



## WEBINAR TRANSCRIPT: COMPLEXITY AWARE MONITORING (CAM) WORKSHOP SERIES

### SESSION 4: OUTCOME HARVESTING

Lucy Wilson (00:00:02)

I'd like to give you all a warm welcome to the fourth session of the MOMENTUM Knowledge Accelerator Complexity Aware Monitoring Workshop Series. My name is Lucy Wilson, and I'm an Independent Consultant working with the MOMENTUM Knowledge Accelerator, or the MKA award, on Complexity Aware Monitoring, or CAM. Our usual host and moderator, Emily Stammer will be joining us a bit later in the session. Thanks for joining us today, particularly on this holiday week. Next. A bit of housekeeping to get us started... if you could please stay on mute when you're not talking. We're trying to conserve bandwidth for the main sessions, so I'll ask that only the presenters have their cameras on, if they'd like. In the breakout sessions, if you'd like to turn your camera on, please feel free. We have set aside several times during the session to answer questions, so feel free to ask questions during those times, but you can also put any questions you might have in the chat box, and we'll try to answer those as we go.

Lucy Wilson (00:01:10)

If at any point you have challenges with audio and visual, please enter your questions into the chat. We've got Devin on hand to help out with those. As you'll see, we'll also be recording the session today. The recordings will be placed on the MOMENTUM Knowledge Management Hub along with the presentations shortly after the sessions. Recordings of presentations from past sessions are already available on the Hub, and if you are outside of MOMENTUM, we can share with you the links to the recordings on YouTube, and we'll also work to make the materials available after the workshop session concludes. If you haven't seen it yet, the new CAM resource collection is available on the MOMENTUM Hub. It includes both the MOMENTUM Complexity Aware Monitoring Guide and many of the documents that were used to create the CAM Guide and this workshop series. We're hoping to expand that collection as we go, so if you have resources to add, please reach out and let us know. The link is in the chat. Thanks. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:02:10)

Our objectives for today's sessions are to provide participants with an introduction to Outcome Harvesting as well as some illustrative examples of its use in similar projects... also to increase participants' understanding of how to adapt Outcome Harvesting and to support brainstorming ideas for their adaptation and use within the MOMENTUM awards. These all... These objectives feed into our broader workshop objectives, which are to improve participants' knowledge and understanding of Complexity Aware Monitoring, to improve participants' ability to use Complexity Aware Monitoring, and to expand

participants' networks of CAM practitioners within and beyond the MOMENTUM suite of awards. Speaking of CAM practitioners, we are very excited to have a superstar in the field of CAM with us today. Heather Britt is a Principal Research Scientist at NORC, which is part of the University of Chicago. Heather is an author on several resources for using CAM generally and for specific CAM approaches. We are also excited to have Tilly Gurman with us today to share her experience using Outcome Harvesting. Tilly is a Research and Evaluation Advisor with the Johns Hopkins Center for Communication Programs. I'll also be sharing an experience on Outcome Harvesting.

Lucy Wilson (00:03:29)

As mentioned, Emily Stammer, our workshop series leader, will be joining us shortly. We also have Sammy and Devin from MKA making sure everything runs smoothly. Please take a moment and introduce yourselves in the chat now. If you can include your name, title, and organization affiliation and which MOMENTUM award you're working with, if applicable, also where you're dialing in from today. Thanks. Next. In today's session, we'll start out with an overview of Outcome Harvesting by Heather. Then I'll present on a USAID-funded project in which I used Outcome Harvesting for ongoing monitoring. Then we'll have a short break, after which Tilly will present on her use of Outcome Harvesting in an evaluation of a capacity strengthening project. Then we'll do breakout discussions, which we're going to be doing a bit differently this week, asking you all to self-select a group to join based on your level of interest in and understanding of Outcome Harvesting. And of course, we'll end with another pause and reflect. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:04:35)

Before I hand over to Heather to get into the details of Outcome Harvesting, I wanted to take a minute to tie this approach back to the earlier sessions of this workshop in which we talked about CAM generally, including the MOMENTUM CAM guide that was developed last year. If you were in those earlier sessions, you may remember that we referenced a matrix that is in the guide, and the matrix is designed to help you select among CAM approaches based on various factors. Here, we've pulled just the Outcome Harvesting column of that matrix, so you can see that it's mostly a qualitative approach. It generally requires a moderate skill level and moderate to high levels of effort, but can be done remotely, depending on the project context, of course. It is often used in ongoing monitoring evaluations, and you'll see that from the examples shared today.

Lucy Wilson (00:05:25)

And among the five questions that aren't always easily addressed in typical performance, M&E especially helps projects address those related to unintended outcomes or outcomes missing from the theory of change... And it helps to identify factors that contributed to observed outcomes. Next. Great. And with that, I'm going to hand it over to Heather Britt to tell us more about Outcome Harvesting. Heather... and next.



Heather Britt (00:05:57)

Thank you, Lucy. It's very exciting to be able to spend the morning or the evening with you all practitioners and those interested. Sammy, next, please. Next slide. So just a quick overview of what we're going to cover in this session. We're going to cover some of the basics about when and why Outcome Harvesting can be useful and the basic steps involved. We'll also touch briefly on the guiding principles that are used to tailor Outcome Harvesting to your specific project and its context. I'll also touch on some tips for planning a harvest, and especially related to the fact that Outcome Harvesting is a participatory and iteratively designed method, so you need to revisit those design decisions throughout the process. We don't have as much time as we might like today, so there are a few slides that I've included in here that have some substantive material in it which I encourage you to go back and reread later.

Heather Britt (00:07:16)

I'll just touch on them as we go through, and as Lucy mentioned, there'll be several opportunities for you all to ask questions and engage in discussion. First, I'll do a quick pause for just clarifying questions once we've covered some of the very basics of Outcome Harvesting. And then at the end of this session, we'll also have space for again, a little bit more Q & A. And then we have these great breakout groups that Lucy, Tilly, and I and a few other colleagues will be facilitating, and we suggest that you save your more substantive or sometimes more advanced questions or those that would benefit from input from your peers for those discussion groups. So those are some of the points we'll touch base with each other. All right, next slide, please. Great. I want to tell you that Outcome Harvesting has quite a track record.

Heather Britt (00:08:25)

It was originated by Ricardo Wilson-Grau in 2003, and for the next 10 years or so, worked closely with co-collaborators and co-developers, like myself, to really refine and expand on the approach. And since then it's been used, and I think this number is old... But many different donors, implementers, NGOs, networks, organizations, all types have used it in Asia, Africa, Europe, North America, across the globe. It has a strong track record. I met Ricardo in 2011 in the inaugural conference of Eval [inaudible 00:09:20]. And I just quickly realized that this approach could help answer a lot of monitoring and evaluation challenges that I was facing with my work, and I was working really closely with the Ford Foundation at the time, and they were experiencing a lot of complexity in their work... And so we collaborated to write the first brief, and then shortly after that came out, I moved to work as an Institutional Contractor for USAID for about seven years.

