Program Partner logo

ACTION10

RIGHTS&

SCIENCE

Real-time Outcome Planning and Evaluation (ROPE)

Name of program

Program journal EVALUATION Template with guidelines

Photo Action10, 2011

Document information

Document name: Program Journal Template EVALUATION

Author: Assoc Prof Cecilia ÖMAN, Founder of Action10 and Human Rights and Science

File name: Program Journal Template EVALUATION_For sharing

Revision history	Version No.	Date
	1.0	Dec 2010
	2.0	Jan 2013
	3.0	June 2013
	4.0	September 2013
	5.0	October 2013
	6.0	April 2014
This version	7.05 For sharing	August 2015

Summary

Text

Input

Text

Output

Text

Outcome

Text

Impact

Text

Lessons learnt

Text

Notes

This document can be downloaded as PDF from www.action10.org and www.RandS.se
A word document, where the tables can be filled in, can be sent by e-mail, please just contact us at www. RandS.se. If the user is person or an institution from a higher income country then RandS may charge a small fee. RandS may also ask for voluntary contributions for the continuous development of the method. RandS offers in addition training on the use of ROPE and the Ten Actions (Tact).

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The operation builds on a sequence of monitoring and evaluation events, for with dates, participants and results are recorded. Lessons learnt from the monitoring and evaluation exercises are fed into the program design revisions.

The monitoring starts at the same time as the design of the program. The first task is to identify the baseline of the program; the presentation of the situation prior to the start of the program. Progress marker and Ten Action scorings together with the related comments are compiled in the Monitoring data sheet.

Scoring method in short

Please find details about scoring in the appendices.

5	*Excellent*	*90 – 100%*
4	*Good*	*70 – 90%*
3	*Adequate*	*30 – 70 %*
2	*Poor*	*10 – 30 %*
1	*No performance*	*0 – 10 %*

Please note

- *The sign * behind a scoring signifies that the outcome was achieved as a result of the outputs of other actors than the PPs*
- *If the number of Target partners is increasing with time they should be grouped; Group one may for example include the 300 TPs entered the program during a period of two years. If the number of individuals in Target partner group increases with time then the scoring of each group is indicated in the scoring box, separated by commas.*
- *Scoring based on percentage supersedes scoring based on words. Thus, when a progress marker can be assessed with a percentage, then this is what the scoring shall be based on.*

General comments about this evaluation

Text

2. Evaluation events and summaries

Monitoring Baseline - Event No 0

The baseline monitoring informs about the situation prior to the initiation of the program.

Evaluated period:

Notes:

Logistics

Activity	Date of activity	Site / Venue	Persons in charge/attending	Method	Comment
Collecting on-site data				*Field observations and interviews*	
Scoring[1]					

[1] The basic Progress markers were in actual practice monitored after the initiation of the program, thereafter the baseline scoring was in addition added as new Progress markers were included.

State of the art

Evaluation planning Event No 1

Evaluated period: Text…

Notes: Text…

Summary: Text…

Logistics for the evaluation planning session

Activity	Date of activity	Site / Venue	Persons in charge / attending	Method	Comment
Collecting on-site data			Program partner, Action10 volunteer	Field observations, interviews	Addressing outcome challenges, progress markers and Program partner annual report
Scoring				Action Tool	
Evaluation planning session			Program partners together		On-site or skype
			PPs and TPs together		
			PPs and SPs together		
Updating program journal			Cecilia		

Compilation of monitoring data collected on site by PP

Activity	Date of activity	Site / Venue	Persons in charge / attending	Method	Comment
Progress markers scoring and comments			TCPP	Field observations, interviews	See appendix
Proposes new activities addressing Progress markers that scores low			TCPP	Action Tool	
Lessons learnt			TCPP	Action Tool	
Proposed follow-up meetings					If required
Other			PPs and SPs together		
Method of sharing the data with Action10					Face-face meeting, Skype or e-mail

Evaluation planning summary

Activity	Text	Comment
Input		
Coordination with Authorities and NDP		
Funds		
Work hours		
Output		
Workshops	Number of workshops and number of participants in each	
Awareness rising	Number of awareness rising event and number of	

