent on integrated approaches and the protective umbrella of policy and legislative actions.”

A long-term study of gender norms around adolescents from northern Uganda found that lack of capital made it difficult for adolescents to challenge patriarchal norms, and that access to social and economic capital helped power balances within marriages. Loss of social status and need for economic security were driving factors in adolescents’ behaviors, while violence itself became a tool for (re)establishing patriarchal boundaries (Lundgren et al. 2019).

The balance between community and structural interventions is delicate, however. Evidence from Bangladesh demonstrates that while institutional norms and policies favor women’s employment, leading to increasing numbers of women in out of household employment, the meta norms still favor women’s domestic seclusion and emphasize reproductive labor. This means that women are often trapped in low-wage jobs in the labor force, and many women would prefer to stay home and not work in these precarious, poorly compensated occupations (Heintz et al. 2017).

There is also evidence of successful scale-up of community-based approaches to a wider regional and national audience. Cislaghi et al. (2019) argue that while community-level interventions are often criticized for their limited reach, organized diffusion can help these interventions go to scale and reach a larger audience. The Community for Understanding Scale Up (CUSP), a group of nine organizations working across four regions, has helped develop evidence-based methodologies for social norms change at scale. CUSP uses the ecological framework of different levels of intervention for social norms transformation: from individual/couples-based, to structural/systems level, including policy and legal reform, training of key institutional stakeholders (Goldmann et al. 2019).

Moving forward, more evidence from low and middle income countries on social norms transformation is needed, especially in sectors outside of family planning and reproductive health. Cislaghi and Heise (2018) argue that interventions in health are often concentrated in high-income countries, and that the best evidence of effective social norms interventions for improvement of health in low and middle income countries comes from family planning and reproductive health, including FGC. A World Bank publication (2016) notes that much of the evidence on what works to change norms around interpersonal violence is skewed towards high-income countries, but points to cross-sector approaches involving multiple stakeholders and community engagement work challenging the acceptability of violence through culturally sensitive dialogue on harmful gender norms.

Other development sectors, including agriculture, education, and economic empowerment have begun adopting a social norms approach to improve programming and remove barriers of access to certain
discriminated groups. Still, there is much room for improvement in social norms programming in other sectors: CARE has noted that “agricultural development project evaluations are a lost opportunity for learning ‘what works’ for gender norm change,” largely because of focus on outputs, not impact indicators and outcomes (Springer and Drucza 2018). A landscape review from the Passages project noted that across six non-health sectors in USAID, social norms has been identified as important determinants of outcomes, barriers, and inequalities, but there is little understanding of how to explicitly address normative change within programming (Gardsbane et al. 2019).

Conclusion

The field of social norms theory and practice is rapidly transforming and expanding, in part because of increased donor coordination around Passages, and a growing volume of academic publications around social norms constructs and their interaction with human behavior. There is also growing consensus among policy makers that social norms, especially around gender, are of urgent importance: in 2019 the Lancet published a special series on gender norms and their impact on health outcomes. With commentary from Melinda Gates, Richard Horton, and others, there was agreement that “gender mainstreaming” has been an inadequate approach to improved equality in health outcomes between men and women, and more robust interventions targeting social norms, gender dynamics, and the power relationships within them, is necessary to create real change.

Moving forward, there remains space to examine other social norms beyond gender in both health and other development sectors. As more tools are developed for SBC practitioners to tackle social norms, including UNICEF’s recently published field guide on social norms transformation for SBC programming (Petit and Zalk 2019), more evidence will be generated on best practices for transforming theory to practice. The growing body of evidence will contribute to continued debates on scale of interventions, cross-sector collaboration, and the relation between gender and other social norms in determining outcomes for health and well-being.
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USAID NON-DISCLOSURE AND CONFLICTS AGREEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID Non-Disclosure and Conflicts Agreement - Global Health Program Cycle Improvement Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As used in this Agreement, Sensitive Data is marked or unmarked, oral, written or in any other form,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“sensitive but unclassified information,” procurement sensitive and source selection information, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information such as medical, personnel, financial, investigatory, visa, law enforcement, or other information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which, if released, could result in harm or unfair treatment to an individual or group, or could have a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative impact upon foreign policy or relations, or USAID’s mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intending to be legally bound, I hereby accept the obligations contained in this Agreement in consideration |
of my being granted access to Sensitive Data, and specifically I understand and acknowledge that:

1. I have been given access to USAID Sensitive Data to facilitate the performance of duties assigned to |
me for compensation, monetary or otherwise. By being granted access to such Sensitive Data, |
special confidence and trust has been placed in me by the United States Government, and as such it is |
my responsibility to safeguard Sensitive Data disclosed to me, and to refrain from disclosing |
Sensitive Data to persons not requiring access for performance of official USAID duties.

2. Before disclosing Sensitive Data, I must determine the recipient’s “need to know” or “need to access” |
Sensitive Data for USAID purposes.

3. I agree to abide in all respects by 41, U.S.C. 2101 - 2107, The Procurement Integrity Act, and |
specifically agree not to disclose source selection information or contractor bid proposal information |
to any person or entity not authorized by agency regulations to receive such information.

