

# 2013

## Success Mapping: a brief guide



**Sabina Carlson Robillard &**

**Louino Robillard**

**Future Generations Haiti &**

**Future Generations Int'l**

11/1/2013

# Table of Contents

## **Foundations of Success Mapping**

- **Positive Deviance** **Page 2**
- **ABCD** **Page 4**
- **SEED-SCALE** **Page 5**
- **Crisis Mapping/ Open-Source Mapping** **Page 7**

## **Success Mapping**

- **Context** **Page 8**
- **Methodology/ approach**
  - ❖ **Defining success** **Page 9**
  - ❖ **Field work/ data** **Page 11**
  - ❖ **Peer connection** **Page 12**
- **Analysis/ Lessons Learned**
  - ❖ **Analysis** **Page 14**
  - ❖ **Analysis** **Page 15**

## THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE SUCCESS MAPPING APPROACH

### 1 – POSITIVE DEVIANCE

The Positive Deviance (PD) approach was developed in the early 1990s at Tufts University. The term was first coined by Marian Zeitlin, a nutrition professor at Tufts University, in reference to the fact that in impoverished and generally malnourished communities there always existed children that were better nourished than their peers<sup>1</sup>. A few years later Jerry and Monique Sternin, scholars and development practitioners themselves, learned of this concept, and decided to try to implement this knowledge in Vietnam to see if this could be turned into a development approach<sup>1,2</sup>. The results were remarkable, and PD has since become a respected approach used in hundreds of cases and countless organizations across the world, from small development initiatives to government ministries.

PD differs from traditional developmental approaches because it is not based on needs in the community, but rather in the diversity of strategies within a community to cope with common challenges and needs. While we tend to think of “deviance” as a negative thing, deviance is simply something different from the norm – and if the norm is something negative, such as malnutrition or domestic violence, then that deviant will be the one exhibiting the positive behavior. The concept is that if there is a diversity of approaches within a community to cope with a challenge, for instance malnutrition, then one or more households within that community will have figured out how to better nourish their children *without having access to resources that are too different from or better than their peers*. This local approach to a local problem, figured out through trial and error in the day to day lives of the people actually confronting the problem at hand, has the potential to be both more inspiring and instructive to other people in the community. A family is more likely to think, “if my neighbor has done this, why can’t we?” and because the resources used were locally-available, the strategy has already been adapted to the local context. This is called “social proof”<sup>3</sup>.

**The PD mantra: “You are more likely to act your way into a new way of thinking than think your way into a new way of acting”<sup>3</sup>.**

Imagine this scenario: in an impoverished community, a government worker comes and holds a workshop in which s/he instructs the villagers to give their children x amount of Vitamin A every day, that their children should be eating x amount of calories, and that x percentage of that diet should be protein. With a community confronting perhaps drought or acute poverty or insecurity, it will be easy to dismiss the scientifically-accurate figures and requirements as impossible, or perhaps the language or calories and micro and macro nutrients does not even make sense to them. The government worker might describe the “what” (i.e. how much protein should be consumed each day) and the “why” (i.e. to avoid protein deficiency/ kwashiorkor), but not the all-important “how”.

Or imagine this scenario: a foreign aid worker comes to the same community, and in addition to a training explaining the “what” and the “why” of fighting malnutrition, introduces a program to plant groundnuts that worked wonderfully in a village just 40 miles away. But this community may have a different soil type, a different

cuisine, a different livelihood altogether (maybe they are nomadic herders) – the project will either fail or go through countless iterations before it succeeds. All the while, malnourished children are becoming sick or dying.

While this is a simplification, it is a way to illustrate some of the issues with the more traditional, top-down approach to development challenges. In a PD context, instead of coming with outside mandates or prescriptions to solve the problem, we let the community solve them problem itself. There would still be some knowledge-sharing about nutrition and disease, but the PD practitioner would instead help the community develop the metrics to determine which children in the community are the healthiest. Once those families were identified, the community would study the strategies that this family used to succeed, and those would be promoted as models for healthy families.

**Another PD motto: “Don’t do something about me without me”<sup>3</sup>.**

Another critical difference between PD and traditional development approaches is that the community is the primary actor and the one with the control, while the PD practitioner is playing the role of a facilitator. It is a generative process, meaning that it is self-organizing and is not based on outside “expertise” but rather local experience and knowledge<sup>3</sup>.

The process of Positive Deviance is divided into the 4 Ds: define, determine, discover, and design. Define references the importance of the community reframing the problem in a way that makes sense to all of the local stakeholders and coming up with a shared vision of the future. Determine references the community determining how it perceives success and what are the indicators by which they will measure and judge this. Discover refers to the community identifying the individuals/households/institutions that are successful based on their own indicators. Finally, design refers to the community developing strategies for how more households can adopt and adapt the successful local example to their own lives<sup>3</sup>.

