



Programme Guidance: Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

A. Background

Grounded in the recognition of women and girls as rights holders and change-makers in their communities the Spotlight Initiative is committed to implementing a participatory approach to M&E across the function and at all levels.

What?

Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PME) is a participatory and inclusive approach to M&E whereby a range of stakeholders, including community members, are actively engaged in M&E activities. As such, participants (including community members) in the PME process share control over the content, the process and the results of the monitoring and evaluation cycle. They observe, document, and analyze changes at the community-level and actively contribute to the decision-making processes¹. By valuing (and centering) primary stakeholders' knowledge, experience and expertise, PME actively resists colonialist approaches to programming, reframing M&E from a top down, "policing" exercise, to one of mutual engagement and learning. As a result, ownership is strengthened, as is sustainability and the programme's transformative potential. As detailed further below, PME reflects a rights-based approach to monitoring and evaluation – where a plurality of knowledge is valued, and mutually reciprocal (rather than extractive) relationships are forged².

Through PME, programmes actively contribute to enhancing the rights, empowerment and autonomy of historically disadvantaged and marginalized groups, including those facing multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination, ensuring proper alignment with the principle of "Leave no one behind"³. PME adopts a feminist, human rights-based and grassroots approach to monitoring and evaluation, ensuring that local stakeholders, including feminist and women's rights activists and organizations, are meaningfully engaged and have decision-making power in the process from the design stage to the implementation of corrective actions. PME focuses on tracking and evaluating the socio-cultural and behavioural impact(s) of a programme, contributing to the sustainability of programme results⁴.

Why?

Violence against women and girls is rooted in an unequal distribution of power and resources. Such divisions are formed and reinforced through deeply rooted social norms, behaviors and practices. To address this, programming (and how we learn from its implementation) should promote favorable social norms, attitudes and behaviors at societal, community and individual levels.

¹ World Bank Institute. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. Principles, Action Steps, Challenges, 2002.

http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPAME/Resources/Training-Materials/Training_2002-06-19_Sirker-Ezemenari_PovMon_pres.pdf

² Participatory monitoring and evaluation: a process to support governance and empowerment at the local level. A guidance paper Thea Hilhorst Irene Guijt- the World Bank. Thea Hilhorst and Irene Guijt, 2006

<http://www.bibalex.org/Search4Dev/files/282315/114599.pdf>

³ Ibid.

⁴ German, D. Gohl E. (1996): Participatory Impact Monitoring Booklet 2: NGO-based impact monitoring. [Participatory Impact Monitoring Booklet 2: NGO-based impact monitoring](#)



Effective programming in the field of Ending Violence against Women and Girls (EVAWG) cannot be conducted without meaningfully centering the leadership of programme participants (as rights holders and agents of change) throughout the entire programme cycle. Through PME, stakeholders are engaged as genuine partners, rights holders and agents of change, as noted above (rather than passive “beneficiaries” of a programme), working to dismantle hierarchies, including epistemological hierarchies since practice-based knowledge lies at the core of this approach.

Active involvement and decision-making of stakeholders from the onset of programming is crucial to strengthen local ownership and the sustainability of results, and forge a deepened and improved understanding of specific contexts (and the prevailing attitudes, skills and behaviors), monitor their evolution over time, and adapt programmatic interventions to address the needs and advance the rights of individuals and communities. By generating greater insight into the underlying structural factors that perpetuate discrimination, bias, and inequality, participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation also enable a more comprehensive analysis of the theories of change underpinning programming.⁵

Further, PME helps to surface lessons-learned and promising practices deeply grounded in the local context.⁶ Throughout the process, PME centers the perspectives and analysis of those impacted (or otherwise affected) by the programme, acknowledging and trusting their leadership and knowledge. In this way, PME prevents a potential disconnect between the outcomes of M&E activities (i.e. information gathered or recommendations made) and local realities, better enabling the implementation of corrective actions, as needed.

