

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

Performance Measurement in the Conservation Community

Research survey for "Measuring Conservation Effectiveness Summit," May 5-6, Palo Alto, California.

Over the past few years, there have been major advances in measuring the effectiveness of biodiversity conservation projects, programs, and organizations. There is still, however, a major gap between the rhetoric of organizations and funders in terms of the desirability of measuring conservation effectiveness, versus the reality of actually adopting and implementing systematic and transparent systems that allow us to improve our collective work. To this end, the members of the Conservation Measures Partnership (CMP) and representatives of key environmental funders are planning a Measuring Conservation Effectiveness Summit May 5 & 6th 2010 that will focus attention on these critical issues. In anticipation of the summit, a committee has been formed to conduct original research on the current state and direction of systematic performance measurement (SPM) among summit attendees. We define SPM as:

the regular monitoring, evaluation and adaptation of conservation actions

based on clearly stated goals, objectives, and assumptions

so as to assess effectiveness, promote learning, and report achievements

For the purposes of this survey, our use of the term SPM is roughly synonymous with the terms "adaptive management" and "systematic effectiveness measurement." We now look to you for the status and direction of SPM within your foundation, your grantees, and examples of its use in conservation.

Instructions for Lead Respondent

The survey should take one hour to complete, depending on the availability of information within your organization.

- The lead respondent is not expected to be able to complete the survey by him/herself, but rather act as the data facilitator for the foundation.
- Fill out as much as you can and pursue missing information from key informants within the organization.
- You can forward this link to colleagues, use the link to access and complete the survey over multiple days on multiple computers, BUT *please be advised that you and other respondents must hit the "NEXT" button on each page to save responses* when you exit the survey.

You should also have received the survey as a Word document to facilitate copying and pasting relevant questions and forwarding them to the appropriate colleague.

The survey is divided into four sections: (1) Contact and Org Info, (2) SPM within your Foundation (3) Obstacles and Catalysts for SPM, and (4) SPM & Grantees.

Important Notes

- Your willingness to respond honestly and critically is essential to this survey's success. Responses will be shared

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

in aggregate and anonymously. We will thus not be sharing responses attributed to either specific people or foundations unless subsequent permission is granted.

- If you use only elements of SPM in your work, that is perfectly acceptable, and your answers in this survey can represent what ever form SPM takes within your foundation.
- Recognizing that many lead respondents will not have precise answers to some questions, we ask you to do the best you can and, where necessary, note your confidence or level of precision in the commentary box associated with each question. *We would rather have rough guesses for each question, rather than have them left blank.*

Kristin Sherwood is available for assistance in all aspects of survey completion. She can be reached at kristinlsherwood@gmail.com or (650) 796-8230 and is located in San Francisco, CA. If needed, Kristin would be glad to walk through the survey with folks on the phone. Kristin will also review answers and may email respondents directly for clarification or further information.

Please submit surveys by **April 16th to be included in the summit**

General Information

Contact & Organization Info

1. Lead Respondent

Your Name:	<input type="text"/>
Institution or Foundation:	<input type="text"/>
Program:	<input type="text"/>
Position:	<input type="text"/>
Country in which you are based:	<input type="text"/>
Email Address:	<input type="text"/>
Phone Number:	<input type="text"/>

2. Additional comments on lead respondent and colleagues consulted, if applicable:

3. Within your foundation, what is the approximate number of...

...total foundation staff?	<input type="text"/>
...foundation staff in conservation programs?	<input type="text"/>
...conservation granting programs?	<input type="text"/>
...conservation grants per year?	<input type="text"/>

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

4. Comments on Staff, Programs, and Grant #s:

5. Within the conservation grant-making at your foundation, what % of grants fall into each of these categories?

Site-based conservation

Advocacy and policy work

Conservation science and technology

Other (please specify below)

6. Comments on % of grants and categories

7. Approximate annual conservation budget in US\$ for FY2010

8. Comments on budget

9. Approximate % of conservation work supported in US & Canada vs outside:

US & Canada

Outside US & Canada

10. Additional comments on your organization

Internal Foundation Practices

The goal of Section 1 is to understand your foundation's approach and attitudes towards SPM, with regard to both the foundations programs/strategies and for grantee projects. Please respond on behalf of the entire conservation grant-making program at your foundation.

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

11. How strongly do you agree/disagree with the following statement:

Strongly Agree Moderately Agree Moderately Disagree Strongly Disagree

My foundation does systematic performance measurement (SPM) well.

My foundation is effective at helping our grantees do SPM well.

Our grantees do SPM well.

Comments (optional):

12. Does your foundation have set frameworks for SPM or elements of SPM? Where possible, give specific examples of the kinds of SPM utilized at your foundation. If your foundation does not engage in any form of SPM, please note that.

