The Reach Alliance

Case Study: Women's Economic Empowerment in Jalisco

Appendices

Appendix #1: Interview Guide

Dimensions of Collective Impact:
1. Shared Measurement
2. Backbone Organization
3. Mutually Reinforcing Activities
4. Communication
5. Shared Agenda
6. Equity and Community Lens
7. Learning Organization (Within: Capacity Building)
8. Trust/equality between Organizations
9. Capacity building
10. Systems Change
11. Training

Introductory Questions (for all categories):
- How long have you been with your organization?
- What is your role within your organization?

1. Backbone Organization
- Can you provide an overview of your functions as the backbone organization within the Co-Meta Initiative's Collective Impact structure? (2,3)
- How was the Co-Meta Initiative chosen as an intervention for women's economic empowerment? (5)
    - Follow up: How was the intended target group involved in the design of this initiative? (6)
        - Follow up: Are there any marginalized groups that are not being reached by this initiative, and if so, who? (6)
    - Follow up: How did you choose the organizations that are currently working on the Co-Meta initiative as partners? (4,5)
    - Follow up: Do you sense a hierarchy at all in the participation of the various actors in the Co-Meta network. How might that impact your work? (8)
- What would you say is the overall goal of the Co-Meta initiative? (5)
- In what capacity have you been involved in monitoring and evaluating the program to track its progress? (1)
- How has communication been fostered amongst the organizations within the network of actors? (4)
- What have been the major challenges and opportunities involved in participating within a network of actors for this initiative? (9,7//Depends)
    - Follow up: Do you believe that the network approach is the best way to achieve the goals of Co-Meta? (9)
    - Follow-up: What are the foreseeable opportunities and challenges involved in scaling and sustaining this program? (9//Depends)
    - Follow up: What existing practices do you think should be expanded? (9)

- Follow up: Which practices do you think are not providing any benefit? (9)
- To what extent has your organization been involved in influencing public policy through the Co-Meta Initiative? (10)
  - Follow up: To what extent are any partner organizations involved in influencing public policy? (10)

2. **Implementing Partner OR Supporter**
- What would you say is the overall goal of the Co-Meta initiative? (5)
- How has Prosociedad been involved in this project? (2)
- Can you provide an overview of your functions within the Co-Meta Initiative? (3)
- Have you been involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the program to track its progress? In what capacity? (1)
  - Follow up: Do you believe that monitoring and evaluation of this program is needed; why or why not? (1, 5)
  - Follow up: Do you believe that you have the resources, knowledge, and capacity to conduct monitoring and evaluation of this program; why or why not? (1, 5, 9)
- How has communication been fostered amongst the organizations within the network of actors? (4)
  - Follow up: What communication channels have been utilized to update you with all of the progress of Co-Meta? (4)
  - Follow up: What level of understanding would you say you have regarding what the other actors in Co-Meta's network contribute? (4, 3)
  - Follow up: Do you sense a hierarchy at all in the participation of the various actors in the Co-Meta network and how might that impact your work? (8)
- What have been the major challenges and opportunities involved in participating within a network of actors for this initiative? (9//Depends))
  - Follow up: Do you believe that the network approach is the best way to achieve the goals of Co-Meta, and why? (9)
  - Follow up: What are the foreseeable opportunities and challenges involved in scaling and sustaining this program? (9,3,7//Depends)
  - Follow up: What existing practices do you think should be expanded? (9)
  - Follow up: Which practices do you think are not providing a benefit? (9,7)
- To what extent has your organization been involved in influencing public policy through the Co-Meta Initiative? (10)
  - Follow up: To what extent are any partner organizations involved in influencing public policy? (10)
- What training did you receive to participate in this program? (11)
- To your knowledge, have there been consultations with the program target audience (the women participants) in the program design? Please elaborate. (6)
  - Follow up: Are there any marginalized groups that are not being reached by this initiative, and if so, who? (6)
- Context: As you may have heard, the Collective Impact framework is being used to support the implementation of Co-Meta. How aware are you about the Collective Impact framework? (N/A)

