



**EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ALLIANCE:
An Evaluation of Partnerships in
Support of Youth Employability**

Global Report
April, 2010

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Education and Employment Alliance (EEA) Evaluation Report represents the tireless dedication, remarkable teamwork, and significant contributions of many individuals and organizations. First and foremost, the EEA study owes a deep debt of gratitude to the young people, their parents, trainers, and community members who participated in this global evaluation.

We also wish to express our significant gratitude to our main counterpart at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Chris Capacci-Carneal, for her strong support and guidance during the program and in the conduct of this evaluation. We are similarly indebted to previous counterparts for the program at USAID/Washington including Roberta Cavitt, Joe Williams and our original partner in this effort, Seema Agarwal-Harding. Significant support was also provided by the following individuals who served as our most recent, main USAID counterparts in each country of operation and contributed to the design and implementation of each EEA country program: Robert Burch of USAID/Egypt; Sourav Banerjee of USAID/India; Chimi Thonden of USAID/Indonesia; Jane Casewit of USAID/Morocco; Zachary Orend of USAID/Pakistan; and Tom Crehan of USAID/Philippines. They join many others at USAID in Washington and in each country who we have had the pleasure of working with over the last five years.

We are also indebted to the following organizations and individuals for their leadership and invaluable contributions in making this program a success and for the wide number of partnerships and friendships forged through EEA:

- The National Secretariats, namely Nahdet El Mahrousa in Egypt; the QUEST Alliance in India; Indonesia Business Links in Indonesia; the Rural Support Programmes Network in Pakistan; the Consuelo Foundation in the Philippines; and our country advisory team in Morocco;
- EEA alliance members in each country, including Steering Committee members, Country Advisors, lead implementing partners, business leaders, leverage partners and government officials.

Finally, we are extremely appreciative of the efforts of the global evaluation team members who helped design, write and edit the global and country evaluations contained in this final report. Special thanks and recognition is due to Lin Lin Aung, whose tireless energy and dedication was always on display in managing a complex evaluation process involving multitudes of stakeholders across five countries. She was supported by a wonderful team including Mariam Swift (Morocco), Marcia Miranda (Philippines), and Shereen Nasef (Egypt). These evaluation team leaders worked closely with numerous EEA team members at IYF overseeing global and country operations and providing support in editing and designing the final versions of this report. We are grateful to all of them for their critical efforts.

This evaluation exemplifies collaboration at its best, and such collaboration was only fitting for a program focused on the power of partnership. We are grateful to all who contributed, and trust their efforts will be of important utility to others seeking to use alliance-based approaches to support youth needs.

Awais Sufi
Vice President, International Youth Foundation

CONTENTS

Section I: Introduction	3
Section II: Summary of Global Results	10
Section III: Findings and Analytical Review of Program Achievements	13
Intermediate Result I: Alliance Building and Leveraging Resources.....	13
Intermediate Result II: Improved Access to and Relevance of Education and Employability Training ...	25
Intermediate Result III: Improved Prospects for Employment and Successful Entrepreneurship.....	32
Intermediate Result IV: Positive, Indirect Effect on Families and Communities of Youth	39
Section IV: Lessons Learned and Recommendations	41
A. Building and Sustaining Alliances.....	41
Part 1: Identifying Effective Secretariats	41
Part 2: Establishing Country Alliances and Steering Committees.....	42
B. Assessing EEA Employability Outcomes.....	44
Part 1: Utility of the Alliance Approach in Providing Effective Skills Training	44
Part 2: Internships/Apprenticeships	45
Part 3: Job Placement Services	46
Part 4: Sustainability and Scalability of Employability Projects.....	47
Conclusion	48

FIGURES

Figure 1: EEA Results Framework.....	7
Figure 2: EEA's Accomplishments and Challenges	10
Figure 3: IR I Indicators	13
Figure 4: Country-level Sustainability Status	14
Figure 5: Leverage Contributions by Country	15
Figure 6: Number and Types of Alliance Partners by Country.....	15
Figure 7: Project-level Costs by Country.....	22
Figure 8: Alliance Building and Program Support Costs by Country	23
Figure 9: Unit Cost per Beneficiary	23
Figure 10: IR II Indicators	25
Figure 11: Direct Youth Beneficiaries: Participation, Completion, and Dropout Rates	26
Figure 12: Classification of Gender Participation in EEA Programs by Country.....	27
Figure 13: Number of Trainers Trained by Country	27
Figure 14: Youth Satisfaction with Trainers	28
Figure 15: Youth Satisfaction with EEA Training.....	29
Figure 16: IR III Indicators	32
Figure 17: Overall Job Placement and Entrepreneurship Success Rates by Country.....	34
Figure 18: Job Placement Rates by Country	34
Figure 19: Entrepreneurship Success Rates by Country.....	36
Figure 20: Youth Satisfaction with Internships or Apprenticeships.....	37
Figure 21: Job Satisfaction of Youth	38
Figure 22: IR IV Indicators.....	39

ANNEXES

Annex A: Project-level Sustainability Status
Annex B: Typology of EEA Partners and Leverage Contributions by Country
Annex C: EEA Egypt Evaluation Report
Annex D: EEA Indonesia Evaluation Report
Annex E: EEA Morocco Evaluation Report
Annex F: EEA Pakistan Evaluation Report
Annex G: EEA Philippines Evaluation Report
Annex H: EEA India (QUEST) Evaluation Reports
Annex I: EEA Global Evaluation Framework and Surveys

Section I: Introduction

A. Background

Youth between the ages of 15 and 25 account for 1.1 billion of the world's population, out of which some 400 million are either unemployed, underemployed or live on less than US\$2 a day.¹ Youth in general are three times – five times in Southeast Asia - more likely than adults to be unemployed. The World Bank estimates that in 2010 the worldwide number of youth in this age group will reach 1.8 billion, and 1.5 billion of them (83%) will live in developing nations. The vast majority lack basic education, marketable skills, decent employment, and are not positively engaged in civil society. Out-of-school, unemployed or underemployed youth are at higher risk of becoming victims or perpetrators of violence and crime, teen pregnancy, receipt and transmission of HIV/AIDS and other diseases. Such negative outcomes not only impose costs on young people and their families, but also on the economy and society at large.²

In response to the alarming rise in global youth unemployment and the resulting disengagement and vulnerability of this age group, the International Youth Foundation (IYF), with support from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), implemented the Education and Employment Alliance (EEA) Program in six countries with high youth unemployment rates, particularly among young Muslim populations. Target countries included Egypt, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan and the Philippines. Youth employment stands at 25% and above in most of these target countries - with one out of every three or four youth likely to be unemployed. For example, in the Philippines, the International Labor Organization estimates that over 2.5 million Filipino youth are unemployed, accounting for more than half of the unemployed in the country. In these countries, youth struggle to have access to educational opportunities, and are likely to become unemployed or underemployed under exploitative terms, such as low pay and long hours of work. A high percentage of youth drop out of high school due to poverty and other constraints, and subsequently, are unable to make a full and successful transition to adulthood as productive, healthy and engaged citizens.

B. What is the EEA Program?

The Education and Employment Alliance was initiated in 2005 as cooperative agreement between IYF and the Asia and Near East Bureau of USAID. At its core, EEA's mandate was to create and expand education and employment opportunities for disadvantaged youth through innovative pilot projects conducted in strong partnership with stakeholders across the public and private sectors, as well as civil society. Such multi-country, multi-stakeholder, multi-sector partnerships were anticipated to provide a dynamic and effective platform to better leverage financial and human resources in support of youth development. At the same time, they were intended to support the collaborative design, testing and implementation of alliance-based interventions in support of youth education and employability needs. Throughout the alliance building process, the program hoped to demonstrate that such partnerships could help youth better acquire marketable employability skills, gain decent employment or self-employment, and make a full transition into adulthood as successful, engaged and productive citizens. Simultaneously, EEA sought to promote the long term sustainability and scalability of activities involving partners across all sectors. Alliances were forged and reinforced at the global, country, and community or project levels.

Global Level: With overall management by IYF, global level alliances were developed by establishing a common framework for alliance development across all six countries; sharing lessons learned across interventions; providing crosscutting technical assistance; creating linkages to multinational corporate partners; and supporting the leveraging of their resources.

Country Level: Building on this global platform, Steering Committees within each country were established to help formulate and guide specific alliance-based projects in support of the needs of youth. In this respect, country level alliances looked to establish an insightful and credible steering committee of multinational and local businesses, local governments and community associations that could come together to:

¹ International Labour Organization, "New ILO Study Says Youth Unemployment Rising," Press Release.

² EQUIP3 guide to conducting USAID cross-sectoral youth assessments.

- Discuss their current activities that supported young people in securing better livelihoods, as well as where they perceived critical gaps that needed to be addressed in the educational and employment domains; and
- Work collaboratively in ways that would bring the unique skills, expertise and resources of partners from across all sectors to address such needs.

To ensure that such dialogues were action-oriented and purposeful, in each country a local organization or team was designated to serve an Alliance Secretariat. This Secretariat was first and foremost tasked with working closely with IYF and the Steering Committee to design multi-sector pilot programs that would be approved by the Steering Committee for receipt of approximately \$3 million in Alliance “seed” funding to be leveraged by other partners. As programs moved forward (between five and eleven projects depending on the country), the Secretariat and IYF worked collaboratively to help ensure project and overall alliance program success through the monitoring and evaluation of project activities; the building of partner capacity to implement programs; the sharing of effective practices across pilot programs; and the leveraging of resources to expand and sustain program activities.

Community Level: These global and country level alliance structures were in direct support of alliance building at the project or community level, where more than 310 EEA partners across sectors helped implement and support pilot projects designed to address education and employability challenges faced by young people in each targeted country. In sum, EEA and partners supported 43 such pilot programs across its six countries (inclusive of EEA/India programs), which collectively benefited over 1.2 million young people through a variety of activities intended to improve learning outcomes, develop new employment skills and help young people start their own businesses. Taken together, including India, EEA programs leveraged approximately \$12.7 million in partner contributions in cash and in-kind resources to build upon USAID support. Of particular interest and importance for the purpose of this evaluation, a number of such projects went through more than one stage of implementation, with partners across sectors building on their initial cooperation to build upon what they viewed to be successful initiatives and expand and better sustain these initial partnership activities.

EEA pilot activities covered a wide array of programmatic focus areas,³ including:

- Job preparedness programs that looked to combine technical/vocational and life skills, equivalency education, internship/apprenticeship training, mentorship and job placement services - specifically designed to address the unique needs of underserved youth such as out-of-school and other at-risk populations (Morocco, Indonesia, Philippines and Pakistan)
- Career counseling, mentorship, and job-matching programs directed at students and graduates of higher educational institutions (Egypt)
- Entrepreneurship support and leadership development programs (Indonesia, Egypt, Philippines and Morocco, Pakistan on a smaller scale)
- Programs that supported the creation of new digital tools and learning approaches that increase student learning at the basic education level and also better prepare youth for work (India)
- Programs that directly linked schools and training programs with businesses to ensure educational programs meet the needs of industry (All EEA countries in general)
- Programs that were specifically targeted to improve the education and employability of girls and young women (all EEA countries)

It should be noted that given the unique nature of the EEA/India program, it was concluded that program activities in this country should be evaluated separately from the other five countries which are collectively assessed in this global EEA report. While EEA programs in Egypt, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan and the Philippines focused almost entirely on school-to-work transitions and employability programs, the India program centered largely on innovative and effective uses of educational technology, with large numbers of beneficiaries receiving basic educational support through innovative uses of technology. Moreover, in India, in consultation with the USAID Mission, IYF established a field office structure with the aim of the field office “spinning off” as an independent entity to promote alliance-based structures, while in other countries Secretariats were existing organizations that integrated EEA activities into their programming portfolio. Evaluations of several EEA/India programs under its QUEST Alliance are provided in Annex H of this report.

³ A table listing each of the EEA programs, core implementing partners, a general description of activities and targets, and sustainability status is included as Annex A of this report.

C. Project Evaluation Objectives, Scope and Methodology

This evaluation was overseen by a four-person evaluation team formed in early 2009 as the EEA program entered into its final year of operation. The report is structured in four main sections: Introduction; Summary of program results by country; Findings and analytical review of program achievements by intermediate result; and Lessons learned and recommendations. As it developed the scope and methodology to be undertaken in this final evaluation, the evaluation team had numerous consultations with USAID in Washington and in each country, as well as IYF management and key alliance stakeholders within each country program. Such consultations demonstrated the desire across all stakeholders that the evaluation team center its attention on two key questions:

1. Did the EEA alliance/multi-stakeholder approach bring forward unique benefits in terms of education and employability outcomes for young people in comparison to more traditional development models that placed less emphasis on multi-sector engagement, planning and design?
2. Did the EEA alliance-building approach and the use of multi-stakeholder partnerships to design, implement and oversee programs help promote the sustainability and scalability of interventions?

This evaluation seeks to address such questions in a way that builds upon the overall approach of monitoring and evaluation set forward by the program from its outset. In this respect, the evaluation team centered its work on the following intermediate results (IRs) for the EEA program, using these overall guideposts to help best frame survey questions, data collection and analysis:

1. Alliance building and leveraging of resources (i.e. to what extent did EEA succeed in building partnerships and in promoting sustainable and scalable youth employability programs?)
2. Improved access to and relevance of educational and employability training
3. Improved prospects for employment and successful entrepreneurship
4. Positive, indirect effect on families and communities of youth (IR IV was added as part of the evaluation to determine whether there is any indirect effect on the families and communities, although it was not included in the original monitoring and evaluation plan utilized by the program.)

Within each of these IR's, a number of relevant indicators set forth are listed in the EEA Results Framework below:

Figure 1: EEA Results Framework



Findings with respect to each of these indicators are discussed in detail in the following sections. Reflective of the multiple levels of activity undertaken by the global and country level EEA programs, the evaluation process was divided into two stages:

1. A country-level evaluation framework, which included questionnaires,⁴ focus group discussion protocols and reporting templates that were developed and finalized in late-2008. Surveys were then made available, translated into several local languages, and tested and adapted by each country in early-2009. Country report drafts were then made available for review and feedback, and were subsequently revised based on feedback received from USAID and other stakeholders.
2. A global evaluation framework with a set of common indicators was finalized in early-2009, and data aggregation from country level reports and analysis of overall findings began in June-2009. Findings from this global evaluation are provided within this report; however, they build heavily on aggregated findings from the country level reports referenced above.

The evaluation used a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods including focus group discussions with youth, the administration of surveys, and key informant interviews. The survey tools were developed to measure how EEA performed against indicators set forth under each IR and to generate discussions leading to a better understanding of the motivations, behavior and perspectives of EEA partners, employers and the youth.

As a part of the final evaluation, 711 youth from across all five countries of focus were surveyed through questionnaires, one-on-one interviews, group interviews, and focus group meetings. In addition, 70 employers and 62 alliance partners of whom 30 were implementing partners and 32 were country-level alliance members were interviewed. Finally, given the inherently qualitative nature of some aspects of alliance building that are not capable of precise measurement, this report includes anecdotal facts and testimonials that illustrate the utility of the alliance for youth, implementing partners, employers and their families.

D. Evaluation Challenges and Limitations

While the evaluation was conducted with significant rigor and extensive support from numerous program partners in data collection, several constraints are noteworthy. Such constraints often were centered around the inherent difficulty of aggregating numerous programs of different types, timeframes, partnership structures and partner capacity under one uniform umbrella for the purpose of data aggregation and analysis. More specifically, the team faced the following challenges:

Time Constraints: Most projects were completed between September and December 2008, with the exception of projects in Egypt, which continued until April 2009, and some Moroccan projects that continued until June 2009. Due to time and budget limitations, the process of collecting the data for the final project reports started in February 2009, with an understanding that some available data, particularly for the programs still ongoing, would not be based on fully completed projects. Because of this difficulty, the evaluation team relied on the triangulation method to measure particular change such as learning acquisition to ensure findings provided a realistic view of program achievements. Where appropriate, the team also attempted to divide certain projects into training cohorts that had completed training and placement activities, and those cohorts that were still within training programs as the evaluation data collection was being finalized. Such division of training cohorts is footnoted as relevant.

Data Uniformity: EEA pilot projects significantly varied in terms of the target beneficiaries, age, type and duration of training offered and placement strategies. For example, Egypt provided two to five-day job readiness courses to very large numbers of university students and basic job matching support, while Indonesia and the Philippines offered an average six-month (for in-class and on-the-job) vocational skills training to more limited numbers of out-of-school youth, together with direct job placement services with employers who frequently participating in training. Morocco on the other hand provided a much longer skills training and placed youth in one-year long internships. Such diversity made an overall evaluation, particularly data aggregation and analysis, extremely challenging. Therefore, while the evaluation team made every effort to compare and present the results of interventions across all countries, some exceptions were important to consider and have been put forward despite the team's original hope for full

⁴ Five surveys were developed for different stakeholder groups: youth, employers, alliance members, implementing partners and secretariats. See Annex I.

uniformity in presentation. Other country-specific challenges have also been elaborated in country reports and where such challenges have been found, the evaluation team has sought to fully disclose such issues. Nonetheless, while such limitations are inherent in any multi-country evaluation of this nature, the evaluation team has tried to provide an objective analysis of program outcomes across five countries and overall believes that the evaluation produces significantly relevant program learnings with a high degree of quality for further analysis.

