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Introduction
1. About this User Guide

The Theory of Change for AmplifyChange describes the goals we hope to achieve and pathways towards those goals (see the diagram on the next slide). Based on the Theory of Change, we developed a set of indicators to measure progress on an ongoing basis.

This User’s Guide provides detailed information on these indicators. Designed primarily for applicants and grantees of AmplifyChange, it is intended to help organisations better understand how AmplifyChange measures results so that they can select indicators that are most relevant and meaningful to their work.
2. How this Guide is structured

Before reading this Guide, we strongly recommend that you review the User Guide #1 Explaining our Theory of Change and User Guide #2 Demystifying Monitoring, both available on amplifychange.org.

The rest of this Guide is organised into the five outcome areas of AmplifyChange:

Outcome 1: Stronger and more inclusive movements for SRHR
Outcome 2: Changes in, and implementation of, policies and laws
Outcome 3: Access to SRHR resources, information & services
Outcome 4: Transform social norms
Outcome 5: Increase individual awareness of SRHR as human rights
In each outcome area, we present a list of recommended indicators and provide the following information on each indicator:

- What it measures
- Indicator expression
- How to report on this indicator
- Means of Verification
Indicators can express quantitative and/or qualitative information. Quantitative indicators are measures of quantities or amounts. Qualitative indicators measure people’s perceptions about a subject. Both types of indicators are essential when measuring progress in the context of advocacy and policy change.

When reporting on the indicators, you will be asked to provide both quantitative data and qualitative explanation in order to capture the stories behind the numbers and changes that have taken place.
3. Core Indicators

From the list of AmplifyChange indicators, we identified a smaller set of indicators to report to our donors. We call them “core indicators.” These are our preferred indicators as we think they best capture the goals of AmplifyChange and we need to be accountable to our donors on them.

These core-indicators are marked with an asterisk (*) throughout this Guide.
4. Selecting Indicators

We do not anticipate all organisations to work on all five outcome areas. We encourage you to review the list of indicators and select the ones that are most relevant and meaningful to your work.

If your intended outcomes are not reflected in the current list of indicators, you can suggest new indicators. However, we encourage to review the entire indicator list first before you create a new one.

Make sure you don’t select more indicators than your organisation can manage. If you think you have too many indicators, we suggest that you prioritize the core-indicators.
We understand that most of you work in environments that are unpredictable.

You can change your selection during the grant period if you modify your strategies as the context changes.
Outcome 1: Stronger and more inclusive movements for SRHR

This outcome focuses on the progress toward strengthening movement capacity and has six sub-outcomes. The table on the next slide provides an overview of these sub-outcomes and recommended indicator(s) for each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MB1. Improved quality of data and analysis that allow advocates to use evidence to support their work | *MB1.1a. New evidence on SRHR generated and used for advocacy and policy engagement  
*MB1.1b. Existing evidence synthesised and used for advocacy and policy engagement  
MB1.2. Improved quality, usefulness and impact of the research reported by stakeholders (e.g., advocates, policymakers, etc.) |
| MB2. Increased participation and leadership of representatives from marginalised groups in networks or coalitions, such as people with disabilities, youth, minority ethnic groups, LGBTI, lower castes, refugees etc. | MB2.3. % of network/coalition members representing marginalised peoples  
MB2.4. % of leadership roles in network and coalitions held by members of marginalised groups |
| MB3. Strengthened capacity of CSOs to advocate for SRHR | *MB3.1a. AmplifyChange grantees strengthen their own organizational capacity  
*MB3.1b. AmplifyChange grantees provide support to other CSOs to strengthen their organizational capacity  
MB3.2. Increased capacity to ensure the safety and security of human rights defenders and their organizations. This includes physical, psychological, and digital safety and security |
| MB4. Strengthened collaboration among movement actors | MB4.1. New joint advocacy campaigns planned and implemented across AmplifyChange countries  
MB4.2. Improved collaboration among activists and organizations at the grassroots level and through online platforms |
<p>| MB5. Increased engagement of potential allies across sectors and movements | *MB5.1. Partnerships established with non-traditional SRHR allies (including: religious leaders, faith movements, youth groups, social justice / budget tracking / research / media organisations that don’t traditionally work in SRHR) |
| MB6. Locally developed new ideas implemented, lessons learned shared | *MB6.1. Lessons learnt gathered, disseminated and used by AmplifyChange grantees (including: AmplifyChange grantees generate lessons learned and use it to adapt activities; AmplifyChange grantees adapt activities based on lessons learnt from other grantees) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *MB1.1.a.</th>
<th>New evidence on SRHR generated and used for advocacy and policy engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator captures whether or not new evidence for advocacy and policy engagement activities is being generated and used for advocacy initiatives and policy engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator expression | • New evidence generated (Yes/No)  
  • Evidence generated supports advocacy / policy engagement (Yes/ No) |
| How to report on this indicator | A. To report on this indicator, you need to identify whether new evidence has been generated and provide evidence for your response.  
 B. Please describe your research products (e.g., data, analysis, etc.) and your target audience.  
 C. Please provide a story of how your research products are being used by the target audience in their policy and advocacy work. How has the research product helped with policy and advocacy work?  
 D. Please share any lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Retrospective surveys and interviews with target audience  
  • Research reports or publications  
  • Outcome of advocacy initiative or policy engagement |
**Indicator *MB1.1.b.*

Existing evidence synthesised and used for advocacy and policy engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator captures whether or not existing evidence for advocacy and policy engagement activities is being synthetized and used towards advocacy initiatives and policy engagement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Indicator expression | • Existing evidence synthesised (Yes/No)  
• Synthesised evidence used for advocacy / policy engagement (Yes/No) |

**How to report on this indicator**

A. To report on this indicator, you need to identify whether existing evidence has been synthesized and used and provide evidence for your response.  
B. Please describe your research products (e.g., data, analysis, etc.) and your target audience.  
C. Please provide a story of how your research products are being used by the target audience in their policy and advocacy work. How has the research product helped with policy and advocacy work?  
D. Please share any lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work.