Positive Deviance is not appropriate in all development circumstances. In cases which are mostly about technical answers to technical issues, such as how to build a bridge or the best way to refrigerate a vaccine – PD is not applicable. PD is applicable in cases where there is an issue more related to the need for behavior change, where the question at hand is complex and seemingly intractable, and where there is genuine local leadership and will to tackle the problem<sup>3</sup>.

#### References:

1. “The Positive Deviance Initiative” website, Tufts University. [www.positivedeviance.org](http://www.positivedeviance.org)
2. “When Deviants Do Good”, article, the New York Times. [http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/27/when-deviants-do-good/? r=0](http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/27/when-deviants-do-good/?r=0)
3. “The Power of Positive Deviance”, Field Guide. <http://www.powerofpositivedeviance.com/pdf/fieldguide.pdf>

## 2- ASSET-BASED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (ABCD)

---

Asset-based Community Development (ABCD) is a development philosophy that is complimentary to Positive Deviance in that it is based on the underlying theory that the necessary elements and strategies to develop communities exist inside of them already, that it is primarily a matter of mobilizing and building upon them. While building on the growing research-base of community development with local resources, ABCD as a defined approach was developed by John P Kretzmann and Kohn L McKnight at Northwestern University<sup>1</sup>.

ABCD, like positive deviance, offers an alternative approach from the needs-based focus of traditional development practitioners. The underlying theory is that communities naturally have assets, skills, and knowledge that go un-appreciated and under-valued, and that these should be the fundamental building blocks of development. ABCD does not ignore the needs and problems in the community, but rather emphasizes how the community can leverage existing assets and relationships to resolve those needs<sup>1</sup>.

Take the following scenario: there is a remote rural village close to a lake where the poverty level is such that children cannot afford to pay the teachers at the local primary school. In taking a needs-based approach, a government or foreign NGO may decide to pay the primary school teachers – but then this community will be dependent on that foreign source of money to continue to pay for the teachers, and whenever the money runs out the school will be closed. Taking an asset-based approach, the local lake could be perceived as an asset and a fish-farming scheme could be set up that generated revenue for local people and to pay the school teachers for the next decade. By basing the development strategy on an existing asset, the community has found a more sustainable solution to their problem.

Like Positive Deviance, ABCD is a participatory process. The community members themselves analyze the community's history and previous successes, map out their assets and capacities, developing a community development plan based on those assets, and mobilizing those assets within the community through local relationships<sup>2</sup>. This is what is called community-driven development, because ultimately it is the community itself that is making the decisions based on their existing resources; outside resources can be contributed, but under the community's direction and to reinforce an existing capacity.

According to the scholar-practitioners at Coady International Institute, ABCD is built on the following concepts:

- “Appreciative inquiry which identifies and analyses the community's past successes...
- The recognition of social capital and its importance as an asset....
- Participatory approaches to development, which are based on principles of empowerment and ownership of the development process
- Community economic development models that place priority on collaborative efforts for economic development that makes best use of its own resource base
- Efforts to strengthen civil society. These efforts have focused on how to engage people as citizens (rather than clients) in development, and how to make local governance more effective and responsive”<sup>2</sup>

### References:

1. “Who is driving development? Reflections on the transformative potential of asset-based community development”. Coady International institute’s Occasional Paper Series, No. 5. Allison Mathie and Gord Cunningham
2. “Asset-Based Community Development – An Overview.” Paper for ABCD Conferenece in Thailand, 2002. Gord Cunningham and Alison Mathie
3. ABCD Institute, Northwestern University. [www.abcdinstitute.org](http://www.abcdinstitute.org)

### 3- SEED-SCALE

---

SEED-SCALE is a framework for community empowerment that was developed based on decades of research by Dr. Carl E Taylor and Dr. Daniel Taylor of Johns Hopkins University. After traveling the globe identifying and examining community-based development successes that had not only sustained themselves but grew to a regional scale, they synthesized their findings by looking for core principles and activities that were common to these successes<sup>1</sup>. These findings would be developed into a process for community empowerment called SEED-SCALE.

Like both Positive Deviance and ABCD, SEED-SCALE is focused on community-driven development and bases itself on the knowledge and resources inherent in communities. While Positive Deviance emphasizes local knowledge and strategies and ABCD emphasizes the assets and skills within communities, SEED-SCALE emphasizes that human energy is the fundamental basis for community-driven development. Human energy is viewed as the one universal resource that all human beings possess in equal amounts and it can never be depleted, and as such the mobilization of human energy is the momentum on which community development can be sustained and scaled<sup>2</sup>.

