

Evaluation Frameworks

For Social Justice Philanthropy:

A Review of Available Resources

Draft – June 3, 2008



Consulting for the
Ford Foundation Working Group on Philanthropy for Social Justice

Abstract

Evaluation Frameworks for Social Justice Philanthropy: A Review of Available Resources is a report dedicated to answering the question, “How can anyone tell whether, and how, social justice efforts are successful?”

The *Review* sharpens this question by defining “social justice” and sketching some of the distinctive features of social justice efforts that should be considered as part of an evaluation. In short narratives and in a matrix that enables easy comparison, the *Review* also provides descriptions of fourteen of the most frequently used and/or promising frameworks that have been employed to evaluate social justice efforts throughout the world. These descriptions focus on the distinctive features of each framework, and provide preliminary considerations that might help users choose one framework over another: for example, their topical focus; appropriateness to relatively simple, or complex, efforts; relative focus on pre-planned vs. emergent outcomes; accessibility to people who are not experts in evaluation; and associated tools. An extensive bibliography provides references to Internet-accessible materials on each of these frameworks, as well as other many other materials related to social justice philanthropy and its evaluation.

Intended audiences for this publication include the staff and board members of grantmaking institutions, individual donors, and professional evaluators, as well as those who design, implement, and evaluate social justice programming within organizations that receive philanthropic support.

Table of Contents

I. Social Justice Philanthropy: Unity and Diversity	4
II. The Importance of Social Justice Evaluation	5
III. Challenges to Evaluating Social Justice Philanthropy, and Emerging Points of Agreement	6
IV. Evaluation Frameworks that are used for Evaluation of Social Justice Efforts	8
ActionAid	8
Alliance for Justice	10
Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services – Advocacy and Policy	12
Composite Logic Model (Harvard Family Research Project)	14
Constituency Voice (Keystone)	16
Continuous Progress (Center for Global Interdependence, Aspen Institute)	19
Evaluating the Effects of International Advocacy Networks	21
Initiative Evaluation (W.K. Kellogg Foundation)	23
Logical Framework Approach	25
Making Connections (Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services)	26
Making the Case (Women’s Funding Network)	28
Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment	31
The California Endowment / Blueprint Research & Design, Inc.	33
Urban Institute and The Center for What Works	36
V. Information Clearinghouses	37
VI. Bibliography of Resources Available on the Internet	38
Appendix: Summary of Evaluation Frameworks for Social Justice Philanthropy	

I. Social Justice Philanthropy: Unity and Diversity

For the purposes of this *Review*, “social justice” is defined as activity that centers on making power relations in a given community or society more equitable over an extended period of time, and “philanthropy” is defined as the giving of money, time, and talent to support activities that are deemed to be in the public interest.¹

Social justice is pursued through many different types of activities, including, but not limited to the following:

- *Administrative advocacy*, focused on ensuring that legislation is implemented in ways that promote equity;
- *Civic engagement* activities, which are intended to help people be more adept at taking advantage of the powers afforded by their political systems to affect public policy;
- *Community organizing*, which takes many forms and is often centered around mobilizing stakeholders – or preparing them for mobilization when the right opportunities arise – and enabling them to express their perspectives to decision-makers;
- *Infrastructure development* for institutions that carry out social justice work, or intend to;
- *Judicial advocacy and litigation*, which argue for the interpretation and implementation of laws in ways that systematically promote equity, within courts of law;
- *Leadership training* for people who promote social justice or whose perspectives have been marginalized;
- *Legislative advocacy*, intended to introduce and eventually pass laws intended to make societies more equitable;
- *Mass communications* efforts that broaden the circle of people who are aware of, and care about, social justice concerns;
- *Movement-building*, which expands community capacity and enthusiasm to engage in social justice activity over the long term;
- *Policy analysis*, which involves the examination of proposed and enacted legislation and policies, with a view towards their impact on social justice in a broader legal and/or policy framework;
- *Public educational efforts* that increase the capacity of individuals to make well-informed decisions about social justice issues; and
- *Research and information dissemination* that documents and analyzes the character and root causes of inequality or unequal access to opportunity.

Promoting social justice is at the heart of much of the best philanthropic activity – whether its practitioners refer to it that way or not. In a broad sense, all personal and organizational efforts that are directed towards addressing root causes that prevent others from getting a “fair shake” can be included in the category of social justice philanthropy, and as such the concept is enshrined in such widely admired and influential documents as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, national constitutions, and religious texts. Social justice philanthropy is fully consistent with our intentions to “make the world a better place,” and to ensure “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” and “liberty, equality and brotherhood” for all. It is animated by values such as fairness, equality of opportunity, and respect for the dignity and rights of all individuals. At the same time, social justice philanthropy seeks to realign power relationships within dynamic

systems in which people, communities, and institutions compete for resources, and in that sense it is politically meaningful.

Many different strategies for promoting social justice have been adopted, and many of them are not explicitly framed in terms of “social justice.” Depending upon the context – including the political, cultural and social systems in question, and the character of the donor and recipient or implementing partner – social justice philanthropy might be framed narrowly, to support, for example, a specific disenfranchised community to achieve a concrete goal; or broadly, to help communities reach higher levels of democratic participation in ways that can benefit all concerned. Similarly, social justice philanthropy can be focused at every level of scale: from the dynamics of personal family relationships, to the determinants of international policy.

Beyond a focus on promoting equity, however, most if not all varieties of social justice philanthropy help people to participate in achieving justice for themselves and their communities. In addition, they focus on transforming systems that perpetuate injustice – or on strengthening systems that nurture justice – rather than exclusively on remedying specific instances of injustice.

Both of these characteristics – building the *capacities* of the disenfranchised to seek justice, and transforming dynamic *systems* – have significant consequences for determining the effectiveness of social justice philanthropy.

II. The Importance of Social Justice Evaluation

Effective evaluations open opportunities for accelerated learning and the generation of enthusiasm, as well as greater accountability, among social justice practitioners and philanthropists, especially when results are provided during project cycles. Not only can they inform mid-term course corrections, but they can also provide encouragement to people who may become disheartened because it is difficult to see complex systems change in real time without systematic investigation and reflection.

Effective evaluations are also important tools for demonstrating to existing and would-be supporters that social justice philanthropy produces concrete results; that despite the long-term investments required and the complexity of the transformations that are sought, it incrementally creates lasting change that can be observed in the lives of specific people and communities. Effective and trustworthy communications efforts rely on accurate information, and accurate information relies, to a great degree, on effective evaluation.

On a more basic level, effective evaluations can enable all partners in social justice work – funders as well as activists – to determine *if, to what extent, and how* their assumptions and strategies lead to the results that they are committed to achieving, and help them transform their own assumptions and strategies to better reflect reality. While, arguably, social justice efforts cannot be effective without the best intentions, those good intentions are no substitute for empirically verified knowledge. Increasingly, those who strive for social justice are eager to learn how they can validate and refine their philosophies and strategies.

III. Challenges to Evaluating Social Justice Philanthropy, and Emerging Points of Agreementⁱⁱ

The principal challenges of evaluating social justice philanthropy derive from features that are inherent in promoting social equity – or, as Irene Guijt (2007[a]: 10) notes, any variety of transformational “social change.” In her words, “Five interlinked features of social change have particularly significant implications for how assessment and learning take place. These are:

- nonlinear and unpredictable;
- multiple efforts on multiple fronts;
- the fuzzy boundaries of social change;
- the difficulty of recognising ‘valid’ results; and
- the long term nature of social change.”

These features, and challenges associated with them, are widely recognized in literature focused on the evaluation of social justice efforts. In general, the importance of making allowances for each of them is magnified as social justice efforts become more complex.

Social justice efforts are nonlinear and unpredictable: According to Guijt (ibid: 10), “Progress towards social justice ... does not follow a linear or predictable trajectory, with certainty beforehand about the impact and the most effective route... [social justice efforts entail] complex change processes [that are] multi-dimensional and resulting from multiple actions and circumstances, involving a mix of intentional and opportunistic actions. Furthermore, the shifting nature of challenges faced, with some obstacles fading while others surface, make a rigid plan of action or accountability on specific results a potential hindrance to strategic efforts. There must be space for seizing the moment and unanticipated innovations.”

To some degree, all of the evaluation frameworks described below seek to achieve a balance between attention to planned courses of action and/or theories of change (see below), on the one hand; and attention to the ability of social justice practitioners to make use of unanticipated opportunities, as well as recover from unforeseeable set-backs, on the other. In order to ensure basic accountability, an evaluation might focus – in whole or in part – on evaluating whether courses of action to which grantees had committed were carried out, and whether those efforts were effective within the context of the grantee’s control. Or, in order to strengthen an effort and draw general lessons, an evaluation might focus – in whole or in part – on assessing whether an effort’s theory of change accurately reflected the course of a social justice project. Alternatively, in order to assess the resiliency and creativity of an effort’s leaders and grassroots base, an evaluation might focus – in whole or in part – on evaluating how unforeseeable opportunities were taken advantage of. These might all be useful approaches, depending on the anticipated use of the evaluation.

Social justice efforts entail multiple efforts on multiple fronts: As Guijt (ibid: 11) states, “The system-wide change that is being strived for requires efforts by and depends on multiple groups on diverse fronts; hence the merit of attributing impact is highly questionable.”

In general, the frameworks below distinguish between actions, products, and outcomes that can be “attributed” to specific actors, versus those that can be described in terms of meaningful “contributions” from multiple actors.

Social justice efforts often have “fuzzy boundaries”: It can be difficult to determine which phenomena that are apparently related to social justice work are meaningful for evaluation. It can also be difficult to determine the extent of the social network involved in a social justice effort.

The evaluation frameworks described below generally rely on a social justice effort’s implicit or explicit “theory of change” to guide the determination of which phenomena are relevant for evaluation and why. According to Jane Reisman et al. (2007: 11), “A theory of change typically addresses the set of linkages among strategies, outcomes and goals that support a broader mission or vision, along with the underlying assumptions that are related to these linkages... The process [of developing a theory of change] is based on the involvement of selected stakeholders who collaborate in a process of developing agreement about the pathway for achieving their collective vision.” Several of the frameworks described below place strong emphasis on explicitly developing theories of change at the beginning of project periods, using them to guide implementation and evaluation planning, revisiting and revising them in light of mid-term evaluation, and using them to structure a summative (or end-of-term) evaluation.

The analysis of social networks has received less attention in evaluation frameworks that have been applied to social justice efforts. Social Network Analysis might offer opportunities for evaluators to identify patterns of relationships (between individuals and institutions) that mark successful “movements,” as well as developmental stages of movement-building that could inform strategic planning (cf. Krebs et al. 2002). Guidance on the evaluation of “community organizing” is notably scarce in the frameworks described below. Attention to how networks do – or do not – develop and function effectively (regardless of topical focus) could enrich the field.

It is often difficult to recognize “valid” results in social justice efforts: Guijt (2007[a]: 11) states that “recognizing a valid result requires valuing efforts along the way.” All of the evaluation frameworks described below advocate the measurement of “steps along a path” – with the “path” referring to the theory of change leading to a long-term goal, and the “steps” representing interim outcomes or benchmarks.

Social justice efforts require long-term attention: Transforming systems so that they promote greater equity is a long-term proposition. Despite hundreds of years of work, slavery continues to exist in forms such as human trafficking and abusive servitude, low-income people throughout the world lack access to effective health care, and women continue to suffer spousal abuse. Despite the best efforts of philanthropists and activists, such injustices might not be entirely eradicated within even the next several hundred years. Nevertheless, philanthropists and activists cannot ignore slavery, lack of access to health care, or misogyny. Instead, they must remain committed – and supported – in their efforts to stamp out social injustice over time frames that extend beyond even the most expansive funding periods. And the evaluation of social justice must reflect this reality – for example, by focusing on the assessment of

benchmarks and outcomes that gain meaning through their relationships to theories of change that are periodically revisited and refined, and by focusing on the pursuit of social justice as a *process* as much as a progression of *products*. These principles motivate all of the frameworks described below, in one way or another.

One additional point of agreement is generally typical of the frameworks described below: *Evaluation should reflect the fact that effective social justice efforts require strong institutions and activists*. Capacity building – in terms of organizational development, leadership training, accountability to constituents, and so on – is an important focus of social justice evaluation.

IV. Evaluation Frameworks that are used to Evaluate Social Justice Efforts

ActionAid

Intended Users: Decision-makers in the NGO sector interested in advocacy.

Social Justice Focus: “Advocacy includes a whole range of tactics such as influencing, lobbying, campaigning, demonstrations, boycotts, etc.” (Chapman 2002: 48).

Characterization: The ActionAid framework urges users to incorporate “different dimensions of success” in monitoring and evaluating advocacy. In addition, it introduces categories of outcomes that could be relevant to such evaluation.

The “different dimensions of success” discussed include the following (ibid: 49-50):

- “*Balancing advocacy work and capacity building* ... [because] without strong systems or NGOs/grassroots groups able to hold government accountable, policy victories can be short-lived.”
- “*Changing public opinion and social norms* ... [since] policy changes on their own are rarely enough to ensure changes in people’s lives.”
- “*Recognizing trade-offs*,” such as the need for community organizing and policy advocacy. “Recognizing there may be trade-offs is a start. But there is the additional issue of who makes decisions when trade-offs need to be made. If NGO advocacy is planned in isolation these trade-offs may not be recognized or given priority: de facto it is likely to be the tactics of the larger, better resourced, and better linked organizations that win out. There is a need to recognize political dynamics within and between civil society groups, and work to ensure systems to enable transparency and participatory decision making.”

Categories of intermediate and long-term outcomes proposed by ActionAid include the following (ibid: 50-51):

- *Policy change*: “Policy advocacy is the process in which a group or groups apply a set of skills and techniques for the purpose of influencing public decision making.”

- *Strengthening civil society*: “The results in this dimension refer to the increased advocacy capacity of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to hold those in power accountable, also the increased capacity of CSOs to work together in advocacy networks at the local, national, and international level, and the increased advocacy capacity of these networks. Issues of transparency, participation, and power within advocacy networks are very relevant here.”
- *Supporting people centered policy making*: “People centered policy making is a process by which the community becomes aware of its rights and develops the confidence, skills, and organization to speak out to demand or negotiate them.”
- *Enlarging the space in which civil society groups can effectively operate in society*: “This dimension looks at whether the effort has increased the access and influence of disenfranchised groups such as women in debates and decision making, or strengthened the accountability of state institutions to civil society groups.”

A 2001 publication outlines the ways in which the ActionAid approach builds on those of the Institute for Development Research (IDR, now part of World Education), the Catholic Institute for International Relations (CIIR, now Progressio), and the New Economics Foundation (NEF). In addition, that publication draws from other sources to provide guidance and questions for evaluation into each of the outcome categories listed above.

