



VALUING RESPECT

— BY **Shift** —

STAKEHOLDER VOICE

Learning from Affected Stakeholders to Better Evaluate Program Effectiveness
and Outcomes

BY JANA MUDRONOVA



About Valuing Respect

Valuing Respect is a global collaborative platform, led by Shift, to research and co-create better ways of evaluating business respect for human rights. Our aim is to develop tools and insights that can help both companies and their stakeholders focus their resources on actions that effectively improve outcomes for people.

Learn more: valuingrespect.org

About Shift

Shift is the leading center of expertise on the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Shift's global team facilitates dialogue, builds capacity and develops new approaches with companies, government, civil society organizations and international institutions to bring about a world in which business gets done with respect for people's fundamental welfare and dignity. Shift is a non-profit, mission-driven organization.

Visit: shiftproject.org Follow us at [@shiftproject](https://twitter.com/shiftproject)

© Shift Project, Ltd. 2019



Introduction

An increasing number of companies, investors and civil society organisations have expressed the need to better evaluate the effectiveness of company efforts to mitigate adverse human rights impacts in terms of outcomes for affected stakeholders. This paper focuses on ways to involve “stakeholder voice” in that evaluation, by which we mean the experiences, perspectives and insights of *affected* stakeholders. These are stakeholders who are affected by companies’ operations and business relationships, and can include community members, workers and consumers.

The *UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights* (UNGPs) state that a company should track its efforts to respect human rights noting that “Tracking is necessary in order for a business enterprise to know if its human rights policies are being implemented optimally, whether it has responded effectively to the identified human rights impacts, and to drive continuous improvement.” The UNGPs state that tracking should “(a) Be based on appropriate qualitative and quantitative indicators; (b) *Draw on feedback from both internal and external sources, including affected stakeholders.*” (emphasis added)

This paper contributes to the latter point by focusing on the role of the stakeholder voice in tracking business efforts to mitigate human rights risks effectively. The reason for our emphasis is the fact that many companies already collect information about resources, inputs, progress and scope of interventions but struggle to find reliable data at scale regarding effects of their interventions on intended beneficiaries. This represents a gap in company efforts to track effectiveness of their work.

Based on our research on evaluation theory and practice, as well as emerging innovative practice in the field, we offer three propositions in this paper:

- **Proposition One:** New approaches to incorporate the stakeholder voice should build on the principles of *participatory evaluation*. Among other benefits, this will minimise affected stakeholders being seen solely as *sources from which a company extracts data*.
- **Proposition Two:** Identifying how to involve stakeholder voice in understanding outcomes of company efforts to respect human rights can be done with reference to the steps in a standard evaluation process, i.e. evaluation design, data collection, analysis and synthesis, communication and improvement.
- **Proposition Three:** There is already innovation taking place to engage stakeholders to understand outcomes for people; some in relation to evaluating business respect for human rights, and some that can be adapted to this challenge.

Proposition One

New approaches to incorporate stakeholder voice should build on the principles of participatory evaluation. Among other benefits, this will minimise affected stakeholders being seen solely as sources from which a company extracts data.

Evaluation can take different forms, using a variety of methods and tools. An entire discipline has emerged in response to calls for more evidence about program outcomes and inputs, alongside greater transparency in spending. This paper focuses on those evaluation frameworks that enrich our understanding of the effectiveness of business efforts in delivering positive outcomes for affected stakeholders, and which use stakeholder perspectives to do so.

Not every evaluation requires participants' involvement. However, with evaluation gaining a more prominent role in improving decision-making and increasing social impact, more attention has been given to the involvement of beneficiaries in evaluation. In this paper, we adopt the umbrella term "participatory approaches¹," for those frameworks which use stakeholder inputs to conduct evaluation.²

Stakeholder involvement in evaluation is a result of different motivations and objectives, which shape the degree of stakeholder participation, as depicted in the "Spectrum of Affected Stakeholder Participation" diagram³ below.



Integrating stakeholder perspectives in tracking companies' efforts to address human rights risks can have numerous benefits, including:

- Leading to more reliable, trusted and meaningful data;
- Expanding company understanding of the outcomes and *relevance* of its efforts by engaging beneficiaries of its interventions directly;
- Increasing trust between the company and affected stakeholders;

¹ Some refer to these approaches as participant-centered or stakeholder-centered approaches.

² Fitzpatrick, J., J.R. Sanders and B.R. Worthen (2011). Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches. (4th edition). Pearson.

³ For detailed discussion on the topic see, for example, Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': Models, meanings and practices, Community Development Journal, 43 (3), pp. 269- 283.



- Enhancing accountability and transparency;
- Serving as a demonstration of a company's commitment to better outcomes for people; Empowering and building capacity and knowledge among affected stakeholders.