Research shows that PME provides numerous advantages compared to traditional monitoring and evaluation processes. In fact, as noted by the World Bank and others “conventionally, M&E has often involved outside experts coming in to measure performance against pre-set indicators, using standardised procedures and tools. In contrast, participatory monitoring and evaluation involves [a range of primary] stakeholders as active participants and offers new ways of assessing and learning from change that are more inclusive, [by reflecting] the perspectives and aspirations of those most directly affected.”⁷.

As noted, participation and leadership of stakeholders is a key human rights and feminist principle, which must be applied to all stages and elements of the Spotlight Initiative, including monitoring and evaluation. Hence, PME is essential to the Spotlight Initiative’s approach and key principles underling the Initiative’s new way of working, as listed below:

- **SDG model fund** – the Spotlight Initiative is a partnership between the UN and the EU in support of the 2030 Agenda. It provides a model for partnership with donors, civil society, and UN entities, to deliver on the SDGs in a comprehensive manner leveraging expertise of the UN system and relevant stakeholders.

⁵ UN Women Independent Evaluation Office, [Transform Issue 14: Working together to empower voices](#), 2018.

⁶ GERMAN, D. GOHL, E. (1996): Participatory Impact Monitoring Booklet 2: NGO-based impact monitoring. Eschborn: GATE/GTZ URL [Participatory Impact Monitoring Booklet 2: NGO-based impact monitoring](#)

⁷ p.16 [World Bank Document](#)

Monitoring and Evaluation, Some Tools, Methods and Approaches- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/THE WORLD BANK, 2004



- **Demonstration Fund** – the Spotlight Initiative will provide a unique and unprecedented opportunity to demonstrate that a significant, concerted and comprehensive investment in EVAWG (and gender equality, more broadly) can make a transformative difference in the lives of women and girls, as well as contribute to the achievement of all the SDGs.
- **Human rights-based approach and SDG principles** – the design and programmes of the Spotlight Initiative will uphold the principles of a human rights-based approach, transparency, accountability, participation and inclusion, and the principle of *leaving no one behind*, which are embedded in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
- **Civil society engagement** – women’s rights organizations will be integral partners in the Initiative’s efforts at global, regional and national levels. At the forefront of tackling violence against women and girls, strong and meaningful collaboration with feminist and women’s rights groups, including organizations who represent historically marginalized groups such as rural women, young women, etc., will be essential to the success and sustainability of the Spotlight Initiative’s results.

PME Working Groups

With the objective of streamlining PME principles and methods within the Initiative’s programming, the Spotlight Initiative Secretariat and programmes will aim to convene working groups on PME to advise on the implementation of the PME Strategy at Spotlight Initiative.

Housed within the Spotlight Initiative’s global civil society reference group as well as national and regional civil society reference groups respectively, the role of PME working group members include the following.

At national or regional level:

- Facilitating systematic feedback (including technical advice) and engagement of key stakeholders, including marginalized groups, in relevant Monitoring and Evaluation processes);
- Participating in monitoring visits, as needed, and engage in broader consultations with groups and networks, especially at the local and grassroots levels, at regular intervals to update them and solicit input on the performance of the Spotlight Initiative Programme and to inform the annual programme reports;
- Support efforts to collect promising and good practices, impact stories and lessons learned from implementing PME at country/regional programme level, and dissemination of lessons to other Spotlight Initiative programmes.

At global level:

- Provide strategic advice on the overall scope and direction of the PME Strategy across Spotlight Initiative.
- Provide technical advice on implementing PME across the Spotlight Initiative
- Feed into existing or upcoming PME exercises/ processes, such as the global thematic evaluation (to be launched in 2021) and/or exercises/processes taking place at country or regional level.



Note: The Terms of References of the Working Groups are available in the Virtual Library.

How?

PME promotes a participatory methodology that recognizes and elevates the leadership and expertise of stakeholders, including community members. To familiarize potential participants in the PME process and explain the concept of PME, one or more face-to-face sessions are recommended. When physical meetings are not possible (as is often the case with COVID-19), virtual meetings can take place online or by phone.

