OUTCOME MAPPING

Outcome Mapping focuses on changes in the behaviour of the people, groups and organisations influenced by a project or programme. Like the logical framework, it is a planning methodology that has implications for how monitoring and evaluation is conducted. However, Outcome Mapping is designed to deal with complexity, and is not based around linear models of change.

Outcome Mapping was originally developed by the International Development Research Centre in Canada. The first comprehensive Outcome Mapping manual was produced in 2001. Outcome Mapping seeks to identify and assess changes in the behaviour of people, groups and organisations with which a project or programme works directly. It does not seek to prove causality or attribution for those changes, but instead attempts to show logical linkages between the changes and a project or programme's activities, thereby enabling contribution to change to be understood (Earl et. al. 2001)

Outcome Mapping is a participatory planning methodology, which has implications for how monitoring and evaluation is conducted. It is based on the principle of participation, and purposefully includes those implementing a project or programme in both design and data collection to encourage ownership and the use of findings. It was designed to be a *"consciousness-raising, consensus-building, and empowerment tool for those working within a development programme"* (ibid, p4).

Some people use the complete Outcome Mapping methodology, whilst others apply only some of its elements and principles. Outcome Mapping forms part of a portfolio of tools and methodologies that address complexity, and increasingly are being seen as alternatives to the more linear, measurement-based models of the logical framework and results-based management.

How it works

Outcome Mapping is designed to be used at the beginning of a programme, after the main focus of that programme has been decided. There are three key stages to planning an outcome map.

1. The first stage, Intentional Design, helps a programme establish consensus on the changes it aims to help bring about, and plan the strategies it will use. It helps answer four questions:

    - what is the vision to which the project or programme wants to contribute?
    - who are its boundary partners?
    - what are the changes that are being sought?
    - how will the project or programme contribute to the change process?

2. The second stage, Outcome and Performance Monitoring, provides a framework for the ongoing monitoring of the programme's actions and the boundary partners' progress toward the achievement of 'outcomes'. Monitoring is based largely on self-assessment.

3. The third stage, Evaluation Planning, helps the programme identify evaluation priorities and develop an evaluation plan.

These key stages, and the steps within them, are summarised in the following diagram. Each of the individual steps is designed to be addressed at the planning stage, using a participatory process, and wherever possible involving a full range of stakeholders. A brief explanation of the individual steps of Outcome Mapping is contained below.

(These explanations are taken directly from the Outcome Mapping manual produced by Earl et. al. in 2001. Interested readers should access that manual for a more complete explanation of each stage, and a set of workshop exercises that can be used to facilitate and plan Outcome Mapping.)

Intentional Design	
Step 1	Vision
Step 2	Mission
Step 3	Boundary partners
Step 4	Outcome challenges
Step 5	Progress markers
Step 6	Strategy maps
Step 7	Organisational practices

Evaluation Planning	
Step 12	Evaluation plan

| Outcome and Performance Monitoring	
Step 8	Monitoring priorities
Step 9	Outcome journals
Step 10	Strategy journal
Step 11	Performance journal

Although the steps are all designed to be used at the planning stage, they also set the scene for how monitoring and evaluation will be conducted later on. For example, journals may be developed that will later be used for ongoing monitoring

Firstly, a vision is developed (STEP 1) that reflects the large-scale, development-related changes that the programme hopes to encourage. The vision describes economic, political, social, or environmental changes that the programme hopes to help bring about. The programme's activities should contribute to the vision, but not be solely responsible for achieving it.

Next, a mission statement is developed (STEP 2) that describes how the programme intends to support the vision. The mission statement states the areas in which the programme will work towards the vision, but does not list all the activities which the programme will carry out.

Then boundary partners are identified (STEP 3). These are the individuals, groups, or organisations with which the programme interacts directly, and where there will be opportunities for influence (see diagram below). Boundary partners may be individual organisations but might also include multiple individuals, groups, or organisations if a similar change is being sought across many different groups (for example, research centres or community groups).

In STEP 4 an outcome challenge statement is developed for each boundary partner. It describes how the behaviour, relationships, activities or actions of the individual, group, or institution will change if the programme is extremely successful. Outcome challenges are phrased in a way that emphasises behavioural change.