Participatory approaches are not about a single method but stress the need to undertake evaluation that is meaningful to stakeholders affected by an evaluated intervention.⁴ A good participatory evaluation should include the following ingredients:

- Active involvement and inclusion of multiple and diverse stakeholders. This includes disadvantaged and marginalised groups, such as women and youth.⁵
- Valuing stakeholder knowledge, insights, subjectivity and experiences, including giving them the same weight as quantitative data.
- Providing opportunity for participants to shape the evaluation process and outcomes. This creates a collaborative process and a space for mutual learning.
- Being adaptable and flexible. The evaluation process should evolve by incorporating lessons learned and recommendations made during the process.
- Empowering and capacitating affected stakeholders. This can take the form of sharing skills, technology and knowledge with participants through training and workshops, allowing participants to use acquired capacity beyond evaluation. For example, to further improve the intervention, on-going monitoring or for future evaluation.
- Recognizing the value of the *process* of engagement, not just the findings of evaluation.
- Sharing conclusions and actions taken based on evaluation with affected stakeholders.

Engaging stakeholder voice in evaluating outcomes should not be done to the detriment of legitimate, rights-compatible and trusted intermediaries, such as workers organizations or local organisations/structures. Rather, this should be considered as complementary to such efforts and will likely be most successful when partnering with such actors to meaningfully involve stakeholder voice in any evaluative exercise.

Proposition Two

Identifying how to involve stakeholder voice in understanding outcomes of company efforts to respect human rights can be done with reference to the steps in a standard evaluation process (i.e. evaluation design, data collection, analysis and synthesis, communication and improvement).

To put stakeholder voice into practice, companies and their stakeholders can start by thinking about how to incorporate stakeholder perspectives into different stages of an evaluation process. This section explores what such evaluation looks like in practice, focusing on how to maximise stakeholder voice in each stage of the

⁴ Guijt, I. (2014). Participatory Approaches. Methodological Briefs, Impact Evaluation no. 5. UNICEF.

⁵ Mark, M. and G. Henry (2013). Multiple Routes: Evaluation, Assisted Sensemaking and Pathways to Betterment, in Alkin, M. (eds.) 'Evaluation Roots: A Wider Perspective of Theorists Views and Influences.' Sage Publishers. 2nd Edition.

process.⁶ Regardless of the approach chosen for the evaluation, the process consists of five phases shown in the table below.

Evaluation Phase	Description
Phase One Evaluation design	Basic parameters of evaluation are determined and include defining: The Purpose, object and scope of evaluation; Evaluation questions, criteria and indicators; Audience; Required data, data sources and data collection methods; Evaluation plan, budget and deciding who conducts the evaluation.
Phase Two Data collection	Based on the design, appropriate methods and tools are put in place to collect data.
Phase Three Data analysis and synthesis	Collected data are subsequently organised, interpreted and analyzed, taking into consideration target audience, analytical techniques and tools available. Data synthesis includes drawing conclusions and formulating findings.
Phase Four Communicating findings	The formulation of evaluation findings can include: reporting to external and internal stakeholders and, importantly, to participants of evaluation; making recommendations and formulating learnings.
Phase Five Using findings to make informed decisions	Putting learnings and recommendations into action, including: developing an improvement plan, designing and implementing improved intervention, and using learnings for streamlining future evaluation efforts.

Phase 1: Designing evaluation

Evaluation design, including the evaluation object (what we evaluate), aims (why we evaluate) and audience (for whom we evaluate), is the core of the evaluation process. It determines the rest of the evaluation process, underlines an evaluation approach and shapes the type of evaluation used, and its methods and tools. The evaluation plan formulated in this phase includes information about data collection methods, tools and sources of data.

Affected stakeholders can contribute to this planning phase through collaborative design. An evaluator can conduct initial stakeholder assessment, which identifies the most relevant stakeholders who can take part in scoping (i.e. determining the scope, object and broad terms of the evaluation process). They can also participate

⁶ It is not our objective to present a comprehensive tool for evaluation in this paper, but to highlight how evaluation of company's interventions can benefit from stakeholder insights.



in inception and planning workshops.⁷ Such collaborative design, or “co-design” can help define the boundaries of evaluation, by better understanding which program components are most relevant to affected stakeholders. Additional participation can take place in:

- Formulating questions;
- Designing indicators;
- Designing and testing data collection tools.

By including intervention beneficiaries, the purpose is to collectively decide the focus of evaluation, the type of desired data and intended use of findings.⁸ When it is difficult to include all affected stakeholders, community representatives, locally-trusted NGOs, trade unions or worker organisations can play an intermediary or even representative role.

