

CTIP MEL Toolkit: Resource

Method for Monitoring and Evaluating Private Sector Engagement Outcomes for CTIP

Dr Emily Wyman

This resource outlines a novel method for civil society organizations aiming to monitor and evaluate their private sector engagement (PSE) activities for counter-trafficking in Persons (CTIP).

PSE work is challenging to monitor and evaluate effectively: There are few established indicators for monitoring the influence that civil society organizations (CSOs) exert over time on private sector entities that ultimately lead to highly significant outcomes (such as new company CTIP policies or effective grievance mechanisms for workers being introduced). Also, monitoring only these highly significant outcomes can under-represent the amount of work that CSOs invest in bringing them about.

This method, therefore, guides CSOs in how to monitor and evaluate private sector support for a CTIP issue or proposal by systematically collecting records of company engagement and using these to rate company support for it over time.

(A) The Rating Method

Start by identifying **3-5 policy advocates** (the more the better) to participate in the rating process. Advocates will often be CSO staff or consultants with roles related to PSE (e.g., business engagement or sustainability and human rights specialists). They may also be individuals with extensive knowledge relevant to PSE advocacy (e.g. from evidence gathering or company engagement experience). The important point is that advocates have a context-relevant understanding of how private sector entities engage with human rights issues.

Then proceeds as follows:

1. **Identify the PSE advocacy objective** (e.g., to see a new company policy developed and / or made public, a new practice implemented, a company or group of companies sign up to initiative, etc.).
2. **Identify PSE targets** (e.g., influential individuals in a company / a company team with members rated individually / a CEO or group of CEOs rated individually/ key influential people in the private sector). The more targets that are identified and rated, the more information will be available for reporting, and the impact of staff turnover amongst targets will be reduced (see [here](#) for examples).
3. **Adapt the PSE Rating Scale Template (below) to define criteria for rating PSE target support and influence.** In contexts in which advocates regularly engage with PSE targets, advocate confidence ratings may be excluded. Also and in contexts where only influential targets are selected for rating, influence ratings may also be excluded (see [here](#) for examples).
4. **Rate PSE targets and advocate level of confidence using the criteria developed in step 3 at two or more time points** (either as a group to arrive at a consensus group rating or by averaging the ratings).

(B) Information Gathering

During PSE advocacy activities (e.g. outreach, event participation, information gathering, private meetings, email communications, etc.) advocates should regularly record notes and public materials about significant conversations, events, statements and actions by PSE targets, so that supporting information can be documented to support PSE ratings.

For example, where relevant mentions or statements are made in person by PSE targets or individuals related to them, it may be useful to note what was said, where it was said, by whom (the role of the person(s)), the date, and the media (in person, online, social media post, etc.).

Where significant statements are made during event participation, it is recommended to record details of the event (title, objective, hosting / organizing organizations, etc.) and relevant individuals of influence (roles and company names) present in the event.

During company engagement activities (e.g. outreach, event participation, information gathering, private meetings, email communications, etc.) it is recommended that advocates routinely record notes and public materials about significant exchanges, events, statements and actions by PSE targets, so that supporting information can be documented to support PSE ratings.

For example, where relevant mentions or statements are made in person by PSE targets or individuals related to them, it may be useful to note what was said, where it was said, by whom (the role of the person(s)), the date, and the media (in person, online, social media post, etc.).

Where significant statements are made during event participation, it is recommended to record details of the event (title, objective, hosting / organizing organizations etc.) and relevant individuals of influence (roles and company names) present in the event.

