

Puntos Centinela 2018

Executive Report

National-level Results

English

PROSPERA
PROGRAMA
DE INCLUSIÓN SOCIAL

clear 
Centros para el Aprendizaje en Evaluación y Servicios
CIDE 

CIDE/CLEAR LAC Research Team

Gabriela Pérez Yarahuán, PhD

Blanca Heredia Rubio, PhD

Salomón Chertorivski Woldenberg

Carolina Romero Pérez Grovas

María del Carmen Herrera Bautista

Germán Paul Cáceres Castrillón

Jorge Luis González Cruz

Silvestre Orozco Sánchez

Oliver Peña-Habib

PROSPERA's National Coordinator's Office Team

Jaime Gutiérrez Casas

Daniel Rosales Méndez

Diego Leyva Cortés

Guillermo del Mar Vera Hernández

We are truly grateful to our collaborators for their participation in and commitment to the Puntos Centinela 2018 study. These include CIDE professors, associate professors, research assistants, the teams from CLEAR LAC, PIPE, and LNPP, as well as officials from the National Commission for Social Protection on Health, IMSS-PROSPERA, and PROSPERA's state offices and central administration.

We are especially thankful to Citlalli Hernández, Laura Dávila, Mariana Rodríguez, Carla M. Vázquez, Itzel Cabrero, Adriana Ornelas, and Mariana Bulos for their contributions, guidance, and constant feedback since the Puntos Centinela 2017 redesign.

We acknowledge the team from Parametría, S.A. de C.V. and every field interviewer and supervisor for their effort and dedication conducting the survey for Puntos Centinela 2018.

Contents

Acronyms	3
Introduction	4
I. The Puntos Centinela 2018 Study	5
I.1. Background	5
I.2. Scope and Limitations of the 2018 Study	8
II. Methodology	9
III. Representativeness of the Puntos Centinela 2018 Population	11
IV. Characteristics of the Puntos Centinela 2018 Population	12
V. Results of the Puntos Centinela 2018 Indicators	17
V.1. Indicator Descriptions	17
V.2. PROSPERA Study Area	22
V.3. Education Study Area	26
V.4. Healthcare Study Area	27
VI. Conclusions	29
VII. Recommendations	32
VIII. References	33

Acronyms

BANSEFI: Banco del Ahorro Nacional y Servicios Financieros (Bank for National Savings and Financial Services)

CCMO: Customized Care Model for the Operation

CIDE: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (Center for Research and Teaching in Economics)

CLEAR LAC: Center for Learning on Evaluation and Results, Latin America and the Caribbean

CNP: Coordinación Nacional de PROSPERA (PROSPERA's National Coordinator's Office)

CONAFE: Consejo Nacional de Fomento Educativo (National Council for Educational Development)

CAUSES: Universal catalog of health services

DGPS: Dirección General de Planeación y Seguimiento (Directorate General for Planning and Monitoring)

Education: PROSPERA's education component

Healthcare: PROSPERA's healthcare component

LNPP: Laboratorio Nacional de Políticas Públicas (CIDE's National Laboratory for Public Policy)

Nutrition: PROSPERA's food and nutrition component

Outreach: PROSPERA's outreach component

PC: Puntos Centinela

PCI: Puntos Centinela Indicator for SRS

PCI-RES: Puntos Centinela Indicator for RES

PIPE: Programa Interdisciplinario sobre Políticas y Prácticas Educativas (CIDE's Interdisciplinary Program for Education Policy and Practice)

PSD: PROSPERA Support Desks

RES: Responsibility-exempt Scheme

SRS: Shared Responsibility Scheme

Introduction

Monitoring the operation of social programs is a cornerstone for evaluating their performance and results. Analyses on operations and implementation processes are fundamental for the use of evaluation in decision-making and improving public programs in the middle and long run.

Since 2000, PROSPERA – then known as PROGRESA, later OPORTUNIDADES – has implemented an Operational Monitoring Model that includes a study called Puntos Centinela (PC). This study periodically analyzes a set of core program processes and the level of satisfaction with the services provided through the program’s main components (Education, Nutrition, Healthcare, and Outreach), based on perceptions from program beneficiaries, service providers, and program staff.

By conducting a representative survey on the population of interest, PC has become an institutional mechanism to collect information on beneficiary and staff perceptions. The study’s results allow to timely detect operational problems and collect information on the timeliness of, satisfaction with, and quality of program services.

PROSPERA’s National Coordinator’s Office, through the Directorate General of Planning and Monitoring (DGPS), decided to continue the study in 2018 through the project “Puntos Centinela Analysis 2013-2017: Update, Survey, Data Processing, Analysis and Results Reports of the 2018 Study.”¹

The National Coordinator’s Office commissioned the Center for Learning on Evaluation and Results, Latin America and the Caribbean (CLEAR LAC), hosted by the Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE), with the 2018 study. This entailed coordinating with the several agencies involved in the program’s operation, the fieldwork for conducting the

¹ CNP, Technical Appendix: “Análisis de Puntos Centinela 2013-2017, actualización, levantamiento, procesamiento, análisis y elaboración de informes de resultados del estudio 2018,” p. 4.

survey, and the data processing and analyses conducted for the results reports. This work was based on CLEAR LAC’s 2017 redesign of the study, which reconceptualized the sample design, questionnaires, indicators, and the structure of results reports.

PC 2018 is organized into three study areas based on the program operation’s components: (1) PROSPERA, which includes the Nutrition and Outreach components, as well as operational and coordination aspects across different agencies; (2) Education; and (3) Healthcare. This document is the executive report for PC 2018’s national-level results.

The first section of the document includes background information and the scope and limitations of the study. This edition is a relevant contribution as it is comparable with the 2017 study, and it is helpful for program decision-making given the ongoing government transition.

The second section synthesizes the methodology. The third contains a general explanation on the representativeness of the study’s units of analysis. The fourth section describes PROSPERA participants’ characteristics, and the fifth summarizes indicator results. The sixth and seventh sections draw conclusions and recommendations for improving PROSPERA. Lastly, the eighth section contains references. Further information on methodology and results is available at www.puntoscentinela.info.

I. The Puntos Centinela 2018 Study

I.1. Background

On September 5, 2014, a presidential decree was enacted to create PROSPERA as a transformation of its predecessor, OPORTUNIDADES, with the objective of “articulating and coordinating the institutional supply of social policy programs and actions, including those related to productive development, income generation, economic wellbeing, financial and employment inclusion, education, nutrition, and health, targeted to population in poverty

under shared responsibility benefit schemes that allow families to improve their life conditions, use their social rights, and have access to social development under equal opportunities.”²

PROSPERA strengthens services and actions implemented through institutional coordination that contribute to capacity development, access to social rights, and the wellbeing of the population in poverty. These services and actions are deployed through four components: Nutrition, Healthcare, Education, and Outreach. Given that the extent of the program’s coverage and capacity in Education and Healthcare determine the feasibility of operating all components at the same time,³ the program offers two different benefit schemes for beneficiaries:

- a) Shared Responsibility Scheme (SRS). Families may receive benefits from all four components and they commit to specific actions for the Education and Healthcare components.
- b) Responsibility-exempt Scheme (RES). Families may receive benefits from the Nutrition and Outreach components, and only higher education scholarships from the Education component.

The first PC study was conducted in 2000 for PROGRESA. It was created as a response to the need for strengthening operational processes and complying with monitoring and evaluation requirements from program norms. Despite the historical focus given to PC in the program’s Rules of Operation, the study was built as an institutional component that

² GOB.MX. *¿Qué es PROSPERA Programa de Inclusión Social?* Retrieved September 7, 2018 from: <https://www.gob.mx/prospera/documentos/que-es-prospera>

³ Diario Oficial de la Federación, December 29, 2017, Rules of Operation, numerals: 3.6.1. “Componente Educativo”; 3.6.2. “Componente de Salud;” 3.6.3. “Componente Alimentario” and 3.6.4. “Componente de Vinculación.”

conducted a survey to collect information on beneficiary and staff perceptions about several aspects.

When the program's Rules of Operation change and, as a result, the program operation changes, the monitoring and evaluation instruments need updating. Such changes have been increasing recently, and PC has been affected by those changes. Despite the essence of the program remaining untouched — cash transfers —, these changes have introduced components and potentially synergic actions to adapt to the circumstances of beneficiaries and get closer to the long-term objective of breaking the intergenerational poverty cycle.

