

“Developing an Impact Model for KNOW-HOW3000 Program”

24th of May 2016, 14:00-17:00, Vienna

With participation of staff from Member Organisations, Vorortstruktur and Horizont3000

Facilitation and report: Janine Wurzer, ReflectionWork, www.reflectionwork.at

WORKSHOP REPORT



Inhalt

Introduction and welcome to the workshop	3
Input on which the methodology will be used to develop the Know-How3000 impact model	3
Working groups to define impact model for each result area of Know-How3000	5
Conclusions.....	9

Thank you to all the participants!

Introduction and welcome to the workshop

Petra Herout provides an introduction to Know-How3000 Program, main result areas and objective.

Input on which the methodology will be used to develop the Know-How3000 impact model

The facilitator provides a quick comparison between the *Theory of Change Methodology* and *Results-Based-Management* (new EU logical framework).

Theory of Change (transformation oriented)

A theory of change is most commonly developed for large, long term programs; it focuses on what needs to be changed in order to reach the main objective. Pathways of change are developed for the main domains of change that have been identified based on a problem analysis. It is developed “backwards” from the main objective; the main question that guides the development of the pathways of change is: What needs to be changed/transformed in order to get to this objective/result,... Thereby often a logic of “if-then” is developed similar to a logical framework but with focus on change. Only the absolutely necessary changes are considered to be included in a theory of change. A fully developed theory of change will include breakthroughs, indicators, assumptions and activities.

In case of the Impact Model of “Know-How3000 Program” the organization has decided not to develop a theory of change but to use the result based management model described further below because it fits better into the logical framework – this will be more helpful for the program because its implementation has already started and is guided by a logical framework.

Nevertheless similar to a theory of change a **program hypothesis** could be developed for Know-How3000 Program; it could read more or less like **(the below is a proposal from the facilitator and therefore needs adaptation by H3, MOs, and partner organizations):**

If partner organizations and ... share between and learn from each others’ experiences and their own experiences

+

If an easy to access internet platform provides up to date information and know how on themes which are relevant for the work of the partner organization and ...

+

If knowledge management and learning is integrated in the partner organizations’ structures and processes

= then partner organizations and ... will have improved their performance to serve their target populations

Results-Based-Management; “Developing a Impact Model” (possible to be used as a handout)

In order to increase focus on effects and impacts it is useful to define intermediate outcomes between two levels in the logical framework, namely the activities/outputs level and expected results/components level.

If the intermediate level is defined it describes the effects and changes (especially regarding behavior) that the program wants to reach by its activities and outputs – this intermediate level can be called “**use of outputs**” or “**intermediate outcomes**” or “**Wirkungsziele**”, depending on preferences. It strengthens the monitoring and evaluation of effects/changes and impacts.

The term “Wirkungsziele” highlights that these are the (medium term) impacts that the program wants to reach through its activities and outputs; the term “use of output” is sometimes found more helpful especially during program design and planning phase as it is self explanatory. It is still the same, it defines medium term outcomes which if reached should lead to the objective; the objective will be the consequence of the outcomes.

Objective and results are actually the same – an objective looks at what will be the result in the future and a result looks at what has been the objective in the past.

It is useful to explicitly look at the assumptions behind each defined “use of output”/intermediate outcome. This helps to be able to manage the assumptions and create the positive conditions necessary to reach the intermediate outcomes and in the end the objective.

- Assumptions are positive conditions that will allow the impact to be reached = necessary events.
- Risks are negative conditions that make it impossible to reach the impact = unwanted events.

Overall objective (contribution)	Indicators	Means of verifications	
Specific objective (consequence of results)	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
Results/Components (fully responsible to reach)	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
Intermediate Results/Outcomes/use of output level	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
Outputs and Activities	Necessary inputs	Budget	Assumptions

Working groups to define impact model for each result area of Know-How3000

In the workshop three working groups were formed, each working on the following three questions:

- 1) Define the use of output level of one of the expected results of Know-How3000 Program – “was macht wer genau anders?” (in Folge der Nutzung und Anwendung der outputs des Know-How3000 Programs)
- 2) Wer oder was beeinflusst die Nutzung und Anwendung der outputs von KNOW-HOW3000?
- 3) Maßnahmen, um das Eintreten der Wirkungsziele (intermediate outcomes) zu unterstützen?

