African Universities' Research Approaches (AURA)

Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Contents

Introduction

The focus of this Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework separates into two parts. The first part looks at standards, frameworks and guidelines for conforming to good M&E practice. This includes a discussion on the rationale for adopting participatory methods in the design and data collection processes throughout the programme. This document also looks at frameworks the African Universities' Research Approaches (AURA) programme will draw upon in its assessment of improvements to research and teaching practices in the partner institutions. The intention is to draw upon well-established frameworks as a first step, modifying or refining the framework(s) as required over the course of the programme. Finally, this document will discuss the M&E model that will be used to measure the cost-effectiveness, impact and effectiveness of the partnership and product, namely the Facilitated Self-Evaluation (FSE).

The latter part of this document covers material that is more practical in nature. The section entitled 'Data collection for M&E' (section 4) includes a set of guidelines and templates that will be used to collect evidence throughout the programme. The broad aim of this section is to capture evidence of the AURA project's ability to achieve its programme targets. Naturally, many of these targets come from the logframe that's been agreed between the AURA project consortium (i.e. IDS-ITOCA-Loughborough University) and the donor, the UK's Department for International Development (DFID). The logframe defines the contractual obligations that should be achieved / delivered in this programme, and these obligations are articulated as impacts at: an individual, institutional and sectoral level.

> Individual is defined as: the skills and competencies of individuals (e.g. academics, and professional staff).
>
> Institutional is defined as: the specific capabilities of an organisation to carry out coordinated actions to deliver organisational goals.
>
> Sectoral is defined as: the wider environment that may support or constrain the organisation's ability to carry out its functions, or could benefit from increased capacity of the organisation, and the framework, approaches and tools produced through the learning partnership.

As a result, the data collected from monitoring and evaluation processes needs to link to the outcomes and indicators outlined in the AURA logframe. We aim to strike a careful balance in capturing the required information, without overburdening the project team with unnecessary details or processes. For this reason we propose that the data gathering templates used in this document (see the Appendices) are subject to continuous review during the course of the programme, so that these continue to respond to our ever evolving needs.

This M&E framework is seen as a 'living document' – in that it will be continuously updated by the AURA Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor during the course of the programme.

The role of the AURA M&E Advisor is to facilitate the M&E process, therefore if you have any additions, modifications or general feedback to make please contact the M&E Advisor directly via the details below:

Name: Mr Jagdeep Shokar
Email: j.shokar@ids.ac.uk / shokar@gmail.com

As this document expands we may produce separate standalone documents or policies in order to support the management of the AURA M&E processes in a comprehensive, and efficient, way.

A copy of this framework can be found in the AURA Programme Documents folder entitled: M&E Framework. The latest version of the framework will always contain the latest date as a suffix i.e. AURA M&E Framework_30 March 2015.docx

1. AURA Standards and guidelines

The AURA project intends to make use of existing standards and guidelines where it is relevant and applicable to do so. This is to ensure that our programme incorporates thoroughly researched best practices where they already exist, rather than developing our own. It's important to emphasise, however, that we do not advocate the wholesale use of any one particular framework, particularly when it comes from a context that is different to our partner institutions' environment. The intention is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of relevant frameworks as they apply to our partners' context and to modify as necessary. The AURA programme will draw on a range of established frameworks to monitor and evaluate the programme at an individual, institutional and sectoral level.

One such framework is the Researchers Development Framework (RDF)[1]. The RDF is skills-focused and applies to AURA's monitoring and evaluation processes *predominantly* at the individual and institutional levels. It will be used as a model for establishing competency / skills baselines, and for designing the AURA capacity development interventions. Section 1.1 covers the rationale, and extent to which, we will be using this framework in more detail.

Another framework we will draw upon is the Research Excellence Framework[2] (REF). This framework focuses on research outputs and applies to AURA's monitoring and evaluation processes *predominantly* at the departmental and institutional level (although it also provides a structure for communicating the impact of research outputs at a sector level). Section 1.2 covers the rationale, and extent to which we will be using this framework in more detail. Equivalent frameworks exist in Australia and South Africa, and these will also be explored to determine the extent to which, we can draw on or contextualise these frameworks to address our partners' needs

Therefore we must adopt a flexible approach to defining standards of good practice, particularly when contextualising and applying these (and other) frameworks to an African context.

1.1 Researcher Development Framework (RDF)

At the individual and institutional level the AURA project will draw upon the Researcher Development Framework (RDF) as a measure of the knowledge, behaviours and attributes of effective and highly skilled researchers. The framework is grounded in research carried out through interviews and focus groups with over 100 researchers, with additional expertise coming from stakeholders and specialists. Their insight has enabled the RDF to define the characteristics needed to carry out effective research, and is appropriate to a range of careers. These characteristics, in the Framework, are expressed as 'descriptors'. The descriptors are structured into four domains and twelve sub-domains, encompassing the knowledge, intellectual abilities, techniques and professional standards to do research, as well as the personal qualities, knowledge and skills to work with others and ensure the wider impact of research.

The four domains are:

[1] https://www.vitae.ac.uk/researchers-professional-development/about-the-vitae-researcher-development-framework/developing-the-vitae-researcher-development-framework/
[2] http://www.ref.ac.uk/

- Domain A: Knowledge and intellectual abilities
- Domain B: Personal effectiveness
- Domain C: Research governance and organisation
- Domain D: Engagement, influence and impact

A diagram, provided by the CRAC Vitae, illustrates the 4 domains and subdomains. The diagram and supporting documentation can be accessed here: https://www.vitae.ac.uk/vitae-publications/rdf-related/researcher-development-framework-rdf-vitae.pdf

The objective of the RDF is to be comprehensive in order to provide a detailed checklist for researchers developing their skills. As is evident from the domain listing, above, the RDF's criteria works at a broad level, which enables it to be applied across different academic disciplines and thus ensures relevance for partner institutions working in health, agriculture and the environment. For instance, the framework provides a range of views or lenses through which to apply the RDF to a broad range of contexts and roles. These include: the employability lens, the information literacy lens, teaching lens and researcher mobility lens. For more details about these lens refer to: https://www.vitae.ac.uk/researchers-professional-development/about-the-vitae-researcher-development-framework/lenses-on-the-vitae-researcher-development-framework

The RDF will play a key role in developing AURA intervention diagnostics, as all AURA interventions will be developed, contextualised and evaluated using pre- and post-diagnostics. Pre-diagnostics are used to assess the knowledge and intellectual abilities, attitudes, values, as well as working practices for all participants. This data enables the AURA project team to tailor the intervention to meet the needs of the target audience, rather than assuming a generic approach. Developing a diagnostic for research courses, for instance, requires a good understanding of the attributes associated with an effective researcher, and the RDF provides a useful insight into defining these competencies.

