



TAMKEEN

**West Bank and Gaza Civil Society and
Democracy Strengthening Project**

Performance Monitoring Plan: Review of Indicators and Proposed Modifications



Funded by:

United States Agency for International Development
Contract No. 294-C-00-00-00077-00



Implemented by:

Chemonics International Inc.

In conjunction with its partners:

AMIDEAST
CARE International
MASSAR Associates

Submitted:

April 25, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction		iii
SECTION I	REVIEW OF INDICATORS AND PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS	I-1
	A. Sub-IR 3.1.1: Increased Capacity of CSOs to Participate in Public Discourse	I-1
	B. Sub-IR 3.1.2: CSOs Effectively Aggregate and Articulate Citizen Issues	I-2
	C. Sub-IR 3.1.3: CSOs Effectively Disseminate Information to Citizens on Public Issues	I-3
ANNEX A	KEY TO PUBLIC ISSUES AND MECHANISMS	A-1
ANNEX B	PUBLIC ISSUES	B-1
ANNEX C	CONSTITUENT OPINION SOLICITATION MECHANISMS	C-1
ANNEX D	INFORMATION DISSEMINATION MECHANISMS	D-1
ANNEX E	GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING FIRST-YEAR DATA	E-1

Introduction

In 2002, the USAID-funded Civil Society and Democracy Strengthening project (Tamkeen) developed a plan to quantitatively measure its progress with respect to the three sub-intermediate results established in Chemonics' contract with USAID. The Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) was approved by USAID in the third quarter of 2002. Upon implementation of the initial version of the PMP, Tamkeen discovered certain inconsistencies and a general lack of clarity when measuring variables. As a result, we engaged an outside expert, Dr. Marwan Awartani, to strengthen the plan.

This report is the result of Dr. Awartani's efforts. It proposes changes to several variables, a more user-friendly data collection sheet, and stricter guidelines for reporting results. In the following pages, Tamkeen and Dr. Awartani explain the modifications to the plan—first in terms of the indicators and then, in the annexes, in terms of the lists of categories of public discourse, public issues, constituent opinion solicitation mechanisms, and information dissemination mechanisms, all elements of the plan. Finally, Tamkeen proposes methods for converting data collected under the old PMP (for the first year of project activities) to the new form.

A second report includes the revised PMP itself, with the modified data collection sheet and a manual for completing the various questions. The revised data collection sheet and manual will be delivered to civil society organizations to complete as part of closing out their grant activities. Tamkeen's team of civil society specialists will assist with this process.

The PMP is one of two elements of Tamkeen's efforts to measure project success. The second element, impact assessment studies, will yield qualitative information and provide concrete recommendations for improving project activities in future work plans.

SECTION I

Review of Indicators and Proposed Modifications

A. Sub-IR 3.1.1: Increased Capacity of CSOs to Participate in Public Discourse

Current Indicator	Modified Indicator	Rationale	Limitations
Average number of draft simplified grant applications per grant per year	<p>No modification is suggested.</p> <p>Supplementary sub-indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average number of draft simplified grant applications per grant per year for first-time grantees • Average number of draft simplified grant applications per grant for past receipts 	<p>The two new sub-indicators would help better gauge institutional capacity gained by Tamkeen veterans. The first sub-indicator is expected to be noticeably lower than the second. Reporting only the current indicator would conceal such a distinction.</p>	<p>The capacity of a CSO in preparing a Tamkeen grant application may not be indicative of its institutional capacity to participate in public discourse.</p> <p>The indicator may not detect the desired shift due to the flux of outgoing and incoming grantees. What one should be testing for is the decline of the indicator value as grantees get more familiar with Tamkeen's grant application system. This decline may be offset by a marked increase in the number of new grantees. Such a distortion will be controlled for by disaggregating data for new and old applicants as well as for renewals of grant applications.</p>
Number of training activities designed according to Tamkeen training standards	<p>Percentage of grants providing training according to Tamkeen training best practices</p> <p>Supplementary sub-indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of trainees • Total number of training person-hours provided • Average number of training person-hours per grant 	<p>Reporting the number of training activities in accordance with Tamkeen's Training Best Practices (TBP) would carry no information on the percentage of applicants complying with TBP. The percentage would.</p> <p>To capture the degree to which CSOs have succeeded in complying with TBP, one can use the other three sub-indicators, which help monitor the actual volume and spread of training conducted according to TBP.</p>	<p>Tamkeen's grants system requires all training included in a grant to comply with TBP. This implies that from the second year on, the indicator would register 100 percent and would therefore not carry any meaningful information.</p> <p>It is conceivable that CSOs might shy away from training altogether simply because they find it difficult to comply. Hence, the proposed sub-indicators may show a decline in the second year. In other words, the compliance requirement will have a natural filtration spin-off.</p>

