

Lessons in Capacity-Building

In the following report, Tom Novick and Erin Anderson of M+R Strategic Services verified the effectiveness of the Ms. Foundation's Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative (SEAI) "funding-plus" support strategy and highlighted that **the power of this work lies in grantees' ability to work as trusted messengers from within communities to engage youth and adults directly affected by local sexuality education policies.** From a statewide health education graduation requirement in New Mexico to parent and youth-led curriculum development in Texas and California, grantee organizations have realized significant gains with Ms. Foundation support.

SEAI, begun in 2005, was designed to support state-level efforts to secure mandated, fully-funded, comprehensive and medically accurate sexuality education for all students, as well as strong curricula and teacher training programs for meaningful implementation. SEAI has also been a strategic investment by the Ms. Foundation to test the unique grantmaking, technical assistance and networking strategy of support for community-based advocacy organizations in the field of sexuality education.

The Ms. Foundation engaged M+R Strategic Services and Mr. Novick, a nationally recognized expert on civic engagement, to evaluate the Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative by conducting interviews and site visits and speaking with external stakeholders to track the growth and effectiveness of multi-year grantees. The report focuses on the Ms. Foundation's role in supporting grantee progress as a means to assess its theory of change and the effectiveness of the unique, "more than money" combination of support.

The grants gave us the opportunity to develop internal infrastructure while having positive policy outcomes.

—Ms. Foundation SEAI Grantee



California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
Photo ©Elizabeth Rappaport and Ms.
Foundation for Women

For more information

A. Caroline Hotaling, Program Officer for National Policy & Strategic Opportunities
212.709.4402 chotaling@ms.foundation.org

September 2010



Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative

An Assessment for the Ms. Foundation for Women

Prepared by Erin Anderson and Tom Novick

M+R Strategic Services

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Strategy Guiding SEAI	5
Executive Summary of Findings	6
Methodology	8
Overarching Finding	9
Findings from the Field	10
Findings from the SEAI Grant-Making Model	17
Program Snapshots	23
Conclusion	28
Appendices	
<i>SEAI State Grantee Interview Guide</i>	29
<i>Interview List</i>	32

Introduction

The Ms. Foundation for Women has a strong history of supporting sexuality education advocacy at the local and state levels through its reproductive rights, health and justice funding areas. A large majority of Americans – including members of traditionally conservative communities – agree that young people should receive medically accurate sexuality education in schools, yet many school districts fail to provide this, instead offering inaccurate, misleading and unscientific “abstinence-only until marriage” curricula. Sexuality education is an issue that has the potential to galvanize numerous constituencies and build bridges across diverse groups including youth, parents, communities of color, educators and education reformers, and community organizers.

In 2001, the Ms. Foundation launched a three-year program titled “New Partners, New Initiatives.” New Partners tested models for enhancing community-based advocacy to improve access to sexuality education and services for young people. The Ms. Foundation focused New Partners grant support on non-typical advocates and those who have not traditionally been seen as members of the reproductive rights movement. The Ms. Foundation selected eight grantees in Arizona and Washington representing urban and rural Latino communities, gay and lesbian youth groups, and family health service and prevention providers. By the conclusion of the program, New Partners demonstrated that the issue of sexuality education is an effective tool to engage diverse constituencies and build new relationships between reproductive health, education and rights advocacy groups.

In 2005, building on the lessons learned from the New Partners project, the Ms. Foundation launched the Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative (SEAI). The vision guiding SEAI is that all young people should have access to the information they need to make informed decisions for lifelong sexual health, and that this is accomplished by mandated, fully funded, comprehensive, and medically accurate sexuality education. To make progress toward this vision, SEAI built a program based on the following objectives:

- Supporting grantees in achieving concrete policy and organizational wins;
- Providing grantees with capacity building support to increase their membership or power base, improve the efficacy of their policy strategies, and identify measurable outcomes; and
- Supporting the networking and information-sharing between states and national groups to enhance the alignment of local, state and federal policy.

Since launching its Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative in 2005, the Ms. Foundation has given \$1,720,000 in grants to state-based groups and coalitions and their national partners. During SEAI’s first three fiscal years, the initiative funded a total of 11 state-based groups or coalitions in different states as well as three national partners.

These grantees are advocating within local communities, school districts, state agencies, and state legislatures to urge the adoption of policies and implementation to make medically accurate, comprehensive sexuality education a required part of community and school based curriculum. Objectives include passage of legislation, program implementation, curriculum development and training.

The SEAI model of grant-making is a “funding plus” model that provides both funding and technical assistance to already established organizations that are poised for significant policy wins, while building grantees’ organizational capacity to achieve these and other victories over the long-term. SEAI’s technical assistance supports have been primarily provided by the team of Desirée Flores, Ms. Foundation Program Officer, and consultant Teresa Purcell of Purcell Public Affairs.

SEAI supported eight state-level grantees in Year One, and those grantees that made clear progress were invited to continue in the initiative’s second and third years. In Year Two, several additional grantees were added to the SEAI docket to increase diversity in constituencies and geography. SEAI began its fourth year in June 2010. At that time, the Ms. Foundation decided to transition SEAI from existing as its own initiative to sitting under the umbrella of the reproductive/sexual health and justice program.

The SEAI state grantees in the first three years were:

- Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health;
- Planned Parenthood Affiliates of Michigan;
- NARAL Pro-Choice Montana Foundation, Montana Reproductive Rights Coalition;
- New Mexico Teen Pregnancy Coalition/New Mexicans for Responsible Sexuality Education;
- The Education Fund of Family Planning Advocates of New York State;
- NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation;
- California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (Years 2 and 3);
- AIDS Taskforce of Greater Cleveland (Years 2 and 3);
- Texas Freedom Network Education Fund (Years 2 and 3);
- Planned Parenthood of Georgia, Inc. (Year 1 only – not included in this evaluation); and
- Planned Parenthood League of Massachusetts (Year 1 only – not included in this evaluation).

The Ms. Foundation also gave grants to three national partners to support the collaborative work and technical assistance provided to state grantees by the national partners, including partnering on State Summits and Convenings:

- Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SEICUS);
- Advocates for Youth; and
- Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

In the fall of 2009, the Ms. Foundation engaged Erin Anderson and Tom Novick of M+R Strategic Services (M+R) to conduct an independent evaluation and assessment of SEAI’s grant-making and capacity building. The goal of the evaluation was to document SEAI’s effectiveness, as well as gather feedback to inform future sexuality education advocacy efforts.

This report, as a whole, details the results of the evaluation. It describes the evaluation methodology used; outlines and explains key findings; and provides in-depth program snapshots of four SEAI state grantees that had significant policy wins or particularly unique and effective advocacy efforts.

Strategy Guiding SEAI

The Ms. Foundation launched SEAI in 2005 to test a means of increasing the capacity and power of state and locally based organizations to achieve policy change by providing both grants and technical assistance. Ms. structured this investment in comprehensive sexuality education, which is an issue that attracts a broad range of constituencies for organizing purposes, as a point of entry to engage non-traditional grantee partners and build the base for a variety of reproductive rights issues.

Through SEAI, the Ms. Foundation for Women sought to create connections between national organizations working on comprehensive sexuality education and groups working on the ground in states; this cross-level strategy is one that the foundation prioritizes throughout its grant-making. This evaluation found that the Ms. Foundation has played a critical role in bringing national and state-based organizations together to increase the capacity of the movement to achieve both policy and organizing wins.

