

Research and Advocacy for Policy Change: Measuring Progress

Linda Kelly

Contact information:

Beris Gwynne
FDC
Tel: 61 7 3236 4633
Beris.Gwynne@fdc.org.au

Level 2, 283 Elizabeth Street (PO Box 10445 Adelaide Street) Brisbane Qld 4000 Australia
Tel: 61 7 3236 4633 Fax: 61 7 3236 4696 info@fdc.org.au www.fdc.org.au

© Copyright FDC 2002

Introduction

Research and advocacy work designed to influence policy is a growing area of operation in the non-profit sector, among non-Government organizations (NGOs) and more recently in some government departments concerned with aid and development (Fowler, 2000; Hudson, 2000a; Hudson, 2000b; Davies, 2001, CIDA, 2001). Assessment of the effectiveness of such work, both the immediate outcomes and the integration with broader organizational aims and goals has received little attention until recently. This paper draws from two areas, the emerging discussions about evaluation of advocacy programs, and the broader literature about organizational performance measurement. It seeks to outline a process for NGOs and others to assess the contribution advocacy and research work makes to their organizational goals and mission.

Monitoring and evaluating advocacy and research programs

Recent research indicates that advocacy work among NGOs in Australia is increasing. More organisations are taking up some form of advocacy work, more are directing resources to advocacy and research and more are developing strategies to guide and direct the integration of advocacy work with the other areas of agency operation (Ollif, 2001). However it appears that few organisations, both in Australia and internationally, have evaluated their work until recently and most have struggled with suitable methods and approaches that enable them to be clear about the usefulness of advocacy work (Hudson, 2000, 2000a; Davies, 2001, Ollif, 2001).

Advocacy, which can include public campaigning and awareness raising and/or more private strategies of lobbying, research and documentation and policy influence, is more difficult to assess than other more traditional development interventions (Roche, 1999). On one hand this is related to the nature of advocacy interventions, with each campaign or action being a unique combination of strategies, targets and outcomes which makes it difficult to allow for simple comparisons between interventions over time.

Much advocacy is unique. Seizing opportunities and innovation are often critical components of successful advocacy; there is relatively little repetition, which prevents the gradual accumulation of knowledge across a series of 'projects'. (Roche, 1999: 194)

On the other hand there are also problems with the very process of advocacy. Effective advocacy is rarely a simple and straightforward process. It tends to combine a gradual accumulation of attention and focus, with occasional precipitous events, causing organizations to play multiple roles often spread among various departments (Sutton, 1999, Lied, 2000). It tends to rely upon action by many players, sometimes without each being fully aware of the contributions and actions of the other. It operates in a context that is often unpredictable and can lead to unexpected changes and outcomes. Traditional evaluation and monitoring methods, which compare outcomes with original objectives based upon assumptions of linear progression and limited variables, are not useful for tracking change and evaluating the success of this type of process (Fowler, 1997).

The literature on alternative approaches to advocacy monitoring and evaluation suggests that two, complementary, processes are required to enable organisations to understand what they have achieved through their advocacy work. From one perspective, every advocacy intervention has to be approached as a unique undertaking. Measuring outcomes relies upon building up a picture of what has happened that gives due attention to the unique context, targets, focus and resources of that intervention (Miller, 1994).

Suggested methods include case studies, journals, timelines and story telling. All focus upon gathering sufficient data to build an understanding of what outcomes were achieved within that particular context (Kelly, et al, 2001; Creech, 2001). Evaluation processes can then be utilized to examine why and how these achievements were made (Roche, 1999).

The recent research that has been undertaken about advocacy also suggests that there are common features and considerations which all interventions should include in order to be effective. Monitoring and evaluation of advocacy work can be expanded beyond the focus on the unique intervention to include assessment of these factors, seeking to explore how the particular intervention has covered and/or addressed the issues within their unique context.

The first half of this paper will list and explore these features, first at a general level and then with particular reference to the advocacy strategy of research and documentation. The second half of the paper will look to the methodological question of how these features and the unique characteristics of advocacy interventions can be tracked, both to measure ongoing performance and to evaluate overall achievement.

Features of effective advocacy

The literature suggests that there are some important elements that should be present in all advocacy interventions. The first of these is a clear and accessible **program logic**. Program logic should explain the connection between planned strategies and activities and how they will contribute to the desired outcomes. In effective advocacy work it should be overt and open to scrutiny by key stakeholders and for the purpose of monitoring and evaluation (Chapman & Wameyo, 2001; Creech 2001; Davies, 2001).

The program logic of any particular intervention needs to clearly relate to the longer-term goals of the organization or alliance of organizations. It requires a baseline analysis or at least some assessment of the situation at the beginning of the intervention which allows for comparison of change over time, but also for explanation of the particular strategies chosen for that intervention (Roche, 1999; Kelly et al, 2001)

Specific **objectives**, which flow from the program logic, relate to the desired outcomes of the planned intervention. Objectives need to be realistic, specific and able to be achieved within the timeframe of the planned intervention (Roche, 1999; Davies, 2001, Kelly et al, 2001). Objectives should be clear and shared by all stakeholders. When there are multiple stakeholders the very setting of objectives can be an empowering or an excluding process that impacts upon other areas such as building the capacity and independence of southern partners. Monitoring of advocacy work should include monitoring of the processes of formulating and choosing objectives, as well as the achievement of these objectives (Davies, 2001).

The program logic of an intervention will need updating and redevelopment as circumstances and opportunities change and therefore objectives will also change over time. Monitoring processes need to track both the fact of these changes as well as how effectively they are communicated to all stakeholders (Roche, 1999).

Past assessment of advocacy work suggests that how the goals and objectives of the intervention are **framed** is critical for both immediate clarity of purpose and for building broader and long term support for an issue (Miller, 1994). Effective advocacy campaigns frame the issue or goal of the intervention with attention to both short term, specific and achievable objectives and long term transformational goals.

Issues framed in ways that combine narrow objectives with more transformational goals provide opportunities for winning modest but strategic policy gains while creating the space and vision necessary for avoiding cooption, educating constituencies, and building toward long-term fundamental change (Miller, 1994:15).

The question of the **legitimacy** of an organization in undertaking advocacy is of central concern in the literature (Hudson, 2000a). Legitimacy is derived in various ways, including the credibility of information, the methods of engagement and the reputation of the organization (Chapman & Fisher, 2000). Legitimacy is considered an asset in campaigning and advocacy work that can change according to the performance of the organization and because of changes in the external context. Maintenance of the legitimacy of the organization or coalition of organizations is considered an important indicator of the ability of that organisation/s to achieve its planned outcomes (Davies, 2001).

Of particular importance to the legitimacy of most NGO advocacy is the knowledge they have of the work being undertaken in development interventions in poor communities. Information needs to be up to date, detailed and accurate in order to protect the legitimacy of northern NGOs (Fowler, 1997, Hudson, 2001, Johns, 2001). At the same time the very process of gathering this information and experience in order to influence policy change can itself be a collaborative or disempowering process for the Southern partners which in turn may undermine the very purpose of advocacy on their behalf (Jordan & Tuijl, 1998). This in turn suggests that the process of relationship, as well as the quality of the information made available, should be monitored throughout the advocacy intervention (Davies, 2001).

