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Foreword

With a theme of Social Performance Management (SPM), this year's Regional Workshop brought together 40 participants from 9 organizations\(^1\) from 6 countries to learn and share experiences in the social microfinance sector.

Run by Entrepreneurs du Monde in collaboration with STEP, the workshop featured multiples activities including field visits. The programme reflected a cycle\(^2\) spanning from the definition of social indicators to the use of social results. The materials developed for the workshop build on the rich documentations made available by the Social Performance Task Force.

The event was a great success with positive feedback in particular about facilitation methods, group atmosphere, field visits and opportunities to forge new linkages between practitioners.

This report seeks to bring together the presentations, group activities including field visits of the workshop both for those who were able to participate and for those unable to join us in Kolkata back in March.

We hope the outputs of the workshop will be used to improve organisations’ capacity to fulfill their mission.

---

\(^1\) Anh Chi Em, Chamroeun, Inter Aide, Entrepreneurs du Monde, SAI, SEED, Sont Oo Tehtwin, SCPI, STEP.

\(^2\) See diagram on the next page.
Sessions

Day 1 – Monday 14th March

On the first day, participants introduced themselves and their organisation with conviviality and identify some common characteristics and differences among themselves through a bingo game\(^3\). Organisations’ factsheets\(^4\) had been prepared and made available within the welcome jute bags that presented MFIs from a social performance standpoint.

Abhijit BERA, Carole SULSKI and Eric EUSTACHE opened the workshop by welcoming participants. Then, Eugénie CONSTANCIAS shared participants’ expectations for the workshop that were previously gathered through an online survey. She put expectations in perspective with workshop objectives\(^5\) that were (i.) to learn about Social Performance Management and methods to measure the achievement of social goals, (ii.) to share experiences, knowledge & best practices and (iii.) to identify ways to better systematise and embed the collection of social data into everyday activities.

The programme was presented. It mirrored the social performance management cycle as illustrated by the diagram beside.

Common rules\(^6\) for the well good proceeding of the week were settled.

The theme of the workshop was introduced through a presentation\(^7\) of the concepts of social performance and social performance management, and the importance of monitoring the fulfillment of an organisation’s mission. The five dimensions of the social performance pathway were presented through a game\(^8\) consisting in a set of cards representing activities and tools to place along the pathway according to the dimension they belong to.

\(^3\) See appendices 1.1.1a_Getting to know each other and 1.1.1b_Grid
\(^4\) 1.1.1c_MFIs factsheets
\(^5\) 1.1.3a_Expectations, Objectives & Programme, 1.1.3b_Objectives & Programme
\(^6\) 1.1.4_Group organisation & common rules
\(^7\) 1.1.5a_Topic Introduction and 1.1.5b_SPM Presentation
\(^8\) 1.1.6a_Exercise SP Pathway, 1.1.6b_Exercise Icons, 1.1.7_Exercise results
Participants then worked on an exercise aiming at selecting the most appropriate definitions of mission statements’ key terms. The facilitator wrapped up the exercise by recalling the importance of articulating a mission statement which must be short and clear summarizing the institution’s social goals and describing concrete, measurable, and plausible impacts, rather than vague aspirations that are hard to assess and achieve. Key terms definition enables to have a common understanding or target groups, characteristics of products and services and desired changes in partners’ well-being. It is the foundation for monitoring the implementation of an institution’s mission.

After lunch, a warm-up activity was organised to introduce the next session dealing with the concept of “theory of change”.

Participants got familiar with the “theory of change” through a presentation by the facilitator describing this concept as a process of planned social change, from the assumptions that guide its design to the long-term goals it seeks to achieve. She mentioned that the “theory of change” enables to uncover the thinking that guides the activities of an organisation and helps mapping a process of social change that is always complex.

Two activities were carried out to first apply the concept to a particular service provided by an institution and then to start building the “Tree of Change” of organizations represented at the workshop. It started from the soil that is the context of the organisation, including the problem the institution wants to solve, to upper fruits representing long term desired outcomes.

The last activity on the first day was designed to underline the necessity of choosing monitoring indicators balancing relevance and feasibility.
Social indicators\textsuperscript{16} should be relevant to the organisation’s mission statement, specific, unambiguous, practical to measure, complete but limited in number. Social indicators should also be adopted only if pilot test results are convincing.

