keystone accountability for social change

Constituency Voice Assessment Framework

Version 1.0, 20 July 2009

This framework uses a draft 'relationship cycle' (rather than the project cycle). It covers five dimensions of Constituency Voice:

- Commitments to constituency voice
- Constituency involvement in defining and planning for success
- Feedback from constituents throughout implementation, monitoring and evaluation
- Constituency involvement in reviewing, learning and re-planning
- Related organisational policies

It covers two different levels of activity: the organisational level and programme specific levels. (NB we need to explain why.)

Definition: 'Constituency Voice' is the practice of ensuring that the views of all relevant constituents are seriously taken into account in planning, monitoring, assessing, reporting and learning from an organisation's work. For INGOs this particularly includes 'primary constituents' – the people ultimately meant to benefit.

1. Commitments

Indicator	Evidence	Rating (1-7)
1.1 The INGO makes a public	Public documents state core commitment to	1: No commitment.
commitment to Constituency Voice in its	empowerment, downward accountability, participation,	4: Some commitment made.
core values.	being member-led & other related concepts	7: Unequivocal commitment.
		In between:
		- the range of constituents to which the commitment is made.
		NB the number of commitments made is not important.
1.2 The INGO makes a public	Public documents state commitments to internal or	As above
commitment to Constituency Voice in	external standards/codes e.g., IANGO charter, the HAP	
charters / standards / principles etc.	standard, Sphere, Red Cross Code & other relevant	
	codes.	

ADDRESS: Keystone, 258 Belsize Road, Suite 220, London, NW6 4BT, UK TEL: +44 (0) 20 7316 1844 FAX: +44 (0) 20 7624 3629 WEB: <u>www.KeystoneAccountability.org</u>

2. Planning

Indicator	Evidence	Rating (1-7)
2.1 The INGO determines its 3 - 5 year overall organisational strategy in dialogue with constituents.	Review strategic planning process & strategic plan. Are all "key constituents" identified? Are opportunities created for them to contribute, to the substance of the discussion?	 No input from constituents. Some input from some constituents. All constituents get a chance to contribute to the substance of the strategy.
	NB 'Partners' may be a key constituent for many INGOs. If constituents are represented on the board, then they may be involved here, to some extent. Democratic processes with members would be a great example. This may not be relevant for all organisations.	In between: - % of relevant constituents involved - Size of contribution they make (e.g. making final decisions, contributing original analysis/ideas, commenting on existing drafts)
2.2 The INGO determines indicators and performance targets, to monitor progress compared to its organisational strategy, in dialogue with constituents.	As above	As above
2.3 The INGO determines specific programme strategies in dialogue with constituents.	Review programme planning policies and practices. Are key constituents systematically identified, and involved in planning? NB This depends on practice within different field programmes, which may be hard to gauge. - policies & commitments are a good start - does the organisation systematically monitor practice, compared to the policies? - does the organisation report practice, systematically across all programmes?	 1: No input from constituents 4: Some evidence that there is some input from some constituents in some programmes 7: There is evidence that all relevant constituents contribute to the substance of strategies in all programmes. In between: % of programmes which invite input from constituents % of relevant constituents involved Size of contribution they make (as in 2.1) Is there a policy about this? Is performance measured compared to the policy?
2.4 The INGO determines indicators and performance targets, to monitor progress compared to programme strategies, in	As above	As above

ADDRESS: Keystone, 258 Belsize Road, Suite 220, London, NW6 4BT, UK TEL: +44 (0) 20 7316 1844 FAX: +44 (0) 20 7624 3629 WEB: <u>www.KeystoneAccountability.org</u>

dialogue with constituents.

3. Feedback

Indicator	Evidence	Rating
3.1 The INGO invites feedback on its	Review programme policies and practice.	1: No feedback is invited
work from constituents, across all of its	Review public documents.	4: Some feedback is collected in some programmes
programmes.		7: Feedback is systematically collected in all programmes;
	Feedback may be invited during implementation (i.e.	the amount of feedback is monitored.
	during monitoring) and/or at the end of implementation	
[Do we need a separate indicator here	(i.e. during evaluation).	In between:
for inviting feedback from constituents on		- % of programmes inviting feedback
the organisation as a whole?]	We are particularly interested in 'primary constituents'.	- % of constituents giving feedback (particularly primary
the organisation as a whole 1	But 'constituents' may also include members, influential	constituents)
	organisations and other key actors who play a critical	- commitment is made to collect feedback
	role in achieving the INGO's goals.	- system exists to monitor whether programmes collect
		feedback
3.2 The INGO publishes feedback from	Review public documents	1: No feedback published
constituents about its work, for the		4: Some feedback from some constituents published
organisation as a whole.	This could be comments on drafts of annual reports; or	7: Feedback collected & published from all major
	comments received during open meetings; or	constituents (including primary constituents)
	democratic processes; or other ways.	
	······································	In between:
	Linked to 4.1	- % of constituents providing feedback which is published
		- % of feedback which is published
		- feedback is invited on a draft version of the annual report