Incorporating affected stakeholders in evaluation design can also increase their interest in the evaluation itself. Organisations often rely on providing incentives to participate, which can improve the response rate. However, this also has significant ethical challenges, as well as challenges to data reliability, integrity and accuracy.

Phase 2: Data collection

The time and resources designated to this evaluation phase are determined by the questions the evaluation aims to answer, existing data (collected through periodic monitoring such as audits or visits) and its quality, the complexity of the intervention or program being evaluated and the chosen methods.

For evaluation to avoid becoming a mere data collection exercise, data needs to be gathered purposefully and with clarity on how it contributes to answering the evaluation questions.

Evaluators use different tools to obtain data. Qualitative data can be obtained through the review of existing records or through conducting interviews, surveys, questionnaires, focus groups and observations. Some of these instruments require in-person presence in the field in affected communities or workplaces. Some can be applied through the use of technology. Real-time data collection can reduce time and resource commitment. The proliferation of innovative solutions in recent years has reduced previous limitations of qualitative data collection, including scalability and replicability. On the other hand, quantitative data can be obtained from various financial records, statistical data collected by third parties, publicly available records, surveys, questionnaires, tests and assessments.

It is common for evaluation to include affected stakeholders in this phase of evaluation. Surveys, interviews and questionnaires are often conducted among community members, workers or other beneficiaries of a company's efforts. Companies often rely on affected stakeholders to provide information about human rights violations as part of legal or technical due diligence processes, audits or other periodic assessments. However, these provide companies and practitioners with limited, snapshot-like information about incidents at a specific time. In contrast, systematically collected data using participatory monitoring technologies and methods can improve real-time tracking, and reduce the prevalent need to conduct snapshot data collection in the field.

⁷ Guijt, I. (2014)

⁸ MacDonald, N. and N. Simister (2015). Outcome Mapping. Intac.



The choice of a data collection technique itself affects stakeholder participation. In order to remove barriers between participants and field workers when collecting data in-person, a team should be trained in local language, customs and circumstances. On the other hand, using technology, which might not be adapted to local conditions (for example language, knowledge and skills) and which might not take into consideration participants' needs (for example cost, time, travel requirements, anonymity), can prevent stakeholders from sharing their insights.⁹

Phase 3: Data analysis and synthesis

Collected information needs to be analyzed. Appropriate methods help an evaluation team, a company and stakeholders to make sense of the data. Even though data analysis methods are decided in the design phase of the evaluation process, the actual data collected in step 2 might lend themselves to a different method than anticipated.

There are different methods to analyze data. Some are more appropriate for understanding qualitative data rather than quantitative data; others are more suitable for exploring causality between outcomes and efforts, or deciding which factors contribute to observed outcomes. For example,

- Collected stories can be analyzed using the Most Significant Change method or Sense Making. A more in-depth depiction of changes to people's lives can be better described by using case studies.
- Quantitative data can be analyzed using different statistical methods.
- Descriptive statistics can help summarize data, while more advanced analytical methods can shed light on correlations and significant differences between those affected by the intervention and those not.

To illustrate this point, we summarize selected evaluation methods in a table in Annex A. These methods can be used separately or in combination with each other or other methods.

Participatory data analysis can take different forms. Techniques have been developed to allow stakeholders to interpret time series data revealing changes over time, as well as to identify changes of the biggest significance to them. A key value of involving stakeholders in data analysis is that they are well placed to identify causal, not just correlative, links between program activities and changes in their daily lives. This is because they can better discern which of the numerous life changes are the result of the program versus other factors independent of the program.

Data synthesis is a key process in which data are approached systematically in a way that reflects evaluation questions and objectives, and helps the evaluator to reach justifiable conclusions. The objective of synthesis is to converge information into bottom-line judgments, which make interpretations of collected data and facilitate decision making.¹⁰ Stakeholder voices can be brought in through convening consensus workshops, conferences or less formal gatherings, in which agreement about conclusions and findings is sought. Asking participants to rank (or organise) conclusions gives them chance to express the importance of some findings over others. Joint,

⁹ For example, Estrella, M. et al. (eds.) (2001). Learning From Change: Issues and Experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation. Ottawa: ITDG Publishing.

¹⁰Stufflebeam and Coryn (2014).



collaborative decision-making strengthens participants' involvement in the evaluation process and helps to achieve common understanding of data among stakeholders.¹¹

Real-time data collection solutions often include data analysis and synthesis tools, which allow for immediate data aggregation and interpretation, making the data analysis step of the process more efficient, both in terms of time and resources.