The advocacy landscape is somewhat unique for sexuality education, as curricula are controlled locally and implemented school district by school district and classroom by classroom. There is often little or no consistency at the state level for how decisions are made; enforcement is implemented; and/or how curriculum content is tracked. However, SEAI has been successful at incorporating the concept of *layering* for power building into the strategic targeting decisions of many grantee organizations.

Layering is the concept that, all things being equal, an organization should choose strategic targets for its local organizing efforts that advance the needs of the regional and/or national campaign. As an example, if an organization is working on comprehensive sexuality policy change, the organization should focus activist recruiting activities in a local school district within a key legislative district, within a key congressional district so that activists can have impact at all three levels of government. SEAI's focus has been to build the capacity of state based organizations to achieve policy change. SEAI conducted research and worked with national organizations in the development of the criteria to determine the groups from which to seek proposals. These criteria included:

- Organizations that were already working on comprehensive sexuality education at either the local or state levels;
- Organizations in different regions of the country that could help to build a nationwide story – to make the case that access to comprehensive sexuality education is relevant and important in every region of the country;
- Organizations working in home districts/states of key congressional leaders; and
- Organizations working in states that represented a diversity of goals, strategies and political climates in regard to comprehensive sexuality education.

Executive Summary of Findings

The following key findings synthesize feedback, lessons learned, and recommendations from interviews. We begin with the evaluation's overarching finding. The secondary findings are divided into two sections:

- *Findings from the field*, which focus on the successes and challenges that the SEAI grantees experienced as they launched efforts to achieve policy change; and
- *Findings from the SEAI grant-making model*, which provide insights that can help inform current and future grant-making initiatives.

Overarching finding

The Ms. Foundation's Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative successfully provided grantees with financial and capacity-building support to increase their membership or power base, improve the efficacy of their policy strategies, identify measurable outcomes, and achieve or move much closer to concrete policy wins on comprehensive sexuality education.

Findings from the field

1. Grantees successfully focused and measured their outreach efforts to increase the depth and breadth of their base of supporters who are trained and take action.
2. While each grantee made progress on changing state and local sexuality education policies, this progress took longer than originally expected, and in some cases grantees' initial concrete policy change goals were not actualized.
3. Public education is a largely decentralized enterprise with many small school districts in each state. This decentralization and the "home rule" precedent of locally-controlled decision making in public education contribute to the challenges of passing and enforcing statewide legislation. What is actually being taught often differs widely from district to district, school to school, and classroom to classroom.
4. Statewide legislation requiring medically accurate or comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) is only the first step towards ensuring implementation of adequate curricula. None of the laws recently passed in grantee states have strong statewide enforcement mechanisms, so the onus is on local school boards, curriculum committees, school superintendents, and relevant state agencies to review curricula and make modifications where necessary. Therefore, organizing targets must include local school districts, school boards, school superintendents, and relevant state agencies.
5. Directing attention towards the misleading information and scare tactics of many abstinence-only curriculums can be an effective tool in making the case for policy change.

6. Parents, teens and college students are credible, powerful spokespeople to advocate for medically accurate, comprehensive sexuality education.

Findings from the SEAI grant-making model

1. The Ms. Foundation's "funding plus" grant-making strategy added significant value to its financial support of SEAI grantees.
2. SEAI grantees are a diverse cohort of organizations that vary with regard to their missions, targeted constituencies, and organizing approaches.
3. SEAI grantees are also diverse in their levels of maturity, organizational capacity and political sophistication. This diversity is a strength of SEAI, as it allows for peer learning, but it also creates challenges in designing and implementing technical assistance to satisfy all needs.
4. All SEAI grantees valued in-person convening sessions on strategic planning and relationship-building opportunities with other state grantees and funders. The increased networking and information-sharing between grantees and national groups helped grantees increase revenue streams, and led to greater awareness, alignment and layering of local, state and federal policy advocacy strategies.
5. SEAI grantees found shifting grant reporting metrics onerous, and wished that grantee conference calls had been more substantive.
6. Grantees believe they would benefit from a more comprehensive understanding of the national strategy and their role in it. Grantees also need more assistance in using voter, donor and activist data strategically, and would like an online sexuality education information clearing house.

Methodology

Three primary techniques were utilized to conduct this qualitative evaluation:

A. Interviews

At the beginning of the evaluation, M+R Strategic Services conducted initial framing conversations with SEAI staff and consultant Teresa Purcell to help design the overall evaluation and interview protocol. M+R then conducted 22 in-depth interviews, both in person and by phone with 60 individuals representing a range of stakeholder groups (a full list of interviewees is included in the Appendix):

- SEAI state grantees;
- Coalition partners;
- Activists;
- Legislative champions;
- The Ms. Foundation's national SEAI partners;
- Mosaica: The Center for Nonprofit Development and Pluralism, a firm currently conducting the Ms. Foundation's institution-wide program evaluation; and
- Staff and consultants from the Grove Foundation.

These conversations yielded a wealth of information. Respondents were promised confidentiality in order to encourage frank conversations, and as a result participants were very open and forthcoming. Respondents shared their thoughts and observations with remarkable candor, enabling an honest and comprehensive program evaluation. Quotes used in this report are generally unattributed, to maintain the confidentiality promised.

B. Site Visits

M+R conducted in-person site visits to grantees in Illinois, New York, Texas and Washington in order to gain a deeper understanding of grantee organizations, coalitions and political context.

C. Document Review

M+R Strategic Services conducted an in-depth desk review of written materials, including:

- SEAI's guiding documents;
- Grantee proposals and reports;
- Grantee outreach materials and press clips;
- The Ms. Foundation for Women grant proposals and grant reports submitted to its institutional funders;
- The Ms. Foundation for Women's reporting guidelines and RFPs;
- Agendas and training materials from the state summits and convenings; and
- Grantee surveys and the 2009 Ms. Foundation program evaluation report produced by Mosaica.

Overarching Finding

The Ms. Foundation’s Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative successfully provided grantees with financial and capacity-building support to increase their membership or power base, improve the efficacy of their policy strategies, identify measurable outcomes, and achieve or move much closer to concrete policy wins on comprehensive sexuality education.

SEAI has been successful in meeting its stated objectives of providing financial and capacity-building support to increase state grantees’ abilities to build their bases, improve the effectiveness of their policy strategies, identify and measure outcomes, and achieve or move closer to concrete policy wins. In the words of one SEAI national partner, “the Ms. Foundation strategically used a small pot of money to empower local groups that couldn’t get the money otherwise.”

All state grantees report that SEAI funding allowed them to increase their organizational reach and build or strengthen their base. SEAI funding helped staff and supported the growth of diverse coalitions of traditional reproductive rights allies, as well as non-traditional allies such as child advocacy, education, social justice, and LGBT organizations. Using SEAI funds, the grantees dedicated staff time and resources to identifying, training and mobilizing spokespeople to lobby legislators, local school boards and school superintendents. State grantees found that the best spokespersons for responsible sexuality education policies were parents, teens and college students, as well as professional allies such as nurses, educators and clergy members.