The AURA logframe (see appendix 7) places a large emphasis on research capacity development at an individual level, and includes the skills development of academics (Output Indicator 1.1) and students (Output Indicator 2.3), in participating universities as beyond through the Open Education Resources (Output Indicator 3.4).

RDF Contextualisation

The AURA project team will explore opportunities to collaborate with CRAC Vitae, or draw on the competencies defined in the framework, to contextualise the RDF for our partners' context so that it can assist us in the assessment of the programme, input into our course curricula and respond to our logframe indicators. Negotiations with CRAC Vitae have commenced and will continue in the succeeding months. Once an agreement has been reached, this section of the M&E Framework will be updated.

1.2 The Research Excellence Framework (REF) framework

The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the standard used for assessing the quality of research in UK higher education institutions. The REF is another framework that is well suited to being contextualised and used to assess the programme objectives of AURA, such as evaluating the quality of research outputs or as a guideline for shaping institutional processes for investing in research practices.

In addition to being suited to AURA because of its focus, the REF also brings a degree of credibility to the programme's approaches. This framework plays a major role in determining university research funding in the UK, and given this level of importance, its various components have gone through a comprehensive, iterative development process. The REF has evolved through nearly 30 years of inputs from researchers, policy makers and university administrators on how best to assess research in a transparent and effective way (See article: Evolution of the REF, in the Times Higher Education (HE) Supplement for a more detailed discussion). The 2014 assessment alone assessed 1, 911 submissions made for 191, 150 research outputs that included over 50 thousand academic staff. Of course its widespread use across the HE sector in the UK does not mean the REF will be suitable for our partners' purposes if adopted wholesale. Therefore, the AURA project team will work with our partners to contextualise the REF framework for their needs. We are well positioned to do this as one of our consortium partners, i.e. Loughborough University, has recently experienced working on a REF submission for the 2014 assessment.

The AURA logframe (see appendix 7) emphasises the importance of research output (Output 1.2). An easy way of looking at research output is merely to focus on quantity: for example, simply looking at an increase in research production. However, this would be overly simplistic as it ignores many crucial qualitative elements. The REF has well developed criteria to capture this richness, in quantitative and qualitative data, at the research output level that the AURA programme can draw upon. The following are examples of elements from the REF that the AURA programme could use in assessing research outputs in greater detail:

- Originality will be understood in terms of the innovative character of the research output. The REF has a multifaceted approach on originality and includes how outputs link, 'originally', to new and/or complex problems; develop innovative research methods, methodologies and analytical techniques; or provide new empirical material; and/or advance theory or the analysis of doctrine, policy or practice.

- Significance will be understood in terms of the development of the intellectual agenda of the field and may be theoretical, methodological and/or substantive. Due weight will be given to potential as well as actual significance, especially where the output is very recent.

- The REF also has a separate indicator for Impact, which focuses on the social, economic or cultural impact, or benefit beyond academia that has taken place[3].

[3] Executive summary of REF Decisions on Impact report: http://www.ref.ac.uk/pubs/2011-01/#exec

- Rigour will be understood in terms of the intellectual precision, robustness and appropriateness of the concepts, analyses, theories and methodologies deployed within a research output. Account will be taken of such qualities as: the integrity, coherence and consistency of arguments and analysis; as well as the due consideration of ethical issues.

- Furthermore, the REF includes criteria relating to 'esteem' which is measured through some of the following indicators: Awards, Fellowships of Learned Societies, prizes, honours and named lectures; Personal Research Awards and Fellowships; Keynote and plenary addresses at conferences; Significant professional service; Positions in national and international strategic advisory bodies; Industrial advisory roles; Editorial roles; Research co-ordination[4]. This example clearly illustrates the need for the AURA programme to contextualise criteria to meet the local conditions in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The REF framework offers the programme a set of robust standards for assessing institutional factors, which respond to the need to develop individual skills, sustainably, through addressing institutional barriers, and ensuring the researchers' environment is conducive to producing research.

The AURA programme will use the framework at an institutional level to help our partners assess their environment and readiness for enriched research (and teaching) practices. The REF incorporates these areas in its 'Environment' section, which is divided into 5 sections as follows:

1. Overview: This area provides brief contextual information, describing what research groups or sub-units are covered by the department, and how research is structured. This section will help with contextualisation, and although it is not usually scored and/or assessed, we may apply a scoring system to help us build an initial profile, and communicate the level of readiness / maturity in each partner institution. This information will be collected, initially, as part of the AURA partner application process, and will give us an overview of the department's strengths and weaknesses.

2. Research strategy: One of AURA's aims is to ensure departmental research is strategic in orientation, rather than being ad hoc. This section looks for evidence of the achievement of strategic aims for research, and details of future strategic aims and goals for research; how these relate to the structure described above; and how they will be taken forward. IDS has experience in encouraging a strategic approach to activities that are too often done

[4] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/research-information-management/selected-processes/indicators-esteem/

piecemeal through the IDRC, Think Tank Initiative, Policy Engagement Communications' programme[5]. IDS will share our insights, and resources, as well as explore opportunities to link up research activities across the consortium and partner institutions.

3. People: Changes in how personnel are structured, and are thus in an ideal space to deliver on a department's research strategy, is an important component of AURA. This criterion relates to the staffing strategy and staff development within the department, including: evidence of how the staffing strategy relates to the unit's research strategy and physical infrastructure; support for early career researchers and career development at all stages in research careers; evidence of how the department supports equalities and diversity. Initial discussions with some prospective partner institutions showed that the development of continuous professional development systems / processes were desirable.

4. Income, infrastructure, facilities: Information about research income, infrastructure and facilities. Our consideration, from an M&E perspective relates to the current income, infrastructure and facilities dedicated to research, and monitoring changes in these variables over the course of the AURA programme as an indicator of institutional change.

5. Collaboration and contribution to the discipline or research base: DFID have emphasised the importance of the AURA programme reaching stakeholders outside the target departments. Therefore this criterion relates to contributions to the wider research base, including work with other researchers outside the department, whether locally, nationally or internationally; support for research collaboration and interdisciplinary research; and indicators of wider influence or contributions to the discipline or research base.

Both frameworks, the RDF and the REF, are examples of frameworks that could apply, once contextualised, to the AURA programme. An equivalent process is needed to determine relevant teaching and learning frameworks for defining and assessing educator competencies and skills. A new section will be added to the framework, once these models and standards have been identified by the incoming Training and Quality Coordinators.