Step 4: Communicating findings

Depending on the intended use of the evaluation, communicated findings can include external/internal reporting, making recommendations and formulating learnings, and developing a plan for further improvement. Regardless of the external reporting obligations, findings should be communicated to those participants who contributed to the evaluation process. Presenting findings back to communities, workers or consumers contributes to building trust and is a sign of meaningful stakeholder engagement. Different reporting styles and formats can be chosen for different audiences. Stakeholders can also be consulted on draft reports, which allows for the incorporation of their inputs into a final output.¹² Findings should be shared in usable formats, such as recommendations, lessons and reflections, which ultimately allows greater usability of collected information and conclusions.

Step 5: Using findings to make informed decisions

The purpose of evaluation is to better understand which parts of the intervention work and which do not. The ultimate goal is to improve program design and implementation in order to deliver better outcomes for affected stakeholders. For this reason, the company and others responsible for the evaluated intervention should be prepared to make changes depending on evaluation findings. For learnings to be effective, they need to be put into action.

Recommendations for improvement should be discussed and agreed, starting with the team(s) directly responsible for the intervention and evaluation, and gradually broadening the discussion to other relevant parts of the company. An improvement plan should incorporate proposed changes, a revised theory of change, activity plan, timelines and other revised elements. Importantly, it should also include ways of incorporating stakeholders into design and implementation of the revised intervention.

Apart from improving the existing intervention, evaluation findings can be used to facilitate future evaluation of other efforts by the company to mitigate human rights risks. This can be done in two ways. First, evaluation can build skills and capacity within a company to not only continue improving interventions but also to conduct future evaluations. Second, learning from stakeholder voice in one evaluation can offer macro organisational learnings, which can be used to inform the design or improvement of other analogous programs in the company. In some instances, it may be justifiable to use stakeholder voice data from a conducted evaluation as an input into other evaluations and interventions.

¹¹ Public Profit (2016). *Dabbling in the Data. A hands-on guide to participatory data analysis.* Public Profit. Oakland, CA.

¹² Based on Stufflebeam, D. and C. Coryn (2014). *Evaluation Theory, Models and Applications.* Jossey-Bass. 2nd edition.



To sum up, companies can improve the way in which they engage with stakeholders for the purposes of evaluating their human rights interventions. There is no one prescriptive way a company should include experiences of affected stakeholders. Stakeholders can be included in all or selected stages of an evaluation process, and different levels of participation can be designed, supported by a variety of methods and techniques.

Proposition Three

There is innovation taking place to engage stakeholder voices to understand outcomes for people; some in relation to evaluating business respect for human rights, and some that can be adapted to this challenge.

As a part of our landscaping, we identified several instruments and methodologies used to access stakeholder experiences using international development or customer satisfaction principles. These innovations have not all been developed specifically for evaluation purposes, but are used for reporting, compliance and monitoring. Nor have they all been applied to the challenge of evaluating business respect for human rights. Here, we highlight the following examples:

- The **Most Significant Change** (MSC) method applied to Agricultural Labor Practices (Verite and PMI);
- Using **Sense Maker** to measure aspects of decent work beyond typical compliance metrics (Oxfam);
- Deploying **Field-Level Monitoring Systems** by engaging sugar out-growers in bottom-up indicator design and collection (TMP and Bonsucro);
- Evaluating the **quality of company-community relationships** in mining in South Africa (Gold Fields and Synergy);
- Linking **worker wellbeing** with increased productivity and profit (Impactt);
- Integrating community concerns through digital technology (Ulula);
- Using insights from the customer satisfaction field to collect feedback data from affected stakeholders (**Constituent Voice** by Keystone Accountability);
- Democratizing monitoring and enforcement with an integrated reporting and monitoring system (Timby);
- Monitoring worker experiences for better satisfaction and productivity.

As part of the Valuing Respect project we will continue to gather and profile innovations. By briefly profiling these examples, we intend to highlight workable solutions which could: a) be adapted and applied by companies (individually or in concert with peers) to better understand outcomes from their efforts to respect human rights; and b) inform principles or guidance for how to effectively, legitimately and appropriately engage affected stakeholders in evaluating programs and outcomes.



The Most Significant Change (MSC) method applied to Agricultural Labor Practices [Verité and Philip Morris International]¹³. The MSC method is a way to interrogate a program by asking stakeholders to describe, in their own words, which changes resulting from the program have had the greatest impact on their lives, mindsets and perspectives. In March 2018, Verité piloted this technique in collaboration with Philip Morris International (PMI) and two PMI suppliers in a small community in Malawi, where PMI's [Agricultural Labor Practices \(ALP\) program](#) has been implemented intensively for several years. This participatory evaluation methodology was designed to make sense of farmer and farm workers experiences in the form of stories. In the interviews, farmers and farm workers were asked to reflect on impacts the ALP program had on their lives. The most significant impacts were then selected by a focus group consisting of interview participants, evaluators and other relevant stakeholders.