3. Partner no longer engaged

- What would you say is the overall goal of the Co-Meta initiative? (5)
- How has Prosociedad been involved in this project? (2)
- Can you provide an overview of your functions within the Co-Meta Initiative? (3)
- Were you involved in monitoring and evaluation of the program to track its progress? In what capacity? (1)
    - Follow up: Do you believe that monitoring and evaluation of this program is important. Why or why not? (1, 5))
    - Follow up: Do you think that you have the resources, knowledge, and capacity to conduct monitoring and evaluation of this program; Why or why not? (1, 5))
- To what extent was there communication amongst the organizations within the network of actors? (4)
    - Follow up: In the past, to what extent have communication channels been utilized to update you with all of the progress of Co-Meta? (4)
    - Follow up: What level of understanding would you say you had regarding what the other actors in Co-Meta's network contribute? (3, 5)
    - Follow up: To what extent did you sense a hierarchy at all in the participation of the various actors in the Co-Meta network? Did that influence your work or your decision to leave? (8)
- What were the major challenges and opportunities involved in participating within a network of actors for this initiative? (9)
    - Follow up: Do you believe that the network approach is the best way to achieve the goals of Co-Meta, and why?
    - Follow up: Which practices do you believe are not providing a benefit? (9, 7)
- What type of training did you receive for participation in this program? (11)
- To what extent were there consultations with the program target audience (the women participants) in the program design? Please elaborate. (6)
    - Follow up: Are there any marginalized groups that are not being reached by this initiative, and if so, who? (6)
- To what extent has your organization been involved in influencing public policy through the Co-Meta Initiative? (10)
    - Follow up: To what extent are any partner organizations involved in influencing public policy?   (10)
- Why did your organization choose to discontinue its efforts with Co-Meta? (Depends)

4. Instructor OR Mentor

- What would you say is the overall goal of the Co-Meta initiative? (5)
- How has Prosociedad been involved in this project? (2)
- Can you provide an overview of your functions within the Co-Meta Initiative? (5, 3)
- How well do you think the Co-Meta Initiative has met its goals of economic em-

powerment of women?
- Follow up: Have women seen tangible economic opportunities, or a decrease in poverty as a result of their participation? (3)
- Follow up: In addition to economic empowerment, what other skills do you believe the participants are looking to achieve through this program? (3)
- Follow-up: Can you explain whether or not the Co-Meta Initiative increases the social connectedness and community network? (3)
- What kind of training did you receive to contribute to the program? (11)
    - Follow up: Can you provide any details about the training program? (11)
- To what extent are the intended beneficiaries participating in the project, and what do you think could increase their participation? (6)
    - Follow up: If these women have a concern or idea for the program, how are they dealt with? (6)
    - Follow up: Are there any marginalized groups that are not being reached by this initiative, and if so, who? (6)
- What are the main challenges and opportunities that you've found through your work as a mentor/instructor? (9)
    - How can the Initiative be more sustainable? (9)

Appendix #2: Dimensions Overview

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(1) Shared Measurement	26	17	6
(2) Backbone Organization	23	9	4
(3) Mutually Reinforcing Activities	57	10	9
(4) Open Communication	27	13	4
(5) Shared Agenda	38	7	11
(6) Equity and Community	49	35	14
(8) Trust Amongst Organizations	18	5	6
(9) Capacity Building >>Funding	58	60	17
(10) Systems Lens	23	7	5
(11) Training	29	6	6

Appendix #3: Dimensions Overview, Qualitative Interviews (Summary)

