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Agenda

09:30-11:00

- Outcome Harvesting’s origins
- When is Outcome Harvesting a useful tool
- How does the tool work — exercise
- Six steps

11:00-12:00

Discussion in pairs about potential of Outcome harvesting for monitoring or evaluating your work

Two handouts
Origins of Outcome Harvesting

About 106 results (0.31 seconds)
Inspired by the Outcome Mapping methodology and informed by Utilization-Focused Evaluation.
Over 400 networks and associations, NGOs, community-based organisations, research institutes, and government agencies in 143 countries on all seven continents.

Identifying and reporting thousands of changes they have influenced.
In 2013, the UNDP selected Outcome Harvesting as one of 11 M&E innovations.

USAID is currently piloting Outcome Harvesting as one of 5 approaches appropriate for complexity-aware monitoring and evaluation.

https://undp.unteamworks.org/node/370238

The World Bank has published 10 case studies and a toolkit for Bank use of Outcome Harvesting.
International social change networks
International development funders
What did all of these organisations have in common?

COMPLEXITY!
Simple

Relationships of cause and effect are
KNOWN
M&E of a simple intervention

Annual polio vaccination campaign

Vision and Mission

Inputs

Activities

Outputs

Outcomes

Impact

Plan

Time

Inspired by Jeff Conklin, cognexus.org
M&E of a simple intervention

Annual polio vaccination campaign
Complex

Relationships of cause and effect are UNKNOWN
M&E of a complex intervention
M&E of a complex intervention

Strengthening nonviolent responses to communal conflict in the Horn of Africa
Dimensions in which the relationships of cause and effect are known
Unknown relations of cause and effect dominate.

Results are substantially unforeseeable.
In sum

Outcome Harvesting is “an evaluation approach that does not measure progress towards predetermined outcomes, but rather collects evidence of what has been achieved, and works backward to determine whether and how the project or intervention contributed to the change.” – UNDP

https://undp.unteamworks.org/node/370238
When do you harvest outcomes?

- Developmental
- Formative
- Summative

Progress of intervention

Time
Why focus on outcomes?

Social change = social actors doing things differently

Sustainable social change = social actors taking the initiative to do things differently
What is an outcome?

A. Social actors taking action to change the way they do things
A. **Outcome**: In 2010, the Yem district court of Ethiopia sentenced to 16 years imprisonment an offender who raped a nine-year-old girl.

*Source: Action Aid Ethiopia outcomes harvested in an evaluation of the UN Women Violence against Women Trust Fund (2011)*

Who changed what, when and where?
When is it your outcome?

2. A change that your process influenced

Effect → Cause
Example

Source: Action Aid Ethiopia outcomes harvested in an evaluation of the UN Women Violence against Women Trust Fund (2011)

A. Outcome: In 2010, the Yem district court of Ethiopia sentenced to 16 years imprisonment an offender who raped a nine-year-old girl.

B. Contribution: In 2009, ActionAid Ethiopia conducted a series of training workshops for local law enforcers including the police, prosecutors and judges from the Yem district.

Is AAE’s influence plausible?
Are both the outcome and AAE’s contribution verifiable?
Other information?

- Significance of the outcome
- Collaboration with other social actors
- Contribution of other actors and factors
- History
- Context
- Evidence of impact on people’s lives
- And so forth.
Example

A. Outcome: In 2010, the Yem district court of Ethiopia sentenced to 16 years imprisonment an offender who raped a nine-year-old girl.

B. Contribution: In 2009, ActionAid Ethiopia conducted a series of training workshops for local law enforcers including the police, prosecutors and judges from the Yem district.

C. Significance: This was the first time in the Yem district that a rapist of a minor received a multi-year jail sentence.

Useful information?
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:
1. Design the harvest
2. Review documentation and draft outcomes
3. Engage with informants
4. Substantiate
5. Analyse, interpret
6. Support use of findings
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:

1. Design the harvest
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:

1. Design the harvest
2. Review documentation and draft outcomes

- Outcome
- Contribution
- Other
Exercise

Please take five minutes to read the 2014 annual report from Fund Now that is on your chair.

Then, with the person seated next to you:

A. Identify one outcome:
   - **Who** changed her, his or its behaviour, relationships, activities, actions, policies or practice?
   - **What** changed?
   - **When** did it change?
   - And **where**?
Feedback from our allies and co-workers about Fund Now’s activities in 2014 has been very positive. We received comments emphasizing the usefulness of our research publications to provide information about the funding challenges and opportunities facing women’s organizations in the country. Our research has shown that women's rights organizations have been living in a form of "resist and survive" mode while doing amazing work for the advancement of women's rights. They realize that they must influence governmental and community officials and leaders to take action. People always mention our online newsletter Fund Now as a tool that has helped raise their awareness about how to raise funds for their organizations.