Much advocacy work is undertaken in **coalitions and alliances** of organizations. In Australia ninety percent of the non-government organisations which had undertaken advocacy work had done so in cooperation with other organisations (Ollif, 2001). The consensus in the literature appears to be that few organizations are big enough or multi skilled enough to cover all the change processes which are required for successful advocacy. NGOs and others need to work together to achieve sustainable policy change (Chapman & Fisher, 2000) and the most successful advocacy is built upon the strength of many different organisations undertaking different roles and often approaching the key issue from different perspectives (Edwards, 1993). At the same time, alliances and coalitions are often perceived as time-consuming and tedious processes which if poorly organized can detract from advocacy effectiveness (Kelly et al, 2001).

The way organizations work together can therefore be critical to the success of the advocacy intervention (Miller, 1994). A balance needs to be found between democratic and inclusive decision making structures and the requirement for agile and speedy processes that can react quickly to changing circumstances. The decision making processes of a coalition therefore provide a useful indicator of the likely effectiveness of that alliance (Miller, 1994). In addition, mutual accountability between organizations in a network or alliance is considered a good indicator of the degree to which organizations are usefully engaged with each other (Jordan & Tuijl, 1998; Davies, 2001). If information systems, resources and tasks are being shared voluntarily and with an interest in engaging others then this is a good indication that the coalition is useful to members and therefore more likely to be working effectively.

The **strategies** and tactics of advocacy need to be adapted to the particular context and opportunities of the situation (Miller, 1994). The view emerging from the literature is that effective advocacy requires a flexible approach to the development of strategies, that can move between incremental change efforts and a focus upon global demands. More significantly, strategies need to be multi faceted and multi layered, drawing from the contributions of all participants, with an emphasis upon creating the best synergy

between those contributions (Edwards, 1993). Advocacy needs to be supported by high quality, field based research and should present viable alternatives to the policy or action it is seeking to challenge.

Increasingly advocacy work is being understood not as one action, but as part of a series of interventions necessary for sustainable change. Many NGOs are moving toward a framework that sees advocacy interventions situated within a wider program logic or strategic plan for change that includes work at the grassroots, at national and regional interventions and also international action. Their view is that this type of **joined-up approach** is essential to achieving sustainable change (Chapman & Wameyo, 2001). A common framework utilized by some organizations is to understand advocacy as a set of parallel processes, which involve direct policy influence, development of the capacity of civil society organization in the south to undertake their own advocacy and the creation of democratic space to allow for the further development of civil society in a country or region (Chapman & Wameyo, 2001; Davies, 2001). Another perspective argues that the emphasis must not be on policy development and change alone, but must also focus upon the implementation and utilisation of that policy change at the field level (Sutton, 1999). Clearly not all these interventions will be under taken by one organisation in all situations.

From this understanding of advocacy and policy change work, evaluation and monitoring therefore requires some attention to how well the specific processes of direct policy influence link with other interventions, within or external to an organisation, to ensure the results sought will be achieved and sustained (Chapman & Fisher, 2000). Failure to do so may undermine the impact being sought by the advocacy intervention.

This concern is one that resonates across the research being done by the other coalitions and raises important questions about the need to place a higher priority on institution and constituency-building activities when designing policy influence efforts. If such activities are not incorporated and understood as a vital integral part of the process, policy work may actually undermine the institutional basis of civil society and the potential for promoting long term social accountability and responsible government (Miller, 1994:22).

This may require cooperation with other organizations in measuring how their interventions operate in synergy to ensure the best possible set of outcomes across a range of measures.

Research and documentation

A subset of the discussion about measuring effective advocacy includes the use of research and documentation for policy change. This area has received some focus in recent times (Creech, 2001; Neilson, 2001; Stone et al, 2001; Williard, 2001). It is difficult to assess the value of one method of influencing work in what is usually a process of multiple interventions, but research has begun to identify the necessary elements of effective research and information dissemination for the purpose of policy change.

The literature suggests that research should be assessed for **relevance, utility and influence** (Stone et al, 2001). That is, some assessment needs to be made of the quality of the research material itself in relation to the task at hand. Neilson (2001) notes that research can be used for the purpose of providing data, for promoting ideas or to support established arguments. He argues that organisations need to be aware of the type of research they undertake and the way in which it will be used.

Policy makers tend to simplify issues in order to understand a situation and develop solutions. In order to be influential, research information can either expose the simplicity

of the present available information or develop alternative scenarios which reveal or expose other possible policy choices (Sutton, 1999).

There are always other choices in policy. The need, but also the difficulty, is to reveal them... There need to be hard searches for alternatives within highly reiterative practices and apparently unquestionable agenda, data and strategies (Clay & Schaffer, quoted in Sutton, 1999).

Finally, in line with the discussion about legitimacy and joined-up approaches to change, attention needs to be given to the way research includes or excludes key stakeholders. Policy debates typically are overtaken by experts, excluding those who are the targets of the proposed changes (Fowler, 1997; Sutton, 1999). Research needs to be self-aware and able to identify how it has enabled people to be both more informed about their situation and more able to speak about their own experience.

The nature of the **engagement strategy** undertaken with policy makers is key to the effective take-up of research information. Too often researchers are only able to communicate to others like themselves and few organizations appreciate the need for long-term and planned strategies of engagement with the targets they wish to influence. People are more likely to act on and use information if they trust the source of that information, and this requires relationship building which positions the researcher or their representative, as a person of influence for the policy maker (Willard, 2001). The most effective engagement of decision-makers has them actively involved in the research process or part of the research network (Neilson, 2001).

Researchers have to also consider the nature of the **policy environment** where they operate. There are numerous frameworks for understanding the process of policy influence and change (Neilson, 2001), almost all of which suggest that research and information are but single elements in the multiple influences upon policy development. Other influences include political will and interest, public and media interest, history of previous policy efforts and implementations, resources and costs and the incentives for change offered in any system or situation. Effective research and information dissemination rests upon adequate analysis of the policy environment and careful planning of how to present and take up opportunities in that environment (Stone et al, 2001).

The situation becomes even more difficult to assess outside of countries with democratic political systems (Miller, 1994, Edwards, 2001). The frameworks for understanding policy processes assume open and pluralistic political and social environments (Neilson, 2001). For organisations operating in other countries and regions of the world there are no blueprints or guides, each policy environment needs to be assessed and addressed afresh.

Assessing performance and impact

NGOs and other organisations require processes that will enable them to track and assess their effectiveness in advocacy work. The literature suggests that the process must include attention to a range of common factors, as discussed above, together with an understanding of the unique and context specific story of each process. The key question for organisations is how to develop systems of monitoring and evaluation that will provide this information, which are also simple and accessible to different groups of stakeholders. In this half of the paper attention will be given to the methodologies of performance monitoring and program evaluation suitable for advocacy work

Performance measurement

Performance measurement is about assessing the outcomes of an organization in relation to the vision and long term strategic plans of that organization (Kaplan & Norton, 1996a). Outcomes assessment is the task of all levels of an organization, with different types of information collected at different levels, but all related to assessment of how those outcomes are contributing to the long-term goals¹ or the performance of the organization. Performance assessment allows for the outcomes of individual programs like advocacy and research work to be considered in relation to the overall achievements of the organisation².

Performance measurement is intended to be the tool for linking planning processes to ongoing action throughout the entire organization. The underlying assumption is that measurement focuses attention. Research undertaken among for-profit companies suggests that strategies devised by the executive of the organization often do not result in action because they are perceived by staff to be irrelevant to the operations of the organization (Rolph, 1999). The task of performance measurement is to focus the attention of both staff and management upon the same shared goals, albeit at different levels of detail, therefore ensuring greater coherence between planning and organizational operation (Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

Performance measurement of organizations is not a new field. Government departments, including Australian Federal and State governments, have adopted the approach to provide more direct accounting for use of taxpayer resources. For-profit companies have been engaged in developing tools and techniques to measure their effectiveness for many years.