Tracking Graduates: Another challenge was difficulty tracking and accessing program graduates from EEA-supported job training programs, particularly those who were working far away from original training sites. In this respect, as EEA concluded, it was challenging to get appointments with graduates who had already begun working to attend survey administration and focus group discussions. While random sampling was not an option, surveys and focus group discussions were administered after work in the evening or on weekends to maximize youth involvement. Where possible, surveys were mailed out to some graduates and follow-up telephone interviews took place. Therefore, purposive sampling is considered another limitation of the study. Additionally, in limited cases where data were available on program participants but not on job placement, particularly six months after program completion as required under the EEA global indicator, the team has not included the number of beneficiaries under such programs when performing an overall assessment of employment outcomes of the program.

Evaluator Independence: Finally, this study is inherently limited by the lack of a fully external evaluation of program outcomes, as each of the evaluators has over time provided evaluation and other support to EEA country programs and partners during the course of program implementation. Given both resource constraints and the desire to leverage the broad experience of program participants to fully compare and contrast approaches used in the different countries for governance, program design, leveraging of resources and other elements, a strategic decision was made to utilize participants in the overall program to support this evaluation. In the interest of promoting learnings and improvement, the EEA teams have done their best to fully express challenges and problems within programs and the alliance structure, grounded in the reality of their experience in the program. However, the study does have this inherent limitation, which is important to disclose fully.

Section II: Summary of Global Results

Overall, this evaluation finds that the EEA program has shown important progress in core activity areas of the program, most specifically in:

- Developing a broad platform for building public-private alliances that increased resources and expertise available for supporting youth employability aims
- Increasing the avenues for long term sustainability and scaling of successful pilots, particularly by providing a means for local partners with strong community connections to “plug into” alliance-based structures and integrate best practices into their own networks
- Promoting greater relevance and support for training programs by closely involving employers in program design, training and oversight of activities

Specific outcomes of the program within these overall findings are presented in the following sections, using the specific indicators set forth by the EEA program’s Intermediate Results as a guide. In summary, the most relevant findings under each of these Intermediate Results include:

Figure 2: EEA’s Accomplishments and Challenges

Accomplishments	Challenges
IR I: Alliance Building and Leveraging Resources	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirty-five pilot projects were designed and implemented across five countries. Approximately 78% of 37 partner organizations had not previously worked with USAID, demonstrating the broad engagement of new stakeholders in youth employability programs. • \$9.3 million was raised in leverage contributions of which 31% was in cash and the rest were in-kind contributions. • Partnerships were forged with 319 multi-sector organizations (25% represented governments, 45% local and multinational corporations and 30% local NGOs). • Utility of the alliance approach demonstrated through improved program quality, relevance, scalability and sustainability. • Seventy-seven percent of thirty responding implementers rated the EEA alliance experience as <i>better</i> than other project experiences using non-alliance approaches. • Approximately forty percent of the 35 projects supported by EEA continued to be active following the conclusion of USAID support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alliance building process was more time-consuming and resource-intensive than anticipated. Challenges included lack of sufficient resources allocated for alliance building and coordination efforts, and complexities involved in working with multiple partners. • Some partners felt alliance building focus took away their time and focus from the actual delivery of programmatic activities.
IR II: Improved Access to and Relevance of Education and Employability Training	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An aggregated 29,873 (vs. 24,210 target) youth participated in various technical/vocational, entrepreneurship and life skills training - 57% male and 43% female. • A total of 26,006 completed the training achieving 87% completion rate. Dropout rate was relatively low at 13%. • A total of 432 trainers were trained (vs. 388 targeted). • Youth satisfaction with the training was high. Over ninety percent of 558 respondents reported gaining new technical and life skills. Of nearly 300 youth respondents, 73% rated their internships as <i>good</i> or <i>excellent</i>. • Employer satisfaction was high. Of employers surveyed, 79% rated the overall performance of EEA graduates as either <i>good</i> or <i>excellent</i>. • Sixty percent of employers interviewed rated EEA graduates as <i>better</i> than other employees of similar age 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversubscription and inability to serve all interested youth posed challenges • Monitoring and ensuring the quality of training as durations and curricula varied by project. • There was difficulty recruiting female participants for certain types of technical training in a few countries. • Not all EEA graduates were ready to work as many were enrolled in high school or universities. As such, comparing country data proved to be challenging.

<p>groups. Additionally, 96% of responding employers stated that EEA program was closing the gap between employers' needs and the employees' qualifications.</p>	
IR III: Improved Prospects for Employment and Successful Entrepreneurship	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of 8,580 graduates ready to work, 4,801 graduates (56%) secured jobs or set up small businesses. Of these 4,801 youth, 3,843 were placed in jobs and 958 set up small businesses. Against an initial target of 7,046 youth to become employed or self-employed, EEA attained the overall employment rate of 68% against this target. • Approximately 84% of over 200 respondents (working youth) were satisfied with the overall work environment while 60% were happy with their salaries. • Youth-led enterprises created over 500 additional jobs. • Most of the new businesses created are sustainable and viable. Eighty percent of the 127 respondents (entrepreneurs) reported making profits. • Half of the surveyed entrepreneurs who had previous jobs reported to be earning more income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding jobs for out-of-school youth with no job experience in fluctuating job markets and in the midst of global economic crisis. • Some trainees were still undergoing one to two-year internships at the time of evaluation, and placements could not be tracked. • Negotiating fair compensation because of reluctance of employers to hire out-of-school youth and offer fair compensation packages was difficult. There was greater need for post-training support than anticipated given transition of marginalized youth into unfamiliar job environments.
IR IV: Positive Indirect Effect on Families and Communities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of 238 youth responded, 75% were found to be financially helping their families. • Of 295 youth responded, 82% reported varying degrees of improvements in social and economic situations of families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some youth were still earning minimum wage and trying to make ends meet.

EEA's global accomplishments are built upon activities and achievements within each EEA country of operation. Full evaluations from Egypt, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan and the Philippines are included as separate annexes (see Annexes C-G) of this report, which tracks program achievements against the intermediate results and indicators utilized in this global framework. In summary, significant findings with respect to each country include:

Egypt: EEA Egypt piloted innovative, new approaches to provide employability skills training for 17,644 young Egyptians at universities and youth centers. This large number of youth served by EEA was a direct result of the program's success in penetrating Egypt's challenging public sector to directly reach youth with needed services. In fact, twelve MOUs have been signed with additional faculties at Cairo University and four more public universities to replicate the career development model pending available resources. Additionally, through its alliance building model, the program has been able to build an extensive network of private sector and NGO partners that leveraged nearly \$3 million in cash and in kind resources to increase service offerings and reach a larger number of participants. As detailed further in the EEA Egypt report, while extremely successful in accessing youth for the provision of needed training and career counseling, the program focused more heavily on short courses and career counseling, with a less robust job and internship matching service provided as compared to other EEA programs with more lengthy interventions for smaller cohorts. As such, of those youth tracked, a total of 484 trainees obtained a job and 402 set up small businesses out of 5,875 students who were ready to enter the employment market or start small businesses. As the program looks to expand based on the available opportunities, such findings and approaches are being re-examined and refined to both maximize the program's entry into the formal sector while providing more robust job training and placement services.

Indonesia: EEA Indonesia reached a total of 13,202 people of which 12,686 are direct youth beneficiaries and 516 are indirect who received additional jobs created through enterprise development.⁵ Of 1,286 graduates who were ready to work, 1,074 youth became employed or self-employed. EEA Indonesia contributed to establishing a culture of working in alliances and worked with over 65 partners that provided over \$1.27 million in leverage contributions. A number of subgrant projects have demonstrated to be sustainable with continued support from alliance partners. Among important challenges faced by the program was a higher level of management support

⁵ This aggregated number included 7,655 Nike factory operators who received a life skills training, 3,232 vocational high school students who received entrepreneurship training, and nearly 1,000 youth who received a two-day short course on managing T-shirt franchises in Bandung.

and coordination efforts than anticipated to implement eleven projects, which in turn brought forward a perception by some partners that the alliance building process was too challenging and time-consuming. In another area, EEA Indonesia learned that graduates who started working or running businesses after six months of completion still needed substantial support from the program, which faced time and resource constraints in attempting to provide such support before the overall EEA program ended.

Morocco: MEEA has been devoted to developing and expanding job training, placement and entrepreneurship programs for disadvantaged youth in Morocco. MEEA implemented seven training and placement projects in such sectors as computer refurbishment and repair, textile, tourism, preschool teaching, and basic vocational trades, and raised over \$2.4 million in leverage. A total of 2,238 youth participated in MEEA-supported technical and life skills training of whom 1,688 completed the training. Three-hundred graduates have been placed in jobs, 15 graduates have set up small businesses, and over 700 are currently undergoing one to two-year internships. The MEEA approach fostered a new culture in Morocco through the six NGOs that implemented the MEEA projects. MEEA appears to have shifted its partners' perspective from working in isolation using their limited resources and capacities to working in partnership with other organizations and leveraging resources, sharing knowledge, exchanging services and expertise. In this respect, the Alliance grew to include over forty active partners ranging from local businesses and associations to government ministries, international foundations and multinational corporations. Using such partnerships, one of MEEA's key successes is the replication or scale up of six pilot projects. These new partnerships have helped and will continue helping with project continuation, sustainability, and most importantly, with placement in internships and jobs.

Pakistan: EEA-Pakistan supported six workforce development projects which trained a total of 1,406 youth and placed 551 youth in jobs in customer service, IT, and hospitality industries. Additionally, more than 10,000 trainees across 100 vocational training institutes throughout Punjab benefitted from basic IT training improved through EEA. EEA-Pakistan provided capacity building support to sub-grantees who in turn built project-focused public-private alliances that added value in terms of technical inputs around curriculum development, community mobilization, and job placement. The Alliance also raised leverage resources totaling \$862,742 in support of expanding these programs. Among significant challenges faced was the inability of some project partners to track graduates who got jobs through quasi-government training institutes or set up small businesses in remote areas. Additionally, the program faced significant difficulty in recruiting female participants in some technical training programs because of social norms, although it was able to create opportunities for those who were willing and able to participate. For example, a hospitality training program revealed employment opportunities for women to cook in restaurants and hotels, a trade previously considered to be exclusively reserved for Pakistani men. One highlight of the training programs initiated under EEA was the ASK Development project, which has continued to train young people and place them in jobs with follow-on funding from the National Vocational and Technical Education Commission (NAVTEC).

Philippines: EEA Philippines supported six integrated employability skills training projects and reached an aggregated 3,036 youth. Of 2,669 youth who completed the training, 1,794 have been placed in jobs and 167 have set up small businesses. Overall program success is attributed to the ability of partners to help prepare graduates for the job market by providing both technical and soft skills and acquire government educational equivalency certificates in place of high school diplomas. Lack of willingness from industries to hire out-of-school youth with minimal formal educational experience and work experience was a major challenge, but active liaison and networking with industries and follow-up meetings with internship providers proved to be helpful. As in Indonesia, youth in the Philippines expressed a desire to receive more post-training, counseling support particularly after their short-term contracts expired – which most partners were not able to provide because of time and resource constraints. As part of its sustainability strategy, EEA supported local governments in developing their own community supported employability programs for youth which built upon successful approaches used during the EEA program. This new initiative has been launched as the Youth Productivity Services in Misamis Oriental which is reaching 450 additional youth and testing a platform for long term support by local governments of community-based training initiatives.

Section III: Findings and Analytical Review of Program Achievements

Intermediate Result I: Alliance Building and Leveraging Resources

Intermediate Result I for the EEA program focused on EEA’s ability to build and develop effective alliances in support of youth education and employability needs. In this respect, the design of the EEA program anticipated that the program could set forward measurements for the effectiveness of alliance building processes, as well as for the ability of created alliances to promote more scalable, sustainable and cost effective interventions in support of youth needs. As it looked to measure EEA’s performance in this respect, the program focused on several indicators that could help assess progress toward this intermediate result. They included:

Figure 3: IR I Indicators

LEVERAGE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 1.1: In-kind and cash resources leveraged for the EEA program through private sector, government, civil society and other partners
ALLIANCE BUILDING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 1.2: Number of private sector, government and civil society partnerships formed through EEA to offer employment and entrepreneurship training
SUSTAINABILITY AND SCALABILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 1.3: Effectiveness of the EEA alliance approach in building partnerships and promoting sustainable and scalable youth employability programs Indicator 1.4: Non-target institutions that requested to adopt the EEA program, models and tools as part of their activities

Summary of Intermediate Result I Findings

Several findings discussed in more detail in the following subsections are of note. In particular, with respect to leveraging of resources and building of partnerships, EEA made significant strides. In this respect, across five countries, over \$9.3 million in cash and in-kind resources were leveraged from a large array of over 300 partners across the public and private sectors as well as civil society. This amount exceeded original targets set forth at 3:1 against USAID seed funding of approximately \$2.9 million, and also exceeded a 1:1 ratio against overall USAID funding of \$9 million toward both country and global activities. Similarly, with respect to partnerships, a significant additional finding relates to the number of new partnerships formed with groups who traditionally have not worked with USAID. With respect to the 37 primary implementing partners in the program who have received direct USAID support, 78% of 37 partner organizations (including Secretariats) had not received support from USAID before the EEA program. While direct surveys on this issue were not undertaken with non-USAID funded recipients under the program (e.g., local corporate leverage partners), anecdotally, many of these partners, likely at a similar percentage, have also not worked in partnership with USAID previously.

Additionally, EEA earned high marks for its collaborative strategy. Seventy-seven percent of thirty implementing partners rated the EEA model and experience as *better* or *much better* compared to previous programs they had conducted in the youth employment field but without a strong focus on forming partnerships and gathering leverage from other stakeholders to support activities.

This expansive network of partnerships formed was found to be directly relevant with respect to indicators attempting to measure sustainability, scalability and cost effectiveness of the overall program. In general terms, the five country evaluations find that USAID-seed funds were able to attract the attention of a significant number of new partners and fuel additional contributions from these partners in support of programs. The interest of these partners, grounded in direct contributions they made to project activities, helped set the stage for further, second stage activities once initial projects matured and showed success. The second stage of these partnerships in turn helped expand the number of beneficiaries reached, and brought forward new avenues for sustainability beyond USAID support through revenue generation,

continuation of activities with implementing partner resources or contributions of other local, national or international stakeholders. In sum, approximately forty percent of the 35 projects supported by EEA continued to be active following the conclusion of USAID support. The figure below summarizes the sustainability status of each country, and section 1.3 below provides further examples of programs sustained following EEA interventions.

Figure 4: Country-level Sustainability Status

Country	Country-level Sustainability Status
Egypt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alliance activities largely continue with the new grant from IYF/Samsung benefitting approximately 2,500 youth. • MOUs have been signed with 12 university faculties to replicate the career development model. • Revenue-generating models will be introduced at universities for self-sustainability.
Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National alliance – Steering Board – expressed interest in continuing its role as an organized group advocating for youth employability issues. It may be sustained with support from the National Secretariat. • Two projects are being replicated and are providing life skills and entrepreneurship training for an estimated 30,000 Nike factory operators and 3,000 vocational high school students.
Morocco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Education’s Casablanca Academy’s vocational training centers adopted the EEA skills training model. • A number of NGOs and donors (such as Silatech, Finnish Children & Youth Foundation, Near East Foundation, Fondation Auteuil) requested to fund the EEA project model and methodologies for expansion of phase 1 projects into new government or NGO venues. • Emploi Habilité training program is being replicated in Tétouan-Tangiers. • National alliance ceased activities as EEA funding ceased.
Pakistan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 10,000 trainees at Vocational Training Institutes anticipated benefiting annually from the curriculum improved through EEA. • The National Vocational and Technical Education Commission provided \$100,000 to an EEA partner, ASK Development, to continue a second phase of EEA skills training. • Additional investments are being made by outside partners to scale and sustain EEA pilot activities in the Service and Compressed Natural Gas industries. • National alliance did not continue post Secretariat operations ending in early-2009.
Philippines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial government launched an alliance project, based on the EEA model, to train 450 youth in Misamis Oriental. • Similar alliance-driven skills training activities continue benefitting 600 youth under the new IYF/Wrigley grant for the Rizal Province. • Working with local networks including trade associations in growth areas helped ensure long term sustainability and effective outcomes. • National alliance ceased operations as Secretariat operations ended in mid-2009.