The Ms. Foundation’s “funding plus” model helped to enhance the grants’ reach by helping the grantees increase the effectiveness of their policy advocacy. By providing “funding plus” assistance in designing advocacy campaigns, identifying targets and measuring outcomes, the Ms. Foundation was able to get “more bang for its buck” than if it had assumed the traditional, passive role of the grant-maker: awarding grants and waiting for outcomes. Instead, the Ms. Foundation executed, as a national partner stated, an “on the ground grassroots strategic consulting model to build political, communications and organizing” capacity for grantees. This increased capacity helped state grantees achieve or move much closer to achieving significant policy wins. One national partner remarked that “there were some great wins along the way due to funding local groups and coalitions that they didn’t previously have the ability to achieve.”

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “The grants gave us the opportunity to develop internal infrastructure while having positive policy outcomes.”
- “We were successful - all of the legislators we targeted voted with us.”
- “It was an incredibly important and strategic initiative.”

Findings from the Field

1. Grantees successfully focused and measured their outreach efforts to increase the depth and breadth of their base of supporters who are trained and take action.

The funding provided by SEAI enabled grantees to expend time and resources on outreach and training activities that in turn increased and strengthened their base of supporters and activists. Each grantee approached the task of base-building differently, but all grantees successfully focused their efforts in targeted districts and on specific constituencies such as parents, teens and/or college students.

The importance of base-building was reinforced through SEAI's technical assistance supports. All grantees reported that Teresa Purcell, principal at Purcell Public Affairs and SEAI consultant, helped them to think strategically about where they needed to strengthen their base of supporters, and which communities those supporters should represent. Additionally, SEAI's technical assistance supports and reporting requirements helped grantees create concrete outreach goals and measure their progress towards those goals.

Grantee	Examples of base-building and mobilization successes
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice	Trained over 250 emerging Latina leaders on reproductive justice issues; hosted Reproductive Justice Action Summer with nearly 120 participants representing 55 organizations.
Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health	Email action list has a 20% response rate; trained 1,000 adolescent service providers on sexual health issues; hosted youth lobby day with over 50 young people.
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of Michigan	Trained 158 teens and college students on advocacy skills; 75 teens and 15 college students attended a legislative lobbying event that visited 40 legislative offices.
NARAL Pro-Choice Montana Foundation	Activist and e-activist lists are growing 15-20% per year; have 924 fans on facebook.
New Mexicans for Responsible Sexuality Education	Increased number of organizations in the coalition from 12 to 28 with an additional 800 individual members.
The Education Fund of Family Planning Advocates of New York State	Trained 200 teens in key advocacy skills like phone banking and letter writing; built Get the Facts NY campaign to include 150 organizations and 7,000 endorsing individuals.
AIDS Taskforce of Greater Cleveland	Collected 2,500 postcards to send to the state school board; built the organization's activist database to 5,000 people.
Texas Freedom Network Education Fund	Hosted 3 trainings and a webinar to reach 130 participants; recruited 39 people to serve on School Health Advisory Committees in 16 districts.
NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation	Had a legislative lobby day with 300 people; trained 27 parents to advocate in their school districts; increased trained activist capacity in targeted districts by 17%.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

“We set quantitative goals, and we have surpassed our goals.”

“Our victories have been in the base-building category. When I started we had some names and addresses on a spreadsheet, now we have an activist database of 5,000 people.”

“The grant was a way to focus our organizing efforts.”

2. While each grantee made progress toward changing state and local sexuality education policies, the initial timelines and goals for concrete policy changes took longer to achieve than originally expected, or in some cases, were not actualized.

The ultimate goal of SEAI is to ensure mandated, fully funded, comprehensive, and medically accurate sexuality education for students nationwide, beginning by securing curricula and implementation in each grantee state. All grantees have made concrete and measurable progress towards this goal, although none have completely realized statewide mandated, fully funded, comprehensive and medically accurate sexuality education.

State	Statewide policy wins	Local or district policy wins
California	Passage of SB 71 and AB 629, which require that the sexuality education provided in schools and state-funded community settings is comprehensive and medically accurate.	
Illinois	Rejected federal abstinence-only funding.	Chicago schools adopted CSE curriculum.
Michigan	Michigan has a law mandating teaching about HIV and other STDs. A mandatory CSE bill passed out of the House Education Committee with support from both parties.	
Montana	Rejection of federal abstinence-only funding. The Department of Health and Human Services adopted a CSE performance measure and added it to the Healthy Montana benchmarks.	Missoula schools adopted a medically-accurate curriculum.
New Mexico	The legislation to require health education as a graduation requirement was signed by the Governor on March 10, 2010 after significant lobbying to get the legislation out of the Senate by the coalition.	Albuquerque (grades 7 and above), Las Cruces and Alamogordo school districts adopted medically accurate, responsible curricula.

State	Statewide policy wins	Local or district policy wins
New York	Rejected federal abstinence-only funding. State Assembly passed Healthy Teens Act overwhelmingly. Governor’s budget provided significant funds for CSE efforts and the Community Based Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services program.	
Ohio	Rejected federal abstinence-only funding.	Cleveland school district adopted a CSE curriculum.
Texas	Received a legislative hearing for a CSE bill, which was the first such hearing in 14 years. Passed more stringent School Health Advisory Council requirements.	San Antonio, Austin and Houston school districts are moving toward adopting medically accurate curriculums.
Washington	Passed the Healthy Youth Act requiring that sex education curricula be medically accurate.	CSE curriculums have been adopted in 4 of the 6 target districts to date – Puyallup, Issaquah, Yakima, and Snohomish.

There are many reasons why progress towards SEAI’s ultimate goal of ensuring comprehensive sexuality education for all students has been slower and more incremental than originally expected. Each grantee’s progress towards the ultimate objective was influenced by a specific set of conditions within that state’s political, policy and economic landscape.

However, there are common obstacles that all or nearly all grantees experienced. These include: the reluctance of legislators and other policymakers to discuss issues related to sex, including sexuality education; the local nature of education politics; the difficulties that “outsiders” face in attempting to participate in these politics; and poor economic conditions that made it difficult to implement new policies or “unfunded mandates.”

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “Our work was challenging, because the perception is that sex education is controversial and that there are other larger problems to deal with.”
- “We thought it would be a no-brainer, but the process was long and arduous.”
- “We need to make a better case for why we need to make investments, in terms of the long-term economic costs.”

3. Public education is a largely decentralized enterprise with many small school districts in each state. This decentralization and the “home rule” precedent of locally-controlled decision making in public education contribute to the challenges of passing and enforcing statewide legislation. What is actually being taught often differs widely from district to district, school to school, and classroom to classroom.

Historically, decisions about public education in the United States have been left up to local governments and communities. Most states are made up of many small school districts, each with its own autonomous school board and school superintendent. For example, Texas, where SEAI grantee Texas Freedom Network Education Fund is located, has 1,032 different school districts and 1,700 high schools. Even as the federal government and states take a larger role in education, much of the decision-making power about what and how to teach is still determined at the school district level. According to one state grantee, “we are a home rule state, so the statewide Department of Education can’t set standards for the whole state.”

In the era of No Child Left Behind and standardized testing, curricula for subjects such as reading and math have become much more standardized and regulated. However, sexuality education tends to be included in the subject areas of health or physical education, where many states don’t have standardized tests or curriculum requirements. This means that school districts have significant flexibility in choosing whether or not and how they will teach sexuality education.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “Local control is so huge in this state.”
- “We are working on finding a way to translate wins on paper into the classroom.”
- “They (the state standards) look really good on paper, but I’m worried about how much students are actually getting.”