However, there is limited evidence of the successful application of performance management in the not-for-profit sector. It is suggested that the processes are underdeveloped in the NGO sector (Hatry, 1997) and also that performance assessment frameworks have been adopted for external political purposes or to give the appearance of strategic planning in an organization, without actually contributing to change and real measurement of the organization effectiveness (Kluvers, 1998).

A review of the available literature points to several key principles and lessons that need to be considered if performance measurement is to be usefully incorporated into the not-for-profit arena.

Performance assessment rests upon the assumption that an organization has a vision and clearly developed **strategic plan** for achieving that vision (Kaplan & Norton, 1993; Sawhill & Williamson, 2001). In NGOs this is sometimes referred to as the development model or approach of the organization. It explains what the organization is trying to achieve and how. The more clear and well developed this strategic plan or development model, the more possible it is to develop measures of desired outcomes.

The strategic plan or development model of any organization will obviously borrow from the available knowledge and practice of like minded organizations and existing research and knowledge in the relevant areas. However, no two organizations are alike, and while the detail of the plan of operation for any organization ought to be well informed by external experience, it should also be unique to the resources, skills and aims of that particular organization (Kaplan, 1994; Plantz et al, 1997). Developing such a plan is not

¹ Kaplan & Norton (1996a) suggest that long term goals of an organization should relate to a five to ten year time period.

² Fowler (1997) notes that information about outputs and activities is different to that of performance outcomes and impact. The latter information goes beyond a program undertaken by an organisation to encompass the whole performance of that organisation.

simple process, especially if the plan is meant to be relevant to the different operations across a diverse and dynamic organization like an NGO.

Each section within an organization needs to undertake its own external and internal analysis and develop a plan of action which will enable it to direct and assess the operations of that section, within the overall organization strategic plan (Kaplan, 1993; Rolph, 1999). Performance information gathered about that section will specifically examine how the outcomes of section work have contributed to shared organizational goals. The intention is for performance measurement to allow specialized work areas to function independently but within a framework of common tasks and goals (Kaplan & Norton, 1996a; Candle, 1997; Miller, 1998). Performance measurement across shared measures is intended to force transparent accountability. It requires sections within an organization, including the executive, to justify any new initiative and resource use in terms of its contribution towards the shared goals of the organization (Kaplan & Norton, 1996b).

Perhaps the most significant learning about performance measurement coming from existing research is that assessment must not be confined to one measure, but must include a range of internal and external aspects of organizational functioning, in order to provide a **balanced picture** of the state of the organization (Van de Vliet, 1997; Corrigan, 1998; Miller, 1998). According to the approach utilized in some for-profit organizations this includes attention to financial outcomes, but also to internal management and processes, innovation and learning and the satisfaction of the 'customers'. This balanced range of measures must be limited in number and must give attention to the key areas of performance that will enable the company to succeed in its desired aims (Willyard, 1997).

The literature suggests that unless performance measurement relates very clearly to the goals of the organization and includes measures of **learning and innovation**, it can lead to conservative performance targets and a focus on 'safe' and less risky ventures (Plantz et al, 1997). Further, program level outcomes have to be clearly linked to broader efforts for change, internal and external to the organization, in order to avoid a narrow sectional or organizational assessment which ignores the need for **synergy** with other areas (Plantz et al, 1997)

Research has shown that the **purpose** of performance assessment needs to be clear from the outset (Newcomer, 1997a). Depending upon the purpose of the performance assessment, people will be more or less willing to identify and learn from failure. It is difficult for example, to mix assessment for the purpose of learning and organizational development with that directed at accountability to external sources or to resource and budgeting exercises (Joyce, 1997).

Performance assessment is a **political and social construct**. The more powerful stakeholders can determine what is important to measure (Newcomer, 1997a). Often for an NGO these are the donors, which has the effect of skewing the performance measures towards external accountability rather than internal learning and improvement. Some analysis of the political context within which strategic planning and performance assessment processes are undertaken will at least help to expose this influence and enable organizations to direct their performance measurement towards their own goals. The development of performance measures should be a shared process between all stakeholders in an organization (Newcomer, 1997a; Fowler, 1997; Van de Vliet, 1997). For NGOs this includes their donors and the people expected to benefit from the services of the organization together with the staff who will be measured by the assessment process (Nankervis et al, 1992).

Performance measurement requires time and resources in order to develop the detailed strategic plan and also the external and internal analysis, which gives an organizational

baseline. It is important that measurement of outcomes is aligned with programs giving consideration to both short and long term gains (Plantz et al, 1997; Chapman & Waymeyo, 2001). **Targets** cannot be developed without a baseline and it is suggested that at least a year of operations is required to develop adequate information to then set realistic and meaningful targets (Plantz et al, 1997).

One alternative is to make some use of the information available from existing research, to both inform strategic planning and also to set outcomes targets which could be reasonably expected to contribute to the desired changes (Sawhill & Williamson, 2001). Rather than wait for the perfect development of outcomes measures, organizations can start with what information is available and further refine and develop their measures and targets over time (Caudle, 1997; Plantz et al, 1997).

Davies (1997) has developed another approach that moves away from using predetermined indicators or targets to the collection of data under key change areas. Management and other stakeholders then take responsibility for analysing the data and establishing the meaning of such change for the operations and relevance of the programs and the organisation. This approach opens up the opportunity to monitor both the organisational performance and the external context, forcing organisations to remain relevant to their changing environment.

The literature suggests that while there are various possible tools for performance assessment³, the senior management in an organization has a critical role to play in **modelling and leading** the process of performance measurement (Latemore, 1997). By engaging themselves in the process and giving attention to the results, they create an expectation that it is a valuable and worthwhile exercise. The attitude and commitment of senior management to a process of learning and change, the values they model and the organizational values related to improvement, together with the rewards systems (formal and informal), which underlie organizational operations are critical in effective performance assessment (Fowler, 1997; Mayo & Brown, 1999). This requires management to integrate organizational performance assessment with individual performance assessment (Nankervis et al, 1992) and also to consider very carefully what behaviour and results they 'reward' in the company (Miller, 1998). If the leadership of an organization are interested in outcomes and rigorously pursue that information then people will become more concerned with working on those same outcomes.

The literature suggests that there is limited value in simple **benchmarking** between organizations. The multiple differences in agency goals, structure and resources means that simple comparison of outcomes has little meaning (Caudle, 1997).

However there is support for a more informed approach to benchmarking (Miller, 1998; Mayo & Brown, 1999), which combines industry norms and historical data together with the performance of other organizations to build an analysis of industry strategies and outcomes to inform the baseline measurement of a particular organization.

In a similar way, Bishop (2001) suggests that benchmarking might be useful for NGOs if it is used in a critical way that examines why other organizations are achieving different outcomes, what are the targets and circumstances of those organizations and whether their achievements mirror the aims of the agency. She suggests that benchmarking needs to be thought of as a tool for beginning the process of organization performance assessment rather than as an absolute measure of comparison.

Finally, Hacker & Kleiner (2000) argue that benchmarking of organizational processes might be more useful than benchmarking the outcomes. Why and how an agency

³ See for example Kaplan & Norton, 1993; Van de Vliet, 1997; Plantz et al, 1997; Davies, 2001.

achieves its outcomes may provide more useful learning than simple comparison of results.

Program evaluation

Performance measurement assesses if an organisation is managing according to the agreed targets set for outcomes. It does not explain why or how an organisation is performing in that way. It also cannot explore the impact of an organisation: that is the long-term change brought about by the organisational outcomes. Information on how and why and about impact comes from program evaluation (Newcomer, 1997a). Performance assessment and program evaluation are complementary tools for understanding the progress of an organisation (Wholey & Newcomer, 1997).