Under the technical leadership of the PME Global Working Group, Spotlight countries and regions are highly encouraged to streamline PME principles and methodology throughout their programme cycle by implementing the following key steps :⁸

1. Identify participants

- a. At this initial stage, the participating groups to be involved in the planning of the PME process must be identified under the leadership of the relevant National and Regional PME Working Groups. The participants may be civil society Reference Group members, Spotlight Initiative grantees and implementing partners, other feminist activists and feminist or women's rights organisations working to EVAWG and advance gender equality, women and girls participating in and/or otherwise impacted by Spotlight Initiative's programmes, including those from structurally (and historically) marginalized groups. The selected PME-participants should be directly involved in the Initiative's programme. One or more participants should be responsible for observing the PME process.
- b. Clarify participants' expectations of the process (what are their information needs) and in what way each person or group wants to contribute. Participants should be encouraged to bring in their own experiences and ideas into the process.
- c. Discuss the resource implications of meaningfully implementing a PME approach (time and cost etc.) and collaboratively/collectively identify how resource requirements will be shared.
- d. Surface potential tensions/contradictions/limitations in the meaningful application of a PME approach; and collectively reflect on and identify mitigation strategies. Ensure this is reflected in the plan of the PME process.
- e. Crucial to remember that the PME process is inherently political as it implies disrupting the status quo and involving local participants/ primary stakeholders in the decision-making process. Openness and transparency should be driving this process.

2. Plan the PME Process, Determine Objectives and Indicators

- a. Participants must collectively define the prioritized objectives and purpose of the PME, including what will be monitored, how it will be monitored and by whom, and how the findings are to be used, aligning with guidance and recommendations developed by the relevant National and Regional PME Working Groups.

⁸ Estrella, M. & J. Gaventa. (1998) Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A literature Review. IDS Working Paper no. 70, IDS, Sussex.)



- b. Under the leadership of the National and Regional Working Groups, agree on the methods, roles, responsibilities and timing of information collection and reporting.
- c. Under the leadership of the National and Regional Working Groups, identify the relevant indicators that will be monitored from the Spotlight Initiative menu of indicators, and any additional context-specific indicators that participants would like to prioritise.
- d. The planning stage usually requires a lengthy process of negotiation and collaborative decision-making among various stakeholders.⁹

3. Gather Data

- a. Data collection can include the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods and tools. Quantitative methods can include community surveys, SWOT-analysis, interviews and observations. Qualitative methods can include various participatory learning methods such as visual, interviewing and group tools and exercises.
- b. Adapt the data collection methodology, as needed.
- c. Identify limitations specific to data collection. Limitations related to intersectionality and engaging/reaching historically marginalized groups or those experiencing multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination should be highlighted, as well as those that are a consequence of COVID-19/global health pandemics. Mitigation measures should be presented.

4. Analyze data

- a. While data analysis is often thought of as a mechanical and expert-driven task, PME should be an opportunity to actively involve various categories of stakeholders (participants) in the critical analysis of successes and constraints and the formulation of conclusions and lessons learned. Ideally, data analysis is also an opportunity to reflect and value epistemological plurality (i.e. valuing different ways of knowing).
- b. Data analysis must be well integrated into PME design. For information to be significant and useful, the analysis should be grounded in/mediated through the local context, and “sense making” – what the analysis is revealing – should be done collectively and aligned with the guidance from the dedicated PME working group. This feeds into a joint process of observation, reflection, planning, action, and feedback.

5. Report Results, Share Lessons Learned & Tools and Course Correct

- a. In this step, the results of the monitoring and/or evaluation activities are shared with stakeholders (including community members) by the relevant National and Regional PME Working Group.
- b. To ensure cooperation, coordination and knowledge sharing on PME, it is recommended to systematically share methods, tools and innovations, including through the COSI platform, between M&E colleagues and PME working groups across levels (national, regional and global). The Spotlight Initiative Secretariat will ensure that all tools (monitoring toolkits, annual scorecards, TORs etc.) are available in the Virtual Library.