Heather Britt (00:09:52)

There, I had the delightful experience of being able to support and provide technical assistance to many different Outcome Harvests across the agency, working together with USAID partners and implementers

together to conduct and use Outcome Harvesting and help set up a learning agenda, so we could compile a lot of lessons learned from that. There's a rich experience out there and a lot to draw on for lessons learned. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:10:32)

That's a little bit about my experience with Outcome Harvesting. We'd like to really quickly just take the pulse and hear about your experience with Outcome Harvesting. Sammy's starting the poll now, so just let us know where you fall on your experience. All right. We have quite a number of folks who are hearing about it and have maybe just know a little bit or have a fundamental experience. All right, I'm going to... all right. Stop... and we have... are the results? Yes. So you all can see that most folks are kind of at the beginning of an Outcome Harvesting journey. Well, welcome onboard. We hope you have a great time working with this method. It can be really informative and a lot of fun. Like I said, it's a participatory method, so you work closely with your peers to generate and share learning. Oh, great, we've had someone who's read a book and a couple of people... so that's wonderful. Hopefully you'll reflect on your experience with us. All right. Thank you so much.

Heather Britt (00:11:57)

Sammy, can... Let's move on to the next slide. We're going to dig in now here. I think it's really helpful with methods to just give a... know where they come from. Methods just don't drop out of the sky, and Outcome harvesting is no exception. It grew out of the Outcome Mapping community and is deeply connected to that, and it's strongly influenced by the Utilization-Focused Evaluation approaches. And I hope that you'll, as we talk, as we learn together more about Outcome Harvesting, that you'll see the connections to both of those if you're familiar with them. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:12:47)

Outcome Harvesting can be summarized really in less than 50 words, the essence of it, and you can come back to this definition over and over again and I think it'll really help ground you. It's a participatory method to identify, formulate, verify, analyze, and interpret outcomes to answer actionable, practical questions about a program or initiative. The method captures not just the outcomes that we predicted, but also ones that are unpredicted or even, I would say more accurately, unpredictable... ones we could not have foreseen. It collects evidence about positive and negative outcomes, and then it works backwards to describe and to verify the contribution that the project or initiative had to contribute to those outcomes.

Heather Britt (00:13:50)

It can be useful for monitoring and for evaluation purposes, and it's useful for all three types of evaluation purposes... that is developmental, formative... while something's still... Developmental, while it's still being

developed in process, you're using action to generate a new idea approach. Formative, it's in the early stages and you're providing information to help shape and improve it, and summative, when you're looking back on a project. It can be conducted using either internal staff or an external evaluation consultant... Or you might bring together staff from both the donor and the implementer. You can come up with a lot of different, creative mixes. I've seen a wide variety. Or you might, it might be primarily internal just with an evaluation or Outcome Harvesting Coach throughout the way. There's a lot of different ways to do it. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:15:07)

Outcome Harvesting. As you all know, that in the monitoring evaluation world, there's a variety of different terms and different ways to use the same kind of terms, so I really want to ground us here in the essential concept of outcome. Outcome Harvesting has a particular definition and understanding of what an outcome is that may not line up with the way you've used it in other contexts. Let's go over that together.

Heather Britt (00:15:43)

This map of describing a theory of change comes out of the outcome mapping, this sphere: a Sphere of Control, Sphere of Influence and Sphere of Interest if you're familiar with this. So within the Sphere of Control, project staff carry out activities which lead to outputs. Those are within the Sphere of Control, and those outputs are used by change agents to influence other actors, social actors, to contribute to outcomes, all right? Really, the project staff engage directly with change agents but do not engage directly with social actors. This is the typical definition. We're collecting data about outcomes from change agents, and generally a clue that Outcome Harvesting would be helpful is when we don't have direct access to those social actors. You can't reach them. All right. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:17:01)

Here's a verbal or written summary of what an outcome is in the Outcome Harvesting world. It's a change in the behavior of a social actor influenced by the intervention... And when we talk about behavior here, we're talking about actions or activities, relationships, policies, practices... And a social actor could be one person or it could be a group or it could be a whole community or an organization or institution, right? What we're not talking about here is changes in knowledge, awareness, and attitudes. It really needs to translate into changes in behavior, okay? Outcome Harvesting is a complexity aware approach. It recognizes that there are lots of factors out there influencing outcomes. The project is generally not the only influence, but it should be... you're collecting evidence on the strength of that influence. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:18:08)

Outcome Harvesting is not for all approaches. In fact, it grew up to help meet some very specific kinds of monitoring and evaluation challenges. I've touched on one of them briefly by pointing out that you're not in a situation in which you can just go out and speak to that social actor and get the kind of evidence that you need. Another situation in which it's well-suited to Outcome Harvesting is when you're working in a project in which the desired results are big and bold and difficult to measure. We know the general direction we're headed, but we don't have a lot of specificity to draw on, right? Measurability frequently relies on us being specific. The pathways to achieve the desired results are not well-understood. Again, this is not due to bad planning. It's due to the essence of the situation that we're working in is complex and dynamic and changing, right?

Heather Britt (00:19:13)

For that reason, the project is likely to contribute to unpredicted and unpredictable outcomes. Again, it's due to the complexity of the situation, of the evolving situation. You can recognize as a development practitioner, as a person in the field on the ground... You know that you're in a situation like this when really the key to your success is flexible management and your continuing adapting, right? A CLA moment. If you're working in a CLA context where adaptation is the norm, then you're probably working in a situation in which Outcome Harvesting could be helpful. I just do want to stress that all projects contribute to unpredicted outcomes. It's really a matter of how important are they to your project. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:20:11)

Okay. So again, Outcome Harvesting is not for everybody. It's not intended for where the pathways to achieve the desired outcomes are known and agreed upon or where little value is placed on capturing outcomes not included in the original design. If folks are really convinced that the theory of change tells the whole story or the most important parts of it, then it's not a great fit. I'm going to contrast training and capacity building here as a way to illustrate what I'm saying. When you're doing training, you are able... You are building the specific skills in a certain group of people. You have access to those people after the training, and you can easily measure whether or not there was a difference. We have a whole field of literature that supports training outcomes and training results, how that occurs. That's not a good fit for Outcome Harvesting.

Heather Britt (00:21:21)

On the other hand, we have capacity building, which Tilly is going to give us a great example of, in which the path between the technical assistance and the support that we provide or a project provides... between that and building a resilient, flexible, sustainable organization, high-functioning... That is a path that varies across... Each organization's going to follow a different path, and we cannot predict it in advance. That's the difference between... so Outcome Harvest is a great fit for telling that kind of a story and capturing those outcomes. So just... When you're trying to make a decision about what part of your project would be

to focus on for the Outcome Harvest, come back to this idea about training and capacity building and say, "which basket does this part of my project fit into?" Okay.

Heather Britt (00:22:23)

That's just sort of the basics. Sammy, next slide, please. I want to give a quick example of... We've been talking here in the abstract about Outcome Harvesting... I'm going to give a quick example of an outcome, and then I'll pause for clarifying questions. I'm not going to go over this slide, this one here, in great detail, but I do suggest that when you're drafting your scope of work, come back to this slide here. It has examples of the first four components, brief, concise examples of the first four elements of a good scope of work right in here. Okay?

Heather Britt (00:23:09)

All right. The example I'm going to share with you of an outcome description comes from the Association for Women's Rights and Development. This example is in the public domain in the original brief, so you can take a closer look at it. They were conducting a formative evaluation around an advocacy program to... in the context of... in support of human rights defenders.

