
IMPROVING PROGRAM QUALITY IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Lessons from Oxfam's Program Standards Self-Assessment Year 1

JULY 2014

Report prepared by
Jasmin Rocha
Global Evaluation Research and Learning Officer
Oxfam International Secretariat



CONTENT

Sample Overview.....	1
Standard 1: Collaborative, iterative, analysis of root causes of poverty and injustice forms the basis of all programs	2
is collaborative	2
considers the root causes of poverty and injustice	2
is iterative.....	3
Standard 2: Program strategies are created in a participatory and collaborative manner	3
is developed jointly	3
articulates the scale and nature of changes that will make the most impact on poverty and injustice.....	3
is explicit about the changes in gender relations and social exclusion that it is seeking	4
includes a theory of change, and is explicit about Oxfam’s distinctive contribution and role	4
identifies key risks/ challenges.....	5
is explicit about how it will measure and assess progress and indicators of success...	5
identifies the key relationships and partnerships we need to develop to deliver the changes	6
identifies the resources, capacities and skills needed to deliver the program	6
Standard 3: The program has clear ties to the OI strategic plan	6
contributes to the OI strategic plan priorities	6
reports on results to OI change goals	7
records funding allocations according to CONSOL classifications	7
Standard 4: Programs are flexible and adaptive within the parameters of the OI Strategic Plan	7
reviews and adapts in response to program learning and/or changes in the context	7
is transparent with how decisions to adapt the program have been taken	8

Standard 5: Programs link development, humanitarian, and advocacy and campaigning work (a One Program Approach) in pursuit of a common objective..... 8

- links with work to influence policy at appropriate levels..... 8
- includes Adaptation and Risk Reduction or preparedness work 8
- links with long-term development or humanitarian interventions 9

Standard 6: Program relies upon partnership and alliances with autonomous, independent, accountable organisations to achieve positive changes in people’s lives as well as policy changes..... 10

- set out agreed mutual expectations, with clear roles and responsibilities that are subject to regular and formal review 10
- support mutual growth, organisational development and institutional strengthening . 10
- detail when and why these relationships will end 11

Standard 7: All Country programs will have the capacity to deliver effective national campaigning across the OI Global campaigning force model under the parameters set by the OI Southern Campaigning Guidelines as appropriate in a given country context, and to link this work to Oxfam International global campaigns 11

- has the capacity, or is able to access the capacity, to deliver effective national campaigning 11
- links national realities with regional and/ or international processes, as appropriate.. 12

Standard 8: When programs engage in humanitarian work, they adhere to existing humanitarian agreements, standards, norms, policy, and guidelines. 12

- effectively transitions from an immediate emergency response to longer-term humanitarian work 12
- adheres to existing humanitarian agreements, standards, norms, policy, and guidelines, including Sphere minimum standards 13
- utilises contingency plans and continuously updates them 13

Standard 9: Programs integrate OI’s agreed cross-cutting objectives of Gender Equity and Active Citizenship, and have strategies in place where appropriate for HIV and AIDS response and engagement with the private sector 14

Gender Equity 14
 Active Citizenship 15
 HIV/AIDS 15
 Private Sector 16

Standard 10 :Programs engage in participatory, evidence-based learning and are results based 17

has an M&E strategy in place..... 17
 regularly analyses data, reflects on progress and adapts in light of evidence 17
 involves stakeholders in monitoring, evaluation and learning processes 18
 allocates sufficient resources for MEL activities 18

Standard 11: Programs are accountable to stakeholders 19

are transparent and open (information sharing) 19
 are participatory 19
 are mutually accountable (feedback and complaints mechanisms)..... 20
 demonstrably meets, or strives to meet, the international standards or codes that Oxfam is signed up to 20
 devote time to building equal relationships of mutual respect among staff, local people and partners 21

Training/capacity building needs 21

Sample Overview

Change Goals by Region

Region	AC	EJ	ES	GJ	RiC	Total
LAC	1	10	1	7	7	26
	3.85	38.46	3.85	26.92	26.92	100.00
	11.11	18.18	4.55	24.14	28.00	18.57
Memag+EEFSU	2	7	6	3	1	19
	10.53	36.84	31.58	15.79	5.26	100.00
	22.22	12.73	27.27	10.34	4.00	13.57
Horn	0	2	1	1	1	5
	0.00	40.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	100.00
	0.00	3.64	4.55	3.45	4.00	3.57
ECA	2	7	3	3	1	16
	12.50	43.75	18.75	18.75	6.25	100.00
	22.22	12.73	13.64	10.34	4.00	11.43
East Asia + Pacific	3	10	1	6	7	27
	11.11	37.04	3.70	22.22	25.93	100.00
	33.33	18.18	4.55	20.69	28.00	19.29
South Asia	0	1	0	1	1	3
	0.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	33.33	100.00
	0.00	1.82	0.00	3.45	4.00	2.14
Southern Africa	1	4	4	4	3	16
	6.25	25.00	25.00	25.00	18.75	100.00
	11.11	7.27	18.18	13.79	12.00	11.43
West Africa	0	14	6	4	4	28
	0.00	50.00	21.43	14.29	14.29	100.00
	0.00	25.45	27.27	13.79	16.00	20.00
Total	9	55	22	29	25	140
	6.43	39.29	15.71	20.71	17.86	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Implementation Mode

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Multiple Affiliates	75	68.18	68.18
Single Affiliate	35	31.82	100.00
Total	110	100.00	

Gender Ratio in PSSA Participation

Observations: 120; Mean: 0.51; Standard Deviation: 0.26; Min: 0; Max: 1



Partner Participation in the PSSA

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
No	84	63.16	63.16
Yes	49	36.84	100.00
Total	133	100.00	

Overall Numbers of Participation

Observations	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
133	6.9	3.97	0	13