A set of progress markers are then identified (STEP 5) for each boundary partner. These are desired visible, behavioural changes ranging from the minimum one would expect to see the boundary partners doing as an early response to the programme, to what it would like to see, and finally to what it would love to see them doing if the programme were having a profound influence.

These progress markers represent changes that are easily measurable, and will show if progress is being made

towards the desired outcomes of the programme. They are designed to show progress as a group of markers rather than as individual indicators, which are more common when working with logical frameworks. An example of a set of progress markers is shown in the table below.

Expect to see partner ...	• organising staff training to interact with communities better • inviting communities to contribute opinions • visiting communities in the field on a regular basis
Like to see partner ...	• developing policies and protocols for engaging with communities • receiving and discussing comments from community groups • regularly meeting to consider communities' opinions and comments • making amendments to projects based on community feedback
Love to see partner ...	• developing projects and programmes alongside communities • inviting community representatives onto decision-making forums • being accountable to communities through regularly reporting on progress and lessons learned

In STEP 6 a strategy map is developed to help identify the strategies used by the program to contribute to the achievement of each outcome challenge. For most outcome challenges, a mixed set of strategies is used because it is believed this has a greater potential for success.

The purpose of STEP 7 is to identify the organisational practices that the programme will use to be effective. These organisational practices describe a well-performing organisation that has the potential to support the boundary partners and sustain change interventions over time.

Monitoring priorities are then identified (STEP 8) to focus time and resources on where they are most needed. Monitoring priorities are divided into three areas: organisational practices; progress toward the outcomes being achieved by boundary partners; and the strategies that the programme is employing to encourage change in its boundary partners.

STEPS 9-11 consist of the establishment of journals to monitor progress over time in the three areas described above. Firstly, an outcome journal is established to record changes for each boundary partner. It includes the progress markers set out in step 5; a description of the level of change as low, medium, or high; and a place to record who among the boundary partners exhibited the change.

Then, in order to provide the programme with a systematic way to monitor its actions in support of its boundary partners, Outcome Mapping provides a strategy journal, which can be adapted. This journal records data on the

strategies being employed, and is filled in during the programme's regular monitoring meetings.

A performance journal is also created for the programme which records data on how it is operating as an organisation to fulfil its mission. This is also filled in during regular monitoring meetings.

The final step (STEP 12) is to develop a descriptive plan of a proposed evaluation for the programme. This outlines the evaluation issue, the way findings will be used, the questions, sources and methods to be used, the nature of the evaluation team, the proposed dates and the approximate cost. This information is intended to guide the evaluation design.

Strengths and weaknesses

Unlike some advocates of the logical framework approach to planning, supporters of Outcome Mapping do not claim it is appropriate in all situations. This, added to the fact that Outcome Mapping is rarely forced on organisations as a condition of funding, means debates surrounding Outcome Mapping are less intense than those surrounding the logical framework. But there is still a divergence of opinion; some who have used Outcome Mapping love it as a methodology, and some dislike it.

Some of Outcome Mapping's strengths can be listed as follows.

- It introduces monitoring and evaluation at an early stage of a programme, and ensures that monitoring and evaluation is built into programme design.

- Outcome Mapping is a participatory tool and therefore encourages multi-stakeholder dialogue, as well as learning amongst different participants. It is designed to contribute to the development process itself.

- Because it is based on outcomes of observable behaviour change, it can be more intuitive for field workers to grasp than the sometimes more abstract language of objectives.

- It encourages programmes to assess both the outcomes of programmes – therefore focusing clearly on change – and the processes through which those outcomes are generated.

- It is much better than linear planning tools at dealing with complexity. Outcome Mapping does not seek to show direct attribution for change resulting from a single source. This means Outcome Mapping may be more appropriate for the monitoring and evaluation of programmes with multiple inputs.

- Because Outcome Mapping involves the identification of a spread of possible outcomes (progress markers) ranging from those stakeholders expect to see to those they would like or love to see, it avoids the need for precise predictions about the pace of change at the beginning of a project or programme. This means it is particularly useful when the pace of change cannot easily be predicted.