Current Indicator	Modified Indicator	Rationale	Limitations
Average number of public issues considered per grant per year	No modification is suggested. Supplementary indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequency distribution of public issues desegregated by sectoral area The median of the number of public issues considered 	Reporting the other two sub-indicators is expected to clearly demonstrate the anticipated decline in the indicator value for past grant recipients.	There is a certain degree of ambiguity in the identification of activities that are eligible to be reported as a public issue consideration. The current design would allow a CSO whose grant includes putting up a banner on violence against women to report that it has considered a gender-related public issue. Likewise, it would allow another CSO whose grant includes a full-fledged project targeting various aspects of violence against women to report it has considered a public issue. Both of these considerations would have equal weight in the proposed averaging, which may be misleading.

B. Sub-IR 3.1.2: CSOs Effectively Aggregate and Articulate Citizen Issues

Current Indicator	Modified Indicator	Rationale	Limitations
Number of grantees that use regular and systematic mechanisms to solicit constituent opinions	Percentage of grants that use regular and systematic mechanisms to solicit constituent opinion. Supplementary sub-indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of people reached through constituent opinion solicitation mechanisms Total number of hours dedicated to soliciting public opinion Average number of people reached per grant 	Using an absolute value for the indicator does not control for variations in the number of grants concluding in a given year, while a percentage would. The grant—not the grantee—is a more suitable unit of analysis. Adding the proposed sub-indicators is justified by consistency considerations. The second indicator for sub-IR 3.1.3 monitors the number of people reached by various dissemination activities. It is only natural to introduce a similar indicator for solicitation mechanisms. Calculating the average of people reached per grant would enable us to monitor changes over time.	To adopt a reasonable operational definition of “regular and systematic,” the new manual requires that the activity be explicitly articulated and included in the original design, and hence in the final grant application. This provides Tamkeen civil society specialists (CSSs) with a standardized method to ensure that such mechanisms are truly eligible to be identified as “constituent opinion solicitation mechanisms.”

Current Indicator	Modified Indicator	Rationale	Limitations
Frequency of mechanisms that aggregate and articulate citizen issues	Frequency distribution of mechanisms used to solicit citizens' opinions	The proposed modification is justified by consistency considerations. The third indicator for sub-IR 3.1.3 monitors the frequency distribution of information dissemination activities by type of mechanism. It is only natural to introduce a similar indicator for solicitation mechanisms. In both cases, one would be monitoring the capacity of CSOs to utilize diverse and innovative means of interacting with their constituents.	The distinction between “soliciting” opinion and “articulating and aggregating” issues begs clarification. Despite the overlap between the two kinds of activities, there is a definite distinction between the two. The term “articulate” carries an advocacy connotation, which is not necessarily implied by a consultative activity with the CSO’s constituents.
	Percentage of grants that articulate and advocate citizen issues	This indicator is needed to capture the various advocacy activities usually associated with soliciting and aggregating citizen’s opinions and issues. None of the existing indicators would suffice.	To eliminate any ambiguity or discretionary bias in identifying a proper “advocacy” activity, such activities must be articulated in the original design.

C. Sub-IR 3.1.3: CSOs Effectively Disseminate Information to Citizens on Public Issues

Current Indicator	Suggested Modification	Rationale	Limitations
Number of grantees disseminating information on public issues	Percentage of grants that include information dissemination activities	<p>Using an absolute value for the indicator will not control for changes in the number of completed grants per year, while a percentage would.</p> <p>The grant—not the grantee—is a more suitable unit of analysis.</p>	<p>To adopt a reasonable operational definition for an information dissemination activity, the new manual requires that the activity be explicitly articulated and included in the original design, and hence in the final grant application. This provides Tamkeen CSSs with standardized criteria to ensure that such mechanisms are truly eligible to be identified as “information dissemination mechanisms.”</p> <p>In calculating this indicator, all grants containing well articulated information dissemination activities are included. This covers various mass media activities.</p>

Current Indicator	Suggested Modification	Rationale	Limitations
<p>Number of people reached directly through the dissemination of public information</p>	<p>Total number of people reached directly through information dissemination mechanisms</p> <p>Supplementary sub-indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average number of people reached per grant 	<p>The new sub-indicator would enable us to monitor change over time.</p>	<p>The data used for calculating the indicator should be derived from those mechanisms that are structured to allow reporting of either actual numbers or reasonably realistic estimates of people reached.</p> <p>Calculation of the indicator allows double counting of people reached — i.e., a person who is reached twice is reported twice. Recording and reporting data reflecting the number of different people reached would be too cumbersome and unrealistic.</p> <p>The value of the indicator does not reflect people reached through the mass media, such as radio, television, the Internet, newspapers, or publicity gadgets. This is intended to maximize the reliability of the reported data. The outreach accomplished through the mass media is captured by tracking airtime in number of minutes.</p> <p>The number of people reached through different publication mechanisms will be assumed to correspond to the number of publications disseminated. This is consistent with the “direct” aspect of the outreach.</p>