While such findings are compelling, the evaluation also found that developing and nurturing an alliance-based framework to support programs presented unique challenges that are important to address in future efforts. In this respect, EEA partner NGOs found that building relationships with non-traditional development partners, such as corporations, governments and local corporations, was a challenge that required more time and effort since trust and positive relationships needed to be developed. Similarly, NGOs found that new knowledge and skills were needed, particularly in linking youth training with employment, strategizing how to build alliances and identifying other resources to sustain projects. As such, it was perceived across all countries that allocating time for alliance coordination and management work cut into project implementing schedules and the ability to reach anticipated outcomes under IR II. Detailed evaluation findings concerning alliance building and leveraging resources are presented under each of the following indicators under the program’s global evaluative framework.

Indicator 1.1: In-kind and cash resources leveraged for the project through private sector, government, civil society and other partners

The EEA alliance structures helped to leverage a high ratio of cash and in-kind resources for youth, most of whom were at-risk, out of school and poor. The original targets of 3:1 against seed funds have been exceeded, with USAID country seed grants of \$2,890,133 leveraged by a total of \$9,338,218 in cash and in-kind resources, or a ratio of 3.2 to 1. Cash contributions totaled \$2,930,333 or 31% of the total leverage. In-kind contributions equaled \$6,407,885 or 69% of the total leverage. In-kind contributions were donated in forms of land, equipment, curriculum materials, learning software, trainers and stipends for interns, among other items. See Annex B for the typology of alliance partners and leverage contributions by country.

Individual country leverage ratios ranged from \$1.5 to \$1 in Pakistan to as high as \$5.3 to \$1 in Egypt, as described in Figure 5 below. It should be noted also that such ratios likely do not fully capture all resources accessed by the program in support of overall objectives, particularly time donated by Steering Committee members and the full resource costs donated through drawing linkages to governments. Similarly, to the extent new phases of programs have been initiated in the last quarter of the program to support the scalability and sustainability of EEA interventions, these have not been counted given the reduced management time at the country level available to track and calculate such contributions. Figure 5 presents leverage contributions by country:

Figure 5: Leverage Contributions by Country

Country	Number of Projects	USAID Grant	Leverage Contributions			Leverage Ratio
			Total	Cash	In-kind	
Egypt	5	\$565,500	\$2,985,245	\$1,043,104	\$1,942,141	5.3 :1
Indonesia	11	\$581,592	\$1,272,310	\$386,958	\$885,353	2.2:1
Morocco	7	\$538,825	\$2,415,240	\$543,719	\$1,871,521	4.5:1
Pakistan	6	\$586,248	\$862,742	\$177,829	\$684,913	1.5:1
Philippines	6	\$617,968	\$1,802,681	\$778,723	\$1,023,958	2.9:1
Total/Average	35	\$2,890,133	\$9,338,218	\$2,930,333	\$6,407,885	3.2:1

Indicator 1.2: Number of private sector, government and civil society partnerships formed through EEA to offer employment and business development training activities

While the program did not set overall goals for the number of partnerships formed in support of program goals, the number of such partnerships formed significantly exceeded expectations. In this respect, the evaluation study finds that EEA has been effective in forging vibrant public-private alliances that were critical in generating new leverage resources to support and expand programs, and to drive a partnership model that can engender greater innovation and broader support amongst relevant stakeholders. Through 35 pilot projects, EEA established relationships with 319 public-private sector organizations, including local governments, local and multinational corporations, community-based organizations, implementing partner NGOs and training institutions. Figure 6 presents the number of EEA partners by sector in each country.

Figure 6: Number and Types of Alliance Partners by Country

Country	Government	Private Sector	NGO	International Organization	Total Number of Partners
Egypt	9	47	21	3	80
Indonesia	7	36	20	2	65
Morocco	9	21	14	1	45
Pakistan	5	3	11	0	19
Philippines	51	35	21	3	110
Total	81	142	87	9	319

Partnerships were forged with both local and multinational corporations which were potential employers to: 1) leverage more cash and in-kind resources; 2) serve on steering or advisory committees; 3) design or improve curricula; 4) motivate and mentor youth during the training; and 5) offer apprenticeships and subsequently jobs. On the field level, a number of EEA projects involved communities, parents and

teachers who provided training venues and other support to make sure youth completed their training and found jobs.

Additionally, EEA worked closely with the national and local government agencies in various areas including:

- Recruiting youth from hard-to-reach areas and outreach efforts. For example, in the Philippines, over sixty percent of 86 youth surveyed said they learned about the program through local governments.
- Providing financial and other support to the implementation of youth employability training activities. For instance, EEA Egypt worked closely with public universities and the National Youth Council and its Centers to provide employability training to youth. In West Java, the local government donated land to young entrepreneurs to set up catfish farms.
- Offering services such as trade competency testing and necessary licensing, often to help out-of-school youth who lack high school diplomas to get jobs in countries such as the Philippines and Indonesia.
- Replicating the EEA model and approaches as locally-owned initiatives or serving as part of local committees established to continue providing support to youth-led businesses in countries such as Indonesia, Morocco, and the Philippines.

The study also involved 32 national alliance members who shared the reasons they participated in the alliance.⁶ Responses are presented in an order of importance to these organizations:

- to help youth acquire relevant employability skills and become employed
- *Youth Development* is part of our institutional concerns
- to support community development
- to engage in good corporate social responsibility (CSR) practice
- because of an invitation from a reputable organization

The partnership-building experience, however, was not without challenges. While at a macro level, alliances seem to yield valuable benefits, the alliance development process can appear unwieldy and challenging especially in countries where working in alliances was a relatively new idea such as Indonesia and Morocco. Significant amount of resources were required for developing and strengthening alliances. Some sub-grantees in Egypt interviewed shared that the time involved in creating alliances and meeting leverage requirements at times took focus away from the delivery of core programmatic activities. Some sub-grantees in Indonesia also expressed their reservations about implementing similar alliance projects in the future because of the complexities involved, such as the need to: take a participatory approach in design and implementation; invest more time and resources in engaging a broad segment of partners with a broad diversity of experience in such efforts; and negotiate with various parties in the case of conflicts. Nonetheless, despite such challenges as articulated by partners, it appears that such alliance building efforts did yield tangible benefits as noted in the overall findings of this IR.

Indicator 1.3: Effectiveness of the EEA Alliance approach in building partnerships and promoting sustainable and scalable youth employability programs

This section focuses on the effectiveness of the EEA program model through a number of relevant subtopics, including:

- The value and effectiveness of the Secretariat
- The role of Steering Committees
- The value of an overall alliance approach in promoting sustainable and scalable projects
- The sustainability of alliance-based interventions
- The scalability of alliance-based interventions
- The cost-effectiveness of the EEA model

In each of these areas, the study gathered perspectives from an array of alliance partners, including implementing partners, Steering Committee members and private sector partners, through surveys and interviews.

⁶ National alliance members include Steering Committee members, corporate partners and other alliance partners who were not lead implementing partners. A separate survey was developed solely for lead implementing partners. See Annex I.

Effectiveness of Secretariats: During the first two years, IYF invested significant resources in building the capacity of National Secretariats based on their identified needs, particularly in areas of building and reinforcing alliances, setting up a sub-award monitoring system, leverage raising, conducting due diligence, financial management and overall program management. The Secretariats subsequently shared their acquired knowledge and skills in these areas with all implementing partners through capacity building workshops and regular technical support visits. The Secretariats - with substantial support from Steering Boards in countries such as Morocco and Egypt - also played a critical role in establishing linkages with the private sector and governments for some projects. The ability to attract local businesses to join the alliance and play a substantive role has been noted as one of the major achievements of the EEA program.

All 32 national alliance members interviewed stated that the Secretariats were effective in supporting the work of the alliance. The following are the three areas frequently quoted as most effective across the five countries:

- Designing innovative youth education and employability projects
- Implementing a transparent grant-making process
- Providing technical assistance to partners during the start-up and throughout implementation

The study also asked thirty lead implementing partners how effective the Secretariats were in providing technical assistance and meeting their organizational needs. Across five countries, all implementers reported receiving assistance from the Secretariat in the following areas: designing and implementing youth employability projects using the alliance approach, technical training, partnership linkages, institutional development, monitoring and evaluation, financial management, and trouble shooting.

Of 28 implementing partners (out of thirty) responded to this specific question, 25 or 89% rated the quality of assistance received as either *good* or *excellent* – which demonstrated the importance of establishing local management structures on the ground to provide direct assistance. Of these 28 respondents (partners), one partner from Indonesia rated the assistance as *fair*, expressing a desire to receive more support with entrepreneurship interventions particularly with marketing and product development. Two partners from Egypt and Morocco rated it as *poor*, citing their desire for more monitoring and technical support visits. There was a sense among some alliance members that it would have been useful for alliance members to participate more actively and collectively in outreach events and advocate for a broader policy framework to promote EEA.

Effectiveness of Steering Committees: EEA established Steering Committees and the study assessed the role and contributions of the Committee members across five countries. The Committees were composed of multi-sector alliance members, including development practitioners, government officials, corporate partners and civil society groups. Depending on the country and individual, Steering Committee members may have represented their organizations or themselves. The study finds that Steering Committees were most active in the alliance building, program design and early implementation stages across five countries. A robust process put in place to encourage Board participation resulted in collaboration among Board members and alliance partners with Secretariats playing a facilitation role. At the program outset, the Board met quarterly or more to review proposals, provide suggestions to strengthen program designs, and approve subgrant activities that would best support EEA program goals. In Egypt and Morocco, Steering Board members made major contributions to the program by opening up relationships with public institutions, gaining formal agreements with the National Youth Council, and forming linkages with the private sector. These contacts proved critical to the integration of the EEA model into both public and private sector environments.

It was also noted however that most EEA countries struggled to sustain active participation of some Board members after seed funds were allocated. With less focused activity where they could direct their insight and advice, Board participation naturally waned in most countries. In Indonesia, however, some Steering Committee members were also corporate partners who provided financial support to projects; and therefore, several members continued to be closely involved in program implementation and helped brainstorm ideas to strengthen select activities throughout the program.

Effectiveness of the Alliance Approach: Evaluation findings suggest that the use of an alliance approach had an effect on the following elements of the EEA program: program quality, sustainability and scale, and resource efficiency.

- 1) **Program Quality:** The alliance approach encouraged EEA projects to engage corporate partners or employers meaningfully from the program outset. EEA's strategy and ability to include its multi-sector alliance partners in various aspects of program implementation beyond leverage contributions appears to have positive effects on the quality and relevance of training provided and types of internships and jobs made available. Strategies, such as having corporate partners review and approve training modules and serve as mentors for participants, helped EEA training activities to be demand-driven, high quality, and relevant. Projects that provided employers with access to a pool of qualified graduates and helped them see business benefits beyond social benefits, achieved strong placement rates. Of particular note, as discussed in more detail under indicators 2.4-2.6 below, youth were highly satisfied with training programs and 79% of employers rated beneficiary youth as either *good* or *excellent*.
- 2) **Sustainability and Scalability:** EEA encouraged its partners to consider sustainability and scalability at the program outset, and particular attention was given to successful pilots. As projects showed tangible results, project-level alliances explored different opportunities for scale-up and sustainability. An estimated forty percent of projects were successful in sustaining or scaling-up EEA project activities with support from EEA or outside partners (detailed in the sustainability and scaling up sections below). At the project level, the study finds strong examples across countries of tested partnerships starting a second stage to expand EEA initiated efforts to both scale and sustain efforts perceived as successful. Examples include the following:
 - a. In Morocco, the Ministry of Education's Casablanca Academy's vocational training centers adopted EEA's IT and life skills training.
 - b. Similarly, in the Philippines, the local government in Misamis Oriental is running a locally-owned vocational training program, modeled on EEA, benefitting an initial group of 450 students while Wrigley Company is supporting alliance activities in Antipolo for 600 additional youth.
 - c. In Egypt, a government youth center adopted EEA's "One Stop Shop" projects with a view towards outreach to 4,500 other centers across the country. Samsung Electronics is supporting EEA project activities at both universities and youth centers reaching 2,500 additional youth.
 - d. In Pakistan, a government agency is working with an EEA partner, ASK Development, implementing a second phase of EEA skills training.
 - e. In Indonesia, Junior Achievement is continuing to work with EEA corporate partners to implement a second phase of its entrepreneurship training benefitting an additional 3,000 vocational high school students.
- 3) **Resource Efficiency:** Initial USAID investments made in implementing 35 projects were supplemented by leverage contributions from partners at an average 3:1 leverage ratio. The leverage requirements made certain that partners were not overly dependent on EEA funding, and as a result of contributions, interventions appeared reasonably cost efficient at a unit cost of approximately \$600 per trainee (see the cost-effectiveness section below for details). More importantly, alliance partners occupied roles as equal stakeholders, in that they contributed their own resources while the EEA approach, methodologies and partnerships were tested in the most resource-intensive pilot phase.
- 4) **Social Empowerment Effects:** Anecdotal evidence suggested that the use of the alliance approach improved the self-confidence and social standing of graduates. Interviews with field program managers suggested that the approach also provided them with a sense of community, particularly those who are either employed or self-employed and contributing to their families.

Alliance Participants' Perspectives and Attitudes

Surveys with partners also explored how national alliance and implementing partners generally benefitted from working with alliances. In this area, survey results indicated that the partners felt greater capabilities after EEA in terms of developing new partnerships in support of their work and in designing and implementing demand-driven, alliance-based interventions. For most partners in Indonesia and Morocco, for example, working in public-private alliances was a novel idea, and their EEA experience helped them learn how to build and maintain alliances. The following are the areas commonly identified by partners as added benefits in their survey responses:

- Ability to become part of the extensive network of public-private sector organizations that work on youth employability issues, and access to financial and technical support from the alliance

- Enhanced credibility of individual organizations by being associated with the country-alliance
- Learning management accountability and transparency
- Systematic exchange of ideas, expertise and good practices around designing, implementing and evaluating employability projects, as well as motivating companies and communities to maximizing empowerment programs
- Strengthened organizational capacity in terms of program management, communications and business development skills
- Improved training modules and methodologies
- Ability to access a large pool of graduates and recruit employees

Furthermore, implementing partners were asked to what extent EEA influenced them to improve their capacities to work with youth or become advocates, and 93% of thirty partners reported varying degrees of influence or change. Specifically, 19 or 63% of thirty partners reported a great deal of influence whereas 33% or ten partners reported some influence.

Of thirty implementing partners surveyed, 29 partners have had experience implementing youth projects using non-alliance approaches. When they were asked to compare their EEA experience with other project experience, 23 or 77% of thirty partners who responded rated the EEA alliance experience as *better* or *much better* because of the following reasons:

- Receipt of significant support from government and businesses
- More interaction and linkages with partners and stakeholders together with responsiveness of EEA
- Opportunity to improve organizational capacity in managing youth programs by interfacing with others from whom they could learn
- Likelihood of alliance programs such as EEA to be more transparent and manageable because of the greater number of partners taking an interest in the initiative

Five or 17% of thirty implementing partners responded felt the EEA approach was *similar* to other program models, whereas two partners recounted the EEA experience as *worse* expressing their reservations about implementing similar alliance projects in the future because the complexities involved, such as the need to take a participatory approach in design and implementation, to invest more time and resources in engaging a broad segment of partners with a broad diversity of experience in such efforts, to focus consistently on finding new leverage contributions, and to negotiate with various parties in the case of conflicts. Of seven partners who rated the experience as *similar* or *worse*, six were in Indonesia and one represented Morocco. This finding appears closely linked with the fact that the alliance building was a relatively new idea. Additionally, the Indonesia Alliance, due to USAID rules in this country, had to conduct due diligence on over thirty companies that were program supporters which proved to be time- and resource-intensive and caused delays.

Additionally, survey findings suggest that a majority of partners felt that the use of alliance approach has had a positive influence on program outcomes. When asked to determine the level of effect of the EEA alliance approach on the program using a scale of one to five, the highest ratings of four to five were given by 79% of 28 implementing partners responded, with the rating of three by the remaining 21% of the partners.

Scaling up: A review of project outcomes and activities across all countries, together with data gathered as a part of evaluation surveys and focus groups with key stakeholders, suggests that the EEA program has provided a number of important avenues for scaling up project activities through the participation and support of project partners. No precise model can be identified for such scale-up occurring in different countries, but in a number of circumstances project partners (initially at the suggestion of and with the participation of IYF, national secretariats and/or USAID), gathered together based on a common understanding of challenges in the development of youth and came to general agreement about the need to support such activities. USAID seed funds were then used as an incentive and driver throughout the partnership development process, ensuring that partnership agreements and commitments would be rewarded with concrete resources and program implementation would take place.

As programs were designed and implemented, substantial technical assistance was provided by IYF, national steering committees, national secretariats, USAID and other advisors to the program to help ensure soundness of the technical intervention and the integration of key partners that could support the program in the long term. One critical area of focus for most of these programs was attention provided to

the scalability prospects for the program over time, a focus that helped to encourage partners and implementers to provide strong support for successful implementation during the pilot phase. As pilot phases matured, partnerships were tested and such avenues for scalability were more fully explored. In certain cases, assuming both time and resource availability, USAID seed funds were provided to support such scaling up. For example, in Morocco, the *Emploi Habilité* training program providing life skills, technical skills and internships in partnership with local government, is presently being replicated in the region of Tétouan-Tangier, as a first step towards scaling up the program more broadly across other cities. Building on the success of its first phase, the second phase took the model of IT and life skills training and integrated this package into the Ministry of Education's Casablanca Academy's vocational training centers – *Centres de Formation par Apprentissage* (CFA).

