

# CSP Advocacy Index

---

## Guide for Interviewers

The CSP Advocacy Index analyzes five competency areas: Coalition Building; Engagement with Decision Makers; Outreach; Data Research /Analysis /Utilization; and Policy Development.

Each CSO or youth group is evaluated for each of the five competences. The focus is not on the ongoing grant/project but on the CSO's overall capacity in those competence areas and its experiences so far.

### Before the interview:

- Ensure proper representation: CSO should be represented by someone who knows the history of the group, its activities and initiatives prior to the CSP funding
- Ensure the interviewee has understood the key messages about the CSP Advocacy Index:
  - If you score low does not mean you are “bad” - the Index is a tool to assess training needs of your CSO
  - It is also tool to evaluate capacity development during a grant – there will be two questionnaires, before and after, and results will be compared
  - What is measured is the capacity of the core group in the NGO. Any member of that group who has a capacity in a specific domain can account for the whole group.
  - It will also help you assess what are the areas in which you might want to seek further capacity building after CSP grant ends
  - The results of this interview will be shared only with the advocacy trainer
- Prepare a blank CSP Advocacy Index Questionnaire form to be filled out during the interview

### During the interview:

- Start by discussing the score that CSO representatives assigned to themselves. For example, if it is 3, ask additional questions about it: when did it happen, how.
- Check out that the higher score benchmarks have not been reached (in this case go through the questions for the scores 4, 5 and 6)
- Ask additional questions about the given competence area – the CSO might have more capacity than 3. To find out about it you need to probe.
- If CSO indeed has done more than 3 and less than 4, use a decimal mark and describe the case in a short sentence on the form's margin.
- Skip and mark as N/A the competence area(s) that are not applicable
- At the end of the process calculate the total score by adding up the competence area scores and dividing by the number of applicable competence areas. The areas marked as N/A are not counted.

- Discuss with CSOs what are the areas they feel they would need capacity building/training. ADS: if you feel appropriate, you might use this as an opportunity to pitch one of the training sessions from our portfolio.

After the interview:

- Write a brief narrative explaining the CSO's strengths, weaknesses, progress (if repeated evaluation) and recommendations for further capacity building.

Scoring is based on the following system:

Score	Letter	Description
N/A	N/A	Not applicable
0	A	No capacity/ have not commenced;
1	B	Very little capacity/there is a lot of room for improvement; have taken very preliminary steps
2	C	Modest capacity/have taken modest steps/there is substantial room for improvement;
3	D	Reasonable capacity/made some reasonable progress/there is some room for improvement;
4	E	Effective capacity/made successful progress/there is not much room for improvement or there are very specific needs;
5	F	Capacity is very strong/have made very effective progress/there is almost no room for improvement.
6	G	Notable achievement/enhanced impacts/has multiplier effect/acts as catalyst to broader change/provide new methods/lesson for others, assist others/notable innovation/ improvement on earlier already effective process e.g. research, participation.

# CSP Advocacy Index Questionnaire

---

Name of Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Key Advocacy Issue(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Team Members:

Competency Areas Scores:

**1. NGO Linkages and Coalition Building:**

- 0: No other groups (CSOs, business or government) nor individuals with interest concerning the issue identified and/or contacted  
0.25 Groups (CSOs, businesses, government, etc.. and individuals with interest in the issue were identified and contacted  
0.5 CSO has been invited by other group(s) to join a coalition or a cause
- 1: Other interest groups and individuals were identified and approached to discuss possible engagement (note: project recruitment does not count here) Create a list of concerned and interested individuals in the case or the issue to discuss the possibility of participation / support  
1.25 Communication and meeting conducted between interested groups to know their ability to participate in the coalition for a certain case / issue.  
1.5: concerned parties in the case that have the real desire in participation specified
- 2: CSO joined and participated in an ongoing national/regional coalition (defined as any type of joint working group)  
2.5: CSO participated in coalition meetings and has planned activities in its region/town/village as part of a national/regional coalition  
2.75: CSO created building groups that agreed upon the suggested and specified ideas, and these groups have been invited to plan joint activities.
- 3: CSO has implemented activities in its region/town/village as part of a national/regional coalition  
3.5 CSO members are active within a coalition, but do not have a managing role
- 4: CSO has decision-making power inside a national/regional coalition  
4.5 CSO has initiated to build a coalition and set up a (Memorandum of Understanding).
- 5: CSO has initiated a coalition that has met and planned joint activities  
5.5. CSO has initiated a local/regional/national coalition that has implemented jointly planned activities