Activity	Text	Comment
event	participants	
Drilled boreholes	Number of boreholes drilled	
Outcome		
Health service provided	Number of persons benefitting from health services in centres built by the program	
Social enterprises initiated	Number of persons running successful enterprises	
Education provided	Number of persons attending school and managing the exams	
Safe drinking water provided	Number of persons benefitting from having access safe drinking water	
Impact		
Life quality improvement	Number of persons claiming they have higher quality of life	Questions and replies must be structured
Policy changes		
Lessons learnt		
Program redesign proposed		Added to DESIGN document / Comment
Follow-up activities proposed		Added to DESIGN document / Comment
Volunteer support needed	Volunteers shall only spend time with the Program partner is a specific need is identified that the volunteer has skills to address	
	FAA coaching	
	Social media coaching	
	Expert knowledge sharing on a specific topic identified by the PPs	
	Training and workshops with the TPs	
	Sharing the workload of daily programs	
Visibility		
	Social media	
	Distributed printed material / annual report	
	Distributed visibility items / pens, hats, T-shirts	
	Media	
	Visibility events	
	Campaigns	
Overall comment		

Summary of Journals

The different Journals are developed in the chapters below, only the different summaries are presented here.

Activity	Text	Comment
Outcome Journal		Often developed by volunteers on-site
Progress markers scoring high[1]		
Progress markers scoring low[1]		
Identify Change(s) of scale		
Strategy map Journal		
Sustainable economy Journal		
Institutional capacity Journal		

[1] During a significant period of time.

Additional information

Activity	Text	Comment

3. Journals

The evaluation planning includes four Journals to structure the procedures; the Outcome, the Strategy map, the Sustainable economy and the Institutional capacity journals.

Outcome journal

The Outcome journal monitors the progress of each Target partner towards the achievement of outcomes. Progress markers scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet, first section, if large in volume. If not so large in volume then the progress markers are compiled in the below table.

Method

1. <u>Score Progress markers</u>
   - Compile the progress markers in the Monitoring Data Sheet, first section (excel), or if the volume is small enough, in the below table (word).
   - Give each Progress marker a running number
   - Compile the scoring of each progress marker
   - Compile short comments adding information to scorings when appropriate
2. <u>Compile outcomes</u>
   and related parameters in the table below

Scoring outcome

Scores 1-5 (1= Low, 5 = High)

Monitoring event No / Scores	1	2	3	4	5	Explanation of the rating
Scores 1-5 (1= Low, 5 = High)						
Target Partner: 1: XX						
Level 1; More easy to achieve						
1.						
2.						
Level 2						
1.						
2.						
Level 3						
1.						
2.						
Target Partner 2:: XX						
Level 1; More easy to achieve						
1.						
2.						
Level 2						
1.						
2.						
Level 3						
1.						
2.						
Target Partner 3:: XX						
Level 1; More easy to achieve						
1.						
2.						
Level 2						
1.						
2.						
Level 3						
1.						
2.						

Outcome journal compilation

Translate the progress marker scoring into words in the Table below.

Achieved outcomes are defined as those scoring 4 and 5, whereas not achieved outcomes are those scoring 1 and 2. Note the Number of the Evaluation event when this outcome was registered and when if the achievement was the result of an intervention by a strategic partner. Present the evidence for achieved and unanticipated outcomes and the assumed reasons for not achieved outcomes:

Activities	Description	Comment	Event No [1]
Achieved outcomes [2]	*Present evidence*	**Evidence**	
Not achieved outcomes [3]	*Present evidence*	**Reason**	
Unanticipated Outcome	*Present evidence and the factor causing the outcome*	**Evidence**	
Achieved outcome by Strategic partner		**Evidence**	
Identify Change(s) of scale	*Give each change a name and number and identify the progress markers it refers to*		
Description of change			
Free text			
Contributing factors			
Contributing actors			
Sources of evidence			
Lessons learnt			
Reactions			
Modifications of DESIGN			

Activities	Description	Comment	Event No [1]
New activities or follow-ups			
Supporting documents	Compilation of supporting documents, such a questionnaires		

[1] Note the Number(s) of the Evaluation event(s) when this outcome was registered

[2] Score 4 and 5

[3] Score 1 and 2

Strategy map journal

The strategy map journal addresses the degree to which the implemented Strategy map responds to the Target partners needs. The generic format includes the outputs (activities undertaken), inputs (resources allocated) including funding, work hours, advice and consultancy; and any required follow-up. It can also be customized to include specific elements that the program wants to monitor.

	Output	Input	Required follow-up	Comment / Evidence	Event No
Strategies implemented				Evidence	
Strategies not implemented				Evidence	
Unanticipated activities				Assumed reason	
Activities resulting from SP interventions					
Lessons learnt					
Reactions					
Changes in strategy map					
Other changes of DESIGN					

Sustainable economy journal

This Journal evaluates the sustainability of the economy. The journal compiles the information from the financial reports.
Sustainable economy scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet, fourth section.

