JUPITER PRIME

Consulting • Training • Advisory

جوبيتر برايم للاستشارات والتدريب

COURSE BROCHURE

Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication Training Course

11 – 15 January 2027
Madrid

Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication Training Course

Ref: 3254_123932 **Date:** 11 – 15 January 2027 **Location:** Madrid **Fees:** 5600 GBP

Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication is a 1-week training course for monitoring and evaluation officers and report writers who must turn field evidence into an impact report pack that funders and boards can trust. Organisations now face sharper questions about what their spending changed, and loose claims erode credibility quickly. Jupiter Prime Training places evidence-based impact reporting and communication at the centre of how results are judged and explained.

Why Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication Matters Now

Three forces shape impact reporting today. Funders increasingly tie renewals to credible proof of change rather than counts of activity. Boards want short, decision-ready summaries that separate contribution from coincidence. Public scrutiny punishes overstated claims. An organisation that reports well earns repeat funding, sharper internal learning and a reputation for candour; one that reports badly risks lost grants, misdirected effort and reputational damage. The course rests on a theory of change, results chains, contribution analysis and mixed-methods evaluation.

Who Gains Most from Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication

- Staff responsible for collecting, cleaning and verifying outcome evidence across projects
- Writers who draft donor reports, annual impact statements and board papers
- Officers who design indicators and track them through results dashboards
- Coordinators who turn field findings into leadership briefings
- Analysts who prepare charts, case narratives and evidence summaries for external audiences

A monitoring and evaluation unit gains most when its data collectors and its report writers attend together, because the hand-off between evidence and narrative is where most reporting weaknesses appear.

Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication Capabilities

Participants practise moving from raw findings to claims they can defend in front of a funder or board, with the strength of each claim made visible.

- Assess the strength of outcome evidence before it enters a report — funder renewal decisions
- Design indicator sets that track change rather than activity — board performance oversight
- Build impact narratives that link activities to outcomes credibly — donor relationship managers
-

Communicate uncertainty and attribution limits in plain words — audit and trustee scrutiny
- Specify data visuals that match the question each audience asks — executive briefings
- Test draft reports against an evidence checklist before release — publication sign-off

Key Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication Terms

- Theory of change — a stated chain of assumptions explaining how activities are expected to produce outcomes and longer-term impact.
- Contribution analysis — a method for judging how plausibly an intervention helped cause an observed change, alongside other influences.
- Outcome indicator — a measurable sign that a condition has changed for the people or systems an initiative serves.
- Counterfactual — an estimate of what would have happened without the intervention, used to judge attributable change.
- Evidence hierarchy — a ranking of evidence types by how strongly they support a causal claim.
- Limitations statement — a short, explicit account of what the evidence cannot show and why.

Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication Day by Day

Day 1: Evidence Expectations of Funders and Boards

- Funder Reporting Requirements — Which Results Matter for Renewal
- Board Information Needs — Level of Detail for Governance Decisions
- Theory of Change Review — Testing Assumptions Behind Claimed Outcomes
- Results Chain Mapping — Separating Outputs, Outcomes and Impact
- Stakeholder Evidence Matrix — Matching Audiences to Evidence Types

Day 2: Gathering and Grading Evidence

- Mixed-Methods Data Collection — Balancing Surveys, Interviews and Records
- Evidence Hierarchy Grading — Rating How Strongly Data Supports Claims
- Baseline and Comparison Groups — Estimating the Counterfactual Credibly
- Data Quality Checks — Validity, Reliability and Completeness Before Reporting
- Beneficiary Voice Capture — Ethical Consent and Representative Sampling

Day 3: Indicators and Contribution

- Outcome Indicator Selection — Tracking Change Instead of Activity Counts
- Indicator Reference Sheets — Definitions, Sources and Collection Frequency
- Contribution Analysis Steps — Judging Plausible Causal Links
- Attribution Versus Contribution — Wording Claims to Fit the Evidence
- Results Dashboard Design — Targets, Trends and Variance Flags

Day 4: Narrative, Visuals and Honest Limits

- Impact Narrative Structure — Problem, Change, Evidence and Meaning
- Case Study Selection — Avoiding Cherry-Picked Success Stories
- Chart Choice for Results — Trends, Comparisons and Distributions
- Uncertainty Communication — Ranges, Confidence and Plain Caveats
- Limitations Statement Drafting — What the Evidence Cannot Show

Day 5: Practising the Impact Report Pack

- Evidence Grading Applied — Rating a Live Set of Findings
- Indicator Set Refinement — Aligning Measures With the Theory of Change
- Board Summary Drafting — One-Page Results for Decision Makers
- Peer Evidence Review — Challenging Claims Against the Checklist
- Impact Report Pack Completion — Narrative, Visuals and Limits Combined

Applying Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication After the Course

- Lead a grading session that rates every outcome claim in the next donor report against the evidence hierarchy before submission.
- Rebuild one board results summary with outcome indicators, a clear chart and an explicit limitations statement.

Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication Questions FAQ

What is evidence-based impact reporting and communication, and why does it matter now?

It is the practice of reporting outcomes only as strongly as the evidence allows, and explaining them clearly. It matters now because funders and boards judge credibility closely, and overstated results can cost renewals and trust.

Which roles gain most from evidence-based impact reporting and communication?

Monitoring and evaluation officers and report writers gain most. Data collectors, indicator owners and drafters of donor or board papers all strengthen the link between measurement and claim.

How does evidence-based impact reporting and communication differ from a general evaluation design course?

It focuses on reporting and communicating results rather than designing full evaluations. You work on grading evidence, wording claims, choosing charts and stating limits for funders and boards, not on study design or statistical modelling.

What do you bring back from evidence-based impact reporting and communication training?

You bring back a draft impact report pack built on your own data. It combines graded evidence, refined indicators, an impact narrative, results charts and a limitations statement ready for internal review.

Evidence-Based Impact Reporting and Communication: The Way Forward

The impact report pack becomes the reference for the next funding renewal discussion, where it informs which outcomes to claim and how firmly. Report writers, evaluation officers and senior leaders use it together. After its first use, revisit the evidence grading and limitations statement, since funder questions often show which claims needed stronger support or plainer caveats.