The following paragraph written by Elizabeth Garland, a Senior Director at Verité describes the work:

“The scribes were recruited independently from a local language institute and trained by Verité, and interviews were conducted with farmers and farm workers in the local language (Chichewa). The participants were asked simply to reflect on the biggest impact – either positive or negative – that the ALP program has had on them. The farms were selected by the suppliers, however no one from the suppliers was present during the interviews, and responses were anonymized to protect the farmers’ and workers’ confidentiality. The narratives generated through the exercise powerfully brought to life impacts of the ALP program in the voices of real people – at least within this select and admittedly unrepresentative group of farms.”

The MSC method complemented the existing Philip Morris’ extensive field-level data collection system, which monitors management practices, environmental conditions and people-related issues at tobacco-growing farms across 30 countries. Data is collected by trained field technicians, who regularly visit farms to report on farming conditions and compliance with the ALP. While this systematic monitoring contributes to large-scale data collection and to tracking of major trends, employing the MSC method facilitated an in-depth inquiry into “unknowns” identified through the systematic field-level monitoring.

Using Sense Maker to measure aspects of decent work and gender beyond typical compliance metrics [Oxfam]¹⁴: Sensemaker is both a technique and a tool used to collect and interpret stories (or “micro-narratives”) from workers. Affected stakeholders are encouraged to share their insights in response to an open-ended question. After recording their experience, they are asked a series of interpretative questions, which help evaluators unpack the experience and focus on specific concepts or aspects of the story. Based on their experience of testing this approach with female workers in an agricultural context, Oxfam note:

“SenseMaker can complement in-depth case studies by uncovering generalizable insights. It also complements surveys that can illustrate changes in easily quantifiable indicators, but that are often unable to explain underlying values, causal mechanisms and norms. Capturing a large number of experiences is crucial – a minimum of 200 stories offers a basic level of confidence in stronger trends. An increased sample size boosts this confidence exponentially. The patterns revealed through SenseMaker show which experiences are typical and which are anomalous. It allows users to confidently put forward specific narratives as illustrations of a strong pattern at a

¹³ <https://www.verite.org/verite-pilots-participatory-impact-evaluation-technique/>

¹⁴ <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620476/rr-decent-work-sensemaker-310518-en.pdf;jsessionid=8328C913969BCE54F166CC10F2830A36?sequence=1>



scale that goes beyond anecdotes. Therefore, this method serves as a methodological bridge between large-scale quantitative surveys and small-scale qualitative research”.

With respect to decent work, SenseMaker helped to understand three kinds of information:

- “Known knowns” or variables which are absolutely necessary in order to see how the intervention is delivering compare to targets (for example, number of workers with documentation, a log of overtime hours). These can be tracked using multiple choice questions, which would be quick and simple to answer.
- “Known unknowns” or information which is important but difficult to understand in terms of causes and effects. For examples, dignity or safety considerations important to female workers that go beyond narrowly-defined health and safety concerns in the workplace (e.g. relationship between transport to and from work and workers’ dignity). Instruments such as triads and stones allowed participants to express the relationship between multiple elements and factors, such as wage, job security and dignity, and give nuance to yes/no answers.
- “Unknown unknowns” are the most difficult to track. These are unintended and unanticipated aspects, relationships or dynamics, which are not captured by existing assumptions and hypotheses, but which can shed a new light on what matters to affected stakeholders. By recording stories, SenseMaker encourages participants to share diverse experiences, which do not follow a prescribed pattern. For example, participants have an opportunity to record answers outside the multiple-choice answers (by choosing “other” and elaborating). Moreover, desegregating the outlier answers can also help practitioners notice unpredicted patterns.

Overall, SenseMaker is a valuable tool to unpack concepts which are difficult to grasp unless they are expressed in context. For example, “dignity” is better captured through stories told by workers than a two-dimensional yes/no question. In addition, by disaggregating responses and cross-referencing them, SenseMaker offers a more nuanced analysis by helping to validate or challenge practitioners’ hypotheses, deepening insights and questioning assumptions.

Deploying Field-Level Monitoring Systems by engaging sugar out-growers in bottom-up indicator design and collection (TMP and Bonsucro). Bonsucro, a leading international non-profit organization promoting sustainable sugar cane, partnered with TMP Systems to develop better data collection and management for farms and mills. The field-level monitoring system tracks performance against selected environmental, social and economic indicators using data self-reported by smallholder farmers and millers. Smallholders participate in designing these indicators, which in turn ensures their participation in the monitoring system. In practice, this combination of different indicators means that, in addition to tracking data relevant to downstream producers and Bonsucro, farmers and millers also record information important to them. Self-reporting is done through Android mobile devices, and includes tracking information regarding inputs, pest and disease management, among others. Collected data is subsequently centralised and analyzed, showing trends in real time as opposed to data collected on an infrequent, ad hoc basis. The project was piloted in several Sub-Saharan African countries, including South Africa, Malawi and Mozambique.