Currency: *Identify currency*
Supporting documents: *Annual financial reports etc*

Financial report summary in numbers

Income

Year	Program partners						Strategic partners				
	Source	Type of income [1]	Amount	Total per year	Activity	Comment	Source	Type of income	Amount	Total per year	Activity

[1] Seed money, investment, interest, sales of products or services provided by Action10 or HRS.

- Action10 support the start up of programs through seed-money. These program costs are expected to be covered by program income and/or the national or local authorities with time.
- The TCPP earns income from the interest of giving out investment capital provided by Action10 l to TPs. Action10 proposes 10% interest. The funds are to be paid back after a time period agreed on by the PPs and TPs together, and is immediately reinvested.   PP can in addition extract 7% of the transfers from Action10 to co-fund program running costs.
- HumanRightsScience provides investment capital for the initiation of social businesses by the TCPP and HRS together. The TCPP is expected to generate an income which will fund or co-fund the local and Swedish running costs of the joint program including salaries. The investment is to be paid back within one year or if otherwise agreed. As soon as funds are re paid it shall be re-invested. The activities can include the selling of local training and coaching on the ActionTools.

Expenditures

Year	Activity	Admin amount[1]	Admin, % [2]	Total per year	Comment

[1]Action10 contribution for co-funding of running costs. TCPP can extract 7% of each transfer from Action10 to co-fund program running costs.

[2] Administration costs used in relation to total amount received from Action10

Balance

Year	Income	Expenditure	Balance	Capital kept on account	Comment

Financial report summary in words

Please, comment on how and if each of the activities or issues mentioned in the table has been successfully incorporated into the program in actual practice. Present the lesson learnt if any. Give each activity a scoring number from 1 to 5 and identify the evaluation session the observation was done. Propose an activity to follow-up on the lesson learnt, and how the follow-up has been implemented in the DESIGN document if is concerns and improvement of the strategy and/or in the Strategy map or other program activity, if it concerns an improvement of the program only. Also indicate an assessment of the importance of the change, score from 1 – 5.

Activity	Description the activity	Lesson learnt	Score[1]	Event No	Follow up activity	Redesign action	Priority
Procedure efficiency							
Business plan outcome							
Income versus expenditures							
Long-term sustainability							
Supporting documents							

[1] Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet. Make the same structure for all Journal compilation

Finance Markers

The Finance Markers reflect status of the sustainable economy situation. The Finance markers must be formulated in a way that they are measurable. They are separated into single units which can be easily measured. They are developed per each of nine business model sections and are scored from one to five during the evaluation.

Give each activity a scoring number from 1 to 5 and identify the evaluation session the observation was done. Propose an activity to follow-up on the lesson learnt, and how the follow-up has been implemented in the DESIGN document if is concerns and improvement of the strategy and/or in the Strategy map or other program activity, if it concerns an improvement of the program only. Also indicate an assessment of the importance of the change, score from 1 – 5. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet.

Activity	Description the activity	Lesson learnt	Score[1]	Event No	Follow up activity	Redesign action	Priority
1. Pitch							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
2. Financial vision							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
3. Summary of the Business Model, the Canvas							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
4. Business Model details							
4.1 Value proposition 4.2 Customer Segments 4.3 Distribution Channels 4.4 Customer Relationships							

Activity	Description the activity	Lesson learnt	Score[1]	Event No	Follow up activity	Redesign action	Priority
4.5 Revenue 4.6 Key Partners 4.7 Key Activities 4.8 Key Resources 4.9 Costs							
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
5. The team							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
6. Risk analysis							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
7. Implementation plan							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
8. Cash flow budget							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							
9. Income statement budget							
Text	Text						
Finance markers **1.** **2.**							

[1] Compile the scoring of the previous performance. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet. Make the same structure for all Journal compilations.

More detailed information

Certain activities may benefit from a more detailed explanation than what is presented in the overall Table. Please, then address the below questions.

- Activity to be evaluated: *Text*
- Description of the Activity: *What did you do? With whom? When?*
- Effectiveness: *Text*
- Efficiency: *Text*
- Sustainability: *Text*
- Outputs: *Program Follow-up or Changes required*
- Lessons learnt: *Text*
- Reactions: *Text*
- How well have we done? : *Text*
- How can we improve? : *Text*

Institutional capacity journal

This journal presents the Institutional capabilities of the partner organisations to host the program. Certain aspects are jointly addressed and others are addressed per Institution.