In other cases, scaling was through new resources, provided by either non-USAID resource partners in phase one of a pilot or other funders that were not present during phase one as partners or donors. For instance, in Egypt, public sector involvement is a key component of the program design in order to promote scale and sustainability, and the program's strategy to partner with formal, public sector institutions to build the foundation for this expansion is the key ingredient to scalability. In this respect, a government Youth Center adopted EEAs "One Stop Shop" package of services, which EEA encouraged with a view towards outreach to 4,500 other centers across the country that could potentially learn from this model. Additionally, twelve MOUs have been signed with additional faculties at Cairo University and four more public universities to replicate the career development model pending available resources. One finding of particular note was that scaling through public institutions was promoted substantially through leveraging certain members of steering committees or other advisors who had a unique understanding and familiarity with the workings of government. Such understanding and familiarity was often vital to moving complex partnership models through bureaucratic systems and finalizing the commitment of public institutions to reform. Additionally, while no comprehensive findings can be made in this respect, the alliance platform also appears to have served to benefit reform-minded steering committee members, who were able to use this platform to promote concrete, resource supported reforms and build a constituency in support of more systemic change.

Scaling up, however, also presented unique challenges that should be addressed in future efforts. In particular, insufficient time was available to fully monitor and observe and to provide needed technical assistance to programs during their scale up phases. This was directly relevant to initiatives in the public sector, where focusing on the quality of government trainers and providing constant feedback and mentoring to the system is essential. Similarly, resource constraints in specific areas related to government compensation and incentives can also pose real obstacles to the scaling of initiatives. In this respect, a consistent challenge appears to be the provision of incentives or additional pay to government employees who, after participating in an EEA supported effort, are expected to integrate new teaching approaches and activities into their daily responsibilities, with no or minimal additional compensation.

Alliance Sustainability: Alliance sustainability was viewed through two prisms – the sustainability of project-level activities, and the sustainability of broader, alliance-based systems and approaches among the broader set of stakeholders participating in EEA country alliances.

Project Level Sustainability: In assessing the sustainability of EEA program's specifically, the evaluation team focused primarily on the ability of EEA program activities to sustain themselves without USAID support upon the conclusion of the EEA program. In this area, the evaluation team found that by program end, in all countries, approximately forty percent of EEA projects directly effecting youth were being continued, either adopted by government, sustained with new donor resources, or continued on by EEA partner NGOs as part of their programs and strategic directions. The training curricula developed or improved for many EEA programs in Indonesia, Pakistan and the Philippines also continued to be utilized, which is another mark of sustainability for activities funded under EEA.

Sustainability in this area appears closely linked with the same partnership factors that are relevant to discussions of scalability and cost effectiveness. In this respect, at the outset, the sustainability of the projects appears to be aided by the ability of the project design teams to integrate large numbers of resource and technical partners into the implementation of project activities. Such partners create a diverse array of supporters that provide different inputs into both planning and implementation, and such inputs heightened their interest in monitoring project outcomes given their own contribution to the efforts.

As the project unfolded, initial assessments were then made by each of these partners, often informally, about the value of the intervention and its prospects for long term success in training youth and helping them access jobs or be prepared for employment. These informal assessments were followed up through direct consultations between such partners, IYF and national secretariats with a focus on exploring new pathways for both improvements to projects and long term sustainability. Such consultations, coupled with the broad array of supporting partners that had been developed, allowed for an opportunistic approach to exploration of sustainability options, grounded in the experience and relationships already formed. More broadly, survey results show that 75% of alliance partners surveyed were using their own networking capacity to develop and sustain partnerships. For example, in Indonesia, Prestasi Junior Indonesia has obtained funding from EEA partners to implement phase two of its vocational training program. Similarly, in Pakistan, NAVTEC is providing additional funding to the EEA partner - ASK Development to implement the phase two of this EEA-initiated program.

In addition to the creation of country platforms and a group of strong supporters, EEA appears to be particularly successful in institutionalizing the model on a broader national or provincial level in Egypt, Morocco and the Philippines where the national or local governments adopted the EEA alliance approach and methodologies continuing to work with EEA partners. Examples included activities in the Philippines, where building on EEA's partnership with the Metal Works Industry Association of the Philippines (MIAP) and the success of phase one, the provincial government has adopted the EEA model and mobilized local resources to train 450 additional youth in collaboration with MIAP.

Country-Level Alliance Sustainability: The evaluation team also assessed the sustainability of country-level alliance structures as apart from project-based activities. Such alliances were those managed on a daily basis by country secretariats, with strategic guidance from a prominent group participating in steering or advisory committees.

In assessing the long term sustainability of such country-level activities, it is important to first identify in detail country-level responsibilities of such structures. Across the EEA program, common expectations were set for country alliances. Specifically, such country level alliances were responsible for:

- Assessing gaps in education and employment programs for youth with the support of a respected group of stakeholders from across the public and private sectors and civil society
- Identifying new partners from across sectors to design new pilot interventions to address such gaps
- Approving the allocation of seed funds to partners for implementation of such interventions, and then monitoring implementation, providing needed technical support in ensuring quality outcomes, and supporting effort to scale and sustain such initiatives
- Providing capacity building for partners across the program in areas of common need, including in monitoring and evaluation, life skills programming, leveraging of resources, and job placement
- Sharing and distributing lessons learned and advocating for adoption of best practices by other stakeholders within the country of operation

Such activities were largely focused on project activities and would appear to enhance prospects for the sustainability of specific projects as detailed in the previous section. Of course, project level activities were anticipated to bring forward areas of common interest and learnings, particularly with respect to capacity building for partners implementing EEA projects and beyond, and the spreading of such learnings. The evaluation has found that overall such broader efforts by country alliances toward spreading lessons learned and building capacity of partners in areas of mutual need were very well received.

However, despite the effectiveness of such activities, the evaluation found that sustainability of alliances at a country level was elusive and largely unrealistic. This finding is largely based on the predominant focus of national alliances on project level activities rather than broader advocacy and reform in areas of education and employment. Similarly, experience suggests that advocacy and reform efforts of this nature would likely require a concerted focus in just these areas, often undertaken by large trade associations or other coalitions with this sole mandate, and not a project specific focus like EEA.

At another level, while country level support to individual projects was considered extremely important for the success of programs, finding direct support for secretariat-led activities from donors outside USAID was largely impractical. It is worthy to note that EEA Secretariats and partners were able to find numerous partners willing to dedicate cash and in-kind contributions to specific projects, as such donors could better appreciate the concrete benefits their support would provide to young people. Fundamentally important areas of support such as capacity building, technical assistance, project design, monitoring

and evaluation and leveraging of resources are more difficult to secure from such donors, and are instead better understood by development assistance agencies such as USAID. Nonetheless, despite this overall finding, some areas of national level alliance building have longer term prospects of success, and systems in place for country level activities could be re-initiated should additional support or interest from a variety of quarters become present.

Cost Effectiveness: The overall cost effectiveness of the EEA program was assessed at two levels. The first level is related to country program subgrants, which include both seed grants administered by USAID and cash and in-kind leverage contributions provided by other partners to support EEA country programs. The second level more broadly includes costs classified as alliance building and program support costs. This second level includes costs outside of those directly incurred by project implementers. They accordingly include costs related to the functioning of IYF as the Secretariat, local consultants and advisors in five countries, as well as IYF direct and indirect expenditures attributable to the EEA program. Each of these cost categories are discussed in more detail below.

Subgrant Project-level Costs: As noted above, subgrant project-level costs include seed funds and leverage contributions invested toward 35 individual projects which typically covered curriculum design or improvement, training, job placement costs, and project specific costs of NGO subgrantees. The amount of seed funding support from USAID toward individual projects is a useful metric to assess cost effectiveness given that such funds are directly focused on implementation of projects, are directly leveraged by investments from other parties, and are best positioned for increased efficiency when additional beneficiaries are added to successful pilot programs. Across five countries, the USAID support of \$2.89 million in seed funds that were coupled with leverage investments of \$8.75 million reached a total of 29,871 beneficiaries. If all project-level costs are taken in account, this brings the cost to \$390 per beneficiary. Because of significant leverage raised by EEA, only \$97 of this total was borne directly by USAID and \$293 was shouldered by the alliance partners.

Figure 7: Project-level Costs by Country

Country	Number of Beneficiaries	USAID Funds	Leverage	Total Project Budget	Cost Per Beneficiary
Egypt	17,644	\$ 565,500	\$ 2,415,739	\$ 2,981,239	\$ 169
Indonesia	5,547	\$ 581,590	\$ 1,272,311	\$ 1,853,901	\$ 334
Morocco	2,238	\$ 538,825	\$ 2,399,889	\$ 2,938,714	\$ 1,313
Pakistan	1,406	\$ 586,248	\$ 859,526	\$ 1,445,774	\$ 1,028
Philippines	3,036	\$ 617,968	\$ 1,802,681	\$ 2,420,649	\$ 797
Total/average	29,871	\$ 2,890,131	\$ 8,750,146	\$ 11,640,277	\$ 390

Alliance Building and Program Support Costs: A more expansive examination of costs by necessity also includes alliance building and program support costs of the EEA program. These costs supported significant, collective efforts by IYF, National Secretariats in each country and local program consultants working alongside project implementers. Such global and national assistance was provided in numerous areas related to program activities, including:

- managing the design and implementation of alliance based interventions
- providing international technical expertise on successful employability approaches
- assisting in leveraging of resources
- providing capacity building support to implementing partners in skills training, internship and job placement, and post training support to entrepreneurs
- grant administration services
- financial and managerial oversight
- USAID regulatory compliance
- direct monitoring and evaluation support

Funding at this level also enabled IYF to convene three global summits in Egypt, India and Indonesia with project partners attending from each EEA country, and to publish case studies and other learning materials, with an overall aim to share program learnings with a broader group of EEA alliance members and the development community. Upon examination of IYF accounting records, these costs taken together

with indirect costs attributable to the EEA program, totaled approximately \$6 million across all five countries. This USAID-borne cost adds approximately \$203 on a per beneficiary basis - see Figure 8 below.

Figure 8: Alliance Building and Program Support Costs by Country

Country	Number of Beneficiaries	Alliance Building and Program Support Costs	Cost Per Beneficiary
Egypt	17,644	\$ 846,755	\$ 48
Indonesia	5,547	\$ 1,084,899	\$ 196
Morocco	2,238	\$ 1,227,932	\$ 549
Pakistan	1,406	\$ 686,162	\$ 488
Philippines	3,036	\$ 640,658	\$ 211
Global	0	\$ 1,588,981	\$ -
Total/average	29,871	\$ 6,075,387	\$ 203

Taken together, these overall costs of both seed funds and Alliance building program support costs total approximately \$593 per beneficiary, and appear equivalent - if not cheaper - compared to other good practice country projects of this duration. The World Bank estimates that the unit cost for youth employment programs in Latin America vastly varies between \$500 and \$2,000.⁷ Similarly, the International Labor Organization estimates that non-formal education programs normally cost between \$700 and \$1,500.⁸ Of the EEA unit cost of \$593 per beneficiary, \$300 (51%) was born by USAID and \$293 (49%) was contributed by alliance partners.

Figure 9: Unit Cost per Beneficiary

Cost Category	USAID	Alliance Contributions	Overall Cost Per Beneficiary
Project-level	\$ 97	\$ 293	\$ 390
Alliance building and program support	\$ 203	\$ -	\$ 203
Total/average	\$ 300	\$ 293	\$ 593

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, a full assessment of cost efficiency would also require a more thorough assessment of the effect of alliance building activities on long term sustainability and scalability of proven practice programs. For example, the EEA model of programming demonstrates the significant increase in beneficiaries and benefits possible through up-scaling under an alliance building approach, particularly with government or quasi-government agencies as partners. Should the new efforts to substantially expand the EEA model be successful, the cost effectiveness of initial EEA investments could be dramatically expanded. While the longitudinal study required for this type of evaluation goes beyond the scope and resources available for this study, such factors should be addressed more directly in similar employability projects in the future.

Indicator 1.4: Non-target institutions requested to adopt the EEA program, models and tools as part of their activities

The evaluation also focused on how many institutions have adopted or requested to adopt the alliance approach, model, and methodologies in each EEA country which serves as a proxy indicator of the EEA program sustainability. In this respect, the evaluation team felt this indicator would be helpful in determining the level of local buy-in and ownership of different models and methodologies that EEA tested. In addition to a majority of target organizations continuing to use the EEA model and

⁷ Tesliuc, Cornelia. 2008. "What works in LAC to address youth unemployment?" World Bank power point presentation available at: <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/243472/day8CorneliaTesliucLACYouthApr9Session2.pdf>

⁸ Hans, Christiaan. May 2002. "International Labor Organization's Mekong Project: Non-formal education and rural skills training." <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/asro/bangkok/child/trafficking/downloads/tia-2-publication.pdf>

methodologies to implement similar projects in the future, nearly thirty non-target organizations across five countries – ranging from various government agencies to NGOs - requested to adopt the EEA program, models and tools as part of their activities. A few country examples worth highlighting include the following:

In Morocco, all six implementing partners are continuing to use IYF's *Passport to Success* life skills curriculum to complement technical training components. They have also developed new partnerships with other local NGOs, international organizations and private sector entities, which contributed to ensuring the continuation, replication or expansion of individual projects. A new set of donors and partners include: the Silatech Foundation of Qatar, Finnish Children and Youth Foundation, Near East Foundation, Fondation D'Auteuil and the Moroccan Ministry of Labor. Additionally, some implementers introduced the alliance approach to their new partners who in turn have adopted for their own operations. For instance, EEA partner PlaNet Finance has incorporated the alliance model into their operations and developed new partnerships with other local associations (such as Darna Association) to implement similar interventions.

In the Philippines, nine out of 22 municipalities in Misamis Oriental have requested to adopt and implement the EEA model committing their own funds. The pilot, known as the Youth Productivity Services, is reaching 450 additional youth with the allocated budget of nearly \$90,000. If this pilot is successful, EEA/YPS will be integrated as part of the Unlad Kabataan Program, demonstrating strong potential for institutionalizing the EEA model and approaches.

In Egypt, career facilitation and counseling did not exist in public universities before EEEA's career centers introduced it among its activities. There is a tremendous need for career counseling services because most university students do not have a broad understanding of the various career tracks available to them. Beyond the actual replication of the university career development and youth center models, EEA developed an important strategic partnership with the US-based National Career Development Association (NCDA) which has the potential to create a ripple effect if this partnership can be expanded to reach more students at more public universities in Egypt with needed services.

Intermediate Result II: Improved Access to and Relevance of Education and Employability Training

This section of the evaluation focuses on Intermediate Result II of the EEA overall evaluation framework, and more directly looks at whether the EEA alliance-based programming approach has helped improve target youth's access to quality education and/or employability training and job placement services. The analysis is set forth through the lens of the following indicators.

Figure 10: IR II Indicators

ACCESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 2.1: Number of young men and women participating in EEA programs • Indicator 2.2: Number and percentage of young men and women completing EEA programs
QUALITY AND RELEVANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 2.3: Number of teachers, trainers, facilitators and counselors trained under EEA supported programs • Indicator 2.4: Percentage of young men and women demonstrating improved capabilities through participation in EEA supported programs • Indicator 2.5: Level of satisfaction of young trainees with the quality and relevance of the training, counseling and services received through EEA programs • Indicator 2.6: Level of employer satisfaction with EEA-trained youth

Summary of Intermediate Result II Findings

A total of 29,873 youth (vs. 24,210 targeted) participated in various technical/vocational, entrepreneurship and life skills training between 2006 and 2009. An aggregated 26,006 completed the training (vs. 17,813 targeted) and 3,867 dropped out, thereby achieving an 87% completion rate. In terms of gender balance, 57% of participants were male and 43% were female.

Indicators 2.1 and 2.2: Number of young men and women participating in and completing EEA training projects

In sum, EEA exceeded anticipated totals for number of youth participating in and completing EEA training programs. Across the five countries, a total of 29,873 youth ages 15 to 24 participated in various EEA training programs, versus 24,210 targeted.⁹ Of these participants, an aggregated 26,006 youth or 87% of total participants completed the training, with 3,867 youth (13% dropout rate) not finishing training. Taken together, these figures indicate EEA reached 5,663 more participants than originally anticipated in the development of projects and 8,193 more individuals completed programs than originally anticipated.

In assessing access and overall participation of youth, the team has erred on the side of conservatism. In this respect, it is important to note that this 29,873 figure does not include over 7,655 people who received life skills training at Nike factories in Indonesia because the training provided was short and provided to young operators who are already working as part of their professional development training. Approximately 10,000 youth in Pakistan who received Microsoft IT training were also not counted for purposes of employment statistics under IR III as tracking of graduates in these programs was insufficient to assess their employability outcomes.