In 2017, CLEAR LAC's redesign of the PC study adapted the sample design, measurement tools, technical datasheets for results indicators, and the structure and contents of results reports based on applicable norms. The sample designed also changed, a dialog was held with relevant stakeholders, and a website was launched with all relevant information for transparency and accountability purposes.

As a follow-up to this redesign, PC 2018 kept the methodological and technical elements that allow for comparability of the study's conceptualization, sample design, measurement tools, technical datasheets for results indicators, and results reports. However, some elements were adapted based on the 2018 Rules of Operation and on findings and lessons learned from the 2017 experience and the information needs of program operators.

Thus, the methodological contribution of PC 2018 is continuing the 2017 redesign and keeping the basic characteristics for comparability of results between these years.

CLEAR LAC/CIDE stresses the importance of collecting data, information, and evidence of quality as a key condition to improve the outcomes of social programs and policy outcomes in general. Thus, further updates to the study will be necessary in the future to keep informing on PROSPERA's status and promoting the use of the information generated.

1.2. Scope and Limitations of the 2018 Study

PC's scope has to do with its contribution to a systematic and robust program performance monitoring, generating accurate information for decision-making. Also, the study allows identifying lessons learned and best practices to foster learning among other countries where similar programs are implemented or are under design, to know the perceptions of program stakeholders on its operation, benefits, and services.

However, the study also has some limitations. Some examples are the timing for compiling the beneficiary register and the time when the survey was conducted. The beneficiary register used for the sample design was no longer the most updated one by when the survey was conducted, so there were differences in some of the data collected, especially for those beneficiaries who were switching benefit schemes and the scholarship holders who turned out to be in a different school year (in some cases, these differences were due to a change in education level or school).

The time when the survey was conducted may have influenced the interviewees' responses. For example, beneficiaries may have remembered information or several topics that were addressed more recently relative to the time of the survey.

Moreover, as part of the 2018 election's *veda electoral*,⁴ the program performed tasks or handed benefits earlier than usual or even suspended them temporarily (Support Desks), and the survey was conducted after the election, making the time gap even bigger. This may have influenced the informants' perceptions.

Other difficulties occurred due to extreme weather conditions that made impossible to access some localities. Weather conditions also affected the informants' participation in two main ways—on the one hand, some participants had migrated temporarily due to

⁴ During political campaigns in Mexico, all government propaganda is suspended by federal law. This prevents public agencies from doing any actions that may be interpreted as political propaganda promoting the incumbent party. For further reference, see Ley General de Instituciones y Procedimientos Electorales, articles 209-212.

climate events; and on the other, some were assisting in the climate emergency actions or related cleaning activities. Insecurity was also a reason why some beneficiaries did not want to participate in the survey or why some beneficiaries had migrated.

Lastly, in some states, the PC survey was conducted during the same period than a family census conducted by the incoming administration, which created confusion among beneficiaries, communication challenges, and misunderstandings about the purpose of the PC survey. For example, some beneficiaries thought they would be removed from the program, which made them not want to participate in the survey. In addition, beneficiaries who were contacted by the census staff first claimed they had already spent time answering that questionnaire and they were not available to answer more questions for PC.

II. Methodology

The essence of PC is measuring operational attributes of main program components: Education, Nutrition, Healthcare, and Outreach. PC organizes the analysis into three study areas.

The Education and Healthcare study areas include information on those components. The PROSPERA study area includes the Nutrition and Outreach components, as well as actions against political manipulation during elections, corruption, transparency, and the right to be heard. These actions are implemented across multiple agencies.

We used the following analytic dimensions about the program's operation: (1) the inputs needed for providing program services and benefits and operating the program; (2) program staff perceptions on the process of delivery of services and benefits; (3) beneficiary perceptions on the process of receiving program components; (4) perceptions on the beneficiary support offered by the program. Several aspects are analyzed under each dimension within each study area.

PC 2018 collected the information through 11 questionnaires designed to survey beneficiaries and staff: (1) head beneficiaries under the Shared Responsibility Scheme (SRS); (2) head beneficiaries under the Responsibility-exempt Scheme (RES); (3) PROSPERA spokespersons; (4) higher-middle education scholarship holders; (5) basic education staff; (6) higher-middle education staff; (7) PROSPERA staff; (8) Healthcare staff; (9) healthcare units staff; (10) medicine register; (11) BANSEFI staff.

The same 10 questionnaires used in PC 2017 were also used in 2018. However, this year the study incorporated one additional questionnaire for BANSEFI staff.

Of the 11 questionnaires, two – PROSPERA staff and BANSEFI staff – were self-administered online. The records of staff who were sent the questionnaire was handed in to DGPS. The remaining nine questionnaires were administered in person. Only higher-middle education scholarship holders had a different format, as they answered on paper themselves with the interviewer's guidance. This format helped complete the questionnaires faster and occupied less school time for students.

The sample design, datasets, instruments for collecting information, indicator technical datasheets, and results of the study are available at www.puntoscentinela.info.

III. Representativeness of the Puntos Centinela 2018 Population

At the national level, PC 2018 interviewed 14,151 head beneficiaries under SRS, and 1,285 head beneficiaries under RES. These are representative of 6,215,049 and 575,339 head beneficiaries under each scheme, respectively. 2,945 higher-middle education scholarship holders were interviewed, representing 1,295,870 scholarship holders. 1,313 school staff members were interviewed, 519 from higher-middle education and 749 from basic education, representing 15,441 and 122,102 education centers at those education levels, respectively.

The 2018 sample design allowed for statistical representation at the national and state levels for head beneficiaries under both schemes. It also allowed for national- and state-level representation by urbanization level (rural or urban)⁵ for head beneficiaries in both schemes. In the Education component, results are also representative for higher-middle education scholarship holders and basic schools.

Head beneficiaries under SRS are representative by indigenous stratum of the localities they live in. This is based on PROSPERA's classification of localities.

Results for healthcare units, healthcare staff, and Education are only representative at the national level. Results at the state level for these groups are only indicative,⁶ as they allow to know the perceptions of the units and staff but without a known margin of error.

Results for PROSPERA and BANSEFI staff members are only descriptive, since the universe of staff that could have responded the questionnaire is unknown.

⁵ The sample was stratified by urbanization level of localities, using the categories in the beneficiary register—urban, semi-urban, and rural. However, by using the Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía's (INEGI) classification, it is possible to combine urban and semi-urban localities together to allow for an urban/rural-stratified analysis.

⁶ This means that results and estimations may be drawn from informant responses, but the margin of error is unknown.

IV. Characteristics of the Puntos Centinela 2018 Population

Of the universe of beneficiary households under SRS represented in the study, 55.43% live in rural localities and 44.47% live in urban localities (18.37% in semi-urban localities and 26.30% in urban localities), per the categories in the program’s beneficiary register.

25.50% of households under SRS live in indigenous localities per the program’s classification. However, 36.6% of households reported to have at least one indigenous member. Moreover, 24.5% of households have a member who speaks an indigenous language, and 96% of them have a member who speaks Spanish (including bilingual members).

At the national level, a household under SRS has an average of 4.5 members and has been a beneficiary of the program for over nine years. About half of the head beneficiaries claim their household is under the Differentiated Benefits Scheme, and nearly three quarters receive their benefits through PROSPERA’s Support Desks.

Of the 6.2 million households under SRS represented in the sample, more than 60% of them have a member who receives a PROSPERA scholarship at some education level.

At the national level, an average SRS household has 4.5 members and has been a beneficiary of the program for 2.5 years. More than half of the head beneficiaries claim their household is in transition to the SRS scheme, and a similar proportion receives their benefits through PROSPERA’s Support Desks.

In addition to the head beneficiaries under both schemes, the PROSPERA indicators are complemented with perceptions from program staff and BANSEFI staff. Because both questionnaires were administered in a “cascade effect” fashion,⁷ the universe of staff respondents providing support to beneficiaries is unknown. The results are thus merely

⁷ The questionnaire was sent to an official work email list shared by DGPS. However, the questionnaire could also be shared with other program staff members who did not have work email addresses.

descriptive of perceptions on the program's operation but are not statistically representative. The number of BANSEFI staff respondents by state was between 1-5 members depending on the state.⁸

Of the 630 PROSPERA staff members who answered the questionnaire, 60% had technical or vocational school as their highest level of education, while 30% had high school, and 8% had a college education. Of the 50 BANSEFI respondents, 82% went to technical or vocational school, 10% went to the university, 6% finished high school, and 2% went to graduate school.