Current Indicator	Suggested Modification	Rationale	Limitations
Frequency of information dissemination activities	Frequency distribution of information dissemination mechanisms	<p>This is a minor modification motivated by the need to choose proper scientific terminology.</p> <p>The categorization of mechanisms has been revised to increase consistency and measurability in terms of numerical frequency.</p>	<p>Frequency distribution provides the number of times each dissemination mechanism was used. Each mechanism consists of a category of activities, which were considered adequately similar. However, the numbers attached to the different mechanisms have to be interpreted carefully. All elements in a given category are assumed to have equal weights and their frequency add up to give the frequency of the category. In reality, however, such elements carry quite different weights. A three-week summer camp and a two-hour panel discussion will contribute equally to the frequency, although the actual weight in terms of investment, level of effort, outreach, and possibly output of the summer camp may be 100 times more than that of the workshop. The proposed categorization of the mechanisms may conceal valuable information.</p>
	<p>Total number of people reached through general constituent interaction mechanisms</p> <p>Average number of people reached per grant</p>	<p>The introduction of this indicator is necessary since several grant activities may not be identifiable as “dissemination” or “opinion solicitation” mechanisms. However, such activities need to be reported and accounted for.</p>	

ANNEX A

Key to Public Issues and Mechanisms

A. Categories of Public Discourse: Public Issues

1. Democracy and Governance:

- Elections
- Reforms
- Local government
- Legislation
- Rule of law
- Civic education
- Human rights
- Children and youths
- Gender
- Political parties
- Policy analysis

2. Economy and Development:

- Private sector issues
- Human development
- Poverty

3. Water and Environment:

- Water
- Sewage
- Pollution
- Environment
- Sustainable development

4. Health:

- All matters directly related to health, including disability issues

5. Education:

- Informal education
- Pre-school
- School
- Higher education
- Vocational training

6. Cross-Sectoral Issues

B. Mechanisms for Soliciting Constituent Opinions

1. Structured Forums:

- Seminars
- Symposia
- Focus groups
- Interviews

2. Public Forums:

- Townhall meetings
- Workshops
- Panel discussions
- Other similar meetings

3. Formal Methods:

- Polls
- Surveys
- Needs assessment and impact assessment exercises

4. Internet:

- Email, website, list serve, etc

5. Others/Specify:

- Radio, television, etc

C. Information Dissemination Mechanisms

1. Structured Forums:

- Seminars
- Symposia
- Workshops
- Panel discussions
- Focus groups

2. Public Forums:

- Townhall and other similar meetings

3. Publications:

- Reports
- Books
- Newsletters
- Brochures, etc

4. Internet:

- Email
- Website
- List serve

5. Radio

6. Television

7. Others/Specify:

- Articles
- Summer camps, etc

D. Advocacy Activities

- Meetings
- Workshops
- Petitions
- Lobbying
- Drafting legislation
- Policy analysis

E. General Constituent Interaction Mechanisms

- Structured forums
- Public forums
- Publicity gadgets
- Summer camps
- Ceremonies and festivals
- Drama (theater, story telling, films, and cinema productions)
- The Internet
- Others: Specify

ANNEX B

Public Issues

Category	Suggested Modifications	Rationale
Democracy and governance: elections, reforms, policy analysis, local government, legislation, rule of law, civic education, human rights, advocacy, networking, conflict resolution, political parties, media, information dissemination, etc	Omit “advocacy,” “networking,” “conflict resolution,” “media,” and “information dissemination.”	One should distinguish between dimensions and issues of democracy and governance, and between the mechanisms and tools used to address them. Advocacy is a mechanism that can be used to address all kinds of issues unrelated to democracy. Networking in itself is not a democracy component but may be used to disseminate democratic and non-democratic values alike. The same argument applies to advocacy.
Economic and development-related matters: private sector issues	Add the following types: “human development” and “poverty.”	Poverty and human development issues are attracting more attention from various civil society stakeholders. Yet they cannot be labeled as private sector issues.
Water and environment: water, sewage, pollution, environment, etc	Add “sustainable development.”	Sustainable development is also generating increasing appreciation and interest. It could be alternatively placed under “economic and development matters.”
Health: all matters directly related to health issues, including disability issues		
Education: pre-school, schools, higher education, vocational training, etc	Replace “schools” with “school.”	
Family and children: children issues, family-related matters, etc	Omit this category altogether.	This category does not appear in the formal Tamkeen classification.
Women: awareness, empowerment, inclusion in decision making, etc	Omit this category altogether.	This category does not appear in the formal Tamkeen classification.
Others: Specify.	Replace this category by a category titled “cross-sectoral issues.”	This category includes all public issues that are not unambiguously identifiable in one of the above sectors. Such issues would be intrinsically cross-sectoral. This would make it a lot easier for CSOs since such a provision would save them the cumbersome job of forcing a cross-sectoral issue under a certain category despite its multifaceted nature. Alternatively, if such a modification is not acceptable, a CSO could be allowed to cite a public issue under every area it intersects with nontrivially.