**Means of Verification**

• Retrospective surveys and interviews with target audience  
• Research reports or publications  
• Outcome of advocacy initiative or policy engagement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator MB1.2</th>
<th>Improved quality, usefulness and impact of the research reported by stakeholders (e.g., advocates, policymakers, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures the progress toward improving the quality, usefulness, and impact of the research from the perspectives of AmplifyChange stakeholders, including advocates, policymakers, media, and coalition partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress and provide evidence for your response.  
B. Please describe your research products (e.g., data, analysis, etc.) and your target audience.  
C. Please provide a story of how your research products are used by the target audience in their work.  
D. Please share any important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
<p>| <strong>Means of Verification</strong> | • Survey and/or interview with target audience |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator MB2.3</th>
<th>Percent of network/coalition members representing marginalised peoples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator captures the diversity of network/coalition’s membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator expression</td>
<td>• Percentage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How to report on this indicator | A. To report on this indicator, you need (1) total number of members in your network/coalition and (2) number of members representing marginalised peoples.  
B. Please describe your target goal and explain how your organisation is meeting this goal.  
C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to increase the participation of marginalised peoples in your network/coalition, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
<p>| Means of Verification | • Organisational records |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator MB2.4</th>
<th>Percent of leadership roles in network and coalitions held by members of marginalised groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator captures the involvement of marginalised groups in the network/coalition’s leadership positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator expression</td>
<td>• Percentage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How to report on this indicator | A. To report on this indicator, you need (1) total number of leadership positions and (2) number of leadership positions occupied by marginalised peoples.  
B. Please describe your target goal and explain how your organisation is meeting this goal.  
C. Please share important lessons learned about your network/coalition’s approach to increase the involvement of marginalised peoples in leadership roles, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
<p>| Means of Verification | • Organisational records |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *MB3.1a.</th>
<th><strong>AmplifyChange grantees strengthen their own organisational capacity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures progress towards increasing organisational capacity, including identifying organisational capacity needs and tracking the development and implementation of organisational capacity-building plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress against organisational capacity-building plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. Identify organisational capacity needs of grantee. Please share findings of assessments of organisational capacity needs.  
B. Develop an organisational capacity-building plan  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress made toward achieving planned goals.  
D. Please explain your response in detail.  
E. Please share any important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to strengthen its organisational and advocacy capacity, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Organisational Capacity Assessments (OCAs); baseline and endline comparisons can be made  
• Training reports; attendance registers; pre-post tests  
• Implementation of policies, procedures, systems |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *MB3.1b.</th>
<th>AmplifyChange grantees provide support to other CSOs to strengthen their organisational capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### What it measures
This indicator captures progress towards increasing organisational capacity of other CSOs. This may be done by identifying organisational capacity needs of other CSOs and tracking the development and implementation of their organisational capacity-building plans.

### Indicator expression
- Level of progress; progress against organisational capacity-building plans

### How to report on this indicator
A. Identify organisational capacity needs of the CSOs. Please share findings of assessments of organisational capacity needs.
B. Each organisation that needs capacity building support will develop an organisational capacity-building plan.
C. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress made toward achieving planned goals.
D. Please explain your response in detail.
E. Please share any important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to strengthening organisational and advocacy capacity, including what worked and what didn’t work.

### Means of Verification
- Organisational Capacity Assessments (OCAs) of CSOs; baseline and endline comparisons can be made
- Training reports; attendance registers; pre-post tests
- Implementation of policies, procedures, systems by CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator MB3.2</th>
<th>Increased capacity to ensure the safety and security of human rights defenders and their organisations. This includes physical, psychological, and digital safety and security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator captures progress towards increasing the organisation’s capacity to ensure safety and security of individuals and organisations by developing, implementing and maintaining / improving organisational safety and security plans / systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator expression</td>
<td>• Level of progress; progress against the safety and security capacity-building plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How to report on this indicator | A. Identify the safety and security needs of the human rights defenders and their organisations. Please share findings of assessments of safety and security needs undertaken.  
B. Develop a safety and security capacity-building plan  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress your organisation has made toward achieving your planned goals.  
D. Please explain your response in detail.  
E. Please share any important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to strengthen its safety and security capacity, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Organisational Capacity Assessments (OCAs); baseline and endline comparisons can be made  
• Safety and security plans developed; copies of policies and procedures put in place  
• Training reports; attendance registers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator MB4.1</th>
<th>New joint advocacy campaigns planned and implemented across AmplifyChange countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures the progress toward strengthening collaboration and cohesion among CSOs by documenting the number of new joint advocacy campaigns among CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. To report on this indicator, you need to describe each new joint advocacy campaign and provide evidence to support your response.  
B. Please describe your organisation’s role in this joint advocacy campaign.  
C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to strengthen this joint effort, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Staff assessment  
• Planning documents |
**Indicator MB4.2**