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(1) Shared Measurement	Centers conducted a baseline survey of socio-economic data and this opened the eyes of employees to this data as it is not something that they usually collect and they thought it was interesting. Actors have stated that there has been frequent monitoring and evaluation taking place. Also, there has been the the establishment of life project, job development, financial education, and graduation. M&E evaluation systems have been adapted to fit the reality of the respective actors involved. Some individuals stated that statistics are provided to track the progress of the women involved in the program. Ex) dropout rates. There are actors that have M&E experts that conducted surveys and general reporting on statistics of the programs. There is a general consensus amongst actors that MandE is very important because it allows those that are involved in the program to the issues that the data provides. Moreover, there is an overall general understanding that that the human capital (knowledge, social commitment amongst employees), as well as social capital (allies and contacts involved) exist to conduct effective MandE.	Co-Meta is in the process, halfway through a two year program. Thus they can't say anything conclusively (about the program). More time is needed to truly evaluate the comprehensive impact of the program as it stands. Also, there were many actors that did not know the current capacity of M&E within the network of actors. There seems to be an understanding that M&E is important BUT the capacity in which metrics are recorded and shared are still not salient and obvious to everyone in the networks.	ProS works with limited personnel. M&E in the partner organizations is conducted by someone with many hats. There is not a dedicated person to do this job and therefore it is forgotten. There is a lack of total uniformity in the network of actors regarding M&E. There are actors that have developed their own M&E structure and others that have not. Also, there individual actors that are asked to provide a lot of data that they currently do not have. There is an immediate issue with many organizations, that being: they use the limited resources and time that they have not to conduct monitoring and evaluation but to deal with the immediate and necessary concerns of of the participant women. There are actors that have the ability to conduct M&E, but don't have the time. There were actors that were receiving excel sheets and statistics from ProS but they were not understanding the information that they were looking at. Therefore, ProS decided to go back and explain why M&E is important for the functioning of the organizations. Finally, there have been several individuals that wish that M&E was done better. They would like to see more results but Co-Meta does not have the ability to do this yet.

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(2) Backbone Organization	ProS Function: Measures the program, partnerships, builds tools for the whole process, allows for the measurement of the program's effectiveness. ProS also developed the program by researching BRAC. ProS related what they learned to their reality in Jalisco and has extensive experience in linking actors together. Actors have stated that ProS has created relationships with participants. ProS has a team of psychologists that aid women for emotional support and to help create securer environments. Moreover, ProS helps diagnose the communities through field research about the communities itself (demographics, business opportunities, etc). Finally, ProS helps evaluation of the mentors, classes, and content that women learn. Online classes as currently being evaluated (internet quality, participation rates). ProS works with local actors that have a role in women empowerment services. They established a dialogue and began to build new approaches to deliver better services towards the common goal of helping low income women, especially marginalized women. ProS view themselves as an organization gain knowledge through practice and consolidate information for better decision making. Also, ProS is in the process of creating strategic alliances with actors such as UN Women. As a backbone org ProS has maintained a certain level of evidence based implementation for programs. Many actors from different level organizations has noted that ProS is continuously trying to achieve a horizontal approach in their implementation. They share the knowledge that they have with other organizations but they do not micromanage the manner in which each organization conducts their implementation or their day-to-day activities.	Currently, ProS is in the process of creating and placing attention to a long-term mission. There are actors that have stated that they are in contact with ProS but they are not entirely sure as to the depth of ProS's involvement in women economic empowerment.	As a backbone organization, ProS has in the past lost cohesion with important local actors such as ITESO (in terms of the internships offered by ITESO). There have been situation in which participants have been "on their own" . Actors have also commented that financial inclusion is lacking for the population and that it is critical for the program o workout the details of financial inclusion. Co-Meta itself does not directly pay the women "to flourish" but they do pay for the mentoring. essentially, PRS finds women the funding. There are also significant improvements that need to be made in the human development aspect of the program, namely the psychological aspects. There is a difference between simply attending one session and actually committing to a psychological therapeutic program. This is where followups are needed especially with women that are not fully engaged.