⁹ Guiding Questions: What important changes has your work induced? What socio-economic or socio-cultural factors must be considered? Which changes are normally reported on? Which changes are often ignored? What has changed in people's behavior? What have they learned? Have other groups learned from these experiences? Is it possible to find simple indicators for these changes? How far were these indicators observed by the group members?



- c. Under the leadership of the relevant National and/or Regional PME Working Group, reflect on the agreement made at the onset, and revisit how the findings are to be used and by whom.
- d. Under the leadership of the relevant National and/or Regional PME Working Group, reflect on and determine whether the PME process was helpful/useful and if it should continue, noting any adjustments to be made to the methodology.
- e. Finally, there should be a discussion of appropriate actions to be taken based on the findings of the PME exercise. The findings and lessons learned from monitoring and evaluation activities should be used to make adjustments that strengthen programming design and implementation (for accelerated rights fulfillment, and the elimination of violence against women and girls). Key learning and findings from PME will also feed into global, regional and national M&E processes, such as evaluations and assessments;

Note:

- While acknowledging that, ideally, PME should have been implemented fully from the onset of the programme, the Spotlight Initiative intends to meaningfully and transparently implement PME in the programme cycle, at global, regional and national levels.
- PME will contribute, among others, to tackle and reduce existing differential power dynamics between the Spotlight Initiative and its partners (local and national civil society and women's rights organizations/activists and communities) in terms of financial and human capital resources, status as well as access to information, knowledge and monitoring and evaluation tools. Through PME, Spotlight Initiative aims to address and transform (to the extent possible) this power dynamic and ensures that this inclusive process of M&E is genuinely beneficial to all stakeholders.
- The Spotlight Initiative Teams will consult the Civil Society Global, Regional and National Reference Groups and partners in PME regarding the methodologies, tools and required resource allocations to embark on a PME process. The execution plan will be collectively decided.
- Necessary budget revisions must be made to cover the costs for implementing a PME approach at global, regional and national levels.

B. Key considerations and conditions for efficient implementation

PME aims at effectively tracking programmatic achievements and challenges, while acknowledging and addressing deep-rooted power imbalances often reproduced by development programming. While balancing the following considerations, it is paramount to prioritize relationship building, and genuine collaboration (valuing a range of knowledge). Trust is critical and the work should move at a pace that fosters trust-building and nurtures relationships, centering the leadership and demands of movements, and open to the changes to processes, structures, requirements, that may be required



to support meaningful engagement around PME, and ultimately movement building. The following conditions for efficient implementation should be considered and ideally put in place¹⁰:

- **Time:** Participatory approaches take time and resources (often increased or reallocated budgets) and the process of change is often not linear, with iterative learning throughout. Allocating adequate time is therefore central to the success of PME
- **Organizational culture:** An organizational culture that rewards innovation, openness, transparency (even about failure/what *isn't* working – which itself is often incredibly helpful learning) and is committed to dismantling power imbalances internally is required. Inevitably, PME will require negotiation to reach agreement about who will participate, what will be monitored or evaluated, how and when data will be collected and analysed, what the information means, and how findings will be shared, and what action will be taken. As noted, trust is key to foster relationships where participants can provide open, honest, and constructive feedback (often difficult to share given power dynamics), and disagreements/tensions/conflicts can be managed and resolved productively.
- **Findings must be fed into the decision-making process:** This requires establishing and strengthening the formal and informal spaces for dialogue and exchange between the participating stakeholders, for fostering coordination and encouraging corrective action. It also requires a system whereby Spotlight Initiative Teams are held accountable to implementing corrective actions (or, if not taken up, providing a response as to why they are not being implemented).
- **Accountability:** In order to meaningfully implement PME, it is important to grapple with accountability – namely, who is accountable to whom and why, and how do Spotlight Initiative programmes grapple with the multiple lines of accountability (upward, downward, lateral) they often navigate? What is the impact of multiple lines of accountability (to e.g. member states and governments, donors, communities, rights holders, etc.) on relationships among stakeholders/actors working to EAWG and programming generally? Can these accountabilities meaningfully co-exist when implementing PME? Are particular accountabilities privileged over others? To what extent, for example, is accountability to communities possible in a context of privileged accountability to donors (given the divergent M&E methodologies often required to address each)? These and other questions should be considered when designing and implementing PME.
- **Power-Sharing:** Relatedly, PME processes should grapple with power. Power must be redistributed and shared among stakeholders in a PME process – in this case, Spotlight Initiative teams/staff must explicitly share power with community members/rights holders (those impacted by programming) if PME is to be effective, and truly promote and respect the opinions and insights of women and girls / local community members (“final beneficiaries”).¹¹ The following five principles point to several radical changes required in the