This year, our innovative research on trends in financing for gender equality and women's organizations has supported women’s groups to obtain more and better resources across the country. Based on our research on the impact of projects implemented by the grant recipients of the government’s (Women Employed in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (WE STEAM), we produced a report requested by an important Fund Now ally — an ad hoc group including Department leaders and technical assistance providers responsible for WE STEAM. They used our analysis in their internal planning and funding requests, which resulted in an additional $12 million US Congressional appropriation in late 2014.

In addition, we successfully organized in six strategic meetings in two States with our alliance partners. These meetings invited women's organisations to help develop strategies for mobilization and resource planning. (We organised seven additional strategic meetings in Washington DC with national organisations.) These were the first meetings of their kind in those States. In one State, our alliance partner, the National Association of Diverse Women, co-organised the meeting of 3 funders and 9 women's organizations. In the other, we organised the meeting with two other alliance partners; 2 funders and 6 women’s organisations attended. The background research we did based on our regional surveys in preparation for the meetings was very well received. We published a summary in Fund Now 4/2014. During the breaks, we heard participants say we were filling a clear gap of information with our findings. In the evaluations of the workshops, participants expressed that these meetings were an opportunity to establish new contacts, engage in networking, develop strategies, have a space for potential donors and grantees to meet, and to share experiences. All the participants expressed their commitment to work together in the future to guarantee funding for women's organizations in the two provinces.
Exercise, continued

B. How did FundNow contribute to the outcome?

What activities and outputs plausibly contributed to the change in the social actor, however partial, indirect and even unintentional the contribution may have been?
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:

1. Design the harvest
2. Review documentation and draft outcomes
3. Engage with informants
   - Most knowledgeable
   - Motivated
   - Available (time)
   - On the record
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:

1. Design the harvest
2. Review documentation and draft outcomes
3. Engage with informants

First, review outcomes extracted from documentation
A. Outcome: In late 2014, the US Congress proposed an additional US$12 million for WE STEAM to strengthen the rights and opportunities for women professionals.

Comment [RW-G1]: Can you be more specific about the date — when at the end of 2014, which month and day if possible?

Comment [RW-G2]: Can you be more concrete? Which house and which committee?

Comment [RW-G3]: How big an increase did the US$12 million represent?

Comment [RW-G4]: Is this an appropriate characterisation of the purpose? Can you make it more measurable? How many women professionals stand to benefit? Where are they located?
B. Contribution: Fund Now compiled research that was used by an ad hoc group within WE STEAM in their testimonies to Congress making the case for more money.

Comment [RW-G5]: Specifically, When did you make this compilation?

Comment [RW-G6]: Concretely, what form did the research product take? Is it a report, a file on your website?

Comment [RW-G7]: How small or large was this group? Was it a mixed group (women and men)? What positions did they hold in WE STEAM?

Comment [RW-G7]: Does this accurately describe how the research was used?
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:

1. Design the harvest
2. Review documentation and draft outcomes
3. Engage with informants
   - First, review outcomes extracted from documentation
   - Second, identify and formulate additional outcomes
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:

1. Design the harvest
2. Review documentation and draft outcomes
3. Engage with informants
4. Substantiate
   - Independent
   - Knowledgeable
   - Authoritative
   - On the record
   - Available (time)
A. Outcome: On 5 December 2014, the Higher Education and Workforce Training subcommittee in the House of Representatives proposed an unprecedented 25% increase, an additional US$12 million, for WE STEAM to strengthen the rights and opportunities for potentially 2.3 million women professionals.

1. To what degree you are in agreement with the description of the sub-committee’s decision to allocate an additional US$12 million to WE STREAM?
   - [ ] Fully agree
   - [ ] Partially agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   Comments if you like:

B. Contribution: Fund Now compiled research during 2013-2014 and published it in a briefing paper in the June 2014 edition of Fund Now that was cited by an ad hoc group of five women in middle management positions within WE STEAM in their written testimony submitted to the the Higher Education and Workforce Training subcommittee in the House of Representatives requesting an increase in funding.