Evaluating the quality of company-community relationships in mining in South Africa (Gold Fields and Synergy). In South Africa, Gold Fields faced challenging relationships with local communities adjacent to their mining operations. The relationship was characterized by mutual distrust and discontent, underlined by the complicated history of mining in the country. In order to improve the relationship, the company, with the support of Synergy, applied the ICMM’s Understanding Company-Community Relations Toolkit.¹⁵ In this approach, the quality of the relationship is considered as a leading indicator of outcomes for communities. Using questionnaires, focus groups and interviews, the methodology evaluates the quality of company-community relationships as a leading indicator of outcomes for communities. This is measured through a score in four relationship indicators (respect, trust, legitimacy and compatibility of interests), and three contextual indicators (reputational context, equity & social capital considerations and socio-political and governance context).

A collaborative and trusted environment created in partnership with additional stakeholders (such as local government, trusted non-governmental and community organisations) underpinned this complex evaluative exercise. These efforts were complemented by the advocacy work of a local NGO, the Federation for a Sustainable Environment, which played a crucial role in empowering local communities in voicing their concerns and building mutual understanding between the company and communities.

The evaluation project itself had three outcomes. First, tracking the overall score overtime gave the company an opportunity to measure and evaluate which aspects of the relationship improved, and which needed additional emphasis. Second, insights from the large amount of collected data informed organisational changes in the company itself. Policies, internal procedures and practices were shaped by the evaluation findings, including ways communication is conducted and how community relations are internally managed. Third, by creating an environment in which community opinions were actively sought, listened to and their concerns acknowledged, the evaluation process itself contributed to improved company-community relationships.

Linking worker wellbeing with increased productivity and profit by Impactt. Impactt focuses on assessing working conditions in garment, food and beverage supply chains and argues that improved labor conditions (not only pay) can directly lead to higher productivity for purchasers and supplier businesses while delivering better outcomes for workers. Impactt’s multidimensional work includes identification of crucial factors determining workers wellbeing and increasing job satisfaction while improving business KPIs. Some of Impactt’s project includes in-factory training focused on “re-humanizing” employees in the garment sector in India and Bangladesh, community-based life skills training for female workers in Bangladesh and a child workers remediation program. By correlating worker wellbeing indicators with business performance data collected by factories, Impactt found that better understanding of workers needs and aspirations can reduce absenteeism, build a stable, satisfied and productive workforce and lead to greater efficiency and a better-quality product.

In addition, Impactt created a worker impact assessment tool, the Worker Wellbeing Index. The worker-centric tool measures worker satisfaction and job quality by focusing on three dimensions of worker wellbeing: safety, respect at work and sense of income security. The tool includes a survey distilling the three dimensions into a small set of core questions that can be carried out using mobile phone technology or in-person interviewers, and can be administered on the back of existing audits. Aggregate scores can be analyzed further by a combination of in-

¹⁵ ICMM stands for International Council on Mining and Metals, the tooling can be found <https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/publications/mining-and-communities/understanding-company-community-relations-toolkit>



depth interviews, focus groups, additional questionnaires and site visits. Tracking the change over time can help a buyer and a supplier monitor improvements and benchmark its performance across the industry.¹⁶

Integrating community concerns through digital technology (Ulula). Ulula offers solutions to connect companies with affected stakeholders via a real-time stakeholder engagement platform, including surveys, feedback, broadcasts and data analysis.

The platform can be used to monitor supply chain relationships with communities, to assess risks of operational disruptions and increase business performance. Workers and communities can use the communication channel to report incidents and abuses, receive relevant updates, and get feedback from companies on interventions.

In the extractive sector, companies use Ulula to replace periodic perception surveys and social impact assessments, which have limited usefulness due to their one-off nature. The tool can be used for conducting mobile surveys which break down relevant aspects of mine-community relationships to brief questionnaires, easily accessible by community members. Stakeholders can be incentivised to fill in the surveys through airtime or vouchers ensuring a broader participation rate. Similarly, the platform can be used as a grievance mechanism to monitor health and safety issues, such as levels of dust and noise, and to report other concerns. An integrated dashboard allows a company to analyze data promptly and to update a community on the state of disputes and claims. On the other hand, a company can measure the time it takes to resolve a grievance, satisfaction with the resolution and number of recurring grievances.

