

USAID Civic Initiatives Support Program

Quarterly Performance Report #8

July 1– September 30, 2015

Submitted October 29, 2015
Associate Cooperative Agreement No. AID-278-LA-13-00001
FHI 360 Reference No. 3253-23/101011.025.001.002

Submitted to:

Sean Osner
Agreement Officer's Representative (AOR)
sosner@usaid.gov

Talar Karakashian
Alternate AOR
tkarakashian@usaid.gov

Arwa Ghanma
Senior Acquisition Specialist
aghanma@usaid.gov

Luis Rivera
Agreement Officer
lrivera@usaid.gov



This report was produced for the review of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the U.S. Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II. PROGRAM COMPONENTS	2
A. COMPONENT I: Subawards in Support of Jordanian Civic Initiatives	2
• Activity I.A. Democracy, Rights & Governance Grants (DRG).....	2
• Activity I.B. Partnerships for Jordan’s Development Project (PJD).....	4
• Activity I.C. USAID Civic Initiatives Support Fund (CIS APS)	4
• Activity I.D. Grants for Innovative Approaches in Engaging Students, Teachers, Communities & Parents to Combat Violence & Promote Social Justice (EDY RFA)	5
• Activity I.E. Disability Rights and Inclusion Grants (DRI RFA)	5
• Activity I.F. Enhancing Effectiveness of Grantees and Highlighting Grantee Impact	6
B. COMPONENT II: Capacity Building for Sustainability	6
• Activity II.A. Targeted Technical Assistance to USG-Subawardees	6
• Activity II.B. Institutional Strengthening Fund (ISF APS)	7
• Activity II.C. Internal Strengthening for Change (ISC)	7
• Activity II.D. Demand-Driven Off-the-Shelf Courses	8
• Activity II.E: ISO Sustainability/CSO Service Provision -	8
• Activity II.F: Societies Empowerment Fund (SEF) - No activity planned.	8
C. COMPONENT III: Enhancing Government-CSO Engagement.....	9
• Activity III.A: Enhancing the Capacities of Registry & GOJ Civil Society Staff	9
• Activity III.B: Civil Society Research Fund: No activity scheduled this quarter.	9
• Activity III.C: Technical Assistance Support to the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities (HCD)	9
III. Cross-Cutting Initiatives	9
• Activity IV.A. KMS	9
• Activity IV.B. Coordination	9
• Activity IV.C. Gender, Inclusion & Environment	9
• Activity IV.D. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).....	10
IV. Upcoming Quarterly Activities (YII Q4 July-September 2015)	10

ANNEXES

- A. Advocacy Orientation Workshop Report
- B. Mentoring Assessment: Focus Group Findings
- C. Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report covers the period from July 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015, the eighth quarter of the USAID Civic Initiatives Support Program (USAID CIS), implemented by FHI 360. Activities implemented include:

Component I: Subawards in Support of Jordanian Civic Initiatives

- Monitored subawards, providing technical assistance and mentoring as required.
- Submitted 20 subaward packages to USAID, totaling approximately \$2,384,647, and received AOR approvals for all.
- Conducted compliance reviews for three grants and issued modifications (obligation increase, obligation decrease, cost and time extensions, and no-cost extension) to 32 grantees.
- Continued due diligence with the 32 CIS Round 1, 2 and 3 shortlisted applicants, out of which 18 subawards were issued.
- Monitored the 23 EDY Phase I mini-grants, 17 of which completed their activities with the remaining six to start next quarter (pending GOJ approvals). Conducted Phase II grant competition process for those that completed their mini-grant, including two scale-up workshops and held the Grant Evaluation Committee (GEC) for the first group, resulting in three shortlisted for Phase II awards.
- Began due diligence for nine shortlisted proposals from the Disability Rights and Inclusion (DRI) grants RFA; held pre-award workshops on grant management, qualitative research, and disability and inclusion; and conducted due diligence.
- Conducted series of grant orientation workshops and three M&E crash courses for new and shortlisted CIS APS grantees and upon award, held individual orientations for each.

Component II: Capacity Building for Sustainability

- Issued the remaining shortlisted award of the Institutional Strengthening Fund APS 2014-15 and monitored implementation of the two grants.
- Monitored subcontractors' implementation of the Internal Strengthening for Change program (ISC). Finalized and launched Phase IV of the program for organizational mentoring, including customized capacity building for ISC subs on mentoring.
- Marketed open courses for October 2015-February 2016.
- Piloted the inclusion assessment component of the expanded Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool to ensure inclusion of persons with disabilities within programs and CSOs.
- Coordinated with USAID/Jordan Advocacy, Communications and Policy Program (JCAP) and USAID Takamol Gender Project to design customized courses for their partners.
- Conducted 16 institutional assessments of grantees (5 using the Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool/ICAT and 11 using the Institutional Development Assessment tool/IDA).
- Designed the Societies Empowerment Fund RFA.

Component III: Enhancing Government-CSO Engagement

- Coordinated feedback for subcontractor ABCD from the Registry Secretary General (SG) on the Registry of Societies' draft strategy.
- Monitored implementation of Leading Point's subcontract to develop a strategic plan for the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD)'s Disability Directorate.
- Remained on standby to support the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities (HCD) post-USA study tour and finalization of the draft disability law.

Cross-Cutting Initiatives

- Conducted customized sessions on gender for LOYAC and Generations for Peace; held DRG gender focal point sessions; and reviewed grantee research for gender sensitivity.
- Provided mentoring to grantees on gender equality, inclusion, and monitoring and evaluation, as required.

In addition, FHI 360 finalized a cost extension of an additional \$20M for activities through October 2018. As part of this process, FHI 360 noted the following achievements for Year II:

- Designed two new subaward competitions (EDY RFA and DRI RFA) and closed the CIS APS 2014-15 and ISF APS. Overall, the grants support civic initiatives that advance Jordan’s defined development priorities and are in line with the CDCS, resulting in 113 subawards/shortlisted with activities across all 12 governorates.
- Complemented the subawards with strategic capacity building interventions that supported the institutional strengthening of grantees utilizing the adapted USAID Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool (ICAT). This thorough assessment process, which includes a review of gender and an expanded component to assess inclusion of person with disabilities, engages CSO staff and board members at all levels in a participatory process which defines the organization’s priorities for change.
- Introduced the concepts of CBO management and institutional systems strengthening at the local governorate level, fostering sustainability through the development of mission-driven strategic plans and enhanced the capacities of national-level intermediary support organizations (ISOs) to strengthen their own training/mentoring service delivery.

And as part of a reflection on Year II, FHI 360 defined the following objectives for Year III:

- Enhancing the capacities of CDCS sector-specific organizations to be change agents within their fields of expertise and in collaborating with others to advocate effectively for identified priorities through open grants competitions and dedicated technical assistance.
- Continuing to provide customized training and mentoring on concepts, strategies and tactics to enable them to more effectively contribute to advancing Jordan’s development.
- Contributing to a positive enabling environment for CSOs by strengthening good governance practices and supporting the development of a national strategy for civil society based on international best practices, as appropriate.

In addition, the Year III workplan was submitted by the September 4 deadline and per discussions with USAID, it was agreed that revisions may be required pending the results of the USAID civil society sector assessment and CIS performance evaluation.

II. PROGRAM COMPONENTS

A. COMPONENT I: Subawards in Support of Jordanian Civic Initiatives

Below is a snapshot of the results to date from USAID CIS’ multiple grant opportunities:

Snapshot of CIS Grants to Date						
Grant Competition	Total Applications received	Shortlisted by GEC	Withdrawn	Dropped with AOR Concurrence	Awards Issued	Remaining Shortlist/Due Diligence
DRG RFA	31	9	0	2	7	0
CIS APS R1	253	44	1	14	28	1
CIS APS R2	311	30	1	3	25	1
CIS APS R3	241	14	0	0	1	13
EDY RFA Phase I	170	24	1	0	23	0
EDY RFA Phase II	8	3	0	0	0	3
DRI RFA	112	9	0	0	0	9
ISF APS	69	7	1	0	6	0
Total	1195	140	4	19	90	27
Total Awards/Shortlisted					117	

Almost nine months after issuing Rights and Development’s (R&D) grant, R&D officially requested that their award be terminated as they were unable to secure foreign funding approval from the Government of Jordan. The Ministry of Education (MoE) recommended that the Ministry of Industry and Trade (where R&D is registered as a not-for-profit

company) reject the project, which was to advocate for inclusive education for children with disabilities. As regularly reported to USAID, R&D had made numerous attempts to lobby various entities, including the HCD, Prime Ministry and MoIT itself; all to no avail. ***This is the only grant to date that has had to be terminated because of GOJ foreign funding approval requirements*** and, unfortunately, this demonstrates how civil society organizations can be trapped by Government bureaucracy. Others awaiting foreign funding approvals prior to launching activities include: Rasheed for Integrity and Transparency; Center for the Built Environment; Khreibet El Souq Ladies Charitable Society; Forearms of Change; Science League; with Usharek and Partners Jordan pending MoE approval only.