Training activities were designed based on local interests and needs, and therefore, were different in nature, scope and duration. However, generally speaking, EEA training programs had three fundamental components: technical/vocational skills training, life skills training, and on-the-job training followed by counseling and job placement services. These components were present in all countries except for Egypt which in its two largest programs provided career development training and counseling courses that

complemented academic work in universities and was coupled with less rigorous job matching services. Figure 11 presents a comparative analysis of participation, completion and dropout rates across five countries.

Figure 11: Direct Youth Beneficiaries: Participation, Completion, and Dropout Rates

Country	Number of participants		Number of youth who completed EEA Training		Number of youth who dropped out
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
Egypt	11,750	17,644	8,252	14,759	2,885
Indonesia	5,079	5,549	4,063	5,504	45
Pakistan	1,430	1,406	1,287	1,386	20
Philippines	2,958	3,036	2,702	2,669	367
Morocco	2,993	2,238	1,509	1,688	550
Total	24,210	29,873	17,813	26,006	3,867

As illustrated in the figure above, three EEA countries – Egypt, Indonesia and Philippines - exceeded their targets in terms of the number of participants. Pakistan and Morocco achieved 98% and 80% of their targets respectively. In terms of the number of youth who completed the training, Egypt, Indonesia and Pakistan met or exceeded their targets. Philippines and Morocco reached 97% of original targets.

The scope, type and duration of training differed in each country based on specific interventions designed based on local needs of target groups. EEA-Egypt in large part concentrated on providing complementary job readiness training (short courses) and job matching services through public universities which allowed them to reach larger numbers of youth, many of them with higher degrees of educational attainment. In contrast, other countries offered longer, more comprehensive employability skills training relevant for underserved and more traditionally vulnerable target youth populations. In these cases, training generally lasted longer – from a minimum six months to a maximum two years – with a focus on providing integrated life, technical/vocational, equivalency education, job placement support and follow-up mentoring support based on local needs and frequently in direct partnership with industry.

Recruitment Process: The recruitment process was also examined to determine whether EEA has improved access to education and employability training for target youth and what difference the alliance approach has made. In this respect, evaluation surveys and analysis suggest that use of the alliance approach encouraged EEA to work with a large array of local governments, youth groups and NGOs to not only mobilize local resources but also to publicize the program more widely to better reach vulnerable, hard-to-reach youth groups. Survey results show that nearly thirty percent of 447 survey respondents learned about the EEA program through local governments and youth groups. In Indonesia and Philippines, higher percentages of youth learned about the EEA program through these avenues, seventy percent and forty percent of respondents respectively. Survey data also indicate that as pilot activities completed, communities and graduates became advocates for the program and contributed to the recruitment process. For instance, over fifty percent of the youth surveyed heard about the program from their friends or family members who are EEA alumni, and the rest learned about EEA from their former schools and the media (newspaper, radio, TV and brochures).

Selection of Trainees: Upon receipt of applications, across all programs, implementing partners interviewed prospective candidates to assess their interests, motivation, education and other background information. In this process, all EEA implementing partners used the following selection criteria to screen and select young participants: 1) between 15 and 24 years of age; 2) socio-economic situation considerations – youth from economically disadvantaged families; and 3) demonstration of aptitude, commitment and potential. This adherence to selection criteria appears to have helped avoid confusion and maintain transparency and accountability as EEA generated high levels of interest among young people and local government officials who frequently advocated for selection of their own constituents.

EEA's outreach efforts also appeared to be effective in reaching youth from different backgrounds and geographic areas. EEA served youth with various backgrounds including university students (Egypt), youth with only elementary or middle school-level education (Indonesia), as well as out-of-school and rural youth (Indonesia and the Philippines). Each project had its own criteria used in recruitment and selection of beneficiaries, and these criteria included household income, educational attainment and

employment status of youth as set forward in recruitment forms. While baseline data were not available for the overall EEA project, partner surveys and interviews as a part of this evaluation confirmed that partners adhered to such criteria in selecting trainees, particularly from economically disadvantaged families.

Gender: There was no overall gender strategy integrated into the project, although an equal number of male and female beneficiaries were targeted and individual projects sought to recruit equal numbers of both male and female participants. In terms of gender balance, two out of five EEA countries – Indonesia and Morocco - were able to attain nearly equal ratios even though some technical training projects such as engine repair and broiler chicken farm operator training had difficulty recruiting female participants.

Pakistan received a slightly higher ratio of male participants. The country experienced some difficulty recruiting female participants since social norms made mobilization of young women into technical programs more difficult, particularly for its compressed natural gas station operator training project.

In Egypt, the total number of males considerably exceeded the total number of females. This appears to have been due to the fact that EEEA worked largely through the faculties of engineering at Cairo and Ain Shams Universities which traditionally enroll many more male students than female students. Nevertheless, it should be noted that women accessed EEEA youth center projects at higher rates than EEEA university programs. Figure 12 presents the classification of gender participation by country.

Figure 12: Classification of Gender Participation in EEA Programs by Country

Country	Male	Female
Egypt	67%	33%
Indonesia	48%	52%
Morocco	54%	46%
Pakistan	59%	41%
Philippines	70%	30%

Challenges with respect to youth participation and completion were largely around oversubscription and inability to meet needs. Some countries struggled to limit the number of trainees based on agreed activities and budget. This was particularly the case in Egypt and Indonesia where EEA garnered high interest and received more applications than anticipated from unemployed youth. Pakistan and Philippines faced difficulty recruiting female participants because of the nature of some technical training provided, such as chicken farm operator training and engine repair.

Indicator 2.3: Number of teachers, trainers, facilitators and counselors trained under EEA supported programs

EEA provided training to 432 trainers in life skills, IT, and technical skills, exceeding its initial target by 44 as indicated in Figure 13. Such trainers were provided a combination of orientation, mentoring, counseling, placement and training services, and several training of trainers sessions were organized between 2005 and 2008 in all five countries.

Figure 13: Number of Trainers Trained by Country

	Target Number of Trainers	Actual Number of Trainers
Egypt	102	111
Indonesia	24	26
Morocco	97	141
Pakistan	54	51
Philippines	111	103
Total	388	432

The training of trainers varied according to country needs. In Morocco, Philippines, and Pakistan, country programs adapted IYF's *Passport to Success* life skills curriculum and trained trainers specifically to deliver life skills lessons during and beyond EEA. For technical/vocational training activities, EEA relied largely on locally accredited training institutions for training curricula and trainers minimizing the need to recruit and train new trainers. However, while this strategy allowed creativity and flexibility and

promoted sustainability, it proved to be more challenging because it required a greater level of monitoring and quality control to ensure quality and effectiveness of a series of training offered.

More generally and consistent with best practices, country programs that conducted pilot or mid-term evaluations performed better because they were able to garner feedback from both youth and employers and improve as necessary. In this process, youth were also given an opportunity to provide feedback and suggestions – which in itself is a worthwhile and useful process because it was the first time for many students to critique their trainers who were encouraged to leave the rooms to give privacy to students.

Since EEA interventions were designed to provide a combination of services in various countries within different cultural contexts, program success became largely dependent upon the quality of teachers, trainers and counselors. Accordingly, EEA graduates were asked to rate their trainers/teachers in the following four areas during the evaluation using a five point rating scale:¹⁰ overall performance, technical knowledge, ability to provide mentorship and counseling, and capacity to keep youth engaged and motivated. An average of 557 students responded to each question and over ninety percent of students rated their trainers as either *good* (55%) or *excellent* (36%). Students were most satisfied with trainers' overall performance and capacity to keep them engaged and motivated throughout the program as indicated in Figure 14.

Figure 14: Youth Satisfaction with Trainers

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A	Number of respondents
Overall Performance of Trainers	1%	1%	5%	56%	37%	0%	526
Technical Knowledge	0%	4%	4%	58%	32%	2%	583
Ability to Provide Mentorship	1%	3%	3%	54%	34%	5%	575
Capacity to Keep Youth Engaged and Motivated	1%	4%	2%	50%	40%	3%	544

From a sustainability point-of-view, the use of alliance approach and leverage requirements has encouraged EEA partners to contribute their human resources. Universities, regional education and professional training institutions, ministries, local associations, national NGOs, and private sector entities have shared knowledge and expertise of their own trainers, teachers and facilitators with EEA. Such in-kind contributions have reduced the overall project cost, ensured full adoption and buy-in of the programs by the partners, and promoted program sustainability.

Additionally, EEA seed funds enabled partners to refine their curricula and upgrade the skills of trainers. Capacity building efforts have meant that trainers are positioned to provide the follow-up support and mentoring to EEA graduates to the extent their own institutional resources allow. They will also be prepared to provide similar in-country training, counseling and mentoring services to other youth beyond EEA with tested curricula and teaching methodology.

Also of interest, through interviews conducted as part of this evaluation, trainers in both Morocco and Pakistan reported that they themselves had undergone transformation after participating in training of trainers for life skills programs. In interviews conducted in Morocco, for example, trainers reported that EEA experience changed the way they look at teaching and interacting with youth, and had a positive influence on teacher-student relationships. They also reported improvements in their teaching methodology, coaching styles now catered to meet the needs of youth, and improved team spirit among trainers.

Indicator 2.4: Percentage of young men and women demonstrating improved capabilities through participation in EEA supported programs

As noted in this report's introductory section on evaluation limitations, as EEA used different curricula and methodologies across its 35 pilot projects in the countries of focus, this evaluation was not able to standardize and systematically measure learning gains among youth across the program. To address this limitation, during country evaluations, country teams used a combination of quantitative and qualitative measurement tools to assess the progress of youth in acquiring technical, life and other skills. These

¹⁰ Five-point scale using indices such as very poor, poor, fair, good and excellent.

different instruments have allowed the evaluation team to triangulate the results to ensure data accuracy and validity. Some of the instruments used include, but not limited to:

1. Classroom-based tests administered to youth throughout the training and at the end of each training program
2. Government-administered trade exams
3. Youth self assessment questionnaire: which asks youth to assess their own capacities before and after the program
4. Employers' assessment of the performance of EEA trainees as interns and employees: this is through an interview of employers and direct supervisors of youth that can give first hand observations and assessments of youth job performance (See indicator 2.6)¹¹

While instruments used by each program varied under this indicator, the global evaluation performed a survey of 503 youth trainees who provided self assessments of their learning gains and perceptions of the training's value. This self-reporting questionnaire results show that over 469 (93%) of the 503 respondents reported that they have gained technical knowledge and skills needed for employment. Surveyed youth in all five countries confirmed through self assessment that the EEA supported programs provided them not only with the technical skills they needed for employment, but most importantly, with the soft skills that they felt were needed to be accepted in the job market. Nearly 85% consider that life skills they have acquired through the EEA programs were *good* to *excellent*, and 75% consider that technical skills they have learned from the EEA programs were *good* to *excellent*. In terms of life skills acquisitions, the most significant changes were reported in areas of communication skills, listening skills and self-confidence. For example, 51% of 334 respondents felt that they experienced significant improvements in their communication skills; 50% of 327 respondents for listening skills; 48% of 370 respondents for self-confidence and 43% of 307 respondents for conflict-resolution. Similarly, 77% of 365 youth surveyed reported that they felt more positive about their future as a result of their participation in EEA.

Indicator 2.5: Level of satisfaction of EEA trainees with the quality and relevance of the training, counseling and services received through EEA programs

Survey results indicate that program graduates were generally pleased with the quality and relevance of training provided. It appears that graduates appreciated most a number of activities/approaches used: dynamic mentoring relationships with trainers; practical applications of job skills or the internship component of programs; life skills teaching methodologies; and follow-up technical and social support as they began internships and jobs. Youth were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with five aspects of the training, and Figure 15 presents the results in these areas. On average, 82% of youth rated the training as either *good* or *excellent*, and the ratings were most positive for the content, quality of training materials and life skills taught. As presented in Figure 15, 74% of youth respondents felt that the training received was highly relevant to their employment needs.

Figure 15: Youth Satisfaction with EEA Training

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Number of respondents
Overall Content of the Training	0%	2%	5%	59%	33%	558
Quality of Materials	0%	3%	7%	52%	34%	560
Relevance of Training to Employment Needs	1%	4%	13%	52%	22%	504
Life Skills Acquired	1%	2%	6%	50%	34%	545
Technical Skills Acquired	1%	4%	9%	48%	27%	542

¹¹ Examples of the instruments used under this indicator differed in each country, although all attempted to maintain a standard that would help ensure project outcomes and youth learning gains would be appropriately measured. For example, projects in the Philippines tracked the number of youth who passed the government trade exams and received certificates to determine whether graduates met the competency standards established in specific industries. Some projects in Indonesia such as engine repair upheld similar standards and arranged for students to take local and national competency exams. In Pakistan and Morocco where IYF's Passport to Success life skills training was conducted, implementing partners used specific tools - such as mastery exams and surveys - to measure the learning gains of students.

Of 711 youth surveyed, 184 were entrepreneurs who received entrepreneurship training, financial and business support from EEA. Of 184 entrepreneurs, 87% reported that they gained the necessary knowledge and skills to establish small businesses. Ninety-five percent felt prepared as entrepreneurs. On average, 72% of entrepreneurs rated the quality of coaching services received as *good* (43%) or *excellent* (29%). Youth participated in the evaluation also identified areas for improvement for similar interventions in the future and provided suggestions as follows:

- **Technical training:** In some EEA countries such as Morocco and Indonesia, youth considered the EEA life skills training to be more valuable and higher quality than the technical training component, citing a desire for technical training materials to be reviewed and improved, and strengthening the skills of some trainers.
- **Training Facilities:** In certain countries, the facilities used for life skills and technical training by the projects did not provide for the most conducive learning environment. For example, in Morocco, participants and trainers complained about broken and unsanitary lavatories, inadequate lunch, and rest areas or absence thereof, and inadequate and unequipped classrooms. For two projects in Indonesia, participants of engine repair and carpet making training expressed a desire to have larger quantities of and more advanced equipment and tools to practice with and use.
- **Training Duration:** All countries except Morocco and Egypt provided an average of six-month training programs. In Morocco trainings generally exceeded this timeframe, with one to two years of training inclusive of an internship performed. In Egypt, many courses through the University Career Centers were only for a few days. In general, training durations shorter than six months were considered by youth to be too short and not deep enough to provoke significant and lasting technical gains or attitudinal shifts. From the perspective of the partners, some projects faced time and resource constraints and therefore attempts were made to condense training activities. Some partners were also worried that youth might lose interest if the training was too long as many had to work to earn income. In most cases, the duration of training was not tested before interventions were designed to reach an optimal level for some EEA projects which in turn likely affected the level of satisfaction and outcomes.

Indicator 2.6: Level of employers' satisfaction with the soft skills and/or technical skills of EEA trained youth

This evaluation involved seventy employers who provided job opportunities to 684 youth and internship opportunities to 1,037 youth across five countries. The process of surveying and interviewing employers helped to capture the employers' opinions, satisfaction levels with EEA training programs, as well as suggestions for similar alliance-based interventions in the future. Employers represented a wide range of industries including information technology and hardware, telecommunications, trading, apparel, hotel and hospitality, banking and financial services, consulting, academic institutions and research units, and agriculture and farming companies. Entrepreneurial and technical sectors included automotive repair, mobile maintenance unit, ship construction, house construction, auto repair, mechanical works and fabrication, processed food production, medical services, animal husbandry, handicrafts, and others. Over seventy percent of the employers surveyed learned about the program through implementing partners.

Following market assessments, EEA partners in the different countries used different strategies to approach and recruit employers. In countries where employers were involved more thoroughly throughout the program, programs seem to have performed better in terms of teaching relevant skills and placing youth beneficiaries in internships and jobs. Through a review of program reports and interviews with EEA managers, implementing partners and employers, the following strategies were indicated by stakeholders as most effective in improving internship/job placement rates and achieving high levels of employer satisfaction:

- Involving potential employers in curriculum design and improvement, which helped ensure that training materials were relevant and demand-driven.
- Identifying and making prior arrangements with businesses to offer internships, preferably with stipends, meals or other forms of compensation for young interns.
- Conducting regular consultative and feedback meetings with internship providers to monitor and improve the performance of trainees, which increased their chances to be offered jobs as seen in Morocco, Indonesia and the Philippines. This was seen a critical step towards placing youth in

good jobs because internship is a probationary period for many youth before they are offered jobs and close monitoring has made a huge difference.

- Providing opportunities to potential employers or corporate partners to give competency exams to graduates and recruit them at the training site. This enabled employers to choose from a pool of qualified graduates and corporate partners were able to place youth in jobs quickly and effectively resulting in high job placement rates in Indonesia.

The study also sought to determine how employers learned about the program: Seventy-two percent of the seventy respondents were approached directly by partners, 19% said the program was introduced and referred to them by their contacts, four percent learned about the program from program brochures, and two percent learned about the program from newspapers and advertisements. The rest mentioned other ways such as referrals by the trainers, companies' public relations efforts to reach out to NGOs, personal contacts and youth approaching companies themselves through internship and job applications.