| Scale | Rating | Definition |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| 1. Support | 1. Not supportive | No evidence advocacy target has spoken for or against the issue. |
| | 2. Somewhat supportive | Advocacy target has indicated being favorably disposed to the issue(s), by at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References the issue or expresses support for it in a personal communication (e.g., in person / remote dialogue / written communication); or in closed small group setting. Agrees to further discuss or investigate the issue after initial conversation with the advocate or advocacy team. |
| | 3. Supportive | Advocacy target occasionally acts either publicly or behind the scenes by at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References the issue in public in person or through media; Participates in an event relevant to the issue; Agrees to raises the issue (or raises it) in a meeting; Personally connects civil society organization members with other individuals or organizations relevant to the issue. |
| | 4. Extremely supportive | Advocacy target formally or regularly makes actions or statements that address the issue by at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes statement in support of (or including support for) the issue in a public event, a published company communication, or in a public statement; Signs an advocacy-related letter on the issue destined for a person or body that is influential on the matter; Signs up to an initiative relevant to the issue; Publishes / sends independent public advocacy letters on the issue; Raises a company policy to vote; Leads or contributes to actions/engagement/commitments by target company on the issue. |
| 2. Influence <u>Example Criteria:</u> 1. Relevant content expertise 2. Seniority/experience (e.g., role/ years working in the company) 3. Reputation/respect (e.g., has been able to exercise some power/leadership in the company or a relevant body) 4. Member of a key committee / Board of Directors / Advisors 5. Formal leadership position (CEO, President or VP / Board Chair) | 1. Not very influential | Meets none or only the one criteria. |
| | 2. Somewhat influential | Meets at least two criteria. |
| | 3. Influential | Meets at least three criteria AND / OR is on a key committee or board. |
| | 4. Extremely influential | Meets more than three criteria AND / OR holds a formal leadership position AND / OR chairs a key committee. |
| 3. Confidence | 1. Not confident | Ratings are a guess based on 3 rd -hand, unverifiable or unreliable information about the advocacy target and their related or lack or related interests. E.g., the information is 'hearsay' or the target is observed by advocates reporting that they support the issue in a small meeting where it is perceived by advocates that the target feels pressure to signal support). |
| | 2. Somewhat confident | Ratings are a fairly informed guess. E.g., advocates have picked up consistent information from more than one source, but sources may not be 100% reliable or verifiable; or the information collected is somewhat vague. |
| | 3. Extremely confident | Ratings are based on advocates' direct contact with the individual or information from a trusted and reliable source. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | E.g., contact with the individuals or public statements/ actions made by the company. |
|--|--|---|

Table 1. Sample Private Sector Engagement Rating Scale

(C) Guide to Reporting on PSE Target Support Over Time

First state the methods used in terms of:

1. The **number of advocates** doing ratings of PSE targets and, for each advocate, the **knowledge, experience and, if applicable, their professional role** relevant to PSE work in general and/ or relevant to the specific PSE objective being evaluated.
2. The **process by which final ratings were arrived at**: either through group discussion to arrive group consensus or by averaging advocate ratings.
3. **Whether only PSE target ‘support’ was rated or ‘influence’ and ‘confidence’ were rated also** (and any rationale for excluding influence and/or confidence ratings).

Then add to this the ratings and evidence used to assign the ratings:

4. The **final rating for ‘support’ at the first time point** (and ‘influence’ and ‘confidence’ where used) alongside the evidence and criteria used to assign the ratings.
5. State the **final rating for ‘support’ at the second time point** (and ‘influence’ and ‘confidence’ where used) alongside the evidence and criteria used to assign the ratings.

Finally add any contextual information relevant to understanding change (or lack of change):

6. Any **advocacy work** (by the advocates or others) relevant to understanding changes or lack of change in the ‘support’ ratings.
7. Any **information on the policy or company context that appears relevant to change observed (or not)**, e.g., changes in the legislative or business policy context; any changes within the company or company association that seem relevant to advocates such as staff turnover or merger).
8. Any other **reflection on why change in ‘support’ ratings were observed or not** over the reporting period.

This method is based on the Policymaker Rating Method (see Appendix).

Appendix

(A) Background: “The Policymaker Rating Method”

The [Policymaker Ratings Method](#) is a method for **monitoring political will or support for an advocacy issue or proposal** amongst a defined group of policymakers.

The approach was developed under the Harvard Family Research Project¹ in response to the perceived **inadequacy of impact indicators commonly used to monitor and evaluate policymaker support** (e.g., ‘number of bills or policies introduced’, ‘number of co-sponsors or co-signers’, ‘number of votes for or against specific bills’).

Concerns with **use of impact indicators alone** include that this **fails to reflect progress** towards impacts in terms of changes significant to the impact over time (intermediate outcomes); **fails to capture significant advocacy work** directed at achieving policy impact and so under-represent work invested; and **leads to missed opportunities for course** correction in advocacy strategy.