With respect to the *Policy Dimension* ActionAid discusses the following topics:

- Process evaluation: “Some suggest that the best way to deal with the challenge of monitoring and evaluating the policy dimension of advocacy is to place a greater emphasis on process of evaluation or looking at how well the NGO is carrying out the tasks it has set itself” (Chapman and Wameyo 2001: 23).
- Pathways of influence: “The pathways of influence approach is similar to the process evaluation approach in that it helps teams develop conceptual clarity about whom they are trying to influence, how they will go about this ... and what they should monitor to assess progress” (ibid: 25).
- Proximate indicators (ibid: 26)
- Stages of policy success (ibid: 28)
- Project-out or context-in: “Process evaluation and proximate indicators ... tend to start with the advocacy activity and work outwards from it, and can thus miss larger trends, external influences or unintended consequences. They can be usefully complemented by context-in approaches that look at change in people’s lives, try to trace the reasons for it and then situate the work of external actors within that context” (ibid: 29).

With respect to *Capacity for People Centered Advocacy* – which concerns both people-centered policy making and strengthening civil society – ActionAid discusses the following topics:

- Empowerment
- Group capacity for advocacy
- Stages of group development
- Relationships between NGOs and their clients
- Self-assessment of group capacity for advocacy
- Ladder exercise in which “an organization ranks the degree to which it has increased its capacity to carry out its advocacy work on a ladder of changes” (ibid: 35).

- Evaluating support for capacity development
- Social capital – Grassroots Development Framework (The Cone): “GDF, often referred to as ‘the Cone,’ is a conceptual tool developed to take account of social capital when measuring developmental success... It is an attempt to analyze complex project results in terms of personal and organization capacity or increased voice in decision-making. As such it would appear to measure not ‘social capital’ per se, but increased interaction between organizations, which could be taken as a proxy indicator of social capital” (ibid: 37).
- Networks and movements: “The scoping study did not find substantive information on how organizations are monitoring and evaluating the development of networks and movements for advocacy” (ibid: 39).
- The strengths of links
- Location of power
- Structure of decision making
- Different types of network for different types of campaign

With respect to *Political Space*, ActionAid states that “Monitoring and evaluating political space is perhaps the hardest issue of all, and there is a scarcity of work and literature on it,” (ibid: 44) and recommends the “ladder” (see above) as one promising evaluation method.

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Organizational capacity-building
- Relatively simple efforts
- Relatively complex efforts

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: Moderate

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework:

- Examples of outcomes
- “Ladder exercise” – see above
- GDF (“the Cone”) – see above

Alliance for Justice

Notes:

- Charges apply for download of documents and on-line use of the tool.
- The development of the Alliance for Justice toolkit was funded by the George Gund Foundation. The electronic version of the toolkit has been supported by the George Gund Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Alliance Healthcare Foundation, The California Endowment, and The Joy Foundation.

Intended users: Grantmakers supporting “advocacy” work, and their prospective, new, and current grantees.

Social justice focus: This toolkit focuses on “advocacy,” which is defined as “Efforts to influence public policy. This encompasses a broad range of activities – from researching, organizing, and building communications strategies to lobbying, networking, and educating voters... Avenues for advocating change [include] ... administrative advocacy ... legislative advocacy ... nonpartisan election-related advocacy [and] ... legal advocacy” (Alliance for Justice 2005: 4).

Characterization: The Alliance for Justice toolkit consists of worksheets to be completed by grantmakers and/or grantees, alone or in combination, to assess organizational capacity to implement advocacy efforts, set the groundwork for evaluation, and evaluate advocacy efforts. In addition, the tool includes four questions addressing “overall lessons learned” to be answered with short essays.

The Advocacy Capacity Assessment Tool examines the following “indicators of capacity”: decision-making structures; advocacy agenda; organizational commitment to/resources for advocacy; advocacy base; advocacy partners; advocacy targets; media skills and infrastructure; advocacy strategies; and knowledge, skills, and systems to effectively implement strategies.

Part I of the Advocacy Evaluation Tool is to be completed at the beginning of a grant period, and includes sections focused on “advocacy efforts” and “advocacy capacity-building.” Each of these sections addresses the goals, strategies, benchmarks, and progress outcomes that will be pursued during the grant period.

Part II of the Advocacy Evaluation Tool directs to user to report on the goals, strategies, benchmarks and progress outcomes described in Part I of the tool. In addition, it directs the user to briefly explain deviations from initial plans and targets.

The toolkit can be used in printed form, or online. The online version of the toolkit is password protected, and enables grantmakers to view information submitted by grantees who are registered on the site by the grantmaker. Live technical support is provided, and on-line surveys solicit user feedback for improvement of the toolkit. A detailed guide to using the toolkit on-line, *Advocacy Grantmaking Tools, Foundation Administrators Guide*, is available on-line to registered users.

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Organizational capacity-building
- Policy advocacy
- Relatively simple efforts

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework:

- Interactive, on-line “Advocacy Capacity Assessment Tool,” which can also be used in hard-copy form – see above
- Interactive, on-line “Advocacy Evaluation Tool,” which can also be used in hard-copy form – see above

Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services – Advocacy and Policy

Intended users: Primarily grantmakers. “[T]his guide will be useful for all those parties who wish to do the following:

- Gauge the progress and effectiveness of their advocacy and policy work;
- Learn what is working and what needs to change regarding investments and strategies;
- Build collective knowledge about how to most effectively create effective pathways for successful advocacy and policy efforts;
- Establish accountability for both incremental and long-term changes in public policy, as well as social and environmental considerations; and
- Advance the field of evaluation for advocacy and policy work.” (Reisman et al. 2007: 4)

Social Justice Focus: The Advocacy and Policy framework focuses mostly on “policy change” and “advocacy,” both of which are distinguished from “social change.” “[S]ocial change ... includes both policy change and advocacy but is focused far more broadly on changes in physical and/or social conditions... Changes of this nature are measured on the level of individual and population elements – whether it is human lives or ecological species... *Policy change* targets changes in the policy arena, including both policy development and implementation... The impact of policy change efforts is change in the structural and normative context of communities and institutions... *Advocacy* is a tactic for achieving social and policy change, such as framing the issue, developing alliances, and gathering and disseminating data. The impact of advocacy efforts provides the essential infrastructure that leads to policy change and, subsequently, to social change” (ibid: 12-14).

Characterization: The Advocacy and Policy framework presents “a stepwise approach to making evaluation design choices. The three steps are as follows: 1. Start with a theory of change. 2. Identify outcome categories. 3. Select a practical and strategic approach to measurement” (ibid: 11). The 2007 publication also offers useful framing considerations for evaluating advocacy and policy work.

Step 1: Start with a theory of change: “A theory of change typically addresses the set of linkages among strategies, outcomes and goals that support a broader mission or vision, along with the underlying assumptions that are related to these linkages... The process [of developing a theory of change] is based on the involvement of selected stakeholders who collaborate in a process of developing agreement about the pathway for achieving their collective vision” (ibid: 11).

Step 2: Identify outcome categories: The framework specifies that the choice of outcome categories should be informed by the theory of change that is adopted, and offers the following “outcome categories” (ibid: 17):

- *Shift in social norms:* “The knowledge, attitudes, values and behaviors that compose the normative structure of culture and society.”
- *Strengthened organizational capacity:* “The skills set, staffing and leadership, organizational structure and systems, finances and strategic planning among non-profit organizations and formal coalitions that plan and carry out advocacy and policy work.”
- *Strengthened alliances:* “The level of coordination, collaboration and mission alignment among community and system partners, including nontraditional alliances, e.g., bipartisan alliances, unlikely allies.”
- *Strengthened base of support:* “The grassroots, leadership and institutional support for particular policy changes.”
- *Improved policies:* “The stages of policy change in the public policy arena.”
- *Changes in impact:* “The ultimate changes in social and physical lives and conditions.”

The framework then offers a “menu of outcomes for advocacy and policy work” which lists “examples of outcomes,” “examples of strategies,” and “unit of analysis (e.g., who or what changes?)” within each of the “outcome categories.” For example, within “shift in social norms,” the menu lists “changes in awareness” as an example of an outcome; “framing issues” as an example of a strategy; and “individuals in general public” as a unit of analysis. (ibid: 18-22)

Step 3: Select a practical and strategic approach to measurement: “The broad questions posed are as follows: What will be the level of rigor of data collection? From whom will data be collected? When will data be collected? What type of questions will the data address?” (ibid: 23)

The framework then specifies the following “promising directions to guide development of an evaluation design,” each of which is analyzed in terms of “description,” “when is it applicable?” and “what are the benefits?” (ibid: 23-26):

- Identification and measurement of *core outcome areas* related to social change or policy change
- Evaluation of *strategic progress*
- Identification and measurement of *short term incremental objectives*
- Assessment of the *capacity* of the advocacy and policy organization
- Case study documentation of *process and impacts*.

In order to arrive at specific strategies for evaluation, the framework suggests constructing tables whose columns are headed: “Focus” (or expected outcomes); “Data Collection Methods or Tools”; “Frequency and Schedule of Data Collection”; and “Sampling Strategy.” (ibid: 27)

In their associated publication (n.d.), AECF/ORS offer sample evaluation tools – surveys, interview guides, meeting reporting forms, etc. – which are arranged according to the “core outcome areas” described in the 2007 publication (p. 17): shift in social norms; strengthened organizational capacity; strengthened alliances; strengthened base of support; improved policies; and changes in impact

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Organizational capacity-building
- Policy advocacy
- Relatively simple efforts
- Relatively complex efforts

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework:

- AECF/ORS offer many sample evaluation tools, including surveys, interview guides, meeting reporting forms, etc.
- Example of outcomes

Composite Logic Model (Harvard Family Research Project)

Intended Users: “Advocates, funders, and evaluators.”

Social Justice Focus: “Advocacy and policy” (not defined).

Characterization: The Composite Logic Model framework entails answering a series of questions to arrive at logic models that can guide advocacy and policy planning; and then answering a series of questions that can guide evaluation.

Visual representations of composite logic models are organized in the following columns, which progress from left to right: Inputs, divided into “organizational capacity building” and “preparation/planning” sections; activities/tactics; interim outcomes; policy outcomes; and impacts. Underneath these columns, contextual factors and audiences are listed.

Questions used to construct the logic model and guide planning are the following:

1. What is the advocacy or policy change goal?
2. Who is the audience?
3. What will it take to convince or move the audience?
4. What contextual factors might affect the strategy’s success?
5. Where doesn’t the strategy need to focus?
6. What will strategy collaborators do?
7. What will the opposition or competition do?
8. Is there a contingency plan?

Questions used to guide evaluation design include the following:

1. “Which components are relevant to the advocacy strategy? ... Literally trace ‘a pathway’ through the logic model, selecting relevant inputs, activities, interim outcomes, policy outcomes, and impacts. Select also the strategy’s audiences and

- contextual factors that might impact the strategy... The remaining questions concentrate on how to use the composite logic model to help make ... decisions [about a strategic narrowing of the evaluation's focus]" (Coffman et al. 2007: 2).
2. "Given the evaluation's intended users and use, which outcomes are priorities? Consider the evaluation's primary users, what they want or need to know about the strategy's progress or success, and how they will use that information. Given these decisions, are some logic model components more important to assess than others?" (ibid: 2).
 3. "Are there outcomes the strategy should not be directly accountable for? For some advocacy and policy change efforts, certain outcomes or impacts related to the advocacy or policy change strategy may be so long-term or hinge on so many external or contextual factors that it may be appropriate to focus the evaluation less on them and more on the shorter-term or interim outcomes that are connected directly to the advocacy effort" (ibid: 3).
 4. "Given the evaluation timeframe, which outcomes are achievable? Often, advocacy or policy change strategies are long-term endeavors with evaluations that run on shorter timeframes than the strategies themselves" (ibid: 3).
 5. "Given the evaluation resources available, which outcomes are best pursued? ... Think about available evaluation resources in terms of both staffing and dollars" (ibid: 3).

The preparation materials for the Advanced Practice Institute on Evaluating Advocacy Grantmaking at the 2007 Council on Foundations conference feature Comprehensive Logic Model materials produced by Julia Coffman. In addition they include helpful framing considerations, including the following "Draft Funder Guidelines for Communicating with Grantees about Evaluating Advocacy and Policy Change Grantmaking" (Anonymous 2007: 8-9):

1. "Funders should be clear about what they value in advocacy and policy change efforts."
2. "Funders should convey their understanding that advocacy and policy theories of change or logic models have contingencies."
3. "Funders need to be clear about how they would like grantees to use the evaluation."
4. "Funders also need to be clear about how they will use the evaluation... Funders who want to maximize grantee use of evaluation should communicate their support for evaluation approaches that inform grantees' policy change strategies as they unfold, so that grantees can make good choices and adjust their strategies as necessary."
5. "Funders need to consider a different set of ethical issues regarding evaluation dissemination and exposure. Some advocates may resist having their evaluation results disseminated or their stories told because it reveals too much about their strategies."
6. "Funders need to identify an acceptable level of methodological rigor... Advocacy is a creative and flexible process that takes place in an uncertain environment... Funders need to indicate their support for evaluation designs that don't negatively affect that flexibility."
7. "Funders need to address the attribution versus contribution question... [F]unders should signal that they want grantees to use data to establish a credible and plausible case that their work contributed to policy outcomes."

8. “Funders should communicate that they won’t use evaluation to compare advocacy and policy grantees... The same result on the same measure may mean success for one advocacy effort but disappointment for another. What measures are chosen and how they are interpreted depends on the organization doing the advocacy and its experience with advocacy, difficulty of the issue given the current policy and economic climate, and the advocacy strategy.”
9. “Funders need to acknowledge differing levels of grantee evaluation capacity... Funders need to communicate they are not necessarily looking for grantees to have strong evaluation capacity upfront, but instead are looking for a commitment to evaluation and an ability to articulate the questions grantees would like answered.”

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Organizational capacity-building
- Policy advocacy
- Relatively simple efforts
- Relatively complex efforts

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework: N/a

Constituency Voice (Keystone)

Intended Users: The “three core constituents to any developmental or intervention or process: those who provide resources, those who design and implement the intervention, and those who are most affected – usually those intended to benefit most” (Keystone N.d.[a]).

Social Justice Focus: “*Social justice*,” which can be described in relation to “two reference points: St. Augustine’s ‘Justice is that virtue that gives everyone his due’ and John Rawls’ view of justice as consistency with that set of rules and conditions derived from ‘behind the veil of ignorance,’ that is to say, from the perspective of not knowing what talents or station in life one may be born into. Whether one looks to Augustine or Rawls or other philosophical traditions ... social justice is not to be understood as a final state or condition, but as something that derives from the relationships between individuals and institutions. In measuring social justice, therefore, we are measuring process more than content.”

“*Development* is a process of conscious action leading to fundamental and sustainable change in human or environmental well-being” (Keystone 2006: 1).

Characterization: Keystone’s Constituency Voice framework – which is relevant to social justice philanthropy, although not focused exclusively on it – is built upon “Four Fundamentals” (Keystone N.d.[a]):

- *Foster Community Voice*: “Constituency Voice comes about when all constituents, especially those most affected, participate meaningfully in defining success, planning activities toward outcomes, and evaluating and learning from results.”
- *Map Pathways to Outcomes*: “In most social change work, the problems are complex and not well defined. Solutions involve changing attitudes, relationships, capabilities, conditions and behaviours, and need to be worked out over time, with constituents, and often in collaboration with other organizations. Processes like these are best managed within the framework of a shared theory of change that guides planning, acting, reflecting and learning. Constituents first clarify a shared vision of success (or impact). Then they try to identify what change processes are already happening and how they work. Finally, they map pathways to outcomes.”
- *Think and Act From an Ecosystem Perspective*: “When organizations, including donors, begin to think of themselves as working in an ecology of actors towards shared outcomes, they can plan and act collaboratively without losing their individual focus or identity.”
- *Publish Your Learning*: “Transparent public reporting that reflects constituency voice enables accountability and societal learning.”