¹⁰ GERMAN, D. GOHL, E. (1996): Participatory Impact Monitoring Booklet 2: NGO-based impact monitoring. Eschborn. [Participatory Impact Monitoring Booklet 2: NGO-based impact monitoring](#)

¹¹ Estrella and Gaventa, *ibid.*



power dynamics between programme staff and community members and are preconditions for successfully implementing PME¹²:

1. **Negotiation** is an important dimension between programme managers, programme partners and community members to agree on what will be monitored or evaluated, how and when the data will be collected and analyzed, what the data actually means, how the findings will be shared and what actions will be taken. It is also important to find a balance to ensure flexibility and autonomy in selecting the indicators from the global menu of indicators, and any additional indicators that participants would like to prioritise, while providing uniform information to compare results.
2. **Resources:** As noted above in key steps #1 (Identify participants), PME requests resources (time, money, human resources). Collective and honest discussions and decisions on how the responsibility for resourcing PME is essential. This should be taken on by participants, Spotlight Initiative Secretariat and Country/Regional Offices at the onset of the PME process.
3. All those involved in PME need to be **open to the learning** from the process and from the contributions of other participants. Everyone has critical experience and has something to share – learning, collaboration and mutual respect must be fostered. The process and outcome should be genuinely responding to the data/information needs of community members/participants, as well as Spotlight Initiative. Trusting the participants' perspectives, based on their lived realities, is fundamental to achieve a successful PME process.
4. **Flexibility** is essential as the number, role and skills of participants and other factors change over time.
5. **Power and legacies of colonialism:** With the aim of decolonizing knowledge (and grounded in anti-colonialist principles), PME should capture the diverse values, worldviews, and perspectives of rights holders/communities (and avoid favoring particular ways of “being and knowing”), as noted above. Toward this end, and linked to the above principles, donors (and the Spotlight Initiative itself), must trust and respect the experience and knowledge of those directly impacted by violence, and those (feminist and women’s rights groups) organizing to combat it. In particular, donors (and the Initiative) should be accountable to women’s and feminist movements who have and continue to be at the forefront of organizing against and demanding an end to all forms of violence against women and girls. Movements represent the communities and women most affected by violence, and have the knowledge/solutions to end it (colonialist approaches and legacies often undercut / dismiss this expertise and knowledge). Indeed, research has shown that that investing in progressive feminist movement building – including cross-movement building – is critical to EVAWG.¹³ Donors’ funding approaches

¹² Gujit et al.

¹³ See for example: S. Laurel Weldon & Mala Htun (2013) Feminist mobilisation and progressive policy change: why governments take action to combat violence against women, *Gender & Development*, 21:2, 231-247, DOI: 10.1080/13552074.2013.802158



(and programming priorities), as well as those of the Initiative, should be driven by this evidence and aligned accordingly (including M&E efforts).

C. Tools and resources for implementation

A participatory approach to monitoring and evaluation will usually make use of several techniques and tools selected and combined to suit the objectives of the work and the resources available.