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

13. How important is answering the following questions within your foundation?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Minimally important	Not at all important
Are our funding programs having their intended impacts?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our grantee's projects having their intended impacts?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our grantee's actions cost-effective?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our grantee's actions being adapted and improved?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our foundation strategies regularly being adapted and improved?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can our funding be better coordinated across the foundation?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can our funding be better coordinated with other foundations?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can credible results be demonstrated to our board?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do we understand why a grantee's project fails when it does so?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What can be learned to improve our foundation's work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>			

14. Using your foundation's current SPM system(s), how well can your foundation answer the following questions?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Minimally well	Not at all
Are our funding programs having their intended impacts?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our grantee's projects having their intended impacts?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our grantee's actions cost-effective?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our grantee's actions being adapted and improved?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are our foundation strategies regularly being adapted and improved?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can our funding be better coordinated across the foundation?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can our funding be better coordinated with other foundations?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can credible results be demonstrated to our board?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do we understand why a grantee's project fails when it does so?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What can be learned to improve our foundation's work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>			

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

15. Comments on questions listed above and any additional questions (please indicate importance within foundation and how well you're able to address them currently):

16. In general for each audience within your foundation, how strongly do you agree/disagree with the following statements:

	Program directors	Upper management	Board
Has a thorough understanding of what SPM is and how it is implemented at the foundation	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Has a thorough understanding of what the possible benefits of SPM are to the foundation	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Has a positive/favorable attitude towards implementing SPM within the foundation	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Views the implementation of SPM in the near future as a high priority	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Comments on statements and audiences:

17. Within your funding programs at your foundation, is SPM....

	...mandated?	...practiced well?
.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Comments on mandate, quality, and extent:

18. How many full-time equivalent staff are dedicated to SPM at your foundation (across all programs)?

19. Of conservation program staff, approximately what % of time is dedicated to SPM?

20. Comments on staff and staff time dedicated to SPM. For example, please tell us if there are full-time staff specifically dedicated to SPM within conservation programs.

Obstacles & Catalysts

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

The goal of Section 2 is to understand what barriers and catalysts exist for operationalizing SPM within the conservation programs at your foundation.

21. Where you do see SPM happening in your foundation's conservation programs, how important were the following 'key ingredients' or 'catalysts' to SPM adoption? (Please answer this question ONLY if you feel that SPM has been adopted)

	Absolutely essential	Very important	Moderately useful	Not necessary
A vision for what could be accomplished with SPM (i.e., SPM is an a integral part of foundation's mission & goals)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evidence that SPM led to increased effectiveness and/or efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seeing it being successfully implemented by other conservation or development foundation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A requirement exists for SPM plans within program strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presence of a champion within organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dedicated SPM program with staff supporting implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dedicated funding for SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Institutional mandate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Board requirement to adopt SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Board reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Software tools that support SPM collection, management, & reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

22. In rank order and using the list above, what are the top 3 most important key ingredients or catalysts to SPM adoption within your organization? Please do not list the same factor more than once.

Key Ingredients or Catalysts to SPM adoption

#1 (most important)	<input type="text"/>
#2	<input type="text"/>
#3	<input type="text"/>

Comments on ranking

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

23. Do you have evidence that SPM leads to improvements in conservation grant-making? (i.e. more effective grant prioritization, strategy selection etc)

- Strong evidence
 Moderate evidence
 Weak or anecdotal evidence
 No evidence

General comments on evidence

24. In your experience, how important are the following factors in impeding adoption of SPM in your foundation's conservation programs?

	Very important (extreme obstacle)	Somewhat important (major barrier)	Minimally important (minor hurdle)	Not important (not an issue)
Lack of money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of staff dedicated to SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of good examples of SPM helping to achieve conservation goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM is too complex	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM is too simplistic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM (or related terms: adaptive management, monitoring & evaluation) has become a meaningless buzzword	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM is unnecessary to doing effective conservation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of board pressure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of peer pressure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of quality trainers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of database exchange to share practices and learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of support from upper management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of demand from upper management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of support and/or interest from grantees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of good software tools to implement SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of an overall culture of accountability to our bottom line (biodiversity conservation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of incentives to change the status quo (i.e., SPM not a part of business practice to date and no incentive to change)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

25. In rank order and using the list above, what are the top 3 most important obstacles to SPM adoption within your foundation? Please do not list the same factor more than once.

	Obstacles
#1 (most important)	<input type="text"/>
#2	<input type="text"/>
#3	<input type="text"/>

Comments on ranking

26. Please describe the outlook for SPM in your foundation. Where possible, give anecdotes or evidence that provide insight on:

- the future direction of SPM in your foundation's conservation programs, and
- critical future steps if SPM is to be adopted more widely within your foundation

Grantee Orientated

The goal of Section 3 is to understand SPM within your grantee population, both in terms of the grantee organizations adoption and use of SPM, as well as the extent to which your foundation promotes SPM with grantees.