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(3) Mutually Reinforcing Activities	Regarding mutually reinforcing activities, there are monthly meetings in which organizations socialize with one another and these range from government of Zappopan, to Cemex (enterprise) to ProMexico (NGO). These three different entities support one another as they each individually have specific resources and skillets that the others rely on. In addition,UN Women has been involved in reinforcing activities and relationships building in this network of actors. For instance, UN Women recently signed an agreement with Jalisco government regarding second chance education programs. This gives a boost to all the organizations operating in Jalisco,. UN Women fostered this relationship with Jalisco gov and helps the government implement the goals of the second chance initiatives. essentially , UN Women aided ProS by linking their methodology to the sphere of public policy. There is a common understanding that creating alliances and aiding one another by helping improve methodologies and diagnosis of community issues. This then helps different actors and parties coordinate and come up with solutions together rather than on their own.This fosters an ecosystem of mutually reinforcing activities. On a more personal level, Co-Meta has provided women with an opportunity for women to help out other women. For example, women have shared some of their personal issue (lack of financial resources abusive spouse) , and have support one another through their problems.	Mutually reinforcing practices need to be expanded to show they work first. When there is a proof of concept, the model can be extrapolated to other centers.	One of the central challenges to the network of actors is that you do not want to be prescriptive. This is important in that they are working with lots of people and organizations and they must have the freedom to work as they wish due to the differing circumstances of the women they work with and the communities they reach.

(3) Mutually Reinforcing Activities (Cont'd)

This ecosystem has allowed actors to introduce organizations to one another and share knowledge and resources to improve capacity. ex) The relationship between UN Women , government , and ProS was fostered by an individual actor. This relationship has increased funding and resources within the network of actors and has therefore strengthened one another.

A central example of mutually reinforcing activities can be found with the mentors themselves . Ex) ProS has been involved in training mentors on how to work with the participants and gender training. then the mentors, which are provided by another organization teach the women specific skills.

In addition, the State government has revived mentoring from ProS. The gov has inside contact with ProS . These two actors met through events, where they realized that there were areas in which they could collaborate. ProS currently helps with theories and evaluating problems, and have received funding in exchange. The agreement between these two actors has been one of mutual reinforcement and support. In addition to this alliance, there is collaboration taking place to promote UN Women;s Initiative within the state of Jalisco. The Jalisco government is linking UN Women with CO-Meta initially so that participants can have both economic support from the state as well as mentoring and skills building from Co-Meta.

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(4) Open Communication	The main partners have information sharing sessions every 3 months. Many actors stay up-to-date through constant flow of WhatsApp communications. ProSociedad visits and observes what is happening at some community centres. One actor says there are monthly meetings within the network... "ProS processes all the info and delivers it to the organizations they work with. The organizations socialize with each other as well (1) govt of Zappopan (government) (2) Cemex (enterprise) (3) ProMexico (NGO). Each axis has a different role has a different way of implementation." ProSociedad manages the communication between UN women, HP, and government. It coordinates meetings between these important groups. "ProS does quarterly reporting. ProMex carries the admin work of the partnership. UN women has conversations every 1-2 weeks with the admin arm of ProMex. Through Whatsapp UN + ProS discuss. They speak about how things are going and troubleshoot problems. Lots of informal communication. Meetings 1/month and more formal meetings once every quarter to evaluate the past 4 months."	There is an unawareness amongst some actors of who is involved in the network. Example: for a Cemex employee, they are only aware of the participation of ITESO and ProSociedad. Many actors state that they are only in contact with ProSociedad. Communication is an area that needs to be improved. Pros has been the nucleus. There is little communication between implementing partners. This is likely because they are making new alliances with different actors. There is no communication strategy between allies. Centres (Cemex, Zap, ProMexico) have very little communication between each other, and thus don't know how their programs could be improved to replicate positive outcomes from other centres. —-> Prosoc is not facilitating communication between centers. They have had one meeting a month ago. This is not a systematic process. They do not search, evaluate, and disseminate good practices. Some things are working well in specific centers, but there is no system to track those nuances, evaluate, and disseminate them. At the beginning, there was a lack of time/capacity for steady communication of outcomes between the actors involved. The way in which centres communicate to the network is different. One interviewee has said that to scale, there needs to be better systems of communication in place. With an ex-partner, there was a lack of communication as to why the partnership did not continue, from the perspective of the interviewee, there was simply no follow up when the workshop ended. While there are virtual meetings because of the pandemic, it is much harder to keep it up under the current circumstances.	One community centre employee stated that they have a 75% understanding of what goes on at the other centres, and understands their main goals. However, this employee was unaware of the specifics since the community centres are at a distance from one another. ProSociedad has a staff member that is tracking how implementing partners are working, and are attempting to promote training to share the information that was gathered. Staff who work specifically at one community centre as mentors/instructors have stated that they are not in touch with the other community centres.