Over 96% of PROSPERA staff respondents were Beneficiary Support Officers. The remaining ones have had Community-Strengthening Liaison or Head positions for 3.4 years on average. 69% of them had experience working with population in poverty before joining PROSPERA.

On average, PROSPERA staff members report supporting over 60 localities where head beneficiaries live. 96% of BANSEFI staff reports dedicating work hours to support localities or head beneficiaries. Of these, over 65% spent more than half their work hours on these activities.

For the Education component, at the national level 2,945 higher-middle education scholarship holders were interviewed, representing 1.3 million beneficiaries in the 14-22 age range. Of these, 59% were male and 41% female with an average age of 16.7 years old. 7 out of 10 scholarship holders go to school in the morning schedule, while two do so in the evening schedule, and one in both (mixed schedule). On average, commuting from home to school takes them 26 minutes and they pay 16 Mexican pesos for the ride.

⁸ Estado de México was the state with most PROSPERA-related BANSEFI staff respondents (five), comprising 10% of total respondents. Oaxaca had four respondents, while Mexico City and Veracruz had three. The remaining states had one or two BANSEFI respondents. Interpretations of results at the state level might therefore be misleading.

Of the 1.3 million scholarship holders represented in the study, 26% go to school as their only activity. The remaining 74% performs some sort of activity — helping housework (40%), doing sports outside of school (12%), helping in the family business (8.66%), working for a salary outside of home (8.08%), doing unpaid work (2.54%), or performing an extracurricular cultural activity (2.77%).

For this study area, we used sample data from 1,313 schools, of which 794 were basic education schools and 519 were higher-middle education schools. The 794 basic education schools represent over 122,000 education centers at that level. 58% of these schools are in rural localities, while the rest are urban (25% semi-urban and 17% urban). Only 20% of these schools are in indigenous localities per the program's classification.

49% of schools are *primarias* and 51% *secundarias*, representing 60,197 and 61,905 schools, respectively. Of total schools, 98% are in the Ministry of Public Education modality, while 2% are in the National Council for Educational Development (CONAFE) modality.

On average, a school has over 12 teachers, and 61.3% of them are teachers of PROSPERA scholarship holders. 7 out of 10 basic education schools have internet access. 73% of basic education school respondents were the school principals, while 14% were administrative staff, and about the same proportion were teachers of PROSPERA scholarship holders.

The 519 higher-middle education schools represent 15,441 high schools. 51% of these schools are in rural localities, while the rest are urban (30% semi-urban and 19% urban). 20% are in indigenous localities per the program's classification.

Of total higher-middle education schools analyzed, 99% is under the Ministry of Public Education modality and 1% is under the CONAFE modality. On average, these schools have 13.5 teachers each and over three quarters of these teachers have PROSPERA scholarship holders as students. 6 out of 10 schools have internet access.

At the national level, 58% of higher-middle education respondents were the school principals, 12% were teachers of PROSPERA scholarship holders, and the remaining 30% were administrative or school staff.

For Healthcare results, 565 healthcare units were sampled representing over 16,000 units at the national level. Of total units analyzed, 97% are fixed units while 3% are mobile units. Nearly all PROSPERA-serving units (99.8%) report providing nutritional care for children, and 97% serve pregnant or breastfeeding women.

9 out of 10 Healthcare questionnaires were responded by healthcare units service providers with a Director or Unit Chair position, medical doctors, or nurses who provide care to PROSPERA beneficiaries (91% in the case of the healthcare unit questionnaire and 87% in the case of the healthcare staff questionnaire).

When analyzing the interaction between sample households and healthcare units, 94% of the 6.2 million represented informants under SRS claim to have an ID card for medical appointments for the family. Of those who have an ID card, 91% reported that healthcare staff writes down the date for the next appointment of every household member on the card.

Only 37% of these head beneficiaries under SRS said they have had a scheduled appointment for preventive purposes (either for themselves or for another household member) during the month before the survey was conducted. However, 8 out of 10 head beneficiaries said they or another household member attended a self-care health workshop in their community during the six months before the survey was conducted.

As for chronic degenerative diseases, 17% of over 6 million head beneficiaries under SRS are overweight or obese, 12% have diabetes, and about the same percentage have high blood pressure.

As for household members who belong to control groups in the health sector, 8% of 6.2 million households represented have a newborn in the household, while 15% have at least one member under 5 years old. Similarly, of the head beneficiaries under SRS, 2% said they or another female in the household were pregnant and 4.44% said they or another female were breastfeeding. While these proportions may seem small, they account for 129,000 and 276,000 head beneficiaries under SRS, respectively.

Lastly, at the national level, satisfaction with the program's healthcare services is high among head beneficiaries. 93% of them rated the services they receive as good or very good, and 84% thinks their health status improved since they joined PROSPERA. This represents the perceptions of over 5.75 million and 5.23 million head beneficiaries under SRS, respectively.

V. Results of the Puntos Centinela 2018 Indicators

V.1. Indicator Descriptions

Table 1. Indicator Descriptions for Head Beneficiaries (PCI 01-14, SRS and RES)

Head Beneficiaries SRS and RES							
ID	Indicator	Decimal scale					
		Deficient	Regular	Adequate			
PCI 01	Head beneficiaries' degree of knowledge about PROSPERA benefits and their main processes	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 02	Head beneficiaries' rating for the quality of sessions offered by Support Desk staff (PSD and CCMO)	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 03	Head beneficiaries' rating for the quality of information received from program staff	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 04	Head beneficiaries' rating for the time and money costs associated to accessing the program's cash benefits	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 05	Head beneficiaries' rating for the effectiveness of the cash benefits delivery process	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 06	Head beneficiaries' rating for the process of paperwork assistance offered to beneficiaries	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 07	Head beneficiaries' rating for the process for responding to beneficiary complaints	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 08	Head beneficiaries' rating for the Community-Building Committees' usefulness and service	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 09	Head beneficiaries' rating for BANSEFI products and services as part of the financial inclusion element of the program	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 10	Head beneficiaries' rating for the support received from program staff to facilitate their inclusion into productive labor	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 11	Head beneficiaries' rating for the support received from program staff to facilitate their social inclusion	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 12	Head beneficiaries' rating for the program's transparency and security	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 13	Head beneficiaries' rating for the quality of beneficiary support offered by program staff	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 14	Head beneficiaries' rating for the quality of benefits, beneficiary support, and services offered by PROSPERA	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10

Table 2. Indicator Descriptions for PROSPERA Staff (PCI 15-22)

Staff PROSPERA							
ID	Indicator	Decimal scale					
		Deficient		Regular		Adequate	
PCI 15	PROSPERA staff's rating for the inputs available for performing their duties	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 16	PROSPERA staff's rating for the time and money costs associated to adequately perform their duties	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 17	PROSPERA staff's rating for the quality of information received for performing their duties adequately	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 18	PROSPERA staff's rating for the importance and clarity of the contents taught at the several Support Desks	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 19	PROSPERA staff's rating for the process of paperwork assistance to beneficiaries	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 20	PROSPERA staff's rating for problems faced by beneficiaries with BANSEFI's products and services	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 21	PROSPERA staff's rating for the process for responding to beneficiary complaints	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 22	PROSPERA staff's rating for their perceived degree of the program's transparency and security	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10

Table 3. Description of the Education Indicators (PCI 23-32)

Education							
ID	Indicator	Scale (Decimal and percentage)					
		Deficient		Regular		Adequate	
PCI 23	Head beneficiaries' degree of knowledge about the Education component	0%	49.9%	50%	69.9%	70%	100%
PCI 24	Head beneficiaries' and scholarship holders' perceived degree of timely delivery of Education benefits	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 25	Head beneficiaries' and scholarship holders' rating for the efficiency and quality of the Education benefits processes	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 26	Head beneficiaries' and scholarship holders' rating for the amount of the scholarship, school supplies support, and self-care workshops under the Education component	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 27	Head beneficiaries' and scholarship holders' level of satisfaction with the beneficiary support provided by school staff	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10

