Annex To Indicator Guidance

Indicator: Citizen Proposals Funded at The Municipal Level (see here)

Indicator wording: Evidence of [define: services / initiatives] funded at the municipal level that directly reflect citizen proposals submitted through participatory budgeting or consultation processes

If your project wants to assess the degree of change - rather than document evidence - consider reformulating the proposed indicator to *Extent to which municipal funding decisions reflect citizen proposals submitted through participatory budgeting or consultation processes*. To assess the extent, **establish clear criteria and standards for different levels of responsiveness, informed by baseline findings**.

Projects may **use a rubric-based rating** (e.g. on a 1–5 scale or qualitative levels) to show progression over time (*see the guidance in documents below*). **Users should always formulate their own project-specific rubrics at the inception** in line with baseline findings. Ideally, formulation should take place during a joint workshop with project partners. An illustrative example of a simple rubric scale and the description of each level can be:

- *None (=1)* – Citizen proposals are not acknowledged in municipality meetings or documents.
- *Emerging (=2)* – Some citizen proposals acknowledged in meetings or documents, but not yet funded.
- *Moderate (=3)* – A few citizen proposals funded or piloted.
- *Significant (=4)* – Several citizen proposals reflected in budget and implemented, with public acknowledgement of citizen input.
- *Institutionalised (=5)* – Reflection of citizen proposals is routine and embedded in municipal planning and budgeting cycles. Municipality allocates budget lines annually for participatory proposals and reports back to citizens.

Assign a level or score (e.g. none, emerging, moderate, significant, institutionalized) to responsiveness observed in each target location at baseline and then at the planned assessment point(s) and/or endline. Compare the responsiveness on the rubric scale throughout your intervention to assess the change over time. If desired, aggregate results to show how many communities are at each level of progress. Using numerical scores (e.g. 1–5) can make data aggregation and year-to-year comparison easier.

If you want to promote community participation and **increase community ownership**, design rubric levels, conduct scoring, and validate progress together with project staff, partners, and other relevant actors in a participatory manner.

Outcome Harvesting methodology (*see resources below*) can help explain shifts between rubric levels, collect concrete examples, and provide deeper understanding of *how and why* change happened.

If using rubrics is too resource-intensive or if sufficient data cannot be collected to reliably justify scores (e.g. due to project scale or partner coordination constraints), you may **use Outcome Harvesting independently** without rubric scoring, while still maintaining a results-based and evidence-driven approach.

Consider engaging an external expert or evaluator to substantiate / validate your results during project's evaluation.

Indicators that assess extent are **methodologically more complex and may be challenging** to inform, particularly where project partners have limited ownership of the data collection process or where coordination costs are high. To mitigate these challenges, projects should support partners through training and practical tools, involve them in the formulation of rubrics and scoring, and provide clear guidance on how to report on the indicator (e.g. through a dedicated section in the narrative report template). Where outcome-focused data are not systematically collected during implementation, external evaluators may be engaged to harvest and substantiate outcomes as part of the project evaluation.

Links:
https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/approaches/outcome-harvesting
https://www.intrac.org/app/uploads/2024/12/Outcome-harvesting.pdf
https://outcomeharvesting.net/
https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/methods/rubrics