ANNEX C

Constituent Opinion Solicitation Mechanisms

Mechanism	Suggested Modification	Rationale
Audio-visual: radio and television talk shows, etc	Omit this category.	Radio and television talk shows are rarely used as effective opinion solicitation mechanisms. In the unusual case that a CSO did use audio-visual mechanisms to solicit citizen opinions, this activity might be recorded under the last sub-category titled "others."
Public forums: townhall meetings, seminars, symposia, workshops, panel discussions, summer camps, etc	Omit "seminars," "symposia," and "summer camps" from this category.	These mechanisms are intrinsically not conducive to effective citizen opinion solicitation.
Ceremonies: opening, closing, graduation, festivals, etc	Omit this category altogether.	None of the listed sub-categories are conducive to effective citizen opinion solicitation.
Formal methods: polls, Focus groups, interviews, specific and/or sectoral assessments, pre- and post-testing, etc	Add "surveys." Replace "specific and/or sectoral assessments" with "needs assessment exercises." Replace "pre- and post-testing" with "impact assessment exercises."	Surveys are a little more general than polls. Needs assessment is a more proper choice of terminology. Including impact assessment is motivated by symmetry consideration regarding needs assessments.
Internet: email, website, list serve, etc	Omit this category.	Internet use to solicit citizens' opinion is a sophisticated mechanism not yet used by CSOs. Using this mechanism requires a CSO to have a well defined facility on its website through which certain issues are presented and constituents are asked to provide their views on those issues. This should be coupled with an in-house procedure to monitor and process citizen feedback. Keeping this category will allow a wide margin of misinterpretation since CSOs that have websites and that post some of their activities on the Web may mistake this for a "constituent opinion solicitation mechanism" and hence would record the number of hits as the number of people whose opinion was solicited. In the unusual case that a CSO has a well defined procedure to use the Internet as an effective "opinion solicitation mechanism," it can list such a mechanism under the category labeled "others" below.
Drama: theater, story telling, cinema production, etc	Omit this category using the same rationale presented in the "ceremonies" category.	None of the mechanisms listed under this category are conducive to effective opinion solicitation.

ANNEX D

Information Dissemination Mechanisms

Mechanism	Suggested Modification	Rationale
Audio-visual: radio and television talk shows, etc	It is recommended that this mechanism not contribute to calculating the total number of people reached through the various dissemination mechanisms.	The reported numbers would necessarily suffer from nontrivial discretionary bias.
Public forums: townhall meetings, seminars, symposia, workshops, panel discussions, summer camps, etc	It would be more appropriate to move summer camps under the last category titled "others."	The nature and function of a summer camp is quite different from the other elements listed under this category.
Ceremonies: opening, closing, graduation, festivals, etc	Omit "ceremonies" from this sub-category and move it to the category labeled "general."	Ceremonies and other similar public events are hardly eligible for being "effective" information dissemination mechanisms, although some of the speeches may include some advocacy elements. A CSO would not include in the original design a graduation ceremony as an information dissemination activity.
Publications: reports, studies, books, articles, brochures, etc	<p>Omit "studies" from this category.</p> <p>Add newsletters.</p> <p>Move articles to "others." Articles do not contribute to calculating the "number of people reached" indicator value.</p>	<p>Desegregating reports from studies and books may be problematic, since study findings are often published in reports or books. Similarly, reports may be published as books. It is quite clear that reports and books can be effective information dissemination mechanisms. However, studies in themselves are not. Study findings only become an information dissemination activity when they are published in reports. Studies should therefore be omitted as a separate title.</p> <p>Moreover, as indicated above, the term "studies" may include a "needs assessment" study and would therefore fit better under Category A. However, publishing the study findings in a report and disseminating it to stakeholders is an information dissemination activity. The number of people reached in the context of a needs assessment exercise is to be reported under Category A, whereas the number of copies distributed of the findings "report" would be reported under Category B. This shows the delicate distinction between "solicitation" and "dissemination" activities.</p> <p>CSOs need to distinguish between a general brochure and one dedicated to disseminating information about a given public issue or to build awareness about a certain social value.</p>