Standard 1: Collaborative, iterative, analysis of root causes of poverty and injustice forms the basis of all programs

is collaborative

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_1_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS1_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
2	28	20.00	20.00	No	44	31.21	31.21
3	96	68.57	88.57	Yes	97	68.79	100.00
4	16	11.43	100.00	Total	141	100.00	
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No substantive analysis of root causes of poverty and/ or injustice undertaken.
- 2: Analysis into poverty and injustice in the context(s) in which we will be working is conducted as a purely technical exercise, drawing on existing secondary data and/ or past programme experience, with little direct input from local civil society and those whose rights are being denied.
- 3: Potential partners and allies are consulted as part of an analysis into the root causes of poverty and injustice in the context(s) in which we will be working. Consultation(s) with those whose rights are being denied or abridged are held, and their views have some influence on the identification of the root causes of poverty and injustice.
- 4: Participatory analysis is used to ensure that all key stakeholder groups, including women, men and other vulnerable groups whose rights are being denied or abridged, meaningfully input into efforts to understand poverty and injustice. Discussions held with these stakeholder groups substantively influence identification and elaboration of the structural and systemic causes of poverty and injustice.

considers the root causes of poverty and injustice

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_1_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS1_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
2	17	12.14	12.14	No	69	48.94	48.94
3	91	65.00	77.14	Yes	72	51.06	100.00
4	32	22.86	100.00	Total	141	100.00	
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No substantive analysis of root causes of poverty and/ or injustice undertaken.
- 2: An analysis of poverty and injustice is undertaken, but focuses primarily on the symptoms rather than the root causes of poverty and inequality.

- 3: An analysis of poverty and injustice is undertaken in an effort to identify the most important causes of selected problems in the context. This analysis considers vulnerability, trends, natural factors (i.e., climate change), and political economic analysis.
- 4: In addition to level 3: Analysis includes an effort to understand the relative power of key stakeholders, and in particular the differential power of women, men and other vulnerable groups – both within households and between households and/ or communities.

is iterative							
Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_1_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS1_3imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	2	1.43	1.43	No	66	46.81	46.81
2	48	34.29	35.71	Yes	75	53.19	100.00
3	42	30.00	65.71	Total	141	100.00	
4	48	34.29	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No substantive analysis of root causes of poverty and/ or injustice undertaken.
- 2: An analysis of poverty and injustice is undertaken prior to program development. It is not reviewed.
- 3: An analysis of poverty and injustice is undertaken prior to program development. This analysis is reviewed and updated in an ad hoc manner.
- 4: An analysis of poverty and injustice is undertaken prior to program development. This analysis is regularly reviewed and revised in light of program learning and/ or changes in the context.

**Standard 2: Program strategies are created in a participatory and collaborative manner
A quality program develops a long-term program strategy that...**

is developed jointly							
Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_2_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS2_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	17	12.14	12.14	No	66	46.81	46.81
2	50	35.71	47.86	Yes	75	53.19	100.00
3	60	42.86	90.71	Total	141	100.00	
4	13	9.29	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Partners are informed about the program strategy, which has been written by senior/ technical Oxfam staff
- 2: Partners are consulted about the program strategy and provide information that informs it. People's whose rights are being denied or abridged are informed about the program strategy.
- 3: Decisions on program strategy are made jointly by Oxfam and its partners. People whose rights are being denied or abridged are consulted about the program strategy and provide information that informs it.
- 4: Decisions on program strategy are made jointly by Oxfam staff, partners and local people.

articulates the scale and nature of changes that will make the most impact on poverty and injustice

Performance Rating	Improvement Plans
--------------------	-------------------

PS_2_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	3	2.13	2.13
2	41	29.08	31.21
3	79	56.03	87.23
4	18	12.77	100.00
Total	141	100.00	

PS2_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No	97	68.79	68.79
Yes	44	31.21	100.00
Total	141	100.00	

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy mainly describes project activities
- 2: Program strategy articulates the changes it seeks to influence (outcomes) and how many people are likely to benefit, informed by a strong context analysis
- 3: Program strategy clearly articulates its assumptions about how the changes it seeks to influence (outcomes) are necessary and sufficient to achieve lasting change in the lives of local people.
- 4: Program strategy focuses on key levers of change in the context and is demonstrably informed by cost effectiveness considerations

is explicit about the changes in gender relations and social exclusion that it is seeking

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_2_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS2_3imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	2	1.42	1.42	No	98	69.50	69.50
2	47	33.33	34.75	Yes	43	30.50	100.00
3	42	29.79	64.54	Total	141	100.00	
4	50	35.46	100.00				
Total	141	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy does not differentiate between how men, women and their different social groupings experience poverty
- 2: Program strategy provides information on the challenges facing poor and marginalised women and men in the context, but does not explain how these challenges will be substantively addressed
- 3: Program strategy clearly describes the ways in which the program will address the practical challenges faced by poor and marginalised groups in the context, and women in particular.
- 4: Program strategy clearly describes how the program will contribute to improved social equity for marginalised groups in the context, and articulates at least one core objective to deliver transformational change in poor women's lives.

includes a theory of change, and is explicit about Oxfam's distinctive contribution and role

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_2_4	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS2_4imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	3	2.13	2.13	No	88	62.41	62.41
2	49	34.75	36.88	Yes	53	37.59	100.00
3	54	38.30	75.18	Total	141	100.00	
4	35	24.82	100.00				
Total	141	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy mainly describes activities.
- 2: Program strategy articulates the program's long-term goals and objectives, and provides details about the types of activities it will implement, with an indicative timeframe

for change. The assumptions about how the program activities will contribute to the objectives are not clearly communicated.