- **Activity I.A. Democracy, Rights & Governance Grants (DRG)**

Phase II cost extensions/awards were issued to SIGI, HCAC and Phenix while the other four DRG grantees continued implementation as planned. Highlights include:

Greyscale issued multimedia packages on two priority laws which Parliament debated this summer: decentralization and municipalities. Both resulted in a high level of online engagement from “209 King Hussein Street” followers, with more than 21K and 11K views on the Aramram web channel, plus another 75K social media interactions per episode. Greyscale was proud to report that the Parliamentary Legal Committee had reached out to them to encourage more proactive coverage of the draft decentralization law as they felt that the issue was under reported by the media. In turn, Greyscale focused on explaining the basic concept of decentralization, highlighting the elements of the proposed draft, with input from CSOs and government on the potential impact the law would have on the Kingdom. Two main themes were repeatedly raised in online comments: “*Will the law increase scrutiny and accountability in public spending in governorates?*” and “*As long as there is favoritism and waste, the law will not make a real impact.*” On the draft municipalities’ law, mainstream media coverage highlighted the inefficiency of municipalities in providing services whereas Greyscale took their coverage further by focusing on the root causes of this inefficiency: budget deficit at the municipal level; lack of wide citizen involvement and representation in decision-making; government interference and control; and hidden unemployment. Social media feedback focused on corruption: “*If you want to reform municipalities you need to tackle corruption within them. Municipalities are not institutionalized and there is no way you can assess the productivity of its staff.*”

“*Our latest episode on decentralization has gone viral. Our show is not only being followed by activists, members of the parliament, and the public but also opinion formers in Jordan... our credibility is stronger than ever*”
– Hams Rabah, Greyscale

Al Hayat published its report “Measuring the Implementation of the Executive Plan for the National Integrity System” in 2014 for public comment, providing an opportunity for Government officials and ordinary citizens alike to send feedback related to technical and factual issues. Al Hayat made it clear that it would not change the report unless evidence related to factual errors was provided. Government agencies responded but reported more on what they had done rather than challenging the report findings. Nonetheless, the response from Government can be considered a major achievement, as it shows that Al Hayat's work in monitoring the NIS has encouraged government agencies to strive to be more transparent in their outreach, which in turn should help Jordan's citizens understand the government's reform efforts. Al Hayat also held a series of consultation sessions for a diversity of target audiences, promoting dialogue among those interested in transparency in Jordan.

The **Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ)** made great strides this quarter in its efforts to advance media reform, focusing on the independent media complaint council law as well as expanding its collaboration with UNESCO on the role of public broadcasting in Jordan. CDFJ drafted a guidebook to help GOJ information officers implement the

freedom of information (FOI) law, and the CIS gender advisor reviewed the guide for gender sensitivity. As part of the King Abdullah Award competition, CDFJ provided the organizers with a survey to assess the level of awareness about the implementation of the FOI law among the 98 public authorities participating in the 2014-15 award competition. In addition, CDFJ proactively engaged with various initiatives monitoring Jordan's Universal Periodic Review commitments on media freedom as well as drafting a chapter on the treatment of journalists to be included in the Jordan civil society shadow report to the UN Committee on Torture for this November.

- **Activity I.B. Partnerships for Jordan's Development Project** – No activities planned.
- **Activity I.C. USAID Civic Initiatives Support Fund (CIS APS)**

FHI 360 staff continued to monitor CIS Round 1 grantees, providing mentoring and technical assistance as required. As reported in weekly updates to USAID, grantee activities intensified this quarter and impact stories began to emerge. Highlights include:

I-Dare for Sustainable Development leveraged interest in its *Youth to Combat Online Hate Speech* project, complementing its online campaign with expanded offline activities such as a “caravan” that traveled to four cities in the south and replicating it in three cities in the north. Plans for a joint roundtable with Al Rai newspapers' Research Center began where religious leaders and media will come together in October to address the issue of hate speech.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs extended his praise and support for **Al Qantara's** efforts to engage youth, particularly women, in three municipalities in Ma'an. **Jordan Innovators Society** held its third and final entrepreneurship training for 120 youth from Jerash and Ajloun, introducing the concept of green entrepreneurship as environmental issues are a concern in these governorates. **Kings Road Association** completed its grant activities, including training on advocacy for its citizens' committee and launching the results of its research study on tourism in Himmeh and Um Qais. As a result of the outreach efforts, the Minister of Municipal Affairs reached out to the Jordan Valley Authority to crackdown on unlicensed pools in the area and to work with community groups in addressing this problem. FHI 360 reached out to the newly awarded USAID BEST (Building Economic Sustainability through Tourism Project) for potential engagement as well as the USAID SCHEP project (Sustainable Cultural Heritage through Engagement of Local Communities project).

Family Guidance Awareness Center (FGAC) conducted training for female inmates at the Jweideh Correctional and Rehabilitation Center on topics such as anger and stress management, problem-solving, and conflict resolution. The training was an eye opener for inmates who commented on how it helped them understand the impact of violent behavior on themselves and their community. Based on the positive feedback from inmates and center employees, FGAC will volunteer time to conduct counseling sessions. Informal group **Sanady** kicked off the trial phase of their online patient support platform, www.sanadyme.com, and FHI 360 facilitated an introduction for Sanady with the USAID Jordan Competitiveness Project's information and communications technology and health teams to provide feedback on the concept. **I3zif for Music** selected 30 public schools to work with in Mafraq, Karak, Ma'an, Balqa, Amman, Zarqa and Jerash governorates.

FHI 360 worked with other grantees who struggled to implement as originally planned due to a combination of factors such as a lack of technical capacities and/or project management skills. Examples include **Good Land for Development and Environment**, whose project is to combat littering in Mafraq. Poor management skills and lack of good planning of the staff resulted in delays in implementation. **Queilbeh Association** completed its training for youth

in the Rabiyyet Al Koura area, but unfortunately the initiatives proposed by the youth were scattered and did not achieve the project's goal of empowering youth and advancing behavior change on environmental issues. **Alternative Cooperative for Education** faced challenges in coordinating with the Ministry of Education and selected universities to provide volunteer tutoring for school students, in addition to inconsistent financial reporting which required FHI 360 to conduct a closer review of the financial reports and resulted in a decision not to provide further advances until reports were effectively cleared.

In addition, the CIS grants team worked full force this quarter in conducting due diligence and negotiations with remaining CIS Round 1, 2 and 3 shortlisted applicants, securing AOR approval for 20 packages by the end of the quarter.

- **Activity I.D. Grants for Innovative Approaches in Engaging Students, Teachers, Communities & Parents to Combat Violence & Promote Social Justice (EDY RFA)**

The 23 grantees were divided in three groups based on their implementation end dates, with 17 successfully completing their Phase I mini-grants during this quarter, after which they were then invited to attend a scale-up workshop as a requirement to apply for the closed-universe Phase II competition. The first group of eight grantees completed their activities according to the original schedule on June 30, and all submitted Phase II proposals by the August 16 deadline. The GEC convened on August 24 to evaluate and shortlist proposals, resulting in three which scored 71 or above: Social Development Society, Jordan Echo, and Intemaa. With AOR concurrence, due diligence then began with this group to finalize their grant packages.

The second group of nine grantees finished their projects by August 31 after which the scale-up workshop was held for eight grantees as Jubilee School withdrew from the competition due to competing priorities. The proposal deadline is October 1, and the GEC is scheduled to convene on October 22 to evaluate and shortlist organizations for phase II.

Both groups commended FHI 360 on the opportunity for the scale-up workshop, citing how it helped them capture their lessons learned from the pilot phase and that the emphasis on project design helped them redefine their priorities for Phase II. Initially, there was a naïve attitude among many of the grantees that their pilot projects had achieved their intended objectives simply because activities had been implemented; but they gradually acknowledged that this does not necessarily translate into achieved objectives if there were not specific objectives to achieve and/or clarity on how these were measured. The discussions that took place brought forward an understandable level of defensiveness amongst the grantees. They felt that they had defied many odds and had chosen difficult project themes, even using the word 'taboo' to describe the riskiness of their work. But until the workshop, none had truly thought through the process they proposed and only now realized that cutting back on activities or on the outreach is often necessary as a first step. Simplifying objectives is better than over extending to a level where impact is unclear. By the end of the workshop there was a greater willingness to hear more on the "how to" if impact is to be felt.

