



Outcome Mapping

Outcome mapping (OM) is a methodology for planning, monitoring and evaluating development initiatives in terms of outcomes, in order to bring about sustainable social change. The process of outcome mapping helps a project team or programme to be specific about the actors it intends to target, the changes it hopes to see and the strategies appropriate to achieve these. As an evaluation approach, OM unpacks an initiative's theory of change, provides a framework to collect data on immediate, basic changes that lead to longer, more transformative change, and allows for the plausible assessment of the initiative's contribution to results (Better Evaluation). OM puts people and learning at the centre of development and accepts unanticipated changes as potential for innovation.

Outcome Mapping establishes a vision of the human, social, and environmental betterment to which the program hopes to contribute. OM focuses monitoring and evaluation on factors and actors within that program's direct sphere of influence. The program's contributions to development are planned and assessed based on its influence on the partners with whom it is working to effect change.

It follows four guiding principles:

1. Actor-centred development and behaviour change
2. Continuous learning and flexibility
3. Participation and accountability
4. Non-linearity and contribution, not attribution and control

Outcome Mapping has three stages:

1. **Intentional Design** helps a programme answer four vital questions:
 - a. Why – what is the vision of the programme?
 - b. Who – who are the programme's boundary partners?
 - c. What – what are the changes that the programme wants to see?
 - d. How – how will the programme contribute to the change process and towards the vision?
2. **Outcome and Performance Monitoring** provides a framework for monitoring of programmes activities and the progress of boundary partners towards the anticipated achievements.
3. **Evaluation Planning** helps the programme identify evaluation priorities and develop an evaluation plan

OM is flexible and can be used in totality or in parts and in combination with other methodologies.

<http://www.outcomemapping.ca/>



5 Core Capability Framework

The Five Core Capability Framework (5C) was originally developed by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) based on extensive research. The goal of the 5C is to assess in a participatory way (reflection, in-depth discussion) the capabilities of an organization and to assist in evaluating changes over time.

The five core capabilities provide a basis for assessing an organization at any given point in time and define a baseline for evaluating change in capacity and performance over time.

The 5 core capabilities are:

- 1. Capability to commit and engage (act)** – does the organisation have everything in place to be up and running when it wants or needs to be. It includes aspects such as motivation, leadership, identity, empowerment, volition and helpful systems
- 2. Capability to deliver results** – is the organization able to do what it wants to do, i.e. carrying out tasks successfully? This includes looking at necessary systems and mechanisms, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.
- 3. Capability to relate** –When organisations represent or speak for certain groups, e.g. the poor, the marginalized, they need to have the legitimacy and credibility to do so. Aspects of this capability include accountability, networking, managing relationships, resource mobilization and protecting space.
- 4. Capability to adapt and self-renew** – organisations live in an ever-changing environment and must remain relevant. This capability refers to managing change, learning and strategizing, using M&E not just for accountability but also for adaptation, improvement and innovation
- 5. Capability to achieve coherence** – can the organization make sense of all the smaller parts and aspects of their work and so present a coherent and unified whole. They need coherence of ambition, strategies, activities, structures and capacities; and balance between stability and innovation, diversity and focus.

The different capabilities strongly interrelate. However, organisations have different priorities. Depending on their focus and their status they cannot tackle all capabilities at the same time or in the same way. The 5C helps them to clarify what is important to focus on first and how to achieve the next level of any capability in order to be more successful as an organization.



In the PIE handbook, the different levels of each capability are either defined numerically (1-5) or through the analogy of tree growth (seed – mature, fruit bearing tree).

To successfully apply the 5C in capacity development it is important that:

- There is ownership of capacity development and that participating organisations are willing and able to engage and reflect with honesty and an open attitude towards change
- Multiple stakeholders and/or a critical mass of staff members should be involved. The capabilities are specific to each organization and it is important to agree on shared values for the process of reflection to be meaningful

<https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=r-ja&uact=8&ved=0CCkQFjAB&>



PADEV

PADev (**P**articipatory **A**pproach to **D**evelopment) is an innovative toolbox of techniques and methods that aim to achieve a bottom-up assessment of development and change in a particular area over a period of time based on the value systems of the population. PADev is a holistic and participatory approach to development assessment.

In PADev, participants assess a wide range of changes, projects and agencies based on their perceptions. Further, PADev assessments typically look back at development and change over the past twenty to thirty years. This yields extremely valuable information for NGOs in the area: they learn about their own impact vis-à-vis other actors, and in addition, they find out which types of projects have been regarded as most effective and relevant and more importantly: for whom and why. This can be an important lesson for future interventions. PADev should not be thought of as a replacement for conventional approaches, but rather as an alternative approach that enables a "big picture" of development and change to be constructed for an area. The complete PADev methodology comprises nine participatory exercises that can be run in a workshop format over three days, but depending on the objective of the assessment, it is also possible to carry out a selection of the exercises to complement existing assessment approaches.