Education							
ID	Indicator	Scale (Decimal and percentage)					
		Deficient		Regular		Adequate	
PCI 28	Head beneficiaries' and scholarship holders' level of satisfaction with the education services received	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 29	School staff's degree of knowledge about the Education component	0%	49.9%	50%	69.9%	70%	100%
PCI 30	School staff's rating for the efficiency and quality of PROSPERA scholarships' elements and processes	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 31	School staff's rating for the elements of the Shared Responsibility Certification process	0	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 32	School staff's and beneficiaries' rating for the impact of PROSPERA's educational benefits	0%	49.9%	50%	69.9%	70%	100%

Table 4. Description of the Healthcare Indicators (PCI 33-56)

Healthcare							
ID	Indicator	Percentage scale					
		Deficient		Regular		Adequate	
PCI 33	Percentage of days worked by healthcare staff in the healthcare unit		<85	85	89.99	90	100
PCI 34	Percentage of days worked by mobile healthcare units relative to scheduled work days		<85	85	89.99	90	100
PCI 35	Percentage of healthcare units where medical appointments for families are scheduled and performed		<85	85	89.99	90	100
PCI 36	Percentage of healthcare units where community-based family workshops are scheduled and performed		<85	85	89.99	90	100
PCI 37	Percentage of beneficiaries with scheduled medical appointments		<85	85	89.99	90	100
PCI 38	Percentage of beneficiaries who attended their appointment at the healthcare unit and received care		<85	85	89.99	90	100
PCI 39	Percentage of beneficiaries who think waiting times for receiving care at healthcare units are adequate		<75	75	79.99	80	100
PCI 40	Percentage of healthcare units where it is a medical doctor who provides care for PROSPERA families		<80	80	89.99	90	100
PCI 41	Percentage of beneficiaries who report receiving care from a medical doctor at the healthcare units		<80	80	89.99	90	100
PCI 42	Percentage of healthcare units that perform monitoring of children's nutritional status		<80	80	89.99	90	100

		Healthcare					
ID	Indicator	Percentage scale					
		Deficient	Regular		Adequate		
PCI 43	Percentage of head beneficiaries who have information on children's nutritional status	<80	80	89.99	90	100	
PCI 44	Percentage of healthcare units that perform pregnancy monitoring	<80	80	89.99	90	100	
PCI 45	Percentage of pregnant head beneficiaries who have information on pregnancy care	<80	80	89.99	90	100	
PCI 46	Percentage of priority inputs available at the healthcare units for providing medical care	<80	80	84.99	85	100	
PCI 47	Percentage of functional priority inputs at the healthcare units	<80	80	84.99	85	100	
PCI 48	Percentage of medicines from the Guaranteed Basic Healthcare Package and the 27 public health interventions set by CAUSES available at healthcare units	<80	80	84.99	85	100	
PCI 49	Percentage of beneficiaries who received all prescribed medications	<80	80	84.99	85	100	
PCI 50	Percentage of units that offer food support for the target population	<80	80	84.99	85	100	
PCI 51	Percentage of Healthcare staff who received program training over the past 12 months	<75	75	84.99	85	100	
PCI 52	Percentage of Healthcare staff who knows the Healthcare component benefits that PROSPERA families should receive	<80	80	89.99	90	100	
PCI 53	Percentage of head beneficiaries affiliated to Seguro Popular	<80	80	84.99	85	100	
PCI 54	Percentage of Healthcare staff who rates the level of care provided as good	<75	75	84.99	85	100	
PCI 55	Percentage of beneficiaries who were satisfied with the care provided during their previous appointment	<75	75	84.99	85	100	
PCI 56	Percentage of beneficiaries reporting charges for the delivery of healthcare services	>5	5.0	1.10	1.09	0.00	

Table 5. Description of BANSEFI Staff Indicators (PCI 57-61)

BANSEFI Staff							
ID	Indicator	Decimal scale					
		Deficient		Regular		Adequate	
PCI 57	BANSEFI staff's rating for the resources available to perform their PROSPERA-related duties	0.00	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 58	BANSEFI staff's degree of knowledge about the products and services offered to foster financial inclusion	0.00	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 59	BANSEFI staff's rating for problems faced by PROSPERA beneficiaries with the products and services offered to foster financial inclusion	0.00	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 60	BANSEFI staff's rating for the process for responding to beneficiary complaints about the products and services offered to foster financial inclusion	0.00	4.99	5	6.99	7	10
PCI 61	BANSEFI staff's rating for the usefulness of products and services offered to foster financial inclusion of households	0.00	4.99	5	6.99	7	10

V.2. PROSPERA Study Area

Table 6. Indicators for Head Beneficiaries under SRS

State	PCI 01	PCI 02	PCI 03	PCI 04	PCI 05	PCI 06	PCI 07	PCI 08	PCI 09	PCI 10	PCI 11	PCI 12	PCI 13	PCI 14
Aguascalientes	4.09	7.99	7.75	6.71	9.46	7.33	6.17	8.53	6.37	9.52	8.62	8.61	8.30	9.51
Baja California	4.43	7.20	7.83	5.24	9.66	6.27	5.73	8.69	6.32	6.67	6.78	8.42	7.92	9.53
Baja California Sur	4.28	6.54	7.73	3.66	9.69	6.44	5.90	7.76	6.52	7.50	7.10	8.11	7.47	9.31
Campeche	4.19	7.35	7.11	5.11	9.57	5.92	5.03	8.51	5.88	7.14	6.89	8.18	7.29	9.37
Coahuila	3.80	7.03	7.82	3.66	9.75	7.05	5.76	8.69	6.81	8.33	7.09	8.00	7.81	9.63
Colima	4.08	7.84	7.80	5.17	9.55	6.11	5.76	8.22	6.26	6.67	7.10	8.08	7.46	9.44
Chiapas	4.15	6.92	7.27	2.84	9.76	5.43	4.62	8.64	5.30	8.10	6.85	8.05	7.02	9.23
Chihuahua	3.76	7.78	6.98	4.65	9.41	6.08	5.16	8.21	5.80	6.67	7.78	8.19	7.49	9.61
Ciudad de México	4.28	7.41	7.77	4.53	9.19	5.90	5.37	8.74	5.76	7.11	7.05	8.26	7.30	9.28
Durango	4.16	7.08	7.11	4.33	9.83	6.25	5.64	8.46	6.65	6.67	7.29	8.26	7.63	9.44
Guanajuato	3.98	7.51	7.77	4.74	9.82	6.96	6.07	8.98	6.73	6.67	7.17	8.48	8.31	9.66
Guerrero	4.13	6.85	7.02	5.58	9.84	6.06	5.11	8.61	5.89	6.67	6.75	8.36	7.37	9.14
Hidalgo	4.48	6.94	7.63	4.83	9.79	6.11	5.25	8.65	6.74	6.50	6.77	8.50	7.57	9.29
Jalisco	4.21	7.59	8.11	4.82	9.80	6.56	5.94	9.08	6.46	9.17	7.39	8.27	8.18	9.51
México	4.39	7.06	7.49	3.46	9.75	5.72	4.90	8.56	5.84	5.93	7.10	8.31	7.36	9.23
Michoacán	4.39	7.28	7.51	4.56	9.60	6.00	5.32	8.63	5.71	7.17	7.00	8.22	7.44	9.40
Morelos	4.22	7.25	7.41	3.44	9.72	5.95	5.47	8.70	6.18	6.97	6.84	8.41	7.46	9.41
Nayarit	4.30	7.63	7.37	4.30	9.84	6.22	5.92	8.40	6.79	6.67	7.05	8.74	7.76	9.68
Nuevo León	4.31	7.73	7.78	4.00	9.60	6.46	5.89	8.90	6.49	6.94	7.47	8.11	7.73	9.67
Oaxaca	4.15	7.06	7.14	3.68	9.88	6.06	4.92	8.59	5.42	6.19	6.93	8.06	7.24	9.11
Puebla	4.09	6.62	7.02	3.81	9.78	5.95	4.78	8.43	6.18	6.67	6.59	8.40	7.42	9.33
Querétaro	4.17	6.96	6.73	3.25	9.80	5.96	4.92	8.65	6.46	7.67	7.01	8.27	7.13	9.28
Quintana Roo	4.20	7.08	7.86	6.22	9.66	6.03	5.29	8.42	6.15	6.00	6.74	8.43	7.71	9.35
San Luis Potosí	3.83	7.12	7.42	4.02	9.64	6.15	5.20	8.76	6.30	6.19	7.41	8.30	7.52	9.37
Sinaloa	4.33	6.64	8.03	3.56	9.74	7.16	6.08	9.10	6.66	7.78	8.08	8.34	8.05	9.63
Sonora	4.36	6.78	7.60	5.80	9.80	6.39	5.55	8.59	7.10	6.67	6.79	8.47	7.70	9.68
Tabasco	4.34	7.08	7.70	3.77	9.82	6.10	5.24	8.56	5.82	6.67	7.01	8.30	7.46	9.52
Tamaulipas	4.33	7.70	7.97	6.38	9.71	6.36	5.58	9.03	6.36	6.67	7.75	8.20	8.32	9.68
Tlaxcala	4.40	7.27	7.28	5.63	9.76	6.04	5.33	8.57	6.48	7.04	7.31	8.49	7.41	9.33
Veracruz	4.29	7.33	7.26	4.11	9.81	5.86	5.17	8.72	6.15	7.10	6.89	8.11	7.53	9.48
Yucatán	3.80	7.42	7.00	4.88	9.80	5.35	4.82	7.96	6.47	6.92	6.27	8.08	7.04	9.43
Zacatecas	3.93	7.03	7.63	5.39	9.78	6.95	5.81	8.89	6.62	7.50	7.05	8.16	7.75	9.47
National	4.20	7.11	7.42	4.20	9.76	6.04	5.18	8.63	6.04	6.90	6.98	8.25	7.49	9.36