| (4) Open Communication (Cont'd) | "ProS has a capacity building team and this team meets every one to two weeks with staff of community centers. Prosoc has meetings on topics related to a series of main topics. At the start of the collaboration, the priorities was getting information about CoMeta out to the community. Before Covid they had one on one meetings and follow up with WhatsApp. They mostly use whatsapp for their most frequent means of communication. Prosoc dont use email. In strategic areas, the decision-makers of 3 implementing partners, Prosoc is building constant conversations so the 3 partners have a common agenda and open communication. This is high level meetings that craft the agenda of cometa in theory. This process is ongoing."

There was an initial meeting where the instructors/mentors were informed about the network and actors involved. | | |

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(5) Shared Agenda	Actors are largely in agreement about the main goal of Co-Meta (economic and social empowerment for vulnerable populations, connections to job market, training, etc). Some actors emphasize how Co-Meta is also a tool to break Machismo cultural norms. Example responses: •Main goal is to empower women in personal economic and familial ways. For products they make to transcend within the community as well. •the overall goal of Co-Meta is the economic empowerment of women, by means of offering attractive+comprehensive+accessible education. •Main goal is to train people in vulnerable situations, to obtain skills in order to get an income •Goal of the initiatve is provide women with challenging circumstances skills and encouragement to pursue a business idea / other ideas. •The power of co-meta is that they can create alliances so that they can create stronger community. It combats machismo culture and helps with combating the capitalist culture as well. •The goal is to empower women and to make women capable to become entrepreneurs and create alliances between them and the community in order to create stronger communities. •Goal is to 1. promote economic empowerment, 2. promote the organizations that implement women empowerment programs. Managing best practices. 3. Change the social system to remove women's barriers •Goal of CoMeta is improve quality of life of the people that participate in the program. Some actors emphasize how the goal of Co-Meta is to establish a network of allies (ie... promote organizations who promote empowerment).	Many actors act in silos, focusing on their specific tasks and are unaware of the happenings in the wider network. There is an unawareness of the extent of the network. That being said, they have the same goal in mind. Most actors do not have the same agenda in terms of M&E. It is pursued differently per organization.	n/a

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(6) Equity and Community	The Co-Meta Initiative stems from a community food bank program, and focus groups with women from the food bank were conducted prior to designing the program. Many social workers (who worked directly with women of the food bank) were key in crafting Co-Meta. Participants have highlighted the importance of consulting with participants in designing/choosing program components. ProSociedad provides a team of psychologists for follow up and emotional support. When instructors/mentors don't feel qualified to help, they report to ProS who are always able to fill the gaps. Students who participate in internships always collaborate WITH the program's participants, instead of telling them what to do. The program itself has worked to create community cohesion and social fabric for women. Instructors largely sense an increase in teamwork as well as friendship amongst participants. There has been an increase in self esteem sensed amongst mentors. When women have expressed a dislike for a class, or a desire to learn something else, Co-Meta has at times adapted to suit their interests (ex. women not wanting to work with eggs). Mentors have a close, intimate relationship with participants. Mentors are chosen carefully such that they have a good understanding of the community. Mentors participate out of their good will. Due to the pandemic, there is an increase in inequities (ex: women who are not able to access tech). ProS has been supporting women through this.	Two participants stated that the program needs more developmental and psychological follow up once the program has been terminated and throughout the program. In Mexico, there lacks a culture of self care in this way, so more support is needed. Some women do not feel comfortable coming forward with their at home issues. One instructor mentioned that there seems to be a lack of interest in the topic they are teaching (has stated that women may not want to work in agricultural services which are common in their community, but rather with beauty products, for ex). Some of the program components seem imposed on women. There are community barriers to participation —> husbands and kids not wanting women to attend and grow, for example. The difficulty of working within a Machismo culture. There is a lack of a gendered perspective in this initiative, although that is something Co-Meta is trying to improve. Interviewees have expressed mixed understandings as to whether or not the women were consulted in the design of the study. The main consensus is that there were some preliminary focus groups, but not much. This is because ProS works on the theoretical side and less in the field. This is interesting because participatory research is very big in Latin America. COVID has increased inequities and threatened participation in the program. Some women felt they were lied to about what the program would provide them —> they thought they would get rich in 6 months and were disappointed that this isn't the reality. There has been some questions about whether the program gives participants false hope (without enough resources) to change their situation. This would be unethical, says one interviewee. Must be clear about exactly what this program provides	Interviewees have stated that the program should be expanded to reach: •migrants from Latin America •Returning migrants from the US •Indigenous Women •Extremely poor women •Geographically isolated women, certain municipalities around Jalisco that aren't being reached •Women who face severe violence •Illiterate women •Women with disabilities •rural Usually participants are those who have their basic needs met, are literate with some education, and live near community centres. Not the hardest to reach.