Mechanism	Suggested Modification	Rationale
		Articles are often written in newspapers or magazines. The CSO has no control over the number of people reached through this mechanism. Hence, it is more appropriate not to request the number of people for this mechanism and to be satisfied with recording the number of articles published.
Internet: email, website, list serve, etc		
Drama: theater, story telling, cinema production, etc	Replace “cinema production” by “films.” Move the “drama” sub-category to the “general” constituent interaction category.	The information dissemination aspect of most drama activities is indirect. Unless a certain film is an explicit documentary or is explicitly targeting certain issues or values, it is really difficult to label it as an effective information dissemination mechanism. Since the term “cinema production” implies that the activity entails an actual production, showing a film about the virtues of elections would not fit within this sub-category.
Publicity gadgets: T-shirts, hats, etc	It is preferable to move this whole sub-category to the “general” category.	T- shirts and hats as well as other publicity gadgets are rarely used as information dissemination mechanisms. Most summer camp activities and ceremonies include the distribution of such gadgets. Although such gadgets may include some mottos or slogans which carry certain messages, it is preferable that this whole subcategory is moved to the “General” category. The CSO would still have a chance to record some relevant numbers but can’t claim this as an effective information dissemination activity. Just imagine the misleading statistics and ensuing averages resulting from the hypothetical case in which a CSO reached 300 children by giving out hats, and hence reports the figure 300 for people reached and another CSO reports 50 for two workshops which were attended by a total of 50 people.
Others: Specify.		

ANNEX E

Guidelines for Managing First-Year Data

1. First-year data was collected using a data collection sheet different from the current standard Grant Vital Statistics Form. Moreover, CSOs were not aware of the sort of data reporting and segregation needed. Hence, the type of data collected and the format in which it is presented is somewhat different. Consequently, it would be unrealistic to recapture all first-year data according to the new framework.
2. An Excel-based Grant Vital Statistics Form will be supplied to all CSSs and a special orientation workshop for the CSS team will be held to familiarize them with the new form.
3. Each CSS will fill out a new Grant Vital Statistics Form for each first-year grant that he or she managed. Following are some guidelines for this process:
 - a. If a statistic sought under any of the questions on the form is not available, “NA” (i.e., “not applicable”) should be entered in the relevant box.
 - b. The number of draft grant applications is known by the CSS and is easy to report.
 - c. The training conducted in the context of first-year grants is most probably not compliant with Tamkeen’s training best practices. Hence, most CSOs would still record the number of training person-hours.
 - d. When reporting opinion solicitation or information dissemination mechanisms, it is important to regroup them according to the new categorization of mechanisms. For the number of people and frequency, the Grant Vital Statistics Form manual should be used as a reference.
 - e. It is important to report all constituent interaction mechanisms. In other words, if an activity was not included because it is not predominantly “opinion solicitation” or “information dissemination,” it should be reported under the fourth category of the Grant Vital Statistics Form titled “general constituent interaction activities.”
 - f. Since the “advocacy” category was not included in the original data collection sheet, no advocacy activity was explicitly reported. Yet it is recommended that CSSs extract such information from the grant completion report if feasible (it is likely that advocacy activities were combined with the information dissemination category). If this is not possible, the capital letter “A” should be entered in the relevant boxes. The number “0” should only be reported if the CSS is certain there were no advocacy activities.
4. Completed Grant Vital Statistics Forms will be signed by the respective CSSs and submitted to Ranan Muthaffar.

5. Ms. Muthaffar will audit all completed forms and check for consistency. In case of any ambiguities, Ms. Muthaffar will request clarification from Tamkeen's monitoring and evaluation officer, who will supervise the management of first-year data.
6. Audited Grant Vital Statistics Forms will be entered using the Excel data entry platform. Jamal Hasan will assist Ms. Muthaffar with this task as needed.
7. Standard reports on first-year data will be produced and presented to Tamkeen senior management for review.
8. A senior management team will decide how indicators may be used to provide a baseline for the next four years.
9. A report on first-year indicators, supplemented by an explanatory note on limitations and special considerations, will be presented to USAID.
10. Due to the previously mentioned limitations, first-year data should not be regarded as baseline data, at least not formally. However, it is quite feasible that some first-year indicators may serve as proper baseline indicators.