<http://www.padev.nl/guidebook.htm>

Most Significant Change Stories (MSC)

Most Significant Change Story methodology is a form of participatory monitoring and evaluation. Many project stakeholders are involved both in deciding the sorts of changes to be recorded and in analysing the data that are collected. It occurs throughout the program cycle and provides information to help people manage the program. It provides data on impact and outcomes that can be used to help assess the performance of the program as a whole.

Essentially, the process involves the collection of significant change (SC) stories emanating from the field level, and a systematic selection of the most significant of these stories by panels of designated stakeholders or staff. The designated staff and stakeholders are initially involved by 'searching' for project impact. Once changes have been captured, selected groups of people sit down together, read the stories aloud and have regular and often in-depth discussions about the value of these reported changes, and which they think is most significant of all. In large programs there may be multiple levels at which SC stories are pooled and then elected. When the technique is implemented successfully, whole teams of people begin to focus their attention on program impact.



It is an important feature of the MSC system to feedback about the process of and reasons for selecting one most significant story to share understanding of similarities and difference in what different groups or individuals value as significant. Through this process of in-depth discussion and reflection the focus is geared towards programme impact.

MSC is most useful:

- Where it is not possible to predict in any detail or with any certainty what the outcome will be
- Where outcomes will vary widely across beneficiaries
- Where there may not yet be agreements between stakeholders on what outcomes are the most important
- Where interventions are expected to be highly participatory, including any forms of monitoring and evaluation of the results

<http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf>

Sensemaker

Sensemaker is a software suite that helps identify patterns among large numbers of stories collected from multiple sources. Because there are so many stories from different sources a rich and diverse picture of what is happening emerges.

Through prompting questions, people give brief accounts in spoken, transcribed narratives, video clips or photographs that tell a specific story or anecdote. The people who provide these stories then go on to interpret their accounts through a process of “self-signification”, i.e. by indexing them against pre-defined areas of interest. That means the narrators do the first analysis of their accounts and provide the first qualitative/quantitative assessment.

Rather than looking at individual stories, the large number of stories allow you to detect patterns around pre-defined topics of interest and generate evidence-based data. It provides numbers to convince policy and decision makers but also gives access to specific stories to “reveal the world through the eyes of the beneficiaries of a programme or important actors linked to the programme.”

<http://cognitive-edge.com/sensemaker>



Key References

Better Evaluation

www.betterevaluation.org

Impact Evaluation – A Guide for Commissioners and Managers

http://www.bond.org.uk/data/files/Impact_Evaluation_Guide_0515.pdf

Catley, A. et al, 2007, *Participatory Impact Assessment – A Guide for Practitioners*, Feinstein International Center

http://fic.tufts.edu/assets/PIA-guide_revised-2014-3.pdf

Chevalier, J.M., Buckles, D. *Handbook for Participatory Action Research, Planning and Evaluation*

http://www.sas2.net/sites/default/files/sites/all/files/manager/Toolkit_En_March7_2013-S.pdf

Connell , Kubisch – *Applying a Theory of Change Approach to the Evaluation of Comprehensive Community Initiatives: Progress, Prospects and Problems*, undated

<http://www.dmeforpeace.org/sites/default/files/080713%20Applying%2B-Theory%2Bof%2BChange%2BApproach.pdf>

Grandisson, M.; Hébert, M., Thiebault, R. 2014: *A systematic review on how to conduct evaluations in community-based rehabilitation*; *Disability and Rehabilitation*; 36(4): 265-275

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3109/09638288.2013.785602>

International Initiative for Impact Evaluation

www.3ieimpact.org

Jones, H.; Hearn, S. 2009; *Outcome Mapping: a realistic alternative for planning, monitoring and evaluation*; ODI Background Note



O'Flynn, M. 2010 *Impact Assessment: Understanding and assessing our contribution to change*; INTRAC M&E Paper 7

<http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/695/Impact-Assessment-Understanding-and-Assessing-our-Contributions-to-Change.pdf>

Perrin, B. 2012, *Linking Monitoring and Evaluation to Impact Evaluation*, Interaction, Impact Evaluation Notes No 7

<https://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Linking%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20to%20Impact%20Evaluation.pdf>

Ramalingam, B. 2011, *Learning how to learn: eight lessons for impact evaluations that make a difference*; ODI Background Note

<http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7096.pdf>

Udoh, S., Gona, J., Maholo, C. 2013 *Linking CBR, Disability and Rehabilitation; Chapter 7: Evidence Base for CBR* p 90-103; CBR Africa Network

http://www.iddcconsortium.net/sites/default/files/resources-tools/files/cbr_africa_final_2013_en.pdf