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(8) Trust Amongst Organizations	•Trust is the basis of the relationship amongst the actors of the network, almost everyone agrees about this. •Organizations already had a relationship prior to being chosen, so it is easy for them to work well together •ProSociedad and other actors (UN Women) have a good reputation in the community so organizations are keen to become involved. •While there is somewhat of a hierarchy, (funding bodies and Prosociedad are usually seen as leaders), this is natural and it doesn't impact the work at all. Organizations don't feel left out. •Everyone agrees the network of allies is helpful and essential. It allows for more capacity. •Most participants agree that the organization structure is horizontal, all actors have their own essential tasks. •However, it is not horizontal in the way the program interacts with women participants.	One ex-partner does not seem to be aware of why their workshop stopped with ProSociedad, they just did not follow up about the workshop. •A lot of decision making is defaulted to prosociedad. There is this perception that those actors with the theoretical/academic knowledge are the leaders/knowledge holders… ie, there is a divide between the theory/practice practitioners. •Since ProSociedad sees itself as a "capacity builder", this role is inherently vertical/top-down. They recognize this and are trying to change the way they are framing their operations.	Since ProSociedad created Co-Meta, they are the defacto leaders, and a lot of trust is placed in their decisions. One interviewee stated that ProSociedad needs a better system for choosing its partners, such that they fill the program's gaps. Currently, it's based on existing relationships. Interviewees have mentioned the general importance of working with NGOs in communities, as many of these groups are trusted.

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(9) Capacity Building >>Funding	ProMexico has a team of 9 mentors that accompany women through their process - attending 55 women with 3 diff jobs, (1) local gastronomy, (2) care giving for older adults, (3) learning how to treat food to sell food -- dehydrated or conserved foods. Within framework of Solidarity Economy When the Pandemic started, ProMexico did a diagnosis in order to track the new needs of women (psychological, health, food, teaching, teaching children). Promexico women have had obstacles relating to wifi access. Promexico has organized events to establish access to electronic tools. Adapt the program to a rural reality and hand infrastructure challenges. Personal challenges within the association. Each challenge has been overcome. At the start there were jobs that were established and was not accepted by the community. CoMeta does not want to impose jobs and programs on the community. They constantly learn and adapt the conditions and challenges that come up and adapt the program to the reality of the context they operate. Being in a network is helpful to understand what level you are at compared to the others in the network. You can also compare progress and restructure accordingly. The program links them with the tools needed to slove problems When the women finished their projects, Semx and Prosoc helped the women set up a small market stands in their headquarters at an event. There needs to be more spaces like this. Women need to look at their individual products, and find the best places to sell depending on the product. ProS has a lot of experience with linking actors together.	Lack of funding is a huge barrier, many partners have mentioned this. Related to a lack of funding, there is a lack of personnel, which is why some activities such as M&E are not conducted... employees are already at capacity with day-to-day activities. There is concern that turnover of employees at organizations could threaten the capacity/relationships that have already been built. Some organizations are resistant to changing there ways, which has harmed the capacity/scalability of the program. Specific to women, capacity/access to tech is a huge barrier. Capacity for codncuting courses, communication, etc is difficult wtih limited tech during a pandemic. Pandemic has impacted the capacity of CoMeta. In terms of funding, it may be a challenge to continue securing funding in light of the pandemic. Mentors/some instructors are not paid for their services... one interviewee does not think this is quite fair since mentors especially face an emotional burden. Many women don't have basic tools for the classes or the means to get them, so it's hard for them to really implement businesses. One interviewee has the idea of implementing a community kitchen and space, but this would require a lot more capacity To scale, Co-Meta needs a better communication system, better digital software/system for M&E, nd more time to evaluate. The program still needs proof of concept before it scales.	ProS doesn't have the capacity to handle all the issues the women have. Mentors/some instructors are not paid for their services... Many believe that scaling up the program might lead to the program being watered down/less individualist and humanist and thus, less effective in general

