### CTIP M&E Toolkit: RESOURCE

### General Principles for Developing Service Provision Indicators

These General Principles aim to support civil society organisations (CSOs) in developing indicators for monitoring and evaluating service provision. They do not provide exhaustive guidance on developing indicators for service provision, or for developing indicators for all types of service provision. They are instead designed to highlight commonalities in the format of some indicators that can be used to monitor service provision, for example, of shelter, legal support, or reintegration services.

#### **Example of the General Principles**

Counter trafficking CSOs engage in different types of service provision, such as shelter, legal support, or survivor reintegration services.

But often we may monitor what is delivered and the changes that result from delivery (outputs and outcomes) using similar indicators, adapted to the relevant service.

For example, common output and outcome indicators across different types of service provision might respectively be:

- "number of individuals who received the service"
- "number of beneficiaries reporting [relevant outcome] one year later".

#### **Applying the Principles**

**Adaptation:** General indicators such as these must be adapted to the services they are used to monitor (immediate needs, legal, psychosocial, health, economic, education services, etc), and which specific outcomes are most relevant in the context.

**Indicator definitions:** Specific terms in indicators need to be clearly defined by CSOs before use (e.g., what exactly counts as having 'delivered' or 'received a service'; and especially what the specific relevant outcomes to be monitored are).

**Output vs outcome indicators**: In some cases, whether an indicator is an output or an outcome indicator is a matter of the CSO's objectives and therefore a matter of perspective.

If your CSO is engaging in service provision of some kind, you may wish to consider adapting, defining, and using indicators for (a) Service Availability and Capacity (b) Service Uptake and (c) Service Quality as follows.





# CTIP M&E Toolkit: RESOURCE

Consider indicator(s) for:	Example Output Indicators	Example Outcome Indicators	Important Caveats
Service capacity and availability	<ul> <li># services operational /open (e.g., # shelters, legal aid offices, health centres with TIP training) during [X timeframe]</li> <li># relevant resources (e.g., shelter beds / specific health services / repatriation scheme places) available during [X timeframe]</li> </ul>	<ul> <li># individuals using services within [X timeframe]</li> <li># individuals receiving holistic services (e.g., 3 or more services from: immediate needs, legal, psycho-social, health, economic, education support services) within [X timeframe]</li> <li>See Example Output Indicators under "Service uptake" (an example of indicators that may be output or outcomes indicators, depending on the CSO's monitoring and evaluation objective).</li> </ul>	CTIP projects can be designed by staff at geographical distance from implementation with limited understanding of the country context and realities on the ground. This can lead to services being delivered that do not meet the needs of survivors, or service delivery that is uneven or patchy. These dimensions cannot be captured by service capacity and availability indicators. Therefore, it is important the projects are designed in collaboration and partnership with survivors and not solely in response to donor priorities.
Service uptake	<ul> <li># individuals using services within [X timeframe]</li> <li># individuals receiving holistic services (e.g., 3 or more services from: immediate needs, legal, psycho-social, health, economic, education support services) within [X timeframe]</li> </ul>	<ul> <li># &amp; % service users finding/remaining in secure accommodation; reporting improved health; applying skills acquired; reporting increased or diversified income; etc, within [X timeframe]</li> <li># &amp; % of service users reporting increased sense of safety / sense of belonging / confidence after [x timeframe]</li> </ul>	Service uptake indicators (used often in CTIP projects) tell the projects, partners, and donors very little about the quality of those services. These indicators also push the projects and NGO partners to show high numbers, potentially at the cost of quality. NGO partners may try to count as many services as possible, even if the 'service' is simply giving a survivor a bus ticket, because they are concerned that low numbers of 'services' in monitoring





# CTIP M&E Toolkit: RESOURCE

	<ul> <li># criminal/civil cases in which victims have been assisted (or # victims supported across X # cases) within [X timeframe]</li> </ul>		reports may indicate low project achievement. As such, indicators reflecting quality can also be included. See <u>survivor centred indicators</u> for ideas.
Service quality	<ul> <li># and % relevant         services/staff members with         demonstrable evidence of         expertise in:         <ul> <li>Survivor engagement in                 design and evaluation of                 service provision</li> <li>Trauma-informed                 practice in service                 provision</li> </ul> </li> <li>Child-appropriate service         practice</li> <li>Gender-appropriate         <ul> <li>service practice</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li># service staff qualified in trauma-informed / child-appropriate / participatory CTIP practice</li> <li># &amp; % of service users reporting having been treated with dignity during and after service engagement</li> <li># &amp; % service users providing positive feedback on specific relevant aspects of services received (e.g., trauma-informed / child-appropriate aspects)</li> </ul>	The donor-CSO-survivor relationship is a fundamentally unequal one, As such, it is likely that survivors will be hesitant to critique projects, the services offered to them, and to CTIP project staff or NGO staff because they may be concerned that criticism will lead to their support being cut off. As such, survivors must be able to feedback anonymously and must receive assurances that any and all feedback will be considered seriously and actioned.