- **Activity I.E. Disability Rights and Inclusion Grants (DRI RFA)**

At the end of August, eight organizations were shortlisted by the DRI GEC (of which Autism MENA has two shortlisted proposals that will be combined during the preparatory phase). FHI 360 originally anticipated issuing awards with September 1 start dates, but after the initial due diligence meetings decided to take a different approach to the pre-award process. This meant a shift in the technical design of the proposals where a series of intensive training workshops coupled with mentoring took place on the topics of gender and disability inclusion as well as qualitative feedback techniques with shortlisted applicants designing their research

methodologies for the preparatory phase award. Immediately, shortlisted applicants demonstrated how they have benefitted from the training as reflected in the quality of their research designs and in the rights-based terminology they used in their draft action plans.

Although still in the pre-award/due diligence phase, FHI 360 held a grant orientation workshop to introduce grant regulations and financial management requirements to shortlisted applicants, the results of which were also seen in the amended budgets submitted by shortlisted applicants. Seven of the eight organizations provided overwhelmingly positive feedback on this intensive process as described by Petra National Trust: *“The design of your technical assistance is proactive... you are with us every step of the way!”*

In parallel, a tag team between the CIS capacity building and civic engagement teams resulted in the finalization of a new section of the ICAT which assesses the extent to which an organization deals with disability inclusion at various levels. Consistent with FHI 360’s rights-based approach, this new ICAT section will contribute to improving CSO services, programs and policies to ensure engagement and empowerment of persons with disabilities in all project stages. The results of the inclusion assessment will inform grantees of their level of inclusion and will highlight aspects that require further development to be supported through their grant’s capacity building plan.

PILOTING THE NEW ICAT COMPONENT ON INCLUSION: Two sessions were held to pilot the new ICAT chapter on inclusion prior to rolling it out to other grantees. Diala Khamra, executive director of the Haya Cultural Center recognized that the tool provides *“... an opportunity to know what we need and how we should plan to enhance our inclusion approach especially that we aim at providing our programs to all children including those with disabilities.”* And Al Hayat’s Executive Director Ragheb Shraim admitted: *“We already know that we are not inclusive, but we want to learn how to develop our organization to become more inclusive for persons with disabilities”.*

- **Activity I.F. Enhancing Effectiveness of Grantees and Highlighting Grantee Impact**

FHI 360 staff and consultants continued to provide technical assistance and mentoring on programmatic and financial issues. In addition to the workshops referenced above for the DRI and EDY grantees, additional workshops were held for grantees including: Advocacy Orientation Workshop for 26 grantees (*see Annex A for the report*); three grant orientation workshops and three gender and inclusion workshops for CIS Rounds 1 and 2 grantees and shortlisted. And as part of FHI 360’s Fraud Prevention Strategy, ongoing financial reviews took place and compliance reviews were conducted with I-Dare, Good Land and Queilbeh and final closeout review for That Al Nitakain. No major findings were identified and minor recommendations were shared with grantees’ management.

In marking the end of Year II, FHI 360 undertook extensive preparations for the second All Grantee Meeting on October 4 where it will bring together 60 grantees from across the CIS grants portfolio to reflect on their collective contributions to advancing change in Jordan under the theme *Assessing Progress... Advancing Change*. New interactive approaches to sharing lessons learned are an integral part of the design of the day, including ten “innovation stations” led by grantees as well as a session on measuring impact and change.

B. COMPONENT II: Capacity Building for Sustainability

- **Activity II.A. Targeted Technical Assistance to USG-Subawardees**

This quarter marked the completion of the two-part *Organizational M&E Foundations* workshops, resulting in 12 out of the 17 participants completing the full training and mentoring assignments. A follow-up assessment of the mentoring process revealed that the trainer did not adequately explain the assignment for Part B, nor did she provide the required

level of technical feedback that participants required. This proved disappointing as this trainer is one of the three trainers certified by FHI 360 for the M&E curriculum. She will require closer monitoring and additional coaching if engaged again in the future.

Mentoring also continued for participants of the *Effective Communications Planning for Development Projects* workshop. The response was very strong with participants bringing other colleagues from their CSOs to their mentoring sessions so that they can better understand the communications planning process and benefit from the mentoring support.

FHI 360 conducted an assessment of mentoring provided to date in an effort to capture feedback directly from trainees and build lessons learned into future capacity building efforts. (See Annex B for findings from the mentoring assessment.)

This quarter, FHI 360 conducted additional institutional capacity assessments (5 ICATs and 11 IDAs), bringing the total number of assessments completed to 21 of 33 grantees to date, with four ICAT reports and improvement action plans currently underway. Capacity building coaching sessions continued with 10 of grantees to develop action plans in response to the capacity building priorities which emerged from their assessments.

APS/RFA requirements include that applicants set aside 10% of a proposed budget for institutional and technical strengthening. However the majority of grantees cannot clearly define how they will use this support until after the ICAT/IDA, resulting in an earmarking of funds pending the outcomes of its assessment improvement plan. Intensive mentoring and monitoring of grantees is required to ensure that the funds meet their objectives and when they do, results demonstrate a long-term impact on the grantee. To that end, FHI 360 recognizes the importance of continuing this practice as no other donor is providing such core support. This quarter, we began the design of an internal assessment of the effectiveness of the 10% line item in order to incorporate lessons learned into future APS/RFA designs.

- **Activity II.B. Institutional Strengthening Fund (ISF APS)**

Awards were issued to the final two recipients of the ISF APS 2014-15, Taghyeer and Freedom Pioneers, after which an ICAT and IDA were conducted, respectively. Monitoring of grantee implementation of their capacity building plans continued throughout the quarter.

- **Activity II.C. Internal Strengthening for Change (ISC)**

FHI 360 and its subcontractors Jordan River Foundation (JRF), Noor Al Hussein Foundation (NHF) and Al Thoria continued implementation of the ISC program including the launch of the newly developed Phase IV for organizational mentoring which was developed by FHI 360 and its subs in response to participating CSO demand for additional support in implementing their improvement plans. Here is a snapshot of the ISC activities this quarter:

ISC Rounds	July	Aug	Sept
R1: Phase III Finalization of Strategic Plans & Mentoring for 21 CSOs (JRF & NHF)			
R1: Phase IV Selection for Organizational Mentoring Intervention (JRF & NHF)			
R1: Phase IV Implementation with 10 CSOs in Aqaba, Tafileh, Irbid (JRF & NHF)			
R2: Phase III Mentoring 10 CSOs in Mafraq, Irbid, Ma'an, Zarqa & Amman (JRF & NHF)			
R3: Recruitment of new CSOs in Jerash, Ajloun, Northern Badia/Mafraq (Thoria)			
R3: Phase I Orientation Workshops for 37 CSOs (Thoria)			

In parallel, FHI 360 continued to closely monitor the performance of all three of its subs and provided ongoing feedback about how they were simultaneously managing the different

rounds and phases. For JRF and NHF, the diversity of staff and consultants working with each sub on each phase required additional refresher sessions and coaching from FHI 360 to ensure consistency in the delivery of training, strategic planning, and in particular, the structure and process for the organizational mentoring component. Overall, JRF and NHF expressed their appreciation for these sessions, recognizing that this investment will advance their organization's technical capacity to continue such work beyond the ISC program.

FHI 360, JRF and NHF held a one-day workshop to launch Phase IV with the 10 CSOs from Tafileh, Irbid and Aqaba that were selected through a competitive process among the 21 CSOs who completed the third phase of the ISC program (strategic planning). In essence, these CSOs represent the most committed of the 366 CSOs from ISC Round I. CSOs reflected on what they have accomplished to date through the ISC, so what, and now what. The majority provided concrete examples of how they adopted resources from the *Societies Start-up Toolkit* as well as examples of their identified strategic objectives. They explained how improving their systems and setting their strategic objectives contribute to their organizational development, which they believe will lead them to enhancing the quality of their programs, finding more strategic supporters, and expanding their reach to benefit others.

While some organizations saw this opportunity as a means for strengthening their capabilities to receive financial support, a couple of organizations (Al Rashadieh Cement Users and Beer Al Sabba Association) explained that they were not looking for financial support, but rather to strengthen their internal structures and systems to better serve their communities. CSOs also defined their individual priorities and prepared mentoring plans with priorities focused on human resources; development of financial policies and procedures; monitoring and evaluation; follow-up to their strategic planning processes; and project management.

Al Thoria launched Round 3 of the *Toolkit* trainings in Ajloun, Jerash and Northern Badia/Mafraq. CSO responses continued to be positive and focused on how the toolkit itself can assist them in managing their CSO. Ahmad Al Qadiri, Al Wihda Al Watania Association said: *"We benefited a lot from the training. The toolkit will be a reference for our organization and we will be utilizing it in each step of our work."* Dalal Qardan from Rural Women Charitable Association, a newly-registered CSO, explained that they had planned to rely on MoSD for guidance in how to manage their CSO but now realized *"This training was very beneficial and shortened the distance for us in getting what we need for our work. The CD will be the guide in our work in particular in the matters that we are unable to manage"*.