In terms of employers' level of satisfaction with the performance of EEA graduates, 58% of the seventy employers surveyed rated the overall performance of EEA graduates as *good*, and 21% as *excellent*. Employers commented the EEA graduates had the required basic knowledge and skills, were serious, eager to learn, and ambitious. Employers also commented that the CVs that were provided to them through the different EEA programs were of high quality, and that they (the employers) were willing to offer jobs and internships to EEA youth despite the fact that most EEA graduates had no prior work experience. Sixteen percent of seventy employers surveyed rated the overall technical skills of EEA graduates as *excellent*, 54% as *good*, and 27% as *fair*.

The study also asked whether employers would be willing to offer jobs to EEA youth again and 98% of employers said they would consider offering jobs, internships or apprenticeships to EEA graduates in the future. Philippines received some negative responses from larger companies where automation and more complex skills were needed for the work. While largely positive about student capabilities, employers also presented some recommendations to mend the weaknesses of some EEA programs. These recommendations included:

- Further improve technical skills of EEA youth by increasing duration and scope of training
- Further enhance life skills by adding more topics, particularly work ethics and communication skills of EEA youth to work effectively in professional settings
- Ensure continuity of the training program and hiring processes
- Conduct regular assessments of employers' needs and adapt the curriculum to respond to the latest needs and requirements
- Hold consultative and feedback meetings with internship, apprenticeship and job providers

In addition, employers were asked to compare EEA graduates with other employees from similar age groups. In Indonesia and the Philippines, EEA graduates had to compete with and were often compared to graduates of similar or longer two to four-year vocational/technical training programs. Thirty-two percent of the seventy respondents thought the EEA youth were similar to their non-EEA peers in terms of general performance and professionalism, while 49% of respondents reported that EEA graduates were *much better* than their non-EEA peers, and 11% said EEA youth employees were the best. The evaluation results also reveal that 83% of employers thought that EEA has been able to provide qualified graduates for the business sector that met their needs and expectations, and 96% of responding employers stated that EEA program was closing the gap between employers' needs and the employees' qualifications.

Statements by surveyed participants also suggest that working with the Alliance has had any changes on human resource management practices of partner companies. For example, forty percent of surveyed employers said that they were more open to the idea of providing internships and mentorship support to youth in general, and 29% of surveyed employers said that their companies plan to become more involved in EEA-like alliance-based programs focusing on youth employability. Fifteen percent stated that they were more likely to recruit youth through EEA and other similar programs as a result of participation in the EEA program. In sum, EEA appears to have served as a catalyst to encourage corporations through their CSR efforts to be part of programs that helped youth and responded to community needs. This in turn helped employers gain a positive image within their respective communities driven by their involvement in youth employment programs.

Intermediate Result III: Improved Prospects for Employment and Successful Entrepreneurship

This section seeks to address the issue of whether EEA was able to improve prospects for employment and entrepreneurship for target youth and measure the effectiveness of the EEA alliance approach in placing youth in jobs within six months of graduation. The following indicators were used to help guide these assessments:

Figure 16: IR III Indicators

CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 3.1: Number and percentage of trainees who got a job within six months of completing the program • Indicator 3.2: Number and percentage of EEA trainees starting their own businesses within six months of completing program
YOUTH SATISFACTION WITH AND QUALITY OF INTERNSHIPS AND JOBS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 3.3: Number and percentage of EEA trainees with satisfactory internships or apprenticeships • Indicator 3.4: Number and percentage of placed youth who declare having a satisfying and quality job

As noted previously, concerning limitations of this evaluation study, a few factors relating to timing of the evaluation and the comparability of different projects supported in EEA countries posed specific challenges in presenting findings under this Intermediate Result. Three issues are of particular note:

- **Timing of Project Completion versus Timing of the Evaluation:** Deadlines for the completion of the overall EEA Global program necessitated that country evaluations would be required to begin in December 2008 and end by August 2009. Unfortunately, particularly with respect to the largest program in Morocco, Emploi Habilité, the larger cohorts of trainees were still in training-related internships as this overall global evaluation was being finalized. Additionally, under the evaluation framework set forward at the outset of EEA activities, it was anticipated that a period of six months would be appropriate to track placement given the desire to ensure placement efforts could bear fruit and to measure the sustainability of employment generated through the program. This time challenge was exacerbated under this indicator, as a number of projects also lacked this six month time frame to fully assess outcomes under this intermediate result. As such, in certain instances, it became premature to fully measure employment rates, trends and sustainability in a consistent way across all EEA programs and countries. To address this challenge and present the most useful data for analysis, the team only included cohort classes that completed the training in early-2009 to allow sufficient time for tracking and assessment of employment outcomes under this IR. Where the division of cohorts has taken place in this respect, we have made an appropriate notation.
- **Comparability of Country Data:** An additional challenge was in the full comparability of job training and placement programs. As noted above under IR II, four countries – Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan and the Philippines - largely utilized comprehensive training programs that integrated life skills, technical skills, and internship/job placement activities that lasted from six months to a year. While some differences were present in terms of timing and training and placement approaches, such programs were reasonably comparable and data has been included in both global and country-specific tables. With respect to programs in Egypt, however, the substantial bulk of beneficiaries were participants in a more abbreviated range of career development training courses for university students lasting from approximately two days to one week in length. Additionally, as typical with such career development centers in other countries, job placement was more focused on career counseling services and job matching for a subset of participants in Center activities. As such, the comparability of such programs both in terms of the rigor and length of training interventions and job placement was less than optimal and in some respects caused significant variations among country outcomes and overall average outcomes under this intermediate result.

- **Eligibility for Jobs:** EEA provided a range of training interventions through 35 pilots. Some projects were very focused on direct job training and placement for those ready to enter the job market. However, a number of other projects targeted young people were not eligible or ready for jobs right away. These projects included programs for vocational high school students in Indonesia that were not graduating; first, second and third year university students in Egypt; and students who are currently undergoing one to two-year internships in Morocco. As such, for the purpose of assessing employment outcomes, only data and analysis relevant to employable cohorts are presented under IR III. As such, a distinction must be made between the total number of graduates who are counted under IR II and the total number of graduates eligible for jobs or self-employment who are counted under IR III.

Summary of Intermediate Result III Findings

Taking into account these limitations, an aggregated 8,580 youth were determined to be eligible and ready for employment or self-employment in the time frame allotted. Of these, 4,801 have been placed in jobs or set up small businesses within the six months of completion. This figure represents 56% of the total number of youth completing the training. This overall figure of 4,801 youth can be broken into 3,843 youth (80%) who have been able to get decent work upon graduation and 958 youth (20%) that have been able to set up small businesses with EEA support.

Across five countries, EEA set an initial target of 7,046 youth to become employed or self-employed. Therefore, against original targets, EEA attained the overall employment rate of 68% against this original target.

With respect to employment training programs specifically, 7,129 individuals completed programs, and 3,843 found jobs, representing an overall employment rate of 54%. EEA graduates are placed in variously sized-firms representing a wide range of industries such as engineering, marketing and sales, office administration, textile, hotel and restaurant management, chicken farming, auto-repair, welding and seaweed production.

Similarly, out of the 1,451 youth that underwent entrepreneurship training, 958 were able to set up small businesses with EEA support, representing a success rate of 66%. The study also seeks to determine whether youth who had prior jobs are better off working as entrepreneurs, and assess the viability of new businesses established. Survey results show that 44% of 293 young entrepreneurs responded had jobs prior to joining EEA, and nearly half of them reported to be earning more income as a result of joining EEA. In terms of viability of these businesses, survey results point to positive results and trends. For instance, 84% of 94 survey respondents have been able to cover expenses with earnings and 80% of 127 respondents reported making profits. Based on this data, it is concluded that a majority of businesses will be able to sustain themselves but whether the remaining ten to twenty percent of businesses will be able to survive in this financial climate without funded oversight is still in question. Individual country outcomes in both employment and entrepreneurship are provided in Figure 17 below:

Figure 17: Overall Job Placement and Entrepreneurship Success Rates by Country

Countries	Number of youth completing employment entrepreneurship training	Number of youth getting jobs or setting up small businesses	Job placement and entrepreneurship success rate against completion
Egypt	2,750	886	32% ¹²
Indonesia	1,286	1,074	84%
Morocco	912	315	35% ¹³
Pakistan	963	565	59%
Philippines	2,669	1,961	73%
Total/Overall Rate	8,580	4,801	56%

Indicator 3.1: Number and percentage of EEA trainees who got a job within six months of completing the program

EEA placed a total of 3,843 youth in jobs across five countries, resulting in an overall placement rate of 54%. As illustrated in Figure 18 below, success in reaching employment targets varied from one country to another, with a high of 84% in Indonesia and a low of 21% in Egypt.

Figure 18: Job Placement Rates by Country

Countries	Number of youth completing and ready to work	Number of youth placed in jobs	Job placement rate against completion
Indonesia	850	714	84%
Morocco	568	300	53%
Pakistan	963	551	57%
Philippines	2,440	1,794	74%
Egypt	2,308	484	21%
Total/Overall Rate	7,129	3,843	54%

Based on the alliance partner survey results and interviews, job placement success appears attributable to the following factors in most countries:

- Industrial knowledge of EEA's implementing partners
- Ability of partners to respond quickly to local market conditions and work in close partnership with local employers who are in high growth industries
- Ability of local partners to establish good partnerships with local businesses, and engage them in meaningful ways during training and placements
- Development and execution of strategies to monitor the performance of interns and follow up with consultative, feedback meetings with employers to help address trouble areas; and with internships providers – to ensure EEA was meeting the needs of employers

¹² As noted above in the introductory section to IR3, the comparability of some programs in Egypt as related to programs in other countries is somewhat limited. This was due to substantially shorter training courses and job matching services supported by Career Development Centers in Egypt, rather than more rigorous job placement conducted in concert with employer-supported training and internships. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the more limited youth center training cohorts in Egypt, where training programs were roughly comparable to the training programs in the other four countries, had a job placement and entrepreneurship success rate of approximately 58%. If only this cohort is factored into the global averages for job placement and entrepreneurship success, the average rises from 56% in Figure 17 to 66% overall.

¹³ The Morocco EEA program's low overall rates of placement and entrepreneurship are largely due to the poor performance of one entrepreneurship project out of six total projects that experienced substantial management challenges during the project. As such, 344 young people were considered trained by this project, but only 15 were able to start new enterprises given poor follow-up by the implementing partner, resulting in a four percent success rate for this project specifically. As demonstrated by Figure 18, the five remaining projects, all related to job training, had an overall placement rate of 53%.

- Success in nurturing close relationships with local business and partners using appropriate cultural norms around charity and supporting the disadvantaged

Conversely, the reasons for lower employment rates for some EEA countries appear to have included the following factors:

- Original placement targets were set unrealistically high and projects were overly optimistic about their ability to place trainees.
- Some sub-grantees did not conduct sufficiently rigorous labor market assessments at the beginning of the programs to help ensure the availability of jobs.
- Labor markets and demands were constantly changing from the time the training was designed vs. the time for job placements.
- The onset of the global economic crisis during the pendency of training programs caused significant reluctance on behalf of employers to commit to full way employment for trainees.
- Some projects could not facilitate or track job placement for women in some remote and traditional areas where job opportunities were rare, which was the case for Pakistan and part of Indonesia.

Egypt in particular fell short in reaching its original target of 2,497 youth placed in jobs, and had a lower employment rate of 21%, having placed 484 youth in jobs. Such lower placement is likely due to unrealistic assumptions about the possibilities of placement through short term training and job matching services, as well as a very challenging employment market in Egypt during the last year of the program during the global economic crisis. Additional information regarding the comparability of Egyptian job training and placement programs to other countries is provided above.

In order to have a sense of the effectiveness of job placement services, the team asked youth how long it took to find jobs in the youth follow-up survey. Of the 166 youth who responded to this particular survey question, 88% of them reported finding jobs within six months of completing the training, and ten percent reported taking longer than six months to find jobs. Higher percentages of youth were able to find jobs quickly within one to three months in Egypt and Pakistan [92% and 84% respectively].

In terms of the types of jobs offered to EEA youth, each country had its own experience worth highlighting:

Egypt: Employers included multinational companies, national companies (where multinational and national companies were mostly for engineering job and/or internship opportunities), small enterprises such as processed food companies and vocational centers and self-employment. Jobs and internships offered were for the following positions: engineers, administrative, marketing and sales, technical and factory workers, trainers, and quality controllers.

Indonesia: EEA's requirement of placing youth in jobs upon graduation was new to some partners, and therefore, Indonesia Business Links (Secretariat) and IYF took a hands-on approach and invested significant resources in outreach and post-training support, working closely with implementing partners and aiming for a high job placement rate. Corporate partners and potential employers were given access to recruit from a pool of qualified graduates after competency exams. Graduates were placed in jobs with small to medium-sized enterprises in the following sectors: automotive and motorcycle repair, chicken farming, computer assembly, financing and sales, T-shirt design and making, and fish file production – across West Java (Bogor, Karawang, Bandung), Central Java (Pati), East Java (Surabaya, Pasuruan and Jombang) and the Northern part of Greater Jakarta.

Morocco: Sectors covered included tourism, textile, sales, and services (including plumbing, electricity repair, welding, and mechanics), IT, and office administration. The tourism sector hired more youth. There were three kinds of employers that offered internships and jobs to EEA graduates:

- Large international companies and Franchises such as Bull, Munisys (IT), New Rest, Fruit of the Loom (Textiles), Accord (Hotels), and McDonalds (Restaurants). These large companies hired large numbers of young EEA interns at a time.
- Medium-sized enterprises such as member enterprises of the Association of Women Entrepreneurs, small textile enterprises, hotels and restaurants, steel and machine shops, auto repair, and construction companies. Each of these medium-sized companies hired one to five interns.

- Small and micro-enterprises generally ran by one or two people, such as auto repair workshops, or small service companies. These enterprises would typically hire one or two interns at a time.

Pakistan: Pakistan focused on the following industries: hotel and restaurant management, customer relations and services, compressed natural gas (CNG) station management, embroidery and knitting for women. The program faced challenges facilitating and tracking job placements in some areas for women in some remote areas; however, the job placement rate for women in the hospitality sector was higher because of their willingness to work in kitchens.

Philippines: For formal employment, youth were placed in the following industries: steel and machine shops, auto repair, ship building and construction. Employers in two projects were partners of EEA from the beginning, specifically Habitat for Humanity and Sitangkai Seaweeds. They had significant interest in the outcome of the youth training programs since the quality of training outcomes had a direct effect on their core businesses of building homes or growing seaweed. Additionally, many graduates were also employed through industry or business associations that EEA had partnered with. These were employer-members of the Metal Industry Association of the Philippines and the Davao City Chamber of Commerce. These employers offered internships to graduates and hired those who excelled.

Indicator 3.2: Number and percentage of EEA trainees starting their own businesses within six months of completing the program

Across five countries, EEA enabled 958 youth or 66% of those who completed the entrepreneurship training to receive the necessary skills and establish small businesses as presented in the table below: a total of 402 in Egypt, 360 in Indonesia, 15 in Morocco, 14 in Pakistan, and 167 in the Philippines. Against its original target of helping 808 youth become entrepreneurs, EEA has been able to help 150 more entrepreneurs than targeted. In addition to the entrepreneurship training, EEA provided financial assistance, equipment and mentoring support to youth to start and subsequently expand small, sustainable businesses.

Additionally, youth-led businesses in Indonesia created 516 jobs for the communities in West Java. Additional and significant numbers of jobs may have also been created in other country entrepreneurship programs, but such job creation numbers were not tracked regularly. Jobs created within Indonesia were in sorting, harvesting, and marketing of catfish, production of fish feed, and processing and packaging of fish filets. These jobs have become primary or secondary sources of income for many coastal families and youth.

In Pakistan, entrepreneurship was not part of the program design; however, 14 graduates decided to start small businesses with their newly acquired confidence and skills. Gaining access to capital, however, became a major hindrance, and graduates expressed a desire to receive some type of financial support from EEA. As indicated in Figure 19, in Morocco, the Entrepreneurship Spirit Project trained 344 youth but failed to provide substantive support to a majority of graduates given very low capacity and challenges with the implementing partner. Only 15 students from this project set up small businesses after receiving assistance from microfinance institutions.

Figure 19: Entrepreneurship Success Rates by Country

Countries	Number of youth completing entrepreneurship training	Number of youth setting up small businesses	Entrepreneurship success rate against completion
Egypt	442	402	91%
Indonesia	436	360	83%
Morocco	344	15	4%
Pakistan	0	14	NA
Philippines	229	167	73%
Total/Overall Rate	1,451	958	66%

Youth satisfaction rate was generally high in this area – with over seventy percent of 184 young entrepreneurs surveyed expressing satisfaction with the training and support received. Additionally, 87%

of these 184 youth felt they gained the necessary knowledge and skills to start up a small business from EEA as a result of participation in the program.