Table 7. Indicators for Head Beneficiaries under RES

State	PCI-RES 01	PCI-RES 02	PCI-RES 03	PCI-RES 04	PCI-RES 05	PCI-RES 06	PCI-RES 07	PCI-RES 08	PCI-RES 09	PCI-RES 10	PCI-RES 11	PCI-RES 12	PCI-RES 13	PCI-RES 14
Aguascalientes	3.62	7.87	8.02	4.21	9.04	6.53	6.28	5.79	5.13	10.00	10.00	8.24	8.69	9.32
Baja California	4.37	6.92	6.67	4.71	9.58	5.44	5.37	8.38	6.56	6.67	6.67	8.49	7.73	9.15
Baja California Sur	3.99	6.58	7.69	3.11	9.41	6.41	5.92	7.21	6.62	N/D	8.33	7.90	7.38	9.30
Campeche	4.11	6.90	7.50	3.18	9.92	6.61	5.56	8.41	6.45	6.67	6.67	8.08	7.50	9.53
Coahuila	3.66	6.48	6.67	1.32	9.77	6.11	5.20	8.25	5.67	N/D	6.67	7.84	7.52	9.32
Colima	3.86	7.06	7.67	4.75	9.86	6.06	5.19	8.42	6.11	N/D	6.67	7.96	7.65	9.60
Chiapas	4.15	5.89	7.29	2.00	9.87	6.32	5.18	9.10	5.70	10.00	8.33	7.93	7.67	9.54
Chihuahua	3.88	7.45	7.99	3.16	9.75	5.93	5.33	8.11	6.34	N/D	6.67	8.32	8.12	9.69
Ciudad de México	3.87	6.80	7.33	3.54	9.65	6.28	5.38	8.89	6.76	N/D	7.04	7.95	7.49	9.44
Durango	4.06	6.62	7.36	3.49	9.88	6.67	5.82	7.95	7.14	6.67	7.78	8.04	7.66	9.74
Guanajuato	3.59	6.98	8.33	4.33	9.93	6.89	6.28	8.93	6.46	10.00	7.50	8.05	8.27	9.42
Guerrero	3.80	6.84	6.32	5.00	9.77	6.89	5.21	8.74	5.24	6.67	7.00	8.16	7.77	9.58
Hidalgo	4.17	6.17	8.75	4.35	9.89	5.98	5.43	8.55	5.81	6.67	7.38	8.01	7.39	9.34
Jalisco	4.05	7.50	6.67	5.50	9.88	6.93	6.19	8.80	6.39	N/D	7.50	8.02	8.04	9.52
México	4.35	6.71	7.31	2.79	9.86	4.72	5.12	8.64	5.51	3.33	7.50	7.89	7.30	9.35
Michoacán	4.36	7.78	7.64	5.98	9.70	5.22	5.11	8.61	5.52	6.67	7.50	7.90	7.52	9.27
Morelos	4.07	7.03	7.50	3.90	9.89	6.15	5.42	7.72	7.19	N/D	6.67	8.17	7.42	9.10
Nayarit	3.07	6.89	6.39	6.07	9.64	6.11	6.11	8.77	7.53	N/D	6.67	8.51	7.68	9.50
Nuevo León	4.58	8.12	7.78	6.67	9.60	6.46	6.85	8.70	6.92	N/D	8.10	7.64	8.17	9.56
Oaxaca	3.78	7.04	7.92	2.79	9.78	5.65	5.39	8.91	5.97	N/D	7.14	7.90	7.52	8.98
Puebla	3.98	6.20	6.22	4.10	10.00	6.11	4.74	8.59	7.15	N/D	10.00	8.44	7.58	9.11
Querétaro	3.86	6.93	N/D	2.98	9.86	5.49	5.12	8.62	6.17	N/D	6.19	8.08	6.96	9.17
Quintana Roo	4.30	7.63	8.04	4.38	9.84	6.11	5.65	8.01	6.34	6.67	5.33	8.28	7.68	9.51
San Luis Potosí	3.61	7.18	7.68	5.83	9.81	5.71	6.11	8.02	6.29	N/D	7.78	8.02	7.77	9.56
Sinaloa	4.11	6.17	9.10	5.11	9.86	6.96	5.91	8.90	7.05	N/D	7.14	8.27	8.35	9.47
Sonora	3.76	5.70	7.96	3.05	9.93	6.43	5.33	8.90	7.54	N/D	7.33	8.31	8.08	9.38
Tabasco	4.35	7.16	8.83	2.91	9.88	5.99	5.62	8.88	6.56	N/D	7.92	8.04	7.68	9.48
Tamaulipas	3.98	7.38	7.64	4.69	9.81	6.34	5.66	8.65	6.66	N/D	8.33	8.07	7.69	9.84
Tlaxcala	4.24	6.78	6.39	3.47	9.85	5.91	4.90	8.70	5.54	N/D	6.67	8.45	7.27	9.17
Veracruz	3.99	7.12	7.38	3.37	9.95	5.36	5.13	8.37	6.09	6.67	6.67	7.96	7.72	9.57
Yucatán	3.19	6.55	8.33	6.11	9.93	4.81	6.06	8.26	7.97	N/D	10.00	8.10	7.38	9.30
Zacatecas	3.92	6.37	N/D	5.00	9.91	7.01	5.10	8.97	6.47	6.67	7.33	8.23	7.44	9.26
National	4.01	6.86	7.55	3.72	9.82	5.97	5.46	8.67	6.28	6.95	7.29	8.05	7.68	9.40

N/D: These indicators could not be calculated in these states. For PCI-RES 03, no head beneficiary under RES said they learned about the Program's existence from program staff, and for PCI-RES 10, no head beneficiary under RES said they had received productive inclusion support from program staff.