Institutional capacity scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet, third section.

Ten Actions Journal

Comment on how each of the Ten Actions is incorporated into the program in general.

No	Ten Action / Comment / Action marker
1	**Needs driven program**
	- was initiated and designed by the TPs and how the TPs have full ownership. *- addresses the NDP.* *- addresses the UN agreements on human rights.*
2	**Equal partnership**
	- shares equally responsibilities, benefits, work load and finances. *- values equally expertise and experiences.* *- appoints the partner best suited to address each activity* .
3	**Real-time Evaluation planning**
	- collects monitoring data and monitors real-time. *- evaluates real-time.* *- re-designs from lessons learnt real-time and implements the changes in actual practice.* *- produces reports real-time.* .
4	**Strategic partnership**
	- has developed a strategy for SPs *- has identified relevant SPs* *- stays in contact with and keeps the SPs updated about program development* *- invites Ministries to collaborate* *- invites other relevant SPs to collaborate* *- negotiates lower costs with relevant SPs* .
5	**Institutional capacity**
	- addresses vision, mission and strategy *- has organizational skills* *- has a organizational structure* *- addresses its Institutional culture* *- arranges Institutional capacity assessment with board staff and volunteers*
6	**Sustainable economy**
	-avoids being donor driven or dependent on grants *-ensures appropriate finance administration and accounting* *-incorporates social enterprising* *- finds opportunities to be financed through the NDP*
7	**Quality values**
	- keeps quality values high in all activities *-addresses truth, trust, harmony and equity* *- ensured that stakeholder's motives are international development results and nothing else*
8	**Resilience**
	-ensures that despite challenges that may occur, the stakeholders find solutions, stick to the goal of the program and remain resilient, until the expected impact is achieved.
9	**Knowledge sharing**
	-develops and implement a strategy for collective knowledge sharing as knowledge sharing and that the collective knowledge is far beyond in quality than single persons or few people's capacities *- has access to Internet and knowledge about social media*
10	**Visibility**
	-shares quality information and with quality means

Actions Markers

The Actions Markers reflect directly the Ten Actions. The markers address outcomes rather than outputs. The Actions markers must be formulated in a way that they are measurable. They are separated into single units which can be easily measured. They are developed per each of the Ten Actions and follow the discussion on each Action.

Give each activity a scoring number from 1 to 5 and identify the evaluation session the observation was done. Propose an activity to follow-up on the lesson learnt, and how the follow-up has been implemented in the DESIGN document if is concerns and improvement of the strategy and/or in the Strategy map or other program activity, if it concerns an improvement of the program only. Also indicate an assessment of the importance of the change, score from 1 – 5. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet.

Activity	Description the activity	Lesson learnt	Score[1]	Event No	Follow up activity	Redesign action	Priority
1. Needs driven program							
Text	Text						
Action markers 1. 2.							
2. Equal partnership							
Action markers 1. 2.							
3. Real-time evaluation planning							
On-site monitoring							
Action markers 1. 2.							
4. Strategic partnership							
Action							

markers **1.** **2.**	
5. Institutional capacity	
Administration cost	*Action10 transfers 97% of funds raised for this program directly to the TCPP. Admin costs in Sweden are covered by the by the remaining 3%.*
	The TCPP distributes 93% of funds transferred for this program to the Target partners. Operating costs in TC are co-financed by the by the remaining 7%.
Management	
Staff and volunteers	*Staff and volunteers allocated for each task in the activity plan, training and experience*
Physical infrastructure	*Physical infrastructure available to support each activity in the Activity plan, including office space, computers, internet and transportation*
Action markers **1.** **2.**	
6. Sustainable economy	
Balance income / cost	
Action markers **1.** **2.**	
Action markers **1.** **2.**	
7. Quality values	
Action	

markers **1.** **2.**
8. Resilience
Action markers **1.** **2.**
9. Knowledge sharing
Training of staff and volunteers
Action markers **1.** **2.**
10. Visibility

[1] Compile the scoring of the previous performance. Scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet. Make the same structure for all Journal compilations.

More detailed information

Certain activities may benefit from a more detailed explanation than what is presented in the overall Table. Please, then address the below questions.

- Capacity to be evaluated: *Text*
- Description of Capacity: *What did you do? With whom? When?*
- Effectiveness: *Text*
- Efficiency: *Text*
- Sustainability: *Text*
- Outputs: *Program Follow-up or Changes required*
- Lessons learnt: *Text*
- Reactions: *Text*
- How well have we done? : *Text*
- How can we improve? : *Text*

4. Appendix

Monitoring guidelines

Appendix 1
Monitoring data collection

Data can be collected in a variety of ways. The ActionTools is primarily working according to the below methods.