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(10) Systems Lens	Program the has taught the govt how to change perspective when facing public policy by broadening their vision to new proposals. This initiative has also helped connect govt to ngos like promexico and international actors. Prosoc is a consultant of some design of initiative sin Jalisco. The program has changed perspectives amongst women about what they think is achievable in their lives (ex: there's more to life than being a mom/wife), they are more aspirational with their life goals. The program is changing norms relating to machismo culture by allowing women to achieve an education and a chance at opening a business. It increases the self sufficiency of the participants, attempting to systematically change a culture that puts men in financial control. Machismo culture promotes divisions amongst women, this program fights that through promoting teamwork/collaboration. The UN helps ProS with linking political actors. The UN does not have to manage the partnerships networks with ProS as closely. Govt Grants are only provided to at least 50% women owned businesses. the impact of the initiative is general. Has taught the govt how to work in teams, change perspective when facing public policy by broadening their vision to new proposals. This initiative has also helped connect govt to ngos like promexico and international actors.	None of the organizations involved in Cometa are promoting an agenda to influence public policy. They are not ready to think about this yet. There are systemic barriers to participating in the program, largely relating to machismo culture. MANY interviewees have stated that violence against women is an issue. Some women are not able to participate or have dropped the program at their husbands' or kids' request. Husbands often control whether or not women participate. Men control their finances. A few participants have stated that to address this systemic cultural barrier, there must be community education programs... not only focusing on women but also the social development of kids and men to combat the Machismo culturfe. Some interviewees identify that there is not enough being done to target the culture of violence against women. Some participants state it si not up to the program to change cultural norms	allies sometimes speak different languages (metaphorically). The mindset btw Cemex, Pros, ProMex, and the govt is different. They all approach the goal differently, with different agendas and goals. Some women are raising kids on their own with little resources and income. They even struggle with basic needs such as water. The women lack access to the necessary resources to survive. Essentially, the women mainly come to SIlvia because of these problems. . In that poor community they dont have resources that you would find in Guadalajara. There is a culture of Machismo that is more prevalent in Sambancosala. In the rural areas of Guadalajara, its harder to access resources. Starting a new business in Mexico is not easy. Trying to promote small business is very aspirational. Its a very ambitious goal. Recognizing the structural issues in Mexico working against them. Scaling up is a challenge. Pros knows the women personally, but if they scale up, will that individualistic approach remain, Sarahi is not sure Theres a big gap between economic participation bw men and women, payment gap exists, knowledge gap as well (ex: math and sciences don't include women). Policies have tried to integrate girls into the sciences from a young age, developing activities specifically catered to them (which are normally focused for boys, hard sciences). The women still need help to get jobs and opportunities after the program ends (branding, marketing, strategies, client networks). CoMeta itself is fine, but the women in the program are battling systemic issues embedded in Mexican culture. The women are still fighting social and cultural discrimination in the market. The business sustainability hinges on this.