Gruppenarbeit 1

<p>Component KNOW HOW3000 Learning and sharing – result area: Horizont3000 partner organisations and member organisation’ partner organisations are enabled to learn from their and/or other organisations’ experiences</p>	<p>Ebene 1 Fokus auf Outputs Ebene 2 “use of output” – intermediate outcomes - Wirkungsziele</p>	<p>Wer oder was beeinflusst die Nutzung und Anwendung der outputs von KNOW-HOW3000?</p>	<p>Maßnahmen, um das Eintreten der Wirkungsziele (intermediate outcomes) zu unterstützen</p>
<p>(Ebene 2) Intermediate outcome – use of output: Wer macht was genau anders?</p>	<p>1,2,3 Networking and creation of synergies 4 Specific problems solved 1,4 improved activities, management, quality, finance management 5 Of work</p>	<p>Representation of Target Groups Confidence / trust in participants Preparation and facilitation of activities Available (manual) description of methods/good practice (Blitz: 1-1 Übertragung) Documentation and Follow up Know-How is shared in organization Time for participation, follow up and implementation</p>	<p>Criteria for selection of participants Methodological preparation of exchange Guidelines (Leitfaden) for events/activities Participatory and timely planning Ownership partners propose topics</p>
<p>Ebene 1 Activities and outputs</p>	<p>Specific Trainings 1 Exchange of good Practices 2 Sharing Event (conferences) 3 Borrow-a-TA 4</p>		

	Systematisierung 5 CoPs 6 North-South TAs 7 Learning visits 8 South-South TAs 9 Knowolympics		
--	---	--	--

Gruppenarbeit 2

Component KNOW- HOW3000 Internet- Platform - Result area: „The internet platform provides more effectively information and know-how relevant to H3 Partner Organisations’, Member Organisations’ Partners’ and further cooperation partners’ work	Ebene 1 Fokus auf Outputs Ebene 2 “use of output” – intermediate outcomes - Wirkungsziele	Wer oder was beeinflusst die Nutzung und Anwendung der outputs von KNOW-HOW3000?	Maßnahmen, um das Eintreten der Wirkungsziele (intermediate outcomes) zu unterstützen
(Ebene 2) Intermediate outcome – use of output: Wer macht was genau anders?	1) MultiplikatorInnen kennen und nutzen die Plattform Verwendung der Plattform ist gestiegen 2) Partnerorganisationen (kennen) und nutzen Inhalte der Plattform TAs haben Zugang zu für sie relevante Informationen 3) TA besser qualifiziert, kompetenter in ihrer Arbeit	TAs fungieren als VermittlerInnen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk: No access to internet (very limited to PNG) - Assumption: Time and resources at partner level 	Bewerbung der Plattform, des Nutzens (ÖA), (spielerisch) MOZ + PNG: Tas = Knowledge Management Champions – strukturell verankert Bedarfserhebung bei Partnerorganisationen “Reality check” der Bedürfnisse
Ebene 1 Activities and outputs	Plattform an Zielgruppen angepasst Neudefinition der Zielgruppen Starke Einbindung der TAs (INTRANET) Festlegung von „Power Usern“		

	pro VOS/in H3Strukturen Art der Inhalte der Plattform (neu) definiert		
--	---	--	--