Program evaluation allows the organisation to test the underlying hypothesis of its development model, to examine if the outcomes it has tried to achieve were the correct ones in order to reach the desired change. True impact measurement usually requires research by more than one agency, but at the least requires program evaluation processes and approaches (Plantz et al, 1997).

Few advocacy interventions look at impact in terms of change for people in poor communities in developing countries (Davies, 2001). Cooperation between advocacy and development NGOs in broader scale impact measurement might be a way forward to generate useful information on the long term and sustainable change people have experienced as a result of the multiple interventions undertaken with them or for them. The difficulty in such cooperation and peer review tends not to be attribution, but rather the willingness of organisations to accurately and honestly assess their actual contribution to a situation, free of donor and public expectation (Davies, 2001).

Finally advocacy and research work is a relatively new area for many NGOs. Program evaluation needs to be combined with other opportunities to learn and hear new information, such as shared research forums and networks focused around particular sectors, in order to ensure that the processes and strategies adopted are the most useful and relevant to a given situation (Roche, 1999).

Tracking effectiveness

This review of the literature points to several key themes about how to measure advocacy and policy change work. Given that traditional monitoring and evaluation strategies seem to be inadequate to the task, there needs to be creative application of other approaches, so NGOs and other organisations are able to know what they are achieving in their advocacy and research work, why, how it can be improved and what relationship it has to other areas of their work.

It appears that an organisation needs to situate its review of advocacy and research work within a wider program of organizational performance measurements. This organisation-wide program requires careful development of a detailed plan of long term action towards key organizational goals. The more detailed the plan, the more possible it is to build useful measures of the desired outcomes. Such organizational plans are best developed from a mixture of internal assessment and external analysis, drawing where possible, upon the experience and examples of other organizations.

The organization needs to ensure that its strategic plan gives attention to the key areas, which will ensure both long term success of programs and also long term viability of the organization itself. Together with measures which are specific to the goals of the organization, previous research suggests that this will require regular measurement of

the legitimacy of the organization, the effectiveness of the relationships the organization has with other key partners, in both the North and South and also the engagement and communication strategies the organization has developed for the key targets of change. Finally the key measures should also give attention to organizational learning, the ability to draw from own experience and that of others to ensure that the organization is growing and developing in response to changing context and new information. All the stakeholders, especially beneficiaries and staff should be part of developing the measures for these ongoing performance measurement areas.

Programs of advocacy and research should likewise have two levels of assessment. They must develop a program logic of their own which indicates a clear analysis of the context and the available resources and potential for change. This should include assessment of the policy environment and the potential opportunities for influencing and engagement in that environment. This program logic should provide an explicit link between the long term goals of the organization and the specific objectives and activities of that program. Ongoing assessment can then be made through the development of indicators of change associated with the particular objectives of that program.

In addition, each intervention needs to be assessed against those areas that have been shown to be important to effective research and advocacy work. These include the quality of the research itself (relevance, utility and influence), the feasibility and clarity of objectives and the process of their development and change, the adequacy and relevance of chosen strategies, the relationships between organizations working in coalition and the legitimacy of the organization for that particular program area.

Finally the emerging view is that effective advocacy and policy change work needs to be situated within a broader framework of change, that might be undertaken by one organization alone, but is more likely to see multiple organization sharing the work across different levels and locations to provide a joined-up approach to achieving change. Programs of advocacy and research work need to demonstrate how they are situating their interventions within such broader frameworks and how their achievements are contributing towards effective outcomes in other key areas in order that sustainable and real change is experienced by people in poor communities.

Conclusions

There are no simple methods for measuring performance in NGO work, especially in the area of advocacy and research for policy change. It is critical that organizations do the early work of planning and analysis in order to have explicit strategies and objectives for their work against which their achievements can be measured. It is also essential that NGOs learn from the experience of others to date and ensure that they are tracking the variables at both organizational and program levels which appear to be key to the effective undertaking of advocacy and research work.

Finally there is still much that is unknown. Organizations have to learn from each other and have to undertake program evaluation to test their organizational plans and the program logic of their interventions.

Establishing such monitoring, evaluation and learning processes will allow organizations to begin to assess the work they undertake and in particular, how their advocacy and research programs contribute to their vision of change.

Annotated bibliography

Bishop, P. 2001. 'Benchmarking – a misconceived business asset'. *The British Journal of Administrative Management*, Orphigton, Jan/Feb.

This article examines the practice of benchmarking business organisations against their peers for the purpose of assessing their overall quality and improving that quality. The article stress that the process of benchmarking is suitable for middle size companies as well as larger ones and through a large and confidential database, sufficient diversity can be obtained to provide useful information for an organisation across a number of key parameters. The real value of benchmarking comes from regular and continuous application to indicate to a company how and where it is changing and improving.

Broom, C. A. & Jackson, M. 1997. 'Performance measurement training that works'. In *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*, ed. K.E. Newcomer. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 79-90.

This chapter looks at the provision of performance measurement training for those who mandate, implement and use performance information. The roles of the training participants, specifically whether they are agency staff analysts or policy makers, together with their experience and knowledge should determine the content and approach of the training.

Caudle, S. L. 1997. 'Performance results: the information technology factor', in *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*, ed K.E. Newcomer. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 63-78.

This chapter looks at the application of performance management in information technology. The author suggests that there are five key practices in the industry that build and sustain a successful IT performance management systems. These include: following a results chain from goals to outputs and inputs; Following a balanced scorecard approach; targeting measures, results and accountability at different levels of decision making; building comprehensive measurement, data collection and analysis capability; and improving processes which meet mission goals.

Chapman, J. & Fisher, T. 2000. 'The effectiveness of NGO campaigning: lessons from practice', *Development in Practice*, Vol. 10, No. 2, May, 151-165.

The authors investigate the lessons from two long term and large-scale advocacy campaigns undertaken by NGOs. They conclude that campaigns are not simple linear processes and in fact the gains made from campaign work are often slow but cumulative, leading to precipitive moments of change. They suggest successful campaigns need concurrent work at different levels: grassroots, national/regional and international together with collaboration between organisations. They address the question of legitimacy of campaigning organisations and the focus of targeted campaigns. In particular they conclude that changes in policy are not enough to ensure changes at the grassroots.

Chapman, J. & Wameyo, A. 2001. 'Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study', ActionAid.

This study examines the work of Action Aid and other organisations, together with the limited available study which has been undertaken of NGO advocacy work, to try to assess the current knowledge about effective monitoring and evaluation of advocacy work. The authors conclude

that different levels and dimensions exist in advocacy work and these must be understood within the evaluation processes. Further that frameworks for monitoring and evaluations should be seen as models, not straitjackets. It is important to be open to the unexpected. Processes as well as outcomes must be monitored and that policy implementation as well as policy change should be tracked. They give attention to alliances and the ongoing issues of attribution and cooperation within alliances. Finally they suggest that organisational values determine what is sought in monitoring and evaluation.

The authors note that there are a number of limitations in the present knowledge about monitoring and evaluating advocacy. These particularly have to do with the relationship between advocacy and civil society building and the conflictual and political consequences of advocacy

CIDA. 2001. 'Strengthening Aid Effectiveness: New Approaches to Canada's International Assistance Program', June.

This discussion paper reviews the position of Canadian official aid and the new challenges arising from global trends. It outlines various priorities for Canadian assistance to poor countries and groups of people, but also seeks to outline some alternative possibilities to direct funding assistance. These include the development of relations with the private sector, increasing work in civil society and increasing work in policy and research.