- 3: Program strategy clearly communicates the program’s long-term goals and objectives, the strategies it will employ, and the assumptions being made about how these will achieve the intended goal(s). The indicative timeframe for change is realistic and Oxfam’s distinctive contribution to change is clear. The program strategy is reviewed and updated in an ad hoc manner.
- 4: Program strategy clearly communicates the program’s long-term goals and objectives, the strategies it will employ, and the assumptions being made about how these will achieve the intended impact. The indicative timeframe for change is realistic and Oxfam’s distinctive contribution to change is clear. The program strategy is regularly reviewed and revised in light of program learning or changes in the context in which the program is operating.

identifies key risks/ challenges							
Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_2_5	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS2_5imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
	3	2.21	2.21	No	96	68.09	68.09
2	50	36.76	38.97	Yes	45	31.91	100.00
3	48	35.29	74.26	Total	141	100.00	
4	35	25.74	100.00				
Total	136	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Risks and/ or challenges are not identified
- 2: Risks and challenges identified refer mainly to implementation.
- 3: Risks and challenges associated with both implementation and theory of change are identified.
- 4: Risks and challenges associated with both implementation and theory of change are identified, with risk management process in place to monitor and respond to them going forward.

is explicit about how it will measure and assess progress and indicators of success							
Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_2_6	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS2_6imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	22	16.06	16.06	No	68	48.23	48.23
2	34	24.82	40.88	Yes	73	51.77	100.00
3	47	34.31	75.18	Total	141	100.00	
4	34	24.82	100.00				
Total	137	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No details provided on monitoring or quality assurance mechanisms
- 2: Program strategy is explicit about indicators of success. Details are provided on reporting requirements, but little information provided on how and when data will be collected and used
- 3: Program strategy is explicit about indicators of success, and sets out mechanisms for how these will be measured (data collection process and responsibilities). Moments for review and reflection, including evaluations, are not set out.
- 4: Program strategy is explicit about indicators of success, and sets out formal mechanisms for monitoring against indicators of success, review and reflection on data, and when and how analysis will be used to inform decisions about the program going forward.

identifies the key relationships and partnerships we need to develop to deliver the changes

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_2_7	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS2_7imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	3	2.14	2.14	No	88	62.41	62.41
2	44	31.43	33.57	Yes	53	37.59	100.00
3	61	43.57	77.14	Total	141	100.00	
4	32	22.86	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: References to key relationships and partnerships are vague.
- 2: Details on current and potential relationships and partnerships are provided, with some description of the roles these different stakeholders might play.
- 3: Program strategy identifies the key relationships and partnerships that need to be developed, and outlines the roles these stakeholders would play.
- 4: Program strategy identifies key relationships and partnerships that need to be developed, the roles and responsibilities of these different stakeholders, and sets out process(es) to regularly review and update.

identifies the resources, capacities and skills needed to deliver the program

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_2_8	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS2_8imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	8	5.84	5.84	No	81	57.45	57.45
2	54	39.42	45.26	Yes	60	42.55	100.00
3	55	40.15	85.40	Total	141	100.00	
4	20	14.60	100.00				
Total	137	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No obvious links made between program objectives and resourcing needs
- 2: Program strategy identifies the resources, capacities and skills needed to deliver the program.
- 3: Program identifies the resources, capacities and skills needed to deliver the program, and details how these resources, capacities and skills will be accessed by the program – including the identification of donors and Oxfams that will collaborate on the program, and what they will do.
- 4: Program identifies the resources, capacities and skills needed to deliver the program, and details how these resources, capacities and skills will be accessed by the program – including the identification of donors and Oxfams that will collaborate on the program, and what they will do. Mechanisms to regularly review plans and manage resource gaps throughout are set out.

Standard 3: The program has clear ties to the OI strategic plan

A quality program...

contributes to the OI strategic plan priorities

PS_3_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	7	5.43	5.43
2	52	40.31	45.74
3	70	54.26	100.00
Total	129	100.00	

Explanation rating levels (highest rating level 3)

- 1: Program does not link with/ contribute to the OI strategic plan or its priorities.
- 2: JCAS describes how the different programs in country contribute to the OI strategic plan priorities.
- 3: In addition to level 2: Program strategy clearly articulates how it contributes to and/ or links with the OI strategic priorities

reports on results to OI change goals

PS_3_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	25	19.08	19.08
2	106	80.92	100.00
Total	131	100.00	

Explanation rating levels (highest rating level 2)

- 1: Program does not report on results to OI change goals.
- 2: Program reports results on OI change goals.

records funding allocations according to CONSOL classifications

PS_3_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	58	53.70	53.70
2	50	46.30	100.00
Total	108	100.00	

Explanation rating levels (highest rating level 2)

- 1: Program does not record funding allocations according to CONSOL classifications
- 2: Program records funding allocations according to CONSOL classifications

Standard 4: Programs are flexible and adaptive within the parameters of the OI Strategic Plan

A quality program...

reviews and adapts in response to program learning and/or changes in the context

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_4_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS4_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	12	8.76	8.76	No	66	46.81	46.81
2	26	18.98	27.74	Yes	75	53.19	100.00
3	70	51.09	78.83	Total	141	100.00	
4	29	21.17	100.00				
Total	137	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No explicit mechanisms in place to review the program as it is implemented.
- 2: Program informally reviews and adjusts implementation to ensure activities are delivered as per the operational plan.
- 3: Program has formal mechanisms for regularly reviewing program implementation, and demonstrably adapts in light of changes in the external context, new insights about the local context, and/ or new partner or donor priorities.
- 4: Program has formal mechanisms for regularly reviewing both program implementation and progress towards outcomes. Program demonstrably adapts in light of changes in the external context, new insights about the local context, new partner or donor priorities, information about innovation, and/ or learning or new insights about the program's theory of change gained through monitoring & evaluation.

is transparent with how decisions to adapt the program have been taken

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_4_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS4_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	25	18.66	18.66	No	81	57.45	57.45
2	32	23.88	42.54	Yes	60	42.55	100.00
3	67	50.00	92.54	Total	141	100.00	
4	10	7.46	100.00				
Total	134	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program adaptation is done ad hoc and not documented.
- 2: Details of review/ change exist on record.
- 3: A good description of program reviews and any subsequent changes that were made exist and are made available in ways that are easily accessible to most stakeholders, on request.
- 4: Substantive changes to the program are well documented, including how decisions were taken, and are proactively shared with stakeholders, including partners or communities whom Oxfam is directly working with, in ways that are relevant, accessible and appropriate to them.