**Improved collaboration among activists and organisations at the grassroots level and through online platforms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator captures progress toward strengthening collaboration among movement actors, increasing engagement of potential allies across sectors and movements and developing and implementing locally-developed new ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Indicator expression | - Number of grassroots activists and organisations involved in collaboration  
- Type of collaborations (e.g., joint campaigns, stakeholder meetings, establishment of working groups etc. Possibly involving wider range of sectors e.g., religious, education, research etc.) |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| How to report on this indicator |  
A. Share findings of stakeholder mapping of activists and organisations linked to your area of work and any current allies.  
B. To report on this indicator, you need to identify (1) the number and type of new collaborations that have occurred and provide evidence for your response and (2) the impact these have had on progress towards achieving your planned goals.  
C. Please explain your response in detail.  
D. Please share any important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to collaboration including what worked and what didn’t work. |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Means of Verification | - Organisational records; Verification of online platform / database established  
- Digital/media records; Copies of any documents shared / distributed  
- Meeting minutes; attendance registers of grassroots activists and organisations  
- Activity reports, e.g. campaigns held |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *MB5.1</th>
<th>Partnerships established with non-traditional SRHR allies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures the progress toward engaging non-traditional SRHR allies across sectors and movements. This could include: religious leaders, faith movements, youth groups, social justice / budget tracking / research / media organisations that don’t traditionally work in SRHR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Indicator expression** | • Number  
• Type of allies  
• Type of engagement |
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. To report on this indicator, you need to identify (1) the number of new allies your organisation has engaged, (2) what type of organisation they are and which sector they represent and (3) the type of engagement.  
B. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to engage new allies, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Planning documents and organisational records  
• Staff assessment of progress |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *MB6.1</th>
<th>Lessons learnt gathered, disseminated and used by AmplifyChange grantees (including: AmplifyChange grantees generate lessons learned and use it to adapt activities; AmplifyChange grantees adapt activities based on lessons learnt from other grantees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator captures the progress toward sharing lessons learnt, and using those lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator expression | • Existence of lesson learning strategy (Yes/No)  
• Lessons learnt shared and used (Yes/No) |
| How to report on this indicator | A. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate whether you have (1) developed a lesson learning strategy; (2) shared lessons learnt through your organisation’s project(s), and (3) whether you or other organisations made any changes to your or their strategies or activities based on those lessons.  
B. If your organisation shares lessons learnt via channels other than SMILE, please describe those channels.  
C. Please share your experience sharing lessons learnt, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Lesson learning planning documents  
• Retrospective case studies  
• List of organisations with which lessons learnt shared  
• Feedback from other organisations stating how lessons learnt were used to adapted their implementation plans and /or strategies |
Outcome 2: Changes in, and implementation of, policies and laws

There are three sub-outcomes under change in policies and laws. The first sub-outcome focuses on the importance of rigorous advocacy planning and/or regular advocacy plan reviews. The second sub-outcome focuses on the level of engagement and influence of CSOs on policy and budgetary decision-making process. The third sub-outcome focuses on changes in SRHR policies, laws, budget allocations.