The Constituency Voice framework is presented in five “tools” that are available online. Each of the tools includes introductory considerations, a facilitator guide, suggested exercises, and templates for group activities. The tools are:

1. Keystone Capabilities Profiler
2. Developing a Theory of Change
3. Becoming Eco-Intelligent
4. Learning with Constituents
5. The Keystone Public Reporting Framework

In the *Keystone Capabilities Profiler*, Keystone states that “Developmental performance [can be used] as shorthand for describing effective performance towards fundamental and sustainable social change outcomes. The key to effective developmental performance ... lies in three organizational capabilities:

- **Accountability**: How do we empower and balance stakeholder voices so that they participate actively in the high level deliberations around strategy, planning and how we measure success?
- **Strategy**: How do we understand our role within an ecology of social change actors and plan for collaborative action that will enhance solutions to the problems we face?
- **Operational integrity**: How efficiently and transparently do we manage our resources and honour the commitments that we make?” (Keystone 2006: 2)

Within each of these categories, the Keystone Capabilities Profiler instructs the facilitator and constituents (including management, staff and selected external stakeholders) to discuss a number of statements and then assign a score from 1 (incapable) to 5 (extremely capable) once they have reached consensus. For example, the first statement to be scored, under the category of Accountability, is “A clear vision statement describes the desired conditions, relationships and capabilities that the organization wishes to help bring about for specific groups and/or contexts” (ibid: 8). The group then tallies the scores, and can reproduce the exercise at a later time to measure progress.

In *Developing a Theory of Change*, selected constituents and a facilitator participate in three “activities” titled “Creating a ‘vision of success,’” “Mapping ‘pathways of change’ – how we think change happens in our context,” and “Developing indicators and outcomes.” In the final exercise, constituents are encouraged to determine observable, specific, realistic changes that would show progress in pursuit of their long-range vision – in areas such as conditions, behavior, relationships, capabilities, and opportunities. This set of exercises is intended to prepare the group(s) involved to design and carry out an evaluation, to “begin to refine [the] theory of change in dialogue with ... constituents and stakeholders,” and to “begin to bring ... strategies and programmes into line with [the] theory of change” (Keystone N.d.[c]: 17).

In *Becoming Eco-Intelligent*, “eco-intelligence” is defined as “the capability of an organization to understand the activity ecosystem within which it works, to identify potential actors with whom collaboration is possible, and to successfully plan and manage such collaborations so that they enhance social outcomes” (Keystone N.d.[b]: 2). Working with a facilitator, constituents participate in exercises titled “Mapping the activity eco-system,” “Analysing individual actors, assessing their collaboration potential and planning alignments,” and “Developing appropriate governance and management systems for partnerships.” Throughout the exercises, participants are encouraged to focus more on “outcomes” – the changes different groups would like to produce in the world – rather than organizational “mission – which might be expressed and focused quite differently in organizations that could build complementary relationships.

Learning with Constituents presents a number of framing considerations, suggestions, and exercises directed towards involving constituents – and particularly those most impacted by the theory of change in question – in evaluation. Community meetings, surveys, interviews (e.g., to collect personal stories) and “progress journals” are among the recommended methodologies, all of which focus on building dialogue, documenting failures as well as success, and drawing out useful lessons.

The Keystone Public Reporting Framework presents recommendations for reporting on accountability to constituents, as well as lessons learned.

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Coalitions or networks
- Community organizing
- Organizational capacity-building
- Relatively simple efforts
- Relatively complex efforts
- Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework: Facilitator guidelines and exercises

Continuous Progress (Center for Global Interdependence, Aspen Institute)

Intended Users: Grantmakers and advocates

Social Justice Focus: Advocacy (not defined)

Characterization: Continuous Progress offers a number of on-line resources and tools relevant to advocacy planning and evaluation.

The www.continuousprogress.org website is divided into the following sections:

- “Continuous Progress Strategic Services, which offers consulting services”
- “Continuous Progress for Domestic Advocacy”#
 - Evaluation Basics
 - Guide for Advocates
 - Before You Start Your Campaign – Goal Setting: How to Ensure Your Goal is SMART [specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and tangible]
 - During Your Campaign – Checking in With Your Theory of Change
 - After Your Campaign Has Ended – Bringing it all Back Together
 - Guide for Grantmakers
 - Before You Start Planning – How and Why to Invest in Advocacy
 - During Your Campaign – Your Theory of Change: The Path from Funding to Results
 - After Your Campaign Has Ended – Bringing it All Together in the End
- “Continuous Progress for Global Issues Advocacy” (subsections as in #)

Continuous Progress encourages users “look at advocacy evaluation as a dynamic process, one that continues throughout the life of an advocacy effort and contributes to advocacy progress.”

The process requires:

- “Planning for evaluation from the beginning of your advocacy work
- Monitoring and documenting progress, and correcting your course as necessary
- Conducting a summative evaluation at the end
- Sharing your results – both good and bad – with those who could learn from them inside and outside your organization.”

Website pages that are cross-linked to one another give guidance on many topics relevant to advocacy evaluation, including summative evaluation, incremental progress vs. long-term goals, theories of change, and many other topics. Many of these modules can be included in an on-line “toolkit.” The website also includes a glossary of terms, and an information clearinghouse.

The general approach recommended by Continuous Progress is to build evaluation strategies and procedures around a theory of change, which is reflected in an Advocacy and Policy Change Logic Model that can be constructed using the on-line tool available at

<http://planning.continuousprogress.org/>. The tool guides users through a series of screens where they are directed to make choices based on their needs using selection buttons that are accompanied by areas where users can write their own clarifying notes. Key terms used throughout are defined on-line and in a downloadable glossary. The progression of screens is as follows:

- Impacts: “What’s the big picture? What are you ultimately trying to achieve?”
Categories: Improved Services and Programs; Positive Social and Physical Conditions
- Policy Goals: “Thinking about goals: What kind of policy change is needed?”
Categories: Policy Development; Placement on the Policy Agenda; Policy Adoption; Policy Implementation; Policy Monitoring and Evaluation; Policy Maintenance; Policy Blocking
- Audiences: “Thinking about your audience: Who needs to hear your message? The more precisely you define your target audience, the better.”
Categories: Elected Officials; Candidates; Public Administrators; Voters; Public Donors; Specific Constituencies; Media; Popular Culture Artists and Gatekeepers; Business; Community Leaders; Courts; Other Audiences?
- Inputs: “Thinking about what you and your organization(s) have or need: What will it take to implement your strategy effectively?”
 - Capacity Building
Categories: Fundraising; Staffing and Leadership Development; Skills Development; Infrastructure Development
 - Preparation/Planning
Categories: Data Collection; Problem Assessment; Policy Assessment; Landscape Mapping; Goal Setting; Strategy Development; Partner Development; Message Development; Materials Development
- Contextual Factors: “There are many factors you can’t control that may affect your success. Take the time to factor them in...”
Categories: Political Climate; Economic Climate; Social Climate; Prior Experience; Issue Competition; Potential Partners/Competitors/Opponents
- During: Activities/Tactics: “What activities are you planning?”
Categories: Issue/Policy Analysis and Research; Candidate Education; Relationship Building with Decision Makers; Policy Proposal Development; Litigation or Legal Advocacy; Lobbying; Polling; Earned Media; Paid Media; Public Service Announcements; Media Partnerships; Voter Education; Coalition and Network Building; Grassroots Organizing and Mobilization; Rallies and Marches; Briefings/Presentations; Demonstration Projects or Pilots
- Interim Outcomes and Benchmarks: “What are the benchmarks on the way to your goals for advocacy capacity and policy change?”
 - Advocacy Capacity Benchmarks
Categories: Organizational Capacity; Partnerships or Alliances; Collaboration and Alignment (including messaging); New Advocates (including unlikely or nontraditional); New Champions (including policymakers); New Donors; More or Diversified Funding; Organizational Visibility or Recognition
 - Policy Change Interim Outcomes and Benchmarks
Categories: Media Coverage; Issue Reframing; Awareness; Salience; Attitudes or Beliefs; Public Will; Political Will; Constituency or Support Base Growth

Once users have constructed their Advocacy and Policy Change Composite Logic Models, they can save them to their computers in pdf format, and/or save them in a url (Internet address) that can be shared with others.

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Organizational capacity-building
- Policy advocacy
- Relatively simple efforts

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework: The interactive, Internet-based “Advocacy and Policy Change Logic Model” – see above

Evaluating the Effects of International Advocacy Networks

Intended users: Those interested in evaluating the work of international advocacy networks.

Social justice focus: “When the goals and the functions [of an international network] are focused on changing relations of power in a society or between societies, then it constitutes ... an ... advocacy network. An advocacy network generally will have these objectives: (a) Influence change in institutional policies, practices, programmes, or behaviour. (b) Develop the capacity of civil society organizations and individual citizens to exercise that pressure for change. (c) Restructure society so that individuals and groups are involved in decisions made by other social actors but which affect them” (Wilson-Grau N.d.: 2).

Characterization: Wilson-Grau describes a method for evaluating the effects of advocacy networks, which may also be called coalitions, partnerships, alliances, unions, leagues, associations, federations or confederations. The method has also been used to evaluate the work of national networks in the United States and perhaps elsewhere, and perhaps regional and local networks.

The paper describes three challenges to evaluating networks. First, “an advocacy network is characterized by its complexity, openness and dynamism and, in addition, operates in a similarly unpredictable environment” (ibid: 2). “The second evaluation challenge is that ... an advocacy network is loosely organized and non-hierarchical, with authority and responsibility flowing from and around autonomous members” (ibid: 3). “[A]dvocacy networks operate more through facilitation and co-operation around the activities of its organizational components than by directing programs and executing projects” (ibid: 4). “The third challenge ... is that stakeholders [including grantmakers] ... want advocacy networks to be evaluated as they are accustomed to in their own organizations programs and or projects” (ibid: 5).

The author recommends that evaluation of networks be oriented around “operational outputs,” “internal, developmental or ‘organic’ outcomes,” “external or ‘political’ outcomes,” and “impacts.” *Operational outputs*: The processes, products and services that are an immediate result of the activity of the advocacy network. An advocacy network ‘controls’ its outputs” (ibid: 6). “*Internal, developmental or ‘organic’ outcomes*: The changes in the behavior, relationships or actions of the advocacy network’s members that strengthens and develops their collective capacity to achieve the advocacy network’s political purpose. The changes are a result – partially or fully, intentional or not – of the activities of the network” (ibid: 6). “*External or ‘political’ outcomes*: These are changes in the behavior, relationships, or actions of individuals, groups or organizations outside of the advocacy network involved in activities related to the network’s political purpose. The changes are a result – partially or fully, intentional or not – of the activities of the network. An advocacy network ‘influences’ outcomes” (ibid: 6-7). “*Impact*: Long-term changes in the relations and exercise of power in society as expressed in the political purpose of the advocacy network. An advocacy network ‘contributes’ indirectly to these intended impacts” (ibid: 7).

The paper recommends that evaluation of networks focus on outputs and outcomes, and that it be carried out in a highly participatory manner – with or without external evaluators. The evaluation should be both “formative” and “summative.” *Formative evaluation* consists of observation of and reflection on “the individuals, groups, and organizations the advocacy network wishes to influence” on a continuous basis (ibid: 10). *Summative evaluation* is carried out periodically and often at the end of funding periods. “[F]irst the outcomes that the advocacy network influenced are identified, either through the on-going monitoring or at the time of a periodic formative evaluation. The advocacy network would then identify which of its activities and outputs influenced those outcomes, partially or totally, intentionally or not” (ibid: 11).

Wilson-Grau’s framework is largely retrospective, in the sense that emphasis is removed from the determination of outputs, outcomes, and impacts prior to a funding period. “[T]o know step by step, in advance, how the goals will be attained [is] an approach doomed to failure in the complex and rapidly changing world in which social innovators attempt to work... In highly emergent complex environments, such prior specification is neither possible nor desirable because it constrains openness and adaptability” (ibid: 10).

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Coalitions or networks
- Relatively complex efforts

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: Low

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: Moderate

Tools associated with the framework: N/a

Initiative Evaluation (W. K. Kellogg Foundation)

Intended Users: “External evaluators who conduct initiative evaluations for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation [WKKF]” (Kellogg: 2007[a]: 1).

Social Justice Focus: The WKKF framework focuses on the evaluation of “two types of grantmaking that involve multiple projects, locations, and grantees: (1) ‘clusters’ that typically focus on the exploration and/or development of new approaches to a program issue area; and (2) strategic ‘initiatives,’ designed to create systems changes that will lead to intended long-term, sustainable impact,” both of which are termed “initiative evaluation” for purposes of the framework. (Kellogg 2007[b]: 1) Initiatives and clusters are understood to be complex, dynamic systems.

Characterization: “Project evaluation and initiative evaluation serve different purposes and involve different stakeholders. A project evaluation focuses on the specific project of a grantee and serves the needs of the project leaders and participants... On the other hand, an initiative evaluation looks across projects and their meaning within the initiative as a whole” (ibid: 2).

Initiative Evaluation is understood to take place within social systems that can be described in terms of: “a. *the degree of agreement* among those in the group, team, organization, community or other unit (about, for instance, the changes needed in a social system), and b. *the degree of certainty* about actions, conditions, or consequences of actions that exist or are likely at places in the system(s)” (Kellogg: 2007[a]: 2).

Different categories of dynamics are considered to be observable, depending on the levels of agreement and certainty in given initiatives or clusters:

- *Organized dynamics* – which are relatively predictable, orderly and controlled – tend to be present in situations where initiatives or clusters demonstrate both high levels of agreement and high levels of certainty.
- *Unorganized dynamics* – which are relatively random, unpatterned, and seemingly chaotic – tend to be present in situations where initiatives or clusters demonstrate both low levels of agreement and low levels of uncertainty.
- *Self-organizing dynamics* – which are “emerging patterns, coherent but not predictable” – are present between these two extremes. In this domain, “although behaviors or results are not predictable, they are influenced by the local action of agents operating as they deem appropriate or feasible” (ibid: 3-4).

Initiative Evaluation designs can be oriented around each of these categories of dynamics, or around the initiative or cluster overall, for different purposes:

- *Predictive evaluation design* – which is oriented around organized dynamics – focuses on “cause and effect relationships between structured interventions of an initiative and the

predicted outcomes/changes” (ibid: 6). “The evaluation looks at the situation through the lens of predictability and thus if the implemented plans led to the intended outcomes. The evaluation is conducted from outsider perspective. Results from this evaluation design often are seen as important for accountability purposes... This design is useful for looking at common outcomes across ... groups ... and/or larger systems in fairly stable situations. It may take several years for the outcomes of an intervention to be evidenced. Thus such designs may require data collection over extended periods of time” (Kellogg 2007[b]: 19).