Table 8. Indicators for PROSPERA Staff

State	PCI 15	PCI 16	PCI 17	PCI 18	PCI 19	PCI 20	PCI 21	PCI 22
Aguascalientes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Baja California	8.68	6.00	8.19	9.58	6.25	5.33	6.67	8.50
Baja California Sur	7.91	6.67	7.91	8.91	5.44	1.67	3.98	8.33
Campeche	9.09	7.06	8.76	9.13	5.30	2.75	4.28	8.38
Coahuila	6.44	10.00	7.56	8.33	6.67	10.00	6.67	10.00
Colima	8.50	7.31	8.82	8.75	7.11	1.03	6.50	8.58
Chiapas	7.59	3.03	7.88	8.69	6.42	3.65	5.89	8.31
Chihuahua	8.95	7.05	9.12	9.59	6.73	5.71	7.27	8.38
Ciudad de México	7.11	3.18	7.68	8.34	5.99	2.20	5.84	8.35
Durango	7.09	2.50	5.92	8.88	6.16	3.33	3.24	7.92
Guanajuato	8.36	6.36	8.37	8.93	6.02	3.33	5.86	8.45
Guerrero	7.98	4.82	7.75	8.57	6.24	0.36	5.52	8.10
Hidalgo	7.28	3.33	9.33	9.58	5.42	6.67	6.48	8.13
Jalisco	8.06	5.00	7.88	8.68	6.20	3.33	4.58	8.31
México	7.30	2.06	7.55	8.47	6.00	3.10	5.40	8.31
Michoacán	7.86	5.63	7.96	9.05	6.75	2.60	5.76	8.13
Morelos	7.95	3.00	8.37	8.52	6.48	3.33	6.00	8.13
Nayarit	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nuevo León	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oaxaca	7.42	2.73	7.82	8.79	6.23	3.02	5.61	8.47
Puebla	7.81	3.10	8.01	8.55	5.39	2.47	5.81	8.39
Querétaro	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Quintana Roo	7.57	3.75	7.50	8.88	6.55	4.17	5.42	8.20
San Luis Potosí	8.60	5.22	8.05	8.83	7.04	4.85	6.42	8.53
Sinaloa	9.00	8.75	8.56	8.62	6.68	3.54	5.56	8.38
Sonora	8.16	6.25	7.86	9.65	7.45	4.17	4.72	7.97
Tabasco	8.72	3.85	8.87	9.31	6.84	4.44	6.64	8.48
Tamaulipas	8.54	8.13	8.82	9.23	6.32	5.00	4.93	8.83
Tlaxcala	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Veracruz	8.20	1.67	8.51	9.02	6.45	5.06	6.54	8.17
Yucatán	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Zacatecas	8.20	5.83	7.88	6.24	5.86	6.11	5.19	8.13
National	7.99	4.11	8.07	8.78	6.28	3.44	5.75	8.33

Note: Results are only descriptive, since the total universe of staff members that could have responded the questionnaire is unknown at both the national and state levels.

N/A: States where no PROSPERA staff member responded the questionnaire.

Table 9. Indicators for BANSEFI Staff

State	PCI 57	PCI 58	PCI 59	PCI 60	PCI 61
Aguascalientes	7.00	8.75	5.40	8.87	10.00
Baja California	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Baja California Sur	9.00	9.00	9.07	6.60	10.00
Campeche	7.00	8.00	6.91	6.60	10.00
Coahuila	9.00	9.50	6.46	7.73	8.00
Colima	10.00	8.50	8.32	7.73	10.00
Chiapas	8.00	5.25	5.58	8.33	10.00
Chihuahua	7.00	8.00	5.86	8.87	7.00
Ciudad de México	8.33	7.83	5.76	6.62	10.00
Durango	10.00	8.50	5.40	7.73	10.00
Guanajuato	8.00	10.00	6.31	4.40	10.00
Guerrero	8.50	8.25	6.18	3.85	7.50
Hidalgo	9.00	10.00	N/D	6.60	10.00
Jalisco	8.00	9.00	6.78	6.62	9.50
México	7.60	6.00	6.14	4.78	8.80
Michoacán	9.00	8.25	7.55	6.63	9.50
Morelos	9.00	10.00	5.85	7.73	9.00
Nayarit	8.00	7.50	6.16	10.00	10.00
Nuevo León	8.00	9.00	4.95	3.30	8.00
Oaxaca	8.00	9.17	5.51	7.36	8.67
Puebla	9.00	9.00	7.24	6.60	10.00
Querétaro	9.00	9.75	6.86	7.73	10.00
Quintana Roo	8.00	9.00	5.10	5.50	9.00
San Luis Potosí	10.00	8.50	5.55	5.50	10.00
Sinaloa	7.50	5.75	6.02	7.17	10.00
Sonora	10.00	10.00	6.01	6.60	10.00
Tabasco	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tamaulipas	8.00	3.50	6.30	6.60	8.00
Tlaxcala	9.00	9.00	4.66	6.60	8.00
Veracruz	8.75	7.25	4.95	6.62	8.50
Yucatán	9.00	6.25	6.46	7.17	9.50
Zacatecas	9.00	9.50	5.71	10.00	8.00
National	8.36	7.94	6.14	6.77	9.16

Note: Results are only descriptive, since the total universe of staff members that could have responded the questionnaire is unknown at both the national and state levels.

N/A: States where no PROSPERA-related BANSEFI staff member responded the questionnaire.

N/D: These indicators could not be calculated in these states. For PCI 59, all respondents said the head beneficiaries did not have any problems with BANSEFI products or services.

V.3. Education Study Area

Table 10. Indicators for the Education Study Area

State	PCI 23	PCI 24	PCI 25	PCI 26	PCI 27	PCI 28	PCI 29	PCI 30	PCI 31	PCI 32
Aguascalientes	34.57	6.52	6.38	6.45	6.74	5.56	34.28	3.78	3.53	64.26
Baja California	34.03	7.35	5.96	5.89	5.24	5.02	32.80	5.04	4.79	50.89
Baja California Sur	33.01	7.92	5.96	5.69	6.10	4.87	29.90	5.29	4.78	55.13
Campeche	36.20	7.11	5.72	5.44	5.46	4.91	32.89	4.85	5.62	50.48
Chiapas	37.70	8.03	5.55	5.27	5.61	5.03	37.80	3.77	3.16	50.66
Chihuahua	31.52	7.42	6.14	6.13	5.50	4.99	28.29	4.60	4.54	51.05
Ciudad de México	36.19	6.28	5.64	5.34	5.36	4.84	21.07	5.08	3.84	55.37
Coahuila	32.15	8.00	6.78	6.57	6.41	6.08	30.40	4.25	4.66	62.88
Colima	35.26	6.09	5.93	5.78	5.38	4.96	29.34	5.34	4.94	53.77
Durango	33.99	7.57	5.88	5.72	5.31	5.08	37.72	7.16	6.44	54.09
Guanajuato	36.07	8.28	6.43	6.48	6.26	5.47	27.55	3.38	2.36	60.00
Guerrero	35.78	7.48	5.78	5.30	5.14	4.36	38.17	4.99	4.52	50.26
Hidalgo	37.49	8.02	5.63	5.32	5.57	4.79	32.25	4.95	5.43	52.56
Jalisco	37.31	7.82	6.22	6.24	5.81	5.24	30.65	5.30	5.31	57.30
México	36.38	7.74	5.49	4.77	5.02	4.75	37.01	5.00	5.28	50.30
Michoacán	38.52	7.36	5.84	5.68	5.57	4.77	34.25	3.76	3.98	53.45
Morelos	34.95	7.50	6.03	5.57	5.25	4.57	27.62	5.16	5.37	51.61
Nayarit	39.45	7.55	6.08	5.88	5.30	4.95	34.55	5.60	5.01	50.25
Nuevo León	39.94	7.77	6.14	6.32	5.28	4.99	34.79	5.02	4.72	51.16
Oaxaca	38.34	7.38	5.61	5.31	5.55	4.83	44.78	4.36	4.49	51.85
Puebla	36.02	7.91	5.70	5.33	5.28	4.33	41.26	4.23	3.56	51.34
Querétaro	37.23	6.67	5.48	4.89	5.32	4.75	37.27	5.65	5.18	53.93
Quintana Roo	33.65	6.55	5.76	5.48	5.86	5.07	30.97	5.25	4.32	53.89
San Luis Potosí	36.00	7.36	5.97	5.47	5.24	4.40	33.48	4.21	3.86	50.66
Sinaloa	37.30	8.24	6.46	6.17	6.38	5.72	29.65	5.26	6.12	57.71
Sonora	39.40	7.84	5.92	5.97	5.46	5.10	32.16	6.11	5.44	52.30
Tabasco	39.15	7.78	5.50	5.25	5.33	4.62	48.73	4.42	4.96	51.38
Tamaulipas	37.93	8.24	6.28	6.09	5.58	4.83	38.43	6.26	6.21	56.36
Tlaxcala	33.23	8.10	5.69	5.53	5.54	5.07	31.96	4.73	4.86	52.44
Veracruz	37.85	7.60	6.09	5.99	5.41	5.00	29.72	4.67	4.52	50.62
Yucatán	34.27	6.87	5.41	5.24	5.34	4.61	35.63	3.87	3.34	50.45
Zacatecas	36.47	7.47	5.94	5.91	6.18	5.51	34.53	4.09	5.04	62.97
National	36.81	7.68	5.84	5.55	5.49	4.88	34.90	4.63	4.50	52.45

