

Annex To Indicator Guidance

Indicator: Changes Resulting from Joint Initiatives ([see here](#))

Indicator wording: Evidence of changes in [define: policy / service delivery / community engagement practices] resulting from joint initiatives between [specify actors]

If your project wants to assess the degree of change - rather than document evidence - consider reformulating the proposed indicator to *Extent of changes in [policy / service delivery / community engagement practices] resulting from joint initiatives between [actors]*. To assess the extent of change in policy / service delivery / community engagement, **establish clear criteria and standards for different levels of change, informed by baseline findings.**

Projects may **use a rubric-based rating** (e.g. on a 1–5 scale or qualitative levels) to show progression over time (*see the guidance in documents below*). **Users should always formulate their own project-specific rubrics at the inception** in line with baseline findings. Ideally, formulation should take place during a joint workshop with project partners. An illustrative example of a simple rubric scale and the description of each level can be:

- **None (=1)** – No joint initiatives or actions are in place.
- **Emerging (=2)** – Joint initiative leads to discussion, recognition of issues, or commitment to collaborate.
- **Moderate (=3)** – Initial actions or pilots implemented through joint initiative.
- **Significant (=4)** – Joint initiative produces observable improvement in policy, service, or practice.
- **Institutionalised (=5)** – Change produced by joint initiative becomes embedded in systems or regulations and maintained by authorities.

Assign a level or score (e.g. none, emerging, moderate, significant, institutionalised) to changes observed in your target location(s) at baseline and then at the planned assessment point(s) and/or endline. Compare the performance on the rubrics scale throughout your intervention to assess the progress over time. If desired, aggregate results to show how many communities, policy areas, or services are at each level of progress. Using numerical scores (e.g. 1–5) can make data aggregation and year-to-year comparison easier.

If you want to promote community participation and **increase community ownership**, design rubric levels, conduct scoring, and validate progress together with project staff, partners, and other relevant actors in a participatory manner.

Outcome Harvesting methodology (*see resources below*) can help explain shifts between rubric levels, collect concrete examples, and provide deeper understanding of *how and why* change happened.

If using rubrics is too resource-intensive or if sufficient data cannot be collected to reliably justify scores (e.g. due to project scale or partner coordination constraints), you may **use Outcome Harvesting independently** without rubric scoring, while still maintaining a results-based and evidence-driven approach.

Consider engaging an external expert or evaluator to substantiate / validate your results during project's evaluation.

Indicators that assess extent are **methodologically more complex and may be challenging** to inform, particularly where project partners have limited ownership of the data collection process or where coordination costs are high. To mitigate these challenges, projects should support partners through training and practical tools, involve them in the formulation of rubrics and scoring, and provide clear guidance on how to report on the indicator (e.g. through a dedicated section in the narrative report template). Where outcome-focused data is not systematically collected during implementation, external evaluators may be engaged to harvest and substantiate outcomes as part of the project evaluation.

Links:

<https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/approaches/outcome-harvesting>

<https://www.intrac.org/app/uploads/2024/12/Outcome-harvesting.pdf>

<https://outcomeharvesting.net/>

<https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/methods/rubrics>