- *Exploratory evaluation design* – which is oriented around unorganized dynamics – focuses on “potentially important components and dynamics of change that are not yet delineated in the initiative’s theory of change” (Kellogg 2007[a]: 6). “In the exploratory design, the evaluator engages in the evaluation from either an insider or an outsider perspective... [The evaluation] is designed to see what insights can be gained about the areas where the complexity of the initiative is not yet understood or articulated... Results from this design are likely to enrich the theory of change by, for example, indicating where boundaries or relationships can be established or encouraged that will help support the desired direction or outcomes of the initiative” (ibid: 14-15).
- *Self-organizing evaluation design* – which is oriented around self-organizing dynamics – focuses on “the patterns of change emerging from self-organizing dynamics within the initiative” (ibid: 6). “In complex self-organizing systems, a new order or pattern can emerge with no preplanning. The entangled complex systems ... may ... be continually in a state of disequilibria ... often characterized by contradiction and contention. Cooperation may coexist with competition, independence and interdependence... An initiative evaluator is looking for general patterns of similarities, differences, and relationships over time and locations that provide insights into ways those involved adapt to one another and local conditions to lead or not lead in the desired direction. Evaluators conduct the evaluation from an insider perspective” (Kellogg 2007[b]: 25-26).
- *Initiative Renewal evaluation design* – which is oriented around the initiative or cluster overall, or around the initiative in context – focuses on “the interplay of multiple dynamics of change within the initiative and with its context that enrich its theory of change and have implications for the sustainability of the initiative” (Kellogg 2007[a]: 6). “The evaluation encourages big-picture adjustment and longevity as the initiative’s strategies (and, perhaps, the direction) change over time. This design takes into account the multiple dynamics in operation in the initiative as well as the larger context. This type of evaluation helps initiative leaders, evaluators, and grantees periodically reflect on their overall progress and determine if redesign of aspects of the initiative, its evaluation, and/or its theory of change is needed. In conducting the evaluation, evaluators move back and forth between an insider and an outsider perspective” (Kellogg 2007[b]: 31).

WKKF describes three related evaluation processes that are relevant to all types of Initiative Evaluation: (ibid: Table 3)

- *Designing the evaluation*: “Clarify theory of change or its status; identify meaningful units within initiative for evaluation; match characteristics of initiative units and evaluation orientations.”
- *Planning and engaging in data collection*: “Gather data with attention to aligning data collection and analysis.”

- *Making meaning and shaping practice:* “Data analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and use of results to enhance the initiative.”

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Coalitions or networks
- Relatively complex efforts
- Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: Variable

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: Low

Tools associated with the framework: N/a

Logical Framework Approach (LFA or Logframe Approach)

Intended Users: Decision-makers in international development and humanitarian relief.

Social Justice Focus: The Logical Framework Approach (LFA or Logframe Approach) is widely used by international development and humanitarian relief agencies, as well as intergovernmental organizations, many of whose programs explicitly seek to transform structures to foster greater equity. It has been adapted by CARE International (CI) for the monitoring and evaluation of its “Rights-Based Approach” (RBA), which “deliberately and explicitly focuses on people achieving the minimum conditions for living with dignity (i.e. achieving their human rights). It does so by exposing the roots of vulnerability and marginalization and expanding the range of responses.” These aims are related to CI’s vision, which states “We seek a world of hope, tolerance and social justice, where poverty has been overcome and people live in dignity and security.” (2003b: 1) CI also uses LFA in the context of its work in “advocacy,” which it defines as “the deliberate process of influencing those who make policy decisions” (Sprechmann 2001: 2).

Characterization: LFA practitioners use “logical framework” matrices or “logframes” for planning purposes, as well as for “monitoring and evaluation” (M&E). Although terminology may differ, a logframe will generally take the following form (Bakewell et al. 2005: 3):¹

Narrative Summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
Goal – the overall aim to which the project is expected to contribute	Measures (direct or indirect) to show the project’s contribution to the goal	Sources of information and methods used to show fulfillment of the goal	Important events, conditions or decisions beyond the project’s control necessary for maintaining the progress towards the goal
Outcomes (or	Measures (direct or	Sources of information	Important events, conditions or

¹ Adapted from: Mikkelsen, B. 1995. *Methods for Development Work and Research: A Guide for Practitioners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

objectives) – the new situation which the project is aiming to bring about	indirect) to show what progress is being made towards reaching the objectives	and methods used to show progress against objectives	decisions beyond the project’s control, which are necessary if achieving the objectives is going to contribute towards the overall goal
Outputs – the results which should be within the control of the project management	Measures (direct or indirect) to show if project outputs are being delivered	Sources of information and methods used to show delivery of outputs	Important events, conditions or decisions beyond the project’s control, which are necessary if producing the outputs is going to help achieve the objectives
Activities – the things which have to be done by the project to produce the outputs	Measures (direct or indirect) to show if project outputs are being delivered	Sources of information and methods used to show that activities have been completed	Important events, conditions or decisions beyond the project’s control, which are necessary if completing activities will produce the required outputs
Inputs	Resources – type and level of resources needed for the project Finance – overall budget Time – planned start and end date		

Innumerable varieties of M&E plans can be developed from the basis of logframes (cf. Hussein N.d., Dearden et al. 2003). Nevertheless, criticism of the Logframe Approach to monitoring and evaluation has been widespread, in particular with reference to advocacy and other social justice programming. Principal critiques have centered on: the tendency of LFAs to lead to the rigid interpretation and implementation of predetermined plans that are not adaptable to changing circumstances in complex environments; the difficulty of seeing, and treating, programs in a holistic manner, given LFA’s compartmentalizing approach; the time-limited, project-focused nature of the approach, which is unsuitable to efforts that require long-term attention; the difficulty of reflecting nonlinear relationships in LFA; quantitative bias; focus on attribution rather than contribution; and the adoption of “technocratic,” as opposed to politically engaged, approaches. Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA), which is described elsewhere in this document, is one major attempt to address elements of this critique.

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Relatively complex efforts
- The likely congruence of social justice efforts with standards of international development and humanitarian evaluation.

Making Connections (Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services)

Intended Users: Partners (including grantmakers) in AECF’s Making Connections initiative. Also “the philanthropic community – particularly those foundations that are involved or are considering involvement with place-based strategies” (Reisman et al. 2004: 2).

Social Justice Focus: Making Connections’ “core strategy helps children succeed based on the belief that the best way to improve outcomes for vulnerable children living in tough neighborhoods is to strengthen their families’ connections to economic opportunity, positive social networks, and effective services and supports.” Making Connections focuses on working

with multiple interrelated stakeholders in identified communities.² Specific focus is placed on documenting “influence” and “leverage” outcomes, which are distinguished from “impact outcomes.” *Impact outcomes* are “changes in a condition of well being for the children, adults or families directly served by programs, agencies, planned strategies or services systems.” *Influence outcomes* are “changes in community environments, relationships, institutions, organizations or service systems that impact individuals and families, including changes in issue visibility, community norms, partnerships, public will, political will, policies, regulations, service practices or business practices.” *Leverage outcomes* are “changes in investments (monetary or in kind contributions) by other public or private funders, institutions or organizations that help to create and support impact or influence changes related to ... powerful strategies” (ibid: 5-6).

Characterization: The Making Connections framework focuses on helping partners to identify and document their achievement of influence and leverage outcomes, while working within their specific variants of the Making Connections theory of change. Sections are focused on “guidance in selecting and developing specificity around key influence and leverage outcomes for your community,” “techniques and tools for documenting influence and leverage outcomes,” and “suggested approaches to connecting the documentation of influence and leverage to an action agenda.”

Making Connections suggests considering the operating theory of change and strategies as part of “selecting and developing specificity around key influence and leverage outcomes,” and then making “so that chains.” “So that chains” begin with strategies, and end with impact outcomes. The following example is provided: (ibid: 16)

Strategy: Increase media coverage about amount of money low-income families and individuals pay to the tax industry for tax preparation and RALs and how this reduces the net benefit they receive from EITC and other tax credits...

So That: Public awareness of this issue increases. (Influence Outcome)

So That: Policy-makers increase their knowledge of and interest in this issue. (Influence Outcome)

So That: Policies change to require the tax industry to provide specific disclosures to individuals seeking an RAL. (Influence Outcome)

So That: Tax preparation businesses change their business practices to abide by the new policies. (Influence Outcome)

So That: Individuals and families have increased ability to make choices to avoid paying interest and fees to the tax industry for services they may not need. (Impact Outcome)

So That: Low-income individuals and families receive more case for their EITC and other tax credits or refunds and can use these funds to meet their basic needs, pay off debts or save for the future. (Impact Outcome)

So That: Families have increased levels of assets. (Impact Outcome)

Making Connections also suggests naming “broad outcome areas” (e.g., “changes in visibility of issue”) and associating them with “sample outcome statements” (e.g., “Local media accurately cover the message(s) of the media campaign.”) as a step towards specifying outcomes to the point where they could be measurable (ibid: 17-20).

² See <http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/MakingConnections.aspx>.

In the section focused on “documenting influence and leverage ... methods and tools,” Making Connections provides sample evaluation tools – e.g., surveys, interview guides, and observation protocols – in the following categories: changes in public will, changes in visibility, changes in partnerships, changes in funding and resources, changes in policy and regulation, and changes in service practice.

In the final section, Making Connections “[shows] the relevance of documenting influence and leverage to the everyday life on the ground in Making Connections communities.” Specifically, focus is placed on: (ibid: 57-58)

- “Use common language to describe change strategies.
- Step up the intensity of an effort.
- Celebrate and publicize a successful result.
- Recruit new partners who have the potential to contribute to a powerful strategy.
- Keep the heat on partners to act differently or change their practices.
- Make decisions to change directions.
- Make decisions to expand partnerships.
- Call the question about a neighborhood group that has ‘stalled out.’
- Support efforts of community groups to gain effective problem solving and conflict resolution strategies.
- Recognize public officials that take stands or actions that support the community.
- Practice accountability to the people and systems that have invested themselves, their time, their money and their hopes.”

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Coalitions or networks
- Policy advocacy
- Community organizing
- Relatively complex efforts
- Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework: Several sample evaluation tools are provided – e.g., surveys, interview guides, observation protocols

Making the Case (Women’s Funding Network)

Intended Users: Grantmakers and their grantees engaged in “social change” work, and particularly those focused on women and girls.

Social Justice Focus: “Social change”: “Social change philanthropy specifically invites people to invest in transforming some component of their world for the better” (Puntenney 2002: 1) Social change is described in terms of both structural or institutional change, and cultural change; and on various levels of scale (from micro to macro) (ibid: 4-6).

The Women’s Funding Network’s (WFN’s) basic theory of change is as follows: Existing situation + Strategies to change the situation + Accelerators (factors that advance your progress) + Inhibitors (factors that slow or stop your progress) = Expected and/or unexpected social change results.

“Results” are categorized as follows:

- *Shift in definition*: The issue is defined differently in the community or larger society.
- *Shift in behavior*: People are behaving differently in the community or larger society.
- *Shift in engagement*: People in the community or larger society are more engaged.
- *Shift in policy*: An institutional, organizational, or legislative policy or practice has changed.
- *Maintaining past gains*: Past gains have been maintained, generally in the face of opposition.

Through using Making the Case (MTC), grantees develop theories of change, although users’ “theories of change” are not the objects of explicit focus.

Characterization: WFN’s MTC framework is accessible online, for a fee, in versions for both grantmakers and grantees. It is also used in hard-copy (paper) form by groups that have limited access to the Internet. Main sections of the toolkit include “Planning,” “Evaluation,” and “Reports” which reflect the intentions and judgments of users (self-reports). In addition to sections to be completed by users by writing sections of narrative and selecting pre-set menu options, MTC includes a glossary and documents that provide information on MTC’s approaches, philosophy, and online applications. A revised version of MTC, with improved user interface and other improvements, will be released later in 2008.

“MTC is both a planning and evaluation tool. The Planning section includes exercises and resources to enhance strategic planning for social change work. MTC is a helpful resource to use when writing proposals and creating work plans... The Evaluation section will enable you to record your progress and activities as you go. Once your work is completed you’ll have the information to conduct a thorough self-evaluation of the social change impact made. MTC is applicable for both direct-service grants, and capacity-building grants.” (Online 5/27/08)

Grantmakers that use MTC in the U.S. and elsewhere typically incorporate the framework’s approach and language into their operations in a comprehensive fashion: for example, by referring to “shifts” in their requests for proposals. In addition, they or WFN will typically carry out training sessions with grantees and prospective grantees in order to orient them to the approach and toolkit.

MTC’s Evaluation section is divided into the following five subsections:

- **Project Profile**: Provides background on the project or program

- Selecting the Shifts: See “Social Justice Focus” above
- Evidence: Evidence is the data that substantiates an organization’s claims
- Inhibitors and Accelerators: Factors in an organization’s internal or external environment that help or hinder the organization’s ability to reach its intended project goals
- Your Story: Provides the chance to weave together the facts and information collected

Often grantees enter their plans into MTC as part of their proposal development process. However, plans (including predicted “shifts,” etc.) can be added after grant periods have begun, as well. Trainers emphasize that it is important for grantees to document “unintended outcomes,” and that planning and reporting are often not linear processes that can be completed one after the other.

MTC generates the following types of reports, which can be viewed by grantmakers and grantees:

- Shifts and Ratings Report: A summary overview and listing of all projects by shift and rating
- Project Description Report: An overview of each project(s), including the project description, baseline, goals, and strategies
- Project Outcomes Report: The measures of project outcomes, including groups impacted, number of people impacted, progress made per shift, evidence of shifts, and the narrative
- Strategies for Change Report: A summary of the work being done, including the baseline, goals and strategies per shift
- Direct Impact Report: An analysis of the impact made (compares Progress Ratings for each shift with the groups directly impacted)
- Indirect Impact Report: An analysis of the impact made (compares Progress Ratings for each shift with groups indirectly impacted)
- Causal Factors Report: A comparison of project inputs (controllable factors as well as external forces), with project results
- Inputs vs. Ratings Report: A comparison of the groups impacted and project inputs with progress on project goals

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Policy advocacy
- Relatively simple efforts
- Efforts focused on women and girls

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: High

Tools associated with the framework: The interactive, Internet-based toolkit – see above

Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)³

Intended Users: Decision-makers in humanitarian relief and development fields, many of whom use Logical Framework Analysis

Social Justice Focus: Peace and conflict in societies, and the roles that development and humanitarian relief efforts play in affecting them.

Characterization: PCIA “differs from ‘evaluation’ in the conventional sense because its scope extends far beyond the stated outputs, outcomes, goals and objectives of conventional development projects or programmes. Rather, it attempts to discern a project’s impact on the peace and conflict environment – an area it may not have been designed explicitly to affect. Thus, it is quite possible that a project may fail according to limited developmental criteria (e.g., irrigation targets...) but succeed according to broader peacebuilding criteria... The converse also holds true...”

“At the most elemental level, [PCIA]... may be distilled down to a single – but far from simple – question: Will/did the project foster or support sustainable structures and processes which strengthen the prospects for peaceful coexistence and decrease the likelihood of the outbreak, reoccurrence, or continuation of violent conflict?”