The table on the next slide provides an overview of these sub-outcomes and recommended indicator(s) for each.
## Sub-outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL0. Rigorous advocacy planning</strong></td>
<td><em>PL0.1. AmplifyChange grantee undertakes rigorous advocacy planning and/or regular advocacy plan reviews (including policy mapping, audience analysis, decision-making pathways in order to structure and target advocacy activities logically) for SRHR policy change</em>  &lt;br&gt;Note: This is a mandatory indicator for any grantee who is working toward change in policies and laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL1. Increased engagement and influence of CSOs on policy and budgetary process</strong></td>
<td><strong>PL1.1.</strong> Number and type of legislators, regulators, and other decision-makers increase engagement in SRHR  &lt;br&gt;*PL1.2. Increased CSO participation in the policy and budgetary process (e.g., Joint Annual Reviews, development of health sector strategic plans, national delegations on the country's SRHR commitments, etc.)  &lt;br&gt;<strong>PL1.3.</strong> Inclusion of CSO recommendations in policy and budgetary decisions/proposals/reviews  &lt;br&gt;<strong>PL1.4.</strong> Increased availability and/or accessibility of data on SRHR indicators disaggregated by marginalised populations released by Government HMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL2. Changes in SRHR policies/laws/budget allocations</strong></td>
<td><em>PL2.1a. New national policy or law introduced or current national policy or law improved</em>  &lt;br&gt;<em>PL2.1b. Negative policy or law repealed</em>  &lt;br&gt;<em>PL2.1c. Maintain current law or prevent negative law from passage</em>  &lt;br&gt;<em>PL2.1d. Implementation of current law (including monitoring)</em>  &lt;br&gt;<em>PL2.1e. Budget allocation increased (including domestic resources mobilised to finance reproductive health services such as basket funding)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator PL0.1</td>
<td>AmplifyChange grantee undertakes rigorous advocacy planning and/or regular advocacy plan reviews (including policy mapping, audience analysis, decision-making pathways in order to structure and target advocacy activities logically) for SRHR policy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator captures progress towards increasing the advocacy capacity of the organisation by tracking the development and implementation of advocacy planning and review tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator expression | • Existence of improved planning tools used for advocacy (Yes/No)  
• Level of progress |
| How to report on this indicator | A. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress in planning and reviewing your advocacy work and provide evidence to support your response.  
B. Please explain your response in detail.  
C. Please share any important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to strengthen its advocacy capacity, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Organisational records  
• Planning tools |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator PL1.1</th>
<th>Number and type of legislators, regulators, and other decision-makers increase engagement in SRHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator focuses on the change in awareness, attitudes, position, and/or perceived urgency of SRHR issues among targeted legislators, regulators, and other decision-makers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator expression | • Number  
• Type of decision-maker |
| How to report on this indicator | A. To report on this indicator, you need to capture the number and type of decision-makers reached by your organisation who show an increase in their engagement in SRHR.  
B. Please describe their change in more detail.  
C. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Interviews with decision-makers to capture their awareness, reactions, and support for issues advocated by CSOs before and after the intervention  
• Observations by staff of the decision-makers if interacting regularly |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *PL1.2</th>
<th>Increased CSO participation in the policy and budgetary process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures the CSO’s involvement in policy and budgetary process. Examples include participation in Joint Annual Reviews, development of health sector strategic plans, being part of the national delegations on the country's SRHR commitments, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress and provide evidence to support your response.  
B. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Public meeting records  
• Staff assessment of progress  
• Analysis of policy documents |
Indicator PL1.3  
Inclusion of CSO recommendations in policy and budgetary decisions/ proposals/ reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator captures if and what recommendations provided by CSOs are included in policy and budgetary outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator expression</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existence (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to report on this indicator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate whether CSO recommendations are reflected in policy proposals during a reference period. Please also describe in more detail what recommendations are included, in what policies or budget items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of policy documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator PL1.4</td>
<td>Increased availability and/or accessibility of data on SRHR indicators disaggregated by marginalised populations released by Government HMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures the progress toward increasing the availability and accessibility of data on SRHR indicators disaggregated by marginalised populations released by Government HMIS. “Marginalised populations” will be defined in conjunction with CSOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. Assessment of government HMIS data on SRHR should focus on the following:  
  o Are the data available in multiple formats, including online and hardcopy?  
  o Are the data translated into local languages?  
  o Are the data equally accessible to everyone, e.g., license-free, downloadable without additional conditions, ready for free-usage among users, etc.?  
  A. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress and provide evidence to support your response.  
  B. Please describe your organisation's role in facilitating this change.  
  C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation's approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
<p>| <strong>Means of Verification</strong> | • Ongoing monitoring of SRHR data released by government HMIS |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator <em>PL2.1a.</em></th>
<th>New national policy or law introduced or current national policy or law improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures progress towards introducing or improving SRHR policies/laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress towards introduction of new national policy or law, or improvement towards current national policy or law (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. Please indicate the national policy or law the organisation is working towards introducing or improving.  
B. Develop an advocacy plan or strategy. Please share any advocacy plans or strategies.  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to identify (1) type of change the organisation is trying to achieve; (2) indicate the level of progress; and (3) provide evidence to support your response e  
D. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
E. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Policy/law reviews and analysis  
• Documents shared with e.g., parliament or policy stakeholders  
• Meeting minutes with e.g., Ministry of Health  
• Copy of e.g., new national policy |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator captures progress towards the repeal of negative policies or laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator expression</td>
<td>- Level of progress towards the repeal of negative policies or laws (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How to report on this indicator | A. Please indicate the negative policy or law the organisation is working towards repealing.  
B. Develop an advocacy plan or strategy. Please share any advocacy plans or strategies.  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to identify (1) type of change the organisation is trying to achieve; (2) indicate the level of progress; and (3) provide evidence to support your response.  
D. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
E. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | - Policy/law reviews and analysis  
- Documents shared with e.g., parliament or policy stakeholders  
- Meeting minutes with e.g., Ministry of Health  
- Official statement of repeal of negative policy or law |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicator <em>PL2.1c.</em></strong></th>
<th><strong>Maintain current law or prevent negative law from passage</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures progress towards maintaining existing positive SRHR laws or halting proposed negative SRHR laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress towards maintaining existing positive SRHR laws or halting proposed negative SRHR laws (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. Please indicate the current law the organisation is working to maintain or the negative law the organisation is working to prevent from passage.  
B. Develop an advocacy plan or strategy. Please share any advocacy plans or strategies.  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to identify (1) type of change the organisation is trying to achieve; (2) indicate the level of progress; and (3) provide evidence to support your response.  
D. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
E. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Law reviews and analysis  
• Documents shared with e.g., parliament or policy stakeholders  
• Meeting minutes with e.g., Ministry of Health  
• Official statement confirming prevention of proposed negative law from passage |
**Indicator *PL2.1d.* Implementation of current law (including monitoring)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator captures progress towards ensuring that current positive SRHR laws are implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator expression</td>
<td>• Level of progress towards ensuring current positive SRHR laws are implemented (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How to report on this indicator | A. Please indicate the current law the organisation is working to implement.  
B. Develop an implementation or monitoring plan or strategy. Please share any plans or strategies and describe how the organisation intends to implement or monitor implementation of the current law including use of any tools.  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to identify (1) type of change the organisation is trying to achieve; (2) indicate the level of progress; and (3) provide evidence to support your response.  
D. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
E. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Law implementation reviews and analysis  
• Policies and protocols established to support implementation of current law  
• Services established to aid implementation of current law  
• Systems established to monitor implementation of current law  
• Feedback from stakeholders / interviews and opinion surveys |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *PL2.1e.</th>
<th>Budget allocation increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures progress towards increased budgets dedicated to SRHR (including domestic resources mobilised to finance reproductive health services such as basket funding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress of budgetary contribution towards SRHR (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. Please include a budget assessment or budget review if they have been undertaken, and any gaps in budget allocation identified.  
B. Develop a plan or strategy to advocate for increased budget allocation  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to identify (1) type of budgetary change the organisation plans to achieve; (2) indicate the level of progress; and (3) provide evidence to support your response.  
D. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
E. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Budget reviews and analysis  
• Meeting minutes with stakeholders  
• Declaration of commitment made by e.g., MoH |
Outcome 3: Access to SRHR resources, information & services

