

Setting specific outcomes and indicators in church and community mobilisation proposals

This paper aims to advise Tearfund Regional Teams and partners on how specific outcomes and indicators can be set for Church and Community Mobilisation (CCM) proposals.

Four phases of church and community mobilisation (CCM)

In thinking about outcomes and indicators for CCM processes, it is helpful to identify four different phases of the process:

1. Developing the commitment and capacity of the regional co-ordinating structure (e.g. the diocese or the Christian NGO facilitating the process) to support local church congregations and communities going through the process
2. Envisioning and mobilising the local church congregations to be willing and prepared to engage in integral mission
3. Mobilising the local church congregations and communities to identify specific causes and consequences of poverty and develop action plans to address them
4. Addressing the specific causes and consequences of poverty in each community.

These phases do not occur in a linear, sequential order. However, Phase 1 must have begun before Phases 2 and 3 can begin, and Phases 2 and 3 lead to Phase 4.

Outcomes and indicators

The table below suggests how these four phases of a CCM process can be reflected in anticipated outcomes and indicators. Please note that the indicators are not to be taken as prescriptive or exclusive. It is expected that anyone using these indicators would contextualise them, and, where appropriate, include additional indicators.

Guidance on the indicators for each of the four Phases is given in paragraphs (2) and (3) below.

Phase	Anticipated outcome	Anticipated outputs
1	Capacity of the regional coordinating structure to support local church congregations and communities going through the CCM process developed .	1.1 Appropriate structures and processes for developing capacity to support CCM processes formed within the regional coordinating structure. 1.2 Knowledge of the biblical mandate for the engagement of the local congregation in integral mission increased within the regional coordinating structure. 1.3 Knowledge and skills to engage in CCM processes increased within the regional coordinating structure. 1.4 Capacity to replicate CCM processes with other local congregations and communities increased within the regional coordinating structure.
2	Local church congregations envisioned to be willing and prepared to engage in integral mission.	1.1 Appropriate structures and processes for developing capacity within the local congregation for integral mission formed by the leadership of the local congregation. 1.2 Knowledge of the biblical mandate for the engagement of the local congregation in integral mission with the community increased in the local congregation. 1.3 Knowledge and skills to engage in integral mission with the local community increased in the local congregation. 1.4 Knowledge of the causes and consequences of poverty within the community (including the needs, vulnerabilities, and capacities of the community) increased in the local congregation.
3	Local church congregations and communities mobilised to identify and address specific causes and consequences of poverty.	3.1 Appropriate structures and processes for engaging in integral mission to address the agreed specific causes and consequences of poverty in the community formed by the leadership of the local congregation and the community. 3.2 An Action Plan to address the agreed specific causes and consequences of poverty in the community developed . 3.3 Resources to implement the Action Plan mobilised by the leadership of the local congregation and the community.
4	The specific causes and consequences of poverty addressed in each community.	1.1 Specific milestones and targets in the Action Plan achieved.

Guidelines for partners and regional teams on putting together CCM proposals

The following guidelines may be helpful for partners putting together proposals for CCM projects, and for Regional Teams appraising such proposals:

1. In the first instance, the proposal must outline the particular causes and consequences of poverty within the community, and an indication of which causes and consequences could realistically be addressed through a CCM approach. At this stage it needs only be an outline. A detailed needs, vulnerabilities and capacities assessment will be completed during Phase 2, and this assessment will determine the specific causes and consequences of poverty that will be addressed by the Action Plan developed in Phase 3 and implemented in Phase 4. Therefore, at this stage, there is no need to state the specific causes and consequences of poverty that will be addressed by the project.

It would be helpful if the proposal also outlines the general state of the church, describing its present engagement with the community and its commitment to integral mission.