The approach is divided into the two phases of SEED and SCALE. According to the website of Future Generations, the organization founded to promote the practice of SEED-SCALE around the world: “Seed is the process of activating empowerment at the community level and growing a local success. Scale is the expansion of this activity, both in geographic coverage and across development sectors for sustained improvement in quality of life.”<sup>1</sup>

Seed also functions for a metaphor about what community-driven development means. In this metaphor, the community, like a seed, has everything it needs inside of it to grow. However, a seed does need rain and sunlight, two things that it has no control over – in this metaphor this is standing in for the “enabling environment” wherein the authorities (national government, local authorities, tribal leaders, etc) either create an environment conducive to community empowerment or one that neglects or represses it. The growth of a seed can also be augmented by fertilizers, both natural and artificial – this represents the role of outsiders (NGOs, businesses, academics, etc), which can speed up the growth of community development efforts but, like artificial fertilizers, can leave the community dependent on that outside input for continued growth or survival.

This approach, like ABCD and Positive Deviance, teaches us to search for successes in the community, what it refers to as the “seeds of human energy”, and to build on them. It then discusses how the momentum generated by these community successes can be maintained and channeled using a series of principles, criteria, and tasks:

#### THE FOUR PRINCIPLES OF SEED-SCALE:

1. **Build from success:** identify what is working in the community (similar to ABCD and Positive Deviance)
2. **Build three-way partnerships:** for community change to truly go to scale, there must be collaboration between the bottom-up (the community), the top-down (the state/authorities), and the outside-in (any outside change-agents)
3. **Evidence-based decision-making:** unequal power distributions can skew the community’s energy and resources towards the benefit of an individual or single group. The only way to ensure that the decisions being made in a community are neutral is to have them be based upon evidence that everyone in the community can agree upon
4. **Behavior change:** like Positive Deviance, the primary outcome being worked towards is the changing of human behavior and the strategies with which they confront their challenges<sup>3</sup>.

## THE SEVEN TASKS OF SEED-SCALE:

1. **Establish collective leadership:** create a local coordinating committee. Movements based on single-person leadership are weak
2. **Identify successes:** participatory process of identifying what has worked in the community
3. **Peer learning:** visit other communities that have accomplished something to learn from their success
4. **Self-evaluate:** gather data and evidence-bases in the community as the basis for action
5. **Create an action plan:** gather all stakeholders to create a work-plan that identifies resources and assigns responsibilities, and display it publicly
6. **Take action:** start working with the resources at hand and ensure mutual accountability
7. **Iteration:** with all stakeholders, throughout the process have a forum to evaluate and make mid-course corrections. At the end of the action, evaluate, critique, make recommendations, and start again<sup>3</sup>.

## The five criteria of SEED-SCALE:

1. **Equity:** does the process create an opportunity for all community members to be involved and move forward?
2. **Sustainability:** is this process sustainable economically? Environmentally? Culturally?
3. **Holism:** are all domains of life (economic, social, health, education, etc) being positively affected by the process?
4. **Interdependence:** is the process encouraging a one-way dependence on an outside entity or is there a mutually-dependent and mutually-beneficial relationship being formed?
5. **Iteration:** is the process getting better over time?

Unlike ABCD and Positive Deviance, SEED-SCALE has developed theories about change being promoted beyond the borders of one community and up to a regional or national level. SEED-SCALE sees this as occurring in 3 phases: the first is quantitative expansion, where an increasing *number* of people and communities are becoming involved in the process of change. The second is a qualitative expansion, where the quality of life in multiple aspects is improved for those participating. These two feed back upon each other: the more the quality of life changes, the more people get involved, the more people get involved, the more human energy there is to change the quality of life. The third is the changing of the enabling environment, where the process has grown so much that the authorities (the top-down) are forced to change policies in a way that acknowledges and encourages the change<sup>2</sup>.

The scale process also highlights the role of what it calls “Scale-Squared Centers”, which are in essence communities that act as demonstration centers. These are communities which have effectively used the process to create visible change and are learning sites where other communities can come and learn from a peer about how to replicate this change at home<sup>3</sup>. This is in many ways parallel with Positive Deviance’s emphasis on peer learning on an intra-community level.

## References:

1. “SEED-SCALE Process for Community Change” Future Generations. <http://www.future.org/applied-research/process-change>
2. “Overview – SEED-SCALE”. Seed-SCALE.org. <http://www.seed-scale.org/overview>
3. Just and Lasting Change: When Communities Own their Futures. Johns Hopkins University Press. Dr. Carl E Taylor and Dr. Daniel Taylor.

