

QuIP and Outcome Harvesting compared

Outcome harvesting steps	Comparison with the QuIP
<p>1. Design. Identify useful questions and information to be collected through discussion with the change agent. This includes identifying key ‘social actors’ affected by the actions of the change agent. Key questions include the following. What happened? Who did it? How do we know? Why is it important?</p>	<p>QuIP starts with dialogue between the commissioner and lead researcher, including identification of the activities to be assessed, intended beneficiaries, which of them to interview and what potential outcomes (‘domains’) there should cover.</p>
<p>2. Gather data and draft outcome description.</p>	
<p>3. Engage change agents in formulating the outcome description.</p>	<p>QuIP requires that the lead researcher elicits from the implementing agency a clear ‘theory of change’, including as much detail as possible about what activities selected interviewees participated in and when. Discussion also covers how to approach interviewees, and how to frame discussions with them, including the choreography of blindfolding and un-blindfolding activities once data collection and analysis is complete (see below).</p>
<p>4. Substantiate. This entails obtaining the view of independent individuals (‘substantiators’) about the selected outcomes and how they were achieved. Their feedback affirms or challenges the credibility of the initial outcome descriptions. Substantiators may include key informants and/or panels of experts.</p>	<p>QuIP does the same but in a more prescriptive way through purposive sampling and interviewing of intended beneficiaries of the activities being assessed. QuIP seeks to enhance the credibility of this evidence through blindfolding. The more fluid and open approach adopted by OH appears closer both to process tracing and realist evaluation.</p>
<p>5. Analyse, interpret and make sense of the evidence. This is more straightforward for assessment of the contribution of one project by one change agent within a single period. But generalisations may also be sought for multiple activities and agents over multiple time periods.</p>	<p>QuIP focuses on the simple case, but offers a more systematic approach to coding and analysis of multiple sources of evidence. Being more prescriptive it can interpret findings more rapidly and transparently. Clear and succinct visualisation of findings is also critical.</p>
<p>6. Engagement with potential users of the findings. While there is a strong emphasis on generating useful evidence it is also recognised that it is rarely possible to make specific recommendations for action, as these are likely to be informed by other sources of information and operational factors not addressed by OH, particularly in complex and rapidly changing contexts.</p>	<p>QuIP also emphasises the importance of active engagement, beyond presentation of a final report. Opportunities arise to stimulate constructive encounters between change agents and other social actors through ‘un-blindfolding’ meetings (between field researchers, commissioners, operational staff and interview respondents) to discuss findings and their implications for action.</p>