“[PCIA] is premised on a central, underpinning assumption: any development project set in a conflict-prone region will inevitably have an impact on the peace and conflict environment – positive or negative, direct or indirect, intentional or unintentional.” (Bush 1998: 7-8)

PCIA places heavy emphasis on addressing the political context of program design and evaluation, in part because it is only within such a context that development work and evaluation are considered to be meaningful. Kenneth Brown, a leading voice in the field, states that “PCIA ... is fundamentally political. To treat it in a non-political, technocratic manner is therefore just as dangerous as it would be to deal similarly with arms control mechanisms.” (Bush 2003: 37) Brown decries the tendency to “compartmentalize” PCIA within development efforts, by treating it as a set of mechanical exercises that are isolated from overarching political contexts: for example, the uses of evaluation results within and among agencies, and the negative impacts of donor nations upon the environments where development programs operate.

PCIA refers to a body of theory and practice with several variations. One relatively straightforward toolkit has been developed by the Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network (CPR), “an informal network of senior managers of bilateral donor countries and multilateral agencies dealing with the complex issues of conflict management and

³ “Among those contributing to developments in [PCIA] are: Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP), based at Overseas Development Institute (UK); The Clingendael Institute (Netherlands); International Alert (UK); Department for International Development (DFID)/INTRAC (UK); Mary Anderson’s Collaborative Development Action (Cambridge, USA), Reflecting on Peace Practice, a follow up to Local Capacities for Peace project; International Development Research Centre (IRDC) (Canada); European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation (Netherlands); Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee.” (Hoffman 2004: 3)

response.” The PCIA toolkit focuses on needs assessment and planning tasks that could reveal important benchmarks for evaluation purposes. Rather than serving as a starting point for project or initiative planning in many cases, it might provide a framework for considering previously unrecognized contextual factors and possible impacts which could inform initial program design and evaluation.

CPR’s toolkit⁴ is “designed for those who wish to ensure that the impact of their engagement will, as a minimum, ‘do no harm,’ and as an optimum, have a positive effect on the conflict dynamics of the community in which the project is taking place,” and is divided into three sections: Profile Tools, Impact Tools, and Decision Tools:

Profile Tools are intended “to stimulate discussion amongst those who are planning to engage with potentially fragile communities in order to develop an understanding of their various components and undercurrents.” Users are directed to view the communities they are working with through a “political lens,” an “economic, social and cultural lens,” and a “security lens,” and are guided through a series of “steps” with accompanying tables to be completed:

- Step 1: Conflict Profile – Objective: “To understand the history of tensions in the community, their causes, and what fuels them; to identify the priority issues (root causes) of the tensions and identify the priorities for action.”
- Step 2: Peace Profile – Objective: “To understand what factors can contribute to a sustained peace, reduce the incidence of violence, or prevent the outbreak of violent conflict.”
- Step 3: Stakeholder Profile – Objective: “To understand the potential and actual motivations of various stakeholders and the actions they may take to further their respective interests.”
- Step 4: Responsibilities and Underlying Causes – Objective: “To look holistically at the relationship between conflict, peace, and stakeholder dynamics, and the processes and structures that support them; to identify the focal points for future action.
- Step 5: Scenarios and Objectives – Objective: “To draw out the best, middle and worst-case scenarios in order to prepare and define realistic objectives for engagement.”

Impact Tools are intended “to help users understand the overall impact of their projects and programs by considering the unintended negative impacts, and unforeseen positive outcomes.” Again, the user is guided through “steps” with accompanying templates:

- Step 6: Political Impact, which is informed by the understanding that “Although development workers have traditionally avoided political partisanship, experience from the field and ... studies have shown that all aid, at all times has a political impact, whether intended or unintended, on the dynamics within the communities in which the project works. Political impacts need to be considered more deliberately and be clearly recognized as an area for consideration.”
- Step 7: Economic, Social, Cultural Impact – Objective: “To help users understand the economic, social or cultural impact of their projects and programs by considering the unintended negative impacts, and unforeseen positive opportunities.”

⁴ This document contains no page numbers.

- Step 8: Security Impact – Objective: “To help users understand the impact of their projects and programs on the security of the community and its members by considering the unintended negative impacts, and unforeseen positive impacts.”

Decision Tools aim “to help practitioners move from understanding to action. In this step, participants also look at key strategic issues in order to define possible response strategies... There are often constraints or resistance to change – both internal and external, as well as support. It is important to identify both the obstacles and opportunities in order to decide on an effective course of action.”

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Coalitions or networks
- Relatively complex efforts
- Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice
- Efforts that are supported or structured by “development” and/or “humanitarian relief” institutions

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: Moderate

Tools associated with the framework: See the CPR toolkit above (Brown et al. 2005)

The California Endowment / Blueprint Research & Design, Inc.

Intended users: Primarily foundation decision-makers focused on health-related work; also evaluators and people working within organizations carrying out advocacy and promoting policy change.

Social Justice Focus: The framework advanced by The California Endowment (TCE) and Blueprint Research & Design (BRD), Inc., centers attention on “advocacy” and “policy change,” both of which are differentiated from “social change.” “The broadest level is a *social change* schema, which depicts how individuals and groups create large-scale change in society...⁵ “The *policy change* model focuses on the policy arena and presents the process through which ideas are taken up, weighed and decided upon in this arena.⁶ It outlines a policy environment that doesn’t operate in a linear fashion and that often involved much time preparing for a short window of opportunity for policy change. The basic process for policy change includes: 1. Setting the agenda for what issues are to be discussed; 2. Specifying alternatives from which a policy choice is to be made; 3. Making an authoritative choice among those specified alternatives, as in a legislative vote or executive decision; and 4. Implementing the decision...

⁵ “Based on IDR framework, outlined in Chapman, J. and Wameyo, B., *Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy, A Scoping Study*. 2001.”

⁶ “Based on Kingdon, J. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. HarperCollins: New York. 1995.”

The *advocacy model* differs from the other two models in that it describes a tactic for social or policy change, rather than the change itself⁷ (Guthrie et al 2005: 19-21).

Characterization: TCE and BRD provide a framework for evaluating policy and advocacy activities that places strong emphasis on taking a prospective approach that is oriented around a theory of change.

A “prospective approach” to evaluation is one that begins during the initial project planning period, which should be marked by close cooperation between the grantmaker and the prospective grantee. “[P]rospective evaluation involves four steps: 1. Agree upon a conceptual model for the policy process under consideration. 2. Articulate a theory about how and why the activities of a given grantee, initiative or foundation are expected to lead to the ultimate policy change goal (often called a ‘theory of change’). 3. Use the ‘theory of change’ as a framework to define measurable benchmarks and indicators for assessing both progress towards desired policy change and building organizational capacity for advocacy in general. 4. Collect data on benchmarks to monitor progress and feed the data to grantees and foundation staff who can use the information to refine their efforts” (ibid: 15).

Evaluation focuses on determining and monitoring “process indicators” and “outcomes indicators.” “*Process indicators* refer to measurement of an organization’s activities or efforts to make change happen... Generally, process indicators lie largely within an organization’s control, whereas outcomes indicators are more difficult to attribute to a particular organization’s work” (ibid: 26). *Outcomes indicators* are described as empirically verifiable units of evidence that demonstrate that changes, which are relevant in terms of the operating theory of change, are occurring, and that they are attributable to project activities. In addition to discussing indicators conceptually, the publications provide examples of indicators that might be adopted and frameworks for benchmark development which are drawn from various sources.

In addition to the basic framework described above, TCE and BRD provide background on the importance and challenges of evaluating policy and advocacy activities, as well as points that should be considered in designing and implementing evaluation activities. Included among these considerations are the following:

- “Increased attention to evaluation may raise anxiety among some grantees. Nonprofits will be looking to funders to provide evidence that they are interested in evaluation for learning as well as for monitoring for accountability and making decisions about renewing funding. Foundations have to be open to what is being learned. That means welcoming bad news – stories of strategies that failed – as well as success stories. It’s often the negative stories that hold the most opportunity for learning” (ibid: 38).
- “[T]he path to policy change is complex and iterative. In determining what actions will create change or how to assess progress, linear cause and effect models are not particularly helpful in trying to understand the nonlinear dynamics of the system” (ibid: 8).
- “Numerous players and dynamics outside the grantee organization, such as an opposition organization or the political and economic environment, heavily shape policy and

⁷ “Based on Christoffel, K., “Public Health Advocacy: Process and Product.” *American Journal of Public Health.*”

advocacy work... The influence of these external forces is hard to predict and often impossible for a grantee to control... [P]olicy grantees can do everything within their control 'right' ... and still not achieve their goal... Change often happens when an opportunity window opens up" (ibid: 8).

- "Focus on the foundation's and grantee's contribution, not attribution... Focus a foundation's evaluation on developing an analysis of meaningful contribution to changes in the policy environment rather than trying to distinguish changes that can be directly attributed to a single foundation or organization" (ibid: 6).
- "Since dynamics in the policy arena can change quickly, advocates must constantly adjust their strategies to fit the current environment... It requires discipline, attention and a deep understanding of the issues and the policy environment to craft an approach and a set of goals that are flexible without being merely reactive or haphazard" (ibid: 9).
- "The most crucial aspect of getting grantees to collect evaluation is to make sure they value learning in their organization... Grantees need the time, skills and money to collect and analyze data, and then think about the implications for their work" (ibid: 34).
- "The complexity of the process for measuring benchmarks should be commensurate with the complexity of the project" (ibid: 34).
- "Clarify the funder's and grantees' overarching goals, including the assumptions about how they fit together" (Guthrie et al. 2006: 4).
- "Create evaluation designs that have the flexibility to adapt to changes in the policy environment" (ibid: 4).
- "Design evaluations that can meet the needs of multiple audiences and accountability relationships" (ibid: 5).

The following "Guiding Principles for Policy Change Evaluation" are also provided (Guthrie et al 2005: 12):

1. "Expand the perception of policy work beyond state and federal legislative arenas."
2. "Build an evaluation framework around a theory about how a group's activities are expected to lead to its long-term outcomes."
3. "Focus monitoring and impact assessment for most grantees and initiatives on the steps that lay the groundwork and contribute to the policy change being sought."
4. "Include outcomes that involve building grantee capacity to become effective advocates."
5. "Focus on the foundation's and grantee's contribution, not attribution."
6. "Emphasize organizational learning as the overarching goal of evaluation for both the grantee and the foundation."
7. "Build grantee capacity to conduct self-evaluation."

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Relatively simple efforts
- Relatively complex efforts
- Policy advocacy
- Health-related programming

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: Moderate

Tools associated with the framework: N/a

Urban Institute and The Center for What Works

Intended Users: People with decision-making power relating to “advocacy programs.”

Social Justice Focus: The UI/CWW framework is focused on “advocacy programs” which are described in the following way: “To improve the condition of the target population, specifically to help protect human, legal and civil rights, by change efforts initiated by a policy-advocacy organization or organizations that do policy advocacy as a part of their work. Programs may also include non-human issues such as animals or environment” (Lampkin et al. 2006[b]).

Characterization: Along with framing considerations, UI/CWW provides a draft “common outcome indicator framework” to inform the development and review of outcomes and indicators for diverse types of programs. It also provides “candidate outcomes, outcome indicators, and outcome sequence charts” for fourteen specific program types, including: adult education and family literacy, advocacy, affordable housing, assisted living, business assistance, community organizing, emergency shelter, employment training, health risk reduction, performing arts, prisoner re-entry, transitional housing, youth mentoring, and youth tutoring.

The common outcome indicator framework directs users to consider outcomes in the following categories, and then offers examples of common indicators in each category:

1. Knowledge/Learning/Attitude
 - a. Skills (knowledge, learning)
 - b. Attitude
 - c. Readiness (qualification)
2. Behavior
 - a. Incidence of bad behavior
 - b. Incidence of desirable activity
 - c. Maintenance of new behavior
3. Condition/Status
 - a. Participant social status
 - b. Participant economic condition
 - c. Participant health condition

The outcome sequence chart for advocacy (as for other project areas) “Identifies key outcomes presented in the sequence that are normally expected to occur. The chart illustrates how one outcome leads to the next and identifies specific indicators that might be used to track each outcome. Intermediate outcomes tend to be on the left, and end (or final) outcomes are on the right” (ibid). Implicit to this chart – which resembles a logic model – is a theory of change that leads from visibility, publicity, alliances, knowledge, and support; to increased legislative support and favorable litigation (all (intermediate outcomes); to the end outcomes of changes in policy, increased regulatory process implementation, and community benefit.

The candidate outcome indicators table “lists outcomes and associated indicators as a starting point for deciding which outcomes to track.” Columns of the table are titled “common outcomes,” “program specific outcomes,” “advocacy indicators,” “data collection strategy,” “notes,” and “outcome stage.” The first row of the table reads:

- Common outcomes: “Increased awareness”
- Program specific outcome: “Increased visibility by policy advocacy organization on issue X”
- Advocacy indicators: “Number of people targeted with information on issue X
- Data collection strategy: “Organizational records”
- Notes: “1: Specific to a particular ad, website, article etc., as pertains to ‘issue x.’ 2: “# published in local newspapers, # published in newspaper outside of metro area (to demonstrate reach), # of papers published in professional magazines/journals.”
- Outcome stage: “Intermediate”

You might be especially interested in the framework if you are evaluating:

- Policy advocacy
- Relatively simple efforts
- “Advocacy” efforts whose outcomes could potentially be understood in terms that are more generally applicable to the outcomes of different types of efforts

Extent to which evaluation is ideally structured through project planning: High

Accessibility of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation: Moderate

Tools associated with the framework: Lists of potential outcomes and indicators, and data collection strategies that could be appropriate to them

V. Information Clearinghouses

The following websites provide links to resource materials that are relevant to social justice grantmaking:

- Continuous Progress: <http://dp.continuousprogress.org/node/56>
- Harvard Family Research Project: <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/archives.html>
- Innovation Network: http://www.innonet.org/index.php?section_id=101&content_id=369

VI. Bibliography of Resources Available on the Internet

Evaluation Frameworks Described in This Report

► *ActionAid*

Chapman, Jennifer. 2002. "Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy." *PLA Notes* 43: 48-52
Link: www.iied.org/NR/agbioliv/pla_notes/documents/plan_04316.pdf

Chapman, Jennifer and Amboka Wameyo. 2001. *Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study*. Johannesburg: ActionAid.
Link: <http://www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf%5CScoping%20advocacy%20paper%202001.pdf>

► *Alliance for Justice*

Alliance for Justice. 2004. *Investing in Change: A Funder's Guide to Supporting Advocacy*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Justice.
Link: <http://www.advocacyevaluation.org> (charge for download)

Alliance for Justice. 2005. *Build Your Advocacy Grantmaking: Advocacy Evaluation Tool, Advocacy Capacity Assessment Tool*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Justice.
Link: <http://www.advocacyevaluation.org> (charge for download)

Online Tool: <http://www.advocacyevaluation.org/>

► *Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services – Advocacy and Policy*