Data collection on-site and EP meetings

The PPs are continuously collecting data as they work on-site with the TPs. They carry a sheet of the Progress markers and add to the sheet scores and comments related to the scores. This is a crucial work and requires persons being appointed for the task to also be provided with the documents, with necessary resources and with training and coached on the method.

The TCPP Office adds the other scores in the MONITORING DATA Excel sheet real-time.

Once a year or more often the PPs meet to do Outcome and Impact ASSESSMENT and Assessment follow-ups. The follow-ups include program design revisions and the development and distribution of Program Reports.

Separate surveys

Under certain conditions surveys are carried out. The tools used as Monkey survey, paper questionnaires, Excel sheets with Pivot tables.

Database

For large programs databases are constructed.

Appendix 2
Scoring method

Score	In words	In percent (%)	Comment
5	Excellent	90 – 100	
4	Good	70 – 90	
3	Adequate	30 – 70	
2	Poor	10 – 30	
1	No performance	0 – 10	

Please note

- The sign * behind a scoring signifies that the outcome was achieved as a result of the outputs of other actors than the PPs
- If the number of Target partners is increasing with time they should be grouped; Group one may for example include the 300 TPs entered the program during a period of two years. If the number of individuals in Target partner group increases with time then the scoring of each group is indicated in the scoring box, separated by commas.
- Scoring based on percentage supersedes scoring based on words. Thus, when a progress marker can be assessed with a percentage, then this is what the scoring shall be based on.
- The scoring can be developed at three levels; per individual, per group of individual and per program.

What each scoring number represents

The meaning of each scoring number has been borrowed from the Rubrics method (Davidson 2011)

- **Excellent (5):** The performance is clearly very strong or exemplary in relation to the progress marker statement. Any gaps or weaknesses are not significant and are managed effectively.
- **Good (4):** Performance is generally strong in relation to the statement. No significant gaps or weaknesses, and less significant gaps or weaknesses are mostly managed effectively.
- **Adequate (3):** Performance is inconsistent in relation to the statement. Some gaps or weaknesses. Meets minimum expectations/ requirements as far as can be determined.
- **Poor (2):** Performance is unacceptably weak in relation to the statement. It does not meet the minimum expectations or requirements.
- **No performance/ insufficient (1):** There is no performance at all or the evidence is unavailable to determine performance.

When performing the scoring e.g., what evidence led the evaluators to assess the performance as “generally strong”(good) – as opposed to “clearly very strong or exemplary” (excellent) or “inconsistent” (adequate) (Davidson 2011). The evaluation can preferably **include the most important examples of both positive and negative evidence**. Similarly, what were the gaps or weaknesses, and why for example should they be considered “not significant” (good)?, based on what? As for “less significant gaps or weaknesses are mostly managed effectively” (good), what, specifically, is the stakeholder doing to manage gaps and weaknesses, and why do the evaluators consider this “effective management” in most or all instances?

The issue of subjectivity

The scoring obviously intends to avoid “subjectivity”. Davidson (2011) claims there are the three kinds of ‘subjectivity’.

1. Arbitrary, idiosyncratic, unreliable, and/or highly personal (i.e., based on personal preferences and/or cultural biases)
2. Assessment or interpretation by a person, rather than a machine or measurement device, of something external to that person (e.g., expert judgment of others’ skills or performance)
3. About a person’s inner life or experiences (e.g., headaches, fears, beliefs, emotions, stress levels, aspirations), all absolutely real but not usually independently verifiable Plus the red herring: subjective vs. objective measures.

Appendix 3
Evaluation planning journals

The evaluation planning journals include the Outcome, the Strategy map, the Sustainable economy and the Institutional capacity journals.

Outcome journal

The Outcome journal monitors the progress of each Target partner towards the achievement of outcomes. Progress markers scorings together with clarifying comments are compiled in the Monitoring Data sheet, first section, if large in volume. If not so large in volume then the progress markers are compiled in the below table.

Progress markers selected for the monitoring:
As presented in the DESIGN document.