Heather Britt (00:23:39)

Next slide, please. The outcome description contained three basic elements. There should be a concise description of the outcome, which is the change in behavior of the social actor, right? It should also describe the contribution of the project or the organization and the change agents towards achieving that outcome. It also has... The third element is the significance of the outcome. And this, I do want to tie back into the overall statement... Lucy... the table at the start of the presentation here. The significance of the outcome here, this is the opportunity to collect data on the perspectives of the stakeholders, of the change agents themselves, to talk about why an outcome is important. You can also include why the project thinks it's important, but it's a very important opportunity to collect stakeholder perspectives on the importance of outcomes. Okay. This is what an outcome... What we're talking about when we're saying we're Harvesting Outcomes. This is an example of what a full outcome might look like.

Heather Britt (00:25:07)

And I want to just read now the basic description. In mid-September 2011, the Iranian Ministry of the Interior, or the Secret Service released MB, who was a human rights defender after five months in prison. Now I'd like to use this example to describe... To illustrate where Outcome Harvesting can be helpful, because it's clear that AWID would not be able to go straight to the Secret Service and say, "What was our role in contributing to your decision to do this?" We're unlikely to get a straight answer there. And we might



not even be able to reach the Secret Service at all right or find the right person. So it really helps illustrate where Outcome Harvesting has a special niche to solve monitoring and evaluation questions. All right?

Heather Britt (00:25:11)

So next slide please. Great. So here's our pause for just clarifying questions, right? So what I mean is not questions that are more in-depth, but just over the material that we've covered so far. Does anyone have any questions that really need to get answered at this point?

Lucy Wilson (00:26:42)

Heather, if you check the chat, there's a question from Lisa, is this only be regarding the behavior change? Is it only behavior change? What about projects which target policy or systems?

Heather Britt (00:26:52)

Absolutely. So if we go back to that definition of an outcome, in the narrative it will list that it could be behaviors of individuals, it could be policy changes, it could be changes in relationships, it could be changes in the way resources are used. So a wide variety of different... We're just kind of using behavior change as short hand here to distinguish that it's not around just attitudes or knowledge or narratives or things like that. All right? Okay. So shall we move ahead?

Heather Britt (00:27:35)

That was a really good clarifying question. Okay. So there are six steps for conducting an Outcome Harvest. The first is the design stage where working with the primary intended users to design the harvest. The second one is to work with project sources either documents or staff to collect your first batch of outcomes. The third is that you collect data directly from the change agents who were influential in influencing the outcomes. So you go straight to the source. And then in fourth, you substantiate or verify by speaking to folks who are knowledgeable, but independent, that is, they are not a member of the staff of the project or of the donor, and they're not involved in influencing the outcomes, but they have information. They're living and working in the context and can report on that. The fifth is to analyze and interpret the data. And six is to help support the use of findings. Again, this is focusing on actionable information to inform decision-making. Next step, please.

Heather Britt (00:29:09)

I want to just stress again this is iterative. So there's a little bit of ebb and flow between the steps. Next step, please. All right. So I'm just going to touch on this slide here and recommend that you come back and study it carefully, if you conduct an Outcome Harvest, no two Outcome Harvests look the same. So how do you adapt it to your project in the way that still maintains rigor in the method? The answer is these principles. We have process principles that help inform decisions about adapting the process to your context. And we have content principles which emphasize what the findings should be in order to be useful for you. So I recommend that you come back to this, so just to underscore that is the principles that help you with that. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:30:18)

So the essentials of an Outcome Harvest are that they're principles-driven. Each harvest is tailored to the context, but adapts to your context and your situation. It's utilization-focused, always keeping in mind

what you need, what actionable questions, who needs the answers and how they will be using them. And that it's a participatory approach. All right, next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:30:52)

There's four key stakeholders that really are involved when say participatory, it really and we're talking about the involvement of these four key groups. Next slide, please. We have project staff. I'm assuming that's you. You're involved in the implementation of the project and you're very important as a knowledgeable source about the outcomes. And often project staff may also play a role, not only as informants, but if it's an internal they may help to collect data as well. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:31:35)

The intended users are very important. They are the folks that need this, the findings to make decisions or take action. And it was important to sort out that who has responsibility and authority to take action on the findings and distinguish them from just interested stakeholders. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:32:06)

We've talked about who the change agents are, but again, they're going to play a very important role because they're the folks who are going to be the respondents, right? You don't have access to going directly to the social actors so you need to identify the individuals and organizations that influence the outcomes. They are your key informants. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:32:31)

And fourth again, we've touched on the outcome verifiers, third-parties who are knowledgeable and objective about the outcomes. And during that stage, the verification stage, they review the outcome descriptions which have been compiled and they comment on whether or not those descriptions reflect whether or not they agree with them, right? And there's a variety of different ways that you can work with them to collect this information. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:33:09)

So here you can see, again, this just a visual summary of these primary folks who are stakeholders, who are involved and participate in Outcome Harvest. Next slide, please. All right. So I want to just underscore the importance of writing a scope of work for an Outcome Harvest, even if you are conducting it as an internal evaluation or monitoring process. And that is because that as we've mentioned here, that it's a participatory approach, but it's also an iteratively-designed approach. There's key points throughout those six steps of the Outcome Harvest in which you need to return to and ask yourself some questions about

how we want to conduct the next stage. Based on what we just learned or what has happened in our harvest so far, how do we want to do that?

Heather Britt (00:34:15)

So it's important to document the decisions that you make in the early stage, and then go back again and that document really helps ground you and anchor you in this participatory and iterative process. It's useful for both the commissioners, for the internal teams and for an external evaluator or external evaluation coach that you may be working with. All right. So very important document. Next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:34:48)

These, I suggest you come back and take a close look at these. These are the key elements in a sort of traditional or classic Outcome Harvest scope of work or terms of reference. This is the format that Ricardo used to use. Next slide, please. I do really want to pause on this particular issue about the primary intended user. This is a common point of confusion that I see across Outcome Harvests, is to frequently in writing a scope of work or terms of reference for an evaluation or for monitoring, we want to share the data with everyone who we think it might be useful for. So we list a long list of stakeholders and those are terrific. That's terrific and it is very important to keep those folks informed about the Outcome Harvest and about the findings. But it's important to find another mechanism to do that and to make sure that from your primary intended users you have an advisory group of five to seven individuals.

Heather Britt (00:36:11)

It needs to be small in order for them to be an effective decision-making body. They must have the ability and the time availability to participate throughout the process of the Outcome Harvest, to come through and help make decisions that keep steering the harvest to make sure that it's actionable and useful. So I frequently make this statement and then get to review scopes of work again. And I see a very long list again, of the primary intended users being a very long list of folks who could never be very difficult to corral them all into one place regularly to make decisions. So please, please keep that in mind. All right, next slide, please.

Heather Britt (00:37:00)

Again, this is just a summary of some important keys to success that we've collected over many observing and supporting many different Outcome Harvests. Having an orientation and design meeting with the primary intended user, crafting a manageable number of evaluation questions. Again, three to five max and they should be very practical questions. Being clear about which questions can be answered by Outcome Harvesting and which ones can be answered with other approaches, use a blended thing, that's just fine. Just be clear about which one's Outcome Harvesting is going to answer. Come back to your

primary intended users on key decisions throughout the harvest, and set aside some time and budget to adapt as you need going forward. Next slide, please here.

Heather Britt (00:36:07)

Here's a summary of strengths and limitations that it does a really good job working in complex and knowledge care situations. It offers a lot of opportunity for participation, but that may not be feasible for every situation. Again, it needs to be tailored to each project and context, but the trade-off on that is that findings are not necessarily comparable across all evaluations or intervention. So come back and take a look at this when you're making decision about going forward and weigh the pros and cons for your own situation. Right. The next slide, please here.