6: CSO has initiated a local/regional/national coalition that has implemented jointly planned activities, actively existed for at least a year, and existed longer than CSP grant

**Baseline:** \_\_\_\_\_

**End of grant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Follow-up (if applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

Questions to keep in mind:

- How did the CSO find out about the national coalition?
- What exactly is the role of the CSO in the coalition?
- What were the motives behind the decision to start a coalition?
- What is the decision-making structure inside the coalition and how is role distribution decided?

**2. Engagement with Decision Makers:**

- 0: CSO has not identified decision makers to approach concerning the issue
- 1: CSO has identified decision makers concerning the issue, but has not discussed how to approach them
- 2: CSO identified decision makers and discussed/identified several strategies for influencing them (letter writing, public awareness, direct meetings, etc) but has not used any of those strategies

---

2.25 CSO identified decision makers and discussed several strategies for influencing them and used one strategy to approach decision maker. The targeted decision maker refused.

2.5: CSO identified decision makers and discussed/identified several strategies for influencing them, and used one strategy to approach decision maker(s). The targeted decision maker did not respond yet.

2.75 Decision makes responded but did not set up a meeting

- 3: CSO has identified and successfully approached decision maker(s) by using more than one possible strategy (letter writing, public awareness, direct meetings, etc). The decision maker responded. called for a meeting.

3.5: .

- 4: CSO has identified key decision makers concerning the issue, evaluated, identified different strategy for each decision maker, and effectively approached different decision makers by implementing different strategies

4.5: CSO approached more than decision maker with different strategies, who responded positively and organized a meeting with CSO

- 5: As a result of consultations with the CSO, decision makers have introduced new policy  
5.5 As a result of consultation with CSO, decision makers have agreed on the new policy

- 6: CSO has developed positive working relationships with key decision makers on the local/national level and has regular professional contact with them. Or CSO has gained an official consultative status with the agency, Parliamentary Committee, Ministry or similar agency.

**Baseline:** \_\_\_\_\_

**End of grant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Follow-up (if applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

Questions to keep in mind:

- What is the comfort level of the CSO in approaching local/national decision makers?
- How carefully does the CSO prepare before meeting with a decision maker?
- Does the CSO have a cooperative, confrontational, or “a little of both” feeling about decision makers? Whatever the feelings are, can they justify them?
- How often has and does the CSO meet with relevant decision makers?
- Has the CSO contact with decision makers been established through “wasta” or through other means?

**3. Outreach / Awareness:**

- 0: CSO has not identified key target audiences
- 1: CSO has identified key target audiences but does not have different messages for them
  - 1.5: CSO has identified key target audiences, created a message for them
- 2: CSO identified key target audiences and proactively prepared specific messages to be delivered in at least one of the following: prepared and sent out a news release; gave an interview to the media; CSO representative visited school or university to attract youth, developed a facebook (page or group), blog, websites and CSO could link the social media tools with the campaign / project
- 3: CSO has initiated to implement one of the following: organized a public meeting such as round table, discussion forum or similar, designed and distributed poster or billboard, prepared and distributed a newsletter .
  - 3.5 CSO has Engaged citizens in the campaign by using different communication channels (social media or traditional communication channels) since they will be able to give their opinions towards the campaign or the topic they will work on.
- 4: CSO has been able to gather the media around an issue; has organized a press conference or an event with at least three media representatives participating or had journalists visit the CSO and wrote a press release.
- 4.5 CSO has reached out to different stakeholders (some of which might fully support, some fully oppose, and some partly oppose / support the initiative), either or meeting them one on one, by organizing round table discussions or through intermediates, in order to discuss the initiative.
- 5: CSO has encouraged citizens to take appropriate actions and provided channels, such as writing letters to legislators, becoming members of a FaceBook group, signing a petition, linking to topical Google Maps, etc.