4. Statewide legislation requiring medically accurate or comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) is only the first step towards ensuring implementation of adequate curricula. None of the recently passed laws have strong statewide enforcement mechanisms, so the onus is on the local school boards, curriculum committees and school superintendents to review their curriculum and make modifications where necessary. Therefore, organizing targets must include local school districts, school boards, and school superintendents.

All SEAI grantees understand that they must target local school districts as part of their overall policy advocacy strategy. Grantees came to the realization that organizing at the local level was an important building block in achieving their ultimate goal via multiple paths.

Some grantee states, such as Washington and California, passed legislation that required sexuality education to be medically accurate, but included few enforcement mechanisms. Grantees learned that bringing school districts into compliance required local advocacy campaigns, as implementation of the legislation then fell on the shoulders of local school boards, curriculum committees and school superintendents. Grantees learned that sexuality education is a topic that most decision-makers tended to shy away from because of a fear of controversy and/or political repercussions. For this reason, SEAI grantees found that they needed to launch local, community-based accountability efforts to nudge school boards along, provide political cover for districts to comply with new laws, and/or actively work to change the make-up of local school boards and curriculum committees.

For other SEAI grantees, such as those in New York and Illinois, intractable political obstacles including huge budget deficits, political scandals and resignations and impeachments at the state executive level have prevented passage of statewide legislation. Organizing at the school district level can provide an opportunity for incremental policy changes in the interim, while also demonstrating that comprehensive sexuality education is not too controversial for the state or region.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “We picked that school district because we wanted to show that if CSE can be implemented there, it can be implemented anywhere.”
- “We had a big victory of getting a CSE curriculum in the Chicago public schools, which is the second largest school district in the country.”
- “The local school boards will generally make the least controversial decision.”

5. Directing attention towards the misleading information and scare tactics of many abstinence-only curriculums can be an effective tool in making the case for policy change.

Many of the abstinence-only curriculums taught in schools around the country rely heavily on the use of scare tactics, misinformation, gender stereotypes, and moral judgment to shame students into abstaining from sexual activity. To be clear, there is a wide spectrum of abstinence-only curriculums, but many tend to share these characteristics. For example, one curriculum incorrectly states that “chemical forms of birth control damage the inside of a young girl’s body in ways that can affect her fertility later on, too.” Another curriculum describes sexual activity the following way: “WARNING! Going on this ride could change your life

forever, result in poverty, heartache, disease, and even DEATH.” Yet another curriculum tells students that “the safest place for a woman to live is married to a man.”

SEAI grantees learned that documenting and publicizing the content of abstinence-only education programs helps convince parents, state and local decision-makers, the media, and the general public that there is a need for policy change. Both Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health and Texas Freedom Network Education Fund were able to leverage attention and support by researching what is being taught in their states’ schools and detailing their findings in formal reports. Grantees learned that when people realize what many of the abstinence-only curriculums are actually teaching, they become more willing to consider adoption of comprehensive, medically accurate sexuality education curriculums. Furthermore, grantees found that pointing to the research on the connections between students receiving abstinence-only education, teen pregnancy rates, and drop-out rates helps convince swing decision-makers that comprehensive sexuality education should be considered a “drop-out prevention strategy.”

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “It’s amazing the power of paper. The research (on what was actually being taught) mattered, and was a game-changer.”
- “Once parents realized what abstinence-only entailed, they were outraged.”

6. Parents, teenagers and college students are credible, powerful spokespeople to advocate for medically accurate, comprehensive sexuality education.

Each state grantee focused their organizing on at least one of three main constituencies that have been found to be ideal spokespeople to advocate for comprehensive sexuality education: parents; teens; and college students.

When working at the local school board level, several grantees found getting information about curriculums to be very challenging. However, parents tend to have much better access to school officials, school board members and curriculum review committees than does the general public. Parents can also speak from a position of strength in terms of presenting the moral argument that we owe it to our children to equip them with the skills and knowledge they need to make good decisions.

Teenagers and college students are also well-suited advocates for two primary reasons. First, in recruiting, training and mobilizing young people, grantees are building a leadership base for the next generation of activists. Second, teens and college students can speak from personal (and recent) experience about what is actually being taught, or in many cases, not being taught during sexuality education class at school. Several grantees were successful in bringing young people to state capitols to testify for the need for legislation mandating medically-accurate, comprehensive sexuality education.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “Training high school and college students to be the activists on the ground and teaching them leadership skills will make them lifelong advocates.”
- “We developed a group of peer educators who were all (young) women of color and from varied economic conditions. We took them to DC, which was really impressive.”

Findings from the SEAI Grant-Making Model

1. The Ms. Foundation’s “funding plus” grant-making strategy added significant value to its financial support of SEAI grantees.

All grantees appreciated and benefited from the “funding plus” support offered to complement the funding they received. Along with gratitude for the technical assistance, grantees and national partners acknowledge that the Ms. Foundation’s approach is unique within the grant-making community. One national partner summed up the Foundation’s distinctive approach: “I’ve never seen a fund take such an active role in providing capacity-building assistance to their grantees.”

The “funding plus” training and technical assistance were extremely effective in helping achieve the SEAI objectives. SEAI grantees had access to Teresa Purcell’s strong strategic planning, targeting, and training expertise, opportunities for peer-to-peer learning, and increased exposure to national advocates in and funders of the comprehensive sexuality education movement. This support helped grantees become more strategic and precise in targeting and organizing, and helped them see the connections between advocacy efforts at the local, state and national levels. As one national partner put it, “we have a real need in our field for intermediaries, and Ms. is really good at that.”

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “SEAI is an incredibly important and strategic initiative.”
- “Teresa has taught me how to manage a coalition.”
- “Teresa is a two edged sword; sometimes she ruffles feathers, but she is an incredibly helpful consultant.”
- “Desirée and Teresa are a good tandem team. They can play good cop/better cop.”

2. SEAI grantees are a diverse cohort of organizations that vary with regard to their missions, targeted constituencies, and organizing approaches.

The SEAI grantee docket includes four organizations that are traditional reproductive rights organizations, such as Planned Parenthood and NARAL affiliates; three organizations that focus on Latinas, immigrant women and women of color; two organizations that work specifically with youth; an AIDS advocacy organization; and an organization focused on countering the influence of the religious right. Despite their different missions, all SEAI grantees are committed to expanding their states’ coalition to include more diverse perspectives, while situating the effort to secure comprehensive sexuality education within the larger context of other social justice movements.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “We had pushback originally from the AIDS organizations, but we have made the light bulbs go on for them.”
- “It’s important for this fund to look at organizations that are building bridges to new constituencies.”
- “We provided a layer that didn’t exist- the ability to have this information at the local level was helpful to the grassroots activism.”

3. SEAI grantees are also diverse in their levels of maturity, organizational capacity and political sophistication. This diversity is a strength of SEAI, as it allows for peer learning, but it also creates challenges in designing and implementing technical assistance to satisfy all needs.

SEAI grantees represent a range of stages of organizational development. The spectrum ranges from organizations like New Mexicans for Responsible Sexuality Education, which was started by a Ms. Foundation grant, to firmly established and venerable organizations like Family Planning Advocates of New York, NARAL Pro-Choice Washington and Texas Freedom Network, which operate with relatively large funding streams and sizable staffs.