	Positive	Inconclusive	Negative
(11) Training	The dynamic with ProS is mutual training . Always start a group process with a methodology & diagnosis, share what you find with Prosociedad, and normally, both parties build the solution together. So training is not relevant, they are essentially partners. The mentors and members in the program have been trained on violence intervention. Mentors are able to connect women with appropriate resources. training was excellent. 1x a week for two months (ish) for courses involving group work, games, lectures. Looked at what a mentor is, what skills you need, how to navigate problems, etc. Gave her a very good base of tools to use… Has a "PD day" every second month for even more training, involving the psychological aspects of how to help women. There's also a mentor coordinator who helps with issues and resources Most participants highlighted the importance of having access did have access to ProS, ProMexico and other partners to informally help troubleshoot problems. Understanding the gender perspective and integrating it into their practice. was taught how to teach the women in a way that was collaborative instead of hierarchical. So students and teachers are at the same level sharing information		it is hard to put this training into practice, so in this regard, it's likely that the goal of economic empowerment has not been met. We found ProMexico receives extensive training, and Cemex instructors receive some, points to a big difference between the programs.

Appendix #4: Cohesion and Collective Impact

A. Defining Cohesion

We define cohesion as the interconnectedness of "actors via dense, directed, and reciprocated relations. This allows for sharing information, creating solidarity, and collective actions" (Mateos, 2020).

B. Cohesion & Collective Impact

1. Common Agenda

A shared goal and vision is key to promoting effective collaboration and cohesion within a network. Without a common agenda, it is difficult to determine whether Co-Meta actors are truly working towards the same goal. **Co-creation of a shared agenda allows for all voices within the network to be heard, which also promotes cohesion.**

2. Mutually Reinforcing Activities

When actors work in silos, group cohesion is more challenging. It is important that the efforts of Co-Meta actors build upon one another to promote efficiency. **Frequent meetings amongst key actors, and a systematized process for tracking progress, builds cohesion by ensuring that the network is working as a whole.**

3. Continuous Communication

Without continuous communication, it is difficult to ensure that network actors are on the same page and working cohesively. **The use of formal and informal communication channels, as well as frequent meetings amongst key actors, is key to promote cohesion.**

4. Backbone Function

The backbone organization serves as a pillar for collaboration, maintains the tethers of the network by providing key supports to sustain operations. **Cohesion requires coordination among actors and the backbone directly provides that structure.**

5. Shared Measurement System

Shared measurement facilitates cohesion. When actors are maintaining the same data set, there is a unified frame of reference for monitoring and evaluation. **Alternatively**, when each network utilizes separate measurement systems, overall trends and deviations are not able to be tracked. **Cohesion is promoted by**

centralizing the system so the network can collectively track trends as a whole, instead of working with disjointed data.

C. Measuring Cohesion

Due to the scope and parameters of our evaluation, we were unable to include social cohesion within our direct measurement approach. We find elements of connectedness and collaborative group dynamics, aspects of social cohesion, within the Co-Meta Initiative. The measurement of group cohesion is a topic that subsequent Reach Alliance teams, or other research groups assessing Co-Meta, could focus on. Below we have provided examples that are indicative of the presence of potential social cohesion.

Example 1: Organizational trust is important to the maintenance of a strong and cohesive network, as it allows actors to rely upon one another. As such, the measurement of organizational trust can serve as an indicator of cohesion. We found that the majority of interviewees cite trust as very high within the Co-Meta network.

Example 2: A centralized training is integral to the Co-Meta project to maintain a cohesive operational structure. However, our interviews have shown Co-Meta lacks a consistent and common training framework which limits the ability for the network to operate cohesively. Actors within Co-Meta should have a standardized understanding of operations, best practices, and expected outcomes in order to build cohesion through a shared frame of reference and language.

Example 3: Open and continuous communication ensures that actors are on the same page, thereby indicating cohesion. We find that continuous communication amongst instructors, mentors, and facilitators has been maintained through informal channels, such as WhatsApp. However, there appears to be a lack of communication between implementing partners. Interviewees stated that they are unaware of the Co-Meta operations at other community centres, which is an example of where cohesion may be affected due to a lack of adequate communication.

Bibliography:

Mateos, G. (2020). Characterizing Network Cohesion. Retrieved November 1, 2020, from http://www2.ece.rochester.edu/~gmateosb/ECE442/Slides/block_3_descriptive_analysis_properties_part_d.pdf