27. Among the grantees that your foundation funds, how does your foundation promote SPM within those grantees' organizations?

- We mandate the use of SPM We formally promote the use of SPM We informally promote the use of SPM We do not promote the use of SPM

Comments on SPM promotion:

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

28. Do you have evidence that SPM leads to improvements in conservation project outcomes? (via improvements in either effectiveness or efficiency)

- Strong evidence Moderate evidence Weak or anecdotal evidence No evidence

General comments on evidence

For the following questions (Q29-Q38), your answers should *only* reflect the grants within your portfolio, or those that you are deeply familiar with. If more than one person is filling out this survey, please pool your responses across portfolios.

29. For the following questions....

What is the name of the grant-making program(s) you are responding for?

What % of conservation funding at your foundation is represented by this/these program(s)?

30. Among the projects within your portfolio, to what extent is SPM practiced well?

- Almost always (>90%) Often (50-90%) Occasionally (10-49%) Almost never (<10%)

Comments on SPM extent:

31. Of the projects within your portfolio, estimate the % of projects that have...

...good conservation plans in place (i.e., planned)

...implemented plan and monitoring (i.e., planned, implemented plan, and monitored)

...gone full cycle (i.e., planned, implemented plan, monitored, evaluated, & adapted)

32. Of the total annual budget for your funding portfolio, roughly what % of...

...grants have an SPM component? 0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%

...project funds are spent on SPM? less than 1%, 1-5%, 5-20%, more than 20%

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

33. In general, for the grantees within your portfolio, how strongly do you agree/disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
Our grantees have a thorough understanding of what SPM is and how it is implemented at their organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Our grantees have a thorough understanding of what the possible benefits of SPM are to their organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Our grantees have a positive/favorable attitude towards implementing SPM within their organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Our grantees view the implementation of SPM in the near future as a high priority	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

34. Where you do see SPM happening among your grantees, how important were the following 'key ingredients' or 'catalysts' to SPM adoption? (Please answer this question ONLY if you feel that SPM has been adopted among your grantees)

	Absolutely essential	Very important	Moderately useful	Not necessary
SPM as an integral part of organization's mission & goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evidence that SPM led to increased effectiveness and/or efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seeing it being successfully implemented by other conservation or development NGO	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A workplan of activities that integrated SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presence of a champion within organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dedicated SPM program with staff supporting implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dedicated funding for SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Institutional mandate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Donor requirement to adopt SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Donor reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Software tools that support SPM collection, management, & reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

35. In rank order and using the list above, what are the top 3 most important key ingredients or catalysts to SPM adoption among your grantees? Please do not list the same factor more than once.

Key Ingredients or Catalysts to SPM adoption

#1 (most important)

#2

#3

Comments on ranking

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

36. In your experience, how important are the following factors in impeding adoption of SPM among your grantees?

	Very important (extreme obstacle)	Somewhat important (major barrier)	Minimally important (minor hurdle)	Not important (not an issue)
Lack of money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of staff dedicated to SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of good examples of SPM helping to achieve conservation goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM is too complex	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM is too simplistic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM (or related terms: adaptive management, monitoring & evaluation) has become a meaningless buzzword	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perception that SPM is unnecessary to doing effective conservation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reporting guidelines of major donors discourage or inhibit SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of donor pressure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of board pressure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of peer pressure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of quality trainers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of database exchange to share practices and learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of support from upper management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of demand from upper management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of support and/or interest from project managers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of good software tools to implement SPM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of an overall culture of accountability to our bottom line (biodiversity conservation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of incentives to change the status quo (i.e., SPM not a part of business practice to date and no incentive to change)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Measuring Conservation Effectiveness - Donor Orgs

37. In rank order and using the list above, what are the top 3 most important obstacles to SPM adoption among your grantees? Please do not list the same factor more than once.

	Obstacles
#1 (most important)	<input type="text"/>
#2	<input type="text"/>
#3	<input type="text"/>

Comments on ranking

38. Please describe the outlook for SPM among your grantees. Where possible, give anecdotes or evidence that provide insight on:

- the future direction of SPM among your grantees, and
- critical future steps if SPM is to be adopted more widely among your grantees

Thanks!

You're done! Please remember that Kristin Sherwood is available for assistance in survey completion, general questions, complaints that the survey is too long, etc. She can be reached at kristinsherwood@gmail.com or (650) 796-8230, and is located in San Francisco, CA.

39. Do you have any specific ideas for the Summit that you would like to offer to the organizers? Do you have any specific concerns that you would like to share?

40. Additional comments: