Outcome Mapping
LEARNING COMMUNITY

Discussion Summary

Topic: OM and Gender

Discussion: July-Sept 2016
Summary published: July 2017
Authors: Sonal Zaveri

There is growing interest in addressing persistent and structural gender and social inequities in development and humanitarian programmes. Outcome Mapping is considered by some to be particularly useful for planning and monitoring such efforts, yet there have been few examples or adaptations of OM for this purpose shared.

To begin the conversation on the subject topic, a short survey was posted online requesting community members to post examples and reflect on what worked, what did not and their suggestions regarding the use of OM and OH in relation to gender and equity.

The two questions asked were:

a) How have you used OM or various components of OM (selecting boundary partners, developing progress markers, developing strategy maps, etc.) to strengthen your monitoring and evaluation of gender and social inclusion?
b) What have you found most helpful or challenging in using OM in gender and social inclusion?

We had a wonderful response to the survey - 25 people sent their views. Some expressed that there was an urgent need to address gender and equity in the context of OM and OH; others shared their work on integrating gender and some had specific queries such as, how to go beyond just 'counting' the number of women, and how to address gender and violence in the context of OM.

The discussion that followed was rich in examples of OM practice across many sectors – agriculture, violence against women, animal health, child marriage, child safety net projects, youth leadership, disabilities, agriculture related, HIV and others. Queries regarding how to use OM and specific problems associated with doing so led to a rich sharing, indicating the diversity of demand to meaningfully address gender and equity concerns. The responses below were received through the discussion and the survey.

Summary of Responses

Kate Dyer queried how to best capture gender in outcome journals. For example, in the context of a governance programme, was it better a) to try and make relevant progress markers gender sensitive, or b) should one specify women as *separate* boundary partners with the progress markers capturing the extent to which they attend/speak out at/set the agenda at meetings/ stand for election etc. Clearly, there were advantages and disadvantages with both approaches. She illustrated some key questions related to OM with the example of a governance programme aimed at enhancing the responsiveness of local government leaders to community members, where a boundary partner (CBO) was expected to carry out the training. In this case, a number of "people" were involved – duty bearers (local government leaders), rights holders (community) as well as the capacity building organization. Change in behaviour would be expected with all stakeholders: a) How nuanced was the CBO training on roles and responsibilities related to gender and equitable participation b) Were all women and men (leaders and community) more knowledgeable and better informed ("expect to see" change) c) Were women and men taking action related to the knowledge such as a leader convening meetings or a

community member participating actively ("like to see" change) and d) Were passive citizens standing for election or were community members (and perhaps duty bearers) challenging processes that were unfair ("love to see" change) ?

Anne Mulema from CGIAR has integrated gender issues in their animal health project by conducting gender analysis prior to the interventions, and these results informed their interventions to ensure that the project responds to the needs of men and women The project aims to control diseases in small ruminants to boost women's participation in and benefit from the small ruminant value chain. They are in the process of developing indicators which will aid outcome mapping. The project is implemented by the International Livestock Research Institute, funded by DFID and is known as SMART project in Ethiopia. She also shared her experiences in using outcome mapping in another bean project using visuals - drawn together with farmers. Outcome mapping in her experience, aids systematic monitoring but is challenging to map qualitative outcomes. She especially mentioned the power of documenting stories. Her challenge however was to get commitment from non-gender staff.

Jacqulyn Joseph reflected how important it is to understand the underlying issues associated with the change processes in a particular situation.

Claire Hughes from ITAD shared a work in progress where they are using outcome mapping (or havesting) on Voices for Change, a DFID Nigeria project, which seeks to strengthen the enabling environment for women and girls. Outcome mapping is being used to prepare case studies of significant changes which the project has contributed to.

Nidal Karim from CARE shared the initial findings from their Project: Tipping Point being implemented in Nepal and Bangladesh; The program focus was girls' empowerment and challenging the social norms to prevent child marriage. Nidal and her team shared that the biggest challenge has been the time it takes for field staff, who are the ones doing the primary documentation, to get comfortable and truly understand the intent of documenting changes and also of sharing good quality change stories. While OM in principle is a great fit for the project the practicalities have been a little difficult to roll out.

Anupama Sharma shared inequities are hard to measure due to absence of such framework integrated in MIS at the beginning stage of project /program. If staff can be trained / made aware about the importance of measuring inequities with OM, lot of problems are solved.

Emily Hillenbrand has used Outcome Mapping to develop Progress Markers as a monitoring tool specifically for gender behavior changes in Pathways (a multi-country gender and agriculture program in Africa and India, funded by BMGF), as well as two USAID-funded programs. OM has been applied in Malawi, Mali, Ghana, India, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, and Ethiopia. They have not only aggregated data but also worked on reinforcing capacity at country level on how best to collect, make sense of, and use the monitoring data. Some of the challenges were in analysing and using the data, avoiding a checklist mentality and resisting the temptation to rely on the quantification of the PMs. It has also been a challenge to figure out how best to integrate into an overall MLE system, so that it complements and supplements other learning.