4. I have reviewed my employment (past, present and under consideration) and financial interests, as |
well as those of my household family members, and certify that, to the best of my knowledge and |
belief, I have no actual or potential conflict of interest that could diminish my capacity to perform my |
assigned duties in an impartial and objective manner.

5. Any breach of this Agreement may result in the termination of my access to Sensitive Data, which, if |
such termination effectively negates my ability to perform my assigned duties, may lead to the |
termination of my employment or other relationships with the Departments or Agencies that granted |
my access.

6. I will not use Sensitive Data, while working at USAID or thereafter, for personal gain or |
detrimentally to USAID, or disclose or make available all or any part of the Sensitive Data to any |
person, firm, corporation, association, or any other entity for any reason or purpose whatsoever, |
directly or indirectly, except as may be required for the benefit USAID.

7. Misuse of government Sensitive Data could constitute a violation, or violations, of United States |
criminal law, and Federally-affiliated workers (including some contract employees) who violate |
privacy safeguards may be subject to disciplinary actions, a fine of up to $5,000, or both. In |
particular, U.S. criminal law (18 USC § 1905) protects confidential information from unauthorized |
disclosure by government employees. There is also an exemption from the Freedom of Information |
Act (FOIA) protecting such information from disclosure to the public. Finally, the ethical standards |
that bind each government employee also prohibit unauthorized disclosure (5 CFR 2635.703).

8. All Sensitive Data to which I have access or may obtain access by signing this Agreement is now and |
will remain the property of, or under the control of, the United States Government. I agree that I must |
return all Sensitive Data which has or may come into my possession (a) upon demand by an |
authorized representative of the United States Government; (b) upon the conclusion of my |
employment or other relationship with the Department or Agency that last granted me access to
9. Notwithstanding the foregoing, I shall not be restricted from disclosing or using Sensitive Data that:
(i) is or becomes generally available to the public other than as a result of an unauthorized disclosure by me; (ii) becomes available to me in a manner that is not in contravention of applicable law; or (iii) is required to be disclosed by law, court order, or other legal process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCEPTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The undersigned accepts the terms and conditions of this Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie Solo</td>
<td>October 18, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie Solo</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOBAL HEALTH PROGRAM CYCLE IMPROVEMENT
PROJECT

Sensitive Data; or (c) upon the conclusion of my employment or other relationship that requires
access to Sensitive Data.

9. Notwithstanding the foregoing, I shall not be restricted from disclosing or using Sensitive Data that:
(i) is or becomes generally available to the public other than as a result of an unauthorized disclosure
by me; (ii) becomes available to me in a manner that is not in contravention of applicable law; or (iii)
is required to be disclosed by law, court order, or other legal process.

| ACCEPTANCE |
The undersigned accepts the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suruchi Sood</th>
<th>06/01/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suruchi Sood</td>
<td>Social Norms Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Julie Solo, Team Leader, has more than 25 years of experience in international reproductive health. She has been working as an independent consultant for almost 20 years on a wide range of assignments, including conducting evaluations, developing strategies, and writing documents for donors and implementing agencies. Julie has an MPH from the University of Michigan School of Public Health. As team leader, she managed all activities for the evaluation.

Suruchi Sood, Social Norm Specialist, is an Associate Professor at the Department of Community Health and Prevention, Dornsife School of Public Health, Drexel University. Her career has spanned areas inside and outside academia for 20 years, specifically around research processes associated with the design, implementation, and evaluation of communication programs. Her research skills cover the range from advanced multivariate statistical modelling to community-based participatory visual and narrative techniques. Her research has addressed cross-cutting issues in more than 15 countries, including Nepal, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Tanzania, Jamaica, Mozambique, and Ethiopia with multiple stakeholders and donors. She has managed communication research within a variety of contexts—social media, mass media, interpersonal communication, community mobilization, social marketing, and advocacy. Her research has been widely published and she has led the writing of more than 50 technical reports and conference papers. Suruchi was the social norms specialist for the team and worked closely with the team leader on all aspects of the evaluation.

Afeefa Abdur-Rahman, Gender Technical Specialist, has more than 15 years of experience working on SBC and gender integration for RH programs. She serves as a Gender Advisor in the Office of Population and Reproductive Health in USAID’s Global Health Bureau. In this role, Afeefa works with USAID staff and implementing partners to integrate gender into FP projects and advance gender priorities for improved FP outcomes. She provides technical assistance to HQ and field programs on gender integration across USAID FP and RH efforts with a focus on engaging men and boys in FP, SBC, and training and capacity building. She assisted with planning, data collection, analysis and report-writing for the evaluation.

Julianne Weis, Senior Research Advisor, holds an MSc and PhD from Oxford University where she studied the history of global reproductive, maternal, and child health policy in the context of local norms and community practices in African countries. She has worked for more than 10 years in researching and evaluating RMNCH programs in Africa and South America, and is now a Senior Research Advisor in the Office of Population and Reproductive Health at USAID. For the evaluation, Julianne completed a thorough literature review on social norms, building on her background in academic research. As a French speaker, she also assisted with data collection and translation of tools into French, and assisted in the analysis of results and development of recommendations for the internal USAID memo.