Scoring method: Action10 scoring method
Complementary scoring method besides ActionTool: *Text*
Notes: *Text*

Method

1. Scoring of Progress markers
   a. Compile the progress markers in the Monitoring Data Sheet, first section (excel), or if the volume is small enough, in the below table (word).
   b. Give each Progress marker a running number
   c. Compile the scoring of each progress marker
   d. Compile short comments adding information to scorings when appropriate
2. Registering outcomes
   a. Compile achieved outcomes
      i. What evidence demonstrates this change in terms of outcome?
   b. Compile not achieve outcomes
      i. Which revision seems necessary to achieve the outcomes?
   c. Compile unanticipated outcomes if any
3. Compile Descriptions of Change
   a. Identifying the progress marker´s number(s) it refers to
   b. Compile contributing factors and actors as well as sources of evidence
4. Compile lessons and reactions
5. Identify the appropriate program design changes

To track progress over time, an outcome journal is established for each Target Partner that the program has identified as a priority. The Outcome journal used is a modified version of the Outcome Mapping tool developed by Earl, Carden et al. (2001).

Direct learning from the monitoring exercises should be fed into the program design revisions.

Base line

The monitoring starts at the same time as the design of the program. The first task is to identify the baseline of the program; the presentation of the situation prior to the start of the program. Progress marker and Ten Action scorings together with the related comments are compiled in the Monitoring data sheet.

Progress markers

The progress markers are graduated, and some of them, particularly those listed under “level 2 and 3”, describe a complex behaviour that is difficult to categorize as “having occurred” or “not having occurred.” Although many of the progress markers could be the subject of an in-depth evaluation themselves, this is not their intended purpose (Earl, Carden et al. 2001). The progress markers are not developed as a lockstep description of how the change process must occur; rather, they describe the major milestones that would indicate progress towards the achievement of the outcome challenge. The purpose of the progress markers in monitoring is to systematize the collection of data on the Target Partners' accomplishments. These details should be viewed as the richness of the results, not as check-marks to be obtained.

The Progress markers articulate the results that the program has helped to achieve (Earl, Carden et al. 2001). They do so by tracking and discussing trends in the behaviours of the Target Partners. Although there is not a cause-and-effect relationship between the program's actions and changes in the Target Partner, by compiling information using the outcome journal, the program will better understand how its actions do, or do not, influence its Target Partners. With this information, the program will be able to improve its own performance and encourage its Target Partners to achieve deeper levels of transformation. The program will also be creating records of observed changes. These records can periodically be synthesized to tell the story of influence and change relative to areas of interest or achievement.

The purpose with the Action Evaluation planning Tool is to avoid focusing on outputs until these have been identified by the Target partners. The dream, the mission, the Outcome challenges and Progress markers all address the wish of the Target partners to be able to do certain things to improve their livelihood or operations. Only in the Strategy map do outputs appear.

Theory of Change

Theory of Change (ToC) is a specific type of methodology for planning, participation, and evaluation that is used in the philanthropy, not-for-profit and government sectors to promote social change[1]. Theory of Change defines long-term goals and then maps backward to identify necessary preconditions. The innovation of Theory of Change lies (1) in making the distinction between desired and actual outcomes, and (2) in requiring stakeholders to model their desired outcomes before they decide on forms of intervention to achieve those outcomes. Theory of Change is a form of critical theory that ensures a transparent distribution of power dynamics. Further, the process is necessarily inclusive of many perspectives and participants in achieving solutions.

[1] Theory of Change emerged from the field of program theory and program evaluation in the mid 1990s as a new way of analyzing the theories motivating programs and initiatives working for social and political change. Theory of Change as a concept has strong roots in a number of disciplines, including environmental and organizational psychology, but has also increasingly been connected to sociology and political science.[6]

Strategy map journal

The Strategy of Action10 is based on the premises that the program has to be prepared to change along with its Target partners. The Strategy map will need to continuously be revised in order to respond to its Target Partners' changing needs. In order to provide the program with a systematic way to monitor its activities, so that it can think strategically about its contributions and modify its activities as required the Strategy map is assessed real-time.

The Strategy map journal records data on the strategy being employed to provide the means necessary for the Target partners to reach their Dreams. It is filled out during the program's regular Evaluation planning meetings. Although it can be customized to include specific elements that the program wants to monitor, the generic format includes the resources allocated (inputs), the activities undertaken, the outputs, and any required follow-up.

Sustainable economy journal

The Finance Markers reflect status of the sustainable economy situation. The Finance markers are developed per each of nine business model sections and are scored from one to five during the evaluation

Institutional capacity journal

The journal records data on how the institution managing the program is operating fulfil the mission of the program. The Institutional capacity assessment concerns the section of the Institution managing the addressed program.