The end of the day was dedicated to receive feedback from participants on the first workshop day\textsuperscript{17}.

Day 2 – Tuesday 15\textsuperscript{th} March

The “bindi game”\textsuperscript{18} opened the second day. A plenary session followed with speakers from Anh Chi Em (market survey), Chamroeun (pilot of a set of indicators to track partners’ profile: PPI+) and STEP (drop-out survey) to illustrate the wide variety of partner surveys that differ in terms of questions to answer, methodology (qualitative/quantitative methods, characteristics of partners included in the survey, etc.)\textsuperscript{19}. Yet, they all have in common certain features in the sense that they followed a survey process consisting in defining the questions the organisation wants to answer, implementing data collection method, processing and managing the information, analyzing and using findings.

The plenary session was followed by a group exercise to define research objectives\textsuperscript{20}.

Then, the facilitator gave an overview of survey methods\textsuperscript{21}. The presentation was interrupted by two interludes\textsuperscript{22} consisting in a quiz to bring participants to better listen to a presentation with dense content and quickly use the information received.

Afterwards, based on a research objective, groups were then asked to select the first research method to implement and to draft a questionnaire/guidelines\textsuperscript{23}.

\textsuperscript{16} Referring to the 3 social goals i.e. target population, characteristics of products and services and change in partners’ well being.
\textsuperscript{17} 1.5.1_Evaluation end of the day 1
\textsuperscript{18} 2.1.1_The bindi game
\textsuperscript{19} 2.1.2a_Sharing of Experiences_Outline and 2.1.2b_Sharing of Experiences_Illustrations
\textsuperscript{20} 2.2.1b_Exercise_research objectives and 2.2.1c_Set of missions & problems
\textsuperscript{21} 2.3.1_Overview research methodologies
\textsuperscript{22} 2.3.2a_Interludes 1&2 + questions, 2.3.2b_List of questions, 2.3.2d_Right answers
\textsuperscript{23} 2.3.3a_Research Method Selection and 2.3.3c_Methods to collect data
The afternoon began with a warm up activity which drew a link with the session on sampling strategies. Teams were formed and asked to answer a call for proposal about carrying out a satisfaction survey. Teams were given various amounts of money and they had to define survey methods, activities, number of partners they will include in the survey and their characteristics (sampling) as well as a global budget for the survey. A summary of the research methods was given to them to help carry out the exercise.

The second half of the afternoon focused on data entry and processing with a session facilitated by Michael KAZMIERCZAK that focused on the “questionnaire” module of SMS software developed by Entrepreneurs du Monde. The facilitators concluded the session by replacing SMS software within the landscape of other softwares used by participants. The end of the day was dedicated to receive feedback from participants on the second workshop day.

24 2.4.1a_Common characteristics
25 2.4.2a_Call for proposal, 2.4.2b_Maps, 2.4.2c_Budgets, 2.4.3a_Tenders' presentation
26 2.3.3c_Methods to collect data
27 2.5.1_SMS Software
28 2.5.2_Conclusion
29 2.6.1_Evaluation end of day 2
Day 3 – Wednesday 16th March

Wednesday morning, participants were invited to go to the field to discover STEP's activities and practice a quantitative survey method\(^{30}\). Each participant visited four partners. During the first visits, participants observed financial transactions while the other visits were dedicated to survey partners through a questionnaire. A debriefing session\(^{31}\) was organized to share the experiences of participants following this first field visit.

Day 4 – Thursday 17th March

“Kolkata is an amazing city!” is the title of the warm up activity\(^{32}\) opening the 4th day of the workshop. Participants spoke about their experience in a country that has a different culture.

The facilitator then introduced the day\(^{33}\) referring to the SPM cycle. Participants were split up in teams to work on the case of the exit survey\(^{34}\). They defined a typical system of data collection and management to track reasons why partners are leaving the organisation.