#### 4- CRISIS-MAPPING AND OPEN-SOURCE MAPPING

---

Crisis-mapping is an evolving, inter-disciplinary field of gathering, analyzing, and visualizing/displaying data from a crisis in real-time, as it unfolds. It is evolved from the concepts of “dynamics maps” i.e. online maps that are interactive and can be changed and updated to contain represent real-time information and “neogeography”, a participatory approach to geography in which people are not only consumers of maps but are creating and contributing to maps by drawing on existing geographic toolsets<sup>1</sup>. It was also enabled by a new set of user-friendly and often open-source tools that allowed humanitarians and academics to see the spatio-temporal progression of conflicts and disasters and allowed ordinary to participate in contributing data to make those maps reflect their realities.

One of the early breakthroughs came in the wake of the post-election violence in Kenya. An online platform called Ushahidi (meaning “Witness” in Swahili) was established to collect testimonies of looting, ethnic attacks, and other crimes in real time. In addition, it was able to display the data on a map in which the incidents were represented as small dots that, when clicked upon, opened up to a more complete report.

Ushahidi is an open-source tool, meaning that its programming code is free and open to be used and improved upon by other programmers and practitioners. In the wake of the earthquake that hit Haiti in 2010, an Ushahidi platform was customized for the crisis. An unprecedented level of virtual collaboration was set up: victims of the earthquake in Haiti could send a text message with their needs and location to a shortcode 4636 (provided by the Haiti telecoms company Digicel). That text message would be translated into English in real-time by thousands of volunteers in the Haitian Diaspora through a micro-tasking platform called Crowdfunder. Those translated text messages would be fed into Ushahidi Haiti’s server, in which dozens of university student volunteers would try to geo-locate the person in need and upload it to the interactive map. That data feed would then be accessed by humanitarian responders on the ground to identify individual persons to be rescued or be synthesized to identify “hot spots”.

All of this is dependent on accurate geographic information, and in many places such as Haiti, the maps are very poor. OpenStreetMap is an open-source mapping platform, meaning that anyone trained on how to use its platform can upload new data and correct existing data. In cases such as Haiti, hundreds of Haitians were trained on how to map their communities with basic GPS skills and then uploading their information onto the server, and Haiti’s maps are now exponentially more detailed than they were when the earthquake hit.

While it is a new and emergent field, it has recently seen signs of organizing through the International Network of Crisis Mappers, a global online forum established in 2009 to be a hub to the thousands of individuals representing more than a thousand institutions that are in some way connected to this field<sup>2</sup>. This platform acts not only as a network for communication but as a launch-pad for action – there is now a standing volunteer group that is ready to lend their time and expertise remotely to crisis mapping initiatives. Crisis mappers range from individual volunteers with little to no technological experience to academics to humanitarian responders to large institutions such as the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, who recently released a report on Disaster Relief 2.0, highlighting these changes in the way data, disaster-affected communities, and humanitarian action interact<sup>3</sup>.

#### References:

1. “A brief history of Crisis Mapping”. Patrick Meier, PhD. iRevolution. <http://irevolution.net/2009/03/12/a-brief-history-of-crisis-mapping/>
2. “Crisis Mapping: The Construction of a New Interdisciplinary Field”. Jen Zeime.
3. “Disaster Relief 2.0: the future of information sharing in humanitarian emergencies”. Harvard Humanitarian Initiative. UN Foundation & Vodafone Foundation Technology



## CONTEXT OF SUCCESS MAPPING IN HAITI

Future Generations Haiti is the Haiti branch of Future Generations, an organization founded by the researchers behind the SEED-SCALE methodology dedicated to sustainable social change. Future Generations Haiti (FGH) was established in the wake of the devastating earthquake that hit Haiti in January of 2010, when all of the attention of the world was fixated on Haiti's pressing humanitarian needs. In the midst of this attention to the needs of the disaster-stricken country, Future Generations was interested in finding examples of Haitian strength and resilience.

The early Future Generations Haiti team included three students in the Future Generations Graduate School, where they would study SEED-SCALE and empowerment on the way to receiving Master's Degrees in Community Change and Peace-building. It also included a team member who had been involved in the Crisis Mapping community and the Ushahidi Haiti deployment, and another member who was trained in OpenStreetMap. One of the founders had also attended Tufts University and had been taught the theory of Positive Deviance and ABCD. This team was supported by Future Generations International and its decades of experience in community empowerment.

The concept of Success Mapping came from the previously-described fields and the combined expertise of the team. The idea was to take the interactive, crowd-driven maps associated with Crisis Mapping but instead of searching for needs and crises, searching for the resources and successes that SEED-SCALE and ABCD advocate for. This would attempt to make community successes as accessible and visible as humanitarian needs were in the field of Crisis Mapping – hence "Success Mapping" was born.