The institutional journal as a whole includes a variety of components and the Program needs to make prioritisations. The Program may choose only a few parameters at the start of the Program with the aim of increasing the number of parameters with time. Institutional capacity scoring is done annually with all staff and volunteers attending a one – five day meeting. Below is compiled a selection of parameters, whereas a more elaborated compilation of parameters is available as one of the ActionTools.

Ten Actions

All PPs ensure that the Ten Actions are addressed fully in all procedures and all programs

Evaluation planning

The revisions in any of the Program Parameters are recorded together with dates and the decision makers.

Knowledge sharing

All PPs shall manage social media such as website and facebook.

Finance administration and accounting

Action10 has developed guidelines presenting international standards. All Program Partners have agreed to follow the international standards. PPs can provide training and coaching. All PPs ensure full transparency in all procedures and all programs

Program revisions

The level of the incorporation of results from Impact assessment sessions into revised programs is monitored.

Staff

Each PP has to have at least one “program manager” who is responsible for the activities on site as well as the real-time monitoring and evaluation planning. Each PP must also have a financial manager who is responsible for the finance administration and accounting as well as the agreements between the PPs.

Develop and maintain policy for; Keeping staff and volunteers trained, motivated, aware of tasks, responsibilities and obligations.

Countering conflicts

Each PP may develop, update and implement when appropriate a conflict resolution strategy.

Appendix 4
Definitions

The ActionTool Evaluation planning addresses a logical relationship between the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact of a program. The purpose is (as with any logical model) to assess the causal relationships between the elements of the program; if the resources are available for a program, then the activities can be implemented, if the activities are implemented successfully then outputs are provided and certain and outcomes can be expected short term and an impact can be expected long-term.

The ActionTool Evaluation planning uses the below definitions:

Inputs: The resources that are invested in a program, e.g. money, staff and equipment.

Activities: The activities the program undertakes, e.g. development and distribution of materials, awareness raising sessions, training programs or coaching.

Outputs: What is produced through those activities, e.g. number of booklets produced, workshops held, people trained.

Outcomes: The changes or benefits that result from the program, e.g. increased skills, knowledge, awareness, confidence and motivation; leading to e.g. higher ration of school attendance and exams passed, new business establishments, employments and promotions.

Impacts: Structural changes that result from the program at the local, regional or national level, e.g. practices, decisions and policies with social, economic, environmental implications, e.g. local authorities ensures that all children go to school and that all schools provide quality education or facilitates the establishment of new businesses.

Appendix 5
Assessment in theory

The assessment shall help us to improve the program where weaknesses as well as identify what we did well and ensure to keep this.

The purpose of both monitoring and evaluation is to base management and programming decisions on systematically collected data. Using monitoring journals, the program can gather information that is broad in coverage rather than deep in detail. By conducting an evaluation, the program can choose a strategy, issue, or relationship to study and assess in depth.

There will never be sufficient time and resources for a program to evaluate everything, therefore priorities should be set and choices made. Regardless of the evaluation issue selected, however, the program first needs to devise an evaluation plan carefully so that resources are allocated wisely and the evaluation findings are useful. The program needs to be clear about the identification of clients for the in-depth evaluation and ensure their participation in the process. The Impact assessment stage offers a process by which a program can do this. The program will not necessary complete the evaluation plan during the Assessment meetings; it can be developed at any point, whenever the program is preparing to begin an evaluation process.

The assessment plan provides a short description of the main elements of the evaluation to be conducted by the program. It outlines the evaluation issue, the way findings will be used, the questions, the information sources, the assessment methods, the assessment team, the dates for the assessment, and the approximate cost. The information in the assessment plan will guide the evaluation design and, if the program has decided to use an external evaluator, it can be used to set the terms of reference for the contract. Discussing the various elements of the assessment plan will help the program to plan an assessment that will provide useful findings. Whether the assessment is a formal requirement or not, the program should ensure that it is relevant to its needs, in order not to waste human and financial resources.

The program needs to plan for utilisation, because utilisation does not necessarily follow naturally from the results.

The assessment is the most straightforward element of a program, and the politics of getting findings used is a key challenge in a program. The information needs of the Primary user of the assessment findings are paramount. The primary user must attend the session when the group is developing the evaluation plan. Getting the Primary user involved in the evaluation process from the planning phase will focus data collection activities on the critical issues and prevent the waste of human and financial resources. Regular involvement of the Primary throughout the phases of data collection and analysis will test the validity of the findings and increase the likelihood of their utilisation. Utilisation is the ultimate purpose of the impact assessment, therefore this “front-end” work should be given due attention, whether the program is conducting a self-assessment or responding to external pressure.