The evaluation also attempts to determine whether youth are better off working as entrepreneurs and assess the viability of new businesses established. Survey results are positive. Eighty-four percent of 94 entrepreneurs surveyed said they were able to cover business expenses with earnings. Eighty percent of 127 respondents said they were already making profits. Based on these data, it is concluded that a majority of businesses will be able to sustain themselves. Whether the remaining ten to twenty percent of businesses will be able to survive in this financial climate without funded oversight is still in question.

Despite ultimate successes in this area, entrepreneurship projects were challenging to start up, according to surveys conducted in the evaluation. Interviews with program managers indicate that EEA countries struggled to implement entrepreneurship projects at the outset of activities due to five reasons:

1. Cultural norms that discourage youth to become entrepreneurs because of a different level of prestige compared to formal jobs or due to uncertainties to earn stable income
2. Youth not having enough confidence or experience
3. Financial climate and external shocks such as natural disasters and sharp increase in consumer prices that threaten the existence of enterprises
4. Inadequate financial resources allocated for entrepreneurs within countries
5. Lack of sufficient experience of partners to implement entrepreneurship components of their overall employability interventions

To address such issues, as projects were underway, EEA learned the need to provide more hands-on business and social support from the alliance. The alliance helped youth stay focused and motivated, and assisted them in mobilizing additional resources to counterbalance external shocks and reinstate project activities if crises occurred. EEA also hired outside experts to strengthen and sustain businesses in precarious situations where in-house expertise was not sufficient. For example, Indonesia provided more comprehensive financial and business support to youth to start businesses with significant contributions from the alliance partners. In two Indonesian projects focusing on chicken farming and auto-repair shops, youth had their parents contribute resources and made them family-run businesses which then increased the likelihood of such enterprises being successful and sustainable.

Indicator 3.3: Number and percentage of EEA trainees with satisfactory internships or apprenticeships

Internships were an integral part of EEA programs. The duration of internships generally varied between two to four months, with some programs in Morocco offering one to two- year internships during which trainees received a complement to their technical training and put into practice their newly learned life skills. In certain cases, trainees received small stipends for their work as interns or apprentices, and in some of these circumstances, especially for trainees in the tourism sector, the best performing interns received employment contracts at the end of their internship period. Youth were asked to rate their internship experience using a five-point scale and results are presented below: seventy-five percent of youth surveyed rated the internship experience as *good* or *excellent* while eight percent rated as *very poor* or *poor*. Overall internship experience was considered the most worthwhile by EEA graduates – followed by technical skills learned and coaching.

Figure 20: Youth Satisfaction with Internships or Apprenticeships

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Number of respondents
Overall Internship Experience	2%	6%	13%	43%	32%	293
Relevance of Internship Assignments	2%	4%	19%	45%	24%	270
Technical Skills Learned	1%	7%	15%	43%	31%	275
Coaching Received During Internships	3%	5%	11%	41%	32%	275

Some negative responses – *poor* or *very poor* - were driven by the following factors:

- Internships did not fit with the training because some youth participated in basic technical training and were not prepared to use sophisticated tools and equipments at factories they interned. Indonesia, Morocco and Philippines had a few of these cases, for example, for training such as engine repair. In some cases, supervisors refused to allow females to take on substantive work. This was especially the case for girls completing their internships in the field of computer hardware repair in Morocco. In some rare cases in Morocco, female interns were subject to subtle yet real harassment from their direct supervisors. This was the case for young women who were completing their internship in the hotel industry. When such incidents were reported, remedial action was immediately taken.
- In other cases, interns were asked to perform tasks that they felt were not directly related to their internships. This was the case for the young Moroccan pre-school teachers who worked in small private pre-schools, and for some interns in Indonesia and the Philippines to some extent.

Indicator 3.4: Number and percentage of placed youth who declare having a satisfying and quality job

EEA graduates were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the following aspects of their jobs: overall work environment, relevance to the field of study, support from supervisors and peers, professional growth opportunities, salary and other compensation. Survey results reveal the following:

- While 84% of 205 respondents were satisfied with the overall work environment, they were not as satisfied (40% unhappy) with salary and other compensation provided to them at current workplace. For example, around fifty percent of the Egyptian trainees considered that they were not paid enough in comparison with the tasks they were implementing. It was also the case for 25% of the employed EEA youth in Pakistan.
- Professional growth opportunities appear to have been made available for EEA graduates with 75% of youth reporting as happy or very happy.
- In terms of training relevance, 75% of youth were happy and the rest were not, which suggests that there are still some cases of skills mismatches.
- Eighty-three percent of youth were satisfied with the support receiving from their supervisors and peers. In Egypt, Morocco and the Philippines, about twenty percent of youth expressed a desire to receive more support from supervisors and peers, and the figure goes up to 38% in Indonesia and down to ten percent in Pakistan. Some of the issues were that youth were viewed suspiciously by older workers or found employment far away from home and needed more technical and social support.

Figure 21: Job Satisfaction of Youth

	Very unhappy	Unhappy	Happy	Very happy	Number of respondents
Overall Work Environment	2%	12%	61%	23%	205
Relevance to the Field of Study	6%	10%	49%	26%	195
Support from Supervisors and Peers	5%	12%	45%	38%	193
Professional Growth	8%	13%	48%	27%	190
Salary	7%	26%	47%	16%	205
Other Compensation	14%	19%	43%	17%	181

It is important to note that trainees' level of satisfaction was greatly influenced by the field they ended up in. For example, those working in tourism and IT are more satisfied with their jobs than those performing more physical tasks. Entrepreneurs who were running successful businesses were found to be happier as they have their own businesses, make profits and can hire additional employees.

Indonesia and Morocco were able to ask whether graduates who had jobs previously were now earning more income as a result of participating in EEA programs. Eighty-five percent of 65 respondents said *yes* in Indonesia while only 29% answered positively for Morocco.

Intermediate Result IV: Positive, Indirect Effect on Families and Communities of Youth

While not included in the original monitoring and evaluation framework for the program, Intermediate Result IV was added to the final evaluation to assess the indirect effect of EEA on the families and communities. As such, two proxy indicators were used:

Figure 22: IR IV Indicators

INDIRECT EFFECT ON FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES OF YOUTH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 4.1. Number and percentage of employed youth financially helping their families with household, health and education expenses • Indicator 4.2. Number and percentage of youth who have reported improved financial and social conditions of their families as a result of their financial support
---	--

Indicator 4.1: Number and percentage of employed youth financially helping their families with household, health and education expenses

It is not uncommon in developing countries, especially in Africa and Asia, for children to share their incomes with their families and help pay for daily household expenditures or education for their siblings once they start working – as a way to repay their parents’ support and as part of becoming a responsible adult. Survey results show that most of the youth share their income with their parents and siblings now that they are able to work and earn regular income through jobs or enterprises that they have set up. Most of the youth in all five countries reported that they can begin saving for their future, invest in their children’s education and cover health expenses as they begin working. However, youth involvement in their community as a whole was not automatic. While most youth showed willingness to help their immediate family and friends, in some countries, such as Morocco, their commitment to help a wider community has not happened yet. This was not part of the original EEA program design, and would need more support and supervision from alliances if youth were to play leadership roles in their communities. Life skills, counseling and mentoring offered through the EEA programs contributed to change this attitude and to promote a sense of responsibility among EEA youth.

The study however shows that EEA has demonstrated to have a multiplier effect, and had a positive if indirect effect on families. With improved livelihood, youth are able to contribute to promoting social and economic development of their families. Survey results are presented below:

- Sixty-three percent of 238 respondents are now sharing their income with parents and siblings for daily household, health and education expenses.
- Twelve percent of youth have their own families and are using the income to support their spouses and children.
- Forty-three percent of youth use their earnings mainly for personal consumption such as rent, food and clothing.
- Forty-two percent of youth are beginning to save part of their earnings for future use and investment.

Indicator 4.2: Number and percentage of youth who have reported improved financial and social conditions of their families as a result of their financial support

The study seeks to determine not only how many youth are helping their families but also how many feel that they now have the ability to improve the financial and social conditions of their families. Survey results show that 82% of 295 graduates responding stated that their financial support (with the income they shared) helped improve their family’s financial and social situation.

- Philippines reported the highest percentage [92%] of 93 youth reporting improved financial and social situation.
- In Egypt, 83% of 12 respondents reported improved financial and social situation.
- In Pakistan, 82% of 60 respondents reported improved financial and social situation.
- In Indonesia, 81% of 85 respondents reported improved financial and social situation.

- Morocco reported the lowest percentage of 42% of 45 youth surveyed reporting some improvements – because youth were primarily using their earnings for personal consumption and felt that their income was not enough to share with families. One significant issue in Morocco that potentially resulted in such perception was the existence of government incentives which subsidized employers to hire youth at only the minimum wage. The unfortunate consequence of such subsidy was all employers providing wages at this level, rather than any higher amount to compete for qualified employees.

Philippines and Indonesia's higher numbers of youth reporting improved situations appear closely linked with the highest percentages of Indonesian and Filipino youth reporting to be earning more income as a result of participation in the program. It should also be noted that some families and communities have benefitted directly from new jobs created by EEA-supported enterprises, particularly in Indonesia.

Overall, 18% of 295 graduates surveyed felt that there was "no change" because earnings from entry-level jobs were not enough to support their families after spending it for personal needs. Morocco reported the highest percentage of youth [58%] reporting "no change" whereas other countries reported much lower percentages [ten to twenty percent] who stated that their income did not help improve the social and financial situation of their families.

Section IV: Lessons Learned and Recommendation

This evaluation has reviewed the progress, achievements and challenges of EEA projects dispersed over five countries, presenting what we hope is a useful framework for reflection on lessons learned and recommendations for future efforts of this nature. These lessons learned are presented in light of the two overarching aims of this study:

- The building and sustaining of country- and community-based alliances through the EEA operational framework and
- An assessment of how employment-related outcomes were affected by EEA alliance building approaches.

Each of these overarching aims is broken down into areas of learning in the sections below, followed by specific recommendations provided in light of such lessons learned.

A. Building and Sustaining Alliances

EEA's approach appears quite unique in its use of country and community/project level alliances of stakeholders from the public, private and civil society sectors to support youth employability development aims. Within each country, as noted in discussions of Intermediate Result I, alliance building was carried out at the global, country and community levels, first through the work of IYF and the establishment of Secretariats and Steering Committees to guide overall program activities. This was then followed by the creation of project-level alliances to achieve specific aims, and these alliances were provided with tailored technical assistance in needs assessments, program design, life skills and technical training interventions, the leveraging of resources, and monitoring and evaluation, among other areas.

Part 1: Identifying Effective Secretariats

EEA has been generally successful in identifying NGOs best-suited to serve as Secretariats and providing them with the technical support necessary to undertake the unique implementation approach supported by this program. This includes the formation of Steering Committees and project-based local alliances in support of programs. The study finds that capacity building was provided in the following areas critical for the development of community-based interventions with multiple stakeholders: designing a subgrant award and monitoring system, identifying and recruiting alliance partners, structuring partner relationships, conducting due diligence on partners, developing or enhancing curricula and other learning materials, training of trainers, and improving program and financial management practices.

Recommendations:

- **Understand that alliance building is a unique skill that requires an emphasis on building relationships, finding areas of common interest and providing creative approaches to structuring workable partnerships among diverse stakeholders.**
- The development of partnerships across sectors is particularly challenging at times, as alliance conveners must be able to speak multiple "languages" of different sectors and translate those languages between partners as deals are contemplated, negotiated and finalized. Such skills are distinct from the focus of many NGOs aimed primarily towards implementation of projects, necessitating that significant effort be taken to find the appropriate organization for undertaking this type of "secretariat" or brokering role. In fact, in some circumstances, initial focus was placed on more implementation focused organizations for this role, and ultimately structural changes were required to better utilize the strengths of different organizations in support of overall alliance building and implementation aims.
- From EEA's experience, secretariat organizations might either be more associational in nature to begin with, or may have used alliance based approaches in their implementation of projects, enabling them to see both the value and also the challenges of partnership. As alliance-based programs are developed, it is critical to assess and understand the areas where secretariats need most support and guidance and provide them with the appropriate capacity building and guidance as they begin to learn this role. These steps have proven to be essential in ensuring that Secretariats were prepared and had sufficient capacity to undertake tasks associated with

alliance building, which also helped promote sustainability of the alliance approach and good management practices.

Part 2: Establishing Country Alliances and Steering Committees

In terms of setting up steering committees or national alliances intended to provide overall guidance, EEA used two approaches. Some countries such as Indonesia recruited mid-level experts and practitioners, some of whom represented an institutional interest in the success of EEA as corporate donors or NGO partners. As a general matter, these alliance members invested significant time and resources during program design and implementation stages to help projects get off the ground. Other countries such as Morocco and Egypt recruited high-level figures who were not able to dedicate as much time and efforts on EEA but had wider networks that proved to be useful at program outset to establish alliances, generate leverage and support long term sustainability and scalability efforts.

Both approaches appear to have their benefits and disadvantages. Programs appeared more likely to get full attention of steering board members and useful guidance under the first approach, where more technical advisors could give fairly direct advice, building on specific experience and filtering best practices into the programmatic discussions. To the extent possible, they would also provide direct connections to prospective leverage and other partners, helping to expand the benefits of programs. Such advisors appeared more likely to continue to maintain interest and focus on the project progress as the overall program matured, taking a keen interest in project outcomes. In the end, however, such technical focused teams did not always have the direct ability to garner broader interest in initiatives essential for a more dramatic expansion of activities and the integration of lessons learned into larger initiatives being undertaken by national stakeholders.

Conversely, those alliances with higher level representation seemed to be successful in engaging members early on in the process to set strategic direction and help distribute grant funds. However, as these key activities concluded, alliance members were more difficult to engage, with other high priority national initiatives taking their attention. This proved more challenging as alliances attempted to present lessons learned and gain further programmatic guidance from alliance members as programs matured. Meetings were often difficult to schedule and frequently alliance members may have designated a less senior person to represent them in meetings.

Nonetheless, in key areas, the presence of a higher level advisory committee had important benefits. As alliances began to engage leverage partners and other key stakeholders, particularly in government, the marketability and credibility of program interventions increased significantly by virtue of its association with a high-level board. Similarly, while difficult to engage at times, certain advisory members became extremely important champions for several efforts, particularly when challenges arose that required high-level brokering and mediation of disputes among sectors and as programs went from a first to a second or third stage with more partners, particularly in the public sector.

Recommendations:

- **Consider recruiting a mix of both high-level and mid-level experts and practitioners focusing on both local and international issues - combined with some policy makers - to maximize contributions and program benefits.** One possible approach is to create two bodies – one more strategic and visible, and another more technical and focused on working level issues. However, it is important in this area to ensure that such structures do not increase bureaucracy and management burdens on the alliance.
- **Clearly formulate strategies, incentives and mechanisms to ensure Secretariat-like structures are effectively coordinating Committee activities, providing regular information and updates, actively seeking the support and guidance of Committee members, and maintaining the momentum for participation throughout the program.** In this respect, Board and Alliance members should be given regular opportunities for providing their feedback at all stages of the implementation, particularly during program design and post-midterm evaluations. In case Board or alliance members have time constraints to attend regular meetings, efforts should be made to have a telephone conversation or individual meeting to solicit their feedback and guidance and gather their support for particularly critical areas of need.
- **Train local staff on how to generate public interest and forge public-private alliances; reinforce alliances in appropriate cultural contexts; and negotiate and resolve conflicts if crises arise.**

Knowledge transfer to local staff and to implementation partner staff helps promote the scalability and sustainability of alliance-based projects.

- **Dedicate sufficient program management support staff to fill the various roles that alliance programs demand.**
- **Develop alliances based on mutual respect and understanding.** If possible, go beyond legalistic, formal partnerships and build vibrant alliances with a shared sense of purpose and responsibility, knowledge sharing and open communication. To the greatest extent possible, leverage local cultural approaches that encourage caring for and partnering with local communities to achieve social good.
- **Clearly define roles and responsibilities of each alliance member and enable members to keep each other accountable and responsible throughout the project.**

Part 3: Forging Project-level or Local Alliances

Forging local alliances was regarded as the most critical and challenging stage in alliance building in order to show real results in overall efforts. At this phase, IYF worked closely with National Secretariats to build their capacity in developing local alliances and working with selected implementing partners to develop and implement alliance based projects. The study finds that capacity building was done strategically and successfully, particularly in light of two indicators tracked globally - the number of partnerships and amount of leverage resources obtained. In this respect, capacity building efforts enabled EEA to forge 319 partnerships and mobilize over \$9 million in leverage in support of the 35 pilot activities by program end. The EEA program demonstrates the significant increase in beneficiaries and cost efficiency possible under the multi-stakeholder approach – with the cost of less than \$600 per beneficiary of which roughly only fifty percent was borne by USAID.