Reisman, Jane, Anne Gienapp and Sarah Stachowiak (Organizational Research Services). 2007. *A Guide to Measuring Advocacy and Policy*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
Links: <http://www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/Publications.aspx?pubguid={4977C910-1A39-44BD-A106-1FC8D81EB792}> and
http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/a_guide_to_measuring_advocacy_and_policy.pdf

Reisman, Jane, Anne Gienapp and Sarah Stachowiak (Organizational Research Services). N.d. *A Handbook of Data Collection Tools: Companion to "A Guide to Measuring Advocacy and Policy"*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
Link:
http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/a_handbook_of_data_collection_tools.pdf

► *Composite Logic Model*

Anonymous. 2007. *Preparation Materials for the Advanced Practice Institute: Evaluating Advocacy Grantmaking*. Council on Foundations Annual Conference.
Links: <http://www.cof.org/Network/content.cfm?ItemNumber=9422&navItemNumber=2303>

Coffman, J., A. Hendricks, J. Kaye, T. Kelly and B. Masters. 2007. *The Advocacy and Public Policy Change Composite Logic Model*. Advanced Practice Institute conducted at the 58th Annual Conference of the Council on Foundations, Seattle, WA.
http://www.thechangeagency.org/_dbase_upl/CompositeLogicModel.pdf

► *Constituency Voice (Keystone)*

Bonbright, David. June 2005. "Measuring Social Justice Philanthropy: The Metrics Are the Method." *Alliance*10(2).
Link: <http://www.allavida.org/alliance/jun05j.html>

Keystone. 2008. *Learning with Constituents: A Guide to Identifying, Documenting and Analyzing Evidence of Impact (Planned and Unplanned), and Learning From This in Dialogue with Constituents*. London and Cape Town: Keystone.
Link: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/tools>

Keystone. 2006. *Keystone Capabilities Profiler (Beta Version 4.1)*. London and Cape Town: Keystone.
Link: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/tools>

Keystone. N.d.(a) *Becoming Eco-Intelligent: Enhancing Social Outcomes by Bringing About Better Alignment, Collaboration and Partnership Among Actors in an Activity Ecosystem*. London and Cape Town: Keystone.
Link: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/tools>

Keystone. N.d.(b) *Developing a Theory of Change: A Framework for Accountability and Learning for Social Change*. London and Cape Town: Keystone.
Link: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/tools>

Keystone. N.d.(c) "The Four Fundamentals." London and Cape Town: Keystone.
Link: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/node/34>

Keystone. N.d.(d) *The Keystone Public Reporting Framework*. London and Cape Town: Keystone.
Link: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/tools>

► *Continuous Progress (Center for Global Interdependence, Aspen Institute)*

Online Tool: www.continuousprogress.org and <http://planning.continuousprogress.org/>

► *Evaluating the Effects of International Advocacy Networks*

Wilson-Grau, Ricardo. N.d. *Evaluating the Effects of International Advocacy Networks*. Unpublished ms.
Link: <http://depts.washington.edu/mlcenter/assets/docs/aisle/Wilson.Grau.TP2.pdf>

► *Initiative Evaluation (W. K. Kellogg Foundation)*

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. 2007(a). *An Overview: Designing Initiative Evaluation; A Systems-Oriented Framework for Evaluating Social Change Efforts*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Link:

http://www.wkkf.org/DesktopModules/WKF.00_DmaSupport/ViewDoc.aspx?fld=PDFFile&CID=281&ListID=28&ItemID=5000405&LanguageID=0

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. 2007(b). *Designing Initiative Evaluation; A Systems-Oriented Framework for Evaluating Social Change Efforts*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Link: <http://www.wkkf.org/default.aspx?tabid=134&CatID=279&NID=212&LanguageID=0>

► Logical Framework Approach: LFA, Logframe Approach

Bakewell, Oliver and Anne Garbutt. 2005. *The Use and Abuse of the Logical Framework Approach*. Stockholm: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA).

Link: www.sida.se/shared/jsp/download.jsp?f=LFA-review.pdf&a=21025

Dearden, Philip, Steve Jones, Rolf Sartorius, and Center for International Development and Training (CIDT) staff. 2003. *Tools for Development: A Handbook for Those Engaged in Development Activity*. London and Glasgow: Department for International Development (DFID).

Link: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/toolsfordevelopment.pdf>

Hussein, Noha (ed.). N.d. *The Basics of Project Implementation: A Guide for Project Managers*. Atlanta: Cooperative Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE).

Link:

<http://pqdl.care.org/cuttingedge/Project%20Design/The%20Basics%20of%20Project%20Implementation%20English.pdf>

Picard, Mary. 2003. "Measurement and Methodological Challenges to CARE International's Rights-Based Programming." Cairo: CARE International Middle East and Europe Regional Management Unit (MERMU); Submitted to the EDIAIS Conference on "New Directions in Impact Assessment for Development: Methods and Practice," University of Manchester, UK, 24-25 November, 2003.

Link:

http://pqdl.care.org/pv_obj_cache/pv_obj_id_4AF41C222214D88FBE54BF00CAEAB9A963E40200

Sprechmann, Sofia and Emily Pelton. 2001. *Advocacy Tools and Guidelines: Promoting Policy Change*. Atlanta: Cooperative Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE).

Link: <http://www.care.org/getinvolved/advocacy/tools.asp>

► *Making Connections (Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services)*

Reisman, Jane, Kasey Langley, Sarah Stachowiak, and Anne Gienapp (Organizational Research Services). 2004. *A Practical Guide to Documenting Influence and Leverage in Making Connections Communities*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Link: http://www.organizationalresearch.com/publications/aecf_influence_leverage_manual.pdf

► Making the Case (Women's Funding Network)

Puntenney, Deborah L. April 2002. *Measuring Social Change Investments*. San Francisco: Women's Funding Network.

Link: <http://www.wfnet.org/documents/publications/dpuntenney-paper.pdf>

Online Resources: <http://www.wfnknowledgecenter.org/mtc2/login.php> and http://www.wfnet.org/about_wfn/ourwork.php

► Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment

Brown, S, T. Vienings, I Huebner, S. Gbaydee Doe, J. Adbulle, and Y. Shanahan. 2005. *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) Handbook, Version 2.2*. Unknown Location: Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction (CPR) Network.

Links: <http://cpr.web.cern.ch/cpr/> and http://cern.ch/cpr/library/Tools/PCIA_HandbookEn_v2.2.pdf

Bush, Kenneth. 2003. *PCIA Five Years On: The Commodification of an Idea*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Link: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/uploads/download/dialogue1_bush.pdf

Bush, Kenneth. 1998. "A Measure of Peace: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) of Development Projects in Conflict Zones." Ottawa: The Peacebuilding and Reconstruction Program Initiative and The Evaluation Unit, International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Link: www.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/10533919790A_Measure_of_Peace.pdf

Hoffman, Mark. 2004. *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment Methodology*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Link: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/std_page.php?LANG=e&id=11

► The California Endowment / Blueprint Research & Design, Inc.

Guthrie, Kendall, Justin Louie, and Catherine Crystal Foster (Blueprint Research & Design, Inc.). 2006. *The Challenge of Assessing Policy and Advocacy Activities: Part II – Moving from Theory to Practice*. Los Angeles, CA: The California Endowment.

Link: http://www.calendow.org/uploadedFiles/challenge_assessing_policy_advocacy2.pdf

Guthrie, Kendall, Justin Louie, Tom David and Catherine Crystal Foster (Blueprint Research & Design, Inc.). 2005. *The Challenge of Assessing Policy and Advocacy Activities: Strategies for a Prospective Evaluation Approach*. Los Angeles, CA: The California Endowment.

Link:

http://www.calendow.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Evaluation/challenge_assessing_policy_advocacy.pdf

► Urban Institute and The Center for What Works

Lampkin, Linda M., Mary Kopczynski Winkler, Janelle Kerlin, Harry P. Hatry, Debra Natenshon, Jason Saul, Julia Melkers, and Anna Sheshadri. 2006(a). *Building a Common Outcome Framework to Measure Nonprofit Performance*. Washington, DC and Chicago, IL: Urban Institute and The Center for What Works.

Links: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411404_Nonprofit_Performance.pdf and <http://www.whatworks.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=4>

Lampkin, Linda M., Mary Kopczynski Winkler, Janelle Kerlin, Harry P. Hatry, Debra Natenshon, Jason Saul, Julia Melkers, and Anna Sheshadri. 2006(b). *Candidate Outcome Indicators: Advocacy Program*. Washington, DC and Chicago, IL: Urban Institute and The Center for What Works.

Links: <http://www.urban.org/center/met/projects/upload/Advocacy.pdf> and <http://www.whatworks.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=4>

Other Works of Interest

Anderson, Mary B. 2004. *Experiences with Impact Assessment: Can we Know what Good we do?* Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Link: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/std_page.php?LANG=e&id=11

Anati, Miriam. 2006. "EUMAP Advocating for Change: Some Lessons Learned in Conducting Advocacy in Europe's Transition Communities." In *eumap.org: Features, July/September 2006, ADVOCACY: Are civil society organizations any good at it? (And what exactly IS it anyway?)*

<http://www.eumap.org/journal/features/2006/advocacy/anati.pdf>

Anonymous. 2007. "Annex: NGO Accountability – Initiatives and Papers." "Created as part of a study conducted conjointly by Keystone and AccountAbility for the British Overseas NGOs for Development (BOND).

Link: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/resources/articles>

Anonymous. 1996. "Conducting a Participatory Evaluation." In *Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Tips, USAID Center for Information and Evaluation, Number 1, 1996*.

Link: http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/pdf_docs/pnabs539.pdf

Anonymous. N.d. *Frequently Asked Questions on Appreciative Evaluation*. Potomac, MD: EnCompass, LLC.

Link: <http://www.encompassworld.com/publications/Frequently%20Asked%20Questions.pdf>

Applied Research Center. 2004. *Power, Participation & State-Based Politics: An Evaluation of the Ford Foundation's Collaborations that Count Initiative*. Oakland: Applied Research Center.
Link: <http://www.arc.org/content/view/288/102/>

Auspos, Patricia and Anne C. Kubisch. 2004. *Building Knowledge about Community Change: Moving Beyond Evaluations*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute. Link: <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/BUILDINGKNOWELDGE.pdf>

Austin, Alex, Martina Fischer and Oliver Wils (eds). 2003. *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment: Critical Views on Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
Link: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/std_page.php?LANG=e&id=11

Awori, Thelma. 2003. *Monitoring and Evaluation Format for Africa*. New York, NY: UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women).
Link: <http://www.afrea.org/documents/document.cfm?docID=198>

Blair, Jill and Fay Twersky. 2004. *Evaluating Social Change Meeting Summary*. Berkeley, CA: BTW Consultants for Marguerite Casey Foundation.
Link: <http://www.informingchange.com/downloads/EvaluatingSocialChange.pdf>

Bumgarner, Richard, Douglas Hattaway, Geoffrey Lamb, James G. McGann, and Holly Wise. 2006. *Center for Global Development: Evaluation of Impact*. Washington, DC: Arabella Philanthropic Investment Advisors. Produced for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and Rockefeller Foundation.
Link: <http://www.arabellaadvisors.com/CGDreport/CGDWeb.pdf>

Bushe, Gervase R. 2001. "Five Theories of Change Embedded in Appreciative Inquiry." In D. Cooperrider, P. Sorenson, D. Whitney, and T. Yaeger (eds) *Appreciative Inquiry: An Emerging Direction for Organization Development*. Champaign, IL: Stipes. Pp. 117-127.
Link: <http://www.gervasebushe.ca/ai5.pdf>

Carr Center for Human Rights Policy. July 6-8, 2006. *Workshop on Measurement and Human Rights*. Cambridge, MA: Carr Center for Human Rights Policy in collaboration with the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
Link: www.hks.harvard.edu/cchrp/programareas/measurement/Measurement_Report_12_18.doc

Center for Nonprofit Strategies. 2005. *Advocacy for Impact: Lessons from Six Successful Campaigns*. A Report Commissioned by the Global Interdependence Initiative, Aspen Institute.
Link: http://www.gii-exchange.org/web/file_upload/advocacy%20for%20impact.pdf

Centre for Voluntary Research and Development. N.d. *Social Justice Grantmaking: Finding Common Language (Report I)*. Ottawa: Centre for Voluntary Research and Development, Carleton University and the University of Ottawa for Community Foundations of Canada's Project: Social Justice Grantmaking – Moving Beyond Traditional Roles.

Link: <http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/doc/SocJus1ENG2003feb.pdf>

Centre for Voluntary Research and Development. N.d. *Tools of Social Justice Grantmaking*. Ottawa: Centre for Voluntary Research and Development, Carleton University and the University of Ottawa for Community Foundations of Canada's Project: Social Justice Grantmaking – Moving Beyond Traditional Roles.

Link: <http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/doc/SocJus3ENG2003feb.pdf>

Charkiewicz, Ewa. N.d. "Beyond Good and Evil: Notes on Global Feminist Advocacy 1." Manila: Isis International.

Link:

http://www.isiswomen.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=517&Itemid=207

Community Foundations of Canada. 2006. *Addressing Our Toughest Challenges: A Social Justice Discussion Guide for Community Foundations*. Ottawa: Community Foundations of Canada.

Link: <http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/socialjustice/index.cfm>

Covey, Jane G. N.d. "Accountability and Effectiveness of NGO Policy Alliances." *IDR Reports 11(8)*.

Link: <http://www.worlded.org/docs/Publications/idr/pdf/11-8.pdf>.

Cousins, J. Bradley. 1995. "Participatory Evaluation: Enhancing Evaluation Use and Organizational Learning Capacity." In *The Evaluation Exchange 1(3/4)*.

Link: <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/issue2/theory.html>

Davies, Rick. 2003. "Network Perspectives in the Evaluation of Interventions: More Than a Metaphor." EDAIS Conference, 24-25 November, 2003, "New Directions in Impact Assessment for Development: Methods and Practice."

Link: <http://www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/conference/Abstracts/Davies.shtml>

Foster-Fishman, Pennie, Laurie Van Egeren, and Huilan Yang. 2005. *Using a Systems Change Approach to Evaluate Comprehensive Community Change Initiatives*. Presentation to the American Evaluation Association/Canadian Evaluation Society Joint Conference, Toronto, Canada, October 2005.

Link:

<http://www.wkkf.org/default.aspx?tabid=101&CID=281&CatID=281&ItemID=5000160&NID=20&LanguageID=0>

Guijt, Irene. July 2007(a). *Assessing and Learning for Social Change: A Discussion Paper*. Prepared for the Power, Participation and Change Group, Institute of Development Studies, United Kingdom. Funded by the Governance and Civil Society Program, Ford Foundation.

Link:

<http://www.pnet.ids.ac.uk/docs/Publications%20on%20Participation%20February%202008.pdf>

Guijt, Irene. July 2007(b). *Critical Readings on Assessing and Learning for Social Change: A Review*. Prepared for the Power, Participation and Change Group, Institute of Development Studies, United Kingdom. Funded by the Governance and Civil Society Program, Ford Foundation.