The political context and advocacy outcomes achieved from state to state also vary widely. In California, statewide legislation concerning comprehensive sexuality education is already on the books, and in Washington it was achieved during the first year of SEAI funding, therefore advocacy efforts in those states are now focused on strengthening the CSE laws and enforcing compliance and implementation. In Texas, getting a committee hearing on the CSE bill in 2009 was a big victory. In Montana, a substantial “win” came when the Governor rejected federal abstinence-only funding.

SEAI grantees had opportunities to learn from each other’s successes and challenges via participation in conferences, including the state summits and grantee convenings, conference calls, and other communications. Grantees all spoke positively about the increased communication among fellow SEAI grantees and between grantees and national partners that was made possible because of their participation in the SEAI cohort and activities.

However, because of this diversity in the capacities, circumstances, and needs of grantees, it was challenging to make group capacity building services such as state summits, convenings and conference calls relevant for all grantees. For instance, smaller and newer organizations needed introductory guidance on campaign planning, targeting and coalition building. Meanwhile, larger and more advanced organizations needed assistance with specific strategic challenges. Grantee feedback indicates that while less sophisticated grantees were grateful for all of the technical

assistance offered, while the grantees with more experience and higher levels of sophistication wished that there had been a second track of more advanced supports. For instance, more established organizations might have benefited from training on integrating their work into a national strategy, on data management, or from additional peer learning.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- This grant has been “a fabulous peer-learning opportunity.”
- “The Convenings helped us learn from other states and helped us not have to reinvent the wheel.”
- “Trainings at the convenings have been political organizing 101- it’s stuff we have been doing for a long time.”
- “It would be great to pair grantees that are at similar levels of sophistication and policy change and/or have smaller calls.”

4. All SEAI grantees valued in-person convening sessions on strategic planning and relationship-building opportunities with other state grantees and funders. The increased networking and information-sharing between grantees and national groups helped grantees increase revenue streams, and led to greater awareness, alignment and layering of local, state and federal policy advocacy strategies.

Teresa Purcell’s influence on smart strategic planning, targeting and layering was evident in the conversations M+R Strategic Services had with all SEAI grantees. In brief, layering is the concept that, all things being equal, an organization should target their organizing efforts at the local level in places that provide benefits at multiple layers of policy making. For example, a recruited activist should be contacting a targeted school board member, a targeted legislator, and a targeted member of Congress. According to a national partner, “Teresa was helpful with getting the groups to do layered targeting that will pay off at the local, state and federal levels.”

All grantees were thankful for Teresa’s keen insight and assistance. However, one grantee said that their coalition partners saw SEAI’s technical assistance as “an outsider coming out to tell them what to do.” Despite its coalition partners’ skepticism, this grantee was still very grateful for all of the one-on-one support provided. Indeed, the most common response when we asked grantees how the “funding-plus” supports could be made more effective was a request for more of Teresa and Desirée’s time.

All SEAI grantees felt that they received tangible benefits from participating in the convenings and state summits. In particular, grantees appreciated the opportunities for building connections with national organizations and funders, and for peer-to-peer learning. One grantee in particular mentioned that they now receive a grant from another national foundation that they met at an

SEAI convening. Additionally, grantees commented favorably on the evolution of SEAI gatherings, which were judged to be responsive to grantee needs and feedback.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “We were able to call Teresa and be honest about our challenges.”
- “The convenings were very helpful and they got better over time as they incorporated feedback from the grantees.”
- “State summits help to create linkages (between groups), which are adding to their networks.”
- “Layering was ingrained in the beginning by Teresa.”
- “We use the trickle-up effect to work on Congressional issues.”
- “The funding-plus supports were really helpful. I wish we could have more of Teresa’s time, more funding, and more resources.”

5. *SEAI grantees found the changing grant reporting metrics onerous, and wished that grantee conference calls had been more substantive.*

M+R Strategic Services asked grantees what they believed could be done to improve SEAI granting or a similar program. The two most common responses they heard back were the following: conference calls should be more useful and provide more substantive information, and the grant reporting process should be simplified and made more consistent.

In many of their evaluations, M+R has found that conference calls present a constant challenge for most grantees. In addition to the inherent limitations of communication that is not face-to-face, grantees perceived that it was difficult to balance the need for reporting with making calls interesting and relevant for all participants. Grantees suggested that conference calls be more like workshops, reflective of current priorities and flexible enough to accommodate changing situations. Grantees also recommended pairing organizations facing similar challenges on smaller conference calls, and offering increased opportunities to solicit grantee feedback.

Grantees understand the need for accountability, but several expressed frustration with the amount of reporting they were asked to do over the course of SEAI, as well as with the changing tools for reporting and providing feedback. It should also be noted that none of the SEAI grantees mentioned the Ms. Foundation’s new institution-wide strategic framework, *Creating Connections*. It appears that this omission is due to a lack of exposure to the framework among grantees.

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “With so many people on the calls, there was only time for updates.”
- “I appreciate all of the feedback, but I can’t use it if it comes three months after the original conversation.”
- “It would be good to have an up-front agreement on communication and reporting.”
- “We’ve done a lot of evaluation for \$50,000 compared to other grants.”

6. Grantees believe they would benefit from a more comprehensive understanding of a national strategy and their role in it. Grantees also need more assistance in using voter, donor and activist data strategically, and would like an online sexuality education information clearing house.

SEAI grantees are very positive about the initiative overall, but wish that they had been kept apprised of a national strategy for securing mandated, fully funded, comprehensive and medically accurate sexuality education for students in every state.

Raising the specter of a conspiracy, one grantee commented, “There must be a secret paper somewhere with the national strategy on it.” This comment was meant to be a joke, but it pointed to a real grantee concern: they wanted to know not just what they were fighting against, but what they were fighting for, and how the ultimate goal would be achieved. M+R’s evaluation process revealed that the national partners wish that they *had* an over-arching national strategy. Whereas the state grantees assume that there is a national strategy that isn’t being shared with them.

Developing and presenting a cohesive national strategy to achieve medically accurate sexuality education at the federal level may have helped grantees stay on track by allowing them to measure progress towards a bigger goal. Interviews with national partners and state grantees indicated that they desired more substantial evaluation of what was and wasn’t working during the duration of the project. A national partner commented that “there was good information-sharing, but there wasn’t enough analysis during the project. It might have helped keep donor interest, if there had been more of that.”

All grantees would like more tools, training and technical assistance in the use of technology and the implementation of better data management strategies. Even more sophisticated organizations said they would benefit from training in social networking, access to Voter Activation Network (VAN) and an online comprehensive sexuality education information clearing house. Acquiring technology tools and expertise is expensive and time-consuming, and state-based grantees indicated that the capacity needs tend to linger on their “wish lists.”

In the words of SEAI grantee partners:

- “We don’t feel like we are part of a national over-arching strategy.”
- “The Ms. Foundation designed the initiative and technical assistance model at the very beginning, and then they put their heads down and did it. There was not a lot of thinking [or] re-designing along the way.”
- “We have basic database systems in place, but would love more sophisticated tools.”
- “We don’t have the money for technology for phone banking.”
- “We are very strategic in our organizing, but we don’t know how to be strategic with new media.”
- “A sex-ed clearing house on the web is a great idea.”