In addition to continuous, data-driven monitoring of labor force safety and satisfaction, social license to operate and transparency in supply chains, Ulula's innovation can also be used for evaluative purposes to measure impact and effectiveness of a company's interventions at scale and in real time.

Using insights from the customer satisfaction field to collect feedback data from affected stakeholders (Constituent Voice by Keystone Accountability). Keystone Accountability's tool **Constituent Voice** collects data from stakeholders using the customer satisfaction approach to evaluation. The tool combines light touch data with more in-depth follow-up data collection methods. First, simple micro-surveys are used to get a quick 'pulse check' on stakeholder insights. These can be subsequently complemented by occasional in-depth interviews, questionnaires or focus groups to better understand collected data. Engagement with stakeholders is therefore understood as a deliberate process informed by frequent but simple "light touch data" rather than an untargeted must-do attitude.

In the customer service industry, customer loyalty is considered to be an accurate predictor of profits, shareholder value and growth. Measured through a net promoter score, the method highlights the importance of people's experiences in their decision-making. Building on these insights, Constituent Voice attempts to find correlations between stakeholder experiences measured via real time perceptual data and later occurring outcomes. For example, one Keystone client found that "promoters" (those stakeholders who are very likely to recommend the intervention to their friends/relatives) are twice as likely to achieve intended outcome as those with much lower

¹⁶ Worker Wellbeing Assessment, available from <https://www.sedexglobal.com/download-the-worker-wellbeing-assessment-guidance/>



buy-in. Therefore, by asking short, targeted questions regularly an organisation can identify those who are on track to achieve desired outcomes in the future and those who require additional support.¹⁷

Constituent Voice can have a wide range of use for evaluation purposes. In a non-profit sector, the US-based NGO Lift used Constituent Voice to test its theory of change. Following meetings with the organisation's staff, participants answered surveys on iPads. Collected data were subsequently used to assess which elements of the program affected stakeholders valued the most, and which are correlated with the greatest success for the program participants. Additional data analysis has been designed to develop a predictive indicator, which would identify which participants are likely to improve their outcomes, helping Lift to target their intervention more effectively.¹⁸

Another example is evaluating which outcomes can be observed in medium to long-term periods. By asking the right questions now, the tool can design relevant predictive indicators determining interest, use and relationships necessary for achieving outcomes in the future. Additional in-person engagement with affected stakeholders, such as community focus groups or workers workshops, can help a company to share information, validate and further discuss findings from feedback surveys.

Similarly, Constituent Voice can be incorporated into a company's evaluation framework, meaning that a company can rely on data collected regularly via Constituent Voice for evaluative purposes rather than needing to collect new data. This way, the tool complements monitoring with evaluation. The data can also strengthen knowledge-building, which can be used for more collaborative actions among peers and across the industry.

Democratizing monitoring and enforcement with an integrated reporting and monitoring system (Timby).

A multi-purpose mobile phone application and analytical tool developed by Timby is used in different sectors for evidence-based reporting. Affected stakeholders can use the application to record voice, video or photos, which are automatically stamped with location and time information, and synchronised with a web dashboard controlled by trusted actors (a company, a local or international NGO, community leaders etc.). Reports can be subsequently tagged to allow easy tracking and search. The dashboard serves to collect the data, triangulate and analyze them. If used to record grievances, the dashboard can be used to track resolution, to communicate updates and to report satisfaction.

Real-time reporting facilitated holding companies and governments to account in issues such as land tenure, documenting evictions and resettlement, documenting the delivery of corporate social responsibility commitments, recording legal documentation, community meetings and negotiations with companies, reporting impacts of health interventions and environmental conservation.

In collaboration with the Centre for Transparency and Accountability in Liberia, Timby's tool was used by women to record how land corruption affects their lives. Communities in proximity to palm oil farms and extractive industries received training in how to use the app, how to record their stories and evidence. Women shared photos, videos and recordings of encroachment of palm oil company's operations onto community's land, incidents and conflicts with security staff and security trainings conducted by a company.¹⁹ Communities also recorded evidence on negative impacts of extractive operations on their health and quality of life.

¹⁷ Keystone Accountability (2014) 'Constituent Voice: Technical Note.' Version 1.1. September 2014

¹⁸ <https://keystoneaccountability.org/2017/06/26/using-client-feedback-to-test-a-theory-of-change/>

¹⁹ <https://timby.org/2018/04/13/The-impact-of-extraction-in-Liberia.html>



Monitoring worker experiences for better satisfaction and productivity.²⁰ Numerous worker voice innovations have been developed to report insights from workers in supply chains. In general, they combine real-time data collection with ways to engage with affected stakeholders by creating a two-way communication channel. Companies can communicate with their workforce and send messages addressing different human rights issues, such as working conditions, health and safety, gender violence and discrimination. From the perspective of workers, on the other hand, these platforms create opportunities to voice their experiences and concerns and to report human rights violations. Apart from serving as an early warning mechanism, some of these platforms also allow companies to collect additional feedback through once-off (or more periodic) surveys, targeting a selected group of workers (for example, women). These innovations tend to work better in a factory setting, in which the workforce is relatively stable and concentrated. In such instances, data collected through worker voice applications can help identify issues and monitor risk. In order to explain complex relations and unanticipated links for our evaluative purposes, an additional inquiry into these applications' use and potential has to be conducted.