- Because of its focus on boundary partners, Outcome Mapping is good at dealing with programmes with a special focus on organisational change. It can therefore be used to support the monitoring and evaluation of capacity development – an area which people find particularly difficult to assess using more linear tools (see Simister and Smith 2010).

However, Outcome Mapping is not appropriate in all circumstances. Some of its limitations have been described as follows.

- Because it deals with contribution rather than attribution it cannot easily be used for processes that require hard measurement of results, such as cost-benefit analysis or value for money assessment.

- As with any participatory methodology, Outcome Mapping requires a great deal of time, effort and patience to do well. Significant resources are required both in terms of programme staff and the people, groups and organisations being supported.

- Outcome Mapping may be best used at the level of small programmes or larger projects. It is not a tool that is necessarily appropriate for handling large, complex programmes, because it may be difficult to identify who will change and how. Earl et. al. (2001) point out that to be effective Outcome Mapping must be sufficiently specific to enable the identification of key groups who will be influenced by a programme. Equally, Outcome Mapping may not be appropriate for small projects where the investment of time needed would not be proportional to the likely benefits.

- The journaling approach to tracking progress means the technique generates a lot of data, creating challenges for data analysis.

- Outcome Mapping is good at identifying changes within supported groups who are part of the process, partly because it encourages self-reflection and self-assessment. It may not be so useful for identifying change for people, organisations or groups that lie outside a programme, such as the targets of policy influencing work.

- Outcome Mapping does not focus predominantly on impact assessment. It recognises the need to look at long-term changes in people's lives brought about by development interventions, but regards this as the responsibility of a programme's boundary partners. If donors require in-depth impact assessment then Outcome Mapping needs to be supplemented by other tools and methodologies.

- In comparison with the logical framework, Outcome Mapping is less able to provide a short, concise summary of a project, programme or organisation.

Adaptations

Although Outcome Mapping can be, and frequently is, used as a methodology in its entirety, it is often adapted, and can be used in conjunction with other methodologies such

as the logical framework. Indeed it is perfectly possible to embed an Outcome Map within a logical framework, or set logframe indicators that can be generated by Outcome Mapping processes.

Individual features of Outcome Mapping – such as the setting of progress markers at expect to see, like to see and love to see levels – are often used, even when the entire methodology is not. Many CSOs have also carried out work that is based on the principles of Outcome Mapping – such as participatory planning, understanding of complexity, valuing contribution rather than attribution – without necessarily adopting the process in its entirety.

Further reading and resources

The M&E Universe contains other papers dealing with subjects that address complexity within planning, monitoring and evaluation. These include Theory of Change, scenario planning and most significant change methodology.

| ▶ The logical framework | ▶ Scenario planning |
| ▶ Theory of Change | ▶ Most Significant Change |

The most comprehensive guide to Outcome Mapping is a guide written by Earl et. al. in 2001 (see reference below). This is available at www.outcomemapping.ca/download/OM_English_final.pdf. There is also an Outcome Mapping community website at www.outcomemapping.ca which is regularly updated and contains much information on how Outcome Mapping is being used and applied. Further information, and a more comprehensive reading list for Outcome Mapping, can be found at the Better Evaluation website at http://betterevaluation.org/

References

- Earl, S; Carden, F and Smutylo, T (2001). *Outcome Mapping: Building learning and reflection into development programmes*. Evaluation Unit, International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Ottawa, Canada.
- Simister, N and Smith, R (2010). *Monitoring and Evaluating Capacity Building: Is it really that difficult?* Praxis paper no. 23, INTRAC, January 2010.

Author(s):
Neil MacDonald and Nigel Simister

INTRAC is a not-for-profit organisation that builds the skills and knowledge of civil society organisations to be more effective in addressing poverty and inequality. Since 1992 INTRAC has provided specialist support in monitoring and evaluation, working with people to develop their own M&E approaches and tools, based on their needs. We encourage appropriate and practical M&E, based on understanding what works in different contexts.

M&E Training & Consultancy

INTRAC's team of M&E specialists offer consultancy and training in all aspects of M&E, from core skills development through to the design of complex M&E systems.

Email: info@intrac.org   Tel: +44 (0)1865 201851

intrac for civil society

M&E Universe

For more papers in the M&E Universe series click the home button