When is Outcome Mapping not suitable?
Demonstrating a diagnostic tool

Two cases

CASE A

- Overall project theme: Maternal, newborn and child health
- Foci: Nutrition, exclusive breastfeeding, access to clinics, community health worker support

CASE B

- Overall project theme: Women's economic empowerment
- Foci: Small enterprise development, local government support, leadership

Why incorporate Outcome Mapping for monitoring?

- Tell a robust story of change between outputs and outcomes in the logic model
- Understand different actors responsible for contributing to change and what *their* changes are
- Look for unexpected changes
- **Based on identification of Boundary Partners, we used observation journals and "rolling profiles" (key informant interviews). Data from both of these tools were tagged to Progress Markers**

The diagnostic tool

ESSENTIAL ENABLING FACTORS

1. Existence of complexity in the intervention environment
2. Recognition of and willingness to act upon complexity / understanding of rationale for using OM.
3. Champions and the availability of appropriate technical support

OPTIONAL ENABLING FACTORS

4. Funder support
5. Support for and understanding of OM at the executive level
6. The promotion of an organizational learning culture
7. An appreciation of the value of a results and learning-oriented PME system at multiple levels in the organization
8. Availability of sufficient resources for the implementation of OM

Situation / intervention / capacity unsuitable for OM	Simple use of OM possible and optimal	More extensive use of OM steps possible
Two or fewer essential enabling factors present	Three essential enabling factors present	Three essential and one or more optional enabling factors present

(Taken from "10 Years of OM Adaptations and Support" by Richard Smith, John Mauremootoo & Kornelia Rassman, 2012)

Kaia Ambrose, Kaia.Ambrose@care.ca

The results

CASE A - not suitable

- Little experience of team members, including M&E point person, with qualitative data collection and analysis
- Resistance to working outside of the logframe and its contents.
- "Learning culture" on paper only – no processes, spaces or agendas for reflection, sense-making, adaptive management and other creative data use; culture of upward accountability.
- Output monitoring priorities take precedent
- Poor planning of knowledge products and use of monitoring data

1 = yes | 2 = no | 3 = no | 4 = no | 5 = yes | 6 = no | 7 = yes | 8 = yes

CASE B - suitable

- Team members with both qualitative data collection experience and highly analytical skills.
- Team members relate to who boundary partners are (i.e. Team members are community farmers).
- Understand complexity – easily name BPs and their current roles and desired changes, even if not mentioned in logframe
- Detailed calendar of team reflection /sense-making spaces
- Clear roles and responsibilities of each team member around monitoring; divided the workload
- Clear space in reporting for OM-related monitoring information

1 = yes | 2 = yes | 3 = yes | 4 = no | 5 = yes | 6 = no | 7 = yes | 8 = yes

Outcome Mapping
LEARNING COMMUNITY
www.outcomemapping.ca