Heather Britt (00:38:52)

Okay. Quick, based on that, really I apologize it's a really quick overview. I do a three-hour presentation often on just on planning. So we're really running through this quickly so I thank you for your patience. We have a few people saying that they think that's for sure they'll do an Outcome Harvest and a group of folks still deciding that's great. This is our breakout groups will be a great way for you to discuss those together with your peers. And a few folks saying "It doesn't look like a good match for them." All right, great. We'll end the polling here, I think. All right. Very good. Next slide please.

Heather Britt (00:39:59)

All right. So you can come back to this slide, but I just did want to remind people that we have a few... There's a lot of resources out there including in the AEA eLibrary, AEA365 has a number of blogs. We have the OH Community of Practice. I just mentioned the recent AEA Study on planning and Outcome Harvest. So there's a lot of resources out there to support you and Lucy will also direct you to more as well. So next slide, please. I think we're great. All right. Questions, comments for this Q&A period.

Emily Stammer (00:40:48)

Yeah. Great. Thank you so much, Heather. We have a few minutes for some questions, if you all are able to... If you want to come off mute and ask, that's fine, or you can put them in the chat. Also, we're happy to discuss things during the breakout groups. That's a great way to ask questions today, too. So we'll give a couple of minutes for that. Anybody have questions? (silence)

Emily Stammer (00:41:32)

Okay. Doesn't look like it.

Heather Britt (00:41:35)

Alrighty.

Emily Stammer (00:41:36)

Great. If you do feel free to put them in the chat, or like I said, we can address them during the breakout group. So thank you so much, Heather that was really informative. That's great. Okay. So now we are going to do... I'd like to introduce Lucy who you all know already. Who's going to do... Talk a little bit about monitoring the USAID-funded PROGRESS Project at FHI 360. Lucy?

Lucy Wilson (00:42:03)

Thanks, Emily. As I mentioned in the first session of this workshop, my first M&E role was at FHI 360. I was trained by a great boss and mentor Susan MacIntyre on how to do monitoring and evaluation for research utilization indicators. Susan and others from our working group that crossed several USAID projects had developed this approach for research utilization, as well as information dissemination, advocacy, and knowledge management. This was back in the early 2000's so around the same time as the formal Outcome Harvesting approach was being developed. They were similar methodologies meeting similar needs. And when I first read about Outcome Harvesting it's 2013, I was surprised to find that what I was doing had been written up, described, given a name, informalized by others including Heather.

Lucy Wilson (00:42:56)

While there many similarities there are also a few differences between what I'll describe and what Heather described, but as we've emphasized throughout this workshop, adaptation of the approaches is expected work to maintain rigor. Next. So the PROGRESS Project was a five-year USAID-funded global project, implemented by FHI 360 between 2008 and 2013. The goal was to improve access to family planning methods and services among underserved populations through research, research utilization, and capacity building. If you aren't familiar with the term research utilization, it is the process by which research and evidence is incorporated into policies and programs. It usually includes things like stakeholder engagement, collaborative research design, dissemination of research results, knowledge management, advocacy scale-up, et cetera. PROGRESS worked on both the global level and in several focus countries. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:44:01)

And actually, if you could advance one more time, Sammy, thanks. This is a simplified representation of the project logic model. So remember this project was designed in 2008. No one was talking about theories of change yet, logic models were still with causal framework of choice. As mentioned the activities focused on research, research utilization and capacity building. The outputs were the research studies and they're disseminated results, tools created to support the implementation, et cetera. Among the outcomes, the ones that were most relevant to Outcome Harvesting, where these first two. Programs and services changed to reflect evidence and policies and guidelines changed to reflect the evidence.

Lucy Wilson (00:44:43)

Our version of Outcome Harvesting was just one part of the bigger M&E system. Other M&E approaches were used for the other pieces of the logic model and to compliment the Outcome Harvest. Next. Okay. So how closely did our approach mirror the official Outcome Harvesting approach. On the left-hand side of the slide are six steps that Heather presented on a few minutes ago. In the right hand column, I tried

retrospectively to describe our approach as it applies to the six formal steps. When I came across Outcome Harvesting in 2013, I looked at these six steps and said, "Yeah, we did these things a bit differently, but we did step one, designing the Outcome Harvest when we wrote up the PMP or Performance Monitoring Plan, which is now probably what you will call your AMELP or your Activity Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Plan.

Lucy Wilson (00:45:37)

And we definitely did step two. We've gathered a lot of data and drafted outcome descriptions, but we talk more about identifying outcomes and drafting. And while Heather referred to engaging change agents, I was thinking about how we verified our outcome descriptions initially internally among project staff. Our version of substantiation was external validation and documentation for the outcomes. And our version of analysis and interpretation would have been synthesis and reporting. And when the official Outcome Harvesting guide talks about supporting use of findings, that sounded to me a bit like what we would have called using data for decision-making. I'll walk through each of these steps on the subsequent sides. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:46:22)

So step one, developing the performance and monitoring plan. Like any good PMP, ours included a causal framework, the logic model I shared earlier, it also included a list of qualitative and quantitative indicators. There was guidance on indicator sources and how data is collected and the frequency of collection and reporting. There was also description of the Research Utilization Indicator Database that we used for qualitative indicators. And there were sections on reporting, evaluation and other aspects of the M&E system that were used in the project.

Lucy Wilson (00:46:57)

Thinking back to the lessons that I can share with you all for using Outcome Harvesting as part of your monitoring approach, at the stage of developing your PMP and iterating on your PMP, I'd advise fewer indicators, don't complicate things, or try to collect data that no one will ever use and budget adequately. Outcome Harvesting can be resource-intensive. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:47:21)

So here are some of the indicators from that PMP, the ones that were most relevant to the Outcome Harvest, at least. Note that they all start out with the same phrase, instances of PROGRESS technical assistance, research results or products being used in policy or guidelines in the first one, the second one is used in programs and the third is used in services. We actually had seven different use indicators those are way too many. We really only needed one or two and you'll see that we ended up reporting one total



number across all these youth indicators. The source and frequency for data collection and reporting were also described in the PMP in a bit more detail. And I'll talk through that in the next couple of slides. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:48:08)

A bit more about that Research Utilization Indicator Database. It was initially built in Microsoft Access, which was an old program, but later custom built. The screenshot below shows or on the screen here shows a search result screen with five records listed. Each record is an outcome. Some of the key fields here with the activity number, a headline describing the outcome and the specific indicator it addressed along with the country and the status. Was it draft or approved? If you clicked in to a specific database record to see the individual outcome there was a fuller description of the outcome along with the partners, the internal staff involved in the ability to attach documentation. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:48:58)

So how did we identify outcomes and then draft them? I don't remember if this term came from the original Outcome Harvesting guidance document, but sleuthing and slogging is very descriptive of our approach. It happened through M&E staff reviewing documents, including regular activity reports as well as reports from key meetings or trips. M&E staff were looking for the outcomes as they reviewed these documents and also as they participated in regular activity review meetings. We also interviewed activity staff as each activity came to an end and we train non-M&E staff to identify and report on outcomes as well.

