



Southern Hemisphere

SUPPORTING MEANINGFUL CHANGE

**December 2014**

### **Programme design, planning, monitoring and evaluation – which tool to use?**

There are so many terms bandied about in development. Just as you think you have a handle on the one, there is a new method to be learned or used.

We have made a point of keeping up with the trends, so that we are able to help our clients with their individual needs, but also so that we can understand the benefits of using the different tools. A colleague described Southern Hemisphere recently as a “Boutique Consultancy” – and we liked that. We pride ourselves on being able to understand and meet the needs of our clients, which in turn will help them to develop better development outcomes and ultimately achieve social justice. Our consultants are all well-rounded trainers, researchers, evaluators and facilitators – so we mix theory and practice, enhancing the relevance of our work. We work with small NGOs and large international organisations – making sure that the lessons are passed along from ground up and down again.

We now offer courses on Logical Framework Approach, Outcomes Mapping and Theory of Change, and are able to use all of these in our evaluation and design work.

Each reflects trends in development practice. There is no right way to plan or design an evaluation. Your choice of tool depends on your organisations history, skill set, approach, philosophy and very often it is influenced by external forces such as donor requirements or institutional frameworks. For example, the National Evaluation System of the South African Government, Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, uses the Logical Framework approach for Programme Planning, but also requires a Theory of Change to be included in evaluation design.<sup>i</sup>

The tools represent different schools of thought in thinking about development, but are not so vastly different and elements can be fused. Some argue that the ideology is imbedded in the approach, but one can see them as useful processes that can be adapted<sup>ii</sup>. The various tools have some similar features, in that they:

- help develop a strong intervention design or concept
- build monitoring and evaluation into planning
- describe the change that you want to achieve
- identify what it is you will do to bring about change

What is critical is that people understand the basic concepts underlying all the frameworks, such as objectives and results, indicators and data sources, and can then apply them with the different methods. This is what we focus on in our courses as we try to demystify development speak for our

participants. What I like particularly like about Outcome Mapping is that is encourages story- telling, which is accessible and enjoyable.

### **Outcome Mapping:**

Our newest course is on Outcome Mapping for Complex Development Programmes. We invited Terry Smutylo, one of the founders of outcome mapping, to come to South Africa to conduct the training which attracted participants from many countries and regions including India, Denmark, Tanzania and of course, South Africa. He wrote this piece about the approach for our newsletter:

“Outcome mapping (OM) is a framework used in planning, monitoring and evaluating social change interventions. It was originally developed by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) to facilitate evaluating the outcomes of its development research granting programs and is now widely used by governmental, multilateral and non-governmental organizations for a wide range of purposes. It is particularly useful for documenting and learning about the social transformations on which ecological, economic, social or technological change depend. Unlike approaches for measuring outputs (what did the project produce?) and impacts (has it changed anyone’s well-being?), OM focusses on planning for and measuring changes in the behaviours and actions of the people and organizations engaged and reached by the intervention.

Making people the central focus, OM sees both intended and unanticipated outcomes as inevitable in any social change process. It connects ‘outputs’ to ‘outcomes’ by focusing on the patterns of action and interaction among stakeholder to help program participants recognize and understand the changes to which they contribute. OM defines outcomes as the changes in behaviours and interrelationships related to the overall changes in state or well-being sought. Its actor-focused tools enable an intervention to learn about its influence on the roles played by those it works with directly. Faced with a complex web of roles, responsibilities, mandates and motivations, an intervention can use OM to differentiate from among all the actors, those whose interrelationships and actions it can engage with in delivering on its mission. This actors-in-context approach supports the implementation and adaptation of contextually-relevant strategies while building understanding of the system in which the work is being carried out.



**Development planning, monitoring and evaluation helps to ensure that your work achieves the desired results.** Source: InProgress-Integrated Monitoring Manual.<sup>iii</sup>

**Systems approach:** We are increasingly infusing a systems approach into our work. Thinking systemically takes us beyond issue based programming and focuses on the context and the underlying factors that need to be addressed in order for the results to be achieved. Outcomes Mapping builds systems thinking nicely into the process, but as a way of thinking it can be used with any of the other tools. We published an article in the Child Gauge on the use of a systems approach in the design and implementation of child protection strategies, and would like to thank The Children's Institute, University of Cape Town, for inviting us to publish our work<sup>iv</sup>.

---

<sup>i</sup> Guideline 2.2.3 Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation <http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/evaluationsSite/Evaluations/Guideline%20%202%203%20%20Implementation%20%20Programmes%2013%2007%2030.pdf>

<sup>ii</sup> Daniel Roduner, Kaia Ambrose, "OM ideas 1: A conceptual fusion of the logical framework approach and outcome mapping." <http://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/om-ideas-1-a-conceptual-fusion-of-the-logical-framework-approach-and-outcome-mapping> <http://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/om-ideas-1-a-conceptual-fusion-of-the-logical-framework-approach-and-outcome-mapping>

<sup>iii</sup> <http://www.inprogressweb.com/resource-library/monitoring-evaluation/>

<sup>iv</sup> <http://www.ci.org.za/depts/ci/pubs/pdf/general/gauge2014/ChildGauge2014.pdf>

#### **OTHER RESOURCES:**

Kate Dyer, Planning Mentor, THINK PIECE: WORKING WITH LOG-FRAMES AND OUTCOME MAPPING IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ACCOUNTABILITY TANZANIA PROGRAMME (ACT), AcT Programme January 2011 <http://www.accountability.or.tz/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Think-Piece-on-OM.pdf>

There are fantastic resources on OM on the Outcome Mapping Learning Community <http://www.outcomemapping.ca/>

including:

Jones and Hearn, "Outcome Mapping: a realistic alternative for planning, monitoring and evaluation" Overseas Development Institute, Background Note, October 2009 <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/5058.pdf>

and the newly released OM Practitioners Guide.

<http://www.outcomemapping.ca/outcome-mapping-practitioner-guide>