This outcome focuses on the availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality of SRHR resources, information, and services for target populations. It includes two sub-outcomes. The first one – expansion or improvement of SRHR resources, information and services delivered by CSOs – focuses on services delivered by grantee partners. The second one – strengthened multi-sector capacity and engagement for SRHR service delivery – focuses on the broader service delivery system.

The table on the next slide provides an overview of these sub-outcomes and recommended indicator(s) for each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AR1. Expansion or improvement of SRHR services/ information/ products delivered by CSOs** | **AR0.1.a.** Increased number of new users of SRHR services/ information/ products (e.g. new users reached by services, Comprehensive Sexuality Education, sanitary pads)  
**AR0.1.b.** Improved quality of services/ information/ products (using recognised quality standard as defined in conjunction with CSO) (e.g. better quality youth friendly services)  
**AR1.3.** Increased cost-effectiveness per quality and accessible service/ information/ product |
| **AR2. Strengthened multi-sector capacity and engagement (health, education, public institutions, private sector, etc.) for SRHR service delivery** | **AR2.1.** Changes to national medical education curricula that includes in- and pre-service training on SRHR topics (e.g. family planning, abortion, post-abortion care, GBV, working with marginalised populations)  
**AR2.2.** Number, type and level of institutions implementing new mechanisms or practices to strengthen SRHR service, product and education delivery  
**AR2.3.** Increased range (number of different types) of SRHR services/ information/ products available due to AmplifyChange grantee activity  
**AR2.4** Improved routine national data collection to reflect target population/themes |
### Indicator AR0.1a

**Increased number of new users of SRHR services/ information/ products (e.g. new users reached by services, Comprehensive Sexuality Education, sanitary pads)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator focuses on the change in the utilization of the SRHR service(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Indicator expression | • Number  
• Type of service  
• Target group(s) |
| How to report on this indicator | A. To calculate this indicator, you need to capture the number of new users of the relevant services during a reference period.  
B. Please describe the types of service your organisation provides and target groups.  
C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Organisational records |
**Indicator AR0.1b.** Improved quality of services/ information/ products (using recognised quality standard as defined in conjunction with CSO) (e.g. better quality youth friendly services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator focuses on the change in the quality of the SRHR service(s), using a recognized quality standard as defined in conjunction with the CSO. Quality of SRHR services covers a range of areas, including characteristics of the facilities (e.g., location, timings, fees), characteristics of service providers (e.g., backgrounds, competencies, attitudes), clinical practices (e.g. quality of care, clinical outcomes, referral practices), governance and characteristics of programme design (e.g., client participation in programme design, outreach and promotion, integrated services and/or referral system, relationship between service providers and service managers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator expression</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Level of progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to report on this indicator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. To report on this indicator, you will need to indicate whether improvement has occurred and provide evidence to support your response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Please describe the nature of the improvement and the target groups that would benefit from it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Survey or interviews with programme participants to capture their satisfaction and perception of service quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use assessment checklist to determine if your programme meets existing standards and guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follow-up studies with clients to determine clinical outcomes and/ or repeat visits to service users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Improved quality of services/ information/ products (using recognised quality standard as defined in conjunction with CSO) (e.g. better quality youth friendly services)

#### Gender Based Violence
- Sample interview guide for GBV survivors developed by Nhlangano AIDS Training Information and Counselling Centre (NATICC) in Address Gender Based Violence and Child Abuse in the Shiselweni Region, Mid-term Evaluation Report, March 2014 (p.68). Available from [http://m.dfef.no/files/dfef.no/Documents/Midttermevaluation%202014.pdf](http://m.dfef.no/files/dfef.no/Documents/Midttermevaluation%202014.pdf)


#### Youth friendly SRHR services
- Sample Checklist for Assessment of Youth Friendly SRH Services developed by HANDS & Rutgers WPF partners in Guidelines for Youth Friendly Sexual & Reproductive Health Services. Available from [http://www.rutgerswpfpak.org/content/pdfs/reports/SRHR-Service-Delivery-Protocols.pdf](http://www.rutgerswpfpak.org/content/pdfs/reports/SRHR-Service-Delivery-Protocols.pdf)


**What it measures**

This indicator focuses on the cost-effectiveness, productivity and sustainability of service provision without compromising service quality. Cost-effectiveness analysis could measure overall changes in the amount of quality and accessible services provided for equivalent investments of money, time, people and other technical/programme inputs. Our broad interpretation of cost-effectiveness also includes the concept of financial sustainability, i.e. capturing associated income generation activities that do not compromise access.