Program Snapshots

Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health

Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health (ICAH) works in partnership with youth to advocate for sound policies and practices that support a positive approach to adolescent sexual health and parenting. ICAH is a large coalition that employs a reproductive justice framework emphasizing outreach to and leadership development within immigrant and minority communities, and among young women and teens. ICAH aims to build cross-movement collaborations. Securing legislation to mandate comprehensive sexuality education is one of ICAH's three main goals.

Before receiving SEAI funding, ICAH's work had been scattered and a bit haphazard. However, the "funding-plus" supports of the SEAI grant-making model helped ICAH to focus their efforts, and become more targeted and strategic. This has led to increased success in their organizing and helped them to attract more financial resources.

After two years of corruption scandals centering on Illinois' former Governor Rod Blagojevich and a large budget deficit, Illinois' state government is basically non-functioning. In light of this, ICAH recently targeted six geographically diverse communities (Champaign, Quincy, Maywood, Joliet, Bloomington, and Chicago) in which to mount local, youth-led campaigns to implement comprehensive sexuality education curricula within individual school districts.

Grassroots mobilization, training social service providers that target adolescents, and cultivating the next generation of leaders are major components of ICAH's work. Indeed, ICAH incorporates youth leadership development into all of its activities; its three-tiered youth development structure includes a statewide Youth Policy Council to help drive and shape ICAH's policy agenda. ICAH is building a stronger delivery system to support adolescent sexual health needs, and is currently training 1,000 adolescent providers and 200 teachers. ICAH is also developing a toolkit for service providers on how to teach and support sexual health education, and to help community leaders and advocates support sexual health education.

Education Fund of Family Planning Advocates of New York

Education Fund of Family Planning Advocates envisions "a New York where everyone enjoys access to comprehensive sexual healthcare and education." FPA's Education Fund is a coalition effort run by New York's Planned Parenthood affiliates. The Coalition has 150 partners representing diverse constituencies including people living with HIV/AIDS, teachers unions, PTAs and other education advocacy groups, people of faith, communities of color, and immigrant communities. In 2003, FPA's Education Fund launched its Get the Facts NY campaign, which focuses on training teens and young women to advocate for comprehensive sexuality education policies. Get the Facts NY hosts an annual Youth Leadership Conference and has a Youth Advisory Board that is actively engaged in planning campaign events and media and social networking efforts.

FPA's Education Fund utilized the SEAI funding to expand the Get the Facts NY campaign through highly targeted and strategic organizing in key communities and constituencies. FPA's Education Fund was able to fully take advantage of the "funding-plus" supports provided by SEAI to refine their messaging and legislative strategy.

One of the main goals of Get the Facts NY is securing passage of the Healthy Teens Act, which would provide funding for CSE programs. The Healthy Teens Act has passed the State Assembly multiple times, but has repeatedly stalled in the State Senate. There have been many changes in New York's legislative and executive branches in the last two years, beginning with Spitzer's resignation, continuing through legislative upheaval, and now including a major state budget crisis. In the face of continued obstacles at the statewide level, Get the Facts NY continues its layered approach of working locally to pass county resolutions, statewide to pass legislation, and federally to build congressional support from NY's delegation for the Real Act and Prevention First Act.

The coalition currently faces a political predicament. It has the votes needed to pass the Healthy Teens Act through the legislature, but faces a veto from Governor David Paterson, who has vowed to veto any bill with fiscal implications. Given that, the coalition is not pursuing legislation during this session. It has instead turned its attention to influencing the State Regents, who are responsible for the general supervision of all educational activities within New York, and is pursuing options for a statewide policy there.

Get the Facts NY has a sophisticated approach to communications, online advocacy and media outreach. They worked with Advocates for Youth to develop a paid media campaign that included print and radio advertising. Additionally, Get the Facts NY utilizes Web 2.0 tools like YouTube and Facebook. The coalition notes that support from the Ms. Foundation has given them the additional resources needed to run an effective program.

NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation

NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation has been working to ensure that schools in Washington State teach comprehensive, medically accurate sexuality education for nearly a decade. NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation, which has received funding from the Ms. Foundation in the past, has been an SEAI grantee since the project's first round. NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation is a leading member of Washington State's sexuality education coalition, the Healthy Youth Alliance. Additionally, NARAL's field director serves as a co-chair of the Alliance.

NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation utilized the SEAI funding to reinvigorate the Healthy Youth Alliance, which reconvened in early 2006 after a two year hiatus. The SEAI funding-plus model enabled the coalition to gain the momentum that was needed to secure a substantial policy victory.

In May of 2006, NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation, along with the Alliance, successfully lobbied the State Legislature to pass the Healthy Youth Act. The Healthy Youth

Act requires public schools that teach sexuality education to adopt curricula that are medically accurate, include information about contraception, and meet criteria set forth in the state's "Guidelines for Sexual Health Information and Disease Prevention." These guidelines are comprehensive, but the law lacks an enforcement mechanism.

Following passage of the Healthy Youth Act, NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation and its coalition partners focused on implementation and compliance. The law went into effect in September 2008 with a provision that school districts had approximately 18 months to bring curricula into compliance. Several organizations within the Healthy Youth Alliance were ideally suited to partner with the state to provide assistance on curriculum development and teacher training. These services were incredibly useful in fostering collaborative relationships with Washington State's Superintendent of Education and Department of Health.

NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation filled a unique niche within the Alliance as the organization best equipped to continue leading the grassroots campaign that had paved the way for legislative success. With the law in place, NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation switched its targets from key legislators to local school boards and school superintendents. Initially, NARAL Washington targeted six school districts in five geographic regions in order to build grassroots pressure for the districts to adopt comprehensive curriculums. The group recognized that its SEAI grant was intended to help build grassroots capacity, so it chose areas that were strategically important legislatively and where it needed to grow its base of supporters. As one NARAL Pro-Choice Washington staff person acknowledged, although organizing has been difficult, "you've got to slog through it."

As parents are "the constituency with the most influence over school board officials," NARAL Pro-Choice Washington used SEAI grant funds to identify, train and engage parents as activists in targeted districts. The group developed a toolkit for parents that enumerated the steps involved in inquiring about a district's curriculum and included messages and recommendations for influencing school board members' decisions. NARAL Pro-Choice Washington Foundation has succeeded in getting four of their six target districts to implement comprehensive sexuality education curriculums.

Washington was one of the first SEAI grantees to secure statewide legislation requiring comprehensive, medically accurate sexuality education. The most important lesson to draw from the state's experience is that securing statewide legislation was only the first step towards actually having an impact on what students are being taught. According to one Alliance partner, "It all looks really good on paper, but I'm worried about how much students are actually getting." By creating a broad coalition that includes child welfare and education groups as well as the pro-choice and health communities, the Alliance marshaled the depth to influence the legislative process as well as the breadth to make an impact on the implementation process. According to one of NARAL Pro-Choice Washington's parent activists, "This has been a rewarding experience, all the way through with lobbying [and] implementation."

Texas Freedom Network Education Fund

The Texas Freedom Network Education Fund has been an SEAI grantee since Year Two. Texas Freedom Network Education Fund's (TFNEF) mission is to research the agenda, activities and funding of the religious right. It also educates mainstream people of faith in how to formulate and advocate a faith-based response to the religious right's policy agenda. Texas Freedom Network and the Texas Freedom Network Education Fund were founded by Cecile Richards, daughter of the late Texas Governor Ann Richards, after Governor Richards lost her re-election bid to George W. Bush. TFNEF was chosen as an SEAI grantee in part because its mission makes it well-suited for engaging diverse and non-traditional constituencies to advocate for comprehensive sex education policies.