The initial 6-month pilot project was funded by the United Nations Community Violence Reduction unit (UNCVR), and a 3-month extension was funded by Humanity United and the Hawaii Community Fund, thanks to Pamela Omidyar. The pilot team included: Tara Yip-Bannicq, Aimee Gaines, Delphine Bedu, Sabina Carlson Robillard, Louino Robillard, Jimmy Levi, Jean Rony Elie, Savela Jacques Berenji, Jerry Stephane Simon, Marie-Elie Alexis, Winnie Erie, Samuel Bonne-Anne, Felipe Jacome, Dieudonne Cyprien, Lissa Abraham, Willes Louis, Jimmy Rubin, Fenio Robillard, Johnny Metellus, and Fedras Jerome.

The rest of the document will describe the methodology as it was carried out in the pilot phase, and the lessons learned through both monitoring and evaluation and community feedback. There will also be an analysis of the methodology and how it relates to and differs from the 4 building blocks referenced in the previous section.

*Right: team that piloted the Success Mapping methodology in Haiti (some not pictured)*



### PART 1: DEFINING SUCCESS

---

To search for success, the team first needs to know not only what “success” means, but also clear indicators that can be measured to evaluate if a candidate qualifies as a success. In Positive Deviance, the community is looking for a deviant from a norm in the community that is unhealthy or problematic – in Success Mapping, we are looking for community initiatives that are different from a broader societal norm that is unhealthy or problematic. In Haiti, that norm was dependence on foreign aid and a lack of community empowerment – so the success we were looking for were community-based initiatives that were not dependent on foreign aid and represented community empowerment. But in other contexts, the problematic norm may be unsustainable livelihoods, or lack of opportunity for girls – in which case the success you would be looking for would be communities with sustainable livelihoods or where girls had opportunities. This process is critical and should be taken slowly, because it is the foundation for the rest of the process.

1.1: Hold a meeting with the core team and define what the problematic norm is that you want to address, and then discuss the success you will be looking for.

1.2: Based on previous field experience, literature reviews, and/or discussions with experts in the field, develop an initial set of indicators for success.

*→Note: the more concrete and measurable the indicators are, the easier the field work will be. Also, indicators do not have to be yes-or-no – sometimes it is more helpful to develop a sort of scale or range*

1.3: Conduct a series of focus groups with a diverse set of community leaders to gather data how they perceive the success you are searching for and how they would characterize/measure it.

*→Note: make sure the focus groups are well-documented. If possible, get the permission of the attendees to record it, otherwise have a designated note-taker to record the conversation. ALSO, take this as an opportunity to get references from these leaders about community initiatives they know that meet the characteristics they just described. This will be your starting point.*

1.4: Hold a workshop with your team where you compare this with the list of indicators with the one developed by the outside experts, and finalize the list of characteristics, their indicators, and the way they will be measured. In Haiti, we based our characteristics on the 5 criteria of SEED-SCALE (see page #) and the focus groups gave very similar indicators, but also new ones that we incorporated.

1.5: Elaborate a questionnaire or field guide that lays out very simply the indicators and what is being used to measure the indicators so that key information isn't missed. It isn't necessary for field agents to follow the questionnaire step by step like a survey, but rather to have a normal conversation with key informants and ensure that through the course of the conversation they are getting the necessary information on the form.

→ Note: some other useful points of data to include on the questionnaire include

- *GPS coordinates*
- *Name of contact person(s)*
- *Permission to publish the contact information of those key contacts*
- *Areas of community expertise/ areas where the community wants training (if you plan on doing peer exchanges afterwards)*
- *Space to write in other initiatives that this community can refer you to*

1.6: Define the field protocols. These are important questions that need to be answered based on the specific culture and context of what you are looking for. How many key informants are you going to talk to? Do you need key informants representing different genders/ ethnic groups/ religions? Is a formal or informal approach more appropriate? Are recorders and notebooks acceptable? How are you introducing the project? In Haiti, because of the distrust of NGOs and how many organizations come through communities to do formal research, our approach was very informal, striking up dialogues with whoever was interested in talking to us and participating in community events.

1.7: Pilot the questionnaire in one community with the entire team, and then have a debriefing afterwards where both the questionnaire itself and the way people acted in the community can be discussed and improved upon.

*→ Note: throughout this exercise, have everyone independently evaluate the community based on the criteria to see if it is a “success” or not, then compare afterwards. If the results are very similar, then everyone has a common understanding of the criteria. If not, then the criteria are not clear enough*

1.8: Break the team into 3 groups and have each group pilot the questionnaire in 3 separate communities, and then have a debriefing where the results and findings were compared.