Standard 5: Programs link development, humanitarian, and advocacy and campaigning work (a One Program Approach) in pursuit of a common objective

A quality development or humanitarian program...

links with work to influence policy at appropriate levels

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_5_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS5_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	5	3.79	3.79	No	66	46.81	46.81
2	41	31.06	34.85	Yes	75	53.19	100.00
3	64	48.48	83.33	Total	141	100.00	
4	22	16.67	100.00				
Total	132	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program does not explicitly reference any campaign or advocacy work
- 2: Program strategy references relevant advocacy and campaigning work being delivered by others but is not clear about how it will link with these efforts
- 3: Program has explicit advocacy strategy OR sets out how it links to relevant advocacy/ campaign program at local, national and/ or international levels. The relationship between the development work and efforts to influence policy at the appropriate level(s) is clearly articulated. Review of progress on policy goals is not mainstreamed.
- 4: In addition to level 3: The program strategy articulates at least one explicit policy goal and clearly sets out how the mutually supportive relationship between the long-term development work and efforts to influence policy goals at the appropriate level(s) will work in practice. The program's regular reviews of progress include analysis of progress on policy goals.

includes Adaptation and Risk Reduction or preparedness work

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_5_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS5_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	30	26.79	26.79	No	77	54.61	54.61
2	25	22.32	49.11	Yes	64	45.39	100.00
3	24	21.43	70.54	Total	141	100.00	

4	33	29.46	100.00
Total	112	100.00	

ARR/Preparedness (PS 5.2) by Change Goal

OI Change Goal	1	2	3	4	Total
Active Citizenship	4	2	0	1	7
	57.14	28.57	0.00	14.29	100.00
Economic Justice	9	12	9	17	47
	19.15	25.53	19.15	36.17	100.00
Essential Services	7	3	4	1	15
	46.67	20.00	26.67	6.67	100.00
Gender Justice	10	4	2	2	18
	55.56	22.22	11.11	11.11	100.00
Rights in Crisis	0	4	9	11	24
	0.00	16.67	37.50	45.83	100.00
Total	30	25	24	32	111
	27.03	22.52	21.62	28.83	100.00

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy does not include any reference to ARR or preparedness work
- 2: Program strategy and/ or plans recognise ARR or preparedness challenges in the context, but does not explain how these will be substantively addressed
- 3: Program clearly articulates how an analysis of ARR or preparedness issues in the context have informed program design.
- 4: Program strategy articulates at least one explicit objective to support people living in poverty to adapt to climate change and natural disasters.

One Program Approach: cross-tabulation PS 5.1 and PS 5.2

One Program Approach (cross tab)	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Weak on campaigns and ARR	18	16.07	16.07
Weak on campaigns, strong on ARR	20	17.86	33.93
Strong on campaigns, weak on ARR	37	33.04	66.96
Strong on campaigns and ARR	37	33.04	100.00
Total	112	100.00	

A quality campaign or advocacy program...
links with long-term development or humanitarian interventions

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_5_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS5_3imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	4	5.71	5.71	No	116	82.27	82.27
2	17	24.29	30.00	Yes	25	17.73	100.00
3	27	38.57	68.57	Total	141	100.00	
4	22	31.43	100.00				
Total	70	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program does not make any reference to existing Oxfam long-term development or humanitarian interventions
- 2: Program strategy and/ or plans refer to long-term development or humanitarian program(s), or lessons from past program(s), but does not have any formal links with ongoing development or humanitarian programming
- 3: Program pursues policy objectives that complement current long-term development or humanitarian interventions, with whom it shares common or complementary objectives. Collaboration with these long-term development or humanitarian programmes is ad hoc.

- 4: Program has formal mechanisms in place for ongoing collaboration with long term development or humanitarian programs in pursuit of common or complementary objectives. All programs are clear about their particular contributions to these overall objectives.

Standard 6: Program relies upon partnership and alliances with autonomous, independent, accountable organisations to achieve positive changes in people's lives as well as policy changes

A quality program has effective relationships with partners and allies that ...

set out agreed mutual expectations, with clear roles and responsibilities that are subject to regular and formal review

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_6_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS6_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	5	3.55	3.55	No	73	51.77	51.77
2	29	20.57	24.11	Yes	68	48.23	100.00
3	82	58.16	82.27	Total	141	100.00	
4	25	17.73	100.00				
Total	141	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No details are provided on the specific roles and responsibilities of Oxfam and program partners and/ or allies
- 2: Agreements detailing the different roles and responsibilities of program partners and/ or allies and Oxfam exist. Partners and/ or allies provided information which Oxfam used to draw up agreements. Agreements on roles and responsibilities have not been formally reviewed or revised.
- 3: Documentation on the different roles and responsibilities of program partners and/ or allies and Oxfam exists. Decisions on roles and responsibilities were taken in consultation with program partners. Review(s) of agreements on roles and responsibilities, and/ or mutual expectations are done ad hoc.
- 4: Documentation on the different roles and responsibilities of program partners and/ or allies and Oxfam exist. Decisions on roles and responsibilities were taken jointly by program/ project staff and partners and reflect an ongoing commitment to ensuring that the voices of partners and allies can effectively influence Oxfam thinking and practice. Formal mechanisms are in place to regularly review roles and responsibilities and the extent to which mutual expectations are being met.

support mutual growth, organisational development and institutional strengthening

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_6_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS6_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	5	3.57	3.57	No	56	39.72	39.72
2	68	48.57	52.14	Yes	85	60.28	100.00
3	52	37.14	89.29	Total	141	100.00	
4	15	10.71	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No formal plans in place to support the growth, organisational development and/ or institutional strengthening of partners.