Lucy Wilson (00:49:37)

As the potential outcomes were identified, they were first reviewed to ensure that they've met the criteria of indicator and then an initial outcome description with drafted. Here, again, my lessons learned are less is more. The process of sleuthing can be fun, but it can be a real slog. The really good outcomes rise to the surface, whether or not people recognize them as an outcome they are the success stories and people will eventually start talking about them. Also, train staff and let them be your detectives, make it more participatory. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:50:17)

For step three, internal verification. Once M&E staff had a draft outcome description, it was shared with the relevant activity staff for their review. We wanted to make sure that we had the full details to tell the story, that the outcome was accurate and not overstated, and to start collecting relevant documentation that would provide evidence for the outcome and our project's role in contributing towards it. One of the lessons learned here was to share the draft description with multiple staff. Each person brought additional perspectives, and that always helped us to get a more accurate and non-biased description. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:51:02)

So step four was getting external validation or documentation that provided evidence for the outcome and the project's contribution. In the previous step, we focused on documentation we already had available

internally. The next step was strengthening it by reaching out to external stakeholders and collecting additional documentation. For policy change, this might mean ensuring we have a full final copy of the policy noting how the project staff, tools or research were acknowledged, included or cited in that policy. It might also mean documenting the steps in the change process that led to the outcome, then looking for any formal acknowledgement of our role in making the change happen. Finally, we might reach out to a key stakeholder, maybe even a policy maker and ask what role our work had in the change. The lessons learned here were to document thoroughly, as this helps to provide the evidence of the contribution and not to be afraid to reach out to those key decision makers and ask them to review your outcome description or to offer a formal statement that could be part of the documentation package. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:52:18)

So once an outcome description had gone through internal verification and external validation, it was marked as approved in that research utilization indicator database. Here is an example of one outcome description about a policy change that took place in Kenya, allowing community based access to injectable contraception. On the right-hand side of the slide, you'll see the elements that went into each outcome description. They start with a headline which summarizes the outcome. Then the description tells what happened, ensuring that dates and locations are clear. PROGRESS' role in the outcome is described as clearly as possible, as well as the role of others. The evidence or documentation of the change and PROGRESS' role are mentioned. And any reference document, email, quote, et cetera, would be attached to the outcome record in the database. We also made sure to include a statement on why this change was important or the need that it addressed. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:53:23)

My step five was synthesis and reporting. Here, the database was again crucial as the place where the outcome descriptions were collected. As we improved on the database, it allowed us to do more sorting of the outcomes by various factors. It also allowed us to easily show that PROGRESS contributed to 47 major changes in policy or programs at the country and global level throughout the life of the project. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:53:53)

So step six was our weakness. We didn't prioritize using the data for decision-making the way we could and should have. It's something I learned when I went back and looked at the outcome harvesting guidance. It's qualitative data, and when we think about using data for decision-making, we think about those great dashboards that Karen presented last week, the ones with the trend data and the percentage of targets met. Helping people use qualitative data can be trickier. You have to organize and synthesize the data. You have to identify the questions the data could help you answer, and then decide on how to analyze the data to get the answers to those questions. And we got part of the way there. We had the data well organized. We identified questions. Some of them are shown on this slide here. We tried to answer them, but only

really in an informal way. We later talked about how we could have done that better with more formal analysis of our data. But alas, the project was over. Next.

Lucy Wilson (00:54:57)

But we did use this experience under PROGRESS as well as the formal outcome harvesting guidance and other cam approaches to build on and strengthen the NEL approach in subsequent projects. And that's it for today. Any questions? And we can also move on.

Emily Stammer (00:55:27)

Yeah. Thank you, Lucy. That's really interesting. A great example of how outcome harvesting can be used with monitoring or through monitoring. So if there are no questions, I think we will go ahead and move on. We are a little bit behind, so we're going to go ahead. And we had planned a break, but we're going to skip the break. So we'll move right into our next presenter. We're really lucky to have Dr. Tilly Gurman with us today, from JHU CCP. She's going to present on using outcome harvesting for an evaluation activity. I'll turn it over to her. Tilly.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (00:56:11)

Great. Thank you. Thank you for this opportunity. Today I'm going to talk about some work that we did under the Health Communication Capacity Collaborative in Ethiopia. Go to the next slide, please. The Health Communication Capacity Collaborative or HC3 is a project of over a hundred billion dollars from 2012 to 2018. And we worked in over 30 countries during that time period. The project was explicitly designed to build lasting capacity within and among local organizations. And as you can see in the slide, one of the two main objectives from the RFP for the project was very explicitly around building the capacity of indigenous organizations and countries. Next slide.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (00:57:02)

What I'll be talking about today is the work that we did in Ethiopia. Towards the end of the project, of the overall project, we wanted to have a better understanding of the impact of our work in capacity strengthening. And we identified three countries where we wanted to pilot, or try out, outcome harvesting to see how it could inform the establishing of our evidence base for the work that we did in capacity strengthening in our countries. And I was the lead on the three countries. But in Ethiopia, I was much more hands on and on the ground. So I will be speaking to that experience today.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (00:57:44)

So the Ethiopia HC3 project was a buy-in to the larger HC3 portfolio. And it lasted from 2014 to 2016, and it was approximately a \$3 million project. In this slide, you can see the multiple partners that were involved

in the activities from government partners, such as the Ministry of Civil Service, Ministry of Health, the HIV and Aids Prevention Control Office, or HAPCO, the Ethiopian National Archive and Library Agency, or ENALA. And we also worked with international NGOs, local NGOs, universities, and media professionals. So again, it was really a broad range of stakeholders and partners in the project. Next.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (00:58:38)

So the types of activities that the project did, again, focusing largely on capacity strengthening, it included trainings for individuals at both the federal and regional levels in the government. A big part of the project was the transition that the National Aids Resource Center to be controlled and managed by the federal government. Also, other activities around advocacy for social and behavior change communication as well as mentoring for university students around social and behavior change communication, and helping them think of themselves and develop into health communication and social behavior change communication professionals. Next.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (00:59:23)

In terms of the questions that we had for our outcome harvesting evaluation. And again, we didn't come to outcome harvesting until towards the end of the projects. And so, the work that we did was less so from a monitoring perspective and more so at the summative evaluation. So the three questions that really guided our work was looking at, in what ways has the Ministry of Health, HAPCO and HC3 Ethiopia partner organizations demonstrated important changes in their capacity for improved social behavior change communication since the start of the project. And then second, that was looking at, to what extent did these outcomes exceed or fall short of the HC3 project objectives? And for this question, I'd highlight that we were looking at the project objectives, specifically the HC3 Ethiopia project, as well as looking at the global HC3 project objectives. And then the last question that we had was looking at the issue of sustainability. We felt that for capacity strengthening, the question of sustainability is always present. And so we want it to be explicit and explore the issues of sustainability as we identified and tracked and mapped out our outcomes. Next.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:00:45)

One of the things that we used to guide, I guess, the lens that we looked at our evaluation was this framework here called the SBCC Capacity Ecosystem. The HC3 project, in around year four of the project, a group of us worked on developing this framework. And it's a pathway to look at how capacity strengthening, capacity building activities and interventions can work to actually drive and improve social behavior change communication, as well as more lasting impact. And so, we used this framework to help us think about change in capacity at an individual level, at the level of the organization, as well as a more systemic level. Next.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:01:37)

So I'll jump right in and talk about the outcomes that we identified. In total, we had 37 vetted outcomes. And the vetted outcomes, again, we took it through the process by working with our team on the ground to look through the program documentation. We then also verified or substantiated the outcomes with external parties. And so, at the end, we had 37 outcomes that we had identified. And then one of the first things that we did in terms of the analysis was looking at categorizing them by different types of change that was observed. And so, this slide categorizes them according to these different themes. And an outcome could have been classified into one or more categories. So the numbers don't necessarily add up to 37, but you'll still see the relative importance of different themes.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:02:41)