Kaia Ambrose shared experiences from a DFID-funded multi-country climate change program run out of ODI - 'PRISE' - where Progress Markers were made gender sensitive as well as gender transformative. This assumes that individuals and teams monitoring change using progress markers are able to spot gender sensitive and especially gender transformative change. For example, does the monitoring team know what it looks like when a bank manager, village chief or government bureaucrat is behaving in a more gender equal manner? In fact, it is argued that the Organizational Practices step of OM can be 'translated' into a set of Progress Markers that show the progression of building gender champions / gender and equity expertise. Such an internal perspective is important as organizations and staff must first understand *what is gender transformative change* if they wish to encourage a gender lens in programming, M&E and OM. OM would benefit from a gender analysis grounded in feminist research.

Prakash Kafle posted about CARE Nepal/Right to Food Project and how a majority of the boundary partners included gender and social inclusion in their 'dream' vision which in turn encouraged

including gender and equity in developing the strategy map and outcome challenges. The Right to Food (RtF) Project funded by DANIDA through CARE Denmark has been using outcome mapping (OM) as a dominant monitoring and evaluation system for the project. The progress markers of each boundary partner were set considering gender and social inclusion dimension jointly by partners and the project team. CARE Nepal/RtF Project has set progress markers of its boundary partners, who are in fact strategic partners (NGOs and Federation, broadly termed as CSO) of the project. The progress markers of the strategic partners were set under four areas of good governance; representation and inclusion, legitimacy, transparency and accountability and synergy (RILTAS). These four areas are equally important for good governance however representation and inclusion and legitimacy are more relevant for gender and social inclusion. The annual dialogue with strategic partners reviews the progress against each progress marker and has motivated partners to be more inclusive, for example one strategic partner has made provision for at least 33% women in staff structure and 50% of women in the executive committee. The other partner has recently conducted gender audit as per the recommendation of the outcome journal. The gender dis-aggregated data both of quantitative and qualitative nature was collected against each progress marker of respective boundary partners. Similarly, ethnic/caste wise data was also collected. Partners then jointly reviewed these data and follow-up actions were prepared accordingly.

Florence Ediu shared a) Women Protection and Empowerment programme supported by the International Rescue Committee aimed at addressing gender based violence in the Dinka communities in South Sudan and gave examples of how OM was integrated into data collection and evaluation b) HIV prevention (faith based) supported by the Inter Religious Council of Uganda aimed at addressing structural factors that perpetuate imbalances making women and girls vulnerable to HIV infections where OM enabled the. documentation of success stories and routine data collection. She also mentioned the challenges such as inappropriate tools, inadequate information collected, and insufficient evidence.

Margaret Capelezo from CARE Canada shared two to three tools they use to integrate gender equal behaviours into progress markers. Margaret also mentioned that she used progress markers plus a few related OM concepts/processes for almost everything because it was the most efficient way to measure the "need to know" behaviour changes in the projects they are working on.

Alejandra Garcia mentioned that one challenge was to identify outcomes related to women or male status and role especially for those programs that are not solely focused on gender. Sometimes it is difficult to indicate these changes.

Blaga Zlateva shared an example from Tanzania related to supporting smallholder coffee farmers in improving their agricultural production, access to markets and services and how they had used outcome journals to track behaviour change of farming households and farmer organizations.

[Meena Gopal](#) refers to a study with Tata Institute of Social Sciences India, a research partner with American Jewish World Service for the project: 'Early and Child Marriage in India: A Participatory Study on Monitoring Outcomes.' They work with 30 field based organisations in 7 states of India who are working on gender, sexuality and youth rights. The challenge has been in making OM more dynamic in the community organisations and to integrate the use of participatory methods. In an effort to address child marriage in India, the OM framework enabled the development of complex markers of change in girls' lives in communities by the grassroots organizations themselves. This enabled them to identify boundary partners, formulate outcome challenges and progress markers across specified domains of change and with various stakeholders – collectives in the communities, organizations and boundary partners. The Outcome and Performance Journals supported the use of tools to monitor change and document it. So clearly, OM was able to, with a feminist perspective, address complex structural gender-biased practices and identify the small and incremental changes in girls' lives and how families, communities and the state negotiate power in relationships. OM therefore helped to go beyond numbers to plot real change in girls' lives

Kanika Dey has used OM for a child safety net project to protect girl children from trafficking.

Lawrence Kwaghga Nigerian National HIV/AIDS Response Programme. Government of Nigeria and various partner organization (international and local) working to mitigate the AIDS scourge have also expressed the usefulness of OM.