Corrigan, J. 1998. 'Performance measurement: knowing the dynamics'. *Australian CPA*, Melbourne, October.

This short article touches upon the value in performance measurement for companies, stressing the need for instruments that go beyond financial reporting. The key distinction made by the author is the difference between lead and lag reporting. He notes that most lead reporting requires non-financial indicators. Further that any system of measurement has to be related to the changing times and not remain a static tool.

Creech, H. 2001. 'Measuring while you manage planning, monitoring and evaluating knowledge networks', IISD. <http://www.iisd.org/networks/research.asp>

This article, part of a series presented by IISD, examines the tracking of effectiveness in knowledge networks; networks organised to promote policy change and implementation through research and documentation. The author suggests that the examination of the effectiveness of knowledge networks is often reduced to assessment of individual projects, rather than appreciation of the contribution of the network as a whole. Networks need to develop ways to assess their effectiveness. The article examines five traditional approaches to performance measurement and evaluation: SWOT analysis, Results Based Management, Logical Framework Analysis, Outcome mapping and Appreciative inquiry and human resource performance evaluation frameworks. The author draws from each to develop a specific model for planning, monitoring and evaluation of knowledge networks.

Davies, R. 1997. 'An evolutionary approach to facilitating organisational learning: An experiment by the Christian Commission for Development in Bangladesh'. <http://www.swan.ac.uk/cds/rd/ccdb.htm>

This article describes the development of a new approach to monitoring performance in organisations. Moving away from the notion of fixed indicators, the experiment sought to involve all levels of management and staff in collection of examples of 'significant change'. This included change in three areas: peoples' lives, peoples' participation and in the sustainability of peoples' institutions and their activities. Information was also sought about 'any other type of change'. Information was collected from the ground and passed upward, with each level of management participating in analysing and further refining the key examples that were passed

onto more senior levels. The approach presents some strong contrast and challenge to traditional methods of organisational program monitoring.

Davies, R. 2001. 'Evaluating the effectiveness of DFID's influence with multilaterals part a: a review of NGO approaches to the evaluation of advocacy work', Cambridge, UK.

This research paper was part of a broader review undertaken by DFID to examine the processes and outcomes on 'influencing' work. It focuses specifically on International Non-Government Organisations, drawing lessons from examples supplied by 20 different organisations. It seeks to define the type of advocacy work undertaken by INGOs, and the key stakeholders in the process, including alliances of organisations. The author places a strong emphasis upon mutual accountability processes as an indicator of effective alliances and thus successful campaign outcomes. He examines what should be monitored in these processes, focusing on objectives and project logic. The article examines the differences between public and private processes and specifically explores the monitoring of policy change. Finally the article gives some attention to areas of impact, representation of progress, cost efficiency and attribution.

Edwards, Michael. 1993. 'Does the doormat influence the boot?: critical thoughts on UK NGOs and international advocacy', *Development in Practice*, Vol 3, No 3, October.

This article examines the experience of United Kingdom non-government development organisations in advocacy work. The author suggest that NGOs have a disappointing record in bringing about change so far and raises four areas which he consider need further attention in order to improve advocacy outcomes. These include an overall absence of clear strategy; a failure to build strong alliances; a failure to develop credible alternatives to current orthodoxies; and the dilemma of relations with donor agencies. He also suggests the need to find better ways of linking local level action and analysis with international advocacy, both to legitimise advocacy work and to contribute to the development of viable alternatives to current orthodoxies.

Edwards, M. 2001. *Social Policy, Public Policy: From Problem to Practice*. Allen & Unwin, Melbourne.

This book draws on Australian experience of policy change efforts, using four case studies to examine the processes of influence and change in each situation. The author suggests that key to the effective social policy changes was the effective role of research and data collection at various points in the policy change process. Also important was the value placed on research by the policymakers and the ability of researchers to communicate with and enter into the operations of the policy world. A further influence was the media interest in some social policy areas, which in turn drove public expectations.

Fowler, A. 1997. 'Assessing development impact and organisational performance'. In *Striking a Balance*, ed. A. Fowler, Earthscan, London, Chapter 7.

This chapter focuses upon the measurement of organisational achievement among Non-Government Development Organisations. It examines the difficulties in assessing development impact, including the notion that the most effective development processes will be those which blend into the other existing social and political processes and thus are unable to be kept separate for measurement. The author distinguishes between information for the purpose of assessing outputs and outcomes and information that is required to assess impact. The last area is obviously the most difficult and is given the least attention by NGOs. He argues for an interpretive approach rather than a scientific approach to NGO performance measurement and suggests that a stakeholder assessment of NGO performance is the only valid way to judge its effectiveness. The author argues that an NGO bottom line is constructed from the standards set by multiple stakeholders (whose competing interests and powers must be recognised and

negotiated), although this leads to some difficulties in assessment of advocacy work (where some key stakeholders, especially those who are the targets of the advocacy work, will not want the NGO work to succeed). The author proposes that those who are meant to benefit from the advocacy work should be the judges of its effectiveness.

Fowler, A. 2000. 'Introduction: NGDO values and the fourth position'. In 'NGO Futures: Beyond Aid', *Third World Quarterly*, Special Issue ed. A. Fowler, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 589-603.

This introductory article introduces the dilemma of International Non-Government Organisations facing a future with decreasing international aid flows to either sustain their work or direct their roles. The author argues that aid flows are decreasing and notwithstanding the increasing privatisation of aid through NGOs, public and official trust in and reliance upon, aid as a method to alleviate poverty and suffering is decreasing. NGOs will find themselves without official aid to sustain their budgets and with limited support from elsewhere because they have been unable to prove that aid works. In this scenario the author suggests NGOs have various choices. These include finding other roles such as advocacy and policy, developing more realistic partnership with Southern organisations, focusing upon values and rights based approaches to development and/or perhaps returning to their civic rootedness in the North. The author concludes with a strong plea for NGOs to make decisions about their future rather than let other pressures determine this for them.

Hacker, M. E. & Kleiner, B. M. 2000. '12 steps to better benchmarking', *Industrial Management*, Norcross, March-April.

This article argues for the application of benchmarking processes in companies, with attention to results and to processes. The authors suggest that benchmarking often fails because it focuses on the wrong aspects. To improve the process benchmarking needs to be treated strategically, using a framework such as policy development to identify the key processes and outcomes and decrease attention to those which are less important.

Hatry, H. 1997. 'Where the rubber meets the road: performance measurement for state and local public agencies'. In *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*, ed. K.E. Newcomer. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 31-44.

This chapter examines the pressures on local and state government in North America, to adopt performance and outcome measurement processes. It reviews possible future direction and look at obstacles to effective implementation of performance measurement in government agencies. It particularly examines the limitations of performance measurement in relation to program evaluation, stressing that the two need to be complementary and both undertaken to give a complete picture of the functioning of a government department.

Hudson, A. 1999. 'Organising NGOs' international advocacy: organisational structures and organisational effectiveness'. Paper presented at the 'NGOs in a Global Future' Conference, University of Birmingham, 11-13 January.

This paper is a very full overview of the reasons why International Non-Government Organisations have increased their advocacy work and what limitations and difficulties they have encountered in this move. The article also examines the literature on organisational structures and methods for assessing effectiveness. The author is setting the stage for his future research that aims to investigate the effectiveness of NGO advocacy as a variable of NGO organisational structure. The author has no conclusions from his research at this stage.