2. How much do you agree with the description of how Fund Now influenced the sub-committee’s decision?
   - [ ] Fully agree
   - [ ] Partially agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   Comments if you like:
Outcome Harvesting

1. Six steps:
2. Design the harvest
3. Review documentation and draft outcomes
4. Engage with informants
5. Substantiate
6. Analyse, interpret

✓ What?
✓ So what?
Revealing patterns and processes of change
Map of outcomes

1. ATI oversight agencies in Mexico and Chile conducted peer exchanges to strengthen their capacities for ATI implementation.
2. Chile ATI agency proposed online mechanism to share knowledge among other Latin American agencies.
3. Chile ATI agency conducted and published an assessment that identified needs among the oversight bodies.
4. Bolivia, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay ATI agencies formally established Latin American network of ATI oversight bodies.
5. Network reached larger audience by publishing first newsletter to share information on ATI across region (77 issues to date).
7. Network launched revamped website to communicate ATI issues among members and larger audience.
8. Brazilian agency responsible for coordinating implementation and oversight of ATI law joined network.
9. Network members approved its bylaws.
10. Peru’s ATI agency requested support from network for knowledge exchange visit with Chilean member.
11. Colombia’s ATI agency formally expressed interest in joining network.
15. Network members embed working groups in ATI agency structure for regional work to inform country reforms.
16. Network decided on four priority areas for action learning of its working groups to advance ATI.
17. Network agreed to conduct first mystery shopper exercise to assess ATI law compliance in countries.
18. * ATI agencies in Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay used exercise to identify reform needs in key sectors.
19. Chile ATI agency, as group coordinator, published first report on records management practices.
20. Chile ATI agency organized seminar to inform the debate on records management reforms.
21. Chile National Audit Agency using this information to develop guide that updates archives regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional changes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intermediate changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment, participatory priority setting, transparency</td>
<td>Other outcomes are awareness, knowledge and skills; improved collaboration, and new implementation know-how.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance to implement ATI policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Outcomes selected for substantiation; see page 5 sidebar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of ATI network and agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengthening Implementation of Legislation on Access to Information across Latin America

Change strategy

WBI Contributions
- Knowledge exchange and videoconferences
- Grant for knowledge exchanges
- Strategic guidance for network formation, organization and communications

Partners
- Input of civil society organizations to 2013–2015 strategic plan

Change Agents
- ATI oversight agencies in Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay
- Latin America network of oversight agencies

Change Strategy

Commitment of ATI Agencies
- Realized commitment by establishing network of ATI agencies across Latin America
- Committed to knowledge exchange among countries to improve ATI
- Raised awareness of network as valuable to region in advancing ATI

Institutionalized Network and Priorities
- Institutionalized communication, strategy actions for ATI agencies
- Embedded working groups of network into country ATI agencies
- Enhanced networks and knowledge base with ATI agencies across Latin America

Innovation and Policy to Advance Transparency and ATI
- Improved guidance on record management policy and other areas
- Improved knowledge to monitor, implement and enforce ATI policy
- Collaboratively identified action areas and reform needs

Problems Addressed
- Limited knowledge and experience of ATI agencies to implement and enforce ATI
- Lack of agreement on priorities to improve ATI implementation
- Weak realization of ATI agency role in policy implementation

Development Goal
- Improve service delivery for citizens across Latin America
Outcome Harvesting

Six steps:

1. Design the harvest
2. Review documentation and draft outcomes
3. Engage with informants
4. Substantiate
5. Analyse, interpret
6. Support use of findings

Now What?
In summary

Outcome Harvesting enables you to collect, analyse and interpret outcomes that:

✔ Are specific and measurable enough to be verified

✔ Are as credible as required by your primary intended users’ principal uses

✔ Enable you to answer actionable evaluation questions quantitatively and quantitatively
Questions?

✓ Outcome Harvesting’s origins
✓ When is Outcome Harvesting a useful tool
✓ How does the tool work — exercise
✓ Six steps
11:00-12:00: Discussion in pairs about potential of Outcome Harvesting for monitoring or evaluating your work

In the next 20 minutes, with a person sitting next to you, please share an example of when you could potentially use Outcome Harvesting but also another of when you could not.

We will then share and discuss a few of the examples in plenary.
Outcome Harvesting in summary

Methodological challenges

- Participation
- Focusing on what one achieved
- Expressing oneself in writing
- Coaching
- Everyone keeping to the deadlines
- Working as an archaeologist or forensic scientist or police detective
- Recognising what did not change as an outcome
- Not all outcomes are positive
- Harvesting best done by two or more people
- Supporting use of findings
Questions?

25%

ricardo.wilson-grau@inter.nl.net
Useful links

The latest short description and links to other information on Outcome Harvesting can be found at www.betterevaluation.org