- **Activity II.D. Demand-Driven Off-the-Shelf Courses**

No open courses were held this quarter due to Ramadan and Eid holidays. Instead, efforts focused on marketing the open course offerings to take place October 2015-February 2016 (Procurement Fundamentals; Project Design and Proposal Writing; Budgeting for Proposals and Effective Communications Planning for Development Projects). Open recruitment took place through the CIS website and Facebook pages as well as direct mailings to CIS grantees, applicants and Implementing Partner (IP) grantees. Responding to CSO demand for trainings in the governorates, FHI 360 will determine the locale of each workshop by the number of qualified applicants.

- **Activity II.E: ISO Sustainability/CSO Service Provision** - No activity planned.
- **Activity II.F: Societies Empowerment Fund (SEF)** – Design discussions were held internally and preparations for the presentation to USAID took place.

C. COMPONENT III: Enhancing Government-CSO Engagement

- **Activity III.A: Enhancing the Capacities of Registry & GOJ Civil Society Staff**

After numerous delays, the SG, FHI 360, and its subcontractor ABCD met for the SG to provide feedback on the Registry's draft strategic plan. The SG requested that ABCD summarize the draft in a clearer way in order to highlight the big picture goals of the strategy rather than delve into the details. ABCD then sent another draft, but that too did not meet the SG's or FHI 360's expectations, requiring FHI 360 to draft another version as an example which ABCD could use to further develop prior to presenting the strategy to the Registry Council Board. It was agreed with the SG and ABCD that more time is required to complete this assignment, so a second no-cost extension was prepared through December 31.

Subcontractor Leading Point moved ahead in its efforts to assist the MoSD Disability Directorate in developing its strategic plan, conducting numerous consultations with governmental and non-governmental entities engaged in disability programming.

- **Activity III.B: Civil Society Research Fund**: No activity scheduled this quarter.
- **Activity III.C: Technical Assistance Support to the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities (HCD)** – FHI 360 remained on standby to support HCD on follow-up to the USA study tour and finalization of the draft disability law.

III. Cross-Cutting Initiatives

- **Activity IV.A. KMS** – Ongoing KMS data entry continued for CIS activities.
- **Activity IV.B. Coordination**

FHI 360 responded to requests from the USAID Monitoring and Evaluation Support Program team conducting the civil society sector assessment and the CIS performance evaluation. Consultations with the JCAP project continued this quarter, with FHI 360 agreeing to deliver three of its flagship courses (Project Design & Proposal Writing, Budgeting for Proposals and Organizational M&E Foundations) to enhance the capacities of JCAP's family planning coalition members. JCAP later withdrew its request due to the release of its upcoming grant solicitation and instead encouraged its coalition members to apply to CIS' open courses.

Several meetings took place with the USAID Takamol Gender Project related to coordination on gender-related grants (particularly in reviewing SIGI's research on Article 308), as well as planning in response to Takamol's request for CIS to deliver a customized strategic communications course for GOJ gender focal points (to take place in YIII Q2). In addition, FHI 360 shared its experience in gender programming in a lessons learned panel during the USAID IP gender coordination meeting.

- **Activity IV.C. Gender, Inclusion & Environment**

As part of the pre-award support for the DRI shortlisted grantees, a joint gender and inclusion workshop was designed and delivered. The alignment of the two frameworks resulted in the complementarity of concepts and action among participants who expressed their gratitude for the new learning they gained with one commenting, *"Thank you for opening new horizons to consider during our work!"*

In response to a request from DRG Gender Focal Points, a session was held on how to assess reports for gender sensitivity with a practical exercise where members reviewed a document together to better understand what to look for with one commenting: *"I now realize that our documents need review, but we also need practice."*

Technical support was also provided to a number of grantees but mainly focused on research reviews for Al Badeel and SIGI; both of whom gathered valuable information, but presented it in an incoherent manner with disjointed reporting. Despite extensive support from FHI 360, both CSOs have major weaknesses in managing qualitative and quantitative data and analyzing it, and the outcomes remain below expectations.

Two short trainings were held for grantees LOYAC and Generations of Peace (GFP), both of which aimed at reaffirming gender as part of their respective organization's work. LOYAC volunteer trainers recognized gender issues that require more attention, i.e., working with parents of girl trainees, understanding the differences in perception and expectations among girls and boys, orienting trainers on gender to ensure that they are equipped to recognize and handle gender issues. The results of the GFP session was rather different as their staff reiterated that they are not a gender-focused organization and instead address gender issues in a "natural manner"; FHI 360 will follow up on this with them.

- **Activity IV.D. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)** – See Annex C for the M&E updates.

IV. Upcoming Quarterly Activities (YIII Q1 October-December 2015)

Component I: Subawards in Support of Jordanian Civic Initiatives

- Monitor performance of all grantees; provide technical assistance and mentoring as required. Conduct compliance reviews of grantees as required.
- Continue due diligence and issue awards for the remaining 14 CIS APS shortlisted applicants, eight DRI shortlisted applicants and 3 EDY Phase II shortlisted from Group A.
- Conduct Phase II competition for Group B of the EDY mini-grants, conduct GEC for this group and conduct due diligence for those shortlisted for Phase II awards. Monitor remaining grantees and repeat Phase II competition cycle as required.
- Convene the All Grantee Meeting for all sub-recipients of the USAID CIS program.
- Conduct customized workshops for new grantees on (a) gender and inclusion; (b) monitoring and evaluation; (c) procurement; (d) advocacy; and (e) communications.

Component II: Capacity Building for Sustainability

- Monitor implementation of final two ISF awards.
- Monitor subcontractors' implementation of ISC.
- Deliver open courses on project design/proposal writing; monitoring and evaluation; effective communications planning for development projects and budgeting for proposals.
- Conduct ICATs/IDAs for grantees, support development of improvement plans and 10% capacity building line item and provide ongoing mentoring, as required.
- Launch the Societies Empowerment Fund Request for Applications.
- Assess the effectiveness of the 10% capacity building line item in grants.
- Design an evaluation of CIS open courses (40 to date) and ISC full round (Phases I-IV).

Component III: Enhancing Government-CSO Engagement

- Secure feedback from the Registry of Society's Secretary General and Registry Council on the draft strategic plan and determine follow-on support as appropriate.
- Monitor implementation of the MoSD Disability Directorate strategic planning process implemented by subcontractor Leading Point.
- Define technical assistance support for the HCD as appropriate.

Cross-Cutting Initiatives

- Continue mentoring grantees on gender equality and inclusion, as required.
- Continue outreach and coordination with IPs and other international organizations.
- Finalize approval of detailed CIS Year 3 workplan.

- End -

Advocacy Orientation Workshop for CIS Grantees

August 30th 2015 at Century Park Hotel, Amman
FINAL REPORT

Background:

USAID CIS through its open courses advertised for a training course on advocacy using the “five steps to effective strategies” framework developed by New Tactics in Human Rights Program. About 60 organizations applied for the training including USAID CIS grantees. Upon reviewing the applicants, it was agreed to conduct a one-day orientation workshop for the CIS grantees who applied and the other grantees who use advocacy as one of their implementation strategy, or might benefit from understanding the concept to build on what they are currently achieving. The workshop outcomes will then be used to design advocacy training as needed. For the CIS grantees who are experienced in advocacy, it was agreed to arrange consultation sessions to identify what is needed to enhance their effectiveness in advocacy. The response to the non-CIS grantees who applied for advocacy training will be scheduled as well.

26 organizations mainly from CIS Round I and II were invited to a one-day orientation workshop, including one EDY grantee who finished the pilot phase and one shortlisted DRI focusing on advocacy as an implementation methodology. Out of this pool, 10 organizations have applied for the open course advocacy-training workshop. Two persons from each organization, responsible for designing and managing projects, were invited to participate in the one-day orientation workshop.

The one day orientation workshop was designed with the following objectives:

- Common understanding of the concept of advocacy and “5 Steps Strategic Effectiveness” methodology
- Identify further trainings and needs to advocate effectively
- Foster networking among organizations working on similar sector issues

The workshop included the following sessions:

Session I: introducing who are in the workshop per sector, identifying the main roles of the participated organisations and where advocacy stand, conduct using socio-gram a quick advocacy readiness index for organizations.

Session II: presenting the advocacy terminologies, concept with a focus on peoples’ advocacy, the five steps framework with a real example from Jordan (Takafo).

Session III: identifying in groups through brainstorming around a set of questions including; why the interest in advocacy? Limitations in effectively advocating for issues both at internal and external levels, what needs to improve? And what skills needed to advocate effectively?