Hudson, A. 2000. A bigger bang for your buck? UK NGOs and the evaluation of advocacy. Paper submitted to the *Journal of International Development*.
<http://www.alanhudson.plus.com/bang.htm>

This article explores the results of research undertaken by the author on the evaluation of advocacy work among UK International Non-Government Organisations. The research serves as a benchmark of the state of advocacy evaluation in Britain. Most organisations in the study agreed with the need for further evaluation of their advocacy work, yet few had undertaken it and fewer still had thought through the various levels and possibilities for such type of evaluation. The author argues that evaluation can contribute to improvement of advocacy and outlines a four-stage decision process to guide such evaluation. Decisions have to be made about purpose, audience, focus and methods, within a broader context of values and understandings of what constitute advocacy.

Hudson, A. 2000a. 'Advocacy by UK-based development NGOs: the state of play'.
<http://www.alanhudson.plus.com/stateof.htm>

This article is based upon the author's research into UK International Non-Government Organisations. It particularly explores the 'baseline' situation of the evaluation work INGOs have undertaken of their advocacy work. In this article the author gives some emphasis to questions of the place of advocacy in INGOs overall work and how it fits with their respective types of identities as helping organisations. He particularly examines issues of legitimacy and representation and the importance placed on the links and relationships with Southern partners in this legitimacy process. The author suggests that funding from donor organisations does not evidently influence advocacy targets or approaches.

Hudson, A. 2000b. 'Linking the levels?: the organisation of UK development NGOs advocacy'. End of grant report for DfID (ESCOR) R7314.

This report summarises the authors research into the evaluation of advocacy work undertaken by International Non-Government Organisations. The author gives particular attention to legitimacy of INGO advocacy work and the attempts INGOs make to evaluate their advocacy. He recommends that DfID: recognise the complexity of advocacy; value the diversity of UK INGOs; support INGO cooperation in research and policy analysis activities; be clear about legitimacy; ensure funding for southern NGOs does not weaken the role of Northern INGOs in policy work; support development awareness and education; support Southern capacity building of UK INGOs; and promote flexible frameworks for evaluating advocacy.

Hudson, A. 2001. 'Who are you to talk?', *BOND Networker*, February.
<http://www.alanhudson.plus.com/Talk.html>

This short think piece addresses the issue of legitimacy of Non-Government Organisations in global governance debates. The author suggests that there are four ways forward for NGOs in response to challenges about their representativeness and legitimacy. Either to muddle through, to increase representation and accountability from the South, to nurture Southern capacity and domestic constituents or to focus on the quality of relationship with less powerful partners within a political framework. The author calls for an active response from NGOs.

Iied (2000), 'The policy influence of NGOs in sub-Saharan Africa: assessing effectiveness and impact'. <http://www.iied.org/aqri/proj-ngopolicyinfluence.html>

This paper describes the key questions for research to be undertaken into decision making in policy processes. Specifically the authors seek to explore if Non-Government Organisations are effective in influencing the policy process. The research initially will be undertaken with organisations working in sub-Saharan Africa.

Johns, G. 2000. 'NGO way to go. political accountability of non-government organisations in a democratic society'. *IPA Backgrounder*, November, Vol. 12/3.

This article critically examines the legitimacy of International Non-Government Organisations in their roles in the global policy process. The author is generally opposed to NGO work in any advocacy or policy role and highly critical of what he describes as unrepresentational NGO activities. He argues that the only claim NGOs have to a legitimate voice comes from their rootedness in their operations in the South and any direct experience arising from this work.

Jordan and Tuijl. 1998. Political responsibility in NGO advocacy: exploring emerging shapes in global democracy.

<http://www.oneworld.org/euforic/novib/novib1.htm>

These authors argue that advocacy as practiced by NGOs is essentially about the righting of power relations and thus all NGO activities can be viewed as having an advocacy aspect. They argue that advocacy takes place within a political context and that failure to analyse and understand the power relations will lead northern NGOs to simply replicate the same power relationships with their southern partners, against which they are advocating. The authors identify four possible ways of relating between north and south actors in advocacy work: hybrid, concurrent, disassociated, competitive. They argue very strongly for northern NGOs to avoid the latter types and recognise how they must work effectively with their partners in the South if they want to challenge existing structures. The key point in this paper is that mutual accountability is the main indicator of effective advocacy performance.

Joyce, P. G. 1997. 'Using performance measures for budgeting: a new beat, or is it the same old tune?'. In *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*, ed. K.E. Newcomer. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 45-61.

This chapter looks at the use of performance measurement as a key tool to improving public administration in the USA, especially the allocation of resources. The author suggests that unlike examples arising from New Zealand and Australia, there are specific conditions in the USA which make performance based budgeting more difficult. These include the lack of agreement about the objectives of programs, development of the right measures to track inputs and results and then the need to redevelop the government budgeting from one of input centred to results orientated. The author concludes there is limited evidence of successful and valid use of performance information for budget management in public administration.

Kaplan, R. S. 1993. 'Implementing the balanced scorecard at FMC Corporation: an interview with Larry D. Brady'. *Harvard Business Review*, September/October.

This article looks at the practical application of the 'balanced scorecard' at one company. Until the introduction of the balanced scorecard the company had struggled with multiple approaches to improving organisational quality. The Scorecard approach allowed one integrated approach, which in turn allowed for diversified targets and strategies within divisions. That is, the scorecard focused managers on the long-term outcomes, but allowed them to develop their own strategic plans, in response to their own analysis of their area of responsibility. Allowing this difference and also this transparency has been challenging to staff but has enabled the company to focus on long term positioning.

Kaplan, R. S. 1994. 'Devising a balance scorecard matched to business strategy'. *Planning*, September/October.

This article looks at the application of the 'balanced scorecard' to measure organisational performance and assist with strategic planning and management. The key issue in the article is that companies must develop their own scorecard, for business units within the company, which relate to their specific strategic plans. This cannot be copied or imitated from other organisations. Good strategies describe the difference between this company and others.

Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. 1993. 'Putting the balanced scorecard to work'. *Harvard Business Review*, September/October.

This article reviews the early introduction of the 'balanced scorecard' a tool of performance measurement. Stresses the way the scorecard approach goes beyond financial measurement and links organisational vision with individual unit strategy and action. Suggests that at this stage the scorecard is best applied in business units and divisions with a well-defined strategy. Requires further testing and application in order to consider its wider approach.

Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. 1996. 'Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system'. *Harvard Business Review*, January/February.

This article explores the use of the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system. The essential argument is that companies started with the tool as a feedback process that goes beyond measuring financial performance. As they recognised the benefits of looking at the performance of the company as a whole, some companies have begun to use it for further strategic management. The key benefit is the link provided between long-term strategy and short-term actions.

Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. 1996a. 'Linking the balanced scorecard to strategy'. *California Management Review*, Vol. 39, No. 1, Fall.

This article reviews the application of the 'balanced scorecard'. It argues that integration of numbers of different types of performance measurement is key to allowing a company to accurately measure its performance. The article argues that the scorecard approach is not about development of organisational strategy, but rather translation of that strategy into operational measurements. Often this forces clarification and adjustment of that strategy to ensure shared meaning and effective implementation. Accurate strategy and accurate measurement by the scorecard allow for testing of the long-term visions and underlying hypothesis of the organisation.

Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. 1996b. 'Knowing the score'. *Financial Executive*, November/December.

This article looks at the application of the 'balanced scorecard'. It reviews the general application of the tool, stressing that it can be used to evaluate the usefulness of a myriad of initiatives and new ideas in a company. If initiatives do not contribute to essential scorecard measurements then they should be discarded. Alternatively, there needs to be careful investment in resources and long term planning to ensure that all scorecard measurements do have resources and initiatives directed towards them.