Yasmin Karim from AKRSP discussed a project about enhancing employability and leadership for youth in rural settings such as mountain communities where there are less market systems established for economic opportunities. The project's outcome mapping uses a theory of change with gender mainstreaming as a crosscutting theme. Outcome mapping uses a gender analysis matrix against set indicators but the challenge has been a lack of sex desegregated data.

Nandlal Banstola mentioned that it was the first time they had introduced OM in Nepal and was accepted by the Government of Nepal. GESI has seven different projects and has identified priority equity related issues such as disabilities inclusive development, disabilities, friendly model villages and so on. They are working on their implementation of OM and are confident that they will have rich learnings during implementation. They have learned that qualitative evaluation is needed to really map the outcome of one's activities in relation to gender division of roles. For example, they have tried to qualify what women's active participation in (water) committees and their influence actually means, rather than just reporting their formal presence.

Anja Nordland NCG Sweden very rightly highlighted the role of the donor to have a budget for such gender analysis and to accept the program's articulation of changes in empowerment. Gender analysis must be relevant to the specific context being evaluated. For example, one project provides access to grants but the gender analysis indicated that women have little access to decision-making and little experience of handling own money (as in some cultures), and that one might need to consider giving this group a special support so they can apply for the grants. Other strategic decisions could relate to whether one needs to consider special methodologies or communication strategies to get both male and female participation at say, a workshop or meeting.

Mike Clulow sharing his OM experience of working with Womankind's 27 partners in 17 countries, valued that OM enabled a dialogue with key boundary partners to demonstrate what 'change' meant to them rather than just saying "improved attitudes" since "change in empowerment" is always contextual. Another learning was that documentation of the process was very important as it illustrated nuanced understanding of barriers and challenges, what is and is not possible. OM was used with a tool called Empowerment Star to capture change along with adapted outcome journals, focus group discussions, service quality monitoring and case studies. The empowerment star was used to capture incremental change across various dimensions with women survivors of violence and widows receiving support in the program. The tool uses five levels of change (not the three levels of expect to see, like to see and love to see) but follows the same logic of progress markers to express fluidity in change across time.

Dezi Irumba talked about a CARE program in Uganda about a Forest Resources Sector Transparency Program implemented through partners which indicated that prior to the program start, only 19% of women were participating in decision making on matters related forests and other natural resources. The program designed approaches to address such gender imbalances and included the use of community based monitors and the media as social actors of change. Progress markers were defined for both the community based monitors and the media and included whether the monitors conducted awareness sessions in forest adjacent communities and grassroots. Radio stations were monitored whether they, through their debates and awareness sessions, were able to capture the voice of rural women regarding forestry issues. OM along with this gender perspective was able to capture qualitative information that indicated change such as, the representation of women in committees and decision making groups (increased), women's access to land for tree growing (increased), women reporting forest crimes (increased) and so on. Feminist research encourages nuanced analysis and in this case, it was noted that participation of young girls in governance of forestry resources also needs to be studied to assess the overall impact of the program.

Concluding this discussion, it is apparent that OM practitioners DO need skills in gender analysis to guide boundary and strategic partners in developing their strategies, reporting and defining change (especially transformative change) on a continuum. This probably has implications regarding evaluation team composition and the need to have a gender expert. Perhaps gender analysis should

be part of the capacity building (of our partners and staff) and a number of the posts have alluded to that. My other takeaway from the discussion was that OM has the potential to deal with the complexity that a gender lens introduces and that is indeed wonderful to note! Future work by this community could be to further develop our OM toolbox to build in an understanding of gender equity and inclusion.

Some resources available on the OMLC and other websites are:
- Stories of Empowerment: OM and Empowerment: The experience of SAHA in Madagascar
- http://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/change-harvesting-an-outcome-mapping-based-approach-to-capture-complex-gender-transformative-change
- A Resource Pack on Gender Transformative Evaluations. (See Pg. 91-95 for OM) http://www.isstindia.org/publications/1465391379_pub_ISST_Resource_Pack_2016.pdf
- Evaluation Report using OM http://ecf.org.in/wp-content/uploads/ECF-Evaluation-report-of-Action-for-Equality-Programme-Final-version-by-Sonal-Zaveri.pdf
- Gender-Indicator Design Process: Monitoring Gender Behavior Change in Agriculture (booklet from CARE) Programs https://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/gender-indicator-design-process-monitoring-gender-behavior-change-in-agriculture-programs
- Use of Outcome Mapping to Understand Empowerment (webinar presentation from CARE) https://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/use-of-outcome-mapping-to-understand-empowerment
- Measuring gender equality change in the PATHWAYS program (workshop presentation from CARE) https://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/measuring-gender-equality-change-in-the-pathways-program