**Indicator expression**

- Level of progress
- Reduced cost per quality and accessible service
- Reduced time per quality and accessible service
- Reduced cost per new user uptake
- Increased income to cost ratio
Indicator AR1.3 (cont’d)  
Increased cost-effectiveness per quality and accessible service / information/ product

How to report on this indicator

A. To report on this indicator, you will need to indicate whether cost reductions have occurred per unit and provide financial and service data to support your response. This means reporting at least twice, preferably more, including providing a baseline value at the beginning of the activity.

B. Please provide evidence that quality and accessibility of services has been maintained or improved in the process of making cost-effectiveness improvements.

C. If reporting on improved financial sustainability, provide evidence of additional revenue-generation associated with the service and evidence that accessibility or quality have been maintained or improved.

D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation's approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work.

Means of Verification

- Financial reports
- Service data
- Cost calculator tools

Additional resources

For service specific cost-effectiveness analysis tools, see:
- Bond provides a helpful range of resources - http://www.bond.org.uk/value-for-money
Indicator AR2.1

Changes to national medical education curricula that includes in- and pre-service training on SRHR topics (e.g. family planning, abortion, post-abortion care, GBV, working with marginalised populations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator focuses on the change in the national medical education curricula to include more comprehensive and rights-based information on SRHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator expression</td>
<td>• Level of progress (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How to report on this indicator | A. To calculate this indicator, you need to first indicate the level of progress and provide evidence to support your response.  
B. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| Means of Verification | • Staff assessment of progress |
### Indicator AR2.2

**Number, type and level of institutions implementing new mechanisms or practices to strengthen SRHR service, product and education delivery**

#### What it measures

This indicator captures the changes in institutional practices to strengthen SHRHR service delivery. It might include improving or establishing new guidelines or procedures, implementing ongoing staff training on SRHR topics, strengthening the coordination of service delivery across teams and/or across agencies.

#### Indicator expression

- Number
- Type of institution (health, education, human services, police, judicial, private sector, etc.)
- Level of institution (local, sub-national, national)

#### How to report on this indicator

A. To report on this indicator, you need to capture the number of institutions reached by your organisation that have made progress in improving SRHR service delivery.
B. Please describe these institutions and the progress they have made.
C. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.
D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work.

#### Means of Verification

- Surveys or interviews with target institutions
### Indicator *AR2.3

**Increased range of SRHR services, information and products available due to AmplifyChange grantee activity**

#### What it measures

This indicator focuses on the progress toward providing more integrated SRHR services and information. Increased range of SRHR services includes, but is not limited to: comprehensive youth-friendly SRHR services with better opening hours and in better locations, with services ranging from SRHR counselling, provision of contraceptives, STI testing and treatment, voluntary HIV testing and counselling, and abortion related services and counselling.

#### Indicator expression

- Existence of an increase (Yes/No)
- Number of services
- Type of services

#### How to report on this indicator

A. To calculate this indicator, you need to capture the type of SRHR services, information and products received by each client in a target institution over a reference period.

B. Please indicate whether there is an increase in the range of SRHR services and information received by each client during this reference period. Include baseline and endline data.

C. Please describe your organisation's role in facilitating this change.

D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation's approach, including what worked and what didn’t work.

#### Means of Verification

- Organisational records/MIS
- Surveys or interviews with target institutions
### Indicator AR2.4

**Improved routine national data collection to reflect target population/themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator captures the progress toward improving and making routine the national data collection on SRHR related issues, disaggregated appropriately by age, gender, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator expression</th>
<th>• Level of progress (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| How to report on this indicator | A. Assessment of national data on SRHR should focus on the following:  
|                               | o What data are available?  
|                               | o How often are the data updated?  
|                               | o Are the data disaggregated appropriately?  
|                               | A. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress and provide evidence to support your response.  
|                               | B. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
|                               | C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |

| Means of Verification | • Ongoing monitoring of SRHR data released by national government  
|                      | • Staff assessment |
Outcome 4: Transform social norms

This outcome focuses on change in the norms, practices, and values that undermine SRHR. It includes two sub-outcomes. The first one focuses on the change in the target groups in the community in terms of their engagement and support for SRHR. The target groups might include key influencers - traditional, community and religious leaders, police, government policy-makers, celebrities, political leaders; men and boys; service providers; and general public. The second sub-come focuses on media coverage of SRHR issues from a human rights perspective in terms of quantity and content.

The table on the next slide provides an overview of these sub-outcomes and recommended indicator(s) for each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1. Increased engagement among target populations to advocate for SRHR</td>
<td>*SN1.1. Increased and more public support for SRHR, and less negative statements, from key influencers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN1.2. Men and boys increase their engagement to actively supporting SRHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*SN1.3. Increased engagement amongst service providers to actively support SRHR for all populations, including the vulnerable and marginalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN1.4. Changes in public opinion and action on SRHR topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*NOTE: Please select this indicator ONLY if you have a sound methodology and budget to measure public opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN1.5. Stronger support networks for young people to seek SRH services and to make decisions about their own sexuality and body. (Support network can include parents, other family members, teachers, and peers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SN2. Increased media coverage of SRHR from a human rights perspective

SN2.1. Increased media coverage of SRHR demonstrating accurate and holistic understanding of SRHR topics from a human rights perspective. This includes media coverage that challenges discriminatory social norms and stereotypes.