V.4. Healthcare Study Area

Table 11. Indicators for the Healthcare Study Area

Estate	PCI 33	PCI 34	PCI 35	PCI 36	PCI 37	PCI 38	PCI 39	PCI 40	PCI 41	PCI 42	PCI 43	PCI 44
Aguascalientes	100.00	NA	93.33	93.33	94.20	94.17	55.16	80.00	84.82	100.00	95.89	93.33
Baja California	92.36	NA	100.00	95.00	89.37	93.92	56.69	85.00	87.78	90.00	100.00	87.50
Baja California Sur	100.00	NA	94.12	94.12	85.78	95.83	59.05	100.00	89.66	82.35	92.11	76.47
Campeche	75.31	NA	88.24	82.35	96.04	96.91	59.07	94.12	90.53	94.12	90.54	100.00
Coahuila	77.26	NA	100.00	88.89	94.48	90.72	67.97	72.22	82.49	88.89	100.00	75.00
Colima	95.59	NA	94.74	94.74	91.35	93.68	66.07	78.95	79.16	83.33	93.90	63.16
Chiapas	70.25	NA	84.62	92.31	86.26	94.54	67.07	61.54	71.33	100.00	86.11	84.62
Chihuahua	85.26	NA	95.00	90.00	87.42	97.64	72.53	75.00	73.62	100.00	84.78	64.71
Ciudad de México	96.80	NA	100.00	87.50	88.72	93.57	67.56	93.75	89.16	100.00	93.33	93.75
Durango	89.95	NA	94.12	100.00	90.67	97.45	63.53	94.12	80.89	94.12	95.29	82.35
Guanajuato	76.90	NA	95.24	95.24	90.56	92.11	66.67	71.43	83.82	71.43	93.75	85.71
Herrero	93.33	NA	93.75	93.75	88.81	92.47	62.93	100.00	83.33	81.25	91.67	93.75
Hidalgo	84.47	NA	100.00	100.00	96.82	93.87	45.10	73.33	90.00	100.00	97.56	86.67
Jalisco	97.22	NA	100.00	100.00	89.93	91.97	61.76	76.47	82.97	82.35	98.53	80.00
México	93.08	NA	100.00	90.48	88.87	95.27	53.19	95.24	91.39	85.71	88.46	90.48
Michoacán	86.23	NA	84.21	89.47	94.22	96.43	57.92	84.21	86.72	78.95	89.02	84.21
Morelos	79.41	NA	88.89	94.44	89.16	88.41	64.33	94.44	88.27	100.00	96.15	88.89
Nayarit	95.95	NA	95.00	95.00	94.03	90.51	68.07	80.00	82.51	89.47	92.77	84.21
Nuevo León	92.87	NA	90.00	90.00	92.64	93.65	69.23	85.00	81.98	90.00	93.33	68.75
Oaxaca	87.08	NA	100.00	100.00	93.48	96.97	59.41	92.86	90.34	92.86	97.73	92.86
Puebla	85.86	NA	94.12	94.12	95.37	97.59	61.12	100.00	85.88	100.00	96.92	100.00
Querétaro	99.18	NA	100.00	100.00	91.87	94.21	52.85	87.50	85.78	81.25	96.00	100.00
Quintana Roo	82.05	NA	83.33	88.89	91.56	90.45	54.30	83.33	87.33	83.33	96.15	77.78
San Luis Potosí	81.95	NA	95.00	100.00	90.51	95.78	55.97	95.00	82.12	95.00	94.44	90.00
Sinaloa	86.21	NA	94.12	88.24	93.45	93.66	69.43	94.12	86.68	93.75	96.05	87.50
Sonora	84.75	NA	84.62	92.31	91.89	91.30	74.21	76.92	85.36	76.92	100.00	84.62
Tabasco	84.78	NA	100.00	100.00	94.67	96.83	46.45	100.00	91.68	60.00	86.11	77.78
Tamaulipas	94.77	NA	100.00	94.12	80.50	91.55	58.88	94.12	82.54	100.00	97.14	82.35
Tlaxcala	81.62	NA	95.00	90.00	92.58	92.06	54.07	60.00	89.21	94.74	97.30	73.68
Veracruz	94.99	NA	94.12	88.24	94.07	90.67	62.97	94.12	88.13	100.00	94.23	100.00
Yucatán	91.05	NA	80.95	80.95	91.16	93.17	58.20	90.48	91.84	95.24	93.51	85.71
Zacatecas	78.85	NA	90.00	90.00	93.81	94.19	67.48	85.00	79.87	90.00	98.61	95.00
National	86.96	92.50	94.03	93.70	91.19	94.39	60.72	86.13	84.84	90.30	92.87	87.92

N/A: The number of mobile healthcare units in the sample does not allow to estimate results at the state level.

Table 11. Indicators for the Healthcare Study Area (Continued)

Estate	PCI 45	PCI 46	PCI 47	PCI 48	PCI 49	PCI 50	PCI 51	PCI 52	PCI 53	PCI 54	PCI 55	PCI 56
Aguascalientes	50.00	98.15	97.33	64.39	41.98	100.00	88.89	0.00	76.79	100.00	88.17	0.00
Baja California	40.00	96.68	96.09	89.72	74.71	100.00	95.00	25.00	80.54	90.00	95.25	0.00
Baja California Sur	10.00	96.08	91.94	72.10	75.39	100.00	88.24	29.41	67.03	76.47	91.59	0.00
Campeche	45.45	96.73	96.30	80.22	70.05	100.00	88.24	70.59	92.51	82.35	89.65	0.22
Coahuila	0.00	89.30	87.45	71.96	74.94	88.89	72.22	38.89	64.27	100.00	90.17	0.48
Colima	20.00	95.67	94.45	61.97	67.36	100.00	100.00	42.11	83.37	89.47	92.24	0.44
Chiapas	38.46	67.24	63.82	46.80	41.15	100.00	84.62	15.38	96.68	76.92	88.15	0.47
Chihuahua	75.00	81.38	79.26	69.34	81.73	100.00	90.48	33.33	81.29	90.48	95.40	0.00
Ciudad de México	50.00	86.57	84.26	62.14	66.67	100.00	87.50	31.25	83.19	75.00	93.58	0.22
Durango	26.67	98.91	97.17	66.31	76.31	88.24	88.24	17.65	76.22	88.24	94.22	0.00
Guanajuato	0.00	98.77	97.53	76.70	88.50	95.24	76.19	4.76	87.19	100.00	94.38	0.22
Guerrero	16.67	93.98	91.90	52.52	52.63	93.75	87.50	12.50	95.00	81.25	90.48	0.24
Hidalgo	25.00	95.31	92.10	76.22	58.93	100.00	60.00	6.67	91.14	93.33	88.86	0.68
Jalisco	10.00	94.44	93.52	76.61	59.95	93.75	100.00	12.50	84.41	93.75	90.41	0.72
México	33.33	90.79	89.55	61.46	54.12	95.24	90.48	9.52	90.13	76.19	86.13	0.00
Michoacán	27.27	91.92	89.10	63.31	53.55	94.74	84.21	21.05	88.65	89.47	90.79	0.21
Morelos	50.00	95.88	92.59	74.09	53.19	94.44	88.89	38.89	91.37	88.89	90.49	0.22
Nayarit	20.00	91.48	85.56	55.27	62.80	90.00	80.00	35.00	89.09	85.00	93.42	1.03
Nuevo León	0.00	94.63	92.59	66.87	76.53	95.00	90.00	15.00	82.49	95.00	98.22	0.25
Oaxaca	7.69	87.33	81.35	74.12	54.34	100.00	69.23	0.00	96.40	92.31	89.21	1.12
Puebla	10.00	97.17	94.55	77.91	77.92	88.24	88.24	35.29	97.69	76.47	90.74	0.46
Querétaro	0.00	94.34	92.81	78.79	77.65	100.00	94.12	82.35	93.91	88.24	92.33	0.00
Quintana Roo	0.00	89.26	83.70	72.38	59.26	100.00	85.00	10.00	94.67	90.00	89.56	0.22
San Luis Potosí	7.69	90.93	89.07	79.01	63.37	90.00	75.00	0.00	91.61	95.00	91.61	0.44
Sinaloa	25.00	89.18	83.90	79.56	75.06	94.12	82.35	29.41	71.62	88.24	94.54	1.31
Sonora	42.86	93.65	91.01	75.69	74.94	100.00	92.86	0.00	77.25	92.86	95.72	1.13
Tabasco	14.29	97.04	95.19	50.91	31.66	100.00	100.00	0.00	93.82	100.00	91.47	2.13
Tamaulipas	0.00	95.42	93.90	61.65	66.42	94.12	76.47	29.41	75.74	94.12	85.03	0.45
Tlaxcala	0.00	95.00	90.74	66.14	66.59	95.00	65.00	10.00	93.03	100.00	89.66	0.90
Veracruz	0.00	96.51	89.76	68.73	58.00	94.12	88.24	0.00	93.19	94.12	90.55	1.54
Yucatán	41.67	93.15	88.15	87.12	71.26	90.00	80.00	70.00	84.35	90.00	84.13	0.23
Zacatecas	33.33	78.48	77.37	72.83	71.56	95.00	90.00	0.00	90.27	95.00	93.14	1.11
National	20.60	90.57	87.49	67.23	60.09	95.58	84.07	16.16	90.57	88.53	90.13	0.60

