PART 3: TAKING ACCOUNT

HOW ACCOUNTABLE ARE CIVICUS’ RESOURCING PRACTICES?

Listening to our members, partners, and staff about their experiences of our resourcing programmes is one of the most important indicators of success and drivers of change for our practices.

Some ways we’re doing this include:

- A participatory internal review of our core resourcing process, in which staff identified the following priority areas for improvement: better strategy and tools for reaching our target constituents; new mechanisms to make contract management easier; and more accessible sub-grant agreements.

- External feedback collected at various stages, whether during the application process, grant period, or via reporting, has flagged the importance of all resourcing programmes placing more emphasis on consistently providing accessible information and responses to queries (i.e., improving how we ‘give account’).

- Past strategic planning consultations with members identified individual activists, young people, and grassroots groups as key change-makers we needed to provide more support to. This has led to specific projects where we have learned how to provide better financial and non-financial support to these more informal actors.

- Partner feedback highlighting challenges with moving money in hard-to-reach locations, especially where civic space is more closed, has also resulted in a new collaborative workstream exploring alternative options for getting funds to our constituents.
In the last year we have completely redesigned the Solidarity Fund application process using inputs from members around the globe about the hidden costs and barriers they face when applying for these grants.

The Youth Action Lab has shown that using a multifaceted approach to feedback collection is particularly effective for building a culture of sharing, learning and growing together. Bi-weekly check-ins between the team and participants and using Net Promoter Score surveys after group training sessions have been pivotal for building deeper relationships with and among the participants, which in turn has led to greater levels of trust and a healthy ‘feedback culture’.

Innovations made in response to feedback received by one resourcing programme are increasingly being applied by other programmes. For example, when youth members told us that they would require financial compensation to help us assess and select Lab participants, we started remunerating them – a practice we are now trying to replicate elsewhere.

Some gaps remain, however, including:

- More consistently soliciting inputs from delivery partners, donors and critical friends, as well as always ensuring that there are options for anonymous feedback.

- Go further in showing what we are doing with the feedback we collect and how it is transforming our resourcing programmes, so our audiences see the value of giving feedback and keep providing it.

- The depth and frequency of feedback collection is still somewhat inconsistent from one programme to the next. However, new efforts like Resilient Roots’ internal Accountability Accelerator tool and a programme quality framework in the pipeline represent significant strides towards more rigorous organisation-wide norms.

- Again, there is currently rather limited scope for us to address feedback related to the core rules of our re-granting processes. If we more consistently collect data and stories about how these rules make things difficult for our members, then it will provide us with an even stronger evidence base to advocate for more flexibility from our donors and make informed choices about the resourcing we offer and the partnerships we negotiate with donors.