*Note: Please select this indicator ONLY if you have a sound methodology and budget to conduct media content analysis.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator *SN1.1</th>
<th>Increased and more public support for SRHR, and less negative statements, from key influencers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator focuses on the change in the level of support for progressive change in SRHR among key influencers of public opinion. This might include changing one’s position on SRHR issues, announcing one’s support in public for the first time, increasing one’s engagement in advocating for SRHR, etc. Key influencers are defined as: traditional, community and religious leaders, police, government policymakers (both national and sub-national), celebrities, political leaders, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Indicator expression** | • Number  
• Type of key influencer (e.g., traditional, community, and religious leaders, celebrities, political leaders, etc.) |
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. To report on this indicator, you need to identify the number and type of key influences reached by your programme who show increased support for progressive change during a reference period.  
B. Please provide evidence for the change, including stories or quotes from key influencers.  
C. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Public speeches and/or writings in traditional and/or new social media  
• Interviews with key influencers  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator SN1.2</th>
<th>Men and boys increase their engagement to actively supporting SRHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This indicator captures the level of support for SRHR among men and boys. The support can manifest in a range of actions, including supporting the girls and women in their family to exercise their SRHR, speaking out on SRHR issues in public, participating in campaigns advocating SRHR, participating in marches, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Indicator expression** | • Number  
• Type of activity |
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. To report on this indicator, you need to capture the number of men and boys reached by your programme who become active in supporting SRHR during a reference period.  
B. Please describe the types of activities these men and boys engage in and the results, if any, of their actions.  
C. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Survey or interviews with men and boys reached by the programme  
• Survey or interviews with women and girls in the target community |
**Increased engagement amongst service providers to actively support SRHR for all populations, including the vulnerable and marginalised**

**What it measures**
This indicator captures the level of support for SRHR among service providers, and particularly considers support to marginalised and vulnerable individuals. The support can manifest in a range of actions, including supporting their clients to exercise their SRHR, speaking out on SRHR issues in public, participating in campaigns advocating SRHR, participating in marches, etc.

**Indicator expression**
- Number
- Type of activity

**How to report on this indicator**

A. To report on this indicator, you need to capture the number of service providers reached by your programme who become active in supporting SRHR during a reference period. Please also indicate their levels of service to marginalised and vulnerable communities.

B. Please describe the types of activities these service providers engage in and the results, if any, of their actions.

C. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.

D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work.

**Means of Verification**
- Survey or interview with service providers reached by the programme
- Staff observation
## Indicator SN1.4

### Changes in public opinion and action on SRHR topics

**NOTE:** Please select this indicator ONLY if you have a sound methodology and budget to measure public opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator captures the change in public awareness or perception of SRHR topics, such as abortion, STIs and sexual health, stigma and discrimination based on sexual orientation, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator expression</strong></td>
<td>• Level of progress in change in public awareness or perception of particular SRHR topic(s) (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. It may be helpful to conduct a baseline survey if you plan on measuring change. Please share findings of any assessments undertaken.  
B. Develop a robust methodology to measure public opinion and action.  
C. To report on this indicator, you need to indicate the level of progress you have observed on a given topic and provide evidence to support your response.  
D. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
E. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Focus groups with community members to reflect on their observed change in the community, if any, over a reference period.  
• Public opinion surveys  
• Size of mass demonstration in support of or against an issue or proposal |
Additional resources

Safe abortion and post-abortion services


- Shellenberg, Hessini, and Levandowski developed a scale to measure abortion stigma at individual and community level, called Stigmatizing Attitudes, Beliefs, and Actions (SABA) scale. It captures three important dimensions of abortion stigma: negative stereotypes about men and women who are associated with abortion, discrimination/exclusion of women who have abortions, and fear of contagion as a result of coming in contact with a woman who has had an abortion. In Shellenberg, K., Hessini, L., & Levandowski, B. A. (2014), Developing a Scale to Measure Stigmatizing Attitudes and Beliefs About Women Who Have Abortions: Results from Ghana and Zambia, *Women & Health*, 54:7, 599-616.
Stronger support networks for young people to seek SRH services and to make decisions about their own sexuality and body. (Support network can include: SN 1.5a Increased support from parents SN 1.5b Increased support from other family members SN 1.5c Increased support from teachers SN 1.5d Increased support from peers)

What it measures

This indicator focuses on the change in the level of support for young people to seek SRH services and to make decisions about their own sexuality and body from parents, other family members, teachers, and peers. This might include discussing SRHR with young people, changing position on SRHR issues, announcing support in public for the first time.

Indicator expression

- Number of young people supported through strengthened support networks; number of supporters who show increased support for young people’s SRHR
- Type support (e.g. parents, other family members, teachers, and peers.)

How to report on this indicator

A. To report on this indicator, you need to identify the number and type of supporters reached by your programme who show increased support for young people’s SRHR during a reference period.

B. Please provide evidence for the change, including stories or quotes from supporters.

C. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.

D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work.

Means of Verification

- Interviews or surveys with key supporters
- Positive public statements made by support networks
- Interviews or surveys with young people on their perception of support received
### Indicator SN2.1

**Increased media coverage of SRHR demonstrating accurate and holistic understanding of SRHR topics from a human rights perspective.** This includes media coverage that challenges discriminatory social norms and stereotypes.