In total, 29 participants attended the workshop representing 19 organizations (noting that the majority of who were invited confirmed their participation)

The main outcomes of the sessions:

Participants were asked as groups to identify the main roles of CSOs. As per the results, it showed that the majority of organizations work in the following:

- Capacity building and training
- Awareness raising
- Policy and behavior change
- Others: local community development, studies and research, legal aid, civic rights, communication, expression using film making, eliminating school violence.

It was clear that participants were not interested in looking into the activities/projects that the organizations conduct but rather were interested in being able to contextualize those activities/projects within their main role as CSOs.

Through a socio gram exercise focusing on the Advocacy Readiness Index, out of the 26 participants (attending at this moment in time), the following responded to each question:

No	Question	No of Respondents
1.	If Mansaf is your favorite dish (illustrative question)	9
2.	If you applied for the advocacy training with CIS	14
3.	If you attended advocacy training before	7
4.	If you attended more than one training on advocacy	2
5.	If you participated in implementing an advocacy campaign	4
6.	If your organization has advocacy as part in its strategy or vision	14
7.	If your organization has a staff member with advocacy expertise / more than one	4
8.	If your organization has a strong relationship with its constituency	21
9.	If your organization engage its constituency in identifying issues and designing responses	14
10.	If your organization collaborate with other CSOs on specific issues	18
11.	If your organization has worked on changing a policy/legislation/procedure	4
12.	If you think that your organization should focus on advocacy	26

No of participants participated in the exercise: 26

The above table shows the following:

- Almost half of the participants applied to be trained on advocacy (14)
- A quarter of them has been trained on advocacy already (at least once)(7) and only a few participated in implementing an advocacy intervention (4)
- Almost half of the participants has advocacy as part of it vision/strategy (14) but only a few assigned staff with advocacy expertise to take this forward (4)
- The majority has strong relationship with its constituency (21)though less number engages them in identifying issues and designing interventions (14)
- The majority collaborate with other CSOs (18), but only a few worked on advocating for changing policies, legislations or procedures (4)
- All participants think that their organizations has to focus on advocacy (26).

Why CSOs are interested in advocacy

- Changing policies and legislations or ensuring its application and accessing/claiming rights
- Attracting donors and private organizations through their CSR
- Finding logical solutions, expanding the beneficiaries circle and sustaining projects
- Changing culture, traditions and norms and behavior
- Promoting justice and entitlements of vulnerable groups
- Identifying our needs, approaches and strategies
- Influencing decision makers
- creating new tactics that protect human rights
- providing space for youth to participate as pressure groups
- networking between organizations and individuals
- enhancing public participation and then build democratic societies

What are the current challenges/limitations facing CSOs in conducting advocacy

- Lack of expertise within organizations to design and implement advocacy campaign

- Lack of networking and coalition building among organizations
- Fear of society reaction, the society culture and traditions and lack of acceptance to new ideas
- Government response and the conflict of benefits between stakeholders especially the public sector
- Inability to reach out to the society segments especially the vulnerable groups
- Lack of specialized advocacy training and lack of knowledge of right advocacy methods lack of
- Financial support and high cost of specific advocacy actions
- Lack of information about the specific advocacy issue
- Lack of human resources and time availability (limited number of staff)
- Uncertainty of the socio political conditions
- Registration of societies
- Centralization of decision making processes in Amman and lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities
- Belief among organizations that advocacy is a dangerous political work
- Lack of recognition of organizations' decision makers of the importance of advocacy

What can CSOs do to ensure proper implementation of advocacy actions?

- Build capacities of employees and volunteers in advocacy and have specialized team
- Convince organizations' management to Integrate advocacy within organizations strategies and bylaws and annual plans and allocate budget for advocacy actions
- Knowledge of policies and legislations related to the issue that we are tackling
- Clarifying priorities within the organization
- Network with organizations and allies on the issues that we advocate for
- Clarifying the vision and goal for the issue being tackled
- Raise awareness about the benefit of advocacy
- Realistic planning based on real context and evidence
- Engage community/constituency
- Conduct assessment of the community issues and problems
- Design an effective communication plan

How CSOs can join efforts to address similar/common issues

- Build coalitions and networks with related organizations and build capacities of the coalitions and networks (include influential agencies, individuals and decision makers)
- Enhance use of specific tactics (media (public and social), petition, survey,..) and plan well for them especially the media campaign
- Enhance experience sharing among organizations (and within the organization as well)
- Conduct meetings and consultations with relevant people
- Conduct studies and research to provide information and ensure that work is based on evidence
- Expand the constituency and build trust bridges
- Use specific methods for behavior change
- Build a specialized team with clear roles and responsibilities and effective planning
- Build data base for orgs working on similar issue
- Share experiences and success stories
- Promoting the organizations through media to reach out to others

If you want to attend training on advocacy what do you expect (content/ style)

- Intensive practical training on advocacy campaigns planning and implementation with inclusion of case studies and success stories
- Training on communication, presentation, message writing, press releases, negotiation, social media, dealing with decision makers and fundraising skills
- Monitoring and evaluating advocacy campaigns

- Training on problem and objectives identification

Evaluation

The majority of the participants appreciated this opportunity to have common understanding of the concept and methodology and be able to identify next steps.

- “I benefited from the information provided noting that this is the first time I am subjected to this issue”
- “new value added and beneficial information”
- “the workshop was worth the travel from Tafleih and not for once but for more than that”
- “ benefited a lot”, “Awesome”
- “Fruitful day despite being intensive, opportunity to network, professionalism in training”
- “ the examples given were very good and helped in clarifying the methodology”
- “ the advocacy term in Arabic should be changed”
- “ divide the workshop into two days and expand on the advocacy training”
- “Need to continue to get further training on advocacy”

Ibrahim al Masri from Intemma wrote “ *thank you for the valuable workshop, despite the limited time, the presented methodology has a big impact on raising our trust in our capacities to design an advocacy campaign to improve the work environment in specific vocational sectors. We look passionately to the full training on advocacy*” .

Next Steps

In the wrap up the following points were identified for next steps:

- Lessons learned from others who conducted advocacy campaigns through field visits to understand external limitations or challenges they faced throughout the process
- Meet with organizations who have similar views and others with different views about the issue to capture both sides
- Include documented case studies from Jordan and other countries with similar context to be presented directly and have space for discussing and learning (not abstract)
- Practical training using real cases with mentoring /coaching through planning and implementation processes
- Networking with human rights organizations with expertise on the issue that we are tackling
- Identify and access data and information available on the issue

Other technical assistance interventions to enhance their effectiveness:

- Rights: how to identify and understand to know what to claim
- Fundraising for specific issues
- Financial training (managing financial processes) to include practical cases that address the organization context.

About what to include in the upcoming “All Grantees Meeting” to take place on Oct 4th:

- Get to know what others are doing and to network with organizations working within similar sectors
- To have an opportunity for interested organizations to present their products (Booth)
- Share with the participants ahead of time the agenda, projects profile and contact information for organizations

Overall the following summarizes the main results of the workshop, all of which will shape USAID CIS’s follow-up interventions going forward.

- Need to adopt a new term for advocacy in Arabic, as the current one mainly implies an advocacy strategy or tactic rather than the holistic concept/process of advocacy
- Limited and fragmented knowledge of advocacy among participants which means that upcoming training needs to take that into consideration and use practical real examples to illustrate the methodology. The advocacy readiness index results could be used as a base to divide the participants according to their skill level in advocacy

- The majority of participants displayed a need for training on the Human Rights Based Approach, not just as an approach to use in advocacy, but rather as a general lens and framework through which they view gaps/needs and as a basis for designing, framing and implementing interventions.
- Several participating organizations took a moment to pause and reflect on the section related to expected results of advocacy (influencing the decision making process itself to become participatory, transparent and with clear accountability process). Viewing this as a result of advocacy is not something they have thought of before and they seemed interested to know more about this.
- Organizations also voiced a general concern about the lack of a regularly updated database with the names of organizations and the causes they work on.
- When asked about the interest in attending the full training, only one participant said no with an interest for capacity building and achieving the organization objectives. Almost half of the participants did not have an issue that they want to advocate for where others stated issues around such as inclusion of PWDs, amending laws and legislations, establishing associations, autism, violence in schools and divorce.