*→ Note: Have each group present the community they researched in front of the whole team, and have each team independently evaluate the community to see if it is a success. If the results are similar, then each team has a common understanding of the criteria. If not, then the criteria may not be clear enough.*

1.9: Based on the pilots and the findings, refine the questionnaire and the field protocols.

1.10: Establish your data flow, your data handling protocols, and a database. How often is field data going to be collected? Who is going to treat the data once it has come in and enter it into the database? How are both field notes and digital data going to be stored? What should be done is certain fields are incomplete?



1.11: Develop the online mapping platform. If you have access to someone with programming knowledge, there are open-source platforms such as **Drupal** or **Ushahidi** that can be used to create an interactive mapping platform. If you have no programming knowledge, there are user-friendly platforms such as **Crowdmap** that will help you set up an online mapping platform as easily as a Facebook page. For questions and advice, the **International Network of Crisis Mappers** is a wonderful forum for technical questions of every kind.

*Right: team members on our first piloting of the questionnaire in Letan Bosye, a rural mountain community in southern Haiti*

## PART 2: DATA COLLECTION AND FIELD WORK

---

This is a process that is going to be very different based not only on the context and culture of your area but even on the respective skills and personalities of people in your field team. As the field work goes on, there will be a lot of moments to continue to test and clarify the way you are measuring the indicators. In the Haiti experience, each field visit was a chance to really expand how we thought about the indicators we had selected. We found communities which truly embodied the characteristics that we had developed and communities that had challenged how we thought about those characteristics.

2.1: divide field team into teams of 2, taking the skill sets of each member into consideration. Assembling teams that have people with complementary strengths – people-skills and technical-skills – is important.

2.2: begin with the list of communities generated by the initial focus group. Each team goes to one site, and conducts a series of key informant interviews, informal dialogues, and/or formal focus groups, depending on the field protocols established and the context of the site. Ensure that if one of the team members is talking, the other is taking notes. The questionnaire should not be filled out on the spot, but rather after the visit is over, outside of the community where the team members can synthesize what they learned and come to an agreement on the classification.

→ *Note: try to talk to at least one person who has nothing to do directly with the community initiative as a way to verify the information given by the key informant/people implicated in the community.*

→ *Note: depending on the culture/community, contacting the local authorities first may be important*

2.3: have the community leaders give references for other communities to visit, places that they have heard have been successful according to your definition. This will be your starting place for the next visit. Be sure to be able to trace the line of references back.

2.4: data should be stored according to the protocols and the availability of electricity/internet, etc. There should be a regular meeting time fixed (every 2 weeks, every month) where all teams gather together at a central location to share data, back-up data (copies, on an extra server, online backup, etc). Experiences should be discussed, questions debated, and any thoughts about the process and the questionnaire shared. This is a real moment of learning for the support team involved in the initiative to understand the experiences and knowledge being gained on the ground.

→ *Note: it is important to take notes of these meetings because lessons learned will be coming from the field teams and these will be important in any future iterations to have documented*

2.5: after the field team leaves, the data manager will take the data and upload cases that qualify as “successes” onto the online platform.

2.6: follow-ups: for the most interesting cases, follow-up visits should be arranged. An independent team of 2 should be able to go to the community, hold a series of focus groups, key informant interviews, and informal dialogues that will allow them to confirm, elaborate upon, or question the initial observations of the field team. More complete case studies should be written up on these cases for knowledge-sharing and research.

## PART 3: PEER EXCHANGES AND CONNECTIONS

---

Being placed on a map may increase the visibility of a community initiative and that is interesting in terms of potential contacts and support that this may provide for them – but aside from that, how is being put on an online map useful to communities who often have no access to computers, let alone the internet? This is a critical question that we as a team initially struggled with before developing a series of strategies to connect communities on the ground.

We first began by holding a series of regional conferences – selecting 6 of the most dynamic and diverse communities per region. Each region sent 2 representatives to the conference, and the 12 people spent the next 5 days on a bus in our mobile regional conference. The idea was not to sit everyone in a conference room and talk, but for them to live the experiences of their peers in other areas. Each community took a turn hosting the group and gave practical skill-sharing sessions and trainings on what made them a success. After all the regional conferences had been done, everyone came to the capital Port au Prince for a national conference, also focused on concrete skills-sharing and less on elaborate speeches. On their own, without direction from us, communities began creating a sign-up sheet in which they agreed to hold more in-depth peer trainings on a subject of expertise for them (tree nursery management, micro-finance, urban gardening) and other communities signed their names beneath the subjects that interested them. This was followed by months of what we called peer exchanges – communities hosting their peers from other communities and teaching them their skills for free.