Additional consideration when applying technological solutions

Using technology to monitor performance and to collect stakeholder perspectives can address the infrequent, snapshot-like data collection typical of audits. Technology can be more cost-effective and achieve greater scalability and timeliness of evaluation. It can also facilitate more accurate data recording than collecting information using the paper process. Data quality control is made easier, and data can be corrected during the collection process. In addition, data collected using technology can be instantly analyzed and visualized, making analysis more accessible to wider audiences. Lastly, as demonstrated in several instances in our review, some technologies create communication channels with affected stakeholders, allowing instant exchange of information and tracking of issue resolution.

However, the use of technology to collect data for evaluation purposes should not be overstated. Apart from the obvious issues related to digital security and privacy concerns, the excessive use of technologies can lead to exclusion. Technology has to be tailored to needs, abilities and circumstances of those who we intend to share it with. Practical challenges often include literacy and digital skills, penetration of mobile phone network and devices, cultural and social circumstances, gender power relations, weather conditions, trust and security. Often the use of technology should depend on context and should be complemented by in-person interaction (interview, visit or follow-up). This can help to increase responsiveness and validate results. In some instances, including working with vulnerable population, migrant workers or in insecure settings, human-based data collection remains more beneficial. For example, in agricultural seasonal production, migrant workers might feel more comfortable to report human rights abuses to field researchers (monitors, technicians) or a helpline than a mobile application.

²⁰ For example [Elevate \(Labour Link\)](#), [Worker Connect](#) and [Labour Voices](#)



Looking Ahead

The increasing need for better understanding of company's efforts to respect human rights has created an opportunity to innovate and to scope workable solutions.

In the Valuing Respect project, we continue to look for new opportunities to adapt, test and pilot these learnings in applied ways. We aim to develop products, which will assist companies in the process of monitoring and evaluation of outcomes for affected stakeholders. Some of the outputs will include case studies, which will explore methods, techniques and challenges. The overarching objective of improving effectiveness of company's efforts to respect human rights will continue to bind our approach in our future work.

Annex | Evaluation methods: How to understand data

		Description	Objective/Benefits
Making sense of stories	Most significant change	A method to analyze collected stories and decide which of these are most significant. Usually used to interrogate program theory of change.	Provides information about intended and unintended outcomes for people. Clarifies when and how the change to people lives happened.
	Case studies	Offers in-depth examples of an intervention, and creates links between activities and outcomes usually through focusing on changes in people's lives.	Useful to understand overall impact of a program by offering a bigger picture (or context).
	Sense-making	Using stakeholder insights gives meaning to their experiences. Used in combination with other participatory methods in evaluation planning.	Different data tools can be used. For example, micro-narratives, which are then interpreted by the participant.
Exploring causality	Causal loop diagram	Used in systems thinking, causal loop diagram help to depict causality between different elements.	Helps to make sense of complex relationships.
	Qualitative comparative analysis	Way to identify different factors contributing to observed outcome. I.e. identifies conditions which are necessary and/or sufficient for the desired outcome to occur.	Used to test theory of change. Allows for better understanding of program activities and context, and their impact on outcomes.
	Contribution analysis	Used to explore causality. In particular, it focuses on analyzing the contribution a program makes to observed outcomes.	Reduces uncertainty about contribution of the program. Used in real-life programs (as opposed to RCT or other experimental methods).
Experiments and quasi-experiments	Randomised control trials (RCT)	As an experimental method, RCT limits who benefits from a program and compares their outcomes with those did not participate.	Used to decrease bias and increase internal validity through mimicking counterfactuals. RCT needs to be build into a program design; it cannot be undertaken in an on-going project.
	Difference-in-difference	Quasi-experimental technique used to calculate difference between those benefiting from an intervention and those who did not.	Often used when RCT cannot be used for ethical reasons or in interventions which are already in place.



Valuing Respect is a global collaborative platform, led by Shift, to research and co-create better ways of evaluating business respect for human rights. Our aim is to develop tools and insights that can help both companies and their stakeholders focus their resources on actions that effectively improve outcomes for people.

© Shift Project, Ltd. 2019

www.valuingrespect.org