Mentoring Assessment: Focus Group Findings

September 2015

FG Research Design

Course	Training Location	Tool	Trainer	Justification
M&E Fundamentals Parts A & B	Amman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus Group: Participants who successfully completed the assignment Phone Interviews: Participants who did not complete the mentoring assignment 	Lubna Al-Kayed	First M&E Certified trainer to provide training on behalf of CIS
Communications Course	Amman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus Group: Participants who successfully completed the assignment Phone Interviews: Participants who did not complete the mentoring assignment 	Fateh Mansour	Successful course
Project Design Proposal Writing	Karak and Salt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phone Interviews: Participants who did not complete the mentoring assignment (Total 9 responses) 	Fateh Mansour	*Karak and Salt trainings were the most recent. *The participation in the mentoring assignment was very minimal

Communications Course

- The course outline and the requirements shared with the participants before the course were clear. The invitation clarified the mentoring component and the time/effort needed to make it work.
- It was noticeable that the group who successfully completed the assignments had personal and professional motivation to utilize the knowledge gained.
- The quality of feedback provided by the trainer was adequate. The participants noticed significant improvement to the assignment after it was reviewed by the mentor.
- The participants mentioned that the training material was scattered, distracting their focus from the PowerPoint slides, to the folder, to the many handouts and emails they received.
- The SMART chart which is a key tool in the training was not provided in a soft copy format that did not open with participants so they had to “google it” or “redraw” the chart.

Design and structure of the course.

- The course design had some limitations that might have hindered better learning, some of each:
 - Participants were asked to work in groups not on their own projects. So the participants with the elected project received the assignment on a “silver plate” while others had to redo the work. Which some perceived as unfair.
 - The course requirements and communication did not strictly ask for a sample project design /idea prior to participation , that’s why many of the participants attended without preparing one to work on as a sample

Trainer

- Fateh was a very capable trainer. He was outstanding in content delivery and knowledge of the topic.
- At some points his energy declined and he looked a bit exhausted. The participants mentioned he was “juggling” a number of tasks at the same time including, preparing the room, the handouts, putting up the flip charts etc.
- Fateh’s strength as a trainer was demonstrated during the one to one meetings. He gave very strong feedback and ensured the quality of work has been improved.
- Fateh’s use of the example on “smoking” throughout the course helped participants remain focused by referring always to the same case and building on it.
- The case study about the Gay Rights was seen by participants as inappropriate to the context and not very close to the mentality of participants.

Quotes about the Trainer

- *“When we sat with Fateh during the one-to-ones we realized how much knowledge he really has”*
- *“Fateh was much stronger in the mentoring meetings”*
- *“The trainer style was very simple and straight forward”*
- *“Fateh is a very strong trainer, we really benefited from the communications course”*
- *The trainer discussed the plan with me step by step from beginning to end”*

The Assignment

- The assignment was explained and practiced very clearly during the course. Which made it easier for participants to deliver the work on time during the mentoring phase.
- Some participants who had projects that were elected as “case study”, the work was much easier, their assignment was given to them on a “*Golden Plate*”.
- The assignment requested that participants provide a complete communications plan on the first deadline. Then the mentor requested 3 one-to-one meetings with participants to go through the deliverables.

The Assignment

- Although feedback was very constructive and according to the participants it did make the plan stronger, 3 meetings were “not necessary”, it was “very time consuming” especially that the complete plan was delivered on the first deadline.
- The mentoring plan was communicated clearly to the participants (number of meetings and deliverables). However when the participants realized that they have plenty of time to work on the assignment they starting “stalling” and sometimes they felt they “lost the momentum”.
- During face to face meetings the “concentration is much higher”.
- According to the participants the communication with the trainer was very effective and they were able to reach him for guidance via phone, email or face to face at any time.

More Quotes...

- *The assignment helped enhance my understanding of Key concepts in communications*
- *The final deliverable was by far a better product it was more detailed*
- *The mentoring meeting were like brainstorming sessions.. The approach was very participatory during the one-to-ones”*
- *The final deadline was extended by the trainer which made us feel it’s too flexible and we have time”*

Motives to complete the mentoring assignments

The motive for me was the relevance of the course to my work... I didn't want to forget the concepts I learned

I already invested time in the course why not continue

My motive was to submit the plan to the communications department & transfer knowledge to my colleagues

As the strategic projects coordinator I am responsible for developing communications plans. The mentoring was the perfect practice for me

Project Design Proposal Writing (PDPW)

- 9 Phone interviews were conducted with participants from the PDPW course who did not complete the mentoring assignment.
- All respondents said that **TIME** was the challenge that prevented them from completing the mentoring.
- All respondents “agreed” that the **mentoring assignment** and requirements were clearly explained (verbally & written)
- All respondents “agreed” that **deliverable deadlines** were clearly explained (verbally & written)
- The majority of respondents said that they did not share the challenges with the trainer or try to explain the reasons behind their inability to submit the assignment.
- Few said that they informed the trainer that they aren't able to submit due to time and the trainer did offer all kinds of support needed. But they felt it was too late to work on the assignment & they lost the momentum.

Monitoring and Evaluations Fundamentals

- Participants in the M&E focus group mentioned that training was beneficial and relevant to their work. The majority of participants were in M&E positions and needed the skills mainly to develop M&E plans and report more effectively.
- The participants mentioned that Part A was much stronger in content than Part B. The concepts made sense.
- The participants mentioned that the trainer was more capable in delivering Part A than B. The participants noticed that the trainer was reading the slides and her performance declined compared to part A maybe due to time and the intensity of concepts.

Monitoring and Evaluations Fundamentals

- The group work in the training had its advantages and disadvantages. According to the participants on one hand it enabled them to share experiences and exchange ideas and thoughts on how projects are implemented and evaluated.
- On the other hand the groups did change and mix “too much” which did not allow enough time for exchange of ideas to be fruitful and reflect on the case study and training exercises.
- The participants said that they felt they didn’t go deep into M&E. and they still had some confusion in key terms.
- The participants didn’t feel that the feedback given on their questions during the course was sufficient and when they tried to discuss the ideas further the trainer would inform them that they should stick to the content and that she was “asked” to deliver this specific content.

Limitations in content delivery

- The participants mentioned that they felt a gap when trying to formulate their “problem statement” and the logic was not clear in the problem analysis using the problem tree tool particularly the relationship between a problem and its affects .
- The participants who attended the fundamentals course and the crash course (as grantees) mentioned that the problem analysis part became more understandable and was explained differently and clearly in the crash course.
- The “final report” Annex was not referred to during the training.

Limitations in content delivery

- Discussions showed that the trainer did not explain the mentoring assignment clearly, therefore the majority of participants were not able to submit the “small evaluation” part.
- The discussions showed that they weren't able to submit this part because their projects were ongoing and not closed yet. Although the guidelines for this part were:
 - *Conduct a small evaluation for **one activity of your project** using all the evaluation process steps.*
 - *Completed evaluation report for the evaluation conduct for the one project activity.*
- This had contributed to the lack of understanding on the concept of “evaluation”.

Mentoring assignments

- Participants (who submitted and didn't submit the assignments) “agreed” that deliverable deadlines were clearly explained (verbally & written) and the trainer was very “strict” in ensuring the deliverables are submitted on time.
- Participants felt that the feedback on their assignments was not deep it was very brief. The comments provided by the trainer were not major or significant in a way that they felt would improve the quality of the assignment.
- The mentoring meetings were communicated by the trainer as “optional” if participants needed more guidance.
- The mentoring meetings when requested were conducted at the trainer's offices in Jabal Al-Hussein

Mentoring assignments

- Participants mentioned that they felt “somehow” prepared to work on the assignments on their own after the course with limitations in the area of evaluation.
- Participants mentioned that the schedule of the mentoring meetings was not clear to them and that there were no specified dates for us.
- The majority of participants received feedback over the phone and email without face to face meetings.
- Some participants mentioned that although the feedback was brief it enhanced the understanding of some aspects of the work.
- Participants who did not deliver the assignments also attributed this to time and workload.

Quotes on the Trainer

- *I didn't feel fully prepared to do the assignment, I needed more clarification on some concepts*
- *Part A overall was very good but in Part B we felt weakness in content delivery*
- *To be honest in Part B I felt a lecture style and I don't want to memorize I want to understand*
- *If I were the trainer I would give more time to the training and a little bit less to the mentoring phase*
- *Lubna was accessible over the phone would give me feedback and explain things*
- *The Arabic translation of the material is weak.*

Conclusions

- The communications course and the mentoring phase is a success mainly because the trainer was strong in content delivery and follow up and the participants were self motivated.
- PDPW participants lacked the drive because of the work pressure they had and didn't feel the value of submitting the assignments. All respondents said that they didn't have time to do the assignments and the management was not supportive enough therefore they "couldn't manage the workload" . It can be argued that the differences between the two courses (communications and PDPW) were in types of people attending. Not enough evidence was obtained to prove other reasons.

Conclusions

- Small CSOs (CBOs) tend to lose momentum very easily. And do not see the value of the mentoring approach in the bigger picture.
- The people who attended the Communications course were PR and communications staff which maximized the benefit of the training.
- At the CBO level there are no specialized staff dedicated to proposal writing so it remains a task that is done based on necessity and on ad-hoc basis.
- The PDPW course does not request a project concept as part of the application, on the other hand the communications course requests an “idea” from applicants. This could have a role in creating commitment to the course because participants would have invested in an idea that can be used practically.

