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**Objectives/aims**

By synthesising various theory-driven approaches in evaluation, we have developed a “blueprint” useful for the design and planning of non-profit programs. This framework helps to create a simple, practical and unified language for a field plagued by inconsistent terminology and achieves analytic insights not possible when such theoretical tools are used independently. In this presentation, we aim to demonstrate the use of the “blueprint” for strategic planning and design of non-profit programs.

**Methods**

The presentation would demonstrate the use or the application of the “blueprint” to a case example of a social intervention that helps persons with disability gain employment in the open job market. The blueprint allows multiple stakeholders a parsimonious yet holistic overview of how all its program parts connect to one another. In other words, it allows stakeholders to structurally configure the program instead of just tweaking parts of its components. Using the “blueprint”, the following analysis can be performed: (1) checking the logical flow and incremental achievability of the outcome chains; (2) evaluating the tightness of the theory of action by scrutinising the alignment of each activity to its inputs to determine the adequacy of resourcing; (3) understanding the trade-offs between scope of activities and reach (or reasonable impact) of the program; and (4) appraising the overall configuration and assessing structural gaps of the program.

**Main findings**

The potential significance of applying the “blueprint” is that it allows for a simpler assessment of the flow, achievability, tightness, alignment and adequacy of a program’s design. Furthermore, it allows precision of understanding and consensus amongst multiple stakeholders; achieves analytic insights that would not be obvious from the individual vantage points of funders, policy makers, practitioners and program managers; and facilitates important strategic decisions and design refinements that can be done even before implementation, after which such changes will be more costly and more difficult to make.