

Mapping Future Political Leadership of Pakistan: Scorecards on Honourable Senators' Performance 2015-2016

Methodology of Assessment

This report consisting of performance Score Cards is based on a collection of data through a series of quantitative methods of data collection. An indigenous framework of assessment was devised by PILDAT consisting of 10 parameters against which data was collected for each Senator. Data request forms were initially drafted and sent to the Secretariat of the Senate of Pakistan. However, as data on individual Senator's contribution on all the parameters devised by PILDAT was not being maintained by the Senate of Pakistan, PILDAT took on the task of extracting information through various means available on the official website of the Senate, such as Orders of the Day, Hansard, Annual Report of the Senate, etc.

The information on educational qualification of Senators has been taken as available from the official website of the Senate of Pakistan. In some cases, official websites and/or social media pages of Senators have been used and in some, their nomination forms.

Number of Committee Memberships and Percentage Attendance of Committee Meetings of Senators take into account all categories of Committees (such as Standing, Functional, Other, etc.) that were active during the 13th Parliamentary year of the Senate.

Scoring Mechanism:

After the data was compiled, a scoring mechanism was devised by PILDAT in which averages of each parameter across all the senators were calculated. A scale of 1-5 was initially selected to score a Senator on each of the 10 parameters.

The formula for score assignment is as under:

1. If value for a parameter is higher by 2 Standard Deviations than the average value (across the 102 Senators), then a score of 5 will be assigned.
2. If value for a parameter is higher by 1 Standard Deviation than the average value (across the 102 Senators), then a score of 4 will be assigned.
3. If value for a parameter is equal to average value (across the 102 Senators), then a score of 3 will be assigned.
4. If value for a parameter is lower by 1 Standard Deviation than the average value (across the 102 Senators), then a score of 2 will be assigned.

5. If value for a parameter is lower by 2 Standard Deviations than the average value (across the 102 Senators), then a score of 1 will be assigned.

These scores were generated using the min/max technique and then aggregated to arrive at a final score out of 5.

After each score out of 5 was generated, weightages were assigned to each parameter as it was realized that some parameters carried, in the opinion of PILDAT, greater value in evaluation of the performance of a Senator. For instance, parameters relating to committee memberships and chairmanships have been assigned lesser weightage compared to the other parameters in the Oversight category. This has been done keeping in mind that parameters such as 'Committee Attendance' and 'Number of Resolutions/Adjournment motions passed' are more reflective of the participation during Senate proceedings. Similarly, the parameters in the 'Legislation' category have been assigned a higher weightage taking in to consideration that legislative activities such as the drafting of a private bill require a much greater effort and initiative from the Senators. Passage of a private member's bill will require even greater effort. Final weighted percentage scores were then calculated and ranks assigned. The assessment framework and the weightage of each parameter is presented in a later section of the report.

Based on the final scores and the ranks, PILDAT has categorized the Senators into the following:

- 1) Senator of the Year
- 2) Top 5 Ranks
- 3) Top 5 Ranks among Women Senators
- 4) Top Performer in Legislation
- 5) Top Performer in Oversight
- 6) Top Performer in Representation
- 7) Province/Territory with the highest percentage of top-performing Senators
- 8) Political Party with the highest number of top-performing Senators