- 2: Program outlines a commitment to supporting the growth, organisational development and institutional strengthening of partners, but does not have a specific capacity-building strategy in place.
- 3: Program has a capacity-building strategy in place which sets out jointly agreed mutual capacity building priorities, along with appropriate timelines and adequate time and resources to support these capacity building efforts.
- 4: In addition to level 3: Program sets out the process by which progress towards capacity-building goals will be jointly monitored and assessed, and capacity-building strategies adapted in light of results. Partners have demonstrably enhanced capacity as a result of Oxfam's support.

detail when and why these relationships will end

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_6_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS6_3imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	56	40.00	40.00	No	47	33.33	33.33
2	49	35.00	75.00	Yes	94	66.67	100.00
3	28	20.00	95.00	Total	141	100.00	
4	7	5.00	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No exit strategy exists
- 2: There have been discussions with partners on when and why the relations will end, but these have not been formally documented and/ or agreed, and are not reviewed during program implementation.
- 3: Agreements with partners include explicit exit strategies, which were developed with partners at the outset of the relationship. Review of exit strategies and timeframe(s) are ad hoc.
- 4: Agreements with partners include explicit exit strategies, which were developed with partners at the outset of the relationship. These exit strategies and timeframes are continually reviewed and adapted to remain relevant and effective throughout the life of the program.

Standard 7: All Country programs will have the capacity to deliver effective national campaigning across the OI Global campaigning force model under the parameters set by the OI Southern Campaigning Guidelines as appropriate in a given country context, and to link this work to Oxfam International global campaigns

A quality program...

has the capacity, or is able to access the capacity, to deliver effective national campaigning

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_7_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS7_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	10	7.25	7.25	No	68	48.23	48.23
2	53	38.41	45.65	Yes	73	51.77	100.00
3	54	39.13	84.78	Total	141	100.00	
4	21	15.22	100.00				
Total	138	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program is not engaged in or linked to national campaigning.
- 2: Program undertakes ad hoc advocacy or campaigning activities in support of program objectives.

- 3: Program articulates at least one core policy objective, and has an advocacy and communication strategy in place to deliver national campaigning. Program demonstrably has, or is accessing:
- Stakeholder analysis skills
 - Media outreach skills
 - Policy analysis/research skills
 - Policy change process knowledge
 - Mechanisms to mobilize a base
- 4: In addition to meeting level 3: Program demonstrates the capacity to be strategic in the deployment of campaign tactics and/ or tools in country context Program/ Oxfam's advocacy expertise is credible and recognized by other advocates in the community. Program/ Oxfam is regarded as a credible and valuable resource by government, civil society constituents at any level, private sector actors and/ or donor(s).

links national realities with regional and/ or international processes, as appropriate							
Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_7_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS7_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	10	7.46	7.46	No	73	51.77	51.77
2	57	42.54	50.00	Yes	68	48.23	100.00
3	53	39.55	89.55	Total	141	100.00	
4	14	10.45	100.00				
Total	134	100.00					

Cross-tabulation: national campaigning/advocacy (PS 7.1) and linking with regional/international processes (PS 7.2)

PS_7_2	1	2	3	4	Total
Weak national campaigning	9	38	11	1	59
	15.25	64.41	18.64	1.69	100.00
Strong national campaigning	1	19	42	13	75
	1.33	25.33	56.00	17.33	100.00
Total	10	57	53	14	134
	7.46	42.54	39.55	10.45	100.00

Pearson chi2(3) = 39.8082 Pr = 0.000

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program is not engaged in or linked to national campaigning.
- 2: Program strategy references relevant regional/ international processes but is not explicit about how it will link with them.
- 3: Program demonstrates an understanding of how its national advocacy agenda fits into broader regional and international processes, including the program/ organization's strategic contribution is to these processes.
- 4: In addition to meeting level 3: The program's regular reviews of progress include analysis of its contribution to regional and or international processes.

Standard 8: When programs engage in humanitarian work, they adhere to existing humanitarian agreements, standards, norms, policy, and guidelines.

A quality humanitarian program...

effectively transitions from an immediate emergency response to longer-term humanitarian work			
PS_8_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
2	4	7.84	7.84
3	9	17.65	25.49

4	25	49.02	74.51
Total	13	25.49	100.00

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program/ project have not yet been assessed or planned for the transition from immediate response to recovery and reconstruction.
- 2: Program activities have not yet shifted from immediate response to recovery and reconstruction work. While the transitional phase has been assessed and planned, the program has not engaged in any formal process(es) to design and develop an long term programme strategy.
- 3: Most program activities have shifted from immediate response to more long term recovery and reconstruction work, Program has developed a long-term program strategy, which reflects Program Standards 1 and 2. Transition phase has started.
- 4: Program has developed a long term program strategy which reflects Program Standards 1 and 2, and transition has been fully implemented

adheres to existing humanitarian agreements, standards, norms, policy, and guidelines, including Sphere minimum standards

PS_8_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	8	12.50	12.50
2	25	39.06	51.56
3	14	21.88	73.44
4	17	26.56	100.00
Total	64	100.00	

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No evidence of knowledge or usage of the international standards or codes to which Oxfam is signed up by Program team
- 2: Relevant international standards or codes to which Oxfam is signed up are clearly referenced in the program strategy, and communicated to program stakeholders. Some evidence of training but not widespread.
- 3: At least two relevant international standards or codes to which Oxfam is signed up are clearly referenced in the program strategy. A clear process to measure performance against these standards is set out, and delivery against these standards is evaluated. Training in standards is clear and widespread.
- 4: All relevant international standards or codes to which Oxfam is signed up take context into account and demonstrably inform program design and delivery. Clear process(es) for measuring and reflecting on performance against these standards exist, and are used to develop plans to improve future practice.

utilises contingency plans and continuously updates them

PS_8_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	6	9.38	9.38
2	7	10.94	20.31
3	12	18.75	39.06
4	39	60.94	100.00
Total	64	100.00	

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No analysis of risk or context. No contingency plan in place

- 2: Risk and context analysis carried out but no contingency plan agreed among affiliates
- 3: Contingency plan has been developed but is not utilised, reviewed or updated
- 4: Contingency plan utilised by all affiliates in all responses, reviewed and updated on a regular basis

Standard 9: Programs integrate OI's agreed cross-cutting objectives of Gender Equity and Active Citizenship, and have strategies in place where appropriate for HIV and AIDS response and engagement with the private sector

A quality program integrates...

Gender Equity

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_9_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS9_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	4	2.86	2.86	No	64	45.39	45.39
2	43	30.71	33.57	Yes	77	54.61	100.00
3	68	48.57	82.14	Total	141	100.00	
4	25	17.86	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Gender Equity (PS 9.1) by Change Goal

OICG_n	1	2	3	4	Total
Active Citizenship	0	3	5	1	9
	0.00	33.33	55.56	11.11	100.00
Economic Justice	2	19	26	7	54
	3.70	35.19	48.15	12.96	100.00
Essential Services	1	7	8	6	22
	4.55	31.82	36.36	27.27	100.00
Gender Justice	0	4	15	10	29
	0.00	13.79	51.72	34.48	100.00
Rights in Crisis	1	10	13	1	25
	4.00	40.00	52.00	4.00	100.00
Total	4	43	67	25	139
	2.88	30.94	48.20	17.99	100.00

Comparison GJ/non-GJ programs on Gender Equity (PS 9.1)

PS_9_1	1	2	3	4	Total
Non-GJ	4	39	53	15	111
	3.60	35.14	47.75	13.51	100.00
GJ	0	4	15	10	29
	0.00	13.79	51.72	34.48	100.00
Total	4	43	68	25	140
	2.86	30.71	48.57	17.86	100.00

Pearson chi2(3) = 10.19 Pr = 0.017

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy does not differentiate between how women and men experience poverty, and/ or does not substantively address the challenges facing poor and marginalised women in the context.
- 2: Program strategy includes objectives and strategies that address the gender issues identified in the situation analysis, but the program does not have any mechanisms in place to review how effectively gender is being mainstreamed into program implementation, or consider progress towards outcomes for poor and marginalised women.
- 3: The program allocates adequate resources to ensure that gender is mainstreamed into the program, and encourages and measures the participation/ leadership of women and

men in all aspect of program implementation. Management arrangements reflect attention to gender equality and women's empowerment. All monitoring data is disaggregated by sex.

- 4: The program meets performance level 3 and additionally: M&E framework(s) track gender-sensitive indicators, which are reviewed to consider how effectively gender is being mainstreamed into program implementation, and the progress that is being made towards outcomes for poor and marginalised women. The programme is reviewed and adapted in light of findings.

Active Citizenship							
Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_9_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS9_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	4	2.86	2.86	No	92	65.25	65.25
2	19	13.57	16.43	Yes	49	34.75	100.00
3	66	47.14	63.57	Total	141	100.00	
4	51	36.43	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Active Citizenship (PS 9.2) by Change Goal					
OICG_n	1	2	3	4	Total
Active Citizenship	0	0	4	5	9
	0.00	0.00	44.44	55.56	100.00
Economic Justice	3	7	23	21	54
	5.56	12.96	42.59	38.89	100.00
Essential Services	0	3	9	10	22
	0.00	13.64	40.91	45.45	100.00
Gender Justice	1	3	15	10	29
	3.45	10.34	51.72	34.48	100.00
Rights in Crisis	0	6	14	5	25
	0.00	24.00	56.00	20.00	100.00
Total	4	19	65	51	139
	2.88	13.67	46.76	36.69	100.00

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy does not include efforts to build the capacity of individuals or civil society groups to engage with state institutions; or build the capacity of duty-bearers to meet their responsibilities
- 2: Program support to CBO and CSO staff to engage with state institutions and other actors is ad hoc, and used as a means to achieving other program objectives
- 3: Program has at least one core objective to build the capacity of individuals or civil society groups to engage with state institutions and other key actors. The decision about which issues civil society actors will be supported to engage with is taken by the program.
- 4: Program is delivering on at least one core objective to build the capacity of individuals or civil society groups to engage with state institutions and other key actors, allocating sufficient resources to activities associated with this objective. The decision on which issues civil society actors will be supported to engage with is taken in conversation with communities and partners.

HIV/AIDS							
Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_9_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS9_3imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	33	23.40	23.40	No	94	66.67	66.67
2	18	12.77	36.17	Yes	47	33.33	100.00

3	6	4.26	40.43		Total	141	100.00
4	7	4.96	45.39				
9	77	54.61	100.00				
Total	141	100.00					

HIV/AIDS (PS 9.3) by region

Region+	1	2	3	4	n/a	Total
LAC	3	0	0	0	24	27
	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	88.89	100.00
Memag+EEFSU	3	1	0	0	15	19
	15.79	5.26	0.00	0.00	78.95	100.00
Horn	0	2	1	0	2	5
	0.00	40.00	20.00	0.00	40.00	100.00
ECA	9	5	1	1	0	16
	56.25	31.25	6.25	6.25	0.00	100.00
East Asia + Pacific	6	0	1	0	20	27
	22.22	0.00	3.70	0.00	74.07	100.00
South Asia	1	1	0	0	1	3
	33.33	33.33	0.00	0.00	33.33	100.00
Southern Africa	1	7	3	3	2	16
	6.25	43.75	18.75	18.75	12.50	100.00
West Africa	10	2	0	3	13	28
	35.71	7.14	0.00	10.71	46.43	100.00
Total	33	18	6	7	77	141
	23.40	12.77	4.26	4.96	54.61	100.00

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy provides information on HIV/AIDS related challenges facing individuals in the context, but does not provide any detail of how these challenges will be substantively addressed by the program
- 2: An analysis of HIV/AIDS related challenges facing individuals in the context has informed program development. Program strategy does not clearly describe how these challenges will be addressed by the program.
- 3: Program can clearly describe the ways in which it is addressing the challenges facing individuals in the context.
- 4: Program has at least one core objective to benefit individuals, or households affected by HIV/AIDS.