*Note: Please select this indicator ONLY if you have a sound methodology and budget to conduct media content analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>This indicator captures the quantity and content of media coverage of SRHR topics from a human rights perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Indicator expression** | • Level of progress (getting worse, no progress, little or some progress, a lot of progress)  
• Number of accurate or inaccurate messages delivered by the media (e.g., social media, print media, broadcast news)  
• Type of media stories |
| **How to report on this indicator** | A. To report on this indicator, you need to identify the criteria for “accurate and holistic understanding of SRHR topics from a human rights perspective” and use the criteria to analyze stories in the media covering SRHR topics over a selected period of time.  
B. Based on the analysis, please indicate the level of progress you have observed and provide evidence to support your response. Please also report on the number of media stories and the type (print, radio, television, etc.)  
C. Please describe your organisation’s role in facilitating this change.  
D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
| **Means of Verification** | • Monitoring and analysis of news and current affairs content  
• Analysis of news and current affairs content retrieved from media archives |
Outcome 5: Increase individual awareness of SRHR as human rights

This outcome focuses on the awareness of SRHR as human rights among individuals from marginalised groups, whose SRHR are often neglected, denied, or violated. It has three sub-outcomes. The table on the next slide provides an overview of these sub-outcomes and recommended indicator(s) for each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA1. Increased knowledge of SRHR as a human right, particularly amongst</td>
<td>*IA1.1. Number and percentage of individuals amongst marginalised groups reached by the programme have increased awareness and knowledge of SRHR as a human right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalised groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA2. Individuals become empowered to claim their SRHR</td>
<td>IA2.1. Number and percentage of individuals reached by the programme become empowered to claim their SRHR (e.g. reporting GBV cases, requesting services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA3. Individuals increase their engagement in activism to advocate for SRHR,</td>
<td>*IA3.1. Number of individuals from marginalised groups reached by the programme become active in advocating for SRHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particularly amongst marginalised groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator *IA1.1*

**Number and percent of individuals reached by the programme reporting change in awareness and knowledge of SRHR as a human right**

#### What it measures

This indicator focuses on the changes in the awareness of individuals as a result of participating in or being exposed to the programme. Changes in awareness might include increased awareness of sexual and reproductive health and rights as a human right, increased knowledge of laws and policies regarding SRHR in their countries, increased knowledge of where and how to seek SRHR information and/or services they need, etc.

#### Indicator expression

- Number
- Percentage

#### How to report on this indicator

A. To calculate this indicator, you need (1) the total number of individuals participating in or exposed to programme during a reference period, and (2) number of individuals reached by the programme reported change in their awareness.

B. Please provide a story of an individual who changed their awareness as a result of participating in or exposed to the programme.

C. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work.

#### Means of Verification

- Surveys and/or interviews with participants at the end of the programme to reflect on what they have learned, and how, if at all, their understanding of SRHR has changed.
- Surveys and/or interviews with participants at the beginning of the programme (pre) and at the end of the programme (post). Compare the pre and post results to capture any change in individual participants.
- Use creative processes, e.g. drawing, to engage participants in reflecting on their own change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator IA2.1</th>
<th>Number and percent of individuals reached by the programme become empowered to claim their rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>This indicator focuses on individuals reached by the programme who become empowered to claim their rights. Researchers have pointed out that empowerment is a non-linear process and context specific. In the context of SRHR, examples of empowerment might include willingness to report GBV; willingness to seek SRHR information, resources, and services; ability to make important life choices, such decisions about marriage, family size, household purchases; and ability to visit friends and families or travel freely in public spaces. Because of the context-specific nature of empowerment, we recommend that each organisation define what empowerment means in their situation. The resources section provides some great examples of using participatory approach to engage programme participants in defining and measuring empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator expression | • Number  
• Percentage |
| How to report on this indicator | A. To calculate this indicator, you need (1) the total number of individuals participating in or exposed to programme during a reference period, and (2) number of individuals reached by the program become empowered to claim their rights.  
B. Please describe what empowerment means in your context.  
C. Provide a story of an individual who become empowered as a result of participating in or exposed to the programme.  
D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation’s approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work. |
**Indicator IA2.1 (cont’d)**

Number and percent of individuals reached by the programme become empowered to claim their rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Surveys or interviews with participants at the end of the programme to reflect on how, if at all, they have changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surveys or interviews with participants at the beginning of the programme (pre) and at the end of the programme (post). Compare the pre and post results to capture any change in individual participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use creative processes, e.g. drawing, to engage participants in reflecting on their own change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Indicator **IA3.1

**Number of individuals reached by the programme become active in advocating for SRHR**

**What it measures**

This indicator focuses on the individuals who have become active in advocating for SRHR as a result of participating in or being exposed to the programme. This might include outreach to others in the community to raise awareness, taking leadership roles in a campaign, conducting workshops to train others, etc.

**Indicator expression**

- Number

**How to report on this indicator**

A. To calculate this indicator, you need the number of individuals reached by the programme who have become active in advocating for SRHR.
B. Please describe what these individuals do to advocate for SRHR.
C. Please provide a story of an individual's transformation to become active in advocating for SRHR.
D. Please share important lessons learned about your organisation's approach to facilitate this change, including what worked and what didn’t work.

**Means of Verification**

- Surveys or interviews with participants at the end of the programme to reflect on how, if at all, they have changed, and what activities they are engaged in to advocate for SRHR
- Staff observation