[5] http://www.ids.ac.uk/project/policy-engagement-and-communications-pec-program-for-think-tanks-in-latin-america-and-south-asia

2. AURA M&E Good practice

The following section discusses aspects of good practice in monitoring and evaluation that is relevant to, and will be adopted by, the AURA programme. The underlying principles informing the M&E processes is that the monitoring and evaluations systems are carried out using collaborative processes: both in the design and data collection activities. The purpose of this section is to define a collective set of guidelines for undertaking programme M&E.

The good practices discussed are as follows:

3.1. DFID Guidelines on problems encountered in M&E
3.2. Participatory M&E
3.3. A participatory M&E Framework
3.4. Value for Money (VFM) guidelines for the AURA programme
3.5. Looking ahead at best practices.

2.1 DFID Guidelines on problems encountered in M&E

DFID, in their paper A Guide for DFID-contracted Research Programmes[6], outline 2 major failings in monitoring and evaluation that they commonly encounter in their programmes. These are a lack of clarity through an absence of detail; and the limitations of M&E not being built into a programme at an early enough stage. Below is how we will overcome these failings:

- Clarity and detail: we will ensure the AURA M&E framework is detailed. For each monitoring and evaluation activity, we have used standard guidelines – developed by a variety of organisations working in development evaluation – to define the type of information we should be collecting. This includes the activity, its methodology and the resources needed to collect the data, being spelled out in detail. The data collection table, including guidelines are given in section 4.
- M&E as a continuous process: the AURA monitoring and evaluation activities are spread throughout the programme, rather than being concentrated near the conclusion of an activity. The monitoring of the programme feeds into the programme design, and delivery. It is not only central to the programme design but also ensures that the AURA project team (and partners) reflect on the consequential impacts in a collaborative and consultative way. AURA M&E is not reliant on one specialist undertaking the M&E processes. The responsibility for undertaking programme M&E will be shared across the consortium and will be used by partner institutions to gauge their level of engagement, programme successes, and for overcoming challenges (and blocks) too.

[6] http://www.aau.org/sites/default/files/mrci/DFID%20M%20%26%20E%20Report%20Guide.pdf

As such, the AURA M&E Framework has intentionally addressed the need for clarity and detail, and has interwoven M&E processes throughout the design and delivery of the programme.

2.2 Participatory monitoring and evaluation

Conventionally, monitoring and evaluation has involved outside experts coming in to measure performance against pre-set indicators, using standardised procedures and tools. Participatory monitoring and evaluation differs from more conventional approaches in that it seeks to engage key project stakeholders more actively in reflecting and assessing the progress of their project and in particular the achievement of results. These types of approaches are used by multi-laterals such as the World Bank (see: World Bank Resource Page[7]) as well as research institutes such as IDS. The core principles of participatory monitoring and evaluation are outlined in the below bullet points. Included for each is a description of its relevance to our M&E Framework under AURA.

- Local people are active participants — not just sources of information: the AURA programme will discuss M&E at all levels, not just at the consortium level, but with partners and stakeholders.
- Stakeholders evaluate, outsiders facilitate: When the objective behind M&E is to incorporate a diverse range of stakeholders into the assessment process it helps to have one person, not associated with the project, with overall responsibility for this task. Therefore, when the AURA consortium evaluates the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of the programme (see section 5 on the Facilitated Self Evaluation process) we will work with an external facilitator to oversee this process.
- Focus on building stakeholder capacity for analysis and problem-solving: a common problem with engaging with stakeholders on M&E is either a lack of capacity or willingness. The AURA programme includes interventions, face to face and online, that aim to build M&E capacity. The intention of one of these interventions is to strengthen the M&E capacity in partner institutions, which should assist in collecting programme M&E.
- Process builds commitment to implementing any recommended corrective actions: The AURA programme has midterm and final year reports for each of its three years. The aim of year 1 and 2 reports is to feed into the continuous improvements in the design and implementation of AURA.

  Source for guidelines: Rietbergen-McCracken 1998[8]

2.3 The good practice of providing Value for Money (VFM): guidelines for the AURA programme

The activities taking place under AURA must represent good value for money (VFM). VFM is critical to demonstrate, to our donor, that we have 'maximised the impact of each pound to improve poor people's lives'[9].

[7] http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTCDD/0,,contentMDK:20598943~menuPK:608227~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:430161,00.html
[8] http://www.sswm.info/sites/default/files/reference_attachments/WORLD%20BANK%201998%20Participation%20and%20Social%20Assessment.pdf

According to DFID's paper on VFM[9], we will need to be 'very clear about the results (outputs and outcomes) we expect to achieve as well as the costs. We also have to be confident in the strength of the evidence base and explicit in stating the underlying assumptions we are relying on in achieving the outputs and outcomes. This means looking at the 3Es – economy, efficiency, effectiveness (known as DFID's 3Es) as well as the strength of the links in the chain. When we make judgements on the effectiveness of an intervention we need to consider issues of equity. This includes making sure our development results are targeted at the poorest and include sufficient targeting of women and girls. Value for Money is about maximising each of the 3Es, so that we have maximum effectiveness, efficiency and economy for each intervention'.

In order for DFID to understand what works, and for the programme to accountable to DFID, we need to capture the evidence in a transparent way. Therefore, our M&E processes will capture evidence that goes beyond user satisfaction and impact. We will gather evidence of the cost of each intervention, and compare these costs to our comparators (or other interventions) as a guide to assessing the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the programme. Each intervention will be accompanied by an event report (see appendix 3), which must outline the costs associated with each activity. However, VFM does not mean we should take the cheapest option, rather it is about getting the desired quality (or results) at the lowest price (see DFID's Approach to Value for Money (VfM) for a further discussion).

DFID's 3Es Defined

- Economy: Are we buying inputs of the appropriate quality at the right price? (Inputs are things such as staff, consultants, raw materials and capital that are used to produce outputs)
- Efficiency: How well do we convert inputs into outputs? (Outputs are results delivered by us to an external party. We exercise strong control over the quality and quantity of outputs)
- Effectiveness: How well are the outputs from an intervention achieving the desired outcome on poverty reduction? (Note that in contrast to outputs, we do not exercise direct control over outcomes)
- Cost-effectiveness: How much impact on poverty reduction does an intervention achieve relative to the inputs that we or our agents invest in it?

Source: DFIDs Approach to Value for Money, July 2011[9]

The rest of this section applies the 3Es framework (i.e. economy, efficiency, effectiveness) to the AURA project. This section is drawn directly from the AURA business case developed by DFID.