The Primary user of ActionTool Program assessments is most often the local, regional and/or national authorities.

Appendix 6
Real-time assessment in actual practice

It is important to review the logic of the program periodically to ensure that it remains relevant. Based on practical experience, the program looks at whether new Target Partners have been added; whether others have been dropped; and whether the vision, mission, outcome challenges, and progress markers still make sense. If for example the progress markers are no longer appropriate indicators of change, then they should be revised to reflect the new conditions. In this way, the program will be gathering information on the changing context, and will have information about unexpected results in the Target Partner. The changes in program logic can then be made to the documentation. Strategic partners can well contribute to this review.

Frequency

Face to face or well prepared multi stakeholder Skype meetings are arranged at least once a year, but preferably twice a year or more.

Direct communication is arranged at least once a month using Skype, telephone or e-mails.

Appendix 7
External evaluation

Evaluation Issue

Date (start & finish)

Who will use the evaluation? How? When?

Questions

Information sources

Evaluation methods

Who will conduct and manage the evaluation?

Cost

5. References

Brundin, C., (2014). Ownership and Equal Partnership, A study of donor-receiver relationships in two development programs in rural Togo. Independent Research Project in Political Science, International Master's Programme in Political Science, Department of Political Science, Stockholm University.

Davidson, J. E. (2011). "Evaluative Rubrics: The Basics." The Rubric Revolution. 2011, from http://kinnect.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/AES-2011-Rubric-Revolution-Davidson-Wehipeihana-McKegg-xx.pdf.

Earl, S., et al. (2001). Outcome Mapping; Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs. I. D. R. C. (IDRC). Ottawa, Canada.

ITAD Ltd (2010) Evaluation of the Sida institutional support to the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) as member of the evaluation team. Report. www.itad.com

ITAD Ltd (2012). Evaluation of the PRISM (Procurement, Installation, Service, Maintenance and Use of Scientific Equipment) project in Nigeria. Report, ITAD Ltd, East Sussex, UK. http://www.ifs.se/IFS/Documents/Publications/Evaluations/2012%20IFS-PRISM%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf

McKinsey. (2001). Effective Capacity Building in Nonprofit Organizations. Prepared for Venture Philanthropy Partners.

Öman, C. B., K. S. Gamaniel, et al. (2006). Properly functioning scientific equipment in developing countries. Anal Chem 78(15): 5273-6.

Öman, B. C., Edward, R., Gamaniel, K.S., Klutsé, A., Eriksson, S., Hovmöller, H., Feresu, S., Gurib-Fakim, A. (2008) Procurement, Installation, Service and Maintenance Commitments for Scientific Equipment in Developing Countries – PRISM, Phase One, Inventory of the current status of equipment and scientific infrastructure at selected universities in Africa and specification of what additional resources would be instrumental in strengthening scientific capacity. International Foundation for Science, Stockholm, Sweden, info@ifs.se

Öman, C. B. (2009 a). The Ten Actions (Tact). Report. Action10, Stockholm, Sweden. www.Action10.org. Info.Action10.org.

Öman, C. B. (2009 b). Real-time Outcome Planning and Evaluation (ROPE) Program Journal DESIGN. Template with Guidelines, Action10 ; RandS, Stockholm, Sweden. www.Action10.org; www.RandS.se

Öman, C. B. (2009 c). Real-time Outcome Planning and Evaluation (ROPE) Program Journal EVALUATION. Template with Guidelines, Action10 ; RandS, Stockholm, Sweden. www.Action10.org; www.RandS.se

Öman, C. B. (2015 a). The PRISM Concept. Report. www.PRISMscientific.org

Öman, C. B. (2015b). PRISM Financial plan, Guidelines. www.PRISMscientific.org

Öman, C. B. (2015c). PRISM Operation Plan, Guidelines, www.PRISMscientific.org

Öman, C. B. (2015d). PRISM Support Services , Guidelines. www.PRISMscientific.org

Öman, C. B. (2015e). PSAN Institutional framework. Report. www.PRISMscientific.org

Öman, C.B.; Robert, P. (2015) Integration Innovations. Report. www.RandS.se, Facebook Theembassy Embassy.

Öman, C.B. (2016a) Scientific Innovations. Report. www.RandS.se

Öman, C.B. (2016b) The Innovation Centers. Report. www.RandS.se

Öman, C.B. (in preparation) Lessons learnt from Aid.