Private Sector

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_9_4	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS9_4imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	67	47.52	47.52	No	61	43.26	43.26
2	17	12.06	59.57	Yes	80	56.74	100.00
3	28	19.86	79.43	Total	141	100.00	
4	3	2.13	81.56				
n/a	26	18.44	100.00				
Total	141	100.00					

Private Sector (PS 9.4) by change goal

OICG_n	1	2	3	4	9	Total
Active Citizenship	4	1	1	0	3	9
	44.44	11.11	11.11	0.00	33.33	100.00
Economic Justice	24	9	17	2	3	55
	43.64	16.36	30.91	3.64	5.45	100.00
Essential Services	11	2	2	0	7	22
	50.00	9.09	9.09	0.00	31.82	100.00
Gender Justice	15	3	3	1	7	29
	51.72	10.34	10.34	3.45	24.14	100.00

Rights in Crisis	13	2	5	0	5	25
	52.00	8.00	20.00	0.00	20.00	100.00
Total	67	17	28	3	25	140
	47.86	12.14	20.00	2.14	17.86	100.00

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program strategy provides information about key private sector actors (local, national, or global) that influence the context of the program, but does not identify any way the program could engage with them
- 2: Program strategy provides detailed analysis of key private sector actors and their influence, with no options for engagement
- 3: Program strategy analysis provides criteria for prioritizing which private sector actors to engage with and multiple options for nature of engagement
- 4: Program strategy identifies engagement with prioritized private sector actors in multiple ways, and reviews processes for adjustment based on outcomes

Standard 10 :Programs engage in participatory, evidence-based learning and are results based

A quality program...

has an M&E strategy in place

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_10_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS10_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	7	5.19	5.19	No	59	41.84	41.84
2	49	36.30	41.48	Yes	82	58.16	100.00
3	62	45.93	87.41	Total	141	100.00	
4	17	12.59	100.00				
Total	135	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No monitoring or quality assurance done; program simply implements activities.
- 2: Program mainly monitors implementation – monitoring of outcomes is done ad hoc. Program mainly responds to immediate requests for monitoring information from donors. There is no plan to conduct a final evaluation of the program
- 3: Program collects reliable, accurate, complete and timely data against set outputs, outcomes and impact indicators, in order to improve the program and demonstrate results. The roles and responsibilities of program stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation are clearly defined and documented. The program has a plan in place to conduct a final evaluation as appropriate. Monitoring procedures/systems are not reviewed during the course of the program.
- 4: In addition to meeting level 3: The M&E strategy is an integral component of overall program management and is resourced appropriately. Program has formal mechanisms in place to enable an evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and the program's contribution to impact with a high degree of confidence. Formal mechanisms are in place to review the M&E strategy itself during implementation.

regularly analyses data, reflects on progress and adapts in light of evidence

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_10_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS10_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	6	4.41	4.41	No	89	63.12	63.12
2	29	21.32	25.74	Yes	52	36.88	100.00
3	69	50.74	76.47	Total	141	100.00	

4	32	23.53	100.00
Total	136	100.00	

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No review and reflection is done on program progress
- 2: Review and reflection is done ad hoc, and mainly by senior program manager(s)
- 3: Program stakeholders engage in review and reflection processes, but this is done ad hoc and may not always be grounded in the monitoring data being collected by the program.
- 4: Program stakeholders actively participate in a formal cycle of reflection, learning and action -analysing monitoring and evaluation data to take decisions to adjust program strategy and plans.

involves stakeholders in monitoring, evaluation and learning processes

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_10_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS10_3imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	37	27.21	27.21	No	76	53.90	53.90
2	55	40.44	67.65	Yes	65	46.10	100.00
3	33	24.26	91.91	Total	141	100.00	
4	11	8.09	100.00				
Total	136	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Monitoring data is collected from partners. Feedback on what is done with this information is ad hoc.
- 2: Monitoring data is collected from partners and communities. Partners and communities are consulted in evaluations. Program has formal mechanisms in place to communicate findings back to partners and communities.
- 3: Communities and partners are consulted on the development of appropriate outcome indicators. Capacity of partners and communities is built to undertake basic monitoring activities themselves. Findings are reviewed regularly with community.
- 4: Communities and partners participate in decisions about what to monitor and evaluate in a project, helping to define the indicators of success. Findings are reviewed regularly with community. Changes to the project are jointly discussed and agreed. Community and partners are important judges of both what we do and how we do it; the MEL system empowers stakeholders.

allocates sufficient resources for MEL activities

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_10_4	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS10_4imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	32	23.36	23.36	No	83	58.87	58.87
2	26	18.98	42.34	Yes	58	41.13	100.00
3	64	46.72	89.05	Total	141	100.00	
4	15	10.95	100.00				
Total	137	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program does not have an explicit budget line for MEL activities.
- 2: Program's MEL budget is less than 1% of the program's overall budget, with no resources earmarked for evaluation. Program does not have access to M&E skills/ capacity.
- 3: Program has explicit budget line for monitoring and evaluation activities, and sufficient resources for the ongoing collection and analysis of data against output, outcome and

impact indicators - including the availability of skilled M&E staff and technical equipment. Sufficient resources have been set aside for an external evaluation wherever appropriate.

- 4: In addition to meeting level 3: MEL system is an integral part of program management, staff objectives include time to engage, formal moments for review and reflection are in place, there are clear links between the MEL system and decision-making, a healthy mix of data collection methods and internal / external sources are used, that are all contributing to a culture of greater accountability and learning.

Standard 11: Programs are accountable to stakeholders

A quality program has effective relationships that ...

are transparent and open (information sharing)

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_11_1	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS11_1imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	34	24.29	24.29	No	58	41.13	41.13
2	77	55.00	79.29	Yes	83	58.87	100.00
3	23	16.43	95.71	Total	141	100.00	
4	6	4.29	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Limited program information is shared in an ad hoc manner with stakeholders. Most information is provided verbally and/ or informally. It is generally provided at the beginning of the program and may not be up dated often.
- 2: Detailed program information is made publicly available. This includes basic information about who we (Oxfam) are, what we do, how we do it, who we work with, and who funds us, as well as basic information about program budget and activities. Methods for sharing information are chosen by program staff and/ or partners.
- 3: Detailed information about Oxfam and the program, including budgetary information and M&E reports, are made available in appropriate local languages, using methods that are easy for stakeholders to access. This Information is regularly updated. A public annual report of Oxfam's work in country is available in hard copies in all in-country offices.
- 4: Full program and financial information is made available in ways that are easily accessible for all stakeholders. Oxfam negotiates how best to share program/project information about objectives, budget, progress and complaints-handling procedures with its stakeholders, including partners or communities whom Oxfam is directly working with, in ways that are relevant, accessible and appropriate to them. MEL findings are fed back and reviewed with stakeholders.