Some examples¹⁴ of these participatory methodologies' main techniques to monitoring and evaluation are highlighted below.¹⁵ Spotlight Initiative Teams should feel free to consult/use these resources and tools if helpful:

- **Stakeholder analysis:** is the starting point of most participatory work and social assessments. It is used to develop an understanding of the power relationships, influence, and interests of the various people involved in an activity and to determine who should participate, and when.
- **Outcome Harvesting:** Using this approach, the evaluator or harvester identifies demonstrated, verifiable changes in behaviour influenced by an intervention and how a project, programme or initiative plausibly contributed to them. Unlike other evaluation approaches, Outcome Harvesting does not necessarily measure progress towards predetermined outcomes or objectives. Rather, the evaluator collects evidence of what has been achieved, and works backward to determine whether and how the project or intervention contributed to the change.
- **Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA):** is a planning approach focused on sharing learning between local participants (both in urban and rural areas) and outsiders. It enables project managers and community members to assess and plan appropriate interventions collaboratively often using **visual techniques** so that non-literate people can participate (e.g. videos, storytelling, theatre, songs, photovoice). Visual methods are also used to analyze "before and after" situations, through the use of community mapping, problem ranking, wealth ranking, seasonal and daily time charts, and other tools.¹⁶
- **SARAR:** is a participatory approach to community empowerment and training that builds on local knowledge and strengthens people's ability to assess, prioritize, plan, create, organize, and evaluate. The approach includes interactive and visual-based methods to facilitate community discussion with e.g. pocket charts, three piles sorting, and "story with a gap".
- **Beneficiary Assessment (BA):** involves systematic consultation with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders to identify and design development initiatives, analyze constraints to

¹⁴ Apart from the listed examples, PME often entails development of other techniques that are designed to be used by community members and other local-level participants as part of a monitoring and evaluation activity, namely: Visual self-evaluation tools, photographing the evidence, community records and indicators, quantitative tools (community surveys, intercept interviews, structured observations), tools derived from the anthropological tradition such as participant observation and oral testimonies (ibid.).

¹⁵ Monitoring and Evaluation, Some Tools, Methods and Approaches- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The World Bank, 2004
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/829171468180901329/pdf/246140UPDATED01s1methods1approaches.pdf>

¹⁶Examples of PRA-tools: Visualized analysis, Venn diagrams, Pie diagrams, Matrix scoring, Transect walks, Pocket voting, Spider web, Pile sorting, Rating scales, Un-serialized posters, Community mapping, Flow diagrams, Seasonal calendars, Interviews, Focus group discussions, wealth ranking, Group dynamics methods, Community meetings, Group and transect walks, Team review sessions, Lessons learned exercise



participation, and provide feedback to improve services and activities. This includes conversational interviewing and focus group discussions on changes and impacts.

- **Most Significant Change:** As ODI shares,¹⁷ Most Significant Change (MSC) technique is a form of participatory monitoring and evaluation, with multiple stakeholders involved both in data deciding on type of change to be captured/recorded and in data analysis. MSC occurs throughout the programme cycle and provides useful monitoring information to help people manage the programme, and subsequently evaluate it. Broadly speaking, the process entails “the collection of significant change (SC) stories from participants/community members, and the systematic selection of the most important of these by panels of designated stakeholders or staff. The designated staff and stakeholders are initially involved by 'searching' for project impact. Once changes have been captured, various people sit down together, read the stories aloud and have regular and often in-depth discussions about the value of the reported changes.”
- **Gender at Work Framework:** [The Gender at Work framework](#) is an analytical tool that aims to help organizations reflect on and capture the areas in which change ought to happen to contribute to the achievement of gender equality. As noted in the evaluation of UNDP’s contribution to gender equality and women’s empowerment,¹⁸ the framework reflects four interlinked quadrants/spheres of change in formal/informal spaces and at the individual and systemic level: 1) *Consciousness*: Changes that occur in women’s and men’s consciousness, capacities and behavior; 2) *Access*: Changes that occur in terms of access to resources and services; 3) *Policies, institutions, arrangements*: Formal rules/ adequate and gender equitable policies and laws that are in place to protect against gender discrimination; and 4) *Cultural norms*: Changes in deep structure and implicit norms undergirding the way institutions operate, often in invisible ways.