5.5: CSO conducted active lobbying for the policy position, such as by testifying in hearings, personal visits to legislators, etc.

6: CSO established a good working relationship with the media, decision makers and CSOs and is regularly contacted and consulted as a source when the issue is discussed

**Baseline:** \_\_\_\_\_

**End of grant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Follow-up (if applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

Questions to keep in mind:

- Was the media outreach facilitated with CSP support?
- Does the CSO have a website? Facebook page?
- Has the CSO attended previous training on social media and media outreach?
- How is the CSO communicating with the media? Newsletter? Press releases? Phone calls? Other?

**4. Data Research and Analysis:**

- 0: CSO doesn't collect data before starting the project  
0.5 CSO has collected preliminary public opinion on various topics. No research is being done yet.
- 1: CSO identified and collected secondary data on the issue – i.e. used Google and other internet searches to find results of previous research by reputable and trustworthy sources, or data in media coverage, legal sources, etc. It can also include review of academic publications, peer reviewed journals, data from national government agencies and/or international agencies (UN, WB, or similar) on-line or off-line (i.e. in libraries).
- 2: CSO created primary data - qualitative or quantitative - by using less complex research methods i.e. public meetings, individual or group interviews (qualitative research data) or questionnaires (quantitative, non-representative)  
2.5 CSO spreading primary data to exchange and discuss by using less complex methods such as a Facebook group, google, Wall Magazine, Flip charts in events to reach out to a larger target audience.
- 3: CSO studied, analyzed and utilized secondary or primary data developed through such less-complex means, when developing message – for example in media interviews, posters, leaflets, brochures, or policy briefings
- 4: CSO created primary qualitative and/or quantitative research data by using complex research methods i.e. focus groups with stratified participants (at least three focus groups per topic with stratification over age, gender, occupation, etc) or pre-tested questionnaires (questionnaires are developed by testing them for language, potential miss-understanding, etc.)  
4.5 CSO conducted field visits to collect data.
- 5: CSO studied, analyzed and utilized qualitative and/or quantitative research data collected through complex research methodology. This means the data are used for message testing and development – for example in media interviews, posters, leaflets, brochures, or policy briefings

6: CSO collected statistically representative data on the issue- by selecting a representative sample from a targeted population, analyzed (through SPSS or other data processing software) and utilized it in advocating the issue

Baseline: \_\_\_\_\_

End of grant: \_\_\_\_\_

Follow-up (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Questions to keep in mind:

- What did the CSO learn in terms of preparing for an advocacy campaign, in particular related to research methodology?
- With whose support the CSO did research/data collection?
- If the advocacy campaign fails, how would this research be used in a constructive way?
- To what extent would this research benefit the general population?
- Could the research be enhanced if academic institutions take part in it, such as AUB, LAU, USJ etc?
- Has the research been publicized?

**5. Policy Development:**

0: CSO has not discussed any alternative policy solution (meaning procedures, policy or legislation) regarding the issue

1: CSO has discussed several potential policy solutions but has not decided on one

1.5: CSO has discussed various policy alternatives and agreed on one policy

2: CSO has discussed various policy alternatives, weighed financial, human resources, environmental, social and political consequences, and agreed on one policy, but the policy yet has yet to be clearly articulated

3: The policy being advocated exists in writing, with formats and levels of detail that are appropriate for various audiences and policy makers ( such as the use of a power point presentations or one pages)

3.5: The rationale for the policy is coherent, persuasive and uses data and information collected and analyzed in Data Research and Analysis component

4: The CSO becomes a part of a body that is mandated to create new policy proposals

4.5 The CSO initiates ( or creates)a committee that reviews suggested policy proposals

5 Policy proposal has reached the parliament (or decision maker)- but has not yet discussed

5.5 Policy proposal has reached the parliament ( or decision maker) AND has been discussed

6: A policy outreach plan has been developed (see components 2 and 3) and implemented or adopted.

Baseline: \_\_\_\_\_

End of grant: \_\_\_\_\_

Follow-up (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **TOTAL SCORE**



Please fill out this section at the end of the interview by focusing on the FIVE competency areas.

**Narrative Analysis:**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Capacity building needs:**

**Recent improvements**(in case of a recently completed grant/post evaluation)