Gruppenarbeit 3

Component Organizational Development - Result area: „Horizont3000 and its partner organisations’ structure and process are (demonstrably) improved to serve their target group needs	Ebene 1 Fokus auf Outputs Ebene 2 “use of output” – intermediate outcomes - Wirkungsziele	Wer oder was beeinflusst die Nutzung und Anwendung der outputs von KNOW- HOW3000?	Maßnahmen, um das Eintreten der Wirkungsziele (intermediate outcomes) zu unterstützen
(Ebene 2) Intermediate outcome – use of output: Wer macht was genau anders?	R1 mutual understanding and communication between H3, MO, PP R1 more effective and efficient activities are implemented by PP, reg. OD, H3, MO R1 Capacity Building at PP staff is strengthened reg. OD, MO, H3 R2 tools and instruments are locally adapted and used by PP + H3 + MO R2 quality management is secured and accessible and used by PP+H3+MO R2 methods are locally standardized and used by PP+H3+MO	Ass2: PP sind sich ihres Bedarfs bewusst Partner sind interessiert, haben/kennen ihren Bedarf bzgl OE um CoP teilzunehmen Ass2 PP haben Kapazität (zeitl. & fin.) und erkennen Mehrwert an CoP CoP ist effektiv, effizient und PP sind davon überzeugt PP sin offen zu lernen, sich auszutauschen, zu verbessern Ass 2 adequate number of TA for OD available Ass 2 Gegeben sind – technische Voraussetzung – nutzerfreundlich- strukturiert Ass 2 – capacity of masters available – technical / time	→ Partizipative Bedarfserhebung → Netzwerken → Recruiting → Responsibility H3 → Responsible VOS
Ebene 1 Activities and outputs	A1 to install CoP for OD A2 to adapt and extend OD Toolbox A3 to maintain		

	<p>toolbox by masters</p> <p>Outputs:</p> <p>A1 Meetings/CoP are initiated regarding OD topics</p> <p>CoP: Partners TAs</p> <p>CoP: H3, MOs</p> <p>A2 OD toolbox is adapted, updated and extended</p> <p>OD Toolbox is user-friendly</p> <p>A3 OD toolbox masters are identified</p>		
--	--	--	--

Anmerkungen zu Gruppe 2 – MO-Partners, Multiplikatorinnen

Conclusions

Due to the limited time there was no space to facilitate a reflection on the methodology that has been used and tested in the workshop; still the participants were asked to share on cards what they found “helpful” and “good” about the methodology and what they found “not so helpful” or “negative about the methodology. The following comments were shared:

Positiv:

- Durch Austausch im Workshop -> mehr infos über Know_How3000 tools für Mos (tieferer Einblick und Verständnis)
- Schön mit MO-KollegInnen zu arbeiten
- Maßnahmen in Gruppe diskutieren bringt Mehrwert durch Vielzahl von Erfahrungen
- Strukture (Format)
- Planung
- Diskussion der Einflußfaktoren gemeinsam war wichtig
- Schafft schnell Klarheit
- Leicht in Logframe integrierbar
- Intermediate outcomes hilfreich bei Planung (bei logframe)
- Implicit Annahmen in Projektlogik werden explizit gemacht
- Dadurch kann man mehr in die Tiefe gehen bei Ausformulierungen von Wirkungen
- Konkrete Schritte vom Inhalt plus Ablauf her
- Gut den Fokus auf Ziwebene zu legen, benötigt viel Zeit für kritische Reflexion
- Leitet an auf die Wirkung zu fokussieren
- Realitätsnähere Planung möglich
- Absicherung der Resultate
- Umfassenderer Überblick durch direkt zuordenbare Assumptions
- Hilft Begleitmaßnahmen zu definieren
- Klare Fragen, kenne logframe-Planung nur so
- Erweitert den Fokus
- Methode nützlich um zu hinterfragen, beweisen, dass die erwünschte Wirkung da ist
- Reflektieren über Prozess prinzipiell sehr gut
- Blick auf unerwünschte Wirkungen, Assumptions/Risks
- Prozesse bottom up durchdenken

Negativ:

- Wirkung dokumentieren bei inhaltlich „breitem“ Program schwierig
- Zeitintensiv
- Problem: es gibt kein Kriterium für Scheitern einer Aktivität
- Wir sind nur von unseren Annahmen ausgegangen, Sichtweise der Partner war heute nicht einbezogen
- Gefahr der Aufblähung
- Zeitaufwendig
- Monitoringaufwand
- Langfristig Wirkung/Veränderung zu kurz

- Aufwendig
- Ausgehen sollte man von der Wirkung
- Viel Zeit für Verständigung nötig
- Denken in Kästchen kann behindern. Visualisierung über Ketten möglich?

At the end Petra explains how the produced material will be used and when follow up steps will be defined.

Thank you!