Recommendations

- Revisit the mentoring approach (communications and PDPW) to have more specified meeting dates and shorten the mentoring period. The extra flexibility made people feel more laid back and therefore miss deadlines. We can adopt the M&E fundamentals mentoring annex that is handed as part of the training material.
- Revisit the mentoring assignment in the communications course, if the assignment is not broken into a number of deliverables, 3 meetings are not necessarily needed and were perceived by some participants as a waste of time.
- Conduct refreshers for the M&E TOT certified trainers prior to the course to remind them about the procedures and guidelines of the training (including content, deadlines, meetings, training style and communication)

Recommendations

- Aim to specify the requirements of applicants in order to address the right people who would see the value of the training to their own work as this will be the main driver to complete the mentoring phase.
- Investigate the issue of “time” which was given by all participants as the reason why they were not able to submit their work. This could lead us to require a higher level of commitment from the CSO’s management as part of the application process.
- Develop a database of *unresponsive CSOs and individuals* who repeatedly take part in the courses and drop the mentoring phase.
- Simplify the PDPW assignment and propose a deadline for one final deliverable within a short period of time (maximum 10days).
- Investigate the PDPW mentoring approach further with a new group from a more recent course. (expected November- December 2015)

Annex C: Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

I. Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (AMEP) Data Collection

Below is a summary of the primary monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities from PMP data collected from in-process programmatic activities. This is based on the PMP approved by the USAID/AOTR on March 3, 2014.

PMP Data Collection

The following chart displays actual data collected for each program indicator during YII. Data for Q4 – July 1 through September 30, 2015 - has been added for this report. It is important to note the following: *Not Available (NA) means that (a) data is unobtainable pending grantees' quarterly M&E reports; (b) an activity may have started but has not reached its full achievement level; or (c) measurement/assessment of indicator has not been conducted as of yet.*

Indicator	Baseline (CSP & CIS YI)	YII Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Justification	
Project Purpose: Civil society empowered to respond to and promote common interests through the implementation of initiatives at the national and sub-national level. (USAID IR 2.1 and 2.3)									
P.1	Number/type of public policies changed consistent with CSO advocacy. (USAID 2.3.2)	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Progress has been made by Democracy, Rights & Governance grantees (DRG) at drafting, proposing, discussing alternative laws, procedures or policies. But no adoption has been achieved as of yet.
P.2	Percentage of targeted CSOs showing improvement within the area of capacity building support received	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Post ICAT/IDA assessment has not been conducted as of yet.
P.3	Number of instances of GoJ – Civil Society communications in which civic concerns are addressed by local authorities. (Unique) (USAID 2.1.4.1 & CSP 3.1.3)	33	7	NA	2	3	10	15	Total of 3.1.1 (Qantara & CDFJ). SIGI discussion on position paper with Ministry of Justice. Hayat communication with Government stakeholders on Open Government Partnership. Kings' Road communication with Minister of Municipal Affairs on Himma Springs. HCAC/HCD/MoSD communication on quality standards.
P.4	Number of laws, policies or procedures, drafted, proposed or adopted in accordance to Jordan's international and national obligations	7	6	1	NA	NA	2	3	Phenix independent labor unions; disability law; CDFJ Media Complaint Law.
IR 1: CSO engagement is effective									
1.1	Number of new laws, regulations or constitutional amendments that protect fundamental freedoms and are consistent with international human rights standards adopted with USG assistance. (USAID 2.2.3.3)	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	Still in drafting or proposing stages.

Annex C: Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

Indicator		Baseline (CSP & CIS YI)	YII Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Justification
1.2	Number of laws, policies, and procedures proposed, or adopted to promote gender equality at the regional, national or local level	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SIGI has drafted a position paper to delete Article 308 from the Penal Code & amend other articles of relevant laws, it is not yet in the form of a draft law or policy.
1.3	Number of coalitions created as a result of USG support	19	1	NA	1	NA	NA	1	CDFJ co-founding Hemam coalition.
1.4	Percentage of targeted CSOs showing improvement on an advocacy index adapted by USAID CIS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Advocacy index not applied yet.
Sub-IR 1.1 : Civic Initiatives supported									
1.1.1	Number of CSOs receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions. (USAID 2.3.1.2)	52	100	15	NA	NA	50	65	
1.1.2	Number of domestic NGOs engaged in monitoring or advocacy work on human rights receiving USG support (USAID 2.2.3.1)	17	22	7	NA	NA	11	18	7 DRGs and 11 CIS APS Grantees: Family Guidance, Future Makers, Qantara, I-Dare, Khotwetna. ARDD, Namaa. Tafileh Women, Specific Women Farmer Union, Al-Masir, Phenix
1.1.3	Number of local CSOs supported in conducting outreach, community mobilization and civic engagement. (USAID 2.3.2.1)	NA	33	NA	NA	23	16	39	
1.1.4	Number of organizations supported by USG	595	931	492	190	132	158	972	
1.1.5	Number of beneficiaries from the grants	226	1500	946	1,370	3739	513	6568	The target was set before shortlisting all rounds of the CIS APS and/or finalization of grantee work plans therefore the grantee targets were not clear. In addition, the M&E reporting procedures have been improved to capture beneficiaries reached.
1.1.6	Number of initiatives led by informal groups with USAID CIS support	NA	6	6	NA	NA	NA	6	
1.1.7	Number of joint initiatives by CSOs and the private sector	NA	55	NA	59	163	NA	222	LOYAC (CIS RI) provided internship opportunities to youth through partnerships with private sector companies in Amman and governorates. Disaggregation of initiatives per governorates uploaded on Devresults.

Annex C: Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

Indicator		Baseline (CSP & CIS YI)	YII Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Justification
1.1.8	Number of initiatives targeting marginalized groups (youth, women, people with disabilities and refugee host communities).	NA	50	NA	2	23	20	45	Target groups will be clearer after RII grants start to reach to marginalized constituencies. DRI shortlisted grants are still in due diligence. CIS RII: She Fighter. Women Farmer Union. ACE. ARDD. Namaa. RSS. Forearms of Change. Princess Basma. Afaq. I-dare. Khreibet Al-Souq. Phenix. Creativity Club Karak.23 EDY. CIS RI: Qantara. LOYAC. Tafileh Women, Khotwetna, Dissi Women. Generations for Peace. DRG: HCAC
IR 2 : CSOs function more effectively									
2.1	Number of CSOs receiving capacity building support (training & TA). (Non-Unique)	1102	278	109	181	103	122	515	
2.2	Number of CSOs implementing strategic plans	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	
Sub-IR 2.1 : CSO capacity building efforts undertaken									
2.1.1	Number of CSOs that develop a strategic plan	NA	21	NA	NA	20	NA	20	One CSO dropped out of the strategic planning process in YII Q4.
2.1.2	Number of individuals trained within USAID CIS direct interventions. (Non-Unique)	1,056	1932	821	316	168	239	1,544	Indicators 2.2.1 and 2.1.2 actual values are below target due to the change in the ISC Work Plan per the results of the ISC Assessment conducted in January 2015. The number of trainings on the toolkit were reduced and replaced with organizational mentoring assignments with CSOs. This aims at generating tangible results in terms of technical capacities within local CSOs. Moreover and as noted in YII Q2 M&E report, under ISC the number of individuals and CSOs attending the Toolkit training workshops will be counted to reflect a level of "learning" versus the orientation sessions which only captures "reach".
Sub-IR 2.2: ISO service provision expanded									
2.2.1	Number of CSOs and/or CBOs trained by ISOs (Non-Unique) (CSP 2.1.8)	554	820	375	40	25	78	518	See 2.1.1
IR 3: CS-GoJ interaction is enhanced									
3.1	Number of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact. (USAID 2.2.1.3)	17	3	3	NA	NA	NA	3	
3.2	Number of development issues addressed by CS-GoJ cooperation	6	6	5	NA	NA	5	7	5 CDCS themes addressed by RII grants plus disability and gender as cross-cutting themes
Sub-IR 3.1: Civil Society - GoJ dialogue increased									

Annex C: Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

Indicator		Baseline (CSP & CIS YI)	YII Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Justification
3.1.1	Number of opportunities for CS-GoJ dialogue supported(Unique)	NA	10	NA	2	3	6	11	
3.1.2	Number of research activities supported	NA		17	19	1	NA	37	
Sub-IR 3.2: GoJ capacity to engage CS improved									
3.2.1	Number of trainings in support of government capacity building (Unique)	35	3	1	NA	1	NA	2	CDFJ & Generations of Peace
3.2.2	Number of GoJ staff trained (Non-Unique)	234	52	47	NA	37	NA	84	CDFJ & Generations of Peace

In addition, USAID/Jordan launched the information management system DevResults, which became operational for implementing partners' data entry starting in August 2015. CIS received training on the system, and met the deadlines for the first DevResults reporting cycle:

- Indicators' Baselines -August 31, 2015
- Indicators' Targets – August 31, 2015
- Indicators' results for Q2/2015 – August 31, 2015
- Indicators' results for Q3/2015 – September 30, 2015

II. Gender Breakdown

The total number of beneficiaries from the grants for this quarter was 513. Throughout YII, the total number of beneficiaries reached through grants was 6,568 individuals 2,197 (33%) Male and 4,371 Females (67%).