3.1: Identify a set of communities who are particularly interesting, strong, and diverse examples of the success you are trying to define. Write up a set of criteria and go through the selection process with the entire field team, being sure to include regional diversity as well.

3.2: based on the context and the resources available, develop a plan to get the communities to interact. It may be a regional or national forum, or visits based on commonalities in the domain of work or their approach, or inviting communities to public demonstrations. The important thing is to find a way to facilitate community leaders having an opportunity to see other positive initiatives.

→ *Note: Try to avoid just gathering people in a room to talk about their experiences – **seeing and experiencing is much more powerful.***



3.3: either in-person or through series of smaller gatherings, identify community initiatives that are willing to share their experiences and/or teach the skills they have developed that have led them to be a success with their peers in other communities. Create a list and circulate it – or if you have brought everyone to a central meeting space, write it up on a board – and have people sign up for the workshops they are most interested in.

3.4: peer exchanges: based on demand for the workshop and resources available, facilitate these peer exchanges. This generally means working with the teaching communities to fix a time and place, and then helping to coordinate the logistics with the student communities. In Haiti, each exchange received a maximum of \$500 US to cover transportation costs and some materials; in addition, both hosting and visiting communities also contributed time, food, and resources to make these exchanges happen. Exchanges tended to last from 2-4 days.

→ *Note: in some cases the student communities would send representatives to the teaching community, but in others it made more sense for the teaching community to send representatives to one of the learning communities to do on-site demonstrations and trainings to reach more people.*

3.5: documentation. Documenting this process is essential – not only the trainings themselves, but also follow-up with the student communities to see how they are doing in implementing the knowledge they gained during the trainings. If they haven't implemented it, then why? This is important feedback both for you and to the teaching community.

→ *Note: documentation from trainings (such as notes and pictures/ videos) can be transformed into educational tools to help future community learning take place*

→ *if resources are available for this, having the teachers be able to follow-up on their students by visiting them and evaluating their progress is very important.*

3.6: widen the net: include other communities in the network of peer exchanges, and monitor other forms of exchanges. In Haiti, certain communities began to visit each other without assistance from FGH, and others began to exchange seeds and materials.



*Above: workshop on transforming rice into wine in Belanje, the Artibonite.*

*Previous page, bottom-right: workshop on mountain construction in La Montagne.*

*Previous page, top-left: workshop on tree grafting techniques in Valere*

## ANALYSIS & LESSONS LEARNED

### BRIEF ANALYSIS

---

In looking briefly at the Success Mapping approach (including the peer exchanges at the end), there are clear areas where it has built on the 4 frameworks/fields introduced at the beginning of this document, and where it differs:

#### POSITIVE DEVIANCE

Success Mapping is inspired by Positive Deviance but does *not* qualify as an example of Positive Deviance. Like Positive Deviance, Success Mapping is based on the assumption that there will be positive exceptions from negative norms; however Success Mapping is looking at this from an inter-community perspective and the discovery of successful community-based initiatives, while Positive Deviance is based on intra-community work and the discovery of deviant individuals, households, and/or institutions. Also in Positive Deviance, because the work is happening on an intra-community level, the community members themselves are the ones determining the characteristics of success and identifying the positive deviants themselves; in Success Mapping, because this is happening on a regional or national level, this become impossible and instead an outside (but still citizen-led) team is responsible for determining the criteria and identifying the successes. Another area of commonality is the belief that people learn best from their peers; while Positive Deviance encourages this through community members learning from their neighbors, Success Mapping encourages this through people learning from their peers in geographically different communities.

#### ABCD

In terms of ABCD, Success Mapping is also based on the belief that community development should be based on the community's resources and successes, not their needs. ABCD also encourages a form of "asset-mapping" within the community where communities identify all of the resources available to them. Success Mapping, again because it works on a regional or national level, put an emphasis on communities identifying one or more initiatives (which are, in the end, the result of the mobilization of those assets) that have succeeded in moving the community forward.

#### SEED-SCALE

Success Mapping also draws heavily from the SEED-SCALE methodology. The first principle of SEED-SCALE is "start from success", and the identification of these successes is the foundation of the Success Mapping approach. SEED-SCALE also puts forward the importance of Scale-squared Centers, which are community demonstration sites for peer learning. This may be a closer model for the peer exchanges that Success Mapping encourages. The Success Mapping experience in Haiti used the criteria and principles from SEED-SCALE as the basis of the criteria for identifying success because it focused on instances of community empowerment.