So one of the big things that you'll see on this slide is the government institutionalization of SBCC programs with 14 outcomes falling under that category. And then the second category that has the greatest number of outcomes identified was around the HC3 partners requesting our support, or USA support. And again, the idea behind some of these categories was that we felt that they reflected important changes in the multiple social actors. Of course the phone rings right during a presentation. So the changes of the social actors, as Heather described earlier, they were the ones that were changing their behavior. And in this case, the social actors were the administrative health, HAPCO, universities, and partner organizations. And then the changes reflected changing priorities among these stakeholders as specifically around the desire to elevate social and behavior change communication. And so, the second one here about HC3 partners requesting USA support, for us that was a symbol of them taking that step to prioritizing and wanting to seek out social and behavior change communication into their programs. Next slide please.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:04:13)

So the ministry of health and HAPCO, the HIV Aids Prevention Control Office, they represented almost more than half of the outcomes that we identified. [inaudible 01:04:36]. I'll come back to that. I'm in Florida right now [inaudible 01:04:46], and so phone connectivity has been a bit of an issue today. But you should be able to hear me again. Not on my phone anymore.

Lucy Wilson (01:04:53)

Yes, we can hear you.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:04:56)

Thank you. So again, as I was saying, these principal partners, Ministry of Health and HAPCO, they represented more than half of the outcomes that we identified. And we classified them as these big

buckets. And so, one of the main changes that we observed was this increased recognition of social behavior change communication as an important component and skillset for developing and implementing public health programs within Ethiopia. The second bucket was around increased commitment to incorporate SBCC into their policies, systems, and structures. And then the third bucket was around an increased effort to coordinate and strategically collaborate to improve the quality of SBCC in Ethiopia. Next slide.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:05:44)

So one of the things that we really appreciated about outcome harvesting was that you could identify outcomes over a timeline and see the evolution. And so, maybe some of the outcomes weren't these big, massive outcomes. But it was beautiful to be able to see how, over time, they influenced or informed future outcomes. And so the slide here, we mapped out 10 outcomes that we had identified related to the transition of the services, the National Aids Resource Center, that I had mentioned earlier, over time. And then we also were able to map it out, looking at it, that SBCC ecosystem, at what level was that change? And so within this timeline, you see that the vast majority were at the organization level for the few at the system level, and none of the individual level for this specific category of outcomes. Next.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:06:52)

More. Nope, go. Okay. I think I got lost in the translation. Okay. We'll go to the next slide. So with the second question, with exceeding objectives, the evaluation of outcome harvesting really identified a variety of outcomes for both the global HC3 project, as I mentioned earlier, as well as for the HC3 Ethiopia program objectives. So we were able to report that out into our report for the funder, as well as for our partners on the ground. Next slide please.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:07:33)

And when we mapped out the outcomes, looking at it at that SBCC ecosystem level, we were able to identify the vast majority of the outcomes were at that organization level, with then system level changes happening. And again, for me, one of the things that brought me to outcome harvesting was this idea that when we're looking at more traditional or conventional methods of monitoring and evaluation, such as surveys, we know you're often left looking more at the individual level. So I really appreciated the fact that by using outcome harvesting, we were able to map and identify change at the organization and system level. Next.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:08:18)

So then our third research question was related to sustainability. And here, we were looking at the practice and the policy. And we wanted to define for ourselves, well, how could we say a practice or change in

behavior of an individual or an institution or a system would be mapping out something that we would say, okay, well, the project is ending, but maybe we think it's going to continue over the test of time. And so for us, we set a criterion that, to be able to call a practice sustainable, we wanted to make sure that it had occurred at least six months prior to the evaluation, because then we felt that there was at least some indication that it wasn't just something that happened and wasn't going to continue.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:09:04)

And then the idea of a practice really ties to the larger idea of routinization, or this idea of maintenance of activities over time. And then the second category of sustainable outcomes were outcomes that were specific to policy change. And here, we define the policy as a change in planning procedures or policies. So it didn't have to be an official government policy. It could be an organizational policy. But it was just something related to the change in planning procedures or policy related to SBCC. And here, the bigger idea of sustainability is related to standardization in the project, as well as institutionalization within the project itself.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:09:49)

Next. So I wanted to just give you two examples of sustainable outcomes at HAPCO as well as the Ministry of Health. So within HAPCO, these were two examples of outcomes that we identified as sustainable. As you can see at the top of the slide is the contribution of what was it that HC3 specifically contributed, and what was our influence on the outcome. And then at the bottom of the slide, you see the two outcomes. And both of these outcomes we identified or we classified them as practice outcomes.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:10:27)

So the first one on the left, the outcome was, since May 2015, HAPCO integrated SBCC activities and annual work plan of nine rural regions and two urban administrations. And so, that integration and the timeline from when the integration happened and when the evaluation happened, that fell under this categorization of, for us at least as a practice, sustainable practice. And then the second outcome was related to partners specifically. And that they applied most at risk populations SBCC framework in their HIV work. And so again, we had documentation to suggest that from, sorry. Starting 2015, these partners were applying this framework around social behavior change into their HIV work. And so they were making that routine, or that maintenance, of these different activities.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:11:19)

Next. And then at the ministry of health, we identified outcomes, again, for these sustainable outcomes, the ones that we identified here on this slide, were all policy-related. Again, the top of the slide shows you the contributions from HC3, and the bottom is the outcomes themselves. And these were looking at



changes in the strategic plan, incorporating social behavior change into their strategic plan, also incorporating the hotlines, so this 952 hotline, which was a hotline related to HIV Aids that, again, the government took over and they were going to manage and implement it moving forward. They were incorporating that hotline into their core plan. So again, this idea that they were creating these policies that was going to be happening over the period of time after the project ended. And then the last set of the outcomes here related to the Ministry of Health and sustainable outcomes was looking at this idea of the library, incorporating our resource center that they took over into their regular operations.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:12:40)

Next slide please. So I wanted to leave you with just a few lessons learned. And some of these will sound similar to some of what you've heard earlier from Lucy and from Heather. For us, it was a big learning that ideally we would have done outcome harvesting from the beginning of the project. We didn't come to outcome harvesting until the end. But we all agreed that it would have been great value to have been able to start from the beginning looking for these outcomes. I think especially to then be able to make midcourse change in the project. Second was really thinking about the evaluation and timing of other research monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management activities. For us, it was a bit of a challenge that we came in at the end of the project and the M&E officer on the ground and the HC3 office in Ethiopia was also having to deal with other end of project research monitoring activities. And so, it was a bit tricky at times to make sure that we were able to get everybody's input and involvement.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:13:46)

The other one is, again, Heather mentioned this earlier, this idea of outcome harvesting is great for certain things. Again, I think outcome harvesting is fantastic for the capacity strengthening activities that we did. And so, thinking about outcome harvesting as something to compliment, but not necessarily replace other methods. And then training local project team early regarding those outcome harvesting elements. I think for us, we came on the ground, we worked with the team on the ground, but it was a big steep learning curve. And it would have been great to have been able to train them earlier on so that we could just hit the ground running once we got there.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:14:23)

And then our last lesson learned was really to be able to plan sufficient time. It was more labor intensive than any of us really had envisioned. In the Ethiopia project, Ricardo Wilson-Grau came with us to advise and work with us. And, even having that expertise on the ground, it was still an incredible amount of effort and time.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:14:48)

Next slide please. And so with that, I just wanted to acknowledge the team that really worked on the Ethiopia, as well as our Bangladesh and our Liberia outcome harvesting activities, and under HC3 and last slide, please.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:15:06)

And then there's a few resources again, regarding if you're interested in looking at the reports for any of the three countries where we did outcome harvesting, they're available online, as well as we authored a lessons learned to piece around capacity strengthening and using outcome harvesting for that type of activity. Thank you very much.