\(^{30}\) 3.1.2_Partner Visits
\(^{31}\) 3.2.1_Debriefing Guide
\(^{32}\) 4.1.1_Kolkata is an amazing city
\(^{33}\) 4.1.2_Introduction
\(^{34}\) 4.1.3a_Exercise_exit survey process
Then, participants were invited to brainstorm about ways to better systematise and embed the collection of data on partners’ socio-economic profile into operations.\textsuperscript{35}

Participants spent the afternoon in the field to further discover STEP activities and practice a qualitative survey method. They could attend training sessions and facilitate a focus group discussion\textsuperscript{36} with the objective to gather practices, opinions from a group of STEP partners on their income generating activities and saving habits.

A debriefing session\textsuperscript{37} was organized to share the experiences of participants following this second field visit. The end of the day was dedicated to receive feedback from participants on the fourth workshop day\textsuperscript{38}.

**Day 5 – Friday 18\textsuperscript{th} March**

Participants played the “Rock, paper & scissors” game\textsuperscript{39} as a warm-up activity on the last workshop day. The facilitator then introduced the day\textsuperscript{40} referring to the SPM cycle.

Then participants were asked to work in teams to process data from a quantitative survey\textsuperscript{41}. The exercise was based on a 3 tab-Excel sheet from which teams were asked to produce graphs and tables to provide insights on the socioeconomic profiles of the recent beneficiaries (1\textsuperscript{st} loan cycle), a proxy of the change in their living conditions over time, their satisfaction with the loan products and the reasons why they are leaving the institution and their relationship with the staff.
After the morning break, participants got acquainted with the **processing of data from a qualitative survey** through an activity\(^{42}\) that was based on the information collected during the focus group discussions held the day before. The activity followed 3 stages namely: (i.) the sharing of all key information collected in the field with interviewed/observed partners, and the description of what participants saw/heard/observed, (ii.) the identification of the most prevalent/inspiring observations, stories, ideas, etc. (iii.) the selection of one theme with a summary of the main insights/observations collected around this theme.

Then, a case study\(^{43}\) brought participants to interpret social results derived from quantitative and qualitative survey results.

The afternoon started with a game entitled “Journey of the data analysis report within an MFI”\(^{44}\) that aimed at illustrating possible and recommended recipients of a report analyzing social data.

\(^{42}\) 5.1.4a_Processing data_qualitative

\(^{43}\) 5.2.1a_Interpretation of results and 5.2.1b_Interpretation Exercise

\(^{44}\) 5.3.1a_Journey of a report and 5.3.1c_Pictograms
Afterwards, a plenary session\textsuperscript{45} gathered speakers from Chamroeun (satisfaction survey), Anh Chi Em (satisfaction survey) and SEED (poverty assessment baseline survey) to share experiences and advocate on the richness of social results for decision-making in view of improving partners experiences. The discussion stressed the various use of social data to inform decision making on relationship between the staff and partners, the features of products and services, policies and procedures. We could also see that the use of social results is a crucial step for an organisation to make sure it reaches its social goals.

At the end of the day, teams took part in an activity\textsuperscript{46} aiming at assessing the knowledge acquired since the beginning of the workshop. The activity consisted in forming groups representing one step of the process that guided the workshop programme i.e. defining social indicators, data collection, data management, data analysis & reporting, use of social data. Groups were asked to position themselves in a circle. Then, they had to briefly wrap up of what they learned about this step during the week. The facilitator complemented to provide a recap of the whole week.

The organising committee\textsuperscript{47} concluded the week by expressing its gratitude to participants and STEP’s team which made this Regional Workshop possible. Eugénie reminded that all presentations, tools and notes will be available on the \textit{Pratiques Microfinance website} to ensure that the experience and sharing of good practice will last over time.

\textsuperscript{45} 5.3.3a_Sharing Experiences_Internal Use and 5.3.3b_Sharing Experiences_Illustrations
\textsuperscript{46} 5.4.1a_Evaluation end of the day 5, 5.4.1b_Steps of the process
\textsuperscript{47} Eugénie CONSTANCIAS, Gino GICQUEAU, Marie FORGET and Thibaut MARY
The workshop ended with the participants giving a global assessment\(^{48}\) of the event’s content and logistics. Entrepreneurs du Monde would like to share the feedback received. Participants were asked to rate the following aspects giving a score ranging from 1 to 5. Average scores are displayed below.

\(^{48}\) 5.4.2_RW 2016 - Final Questionnaire