3.3 The INGO reports key information back to constituents, for the organisation as a whole.	Review public documents Key information includes: financial performance (income & expenditure) programme performance plans / strategies achievements lessons learned constituency feedback	 1: No information reported back to constituents 4: Some information reported back to some constituents 7: All information reported back to all constituents (including primary constituents) In between: % of information reported information accessible to % of constituents (e.g. in the right language & media)
3.4 The INGO publishes feedback from constituents about its work, for each programme.	Also linked to 4.1 Review public documents & evaluation reports. Review programme policies & practice (Is there evidence that this happens for all programmes?)	 1: No feedback published 4: Some feedback published, from some constituents, for some programmes 7: All programmes publish feedback from all constituents In between: % of programmes publishing feedback % of constituents providing feedback % of constituents providing feedback % of consituents with access to information (including primary constituents – i.e. in right language, media) commitments made to publish feedback system put in place to monitor whether feedback is published

3.5 The INGO reports key information	Review public documents & evaluation reports.	1: No information reported back
back to constituents, for each	Review programme policies & practice (Is there	4: Some information reported back, to some constituents, for
programme.	evidence that this happens for any or all programmes?)	some programmes
		7: All information reported back to all constituents for all
	Key information includes:	programmes
	financial performance (income & expenditure)	
	programme performance	In between:
	plans / strategies	- % of programmes reporting information
	achievements	- % of constituents with access to information
	lessons learned	- commitments made to report information back to
	constituency feedback	constituents
		- system put in place to monitor whether information is
		reported

4. Deliberation & learning

Indicator	Evidence	Rating
4.1 The INGO regularly invites	Review public documents.	1: No review by constituents
constituents to discuss progress and	Review policies and practice.	4: Review of some areas by some constituents
identify improvements for its work as a		7: Review of all areas by representatives of all relevant
whole organisation.		constituents – and learning is published
		In between:
		- % of constituents involved in review
		- % of work reviewed
		- % of reviews that are published
		- regularity of reviews
		- do reviews include identifying improvements?
		- are suggested improvements acted on?

ADDRESS: Keystone, 258 Belsize Road, Suite 220, London, NW6 4BT, UK TEL: +44 (0) 20 7316 1844 FAX: +44 (0) 20 7624 3629 WEB: <u>www.KeystoneAccountability.org</u>

4.2 The INGO regularly invites constituents to discuss progress and identify improvements for each programme.	Review public documents. Review policies and practice. NB This depends on practice within different field programmes, which may be hard to gauge.	 No reviews by constituents Some programmes are partly reviewed by some constituents All programmes are regularly reviewed by all relevant constituents (including primary constituents) – and learning is published
		In between: - % of programme that hold reviews - % of constituents involved in reviews - % of reviews that are published - regularity of reviews - do reviews include identifying improvements? - are suggested improvements acted on?
4.3 The INGO publishes what it learns from deliberations with constituents.	Review public documents. NB to score top marks, an INGO would have to publish negative lessons, where constituents have criticised current practice and suggested improvements.	 1: No lessons are published 4: Some lessons from deliberation with some constituents are published 7: All lessons from all deliberations with constituents are published. In between: % of lessons that are published % of deliberations from which lessons are published

ADDRESS: Keystone, 258 Belsize Road, Suite 220, London, NW6 4BT, UK TEL: +44 (0) 20 7316 1844 FAX: +44 (0) 20 7624 3629 WEB: <u>www.KeystoneAccountability.org</u>

5. Related management systems

	Evidence	Rating
Indicator		
5.1 The INGO has an open information policy, based on the presumption of disclosure.	Review published policies. NB This is not about whether the policy is actually put	 No information policy Policy discloses some information disclosed, some of the time Full open information policy based on procumption of
	into practice, which is covered in section 5 above. This can also be compared to the One World Trust's	7: Full open information policy, based on presumption of disclosure
	Global Accountability Report (where relevant).	In between: - % of information covered by the policy - % of organisation covered by the policy
5.2 The INGO has an effective, accessible complaints system that	Review published policies and practice.	1: No complaints systems 4: Complaints system available to some constituents, for
constituents use.	This can also be compared to the One World Trust's Global Accountability Report (where relevant).	some issues 7: Complaints systems are available for all constituents (in HQ & field offices), and constituents use them
		In between: - % of programme with complaints systems - % of constituents with access to a complaints system (e.g. in the right language, media) - how respectful and effective is the complaints system?

NB 5.1 and 5.2 could be wrapped up in other indicators (e.g. 'complaints' is part of inviting feedback – cf indicator 3.1; and an open information policy is part of transparency & reporting back – cf indicators 3.3 and 3.5).

But including them here separately may allow comparison with the One World Trust's Global Accountability Report (where these INGOs are included there); and hopefully they should be pretty easy to check.

ADDRESS: Keystone, 258 Belsize Road, Suite 220, London, NW6 4BT, UK TEL: +44 (0) 20 7316 1844 FAX: +44 (0) 20 7624 3629 WEB: <u>www.KeystoneAccountability.org</u>