Emily Stammer (01:15:27)

Great. Thank you so much, Tilly. And thanks for joining us in the midst of a hurricane. It's impressive. Does anybody have any questions for Tilly? We've got a few minutes. Can come off mute or put them in the chat if you want.

Lara Vaz (01:16:00)

[inaudible 01:16:00] Heather, this is really been great. And this is a question actually for Tilly, Heather, and Lizzie. I'm interested if whether you have any examples of where outcome harvesting was used or adapted for expected outcomes that weren't fully achieved, and so sort of using the approach to try to capture how far along the pathway, objects or activities were successful towards reaching an outcome versus the outcome was achieved. And this was the contribution of X towards it. I'm just curious as to in situations where perhaps an outcome is partially achieved, but not fully achieved, whether outcome harvesting might be useful.

Heather Britt (01:17:15)

I can provide a partial answer and Tilly and Lucy could step in. I would say that among the community of outcome harvesting practitioners, I shared the definition of outcome, but there's a lot of flexibility within that definition. Some of us tend to focus on really large, significant outcomes and then have a long tail of project contribution or change agent contribution and then others.

Heather Britt (01:18:00)

And so that typically happens in situations in which, as Tilly is describing, it's used as a summative evaluation, right? And especially for a large donor, like USAID, who's really interested in big wins. And then some practitioners or in situations in which outcome harvesting is being used as a monitoring tool, both approaches are perfectly legitimate, I just want to stress that. Is that you may be telling the story and capturing milestones along the way and calling those outcomes.

Heather Britt (01:18:50)

So Tilly's graph where it showed the dots along each year. So those could be interrelated. So in her version they were identified, and maybe just for the purposes of this presentation, as individual outcomes, but oftentimes outcomes are what outcomes helps precipitate or lead to another one. So you could define outcome either small or large, and you could tell the story as you go along typically as a monitoring thing, or just tell, capture one outcome really large until a long contribution story. Does that help?

Lara Vaz (01:19:36)

Yeah. I think we're aware thinking across momentum, which is a unique suite design, but yeah, definitely. Food for thought. Thanks.

Dr. Tilly Gurma (01:19:53)

And for us, even though we came at the outcome harvesting at the end of the project. We, we are, we used the overall program objectives to inform that. And so we mapped out our outcomes around these expected objectives for the project, as well as looking for these unexpected outcomes as well. And so for us, we were sort of able to look at it both ways. And I think had we had done more of the tracking from the get-go we could have really thought about more, what does the program hope to achieve and even design the outcome harvesting more explicitly looking at that. But we were able to do a bit of that by mapping it out, according to the IRS of the project.

Emily Stammer (01:20:53)

Good question. Lucy, do you anything to add?

Lucy Wilson (01:20:55)

I guess I would just say that we addressed a similar challenge moving forward into the subsequent projects by integrating outcome mapping in as well, which as Heather mentioned outcome mapping and outcome harvesting kind of developed to compliment each other. And while they're not always used together, we found that doing outcome mapping like Heather, or like Tilly also just said, helped us figure out what our expected outcomes were. And then to put in place to steps are kind of mini milestones towards the larger outcome.

Emily Stammer (01:21:37)

Great, great question. Other questions. Nothing? Okay. If you think of them, go ahead and put them in the chat, but next we are going to go ahead and break out into the breakout groups. Let's see. So next slide, please. We're going to do things a little differently this week, based on some feedback that we got, I think

in the past, we had just sent you all to breakout groups randomly. This week we have three separate groups and you will be opting into a group based on your interests. So the first group Lucy will be facilitating that group. They're going to focus on folks who would like more information about the approach, maybe are not sure if it's something you might want to use. You have questions.

Emily Stammer (01:00:00)

The second group will be folks who've never done an outcome harvest, but are interested in using it. So Tilly is going to be leading that group. Group three will be folks who have used components of outcome harvesting before or interested in how they might formalize it. Also if you want to join that group, if you have any additional questions for Heather, I think she may be able to answer questions in that until she can answer more questions in group two, and Lucy could answer some more questions in group one. So we will put the groups up if you want to select in based on which group is most relevant to you. I think there may be two additional groups that pop up that are overflow groups. Just ignore those. If we have groups that are too big, we may end up doing some reshuffling. We're going to kind of see how this goes, this is our trial run.

Paul Bouey (01:24:00)

I'm not entirely sure where we got cut off, but I'm trying to identify who do we incorporate into this whole process for our outcome harvesting. Is it our staff or is it the government officials? Because they both have vested interest in the outcomes. So how do we get by that? How do we get through that? If that question makes sense.

Lucy Wilson (01:24:20)

Yeah. I think what I hear you asking is "We know who our stakeholders are, we can identify them as our staff and the government. How do we map them to say the diagram that Heather showed earlier that had project staff and change agents and social actors and verifiers?" And I think I'll maybe let Heather jump in and answer that as well. But to me, I think you kind of figure out where your stakeholders are in the language that's in the guide and the language that resonates and makes sense to you and your team, what works and what makes sense. Again, when I did this outcome harvesting, it wasn't designed as outcome harvesting, so we didn't really line up who people would be, but it still worked. We still figured out how we needed to engage each person based on what we knew about that type of stakeholder.

Lucy Wilson (01:25:14)

Heather, I'm sorry, you didn't hear the whole question, but do you want to comment any on figuring out who's a change agent and who's a social actor.

Heather Britt (01:25:25)

Right. So I think it is really important to distinguish the different roles again, for the perception of credibility, right? For monitoring, it may make sense, and credibility is different every situation, but some donors or intended users may not accept project staff as the only source of data for something, as you mentioned, because they're vested, right. And again, if you can speak directly to what we talked about as the change agents, sometimes you might use the word beneficiaries or program participants. If you can speak directly to them and capture evidence of outcomes from them, what you're calling outcomes in your situation, then perhaps another method might be useful.

Heather Britt (01:00:00)

But we ingest in our breakout group, Bill talked about an example where we, they were collecting data from the folks that they worked with directly - shook hands with - that's the change agents, but then they pushed further to say, "Well, who are the change agents influencing?" And how does that make those outcomes more sustainable, more systems level, more ongoing, and we don't have access to those folks. So that's where outcomes harvesting strength to solve that challenge really comes into play. So we're not

going to be dictators around, which is which, but we do suggest that you push yourself to the next level, to the social actor, because that really is where you can get that juicy, difficult to measure, sustainable stuff.

Heather Britt (01:27:19)

And it solves that monitoring challenge where that's not possible, and you may want to do it on a solid foundation of monitoring that uses primarily project staff as a source, because that's more affordable and all of that, and then push it to the next level for key outcomes and things. So I would just compliment the ways that Lucy was describing ongoing monitoring and pushing the envelope a little bit. Does that help?