The effectiveness of the AURA programme is enhanced by:

- the participation of ITOCA in the programme consortia, which will implement many of the local activities. ITOCA is based, and has operated successfully, in Africa for fifteen

[9] https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/49551/DFID-approach-value-money.pdf

years, and will ensure that local knowledge and expertise shapes and benefits the programme, and that transaction and other costs of local engagement are kept down.
- using a competitive process to select university departments to participate in the programme, which will consider university-wide support for institutionalising the research capacity approaches and teaching and learning framework
- designing knowledge products and training courses that respond to and address the needs, preferences and practices of the partner universities, thereby engaging their attention and commitment to benefitting from the programme.
- working with university partners that have regional and local networks so that the programme will have wider impacts in the African region and beyond.
- using a mix of face to face and e-learning formats to reach a large number of organisations. Materials developed will be made widely available in open licensed format, enabling adaption and benefits for the Higher Education sector as a whole.

The efficiency of the AURA programme is enhanced by:

- coordinating most programme activities at the regional level which means less overall travel, and ensures contextual understanding, response to local needs and effective working with local systems.
- the consortium partners having worked together before in the region, notably under the Mobilising Knowledge for Development programme. Each consortium partner and team member will have a specific role to play so that duplication of activities is eliminated as far as possible.
- IDS' experience in programme management, ranging from small consultancies to large, multi-disciplinary programmes for DFID and other donors, working in partnership across geographic and disciplinary divides.

The economy of the AURA programme is enhanced by:

- distributing tasks to experienced and qualified staff with relevant knowledge and skills, who can be effective in carrying them out at competitive day rates. Recruitment costs and costs of training the team are minimised due to the existence of a strong and versatile team within IDS that presents the expertise needed for this programme.
- making use of existing online opportunities to collaborate and communicate, such as the Chat Literacy virtual community of practice, and existing university platforms to share programme outputs.
- where possible, making use of virtual events and e-learning approaches. Where face to face workshops and training are required we will wherever possible work with our University partners to make use of their facilities for free or for competitive rates
- Travel and subsistence costs will be minimised through use of electronic communications, involving a local partner within the region, and use of economy air fares and reasonably priced accommodation wherever possible. IDS have secured charity rate fees for flights and travel.

2.4 Looking ahead at best practices

As indicated in the introduction to this document: our learning on this programme isn't simply a matter of responding to the donor objectives – although it is necessary that we do

this, it is not sufficient. The programme will be more fulfilling to the project team if it also incorporates institutional (and indeed personal) objectives.

IDS is presently developing an 'engaged excellence' model for defining its research activities, and collaborations with (external) partners, as part of its strategic objectives. Engaged excellence is about working in collaboration, and doing so without compromising on standards of excellence in the collective product. With reference to AURA this might refer to the production of top-quality, rigorous research outputs or capacity development interventions co-constructed and delivered through learning partnerships. Engaged excellence includes collaboration and engagement with change agents, such as institutions within the consortium, and making alliances with partnering institutions, who are positioned to make a real difference[10]. For now we are cognisant that this is an IDS initiative and, that as a partnership-led programme it is important that all members share and are made aware of each other's institutional objectives. As this notion of 'engaged excellence' develops further, details of its application and its strategic importance will appear in this section.

[10] Melissa Leach: http://www.ids.ac.uk/opinion/this-year-and-next-refreshing-ids-for-transforming-times

3. Evaluating the Programme Partnerships & Products: The Facilitated Self Evaluation (FSE) approach

To help adopt participatory standards throughout the course of the programme, AURA will be using the Facilitated Self-Evaluation (FSE) approach.

The AURA M&E framework will adopt, in a modified and contextualised manner, a range of participatory methodologies and approaches. From the outset, however, the framework's activities will broadly be guided by the Facilitated Self-Evaluation approach developed at IDS. The FSE approach has been used by IDS-ITOCA in a previous working partnership under the DFID funded Mobilising Knowledge for Development (MK4D) programme and therefore there is a familiarity with its ethos and its methods among members of the project team. The FSE is – at its core - a robust, participatory framework that is cost effective as it's reliant on the project teams to gather and analyse data (thereby reducing the level of support from an external consultant). The latter is particularly important given DFIDs increasing emphasis on value for money[9]. For instance, working with an external consultant, as outlined below, to bring meaning to the M&E findings constitutes value for money (and cost-effectiveness) as it reduces the amount of time an external consultant needs to familiarise themselves with the project or the data.

3.1 Introduction to the FSE

Facilitated self-evaluation (FSE) is a process that enables project teams to undertake rigorous, critical assessment of their organisational capability and their work. The FSE process was developed in 2011 by Penelope Beynon and Catherine Fisher (both evaluators based formerly at IDS) and to date has been piloted with three project teams: including work done in the IDS-ITOCA partnership between 2010-12. The FSE process is best suited to an evaluation of a product that is delivered in partnership, and where there is a strong commitment from both partners to learn and improve. The AURA programme goals to work with partner institutions in a genuine learning partnership fulfils these requirements.

3.2 Key principles of FSE:

This section outlines the principles that inform the implementation of the FSE process. The FSE process will review the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of a programme at two levels: the product level (i.e. the programme outputs or deliverables) and the partnership level (i.e. the working effectiveness of the collaborating partners from within or external to the programme consortium). The FSE process has a strong focus on 'outcomes' and 'learning'. Outcomes at the partnership level (i.e. improvements in organisational capability) are often overlooked in traditional evaluation design, but these findings are often the most beneficial and sustainable results of working together. As the project team are part of the FSE process they are in a position to discover, and implement, the learning from the findings going forward.

The FSE process will be facilitated by an external M&E expert, but the data gathering and analysis will be undertaken by the project team (and potentially staff at partner institutions). Below each feature of the FSE approach is defined:

Facilitation – an evaluation expert supports the project consortium and partner organisations to undertake every stage of the evaluation. It is assumed that the project team are not evaluation experts, and it is the evaluator as facilitator's role to advise on appropriate tools and approaches to increase the rigour of the evaluation design, data collection and analysis. In particular, the evaluator supports the team to use critical questioning approaches to challenge each other to remain true to the evidence (whereby mitigating bias), to use evaluative thinking approaches to push analysis to a deeper level (whereby maximizing the depth of insights) and to remain focused on the evaluation questions (whereby mitigating scope creep).

Self – the project consortium and partner organisations conduct every phase of the evaluation (design, data collection, analysis and reporting). It is assumed that they have the deepest understanding of their project history, rationale, assumptions and information needs, and that an evaluation designed and undertaken by the project team themselves will have greatest relevance and impact on their work. People learn best through identifying lessons themselves (rather than by being told them by someone else) and that a project team who undertake an evaluation will be immediately able to:

1. apply learning about the project in their daily work;
2. have a deeper understanding about how to do evaluation that will help them to design better monitoring and evaluation in future.