As for individuals trained through CIS direct interventions, the total for YII Q4 was 239 individuals trained in Open courses, Toolkit training under ISC, and receiving the M&E crash course, the Qualitative Research/stakeholder Feedback training and the Inclusion-Gender workshops. Total for YII was 1,544 individuals trained by CIS direct: 709 males (46%) and 835 females (54%).

III. Grantee M&E

III.A. Towards policy change

Real change at the policy level takes time and resources. USAID CIS supported grantees in capturing the different levels of change with results split according to the timeframe of the grant and the different stages of the grantee's interventions. Although to date it may seem like there were no tangible results in terms of actual policy change at the national level, important steps were made by DRG grants with regards to drafting, proposing, discussing alternative laws, procedures or policies.

Annex C: Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

- **HCAC** developed quality standards based on research, international standards and the gap analysis conducted with 19 Care Centres for Persons with Disabilities. The standards are drafted and will be piloted in the field with these centers. Ongoing discussions with the Higher Council for Persons with Disabilities and Ministry of Social Development occurred regarding adopting and integrating the standards into the national health care systems for Persons with Disabilities. Quality standards cover domains such as Staff & Management, Services, Rights, Quality, Management Information Systems and Infrastructure.
- **CDFJ** actively engaged with government counterparts and key players in the civil society sector and to that end, drafted the Media Compliant Law, and discussed it in a meeting with members of Parliament. Moreover, CDFJ co-founded a coalition called “The Coordination Committee of Civil Society in Jordan” (Hemam) to advocate for policy change and to put pressure on the Government and Parliament to amend legislations, and commit to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) recommendations for Jordan. CDFJ facilitated meetings and communication between coalition members (13 CSOs from different sectors) and government stakeholders. During the past quarter CDFJ met with the Prime Ministry, the Minister of Interior, Members of the Parliament, Ministry of Media Affairs to discuss the Media Complaint Law, government's policies related to media, government's compliance to UPR recommendations concerning media freedom and Public Media Broadcasting.
- **SIGI** conducted research findings related to Article 308 of the penal code, and based on the findings presented their position paper on abolishing this law. They also prepared the groundwork for establishing a coalition of 42 CSOs to work on the Article 308 campaign and the global “16 Days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence Campaign”.

III.B. Revalidating EDY Grantee M&E Data

Twenty-three mini-grants were awarded under the “Grants for Innovative Approaches in Engaging Students, Teachers, Communities, & Parents to Combat Violence & Promote Social Justice 2014-16 (“EDY RFA”). Grantees were required to report on pre-selected indicators: USAID CIS existing and EDY new indicators as reflected in the EDY Results Framework using a reporting template provided by CIS.

The data was verified thoroughly by calling and meeting with all the grantees to double check the numbers and compare with the events log (including the name of the event, the date, the number of attendees). However, due to the limited technical capacity of the majority of the EDY grantees, USAID CIS initiated a mini Data Quality Assessment with EDY grantees to revalidate their numbers. Not all of the grantees provided completed sign-in sheets to support their reporting but presented contact lists with participants’ phone numbers (not signatures). Others were not able to provide sign-in sheets because of the sensitivity of the issues in some cases such as focus groups with abused women, or activities targeting the issue of drug use. Moreover some grantees’ main activity was presenting theatre plays in schools and communities, and it was challenging for them to document the number of attendees in a public activity. However, field visits and observation from the CIS Grants Team confirmed some of these numbers.

Because of the difficulty validating the EDY data, the EDY number is not included in the CIS Quarterly, but are outlined here: Across

Annex C: Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

the 23 mini-grants, grantees reported reaching **797** adult influencers through project activities, varying from parents, teachers, school principals, religious leaders, community leaders, mayors, teachers' union members, and representatives of the media (Al Rai, Petra News Agency). Moreover, grantees reported engaging **2,647** youth (ages 12-18) in addressing local concerns. The numbers also show that **166** opportunities for dialogue were created by the grants, including meetings between youth and municipal councils, focus groups, theatre plays followed by debate sessions involving youth and their parents.

III.C. M&E Capacity Building for CIS RII Grantees (Pre-Award)

CIS APS Round II grantees received capacity building in the area of monitoring and evaluation during the pre-award period through CIS' M&E Crash Course. Grantees were divided into three groups based on the mechanism of implementation and the capacities of the organizations. Prior to the crash course, an online survey was sent out to the grantees' M&E focal points to collect data about their M&E capacities, resources in addition to a self-assessment in M&E concepts and interest in M&E topics. Based on the results the material was customized & simplified and the topic of qualitative research (focus group methodology) was incorporated.

The three-day course introduced basic M&E concepts, and included hands-on exercises for grantees to develop a theory of change and results framework for their awarded project. On the third day of the training, participants developed key performance indicators for their results, were trained on CIS M&E templates, and practiced using the tracking sheet where they included baselines and targets for their indicators. Participants also were introduced to CIS' Results Framework and were assigned to report on the applicable USAID indicators.

The approach was effective in building the capacities of grantees in M&E and also giving them the skills they need for grant reporting requirements. Moreover, the crash course was designed to invest strongly in hands-on practice to save time later in submission of M&E plans. Participants left the training with a first draft of their M&E plan and were able to get immediate feedback from the trainer on their work.

The success of the training was noticeable in the grantees' responsiveness to delivering the M&E packages. No delays were observed and the grantees delivered their work on time with very good quality.

Feedback from Grantees:

"I would like to thank you for your time, giving us tons of great instructions in the M&E course to develop our theory of change and results framework." i3zif, CIS RII Grantee

"Thank you for your efforts during the training, we are now able to see the change and plan to capture it, it's the first time we do this kind of work. We have learned so much and we hope will master M&E" Om Laith /Dissi Women CIS RI Grantee

Annex C: Summary of USAID CIS YII Q4 M&E Activities

“Thank you for the M&E course. It was a great addition to our knowledge and skills. I am currently preparing the M&E plan for the project ‘Civic Initiatives to Enhance Environmental Resilience in Jordanian communities that Host Syrian Refugees’ and am excited to put our results framework together!” Bayan Athamneh/ Royal Scientific Society CIS RII Grantee

“The design of your technical assistance is proactive, you are with us every step of the way!” Mirna, PNT on DRI qualitative research and consultations

“Thank you for your input and guidance on our M&E work. It helps us capture the change we bring to the health centers.” Jumana HCAC, DRG Grantee

“Following the qualitative research workshop and the stakeholder analysis, we discovered that we have been doing was not focus groups, now we know the right structured way of doing it!” Injaz, DRI Grantee

III.D. Integrating M&E in program design - Qualitative Research Workshop

Under the Disability Rights & Inclusion Grants Program (DRI), a qualitative research and stakeholder feedback workshop was conducted during the pre-award period for shortlisted DRI applicants. The workshop introduced grantees to the concept of stakeholders and ways to identify stakeholders based on their interest in and influence over the issue. Grantees also used a stakeholder mapping tool to draw maps of their projects and pinpointed stakeholders based on the anticipated impact they can achieve. Part II of the training covered the focus group methodology as a tool to solicit stakeholder feedback and to consult with beneficiaries before designing the initiative. The approach was very hands-on whereby a case study was given to participants and they were mentored to develop the full research design for the case study including research purpose, research questions, discussion questions, demographics and profiles of informants in focus groups, in addition to creating recruitment questionnaires.

The benefit of this approach was apparent when the grantees submitted their research designs on their actual projects as they included an in-depth analysis of stakeholders, defining who to talk to and why. Moreover they were able to look at focus groups as a type of needs assessment tool and understand how different stakeholders have “unique” perspectives and how consultation does not happen by inviting but also involving, asking, and probing.

“The qualitative feedback workshop gave grantees the task of developing an actual research design and giving them one-on-one feedback on their designs. This has enabled them to thoroughly think through what specific information they need to design their implementation phase, who specifically they need to get this information from and how best to design the process of soliciting this information. This upfront investment has already proved its worth by empowering grantees to take their concepts to the concrete design phase so when awards are issued, they are prepared to go!” Nada Hyari, USAID CIS Technical Assistance Specialist managing the DRI Grants.