Paul Bouey (01:27:53)

It does. Great. Thank you both.

Lucy Wilson (01:28:01)

And thanks. We do have a minute or two, if there's any other interesting tidbits that came out of the breakout discussions that somebody wants to share. And maybe we'll actually hear about them in our pause and reflect for today. So think about what you might say, and maybe we can hear from you in the pause and reflect. So I will move on to Emily to give us some takeaways.

Emily Stammer (01:28:46)

Great. Thanks Lucy. So next slide, we're just going to wrap up. So a few main takeaways from today, we learned that outcome harvesting is a great approach for identifying unintended outcomes and assessing a project contributions. As with many of the methods we've talked about in this session, it can be adapted to a wide variety of contexts. We got examples of both monitoring and evaluation today and how it can be used. You may already be using aspects of it and not know. And you can look back at some of these slides and think through how you might want to formalize it moving forward. It can be work intensive and it requires staff training. So make sure that you plan and budget accordingly if you're thinking about using this method. Next slide. So next week is our final session of the series, whoa, so please join us.

Emily Stammer (01:29:43)

The topic will be most significant change. We'll have examples of most significant change in practice from presenters from MCGI, and also from Breakthrough Research, don't forget to register. We've got the link in the chat and you can click right there and register to join us. Otherwise, thank you to our presenters today, and to Sammy and to Dev for helping out with things. I'm going to turn it over to Lucy now for the pause and reflect.

Lucy Wilson (01:30:18)

So again, we're trying something a little bit new today. Sammy can you go to the next slide? So we're going to do a virtual hot potato. So if we were in person together, this is the point where we would get together and stand in a circle and we would throw a ball to each other, or we would pass a drum around or some other talking stick, and each person will share very quickly the answer to one or finish one of the following statements, either "Today, I learned something" or "I'm looking forward to something". And so what we'll ask you to do is to go ahead and take yourself off mute. Emily will be calling your names. That's how we're going to do it since we're on zoom. And when your name is called, you answer with "Today, I learned", or "I'm looking forward to", and again, if you're in a quiet location, go ahead and come off mute so that you're ready to answer when it's your turn.

Emily Stammer (01:31:21)

Okay. So I'm going to spin the random wheel. And the first one is going to is Laura Vaz.

Lara Vaz (01:31:34)

I am looking forward to thinking more about how to use outlook harvesting.

Emily Stammer (01:31:45)

Next Deb Sitrin

Deborah Sitrin (01:31:51)

Hi, I'll say I am looking forward to re watching the first 20 minutes of this, because actually I was 20 minutes late. So I feel like I missed a few key things, but it really peaked my interest in the method. So thank you very much.

Emily Stammer (01:32:09)

Janet McKenna.

Janet McKenna (01:32:20)

I'm looking forward to putting this in practice now with our current trundle evaluation that you're doing for Better Use project.

Emily Stammer (01:32:24)

Great, Ilana.

Elana Dhuse (01:32:26)

I'm looking forward to working with others on this call to see how I can put this into the learning agendas for projects.

Emily Stammer (01:32:40)

Great, Pooja?

Pooja Pokhrel Mandal (01:32:43)

Hi, I'm looking forward to learn more about this because it's very first time I heard about this, thank you.

Emily Stammer (01:32:53)

Awesome, Paul?

Paul Bouey (01:33:14)

Boy, I guess I'm going to be the person who learned today. It is more involved and complex than I had thought or realized, but I also see tremendous utility for it. So I'm actually also looking forward to trying to figure out how to adapt it to some current circumstances. Thanks.

Emily Stammer (01:33:17)

Great. Louis?

Luis Luis Ortiz-Echevarria (01:33:33)

Hi, this is Louis. And I would say I'm looking forward to exploring how we might use this tool, how we might compliment it with some of the other tools that we're using in the program. Thanks

Emily Stammer (01:33:37)

Thanks. Cool. Meg Ivankovich?

Megan Ivankovich (01:33:41)

[inaudible 01:33:42] Our colleagues, I'm really thinking about how to apply outcome harvesting to our work, exploring some of the momentum learning agenda topics, as well as some of the other key methods. You're enlightening us with.

Emily Stammer (01:33:58)

Ann Marie.



Ann-Marie Yongho (01:34:07)

I am looking forward to reaching back out to Emily, Lucy, Tilly, some other folks, because we're doing an outcome harvest right now in a different project. And I know as we start, sometimes these concepts seem more straightforward when you're learning about them than when you're actually trying to implement them so excited that we have some connections to pick your brain.

Emily Stammer (01:34:22)

Great, Jim?

Jim Ricca (01:34:25)

Thanks. This has been really interesting. I think I am interested to find out more and think about how some of the techniques that we're using, whether that are simpler, could feed into this and how this could fit into an ecosystem where we're thinking about contribution analysis, qualitative impact assessment protocols, and a few other things, causal link monitoring as well. So I guess I'm looking forward to thinking more on talking with you all more about this.

Emily Stammer (01:35:03)

Great, Seema?

Seema Giri (01:35:09)

Hey, I'm looking forward to learn more about this, it is new for me.

Emily Stammer (01:35:16)

Yeah. Awesome, great opportunity. Soumya?

Soumya Alva (01:35:19)

I'm looking forward to seeing how we can use this among other complexity of our monitoring methods for where it would fit for some of the questions we want to answer within momentum, but also I missed the beginning, but I did want to go look through the document that Heather mentioned with the [inaudible 01:35:37] example, I'd like to understand how they walked through that whole process to answer those questions.

Emily Stammer (01:35:47)

Dennison?

Danielson Kennedy (01:35:53)

Hi, I'm looking forward to an exciting implementation of outcome harvesting in the evolution that we are just starting now. Thank you.

Emily Stammer (01:00:00)

Cool. Farhad?

Farhad Khan (01:36:09)

Hi everyone. Today, I learned about how this method can be used to map project activity to policy outcomes.

Emily Stammer (01:36:18)

Barbara?

Barbara Rawlins (01:36:25)

I am looking forward to seeing one of the momentum awards apply this approach.

Emily Stammer (01:36:34)

Thank you that was great. Nicole?

Nicole Danfakha (01:36:48)

Hi, today I learned some clarification on when it would be a good idea to use outcome harvesting for conversation when it might not be the best approach. Thanks.

Emily Stammer (01:36:50)

Yeah. Srishti.

Srishti Shah (01:36:55)

Hi, it is a very interesting session today and even sessions before. So I'm looking forward to how these would involve, because a lot of people from our team are attending this and we were still in the process of finalizing our [inaudible 01:37:10] and I'd like to see how these could actually be useful for us. That would be interesting. Thank you.

Emily Stammer (01:37:28)

Great. Is there anybody I missed anybody, anyone who wants to go.

Heather Britt (01:37:34)

Emily? I just wanted to say this is Heather that I learned some about some fascinating situations that folks are thinking about using outcome harvesting and every outcome harvest is different. So it was great to hear examples of practice, so thanks for that.

Lucy Wilson (01:38:07)

Yeah. Thanks. Likewise, it was great to have both Heather and Tilly here to share their experiences and their expertise with this method. And I'll just add my thanks to the speakers, to the team behind the scenes, and to all of you, our participants. Any last thoughts, Emily?

Emily Stammer (01:38:29)

Nope. Thank you all so much. Looking forward to seeing you all next week. Thanks again.

Soumya Alva (01:38:37)

Thank You