Multiple and different strategies were used to recruit corporate, NGO and government partners: countries used IYF and Secretariats' institutional contacts, recruited partners through wider networks of Committee and alliance partners, and identified and visited potential partners door-to-door. This latter effort was time consuming but proved to be highly effective in Indonesia and Morocco in recruiting local businesses that were potential employers. For certain projects, initial alliances had been already established before implementing partners submitted proposals to EEA, which were then built upon and expanded in support of program requirements. In several cases, the IYF global and national secretariats provided substantial support in recruiting corporate partners for innovative project areas before providing formal approvals.

Overall, EEA's ability to engage the private sector for program design and employment support has been looked upon as crucial to the program success. Having potential employers review and approve the curriculum materials helped to confirm that skills training provided was demand-driven and relevant. Giving local business partners access to a pool of qualified graduates and the ability to test and recruit them through competency exams or internships also helped secure high job placement rates. Regular feedback meetings with employers have also enabled the program to improve the quality of graduates produced.

More generally, the study found that alliance development efforts are more effective when public and private service actors and private businesses stop looking at their work with the alliance as mere charitable contributions, but rather as a part of their broader corporate responsibility and a critical community and business issue. In this respect, as corporate partners – particularly at the local level - become more engaged, they begin to working collaboratively with implementing partners in designing program content and on the job training modules, monitoring, and sharing knowledge and expertise. All had the end goal to better prepare youth for employment and help their bottom lines.

Recommendations:

- **Assess and meet the needs of Secretariats before they are tasked with building local alliances,** especially in areas of finding and negotiating with right partners and raising leverage resources in support of programs. Their ability to forge vibrant alliances will ultimately go far in determining program outcomes.
- **Review proposals with a structured but consultative approach,** enabling stakeholders from all sectors to identify flaws in program design, avoid duplication and maximize synergy, and ultimately find ways to contribute themselves to help promptly establish local alliances.
- **Clearly define and agree upon roles and responsibilities of each partner to achieve optimal results.** Moreover, it is important to ensure a reasonably even distribution of roles and

responsibilities, both in terms of fairness and also broadening the platform for expansion of initial program successes through multiple channels. Project-based memoranda of understanding (MOUs) are one avenue to ensuring clarity around roles. However, negotiation of documentation around alliances should not become the focal point of efforts. Rather, the formality of alliance must give way to the practical realities of implementation, and the MOU should be viewed as a step in building trust around a partnership framework that can be expanded once tested and proven successful after its first phase.

- **Find innovative ways to mobilize and recruit local businesses to support the program – such as outreach visits and calls presenting the program and benefits of joining the alliance – to assure long term effectiveness and sustainability.** Global corporate partners are also vital for alliance prominence, recognition, resources and rigor – but optimally partnerships should include a broad array of smaller, local companies to help generate increased appeal in local communities and direct effect in terms of job placement. In this respect, local businesses should be engaged meaningfully by tapping into their knowledge and expertise and involving them in curriculum design and pilot activities. Similarly, they should be given access to program graduates for internships and job opportunities, and regular feedback regarding the performance of graduates should be requested to improve the quality and relevance of the training.

B. Assessing EEA Employability Outcomes

Part 1: Utility of the Alliance Approach in Providing Effective Skills Training

The use of the alliance approach influenced the overall EEA program design and implementation, particularly as it supported strong connections to employers and the private sector. The study shows that engaging potential employers and other stakeholders through this approach has made the training programs more comprehensive, demand-driven and relevant to industry needs. It also mobilized community support to make sure that participants completed their courses and continued on to find productive work. In particular circumstances, CSR community empowerment projects were focused on hard-to-reach areas and, in these areas, conducting community research together and then co-designing the project with corporate partners and local community development experts has proven to be helpful in ensuring that economic activities are locally driven, relevant and viable.

Recommendations:

- **Engage all key stakeholders during the design stage – particularly training providers, prospective employers and local experts – to increase the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the training.** It is equally important to keep in mind, however, that while such engagement of stakeholders had a significant value, engaging new partners in program design and implementation presented certain challenges. In particular, while new implementation partners often had very strong community connections, they had less experience in implementation of quality employability programs. As such, while EEA provided design support for interventions, it often provided less mentorship during implementation and relied significantly on implementing partners to deliver the education/vocational training. This resulted in less desirable employment outcomes in certain projects, highlighting the need to perhaps conduct more thorough review of training materials and testing of modified training durations, as well as more deliberate coaching and capacity building during the implementation phase of activities.
- **Put in place a robust process for Board and Alliance participation that can encourage meaningful collaboration at various stages of implementation and improve the program design, quality and effectiveness.** However, the establishment of such processes requires considerable human resources in terms of time for coordination of all efforts. While in the end alliance building can encourage strong local ownership and better long term sustainability prospects, those designing such projects must be conscious of the level of effort required to fully ensure long term success. It should also be noted that such alliance building poses unique challenges in that time spent in this pursuit should not be substituted for quality mentorship and capacity building during the implementation phase of projects.
- **Increase program effectiveness by integrating post-training follow-up support as a key component of program designs.** This evaluation found that the transition for disadvantaged youth into a formal working environment poses both new and exciting opportunities but also frequent challenges in terms of adjusting to new norms, expectations and often critical feedback.

As such, mentorship for youth should be provided for at least the first six months as youth enter the labor market. This can also help correct cases of skills mismatches and encourage responsiveness to employer needs.

- **Engage youth in meaningful ways as equal stakeholders of the alliance.** Solicit their feedback and consult with them on a regular basis to ensure training is relevant, to better address youth skill deficiencies and is responsive to changing youth perceptions about career opportunities.
- **Increase gender inclusiveness by training females as trainers and providing additional support to women as they run small businesses or take on their first jobs.** Be ready to address related challenges, such as the need to: provide additional support including awareness raising with families of young women and surrounding communities in order to increase retention; create safe classroom environments that are gender-friendly and culturally acceptable; and offer mentoring to newly employed women facing disparities in pay or treatment in the workplace.
- **Assess the capacity of implementing partners dealing with entrepreneurship interventions at the program outset to determine where they need assistance.** If there is no in-house expertise in a particular industry area, engage outside experts who can provide substantial mentoring support to young entrepreneurs at least for the first six months of establishing enterprises. Set program benchmarks to monitor the progress of new businesses. Be prepared for external, unanticipated events that can seriously affect business operations.

Part 2: Internships/Apprenticeships

Demand-driven skills training and internships/apprenticeships are essential steps to introduce young people to the job market, give them tangible experience as they start on their career paths and bring them into the continuum of job placement and career development. In terms of internships and apprenticeships, most students reported having positive experiences, which was helpful to ensure many of them to obtain jobs.

Recommendations:

- **Ensure that internships and on-the-job training are present in virtually all job training programs for young people.** However, the experience of youth in the workforce should be systematically and strategically monitored to ensure that youth receive the necessary support and also fair compensation where possible. Regular feedback meetings with internship providers are helpful because it helps youth improve their performance and increases their chances of getting jobs. In particular, EEA's experience demonstrates that providing follow-up support to out-of-school youth (who are employed or running businesses for the first time) is important, and that this element should be fully incorporated into program designs so that youth can make a successful transition into the labor market. As a corollary, projects should work closely with employers also to ensure they create a nurturing environment for young people starting their transition into the workforce, providing sufficient opportunities for mentorship, growth and reflection on challenges.
- **Help youth beneficiaries to negotiate with internship providers for some form of compensation.** If this is not an option, projects should optimally allocate sufficient resources to provide some stipends to youth so they can participate in internships and gain useful experience.
- **Revisit internship and training periods to ensure youth are equipped with sufficient knowledge, skills and practical experience.** Internship durations that are too short will likely provide little experience or time to adjust to a new working environment, while internships that are too long may discourage employers from taking the step toward hiring for full time employment.
- **Design and provide tailored comprehensive skills training based on the needs of youth.** This helps graduates to be fully prepared to undertake internships and subsequently enter the job market or start new businesses. Solicit feedback from youth throughout implementation. Those projects that have done so appear to have performed better.

Part 3: Job Placement Services

Overall, EEA was able to provide job placement and entrepreneurship support that enabled 56% of its target youth to become employed or self-employed. EEA also helped create over 500 additional jobs for communities in Indonesia, the only country where this element was systematically monitored. Employer satisfaction rates are also high and on average sixty percent of employers interviewed reported that EEA graduates were better workers than other employees of similar age groups. However, EEA programs often did not reach their specific targets as it appears these targets were frequently set unrealistically high for some untested pilot activities being undertaken by new and nascent partnerships. Similarly, the challenging financial climate during this period became worse toward the end of program and affected newly established businesses and available job opportunities. Finally and most importantly, EEA designed and offered shorter technical training to help youth gain marketable skills, get jobs, and earn income immediately. While training programs were in large part reasonably successful in spite of the practical time limitations of training and internships, EEA-graduates faced fierce competition from graduates of longer two to four-year technical, vocational training programs for jobs.

Recommendations:

- Supporting disadvantaged youth in obtaining jobs begins with creating favorable conditions for job placement throughout the design and training process. Recommendations in this area include:
 - **Conduct market assessments and monitor labor market assessments on a regular basis.** Targeted, non-academic market assessments with a substantial sample of employers help ensure that the training provided is demand-driven and enable program designers to make adjustments in order to avoid saturating markets.
 - **Engage potential employers from target industries to develop relevant and quality training models.** Where possible, engage business leaders as resource people or guest speakers throughout implementation, not only to help students acquire practical knowledge but also to help them make contacts which can lead to internships and jobs. Secondly, when deciding training durations, be mindful of employer needs as well as the situations of disadvantaged youth who may have financial constraints. Also, consider offering transportation and meal stipends so that youth can travel to find jobs.
 - **Carefully decide on training duration.** Program designers should revisit and adjust training and internship durations based upon previous program experiences, particularly given the need to provide post-training follow-up support to graduates. Lengthy design times for interventions are necessary to ensure proper engagement of stakeholders. However, this should not come at the expense of sufficient implementation time to enable job training, placement support, and long term integration into the job market.
- **Establish a strong advocacy network to change the attitudes of businesses** toward hiring former out-of-school, inexperienced youth compared to those who have undergone more formal training. Help them understand the business benefits of training youth in their communities, both in investing in human capital and stimulating local economies. Broadcast success stories to show employers that this “risk” is worth it.
- **Provide regular feedback and consultative meetings as the first cohort class graduates and enters the workforce.** This helps ensure real time improvements are made in areas where training is weak. Additionally, in order to produce graduates who meet the expectations of employers, it is important to create organized local or national level platforms for employers from target industries to gather and provide feedback and recommendations on a regular basis.
- **Increase program effectiveness by soliciting feedback from youth and integrating post-training follow-up support as a key component of program designs.** A key finding of this evaluation was that the transition for disadvantaged youth into a formal working environment poses both new and exciting opportunities, but also frequent challenges in terms of adjusting to new norms, expectations, and often critical feedback. As such, mentorship for youth – and if possible allowing them to use training facilities to strengthen their technical skills – should be provided at least for the first six months as youth enter the labor market. Consider utilizing technology, such as mobile phones or online platforms, to systematically track graduates who are either looking for a job or just beginning one, and provide the job counseling support they need to be able make a full transition to productive adulthood.
- **Promote entrepreneurship as a way to help further expand job opportunities for trainees and increase the overall market for jobs for young people.** Pilot projects in EEA that

incorporated entrepreneurship tracks as a back-up plan or part of the overall plan appear to have performed better – as they were able to help youth set up small businesses where jobs were scarce. Develop clear strategies at the outset to help them develop viable business plans and link them with financial institutions. However, EEA learned that implementing partners and youth need more hands-on coaching and mentoring by experts at later stages. As such, to support the sustainability and success of these businesses, similar projects need to allocate enough resources and time to provide such support.

Part 4: Sustainability and Scalability of Employability Projects

As noted under IR1, sustainability can be evaluated at multiple levels, including at the country and project levels. As discussed, the development of long term sustainable country alliances at the national level appears to have been a largely unrealistic goal given the relative size of the EEA program in each country and the presence of a wide array of stakeholders among multilateral and bilateral donors, government ministries, trade associations, educational institutions and businesses of all types that would need to be fully engaged in such an effort. Similarly, as the program focused predominantly on developing alliances around project-level activities, broader advocacy efforts by necessity were not emphasized as frequently. Nonetheless, the EEA alliance-based framework had some success in sustaining project-level activities and positioning them for scale through the multitude of partners involved in the design, support, implementation and evaluation of projects. This has demonstrated the utility of using an alliance based approach, providing a broader array of avenues and supporters to build on projects that work and expand them collectively and through their own networks for the long term.

Recommendations:

- **Start the process of alliance building from the outset of needs assessment and design.** Engaging stakeholders from all sectors in assessing challenges related to youth development and in determining what is currently and successfully being done is a powerful first step in building their interest in supporting youth programs at a later date.
- **Think about scale and sustainability from the very outset of discussions around design.** It should be clear to all parties that initial pilots are being put forward with the expectation that stakeholders will utilize their networks and resources to expand activities if they prove successful. The design should also embed strategies for scale in the pilots, for instance, working with local organizations or training institutes that have proven systems for training of trainers and creating local cadres of master trainers.
- **Think carefully about creating rigorous but user-friendly systems for monitoring and evaluation, so that partners can be kept easily apprised of progress and clear successes can generate momentum around the prospects of scale and long term sustainability.** Similarly, find ways to ensure regular check-in systems and visits to projects by partners that are inclined to support a second and third phase of the project. In all discussions around the project, emphasize the need for rigor in employment approaches and transparency in assessing outcomes, building confidence in the accuracy of project results.
- **Engage local governments and support them to sustain project activities beyond EEA.** Such activities appear to have worked well – especially if the model and methodologies have proven successful and that governments are engaged early as strong internal champions. Local governments have ample resources and also a direct need to serve constituencies of parents and youth. However, it is important also to fully assess capacity constraints and incentive challenges in the system with respect to government employees. Finding champions in the system can help find innovative solutions to such challenges, but this is a fundamental challenge of working successfully with the public sector.
- **Encourage corporate partners to adopt the program as part of their broader CSR initiatives** so that they can help secure strategic financial and material support for the program. The presence of respected corporate stakeholders also helps to increase needed visibility to project efforts for stakeholders such as government and their constituencies. Local corporate partners are often the strongest ally of initiatives and can serve as important catalysts to generate initial interest in the program as well as the scale up of projects later on. Often, corporate leaders are themselves from disadvantaged communities, and are eagerly seeking ways of increasing the local development of these areas.

Conclusion

This evaluation was conducted to address two fundamental questions about the utility of alliance-based interventions in EEA's 35 projects. First and foremost, the evaluation sought to determine whether the use of a multi-sector approach in designing and implementing employability programs for youth delivered unique benefits in terms of education and employability outcomes for young people. This was a particularly important question to ask given the increased time and efforts that appear to have been necessary in developing such programs as compared to more traditional development models that place less emphasis on engagement of partners across sectors.

While a fully comparative evaluation is difficult to make regarding these larger questions, it is clear that the EEA approach fostered significant and direct contacts with the private sector throughout EEA programs, which helped ensure the relevance and ultimate effectiveness of training programs. As noted in this evaluation, the focus on private sector engagement helped to secure strong job placement and internship rates, high employer satisfaction with trainee qualifications, and the high enthusiasm of the trainees about their prospects for success in the marketplace. Similarly, private sector support of the program helped nurture and support entrepreneurship programs, with young entrepreneurs able to leverage this support to help set up new businesses and create new jobs. The alliance-based approach also appears to have had an important side benefit of demonstrating to companies the importance of supporting disadvantaged youth – support that could be provided as both part of their corporate social responsibility commitment and for direct business benefit.

Secondly, the evaluation sought to better understand whether the EEA alliance-building approach and the use of multi-stakeholder partnerships helped promote the sustainability and scalability of interventions. Here too, EEA's multi-sector approach brought forward concrete benefits by involving a broad array of partners who were significantly invested in program activities through the dedication of time, energy and resources. USAID funds, used to incentivize other prospective partners, helped bring in many nontraditional groups to work with USAID and created a framework to test and expand upon project-based partnerships to reach greater numbers of youth in second and third phases of activities. This framework was also instrumental in widening the circle of partners and supporters to help continue projects after USAID support ceased. As a result, a significant number of EEA projects show prospects for long term sustainability and increased cost efficiency over time.

It is our hope that taken together, the experiences, learnings and recommendations in this report will be useful to those in the public, private and NGO sectors who are either planning or already engaged in an alliance-building strategy to improve outcomes for youth worldwide.



The International Youth Foundation (IYF) invests in the extraordinary potential of young people. Founded in 1990, IYF builds and maintains a worldwide community of businesses, governments, and civil-society organizations committed to empowering youth to be healthy, productive, and engaged citizens. IYF programs are catalysts of change that help young people obtain a quality education, gain employability skills, make healthy choices, and improve their communities. To learn more, visit www.iyfnet.org



This project was made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under grant agreement no. RAN-A-00-04-00043-00. This report was funded in part under grant agreement no. EPP-A-00-08-00006-00.