Finally, conducting the design and analysis as a team will help to mitigate bias and ensure everyone has the same understanding about results.

Evaluation – the FSE process is fundamentally about making evidence-based judgments. It is assumed that project teams undertake a multitude of review activities every year (for strategic review, reporting to donors, future planning and etc.) but that many of these processes rely solely on the project teams' observations and lack research rigor. By undertaking an FSE evaluation, teams can test and triangulate their personal experiences of delivering a project with evidence from other data sources (whereby increasing the validity of their own experiential conclusions).

Section 4.1 looks at M&E systems for gathering evidence to evaluate the product(s) and partnership(s). For partnership M&E, we will use methods such as a 'mood monitor' to collect continuous feedback from partners based in the consortium and within the institutions. For the product related M&E, the data we will collect is defined comprehensively in Section 5, which also indicates when (to collect the data), where (to locate or gather the data) and who is responsible for collecting this data.

4. Data collection for Monitoring and evaluation

The following section outlines the practical steps for capturing M&E evidence.

Included in this section is:

4.1 A comprehensive table (AURA Monitoring and Evaluation Table) that outlines all programme M&E related activities

4.2 Guidance on the mood monitoring table (Facilitated Self Evaluation Partnership Monitoring and Evaluation) that is designed to collect evidence on specific elements of the partnership on a quarterly basis.

4.1 The AURA Monitoring and Evaluation Table: capturing product and partnership related M&E activities

The AURA M&E table is inspired from guidelines and approaches that come from multiple development agencies and donors. For instance, the UNDP's Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results recommends a set of criteria that an M&E framework should include. Each of its recommendations is included in the table below. Similarly, the Charities Evaluation Services group emphasise the importance of an M&E framework having clarity around outputs, methodology and being clear on who has responsibility for each aspect of the monitoring. We have incorporated these recommendations where applicable, modified them when needed, and created addition items in building our M&E framework.

The aim of the AURA M&E table (see table 1 below) is to give programme staff a snapshot of all the data collection needed to fulfil our donor, as well as our sector-wide, institutional and individual objectives. Each M&E activity (see column 1) is assigned an individual who is responsible (see column 2) for leading the activity, and gathering and compiling the data. The outputs from these activities will also feed into the communication's activities – such as stories of influence or change, blogs and research publications about the programme.

An explanation for each column is provided below:

Lead:	This is the person responsible for completing the activity
With:	Others who are going to be involved to complete the activity
Activity:	This is the monitoring and evaluation activity to be undertaken
Output:	This is the document from which the information will be extracted: this could be a survey, for instance, or a reflective journal
Aim:	This explains why we are completing this task
Methodology:	This describes the methods used to undertake the activity
Resources:	The time and cost involved in undertaking the activity
Frequency:	Whether the task needs to be carried out weekly, monthly, quarterly or annually
Baseline:	This is the baseline against which progress on this task can be measured
Logframe (Y/N):	This answers whether the task is required by DFID as part of the AURA logframe or not
Level:	The level of analysis can be at the individual level, the institutional level or the sectoral level
Link:	This is the link to where the information fulfilling the activity is held.

The overall responsibility for managing the M&E processes (as defined in table 1 below) rests with the AURA M&E Advisor. The table provides an overview of the M&E activities, which will only be implementable, and effective, if there is regular communication and dialogue between the person responsible for gathering the data (i.e. the implementers) and the M&E Advisor. Therefore, before each activity, the leads and implementors will undertake a full briefing with the M&E Advisor on the expectations, outputs and deadlines for sharing M&E data.

The activities within the M&E Table will be reviewed at intervals throughout the programme to ensure that they are useful, efficient and informative to the AURA project team, and partners.

Table 1: M&E Activity Table

AURA Monitoring and Evaluation Activity Table												
Activity	Lead	With	Output	Aim	Methodology	Resources	When	Frequency	Baseline	Logframe	Level	Link
Reflective meeting	Project Coordinators (PC)	ALIRT Team (AT)	Reflective Report	Capture lessons in programme, progress & challenges, planning, learning, removing blocks	Focused discussion FSE Mood Monitor	Meeting's template	Week 3 or 4,	Monthly Quarterly	N/A	Y	Individual; Institutional; sector	TBA
Reflective meeting	Training Quality Coordinator	PC / AT	Summary Report	Achievements, challenges, progress against plans, adjustments or blockages, stories of impact or change, learning, logistics	Focused discussion, reflective practices, outcome mapping	Summary report template	TBA	Weekly / Bi-weekly	N/A	Y	Individual; Institutional; sector	TBA
Reflective meeting	AURA Programme Manager (APM)	AURA Consort-ium (AC)	Meeting's log	Capture issues related to programme / capacity building / project planning	Census Agreement for meetings	N/A	Weds	Weekly	N/A	N	Individual, institutional, sector	TBA

Activity	Lead	With	Output	Aim	Methodology	Resources	When	Frequency	Baseline	Logframe	Level	Link
Departmental Meeting	(PC)	University Department (UD)	Reflective Report	Capture lessons, planning, sharing learning	Focused discussions, FSE Mood Monitor	Meeting's template	Week 3 or 4	Monthly Quarterly	N/A	Y	Individual, institutional, sector	TBA
Quarterly Donor Meetings	APM	DFID	Budget update: planned v. actual against AURA logframe updates (if applic), highlights progress & learning per work strand	Periodical donor meeting to provide updates: on contractual obligations, learning, VFM	DFID reporting guidance	DFID reporting template	(see report time-table)	Quarterly	N/A	Y	Individual, institutional, sector	TBA
Operational Management Group	AURA Programme Director	AURA consortium	Meeting's report	Tracking progress, planning, resolving issues	Focused discussion, Outcome Mapping, Reflective practices	Manager's meeting template	Week 2	Monthly	N/A	Y	Individual, institutional, sector	TBA
Project Advisory Group	APM	Project Advisors	Summary report, action plan	Advice on strategic goals, link to regional etc. programs	Focused discussion	Summary report template	TBA	Bi-annual / Annual	N/A	Y	Individual, institutional, sector	TBA

Activity	Lead	With	Output	Aim	Methodology	Resources	When	Frequency	Baseline	Logframe	Level	Link
Intervention Diagnostics	Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor	Course trainer / TQC / APM	Qualitative and quantitative measure of participant skills, knowledge, values etc.	Set baseline, inform design & delivery of intervention	Outcome mapping, REF, RDF, Education Frameworks	Diagnostic question / approaches banks	At point of need	Intervention specific	Baselines to be est. through process	Y	Individual (or institutional)	TBA
Intervention Report	Course trainer / TQC	TQC	Event Report, Blog, Story of Impact / Change / Research Publication	Report on VFM, 3Es of intervention	3Es, Summary writing	Event Report	At end of inter-vention	Intervention specific	N/A	Y	Individual, institutional, sector	TBA
Intervention Mood Monitor	Course trainer / TQC	Learner	Mood Monitor input to Event report	Est. the distance travelled, changes in competencies	Mood monitor	Flipchart / Pens	During inter-vention	Intervention specific	N/A	Y	Individual (or institutional)	TBA

Note: this is not a comprehensive list of M&E activities. This table will be refined / adapted at the orientation meetings and in consultation with the Training Quality Coordinators throughout the programme.

