

THE COMMON FOUNDATIONS

Changes made to Version 2.0

The following is a summary of changes made to **Version 2.0 of the Common Foundations essential practices**:

Revision	Date	Changes
1.1	September 2020	<p>1. Addition of an introductory paragraph recognizing that impact measurement practice is not for everyone.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To express a philosophical stance that does not assume that impact measurement is the most appropriate for every context and situation.</p> <hr/> <p>2. Addition of Common Approach definition of impact and impact measurement.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To clarify definitions.</p> <hr/> <p>3. Change in title of essential practice from “Report Results” to “Communicate Results”.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> “Communicate” results better reflects the spirit of the required sub-practices.</p>
2.0	July 2020	<p>4. Change in title of essential practice from “Plan your Intended Change” to “Describe your Intended Change”.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To better reflect the requirements of the sub-practices.</p> <hr/> <p>5. Change in title of essential practice “Use Performance Measures” to “Use Indicators”.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The word "Indicators" is interpreted as encompassing a broader scope than "performance measures", and leaves room</p>



for qualitative measures, measurements that are indirect, and measurement that requires interpretation.

6. Change in title of essential practice from “Communicate Results” to “Communicate and Use Results”.

Reason: The sub-practices have been revised to reflect use of information collected as well as communication of results.

7. Addition of reference to qualitative data and indicators as well as quantitative data and indicators.

Reason: There is often a tendency to read "quantitative" when reading "indicators" and "data". The addition of qualitative is to emphasize that both qualitative and quantitative data and indicators are valid.

8. Inclusion of stories and storytelling as examples of qualitative sources of data.

Reason: Stories and storytelling are important ways of collecting and sharing information and data in Indigenous communities and other communities.

9. Changes to language for the sake of simplification and consistency. For example, using the word "change" instead of "impact" where applicable.

Reason: Significant feedback was received on the need to simplify the language and to be more consistent in the use of certain terms.

10. Changes in the language around stakeholders to emphasize those most affected by an organization’s actions. Replacement of the word "stakeholder" with "those most affected by the organization’s actions".

Reason: The word "stakeholder" can be problematic and can be interpreted in many different ways. The Common Approach seeks to use language that emphasizes a focus on those whose lives are most affected by the impact of the organization.



11. Changes to the phrasing of several sub-practices for the sake of clarity.

Reason: To more clearly specify exactly what is required of each sub-practice to meet the minimum standard.

12. Revisions to sub-practices to ensure that this is a minimum standard that is able to meet most people “where they are at”.


Reason: For a standard to succeed, it must start by meeting people where they are at. The Common Foundations are intended to reflect practices currently being implemented by most—at least 60%—of social purpose organizations.

13. Clarify, with those most affected by your organization’s actions, that the explanatory paragraph on engagement is a suggestion and not a requirement.

Reason: In order to create a minimum standard that can “meet people where they are at”, practices for each essential practice around engaging with those most affected are aspirational. The Common Approach envisions a future evolution when engaging those most affected in different aspects of impact measurement is the norm. The standard will evolve over time to reflect this reality as it changes.

14. The inclusion of suggestions for several sub-practices that are distinct from the requirements for a minimum standard.

Reason: The previous version of the standard somewhat conflated suggestions and requirements. This has been corrected in this version of the standard. This version of the standard also includes suggestions for engagement with those most affected, which for reasons explained in #13 above, are not requirements (yet!).



This work is licensed under a

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