Community Score Cards or Citizen Report Cards

Citizen Report Cards (CRC) are participatory surveys that solicit the feedback of local communities on the quality and performance of public services or programmes in order to gauge their level of satisfaction and pathways for reforms of the services provided. A key feature of the CRC method is that survey findings are placed in the hands of local communities through the use of media and public meetings thus making it an effective instrument to promote transparency, responsiveness and public accountability¹⁹. Accordingly, CRCs are fully aligned with the principle of “leaving no one behind” and of including the most marginalized in the decision-making process. This is particularly important when tackling GBV²⁰.

CSCs are not simple surveys but rather a genuine empowerment tool that places local actors at the heart of the process. Key steps are required to properly implement CRCs from identifying the scope and the stakeholders to designing a non-biased questionnaire and organizing local focal groups with a variety of stakeholders. Thorough statistical analysis (using Statistical Package for the Social

¹⁷ See: <https://www.odi.org/publications/5211-strategy-development-most-significant-change-msc>

¹⁸ Cited from <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/gender.shtml>, page 114.

¹⁹ The Community Score Card, Toolkit. Care Netherlands, 2013, <https://www.carenederland.org/carexpertise/publication/the-community-score-card-toolkit/>

²⁰ Anu Pekkonen, CIVICUS, https://www.civicus.org/documents/toolkits/PGX_H_Citizen%20Report%20Cards.pdf



Sciences for instance) is also required to capture the results of the surveys. More details regarding the implementation process can be found [here](#).

Many benefits stem from this tool. Studies have shown that CRCs encourage citizens to pro-actively demand greater accountability and accessibility while contributing to reforming the services. Moreover, when CRCs are applied over regular intervals of time, they can also help benchmark the changes and thus better capture local realities and perceptions.

The SASA! Methodology

The [SASA!](#) Methodology includes “Strategy Summary Reports”, “Activity Outcome Tracking Tool” and “Activity Report Forms” which enable programme staff to not only to record key programmatic information (e.g. number of participants, location, activity dates) but also community comments and feedbacks, degree of resistance or acceptance of community members, variations in the level knowledge, attitude, skills and behaviors. Observation techniques are at the core of SASA!’s methodology, which is designed to be flexible to cater for different capacities of groups.

Furthermore, [SASA! has developed assessment dialogues tools](#), which are qualitative data collection method to be used by programme staff during the baseline and project closure phases to collect information on the level of knowledge, attitudes, skills and behaviours in target communities and the impact of programmatic actions on their evolution over time. Through pre-tested guiding questions, the facilitators gather information from selected community members and catalyze joint reflections on common perceptions and beliefs in target communities.



**Spotlight
Initiative**

Additional resources and tools

[Monitoring and Evaluation, Some Tools, Methods and Approaches](#)- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/THE WORLD BANK, 2004

[Participatory Monitoring, Evaluation, Reflection and Learning for Community- based Adaptation](#), CARE (2012)

[Participatory monitoring and evaluation: a process to support governance and empowerment at the local level](#). A guidance paper by Thea Hilhorst Irene Guijt- the World Bank, 2006

[Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation for Women's Rights: 12 Insights for Donors](#), AWID, 2011

[Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation: 13 Insights for Women's Organizations](#), AWID, 2012

[Capturing Change in Women's Realities](#), AWID, 2010

[Applying feminist principles to program monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning](#), Oxfam, July 2017

[Toolkit on gender-sensitive, participatory evaluation methods](#), Institute of Social Studies Trust, 2015