4.2 Facilitated Self Evaluation (FSE) Partnership Monitoring and Evaluation.

This section focuses specifically on partnership related M&E data. The following table incorporates partnership related questions that IDS-ITOCA used to feedback on the partnership in the FSE in 2012. However, at that time these were used near the end of the programme, and only one occasion. The aim for the AURA project is that, every quarter, the consortium and partner institutions will fill in the FSE Mood Monitor Table.

An Example of the template is below:

	FSE Partner Mood Monitor				
Date	What benefits do the organisations leverage through working in partnership?	What expected benefits are not being realised?	How well does the partnership adapt to different situations?	How well does the partnership balance competing demands?	What are we learning as a result of the partnership?
Quarter 1					
Quarter 2					
Quarter 3					
Quarter 4					

The M&E / Project coordinator(s) will facilitate this activity by engaging partner institutions (in particular those located in the university departments) in focused discussions. Given the potential for sensitivity in some of the answers, individuals will also be given the option of completing a table anonymously.

The questions in the above table map onto partnership related questions that were discussed during the AURA consortium partner's orientation meeting in November, 2014. The table below shows the connection between the FSE mood monitor (see lead questions in the table) and the research questions that highlight the areas of interest for the consortium partners. The table will be used as a prompt to guide the activities of project team who were not present during the planning stages of the programme: namely the teaching quality coordinators, the project coordinators and the ALIRT teams.

Furthermore, should those coming into the programme at a later stage feel there are areas in the partnership they would like to comment that are not covered in this table, they may do so in the 'free response' field that will be provided in assessment forms.

Example of the link between the FSE Mood Monitor prompts and the consortium's research questions

Mapping of ITOCA-IDS meeting questions with FSE partnership framework				
What benefits do the organisations leverage through working in partnership?	What expected benefits are not being realised?	How well does the partnership adapt to different situations?	How well does the partnership balance competing demands?	What are we learning as a result of the partnership?
• What processes do we need to reach a consensus about how to communicate our work to external stakeholders and internal project staff? • How do we establish; communicate and assure (assess) our standards for the project implementation with external and internal stakeholders?	N/A	• What is the most effective framework for coordinators managing a cross-regional, multi-partner programme?	• How do we manage diversity among partners? • How do we ensure/know our decision making, among the partners, is participatory?	• What is the most effective framework for coordinators managing a cross-regional, multi-partner programme? • Will there be some formal/systematic way in which our skills development are being measured? And how will we test out our strategic thinking skills with faculty and at senior management level?

The data collected in these tables feed into the mid- and annual donor reports, and will result in recommendations for managing effective partnerships or for resolving challenges / issues.

5. AURA FSE product focus: intervention evaluation

5.1 Diagnostics and the Event Reporting

This section looks at our programmatic outputs, particularly the capacity development courses and other interventions such as online learning events and discussions. This section provides details on the monitoring and evaluation of programmatic outputs and is divided into two parts:

5.2 Overview of the diagnostics and event reporting activities
5.3 Capacity development plans (individual and institutional level)
5.4 Cascade plans

5.2 Diagnostics and the Event Reporting

This section will make continued references to the 'Event Report'. An Event Report is filled out after each intervention – this report is aimed at providing a detailed record of each intervention: it includes workshop objectives; an analysis of pre-intervention and post intervention diagnostics; and details of budget and unit costs. A sample template of the Event report is included in appendix 3.

Furthermore, there will also be continued references to diagnostic questions. A sample of diagnostic questions – on IL and pedagogy is given in the AURA Diagnostics Question Bank in appendix 4, which shows the sorts of questions we have asked in the past to establish competencies in these areas. These questions will be further developed and refined based on interactions with partner institutions, during April-May 2015.

Below is an indicative process sequence for carrying out M&E at the intervention level:

1. Prior to the intervention there is a diagnostic exercise. This may involve surveys and interviews with the planned target audience. This is known as the pre-intervention diagnostic. The aim of this exercise is to establish the intervention objectives in a collaborative way.
2. The target audience identifies their objectives and these are mapped to the trainer's aims / intervention objectives. These collective objectives are usually shared at the beginning of an intervention to demonstrate that the activity has been designed with them in mind. Evidence has shown that this approach increases a sense of ownership, and satisfaction amongst participants.
3. The intervention objectives are recorded in the Event Report (appendix 3). An example of this is question 1 in the AURA Diagnostics Question Bank in appendix 4.
4. The next set of questions in a diagnostic may focus on the participants' skill set. This includes questions to test a participant's knowledge: through multiple choice, test questions, and open-free responses. The diagnostic may also include self-assessment questions, which are used as a baseline for measuring the distance a person has travelled in learning or acquiring new knowledge. (see examples in section 5 of the Event Report; and question 2 in the Question Bank).
5. It is, however, important to go beyond just skills. The AURA interventions are aimed at transforming and changing behaviours, rather than focusing just on skills development. This, of course, is a difficult area to capture and one major objective of AURA – from an M&E perspective - is to develop and refine measures

aimed at capturing this elusive concept. At present our pre- intervention diagnostic measures attitudes (an example of this is question 3 in the Question Bank) and values in order to capture behaviour shifts.