#### CRISIS MAPPING & OPEN-SOURCE MAPPING

The actual technical approach was based on experiences with the OpenStreetMap platform and crisis-mapping platforms such as Ushahidi. The objective of transforming data generated from community experience into an easily accessible, visible online platform is consistent with many Crisis Mapping initiatives; however, instead of mapping needs and crises, this approach focuses on mapping assets and successes.

## LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PILOT INITIATIVE IN HAITI

---

### DEFINING SUCCESS:

- ✓ This process cannot be rushed – it is the foundation of everything that will come after it
- ✓ Ensure focus groups and all of the workshops to define the criteria and indicators are well-documented so that the evolution of the criteria is clear for future references
- ✓ The more concrete and measurable the indicators are, the more consistent the results will be.
- ✓ The online platform should be developed after the questionnaire has been finalized to ensure that it effectively captures the information from the field
- ✓ Like the indicators themselves, “success” may be able to be separated into a spectrum or categories. It is not necessarily always a yes-or-no context.
- ✓ The pilot process should have more objective evaluations of the consistency with which different team members evaluated the criteria. If this cannot be proven at the beginning, there is little assurance that what is a success to one individual/team will be success to another

### GATHERING DATA:

- ✓ The specific strengths and personalities of the team members has a significant impact on the field work. The highest-performing team had one member who was very good at connecting with the community but who was unskilled at using a computer; he was partnered with someone who had fewer people skills but was very adept at using both the GPS and the computer.
- ✓ An informal, participant-observer was more effective – by spending more time informally with the community, we were trusted with more honest and detailed information and were given more opportunities to make observations that could confirm or question the statements given to us
- ✓ Speaking to people who were not directly involved in the initiative was a critical way of confirming or questioning the information given to us, although it could be difficult to obtain
- ✓ The data gathered in many ways is like a snapshot of the community at a particular point in time – even over the 6 months of the pilot project, certain communities evolved in an impressive way and others demonstrated tendencies that caused us to re-evaluate them and remove them from the list of successes. Keeping the data updated is time-consuming and challenging, but important
- ✓ Most communities were happy to grant permission to share their contact information with us, but it was important to remind them that well-intentioned and ill-intentioned people could use the data and that it was their responsibility to use discretion when engaging with outside contacts referred by the platform.
- ✓ Treating data quickly was critical because any issues with the data (misplaced GPS coordinates, missing contact information, etc) will be difficult to address when the field team has moved on to a new set of communities
- ✓ One person should be responsible for the data to avoid confusion about the flow of information in the process. Back-ups of data (both hard and digital) should be made regularly.



#### FACILITATING EXCHANGES:

- ✓ The experience of traveling with representatives from other communities, eating with them, sleeping in the same space as them, and participating in workshops during the regional conferences created a bond between not only the select number of conference participants but between their organizations as well. There is still communication ongoing between many of them.
- ✓ Having the regional conferences be mobile instead of fixed in a single space was more effective – instead of people hearing about the innovations and successes of their peers, they experienced it.
- ✓ The most useful part of the national conference was the skills-sharing workshops, further demonstrating that community members were much more interested in practical action than speeches.
- ✓ The peer exchanges far surpassed our expectations for their popularity. More than 200 people participated in just a dozen peer exchanges. This also demonstrated the interest in practical action and skills-sharing
- ✓ Documentation of the peer exchanges themselves is important, but just as important is the documentation of the impact of the peer exchanges in the communities that went to acquire knowledge and skills. If and how they implemented that knowledge at home is critical.
- ✓ The rate and speed of implementation of the knowledge gained during the peer training in the student communities surpassed anything we as an organization had ever experienced in traditional trainings. This indicates an efficiency about peer trainings that needs to be further explored
- ✓ The greatest limitation on the effective implementation of knowledge gained during the peer training was where the student community did not have access to the appropriate technology/resources. While in general we worked to avoid this, more vetting has to be done that a community actually has access to those materials and therefore is enabled by their environment and empowered by the new knowledge to implement something.
- ✓ Another way to make peer trainings more effective would be to give the teachers the possibility to do follow-up visits to the communities they taught to provide continued mentorship and guidance
- ✓ One of the greatest challenges with the peer trainings was the lack of any pedagogic/teaching materials (handouts, visuals, booklets, diagrams, etc). This is largely due to lack of time, resources, and training on the part of the teaching community, and could be overcome with support of the facilitating organization.
- ✓ Many of these exchanges continued without the logistical and financial support of the organization – certain communities continued to keep in contact, visit each other, and even exchange physical goods such as seeds, tools, and materials.

#### OTHER:

- ✓ Implicate the local and national press as much as possible in this process. It will provide further validation and visibility for people in country who may not be connected to the internet