The Policymaker Ratings Method was, therefore, developed to support advocates working on policy-related issues to **systematically describe and monitor changes in policymaker support over time** using a standardised system that is adapted to the advocacy context.

(B) The Policymaker Ratings Method

The method first requires **identification of at least 3-5 policy advocates** (the more the better) to participate in the rating process. Policy advocates are defined broadly as individuals with knowledge relevant to the advocacy objective from intelligence gathering and outreach activities.

Identified advocates are then advised to follow 4 steps:

1. **Define the *policy objective*** (e.g., a local, state or federal policy change);
2. **Identify a *policymaker target*** (e.g., a group of policy makers rated individually / a policy body with all or a select number of individuals rated individually / key leaders rated individually);
3. **Adapt the Policymaker Rating Scale Template** (below) to **define *standard criteria for rating support and influence of policymaker targets***, as well as criteria for **rating advocate confidence in the first two ratings**;
4. **Rate policymaker targets on support and influence**, as well as **advocate level of confidence using the criteria defined in step c) at two or more time points**. Here, advocates either rate the policymaker target as a group to arrive at a consensus group rating or rate the target independently and then average their ratings².

The method aims to avoid creating additional work for advocates (beyond definition of rating criteria) by capitalizing on existing knowledge to **systematize information that advocates already know through intelligence gathering and outreach** for monitoring, evaluation and learning.

The method has been included in [Theory of Change development for advocacy](#), included in [guidance for monitoring and evaluating advocacy](#) in development work, and adapted for [advocacy efforts of the CARE 1325 programmes](#) in Afghanistan and Myanmar, and for both [environmental conservation and research advocacy](#).

¹ A 33 year longitudinal [research and advocacy project](#) on family, youth, school and community engagement and wellbeing based at Harvard University (which later separated from Harvard in 2017 to become the [Global Family Research Project](#))

² Adding them up and dividing the sum of their ratings by the number of advocates doing the ratings.

| Scale | Rating | Definition |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| 1) Support | 1 Not at all supportive | No evidence this person has spoken or taken any action in support of the policy issue (includes opposition) |
| | 2 Somewhat supportive | Has indicated being favorably disposed to the policy issues (e.g., expresses support for the issue or mentions it in one-on-one or small group conversations) |
| | 3 Supportive | Occasionally takes action either publicly or behind the scenes beyond voting in support of the policy issue (e.g., speaks out at public hearings, gets quoted in the media, includes it in speeches, assigns bills to a power legislator, encourages colleagues to support policies, plays a role in budget negotiations) |
| | 4 Extremely supportive | Has a well-known reputation for being a champion of the policy issue and regularly takes leadership on advancing it (e.g., makes it a key part of his or her platform or agenda) |
| 2) Influence <u>Criteria</u> 1. Majority party member 2. Relevant content expertise 3. Seniority/experience (record of public service) 4. Reputation/respect (e.g., has been able to exercise some power/leadership in the legislature) 5. Key committee member 6. Formal leadership position (chairs a key committee or is a Senate or Assembly leader) | 1 Not very influential | Meets <u>none or only 1 criteria</u> |
| | 2 Somewhat influential | Meets <u>at least 2 criteria</u> |
| | 3 Influential | Meets <u>3 or 4 criteria AND/OR is on a key committee</u> |
| | 4 Extremely influential | Meets <u>5 or 6 criteria AND/OR holds a formal leadership position in the legislature or AND/OR chairs a key committee</u> |
| 3) Confidence | 1 Not very confident | Ratings are a guess based on 3 rd -hand, unverifiable, or unreliable information about the policymaker and his or her related (or lack of related) interests. (e.g., the policymaker or her staff saying they “love the issue” in a small meeting where they feel pressure to speak positively). |
| | 2 Somewhat confident | Ratings are a fairly informed guess. For example, advocates have picked up consistent information from more than one source, but sources may not be 100% verifiable or reliable; or the information collected is somewhat vague. |
| | 3 Extremely confident | Ratings are based on advocates’ direct contact with the individual or information from a trusted and reliable source. |

Table 2. Sample Policymaker Rating Scales (Coffman & Reed, 2009)