6. In another example, we use classroom scenarios – some of which are participatory while others are teacher-centred – to ascertain the favoured approaches to teaching and learning.
7. Our pre-intervention diagnostics also look at 'belief statements' – in this type of question the participant is given a set of statements to which they express agreement or disagreement. This is used to ascertain a clearer idea of their attitudes towards various aspects of the intervention.
8. Given our context of working in a diverse set of countries, we consider it important to get a better idea of the barriers our participants face at the pre-intervention diagnostic stage. This could be technical (i.e. relating to internet access and speed) or institutional (such as a lack of management buy in).
9. All of the pre-diagnostic data informs the design of the learning interventions: for example, having an intervention that involves heavy use of internet bandwidth in a locality that suffers from poor internet access would be an inappropriate design. Our pre-intervention diagnostics allow us to identify key issues like this so the intervention can be tailored accordingly.
10. During the intervention the facilitator / trainer may use a range of formative assessment techniques such as a mood monitor, or reflective / learning journals to capture the emerging shifts in skills, knowledge, attitudes and values of the target audience. This assessment data should be used by the facilitator / trainer to make adjustments to the intervention, in real-time, to ensure that learning outcomes are achieved, and participant remain satisfied with their progress.
11. At the end of the intervention, there will be a post-intervention diagnostic. If a survey method is used, then the questions will be framed similar to the pre-diagnostic questions. This is intentional so that we can establish the extent to which the target audience has shifted in terms of competencies, attitudes etc.
12. Three to six months after the intervention has taken place we will follow up with an impact questionnaire or interview. This helps us establish how the learning has been applied, in the working context, and if there is a need for any follow up activities.
13. Although the post-intervention diagnostics (see point 11-12 above) enable us to trace how competencies have changed as a result of our intervention, we recognise that many of these changes may have taken place in spite, rather than because, of our programme. Therefore we supplement our survey approaches with interviews and other qualitative methods to attempt to ascertain attribution. Having a mix of research methods in our diagnostics is an essential part of our work – particularly important in triangulating our findings through the use of several different methods at various points in time.

Note: the above definition of process is not an exhaustive account, but rather a brief outline of the M&E processes for AURA course interventions. Our processes are ever changing in light of new evidence: from emerging research and through sharing resources in our various communities of practice.

5.3 Capacity Development Plans (CDPs)

The AURA programme has the following 4 areas of focus in its suite of interventions:

- Research capacity, research communications & behaviour change interventions
- Teaching practices & behaviour change interventions (i.e. pedagogy / learning theory, and good practices for planning / designing curricula)
- Information Literacy including critical thinking & independent learning
- Monitoring and Evaluation (teaching: learning for assessment / learning from assessment).

At each partner orientation meeting, the AURA project team will begin to define a capacity development plan (CDP). These will work at two levels: an institutional plan and an individual / personal plan. The purpose of these plans are to help the project team identify the priorities at an individual and institutional level in order to use the resources available to the programme effectively.

The capacity development plans (see appendix 5) define the overall objectives that each partner institution, or individual, hopes to address and strengthen through the capacity development activity. The CDP should show a clear link between the partner institution's strategic or departmental plan(s) / goals, and the AURA programme's objectives.

The Training Quality Coordinator (TQC) and Project Coordinators (PCs) are responsible for co-creating the CDP with the institution, and individual academics, and for monitoring progress against the plan through-out the programme lifecycle.

5.4 Cascade Plans

A key aspect of the AURA programme is the ability of each partner institution to cascade the programme approaches to other departments within the organisation. To facilitate this process, the Training Quality Coordinator (TQC) and Project Coordinators (PCs) will draw up a cascade plan for implementation in the second year of engagement with partners. The template for this activity will be added to the M&E Framework in due course and once the TQC posts are filled.

Appendix 1: DFID reporting time table

It is important to bear in mind the timeline for reporting on outputs while undertaking programme M&E. An updated version of the timetable is contained within the Implementation Plan. The version below was correct at the time of creating this document.

Reporting for Phases 1-2

The reporting period for DFID is defined as a 2,3,3,4 reporting cycle. This translates into the following reporting quarters:

Quarter	Months	Reporting cycle
Quarter 1	April to May	2
Quarter 2	June to August	3
Quarter 3	September to November	3
Quarter 4	December to April	4

The following schedule has been defined for Year 1 of the programme, and includes the dates for submitting regional reports for each reporting period. Years 2 and 3 are indicative at this stage and will be confirmed at the end of the preceding financial year.

Year 1 (Actual reporting periods)

Day	Deadline Date	Description	Reporting Period
Fri	20 March 2015	Year 1 Planning	01/04/2015-31/03/16
Tues	24 March 2015	Inception Reporting	01/11/14 - 31/03/15
Mon	01 June 2015	Year 1, Qtr 1	01/04/15 - 31/05/15
Tues	01 September 2015	Year 1, Qtr 2	01/06/15 - 31/08/15
Tues	01 December 2015	Year 1, Qtr 3	01/09/15 - 30/11/15
Weds	01 April 2016	Year 1, Qtr 4	01/12/15 - 31/03/16

Year 2 (Predicted reporting periods)
Years 2 and 3 deadlines are predicted and will be confirmed at the end of the preceding Financial Year. The timetable is likely to be as follows:

Day	Deadline Date	Description	Reporting Period
Weds	01 June 2016	Year 2, Qtr 1	01/04/16 - 31/05/16
Thurs	01 September 2016	Year 2, Qtr 2	01/06/16 - 31/08/16
Thurs	01 December 2016	Year 2, Qtr 3	01/09/16 - 30/11/16
Mon	03 April 2017	Year 2, Qtr 4	01/12/17 - 31/03/17
Thurs	01 June 2017	Year 3, Qtr 1	01/04/17 - 31/05/17
Fri	01 September 2017	Year 3, Qtr 2	01/06/17 - 31/08/17
Fri	01 December 2017	Year 3, Qtr 3	01/09/17 - 30/11/17
Mon	02 April 2018	Year 3, Qtr 4	01/12/18 - 31/03/18

Remember to check the current reporting dates with Emma Greengrass: e.greengrass@ids.ac.uk

Appendix 2: Reflective Meetings - Group Agreement

The aim of the group agreement is to create a respectful space in which people can work together productively. The guidance will also enable us to practice the skill of facilitating conversations online including the sequencing of conversation and ensuring that everyone's views / points are heard.

Current agreement:

- It is the facilitator's role to make sure that everyone is able to contribute: more talkative people are asked to show a little restraint; quieter people your contributions are very important and welcome
- Participate!
- Only one person speak at a time: always mute your microphone (this helps to avoid connection / noise disruptions); indicate you would like to speak by placing a H in the message pane. The facilitator will invite you to speak next. (Note most elearning platforms only allow the facilitator and one speaker to talk at the same time – therefore, we need to get better at sequencing our comments in a discussion) *strategy: make a note of a point you would like to make…*
- Be conscious of time, help to stick to it by: sticking to the point discussed (please do not introduce points that are not relevant to the discussion), the facilitator should always check time commitments at the beginning of the proceedings, and negotiate for more time if proceedings look like they will overrun
- Come prepared: issues related to the technology should be resolved in advance of the meeting (can you set up the link to the online meeting 10 minutes before?); make every effort to read material in advance of the meeting
- Meeting records: a rapporteur should note the actions / agreements, and circulate these to the group within 2 days of the meeting. Each new meeting will commence with a quick update / reflection on agreed action points
- Observer role: is to pay attention to how the meeting is going; to be the emotional 'gauge' (i.e. pay attention to participants reactions / emotions on a particular topic); to draw the facilitator's attention to any emerging issues they need to be aware of and/or address; and to remind speakers when they are coming up to time / out of time.