are participatory

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_11_2	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS11_2imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	21	15.00	15.00	No	99	70.21	70.21
2	54	38.57	53.57	Yes	42	29.79	100.00
3	54	38.57	92.14	Total	141	100.00	
4	11	7.86	100.00				
Total	140	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Stakeholders are informed about the program. Plans are discussed with key informants in the community, who are taken as representative of the full community. There is limited analysis of who holds authority in the local community and how.
- 2: Stakeholders are consulted about program/ project plans. They provide information which program/ project teams use to make key decisions about their work, at all stages of the program cycle. Women and men are consulted separately, and main social groupings in the community are identified, including the most marginalized.
- 3: Decisions are made jointly by program/ project staff and partners, with stakeholders consulted about plans. Local people regularly provide information that program/ project staff and partners use to make key decisions about their work, at all stages of the program cycle. Women and men are consulted separately, and teams ensure main social groupings in the community are identified and their voices heard.
- 4: Decisions are made jointly by program staff and stakeholders. Local people contribute equally in making key decisions about the program, throughout the project cycle, including planning the budget. Staff and partners make sure they work with individuals and organisations which truly represent the interests of different social groups. It is clear that Oxfam's programs are influenced by the partners and people in the communities where Oxfam works.

are mutually accountable (feedback and complaints mechanisms)

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_11_3	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS11_3imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	18	12.95	12.95	No	80	56.74	56.74
2	80	57.55	70.50	Yes	61	43.26	100.00
3	35	25.18	95.68	Total	141	100.00	
4	6	4.32	100.00				
Total	139	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: No formal feedback or complaints mechanisms in place.
- 2: Stakeholders are informed of their right to give feedback about projects, and to make complaints, and are offered at least one way of providing such feedback. Program staff ask for informal feedback from stakeholders.
- 3: Program has formal feedback and complaints mechanisms in place; actively encourages stakeholders to give feedback and make complaints; and records all feedback and complaints. Feedback and complaints always receive a response. The program demonstrably seeks continuous improvement in the quality and use of the complaints mechanisms.
- 4: Feedback and complaints systems are designed with stakeholders, building on respected local ways of giving feedback. They encourage the most marginalised people to respond, and cover many areas including sexual abuse. Feedback and complaints always receive a response. Trends are monitored and learning is fed to the wider organisation. Program demonstrably seeks continuous improvement in the quality and use of complaints mechanisms

demonstrably meets, or strives to meet, the international standards or codes that Oxfam is signed up to

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_11_4	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS11_4imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	57	41.30	41.30	No	76	53.90	53.90
2	46	33.33	74.64	Yes	65	46.10	100.00
3	26	18.84	93.48	Total	141	100.00	
4	9	6.52	100.00				
Total	138	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Program team is not aware of the international standards or codes that Oxfam is signed up to
- 2: Relevant international standards or codes that Oxfam is signed up to, are clearly referenced in the program strategy, and communicated to program stakeholders
- 3: Relevant international standards or codes that Oxfam is signed up to are clearly referenced in the program strategy, and a clear process to measure performance against these standards is set out. Review and reflection on performance is done ad hoc
- 4: Relevant international standards or codes that Oxfam is signed up to demonstrably inform program design and delivery. Clear process(es) for measuring and reflecting on performance against these standards exist, and are used to develop plans to improve future practice.

devote time to building equal relationships of mutual respect among staff, local people and partners

Performance Rating				Improvement Plans			
PS_11_5	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	PS11_5imp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	6	4.35	4.35	No	112	79.43	79.43
2	37	26.81	31.16	Yes	29	20.57	100.00
3	65	47.10	78.26	Total	141	100.00	
4	30	21.74	100.00				
Total	138	100.00					

Explanation rating levels

- 1: Staff understand that respect for stakeholders is important, but are unsure how to strengthen these relationships.
- 2: Staff are always polite and patient with stakeholders. They try to understand local social expectations, and mostly speak local language(s). However, staff don't have much time to dedicate to this challenge.
- 3: Program helps stakeholders build up their self-confidence and self-respect. Staff and partners approach their work as helping local people to analyse and tackle their own issues in their own ways. Formal mechanisms exist to support this aspiration
- 4: Program actively promotes dialogue between staff and stakeholders encouraging reflection on each other's experience. Working together with partners and local people, they develop new options for action, and do not unilaterally impose their own ideas. Formal mechanisms support this aspiration and are regularly reviewed and adapted jointly by staff and stakeholders.

Training/capacity building needs

	Training/CB (Frequency)	Training/CB (%, N=141)
PS 1: Poverty Analysis	71	50.35
PS 2: Program Strategy	57	40.43
PS 3: OSP ties	47	33.33

PS 4: Flexibility/Adaptiveness	30	21.28
PS 5: One Program Approach	42	29.79
PS 6: Partnerships and Alliances	56	39.72
PS 7: Campaigning	50	35.46
PS 8: Humanitarian Programming	30	21.28
PS 9: Cross-cutting issues	56	39.72
PS 10: MEL	50	35.46
PS 11: Stakeholder Accountability	46	32.62

© Oxfam International July 2014

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under ISBN 978-1-78077-662-0 in July 2014
Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

This Technical Annex supports the paper *Improving Programme Quality in International Development* published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under ISBN 978-1-78077-661-3 in July 2014

This paper was written by Jasmin Rocha. It is part of a series of papers written to inform the policy and practice of development and humanitarian programs. For further information on the issues raised in this paper please e-mail meal@oxfaminternational.org

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. E-mail policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 17 organizations networked together in more than 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty:

Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)
Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)
Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)
Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)
Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)
Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)
Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)
Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)
Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)
Intermon Oxfam (www.intermonoxfam.org)
Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)
Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)
Oxfam Japan (www.oxfam.jp)
Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)
Oxfam New Zealand (www.oxfam.org.nz)
Oxfam Novib (www.oxfamnovib.nl)
Oxfam Québec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)