VI. Conclusions

PC is a cornerstone for evaluating PROSPERA's performance and a key tool to monitor the processes that lead to achieving the program's goals. It is an instrument that generates relevant information about the program's operation by identifying areas of opportunity to help evidence-based decision-making that leads to innovation and continued improvement of the program. In addition, this study accounts for the perceptions of all those involved at the different operational stages of the program, allowing to analyze the entire chain of operation, including inputs, benefit delivery, benefit reception, and beneficiary support provided.

A general finding was that PROSPERA's basic components have a high coverage rate relative to their target population, and that the program has enough operational capacity to monitor its processes.

We also found that the information, benefits, and services arrive to beneficiaries in a timely manner. However, the program's operation should focus on attributes like quality, increasing knowledge, and behavioral changes that could be incentivized with the program benefits and services.

Head beneficiaries rated the quality of information and sessions offered by program staff as adequate, yet this is not confirmed in the degree of knowledge they have about the program's benefits and relevant processes, which was flagged as deficient in the traffic light color-coding system used. This was also a finding in the 2017 study, and it becomes all the more relevant given PROSPERA staff's rating of the quality of information they receive to perform their duties as adequate.

For all groups of analysis, head beneficiaries' ratings for the three indicators on program information were lower in 2018 than 2017, except for the SRS beneficiaries' ratings for the quality of information received by program staff, which increased slightly.

PC 2017's results were presented to PROSPERA's management, yet we do not have knowledge that work meetings have been scheduled to consider further actions to improve the program. Therefore, the likely cause of this finding could be the same as the one identified one year ago — the program's communication strategy seems to be inadequate for the beneficiaries' backgrounds, needs, and interests.

As for the program's permanent processes, delivery of cash benefits is rated as adequate, even though the associated costs for receiving them were rated as deficient. In addition, head beneficiaries rated paperwork assistance and response to complaints as regular. This implies there is significant room for improvement in this area.

It may seem trivial that PROSPERA timely delivers cash transfers to 6.5 million people, yet this is the product of multiple internal processes that the program performs in an adequate and synchronized manner. One of PROSPERA's most meaningful strengths is that beneficiaries are certain they will receive their transfers, even the ones in the most remote localities. However, the time and money costs associated are an area of opportunity in this process.

Head beneficiaries rated the paperwork assistance and complaints processes as regular, and response times as deficient. The program might not be providing a timely service in these areas.

Staff respondents consider they receive sufficient inputs in a timely manner (forms, travel expenses) and believe the allocated time and space are adequate, yet they claimed they lack the necessary resources to perform their duties. We recommend conducting a detailed analysis of the costs that staff members face to adequately perform their duties and collecting improvement proposals from staff. This could decrease the high turnover rate among program staff, a problem found in previous external evaluations.

A relevant finding for the Outreach component of the program is the little knowledge beneficiaries have about it. The percentage of beneficiaries who are aware of these benefits

is low (financial inclusion, productive and employment inclusion, and also social inclusion, for which beneficiaries gave an even lower rating).

Head beneficiaries under both schemes mostly rated BANSEFI's products and services as regular, including benefits for productive projects (guidance, information, and creation of a productive project) and information on social inclusion. Although the indicators did not reach an adequate level this year, PCI 10 and PCI 11 improved relative to 2017, and the rating for productive and employment inclusion even doubled for some groups. Unfortunately, there is no program information to identify likely causes of this change.

All indicators associated to the head beneficiaries' overall assessment of the program reached adequate levels (ratings for beneficiary support provided by Community-Building Committees and staff; degree of transparency, and security; and overall rating of the program). As in 2017, the lowest indicator in this group is the rating for the beneficiary support provided by program staff. There is large room for improvement in this area, and it is likely related to the aspects discussed earlier.

Lastly, head beneficiaries have a very good overall perception of the quality of program benefits, support, and services. This does not match most results for indicators on program processes and beneficiary support, although it does match the ratings for the benefit delivery process. It is thus very likely that this process is influencing beneficiary perceptions the most, and this might be due to the certainty they have that they will receive the cash transfers on time, allowing them to complement their household income and fulfill their basic needs.

VII. Recommendations

Based on the most relevant findings, PC is a starting point for creating an integral research program using this study's results and complementing them with data from administrative records and findings from other evaluations and studies. This would allow to provide a full assessment of the program's progress and challenges.

Incorporating administrative records into PC would allow to compare and complement administrative data with self-reported data. This could help solve some of the discrepancies found. In addition, this would allow to monitor the new Outreach component across agencies, identify who the beneficiaries are, and monitor PROSPERA's results on the several types of inclusion-oriented actions.

We also recommend analyzing the feasibility of including a panel subsample or case studies for follow-up on some populations and components in future editions of the study. This would allow to monitor results in the short run and to know the likely effects of new actions and changes in PROSPERA's operation. In addition, conducting complementary qualitative studies could provide a deeper look into some of PC's findings.

Finally, such analyses, while very informative about the program's operation, are pointless if there is no appropriation from program decision-makers. This information should be used as input in further attempts to keep improving the program, including documenting the actions taken to solve the problems detected for follow-up during future analyses.

VIII. References

- CNP (2018). *Anexo Técnico, Análisis de Puntos Centinela 2013-2017, actualización, levantamiento, procesamiento, análisis y elaboración de informes de resultados del estudio 2018.*
- CONEVAL (2014). *Manual para el diseño y la construcción de Indicadores.* Retrieved September 6, 2017, from: <https://www.coneval.org.mx/informes/coordinacion/publicaciones%20oficiales/m anual para el diseno y contruccion de indicadores.pdf>
- EASE. (2016). *Evaluación de Resultados del Programa Integral de Inclusión Financiera (PROIIF).* 1a fase. Informe final. Mexico City: EASE.
- PROSPERA, P. d. (2017). *ACUERDO por el que se emiten las Reglas de Operación del Programa PROSPERA, Programa de Inclusión Social, para el ejercicio fiscal 2018.* D.F: “Diario Oficial de la Federación (DOF texto original 29-12-2017)”. Retrieved from: https://www.gob.mx/cms/uploads/attachment/file/285177/ROP_PROSPERA_2018_dof.pdf
- P.d. (s.f.). ¿Qué es PROSPERA Programa de Inclusión Social? *Programa de Inclusión Social PROSPERA.* Retrieved November 13, 2018, from: <https://www.gob.mx/prospera/documentos/que-es-prospera>.
- PROSPERA, P. d. (2016). *ACUERDO por el que se emiten las Reglas de Operación del Programa PROSPERA, Programa de Inclusión Social, para el ejercicio fiscal 2017.* D.F: “Diario Oficial de la Federación (DOF texto original 29-12-2016)”. Retrieved from: http://dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5468069&fecha=29/12/2016
- Puntos Centinela 2017 (2017). *Informe Nacional de Resultados de 2017 de Puntos Centinela: Tema PROSPERA.* Retrieved November 19, 2018, from: <http://www.puntoscentinela.info/index.php/es/resultados/resultados-2017/informes-2017>
- Rubalcava, L. (2015). *Estrategia de seguimiento, monitoreo y evaluación de los componentes de inclusión productiva, laboral y financiera de PROSPERA Programa de Inclusión Social.* Mexico City: PROSPERA.
- San Pedro, P. (December 2006). El Individuo como agente del cambio: El proceso de empoderamiento. *Desarrollo “En Perspectiva”(1), 1 - 5.* Retrieved from: http://fride.org/download/BGR_IndiviCamb_ESP_dic06.pdf