Texas has been the epicenter of the abstinence-only movement in the U.S. Texas is also the largest market for text books in the country, and therefore many large textbook publishers will only publish materials accepted for use in Texas public schools. For this reason, Texas's abstinence-only policies have far-reaching effects. This is why Texas Freedom Network Education Fund chose to make comprehensive sexuality education one of the three priority policy areas in its Stand Up for Science campaign. Stand Up for Science counters the anti-scientific influence of the religious right in areas including evolution, stem cell research, and sexuality education.

Organizing grassroots advocacy for curriculum reform in Texas presents its own set of challenges. In addition to being the epicenter of the abstinence-only movement, the education system in Texas is highly decentralized, with over 1,000 local school districts and only 1,700 high schools; the majority of Texas school districts only have jurisdiction over one or two high schools. Texas Freedom Network Education Fund knew that changing sex-ed policy in Texas was not going to be easy. TFNEF needed a "game-changer" to draw attention to overwhelming prevalence of abstinence-only curricula in Texas. It was with that in mind that they requested funding from SEAI.

In 2008, Texas Freedom Network created, administered and published a comprehensive survey of Texas' 1,031 school districts in order to determine what students around the state are being taught about sex and sexuality. This ambitious project required making public records requests to all of Texas's school districts, and following up with school districts to ensure they fulfilled the request. Although the process took 12 months, TFNEF ultimately succeeded in getting 96 percent of districts to comply with the request. Once TFNEF had collected the data, it partnered with Dr. David Wiley of Texas State University to analyze the data and write the report, *Just Say Don't Know: Sexuality Education in Texas Public Schools*.

Texas Freedom Network Education Fund released *Just Say Don't Know: Sexuality Education in Texas Public Schools* on February 24, 2009 with a big rollout. TFNEF used the report to generate significant media attention, galvanize their base, and shared the report with key decision-makers around Texas, including every member of the state legislature. The SEAI grant funded the organizing and publicity efforts surrounding the release and promotion of *Just Say Don't Know: Sexuality Education in Texas Public Schools*.

The Texas Legislature responded to the attention the report generated, and a Republican

legislator said he would grant a comprehensive, medically-accurate sexuality education bill a hearing. Texas Freedom Network Education Fund staff, the report's author, and TFNEF's legislative champions all agree that "the research mattered, and (the report) was a game-changer." According to one legislator, "the early preparation – the research that TFNEF did went a very long way in bringing forward facts on how sex ed is being practiced in our classrooms. It's amazing the power of paper."

Just Say Don't Know: Sexuality Education in Texas Public Schools earned widespread attention in large part because of its dramatic findings: fewer than 4% of school districts in Texas were teaching students anything besides abstinence. Students were not taught about responsible and effective ways to prevent unplanned pregnancy and STIs. Furthermore, the report detailed the vast amounts of misleading and false information being taught to students, as well as the shocking "scare tactics and shaming" common in abstinence-only curriculums.

For instance, one lesson plan used in Texas schools states: "Giving a condom to a teen is just like saying, 'Well if you insist on killing yourself by jumping off the bridge, at least wear these elbow pads – they may protect you some.'" Another curriculum includes the morally questionable declaration: "Destructive behaviors such as violence, dishonesty, drug abuse and sexual promiscuity arise from a common core—the absence of good character." Many of the abstinence-only curricula used in Texas schools reinforce pernicious stereotypes about gender and sexual orientation. For example, the WAIT Training used by 53 Texas districts, states that women need "financial support" and "family commitment" in relationships, while men need "domestic support" and "admiration."

Texas Freedom Network Education Fund has continued to use *Just Say Don't Know* as a tool to build relationships and mobilize constituents. According to one TFNEF staff member, "we take a layering approach to public policy. We rolled out the report, got people talking about it, got editorials, and then go for policy change." Texas Freedom Network recently celebrated a significant legislative victory: the passage of a bill strengthening the requirements for local School Advisory Health Committees (SHACs). SHACs, which are tasked with reviewing sexuality education curricula, must now include parents as at least half their members. As a result, TFNEF is engaged in grassroots advocacy, training and leadership development efforts in targeted districts to get supporters, including parents and college students, to join SHACs and lobby local school districts to reform curricula. In the words of a TFNEF staff member, "Grassroots strategies are critical to long-term change. We have a long way to do, but we're on the way."

Conclusion

Since launching its Sexuality Education Advocacy Initiative in 2005, the Ms. Foundation has given \$1,720,000 in grants to state-based groups and coalitions and their national partners.

The main objectives of SEAI have been to:

- Support grantees in achieving concrete policy and organizational wins;
- Provide grantees with capacity-building support to increase their membership or power base, increase the efficacy of their policy strategies and identify measurable outcomes; and
- Support the networking and information-sharing between states and national groups to increase the alignment of local, state and federal policy.

SEAI's success is largely the result of its "funding plus" grant-making model. M+R Strategic Services learned that the Ms. Foundation's technical assistance, when provided in conjunction with grants, enables grantees to increase organizational capacity, grow their base of supporters and improve the efficacy of advocacy efforts. All current SEAI grantees have made tangible progress towards their determined policy wins relating to comprehensive sexuality education, despite the policy changes taking longer and being harder to achieve than originally expected.

Lessons learned during SEAI and M+R's evaluation include:

- The Ms. Foundation's "funding plus" model provides added value to its grant-making efforts. Assistance with strategic planning and targeting, as well as relationship-building and peer learning opportunities are particularly helpful;
- The most effective advocacy efforts *layer* strategies and targeting to push for adoption of comprehensive sexuality education policies and funding by local school districts, by state legislatures and at the federal level;
- Focusing attention on the misleading information and scare tactics contained within many abstinence-only curricula can help make the case for policy change; and
- Parents, teens and college students make great spokespeople to deliver the message about the need for comprehensive sexuality education.

As the Ms. Foundation and its funding partners continue to build on the successes of SEAI, grantees suggest the following enhancements:

- More consistent reporting and evaluation mechanisms;
- A better sense of the overall, national strategy for securing and implementing comprehensive sexuality education nationwide;
- Increased assistance and tools to help them use data strategically and utilize new media effectively; and
- Development of an online sexuality education clearing house.

Appendix 1: SEAI State Grantee Interview Guide

The following questions were used as a foundation for conducting interviews. Not all questions were asked of all people in the same way or in the exact order listed below. The amount of time spent on a particular topic area varied by interview. Rather than being a rigid list to get through, these questions served as a launching point for a dialogue in which the evaluator attempted to glean as much insight as possible from the perspective and experiences of the person being interviewed within an approximately 90-minute timeframe.