Kelly, L. Brown, A., Nichols, M. & Jones, J. 2001. 'Evaluation of the advocacy work of Community Aid Abroad'. Community Aid Abroad, Melbourne.

This study investigates the advocacy work undertaken by one International Non-Government Organisation, through three case studies of different campaigns undertaken by the organisation. The campaigns are examined in detail, using a range of data collection techniques, including interviews with target groups, extensive documentary review and information from all other stakeholders. The findings suggest that while the campaigns have led to change, they struggle with reasonable objective setting, suitable timeframes and from failure to effectively use all of the resources within the organisation. Advocacy is a major focus of the work of this organisation and this study is the basis for further review and development of this strategy in the organisation.

Kluvers, R. 1998. 'The development and use of performance indicators in Victorian local government'. *Accountability and Performance*, Vol. 4, No.2, 61-78.

This article presents the findings of research undertaken in local governments in Victoria, to examine the use and development of performance measurement. The research shows that few local governments are using performance indicators and those that are using them in a limited way. There is a reluctance to have external auditing of performance information which the author suggests may accord with a 'political' 'symbolic' or 'constitutive' model of performance assessment. In other words performance assessment which relates more to the external appearance of accountability rather than internal commitment to learning and improvement. Finally the method of implementation is important in effective performance assessment. Where staff were involved in developing the process they were more likely to cooperate and implement the process.

Latimore, G. 1997. 'The Twelve 'R's': an approach to leading and managing change'. Latimore & Associates Pty Ltd.

This monograph focuses on the issue of change management in organisations. It sets out a model of change that is intended to integrate and further develop existing organisational change models. The central thesis of the paper is that change is the very work of leadership itself and without effective change leadership, the costs of change are high. The model outlines twelve important aspects of leading and managing change.

Mayo, M.C. & Brown, G.S. 1999. 'Building a competitive business model', *Ivey Business Journal*, London, Mar/April.

This article argues that the traditional linear business improvement model is insufficient to explain or ensure effective change in an organisation. They propose a five-part model that seeks to integrate the four key components that create and sustain a competitive business.

First stage is sound assessment processes, based on reliable certification programs. The second is to measure employee satisfaction, as a valid and reliable measure of organisational performance. Third is to ensure that intermediary organisations are valuable to customers and that a relationship is sustained with them, which matches the overall values of the organisation. Fourthly there needs to be a measurement of customer satisfaction which links to the previous processes. The final step is an evaluation of the enterprise, based on financial and reputational measures.

The key to the model is linking the five areas and understanding that the same values and criteria must be used as measures at each step. Managers don't just look at the performance of their part of the organisation, but the way their performance contributes to the overall objectives and vision of the organisation.

Miller, A. 1998. *Strategic Management*, Third edition, Irwin McGraw-Hill, Boston.

This book is a text provided for students of strategic management in for-profit organisations. Of particular interest are chapter four and eleven. Chapter four focuses on internal analysis of an organisation, including discussion of what constitutes the resources of a company, how to identify what to assess, methods for assessing internal strengths and weakness and identification of appropriate comparison standards. Chapter eleven explores the notion of systems as 'implementation levers'. It looks at information, human, capital and control systems and their relationship to change and development in an organisation.

Miller, V. 1994. 'NGOs and grassroots policy influence: what is success?'. *IDR Reports*, Vol 11, No 5, Institute of Development Research, Boston.

This article draws on the experience of non-government organisations working for policy change and reform in the Philippines. It draws on the experience of five different advocacy and policy

change campaigns to examine the overall lessons. The author suggests that there are five overall lessons that can be drawn from the case studies. These relate to the nature and structure of coalitions and decision making bodies in campaigns, the way the issue is framed, the choice of strategies and tactics, the ways in which success is measured and the factors which helped determine success. In addition she raises three ongoing dilemmas for NGOs involved in policy change work. These include the choice of decision-making structures, the balance between professional expertise and grassroots empowerment and the focus on short-term achievements or long term structural change. She concludes that the most successful examples were those that understood their role as achieving policy change as well as increasing democratic space and building civil society. They were also able to combine short-term objectives within a long-term framework and goals for major and transformational change. Finally they were able to be aware of and responsive to the particular political and social context of their operation, changing as necessary to suit the context.

Nankervis, A. L., Compton, R. L., & McCarthy, T. E. 1992. 'Management of performance'. In *Strategic Human Resource Management*, Nelson, South Melbourne, Chapter 11.

This chapter looks at systems of performance management for individuals within a company. It reviews various systems of individual performance management with information from Australian and international research to determine what each system has to offer. The authors stress that the more involved an individual is in developing and participating in their own appraisal the more they will own the outcomes.

Neilson, S. 2001. 'IDRC-supported research and its influence on public policy. knowledge utilisation and public policy processes: a literature review', IDRC Evaluation Unit, http://www.idrc.ca/evaluation/litreview_e.html

This article is a review of the relevant literature on policy-making processes for the purpose of establishing improved evaluation of research and documentation activities at International Development Research centre (IDRC). The article explores three key areas of policy process as highlighted in the literature. These include seven possible ways in which research can be 'useful', three definitions of 'research' and seven policy process models. The article also gives some attention to the application of the information from available literature to developing countries, generally concluding that the accepted definitions and models are inadequate to explain the processes occurring in these countries. The article establishes that overall the linear model of policy processes (which includes the incremental and interactive models) is insufficient to explain the real world of policy change. The author also reviews material which highlights the separation of the communities of social scientist and policy makers, suggesting that practical research which draws policy makers and decision makers into the research process is likely to be more influential than high quality research conducted in isolated form these people.

Newcomer, K. 1997a. 'Using performance measurement to improve programs'. In *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*, ed. K.E Newcomer. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 5-14.

This chapter provides an overview of the issues related to performance measurement in non-profit organisations. A key issues includes the focus of performance. As a socially constructed reality performance measurement can mean almost anything, but in this sector it tends to mean the immediate outcomes of an organisation. One dilemma includes the purpose of the performance measurement is it for learning or accountability, and can both purposes be satisfied through the same system? The complementary relationship between program evaluation and performance measurement is considered. The challenges to using performance measurement are reviewed. These particularly include adequate resourcing and political support to ensure that the measures are designed with adequate input from key stakeholders and sufficient technical expertise.

Ollif, C.E. 2001. Australian NGOs and advocacy. summary of responses'. Unpublished research, University of New England, School of Human and Environmental Studies.

This research in progress look at the experience of all non-Government Aid and Development organisations in Australia who are members of the umbrella body, the Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA). The research investigates which of the agencies are involved in a form of advocacy work and then explores their experience in regard to funding, staff and the emphasis of that work. The research indicates that more NGOs are becoming involved in advocacy work. It also shows that many have become involved via coalition with other organisations, most often around the theme of debt. Finally the research gives some attention to the relationship agencies have with the Australian Government Department, AusAID, suggesting that this has an influence upon the advocacy work of some organisations.

Plantz, M. C., Greenway, M. T. & Hendricks, M. 1997. 'Outcome measurement: showing results in the nonprofit sector'. In *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*, ed. K.E Newcomer. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 15-30.

This chapter looks at performance measurement specifically in the non-profit sector. It describes the development of performance measurement in this sector from focus on numerous variables to increasing interest in outcomes. It defines outcomes as changes in participants knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behaviour, condition or status. It discusses the cause/effect logic of outcomes and the difficulty of focusing upon outcome measurement which captures meaningful change but is not so far away from the causes under the control of the organisation, that the attribution of change becomes too difficult.