2. In the first instance, the proposal must give context specific indicators for Phases 1 and 2. For example:
 - How will prioritisation of integral mission by senior leadership within the regional co-ordination structure be demonstrated? (e.g. key theme of national and district church leader conferences; allocation of funds and personnel to promote integral mission approaches)
 - What specific structures and processes for developing the capacity of the regional co-ordination structure to support CCM processes will be established? (e.g. CCM facilitation team appointed)
 - How will prioritisation of integral mission in this specific congregation be demonstrated by the leadership of that congregation? (e.g. integral mission as a theme for sermons and Bible study groups)
 - What specific structures and processes have been established? (structures e.g. establishment of a church and community mobilisation committee; processes e.g. monthly meetings of the church and community mobilisation committee with the leadership of the congregation)
 - How will increased knowledge and understanding be demonstrated? (e.g. the church and community mobilisation committee make a presentation to the congregation on the vision for engagement of the congregation in integral mission; the church and community mobilisation committee have established baselines for needs, vulnerabilities and capacities in the community) How will increased knowledge and understanding reflect increased compassion for the community?
3. In the first instance, the indicators for Phase 3 can remain generic because the specific detail of, for example, the structures and processes to address specific causes and consequences of poverty may depend on the nature of those specific causes and consequences.
4. In the first instance, the proposal need not give specific details for Phase 4. The specific details will be determined by the Action Plan developed in Phase 3. Indicators of outcomes for Phase 4 should be selected with care to permit aggregation across the different Action Plans addressing the same causes and consequences of poverty. Some suggested outcome indicators are shown below:

Tearfund priority area	Suggested outcome indicator (all should be disaggregated by sex and, where appropriate, age, ethnicity, etc.)
HIV and AIDS	Number of individuals reached with behaviour change messages as a direct result of the CCM process
	Number of individuals provided with counselling and testing as a direct result of the CCM process.
	Number of individuals provided with home-based care as a direct result of the CCM process
Basic education and literacy	Number of children provided with access to primary education as a direct result of the CCM process
Water and sanitation	Number of individuals provided with access to safe water as a direct result of the CCM process
	Number of individuals provided with access to sanitation as a direct result of the CCM process
Health and nutrition	Number of individuals provided with improved access to health care services as a direct result of the CCM process

5. Approval should be given for the full proposal, subject to the usual caveats. Funding for Phases 1, 2 and 3 should be approved at the outset of the proposal. Funding for Phase 4 should be released according to whether the response to the causes and consequences of poverty identified by the church congregation and community fits with Tearfund's own priorities and country strategy. (Please note that processes that lead to heavy reliance on external funding at the Phase 4 stage may not adequately reflect the aim of CCM processes to release the resources of the church and community themselves and decrease their dependency on external sources. Thus Tearfund's failure to fund Phase 4 parts of a process if it falls outside strategy should not undermine the process. It is also to be expected that if we are confident that our country strategies and priority areas are right, then most community action plans will be focused on these issues and so there will be no problem funding the Phase 4 stage anyway).
6. Partners are required to report progress through the four Phases as follows. For Phase 1, partners should submit the normal narrative report outlining achievement of outputs for Phase 1 using the indicators in the proposal. For Phases 2, 3, and 4 partners should report the progress of local congregations and communities through these three Phases using the table below. Additionally, partners are encouraged to present stories that

reflect the journeys made by local congregations and communities as they are envisioned, mobilised and transformed (these need not be restricted to written narratives). Additionally, for Phase 4, partners should provide (i) an aggregated report of anticipated outcomes for all local congregations and communities in or starting Phase 4 during the reporting period, and (ii) an aggregated report of actual outcomes for all local congregations and communities completing Phase 4 during the reporting period.

Phase 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Number of local congregations already at Phase 2 at the beginning of the reporting period					
Number of local congregations starting Phase 2 during the reporting period					
Number of local congregations withdrawing from Phase 2 (and the CCM process) during the reporting period					
Number of local congregations completing Phase 2 during the reporting period and moving to Phase 3					

Phase 3	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Number of local congregations already at Phase 3 at the beginning of the reporting period					
Number of local congregations starting Phase 3 during the reporting period					
Number of local congregations withdrawing from Phase 3 (and the CCM process) during the reporting period					
Number of local congregations completing Phase 3 during the reporting period and moving to Phase 4					

Phase 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Number of local congregations already at Phase 4 at the beginning of the reporting period					
Number of local congregations starting Phase 4 during the reporting period					
Number of local congregations withdrawing from Phase 4 (and the CCM process) during the reporting period					
Number of local congregations completing Phase 4 during the reporting period					

Partners should also be encouraged to develop qualitative indicators for both process and outcomes. While these are not required on narrative reports, they will provide an evidence base from which partners can draw for signs of transformation.

Author: Tulo Raistrick and David Mundy