The interview questions are divided into two sections:

- Impact of SEAI on grantee organizations, goals, accomplishments & strategy; and
- Interaction with and technical assistance provided by SEAI

Section 1 – Impact on Grantee Organizations, Goals, Accomplishments & Strategy

- Tell me a little about yourself, your organization’s history and your history of working on Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE).
- Is your work on CSE a coalition effort? If so, what is the history of the coalition?
- What is the size of and funding for your organization?
 - How many staff people do you have? Are they all working on the CSE project?
 - Has there been staff turnover during this project? If so, what are the circumstances and has that negatively affected your work?
 - How long have you been receiving funding from the Ms. Foundation?
 - Are you receiving other grant funding? If so, from which foundations?
 - Has SEAI allowed you to increase your funding and funding sources?
- Describe the context of CSE in your State.
 - Does a law already exist in your state that governs sexuality education?
 - Is the Governor/Legislature supportive of CSE?
 - Has your state been taking federal abstinence-only funding? If so, are there any limits on how it is used?
 - What role does the state Department of Education and/or Department of Health play in setting sexuality education policy in your state?
 - Are there school districts in your state with existing CSE policies?
 - What are the mechanisms for or hurdles to getting school districts in your state to implement CSE curriculums?
 - What is the overall financial situation in your state?
 - Is the financial situation a barrier to achieving a policy win?
- Has your understanding of the complexities of sexuality education policy-making mechanisms and levers in your state increased during SEAI grant-making?

- Describe your SEAI program.
 - What are your goals?
 - Who/what are your targets?
 - What strategies are you employing to reach your goals?
 - What is your organization's strategic planning process for this project?
 - Have you established metrics to measure your success?
 - Have your program goals and strategies evolved as a result of your SEAI grant?
- What do you see as the greatest successes of your CSE efforts?
- What have been the biggest challenges?
- Have you had legislative, statewide or local policy wins?
 - If yes, what do you think made that possible?
 - If no, why do you think you haven't been able to achieve a policy win?
- Has your organizing around CSE strengthened and increased your base of supporters?
 - Increased recruitment and activity of volunteers and e-activists?
 - Increased level of training of supporters?
 - Increased leadership development?
 - Diversified your supporters?
- Were there new constituencies that were harder or easier to organize than expected?
- What mobilization activities has your organization undertaken?
- What were the tangible outcomes of those mobilization activities?
- Has your organization mobilized your CSE supporters on other issues?
- Has your CSE coalition been strengthened as a result of your SEAI grant?
 - What was the size and make-up of your coalition pre-grant?
 - How has your coalition grown and diversified during the grant period?
- Has your organization's ability to conduct strategic planning, targeting and execute a plan increased? If yes, how?
- Has SEAI increased your organizational capacity?
- Has your organization's ability to use technology to track supporters and their actions increased?
 - Does your organization have a database to track donors, volunteers and activists?
If so, what type is it and how long have you been using it?
- Have you had the opportunity to learn best practices from other state and national organizations to help shape your ongoing efforts?

- One of the goals of SEAI grant-making has been for state-based grantees to layer their work at the federal, state and local levels. Have you been able to successfully “layer” local, state and federal CSE goals and strategies?

Section 2 – Interaction with and technical assistance provided by SEAI

- How would you characterize your relationship with the Ms. Foundation?
 - Ms. Foundation Staff?
 - SEAI consultants?
- Describe the technical assistance has SEAI provided to your organization.
 - Convenings?
 - Strategic Planning?
 - Coalition management?
 - Database and data management?
 - Learn best practices from other state-based efforts and national organizations?
 - Tools for communicating with other state-based and national organizations?
- Which aspects of SEAI’s technical assistance have been most helpful?
- Which aspects of SEAI’s technical assistance have been least helpful?
- How has the SEAI grant-making and technical assistance changed your organizational culture and strategic planning processes?
- Is your organization using the technical assistance, data management and strategic planning tools SEAI has provided in your other work?
- Were you asked to provide on-going input into SEAI’s grant-making program and the technical assistance resources that were provided to you?
- Has SEAI’s grant-making and technical assistance program evolved in response to your feedback and lessons learned at the state level?
- What suggestions do you have for the Ms. Foundation’s future funding and advocacy endeavors for comprehensive sexuality education?

Appendix 2: Interview List

State Grantee Phone Interviews

California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (CLRJ)

- Rocio L. Córdoba, J.D, Executive Director

Planned Parenthood Affiliates of Michigan

- Sarah Scranton, Executive Director
- Margi Long, Former Executive Director

NARAL Pro-Choice Montana

- Alex Corcoran, Program Director
- Allyson Hagen, Executive Director

New Mexicans for Responsible Sexuality Education (NMRSE)

- Monica Trujillo, Coordinator

AIDS Taskforce of Greater Cleveland (Ohio)

- Jessica Gupta, Director of Public Policy
- Earl Pike, Director

State Grantee Site Visits

Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health

- Zahra Alabanza, ICAH
- DeShaya Craig, Chicago Abortion Fund
- Kim L. Hunt, Affinity Community Services
- Lisa Junkin, Sex+++
- Soo Ji Min, Executive Director ICAH
- Cherisse Scott, Black Women for Reproductive Justice
- Nikki Zaleski, Chicago Girls Coalition/Sisters Empowering Sisters

The Education Fund of Family Planning Advocates of New York (FPA)

- Carol Blowers, FPA
- Tracey Brooks, FPA
- Karyn Brownson, New York Civil Liberties Union
- Blue Carreker, Upper Hudson Planned Parenthood
- Hadiayah Charles, HIV Law Project
- Alisa Costa, FPA
- Dana Czuczka, Planned Parenthood of New York City
- Rob Curry, Upper Hudson Planned Parenthood
- Georgiana Hanson, FPA
- Ross Levi, Empire State Pride Agenda
- Ruth Lyons, FPA
- Sarah Miller, Planned Parenthood of Nassau County

- Grace Mose, FPA
- Ronnie Pawelko, FPA
- Rabbi Dennis Ross, FPA
- Joann Smith, former FPA CEO
- Robb Smith, Interfaith Impact

Texas Freedom Network Education Fund

- Val Benavidez, TFNEF Outreach and Field Director
- Kay Duffy, Parent Activist and local SHAC member
- Rachel Glast, TFNEF Development Director
- Matthew Jones, Legislative Director for Joaquin Castro (D – San Antonio)
- Mackenzie Massey, TFNEF Youth Leadership Council Member
- Kathy Miller, TFNEF President
- Garrett Mize, Youth Advocacy Coordinator for TFNEF
- Ryan Valentine, TFNEF Deputy Director
- State Representative Mike Villarreal (D- San Antonio)
- Dr. David Wiley, author of *Just Say Don't Know* and professor at Texas State University

NARAL Pro-Choice Washington

- Courtney Bell, Organizer for Planned Parenthood of the Great NW
- Karen Cooper, former Executive Director
- Kirsten Harris-Talley, Program Manager for Center for Health Training
- Alissa Haslam, outgoing Public Policy and Field Director
- Cydney Marckman, parent activist
- Rosa McLeod, Field Organizer
- Carol Miller, VP of Education and Training for Planned Parenthood of the Great NW
- Brett Niessen, educator for King County Public Health
- Liezl Rebugio, Organizer for ACLU
- Beth Reis, educator for King County Public Health
- Marla Russo, formerly of Department of Health
- Lauren B. Simonds, Executive Director

Interviews with National Grantees, Partners and other Foundations

Advocates for Youth

- Deb Hauser, Executive Vice President
- James Wagoner, President

Grove Foundation

- Rebekah Saul Butler, Program Director
- Danene Sorace, Consultant

Mosaica (Evaluation firm)

- Hilary Binder Aviles, Senior Specialist

SIECUS

- Bill Smith, Executive Director, NCSD, former SIECUS staff