The chapter assesses and summarises the lessons learned from the non-profit sector about performance measurement.

Queensland Treasury.1997. 'Managing for Outcomes in Queensland', Strategic Financial Management Directorate of Queensland Treasury, July.
<http://www.treasury.qld.gov.au>

This document introduces the process of performance measurement and management by outcomes for the Queensland Government. This is a typical example of the outcome based management process common across Australian Government departments. Together with the companion documents in the series, it provides a step-by-step guideline for development of output and outcome measures for Government departments. It gives particular emphasis to the coordination of outcomes to meet the overall strategic direction of the State Government. It also looks to the development of performance targets and measures by which the government can track its outputs and allocate resources effectively.

Roche C. 1999. 'Impact assessment and advocacy'. in *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value Change*, Oxford, Oxfam, Chapter 6.

This chapter deals specifically with the assessment of change through advocacy interventions undertaken by International Non-Government Organisations. The author gives a step by step guide through the process of choosing appropriate focus, purpose, methodologies and the analysis processes for evaluation of advocacy work. The author suggests that advocacy interventions are not easily comparable and it is difficult to draw simple comparison or conclusions from one situation to the next. However he concludes with a number of general lessons which appear to arise from the experience of various organisations involved in advocacy work.

Rolph, P. 1999. 'The balanced scorecard: Get smart and get control', *Chief Executive*, New York, July/August.

This paper describes a management philosophy that draws information from all levels within an organisation, across measurements such as financials, customer loyalty, quality, revenue and employee knowledge to measure the health of the organisation as a snapshot type of presentation. The key assumption of the paper is that most companies fail to turn executive strategy into action.

Essentially, the paper is advertising an electronic version of the scorecard and does not describe the product in detail.

Stone, D., Maxwell, S. & Keating, M. 2001. Bridging Research and Policy. Background paper prepared for an international workshop, Warwick University, July.

This paper explores the relationship between research and policy, specifically about how research impacts upon policy. The paper reviews how policy is constructed, rejecting a simple linear model as unrelated to the complex and unpredictable processes which actually take place in policy development. The authors then review challenges facing policy makers and researchers and suggest some new ways to extend the relevance of both to the other. They conclude that the impact of research is uncertain and contingent on social and political context.

Sutton, R. 1999. 'The policy process: an overview'. Working Papers, No. 118, Overseas Development Institute, London.

This paper is a review of the policy process drawing upon the key ideas from the five disciplines of political science, sociology, anthropology, international relations and management. The central theme of the paper is that the simple linear model of policy development, dependent upon rational and objective analysis of evidence and separated from policy implementation, is inadequate to describe reality. Rather the policy process is understood to be neither logical nor simple and dominated by discourses and narratives which favour the views and interests of the elites. The review provides a very useful glossary of terms and explanation of approaches to policy development from the different disciplines. It also provides some suggestions about ways to counter the dominant policy discourses and the trend towards limitation and simplification of the policy options.

Van de Vliet, A. 1997. 'Are they being served?' *Management Today*, London, February.

This article looks at measurement of customer satisfaction. Argues that customer satisfaction is a key indicator of organisational performance and that companies who do not satisfy their customers will lose them. The formula for measuring this satisfaction is to capture the areas that are important to customers, formulate these into key performance measurements and measure achievements over time. The author notes that there are two distinct objectives in the measurements undertaken with customers: The first is to understand what is important to them and the second to understand how the company is achieving in that area.

Whipps, M. 2000. Using the balanced scorecard to make strategy happen. Presentation to the Leadership and Communications Skills Workshop, 12 May.

This is a power point presentation of key points from 'balanced scorecard' approach.

Wholey, J. S. & Newcomer, K. E. 1997. 'Clarifying goals, reporting results'. In *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*, ed. K.E Newcomer. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 91-98.

This chapter looks at the relationship between evaluation and performance measurement, specifically suggesting that evaluators have much to offer the development of effective performance measurement. The authors suggest that evaluation has been under-utilised in recent years. At the same time there has been a rising interest in performance measurement.

There are certain lessons that can be learned from the experience of performance measurement in Government agencies. These include: the need for top leadership support, commitment of resources, personal involvement of senior line management, participation of relevant stakeholders in the designing of measures as well as technical assistance in the area and clarity about the use of the performance data in order not to inhibit performance itself. Evaluators can utilise their experience and skills to assist further development of performance measurement and can also contribute to increased knowledge through additional processes.

Willard, T. 2001. 'Dating the decision-makers: moving from communications to engagement', IISD. <http://www.iisd.org/networks/research.asp>

This article, one of a series undertaken on the operations of knowledge networks, examines the processes of engagement and communications with decision-makers. According to the author, it is critical to understand that it is easier to leverage relationships to create behavior change than to leverage information. Relationships are at the centre of all communications. However the author argues that many human service organisations and civil society networks have not learned how to plan and implement a strategy of engagement with decision-makers and others who are unlike themselves. The article draws from marketing, fundraising and social psychology areas to outline a process for engagement strategies, identifying the skills, processes and the particular information methodologies that are required for successful engagement.

Willyerd, K. A. (1997), 'Balancing your evaluation act', *Training*, Minneapolis, March.

This article examines the performance measurement tool known as the 'balanced scorecard'. The balanced scorecard tracks key element of the company's strategy using both financial and operational measures. The key issue is to look for indicators of future financial performance rather than focusing upon immediate return on investment. Short-sighted solutions are abandoned in favour of broader integrated performance that will lead to overall company strength. Charting performance is undertaken across a number of agreed areas which link to organisational vision and key strategies and operations.

'Performance monitoring and evaluation'.
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/r4workshop/MONITOR8/sld001.htm>

This summary of workshop slides from USAID outlines the process of performance monitoring and evaluation. It links performance monitoring plans and performance indicators. It provides criteria for indicators and advice about data collection. It gives a brief introduction to evaluation and its links to performance monitoring.

'Introduction to the balanced scorecard. underlying principles -why the scorecard works'.
<http://www.balancedscorecard.com.au/principles.html>

This article about the 'balanced scorecard' looks at the underlying principles of the scorecard approach. These include agreement about the cause and effect relationships between key strategies and desired outcomes; a balance of perspectives between financial and other measures; using measurement to focus on behavior change; and regular review and response.

'Using the balanced scorecard. 1. getting started and design',
<http://www.balancedscorecard.co.au/starting.html>

The article outlines the generic steps in the design of a 'balanced scorecard'.

'Balanced scorecard',
<http://homepages.tig.com.au/~bma/balscore.html>

This article gives a concise overview of the principles and application of the 'balanced scorecard' approach to performance measurement. The approach converts an organisation's vision and strategies into a comprehensive set of performance and action measures that provide a basis for strategic measurement and management systems. It is different to traditional performance measurement because it usually identifies new processes that a company must excel at in order to meet customer and financial objectives. It also incorporates innovation processes. The process is usually applied to a business unit.

Organisation Performance Management reports/systems

World Vision

Introduction to the ADP Ministry Standards Framework, August 2001.

ADP Ministry Standard on Social Sustainability, August 2001.

ADP Ministry Standard on Community Participation, August 2001.

FY 01 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) International and Indigenous Programs, World Vision Australia.

Amnesty International Australia

Priorities for the Year 2001

Section Wide targets for 2001.

Australian Sports Drug Agency

1995-1997 Strategic Plan, Key Performance Indicators and Targets.

The North-South Institute

The NSI Performance Measurement Framework, 2000-2002.

The Foundation for Development Cooperation

Schedule of Performance Measures by Goal.