Link:

http://www.ids.ac.uk/UserFiles/File/Participation_publications/asc_critical_readings_FINAL_no_v.pdf

Hammer, Ferenc. 2006. "Advocacy in the Field of Social Rights: A Story with a Bittersweet Conclusion." In *eumap.org: Features, July/September 2006, ADVOCACY: Are civil society organizations any good at it? (And what exactly IS it anyway?)*

<http://www.eumap.org/journal/features/2006/advocacy/hammer.pdf>

Kelly, Linda. 2002. International Advocacy: Measuring Performance and Effectiveness. Paper presented at the 2002 Australasian Evaluation Society International Conference, October/November 2002, Woolongong, Australia.

Link: http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20021030_kelly_linda.pdf

Krebs, Valdis and June Holley. 2002. "Building Sustainable Communities through Network Building." Unpublished ms.

Link:

http://www.supportingadvancement.com/web_sightings/community_building/community_building.pdf

Kumar, Yogesh. N.d. "Monitoring and Evaluation of Advocacy Campaigns: Opportunities and Challenges." Bhopal: Samarthan Centre for Development Support.

Link:

<http://www.intrac.org/docs.php/2301/TWG%20%20Advocacy%20%20Paper%20Yogesh%20Kumar.doc>

Mayoux, Linda. N.d. *Advocacy for Poverty Eradication and Empowerment: Ways Forward for Advocacy Impact Assessment*. Swindon, Wiltshire, UK: Wise Development Limited.

Link: www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/pdf/Advocacy.pdf

Miller, Valerie. N.d. *NGO and Grassroots Policy Influence*. Washington, DC: Just Associates.

Link: <http://www.justassociates.org/whatissuccess.pdf>

Mott, Andrew. N.d. *Strengthening Social Change Through Assessment and Organizational Learning: Report on the Grey Rocks Conference – An International Exchange with Grant Support from the Ford Foundation*. Washington, DC: Community Learning Project.

Link:

<http://www.pnet.ids.ac.uk/docs/Publications%20on%20Participation%20February%202008.pdf>

Neufeldt, Reina C. 2007. *“Frameworkers” and “Circlers” – Exploring Assumptions in Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Link: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/std_page.php?LANG=e&id=11

Preskill, Hallie. 2007. *Using Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation Practice*. Presented at the AEA-CDC 2007 Summer Evaluation Institute; June 11-12, 2007; Atlanta, GA.

Link: <http://www.eval.org/summerinstitute07/handouts/si07.preskillf.pdf>

Proscio, Tony. 2005. *Advocacy Funding: The Philanthropy of Changing Minds*. New York: GrantCraft, The Ford Foundation.

Link: <http://www.grantcraft.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.viewPage&pageID=734>

Puntenney, Deborah. 2002. *Measuring Social Change Investments*. San Francisco, CA: Women’s Funding Network.

Link: <http://www.wfnet.org/documents/publications/dpuntenney-paper.pdf>

Rachel, Linde. 2006. *Guidelines for Impact or Outcome Evaluation for Projects Funded by the UNIFEM Trust Fund to Eliminate Violence Against Women*. Washington, DC: World Bank Gender and Development Group – PRM.

Link: <http://www.humanrightsimpact.org/publications/item/pub/198/>

Reimann, Cordula. 2004. *Assessing the State-of-the-Art in Conflict Transformation*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Link: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/std_page.php?LANG=e&id=11

Roduner, Daniel. 2006. *Outcome Mapping: Presentation and Introduction into the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Method*. Produced for the CIEA Seminary 2006. Lindau, Switzerland: Agridea Lindau.

Link: http://www.ciea.ch/documents/s06_ref_roduner_e.pdf

Schmelzle, Beatrix (ed.). 2005. *New Trends in Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Link: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/std_page.php?LANG=e&id=11

Shaw, Aileen. 2002. *Social Justice Philanthropy: An Overview*. New York: The Synergos Institute.

Link: <http://www.synergos.org/knowledge/02/socialjusticeoverview.pdf>

Shumaker, Jennifer. 1995. “Participatory Evaluators’ Roundtable, 1995.” In *The Evaluation Exchange* 1(3/4).

Link: <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/issue2/bbt.html>

Smith, Benjamin, Karen Matheson, and Sarah DiJulio. 2006. *eNonprofit Benchmarks Study: Measuring Email Messaging, Online Fundraising, and Internet Advocacy Metrics*. Washington, DC: M & R Strategic Services and Advocacy Institute.

Link: http://www.e-benchmarksstudy.com/pubs/eNonprofit_Benchmarks_Study.pdf

Smutylo, Terry. August 2005. "Outcome Mapping: A Method for Tracking Behavioural Changes in Development Programs." In *ILAC Brief 7*. Rome: Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

Link: <http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/downloads/Briefs/Brief7Proof2.pdf>

Sprouse, Mercedes. 2006. "Postcard from the Frontline: Lessons Learned in the Battle for Hearts and Minds in the New Europe." In *eumap.org: Features, July/September 2006, ADVOCACY: Are civil society organizations any good at it? (And what exactly IS it anyway?)*

Link: <http://www.eumap.org/journal/features/2006/advocacy/sprouse.pdf>

Snowdon, Ashley. 2004. *Evaluating Philanthropic Support of Public Policy Advocacy: A Resource for Funders*. San Francisco, CA: Northern California Grantmakers.

Link: <http://www.ncg.org/toolkit/pdfs/ncgevaluatingppgm.pdf>

Snowdon, Ashley. 2004. *Evaluating Public Policy Grantmaking: A Resource for Funders*. San Francisco, CA: Northern California Grantmakers.

Link: http://www.ncg.org/toolkit/pdfs/evaluating_PPGM.pdf

The National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. 2005. "Social Justice Philanthropy: The Latest Trend, or a Lens for Grantmaking? – Executive Summary." Washington, DC: The National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.

Link: http://www.ncrp.org/downloads/Social_Justice%20Philanthropy-Executive_Summary.pdf

The National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. 2003. *Understanding Social Justice Philanthropy*. Washington, DC: The National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.

Link: <http://www.ncrp.org/PDF/UnderstandingSocialJusticePhilanthropy.pdf>

Tobin, Joseph, Gustavo E. Fischman, and Sylvia Sukop. 2007. *Storytelling Approaches to Program Evaluation: An Introduction*. Los Angeles: The California Endowment.

Link:

<http://www.tcfv.org/pdf/prevention/Storytelling%20Approaches%20to%20Program%20Evaluation%20-%20CA%20Endowment.pdf>

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. 2004. *Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation and Action: Logic Model Development Guide*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Link: <http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub3669.pdf>

Zukoski, Ann and Mia Luluquisen. 2002. "Participatory Evaluation: What is it? Why do it? What are the Challenges?" In *Community-Based Public Health Policy & Practice, Issue 5, April 2002*. A Collaboration of The California Endowment and the Public Health Institute.

Link: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Evaluation.pdf

Appendix: Summary of Evaluation Frameworks Relevant to Social Justice Philanthropy

NAME of the framework & INTENDED USERS	SOCIAL JUSTICE FOCUS	CHARACTERIZATION	You MIGHT BE ESPECIALLY INTERESTED in this framework if you are evaluating...	Extent to which EVALUATION is ideally STRUCTURED through PROJECT PLANNING	ACCESSIBILITY of the framework to people who are not experts in evaluation	TOOLS associated with the framework
<p>ActionAid</p> <p>Decision-makers in the NGO sector who are interested in advocacy</p>	<p>“Advocacy includes a whole range of tactics such as influencing, lobbying, campaigning, demonstrations, boycotts, etc.”ⁱⁱⁱ</p>	<p><i>ActionAid offers an open-ended and evocative – as opposed to proscriptive and fully formed – framework for monitoring and evaluating advocacy that is consistent with general trends in the field of advocacy/social justice evaluation. It is distinctive in its attention to political dynamics within, and between, civil society groups.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ ActionAid urges users to incorporate “different dimensions of success” in monitoring and evaluating advocacy, including: balancing advocacy work and capacity-building; changing public opinion and social norms; and recognizing trade-offs. ◦ Categories of outcomes proposed include: policy change; strengthening civil society; supporting people-centered policy-making; and enlarging the space in which civil society groups can effectively operate in society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Organizational capacity-building ◦ Relatively simple efforts ◦ Relatively complex efforts 	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>High</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Examples of outcomes. ◦ “Ladder exercise” a tool for evaluating improved capacity for advocacy work ◦ GDF (“the Cone”), a tool developed “to take account of social capital.”^{iv}
<p>Alliance for Justice (AFJ)</p> <p>Grant-makers supporting advocacy work, and their prospective or existing grantees</p>	<p>Advocacy: “Efforts to influence public policy ... [e.g.,] researching, organizing, and building communications strategies, ... lobbying, networking, and educating voters... [Includes] administrative... legislative... nonpartisan election-related</p>	<p><i>The AFJ toolkit can be used online (for a fee, most often paid for by grant-makers) or in paper form, and consists of interactive computer modules (or worksheets) to be completed by grantmakers and/or grantees to assess organizational capacity to implement advocacy efforts, set the groundwork for evaluation, evaluate advocacy efforts, and generate reports. AFJ is distinguished by this toolkit, and by its strong emphasis on the capacity of institutions to carry out effective advocacy work.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The Advocacy Capacity Assessment Tool examines the following “indicators of capacity”: decision-making structures; advocacy agenda; organizational commitment to/resources for advocacy; advocacy base; advocacy partners; advocacy targets; media skills and infrastructure; advocacy strategies; and knowledge, skills and systems to effectively implement strategies. ◦ Part I of the Advocacy Evaluation Tool is to be completed at the beginning of the grant period (if possible) and charts goals, strategies, benchmarks, and progress outcomes (e.g. deliverables) to be pursued during the grant period, in both “advocacy efforts” and in “advocacy capacity-building.” ◦ Part II of the Advocacy Evaluation Tool directs users to report on the progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Organizational capacity-building ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Relatively simple efforts 	<p>High</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>See descriptions of the “Advocacy Capacity Assessment Tool” and the “Advocacy Evaluation Tool” in the “Characterization” column.</p>

	[and] ... legal advocacy.” ^v	and explain deviations from their initial plans.				
Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services (AECF/ORS) – Advocacy and Policy Primarily grant-makers; also decision-makers in policy change and advocacy	“Policy change” and “advocacy,” both of which are distinguished from “social change.” Social change is focused on actual changes in physical or social conditions. Policy change is focused on the “policy arena.” Advocacy is a tactic for achieving change.	<i>AECF/ORS presents “a stepwise approach to making evaluation design choices. The three steps are as follows: 1. Start with a theory of change. 2. Identify outcome categories. 3. Select a practical and strategic approach to measurement.” AECF/ORS is distinguished by its strong focus on building planning and evaluation approaches around a theory of change, and by its provision of a wide range of sample information-gathering tools that can be used in evaluation.</i> ◦ “A theory of change ... addresses the set of linkages among strategies, outcomes and goals that support a broader mission or vision, along with the underlying assumptions that are related to these linkages... The process [of developing a theory of change] is based on the involvement of ... stakeholders.” ^{vi} ◦ The following “outcome categories” are listed: shift in social norms; strengthened organizational capacity; strengthened alliances; strengthened base of support; improved policies; changes in impact. ^{vii} ◦ AFJ describes several “promising directions to guide development of an evaluation design.” ^{viii}	◦ Organizational capacity-building ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Relatively simple efforts ◦ Relatively complex efforts	High	High	◦ AECF/ORS offer many sample evaluation tools, including surveys, interview guides, meeting reporting forms, etc. ◦ Examples of possible outcomes
Composite Logic Model (Harvard Family Research Project) “Advocates, funders, and evaluators”	“Advocacy and policy” (not defined)	<i>The Composite Logic Model (CLM) framework entails answering a series of questions to arrive at logic models that can guide advocacy and policy planning; and then answering a series of questions that can guide evaluation. CLM is distinguished by the fact that its approach is largely built around series of questions that advocates, funders and evaluators should answer, rather than around statements or direct guidance.</i> ◦ Visual representations of composite logic models are organized according to the following columns, from left to right: Inputs (divided into “organizational capacity building” and “preparation/planning”); activities/tactics; interim outcomes; policy outcomes; and impacts. ◦ Eight questions guide the construction of the logic model and planning. Five questions guide evaluation design.	◦ Organizational capacity-building ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Relatively simple efforts ◦ Relatively complex efforts	High	High	N/a
Constituency Voice (Keystone) Grant-makers, advocates, and stake-	“Social justice,” which is “something that derives from the relationships between individuals and institutions.”	<i>The Constituency Voice (CV) framework is built on “Four Fundamentals”:</i> <i>Foster community voice; map pathways to outcomes; think and act from an ecosystem perspective; and publish your learning. CV is distinguished by its strong focus on accountability to constituents (or stakeholders), and by its emphasis on facilitator-led workshops.</i> ◦ The framework is presented in five “tools”: Keystone Capabilities Profiler; Developing a Theory of Change; Becoming Eco-Intelligent; Learning with Constituents; and The Keystone Public Reporting Framework. Each tool offers	◦ Coalitions or networks ◦ Community organizing ◦ Organizational capacity-building ◦ Relatively simple efforts	High	High	Facilitator guidelines and exercises

holders		<p>instructions for facilitators and participants, who engage in assessment and planning together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Eco-intelligence is “the capability of an organization to understand the activity ecosystem within which it works, to identify potential actors with whom collaboration is possible, and to successfully plan and manage such collaborations so that they enhance social outcomes.”^{ix} 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Relatively complex efforts ◦ Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice 			
<p>Continuous Progress (Center for Global Interdependence, Aspen Institute)</p> <p>Grant-makers and advocates</p>	<p>Advocacy (not defined)</p>	<p><i>Continuous Progress (CP) encourages grantmakers and advocates to “look at advocacy evaluation as a dynamic process, one that continues throughout the life of an advocacy effort and contributes to advocacy progress. The process requires:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> “Planning for evaluation at the beginning of your advocacy work; Monitoring and documenting progress, and correcting your course as necessary; Conducting a summative evaluation at the end; and Sharing your results – both good and bad.” <p>CP is distinguished by its provision of a free, interactive Internet-based tool that is designed to assist the planning and evaluation of advocacy through the construction of logic models.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ CP offers online guidance to both grantmakers and advocates, in sections dedicated to “before” you start your campaign or begin planning; “during” your campaign; and “after” your campaign has ended. ◦ CP also offers an interactive tool for constructing a logic model for advocacy projects, which begins with a determination of the “impacts” that are sought, proceeds to a determination of “policy goals,” and then proceeds to sections on “audiences,” “inputs” (both capacity-building and program-related), “contextual factors,” “activities/tactics,” “interim outcomes and benchmarks.” Although the guide progresses in a linear fashion, its sections can be revised and worked on repeatedly and in any order. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Organizational capacity-building ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Relatively simple efforts 	High	High	<p>An interactive, Internet-based “Advocacy and Policy Change Logic Model.”</p>
<p>Evaluating the Effects of International Advocacy Networks (R. Wilson-Grau)</p> <p>Those interested in evaluating the effects of</p>	<p>“When the goals and the functions [of a network] are focused on changing relations of power ... then it constitutes ... an ... advocacy network.”^x</p>	<p>Wilson-Grau states that international advocacy networks are especially complex, dynamic, non-hierarchical entities that operate in highly unpredictable environments, and that they require evaluation frameworks that take such features into account. Mirroring much actual evaluation practice, he recommends that evaluation largely focus on working with advocates to document the effects that networks seem to have contributed to, rather than on performance judged against pre-set outcome targets. Within this framework, evaluation might focus some attention on “operational outputs,” or “the processes, products and services that are an immediate result of the activity of the advocacy network”^{xi}. However, this framework is distinguished by the fact that it de-emphasizes connections between planning, effectiveness, and evaluation (which may be carried out with, or without, external evaluators); and by its assumption that important advocacy effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Coalitions or networks ◦ Relatively complex efforts 	Low	Moderate	N/a

international advocacy networks.		<p>are observable, typically, only in retrospect.</p> <p>“To know step by step, in advance, how the goals will be attained [is] an approach doomed to failure in the highly complex and rapidly changing world in which social innovators attempt to work... In highly emergent complex environments, such prior specification is neither possible nor desirable because it constrains openness and adaptability.”^{xii}</p>				
<p>Initiative Evaluation (W.K. Kellogg Foundation)</p> <p>External evaluators who conduct initiative evaluations for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation</p>	<p>“Two types of grant-making that involve multiple projects, locations, and grantees: (1) ‘clusters’ that typically focus on the exploration and/or development of new approaches to a program issue area; and (2) strategic ‘initiatives,’ designed to create systems changes that will lead to intended long-term sustainable impact.”^{xiii}</p>	<p>The Initiative Evaluation (IE) framework is distinguished by its orientation around the understanding that the “dynamics” of initiatives can be grouped into different categories, depending on their relationship to “a. the degree of agreement among those in the group, team, organization, community or other unit (about, for instance the changes needed in a social system), and b. the degree of certainty about actions, conditions, or consequences of actions that exist or are likely at places in the system(s).”^{xiv} According to IE, evaluation can be oriented productively around different categories of dynamics, which are defined by their degrees of agreement and certainty; and different benefits can be gained by focusing evaluation on different categories of dynamics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ To gauge accountability, one can implement “predictive evaluation design,” which focuses on dynamics that, beforehand, could be predicted with a high degree of agreement, and a high degree of certainty. ◦ “Exploratory evaluation design” focuses on dynamics that were not, beforehand, predicted with high degrees of agreement and certainty. This type of evaluation “is designed to see what insights can be gained about the areas where the complexity of the initiative is not yet understood or articulated... Results from this design are likely to enrich the theory of change.”^{xv} ◦ “Self-organizing evaluation design” is focused on dynamics that could have been foreseen with moderate levels of agreement and certainty beforehand. “Complex systems ... may ... be continually in a state of disequilibria ... often characterized by contradiction and contention... An initiative evaluator is looking for general patterns ... that provide insights into the ways those involved adapted to one another and local conditions to lead or not lead in the desired direction.”^{xvi} ◦ “Initiative renewal evaluation design” is oriented around the initiative overall. “This type of evaluation helps initiative leaders, evaluators, and grantees periodically reflect on their overall progress and determine if redesign ... is needed.”^{xvii} 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Coalitions or networks ◦ Relatively complex efforts ◦ Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice 	Variable	Low	N/a
<p>Logical Framework Approach (LFA or Logframe Approach)</p> <p>Decision-makers in</p>	<p>LFA is widely used by intergovernmental and independent development and humanitarian agencies, many</p>	<p>Logical Framework Approaches (LFA or Longframe Approaches) are distinguished by their use of logical frameworks or logframes. In simplified form, a logframe typically takes the form of a matrix, or group of matrices, that specify: in the first column, the goals, outcomes or objectives, outputs, activities, and inputs of the effort; in the second column, objectively verifiable indicators that those targets have been met; in the third column the means of verification; and in the final column, assumptions that underlie reasoning within the matrix (for example, how the “goal” could meaningfully be indicated by the “indicators,” and why the proposed means of verification are appropriate).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Relatively complex efforts ◦ The likely congruence of social justice efforts with standards of international development 	High	Low	There is an extensive literature on LFA, including numerous and diverse tools.

international development and humanitarian relief.	of which explicitly focus on transforming social and institutional structures to foster greater equity.	<i>Critiques of LFA have centered on: the tendency of LFAs to lead to the rigid interpretation and implementation of predetermined plans that are not adaptable to changing circumstances in complex environments; the difficulty of seeing, and treating, programs in a holistic manner, given LFA's compartmentalizing approach; the time-limited, project-focused nature of the approach, which is unsuitable to efforts that require long-term attention; the difficulty of reflecting nonlinear relationships in LFA; quantitative bias; focus on attribution rather than contribution to effects; and the adoption of "technocratic," as opposed to politically engaged, approaches. Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA), which is described below, is one attempt to address elements of this critique.</i>	and humanitarian evaluation			
Making Connections (Annie E. Casey Foundation / Organizational Research Services (AECF/ORS) Partners in the Making Connections initiative (U.S.). Also "foundations that are involved [with] or ... considering ... place-based strategies." ^{xviii}	Making Connections' "core strategy helps children succeed based on the belief that the best way to improve outcomes is to strengthen their families' connections to economic opportunity, positive social networks, and effective services and supports."	<i>The Making Connections (MC) approach is distinguished by its focus on working with groups of people from different institutions (or no particular institution) to plan for and evaluate their collaborative activity. MC is also distinguished by its emphasis on "influence outcomes" and "leverage outcomes," which are said to lead to "impact outcomes." Influence outcomes are "changes in community environments, relationships, institutions, organizations or service systems that impact individuals and families, including changes in issue visibility, community norms, partnerships, public will, political will, policies, regulations, service practices or business practices... [Leverage outcomes are] changes in investments (monetary or in kind contributions) by other public or private funders, institutions or organizations that help to create and support impact or influence changes related to ... powerful strategies." Impact outcomes are "changes in a condition of well being for the children, adults or families directly served by programs, agencies, planned strategies or service systems."</i> ^{xix} <i>MC suggests considering the theory of change that motivates group activity, and then "selecting and developing specificity around key influence and leverage outcomes"^{xx} by making "so that chains." "So that chains" begin with strategies, and then proceed through various kinds of outcomes; an overly simplified example might be: Register community members to vote so that elected officials will pay more attention to the community so that community members will be more likely to obtain the attention they need from government.</i> <i>MC focuses also focuses on showing "the relevance of documenting influence and leverage to the everyday life of Making Connections communities."</i> ^{xxi}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Coalitions or networks ◦ Relatively complex efforts ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Community organizing ◦ Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice 	High	High	Several sample evaluation tools are provided – e.g., surveys, interview guides, observation protocols – in the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Changes in public will ◦ Changes in visibility ◦ Changes in partnerships ◦ Changes in funding and resources ◦ Changes in policy and regulation ◦ Changes in service practice
Making the Case (Women's Funding Network) Grant-makers and	"Social change philanthropy ... invites people to invest in transforming some component of their world for	<i>The Making the Case (MTC) framework is built around the proposition that social change can be observed in terms of "shifts" – in definition, behavior, engagement, and policy – as well as the maintenance of past gains. Another distinctive feature of MTC's framework is that it guides users to consider and plan for "inhibitors and accelerators" – or factors in an organization's internal or external environment that help or hinder the organization's ability to reach its intended project goals. The MTC framework structures an interactive Internet-based tool that walks users through the processes of "planning," "evaluation,"</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Relatively simple efforts ◦ Efforts focused on women and girls 	High	High	See the description of the interactive, Internet-based tool in the "Characterization" column.

<p>their grantees, and particularly those focused on women and girls</p>	<p>the better.^{xxxi}</p>	<p>and “reporting.” Like the Alliance for Justice Internet tool, MTC’s is available for a fee, which is most often paid by grantmakers who integrate use of the tool and its vocabulary into their grantmaking and evaluation procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ MTC has been used more outside of the U.S. than have some other U.S.-developed evaluation frameworks. ◦ Social change is described both in terms of structural or institutional change, and in terms of cultural change; and on various levels of scale (from micro to macro). 				
<p>Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)</p> <p><i>Decision-makers in humanitarian relief and development fields, many of whom also use Logical Framework Analysis</i></p>	<p>Peace and conflict in societies, and the roles that development and humanitarian efforts play in affecting them</p>	<p>Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) “differs from ‘evaluation’ in the conventional sense because its scope extends far beyond the stated outputs, outcomes, goals and objectives of conventional development projects or programmes. Rather, it attempts to discern a project’s impact on the peace and conflict environment – an area it may not have been designed explicitly to affect... [I]t is quite possible that a project may fail according to limited developmental criteria (e.g., irrigation targets...) but succeed according to broader peacebuilding criteria... The converse also holds true...”^{xxiii} PCIA refers to a body of theory and practice with several variations, and, among other things, is a response to critiques of Logical Framework Analysis (see above). PCIA is also distinctive in that at least some of its variations are “designed for those who wish to ensure that the impact of their engagement will, as a minimum, ‘do no harm,’ and as an optimum, have a positive effect on the conflict dynamics of the community in which the project takes place.”^{xxiv}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ PCIA “may be distilled down to a single – but far from simple – question: Will/did the project foster or support sustainable structures and processes which strengthen the prospects for peaceful coexistence and decrease the likelihood of the outbreak, reoccurrence, or continuation of violent conflict?” ◦ PCIA “is premised on a central, underpinning assumption: any development project set in a conflict-prone region will inevitably have an impact on the peace and conflict environment – positive or negative, direct or indirect, intentional or unintentional.”^{xxv} 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Coalitions or networks ◦ Relatively complex efforts ◦ Social justice impacts and implications of efforts that are not specifically focused on social justice ◦ Efforts that are supported or structured by “development” and/or “humanitarian relief” institutions 	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>One relatively straightforward PCIA toolkit^{xxvi} focuses on needs assessment and planning that could set the groundwork for evaluation.</p>
<p>The California Endowment / Blueprint Research & Design, Inc.</p> <p><i>Primarily foundation decision-makers in the U.S. focused on health-related</i></p>	<p>“Advocacy” and “policy change,” as opposed to “social change”: see Annie E. Casey Foundation, above.</p>	<p>The California Endowment and Blueprint Research & Design, Inc. (TCE/BRD) provide a thoroughly articulated framework that places strong emphasis on taking a “prospective approach” that is oriented around a theory of change. A “prospective approach” to evaluation is one that begins during the initial project-planning period, which should be marked by close cooperation between the grant-maker and the grantee. It involves four steps: “1. Agree upon a conceptual model for the policy process under consideration. 2. Articulate a theory about how and why the activities of a given grantee, initiative or foundation are expected to lead to the ultimate policy change goal (often called a ‘theory of change’). 3. Use the ‘theory of change’ as a framework to define measurable benchmarks and indicators for assessing both progress towards desired policy change and building organizational capacity for advocacy in general. 4. Collect data on benchmarks to monitor progress and feed the data to grantees and foundation staff who can use the information to refine their</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Relatively simple efforts ◦ Relatively complex efforts ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Health-related programming 	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>N/a</p>

<p>work; also advocates, evaluators, and grant-makers more generally</p>		<p>efforts.^{xxvii}</p> <p><i>In the TCE/BRD framework, evaluation documents “process indicators [which] refer to measurement of an organization’s activities or efforts to make change happen ... [and generally] lie largely within an organization’s control,” and “outcomes indicators” which are described as empirically verifiable units of evidence that demonstrate that changes, which are relevant in terms of the operating theory of change, are occurring, and that they are to some extent the result of project activities.</i>^{xxviii}</p>				
<p>Urban Institute and The Center for What Works (UI/CWW)</p> <p><i>People with decision-making authority relating to “advocacy programs”</i></p>	<p>Advocacy programs are intended to “help protect human, legal and civil rights [through] ... policy advocacy as a part of their work. Programs may also include non-human issues such as animals or environment.”^{xxix}</p>	<p>The Urban Institute and The Center for What Works (UI/CWW) provide a draft “common indicator framework” to inform the development and review of outcomes and indicators for diverse types of programs. They also provide “candidate outcomes, outcome indicators, and outcome sequence charts” for fourteen specific program types, including advocacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The outcome sequence chart for advocacy “Identifies key outcomes presented in the sequence that are normally expected to occur. The chart illustrates how one outcome leads to the next and identifies specific indicators that might be used to track each outcome. Intermediate outcomes tend to be on the left, and end (or final) outcomes are on the right.”^{xxx} Implicit to this chart – which resembles a logic model – is a theory of change that leads from visibility, publicity, alliances, knowledge, and support; to increased legislative support and favorable litigation (all (“intermediate outcomes”)); to the end outcomes of changes in policy, increased regulatory process implementation, and community benefit. ◦ <i>The UI/CWW framework also provides the template for a “candidate outcome indicators table,” which “lists outcomes and associated indicators as a starting point for deciding which outcomes to track.” Columns of the table are titled “common outcomes,” “program specific outcomes,” “advocacy indicators,” “data collection strategy,” “notes,” and “outcome stage.”</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Policy advocacy ◦ Relatively simple efforts ◦ “Advocacy” efforts whose outcomes could potentially be understood in terms that are more generally applicable to the outcomes of different types of efforts 	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Lists of potential outcomes, indicators, and data collection strategies that could be appropriate to them</p>

-
- ⁱ This bare-bones definition of “social justice philanthropy” will be revised or replaced as the Working Group’s Meaning Definition Team continues its work.
- ⁱⁱ The Logical Framework Approach (LFA) is a possible exception to several of the generalizations supplied below. LFA is included in the *Review* because it motivates much of the evaluation that is focused on social justice programming. However, many would argue that it is an inappropriate framework for social justice evaluation unless it is extensively modified.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Chapman 2002: 48
- ^{iv} Chapman and Wameyo 2001: 37
- ^v Alliance for Justice 2005: 4
- ^{vi} Reisman et al. 2007: 11.
- ^{vii} Ibid: 17
- ^{viii} Ibid: 23-26.
- ^{ix} Keystone N.d.(a): 2
- ^x Wilson-Grau N.d.: 2
- ^{xi} Ibid: 6
- ^{xii} Ibid: 10
- ^{xiii} W.K. Kellogg Foundation 2007(b): 1
- ^{xiv} W.K. Kellogg Foundation 2007(a): 2
- ^{xv} W.K. Kellogg Foundation 2007(b): 14-15
- ^{xvi} Ibid: 25-26
- ^{xvii} Ibid: 31
- ^{xviii} Reisman et al. 2004: 2
- ^{xix} Ibid: 5-6
- ^{xx} Ibid: 16
- ^{xxi} Ibid: 57-58
- ^{xxii} Puntteney 2002: 1
- ^{xxiii} Bush 1998: 7-8
- ^{xxiv} Brown et al. 2005: no page numbers provided
- ^{xxv} Ibid
- ^{xxvi} This toolkit was developed by the Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network (CPR), “an informal network of senior managers of bilateral donor countries and multilateral agencies dealing with the complex issues of conflict management and response” (Brown et al. 2005).
- ^{xxvii} Guthrie et al. 2005: 15
- ^{xxviii} Ibid: 26
- ^{xxix} Lampkin et al 2006(b): no page numbers provided
- ^{xxx} Ibid