Based on: http://www.seedsforchange.org.uk/handbookweb.pdf

Appendix 3: AURA Event report

Event Report Template

1. Event details

Event Name:			
Event Venue:			
Event Date:			
Number of Participants / Institutions:			
Male: [x] [%]	Female: [x] [%]	Institutions:	[x]
Facilitators' Names:			
Facilitators' Email Address:			
Report Date:			
Version / History:			

2. Background information / Introduction

This includes details about the workshop methodology and approach. Details about the rationale for holding the workshop; background information about pre-scoping visits and a brief statement of the proposed approach should be included in this section.

3. Aims / Objectives of Training

Comment on the overall workshop objectives and the number of participants who felt these objectives were met (if recorded).

4a. Event Management (Local Admin / logistics) & Budget

Details of the local organisers & administrators should be included here in addition to a detailed budget breakdown.

[Organisers:] Venue cost Facilitator cost (day rates x number of days) Participant cost (including any flight, hotel or other fees paid to participant). Total (then = unit cost)

Budget:

Description	Cost

Total	

4b. Value for Money (VFM)
Unit cost (that's total cost x. number of candidates)

5. Participants (Profile & Pre-training analysis)

Profiles:
High level overview of the participant profiles. A participants' list MUST be included as an appendix at the end of the report.

Pre-training analysis:
Highlight areas tested in the pre-training diagnostic and how this impacted on the development of the programme. List assumptions; and comment on how the data was collected.

6. Training Approaches & Materials
Information about the type of approach used (was the course a one-off, are there phases to the programme etc.); also include details of the types of materials distributed to the cohort of trainers. Comment on VFM or sustainability in this section. Also, record details of the training materials given to participants.

7. Post-training analysis
This section provides a high level overview of the training impact and captures comments on the training success. The pre- and post-training diagnostics contribute to this section of the report and should show the 'distance travelled' (i.e. impact of training). The report-writer may also choose to include qualitative statements or comments from the reflective journals (if applicable) or the diagnostics.

8. Feedback to organisations

Include general or high level comments and observations about: further training needs, 'challenges' or 'opportunities' that need to be taken into consideration, in particular when planning future training / capacity-building programmes.

9. Next Steps

This section is intended for the facilitator's organisations and should highlight areas for further development; future opportunities or steps that can be taken forward. These opportunities may extend further than the training cohort.

Event Report Appendices

APPENDIX 1: Programme [Insert programme here]

APPENDIX 2: Participant List [Insert participant's list here here]

No.	Name	Position	Organisation / Institution
1.	[name]	[role]	[Organisation]

_____end of report _____

Appendix 4: Sample AURA Diagnostics Question Bank

Question 1: Workshop objectives		
Question pre-assessment	Question post-assessment	Notes/Rationale
1. We would like to tailor this workshop to your needs. Below are some of our areas of experience. Could you indicate 3 areas of preference from these that you would like to see at the workshop. Please note that there is the option to offer your own suggestion in 'other'. We would hope to cover some of these areas where there is sufficient demand and resources. *<Two columns: list of possible objectives in column 1; a drop down menu allowing respondent to choice 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice for each possible objective in column 2>*	1. The following are the objectives of the workshop. Could you look at each statement and score how well you feel today's workshop met the objective from 1 (did not meet objective) to 5 (fully met objective)? Include: free response box in the question, to allow respondents their own comments.	Ideally the workshop objectives are formed through a collaborative process in which you ask participants to give you their preferences over what's going to be covered. My suggestion is to ask participants to choose from a list of material your facilitators have experience in covering and material that is relevant to the broader objectives of your programme. Giving participants the opportunity to specify from outside the list, in 'other' also gives you an idea of what potential participants want covered that you might not currently. The post survey then moves on to assess how well these objectives were covered.
N/A	2. We would like to know more about how you feel the workshop was structured. Please rate the following attributes of the workshop between 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest): Time given to the sessions Stimulation gained from the activities Quality of the facilitation Usefulness of sessions to your future work Usefulness of sessions outside of your work Include open response option for respondent, something like: Please feel free to add any further thoughts on structure	

Question 2: Information behaviour and skills		
2. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 is low and 5 is high) please rate your information skills in the following? <the first column includes a set of skills relevant to your course. Going across, in matrix, are the ratings 1-5 for each skill) Examples of skills: 1 Accessing information; 2 Appraising information; 3 Synthesising evidence 4 Applying evidence to policy 5 Writing briefs	2. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 is low and 5 is high) please rate your information skills in the following <u>before</u> the intervention? <the first column includes a set of skills relevant to your course. Going across, in matrix, are the ratings 1-5 for each skill)	This is the skills self-assessment question that we use. Note: these have to be specific, such as: using communities of practice or using social media – with examples of different types in brackets for clarification. This question is then asked in the post intervention survey, twice. The first asks participants to rate their skills before the intervention (note this question is being asked after the intervention, so respondents are scoring themselves retrospectively).
N/A	3. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 is low and 5 is high) please rate your information skills in the following <u>after</u> the intervention? <the first column includes a set of skills relevant to your course. Going across, in matrix, are the ratings 1-5 for each skill)	Participants then score their skills after training. So, you'll have 3 scores from the participants on their training: the pre-intervention; the pre-interventional question on the post-interventional survey; and the post-interventional question on the post intervention study.
3. Note: in the below question, after each option given to the respondent I've included – in blue font – an explanation for my rationale.	*This question needs to be asked after the workshop, though not immediately after it. There needs to be a follow up at least 3 months after the training to look at impact of training – and this is question that could be	

We want to get a better idea of your use of information. Please take a look at the following statements and indicate whether you agree or disagree. • I tend to get professional information informally from colleagues and friends (this gives you a good idea of networking behaviour) • I quickly scan the text, to ascertain its relevance, before reading a lengthy document (this is an important life skill that helps manage information overload) • I will not 'surf the web' directly, but will ask an assistant to find what I am looking for (it's important to establish whether they are the ones carrying out the searching) • I feel the internet is unreliable as a tool for carrying out research (this is an old fashioned attitude that's still surprisingly common and it's important to identify it) • I often "discover" other relevant information when searching for a specific piece of information.(an important skill, a hallmark of someone who's information literate) • I feel overwhelmed by the amount of information available to me for my work. (In which case the trainer might want to focus on how to handle this very common problem) • I feel underwhelmed by the amount of information available to me for my work. (this indicates poor search skills or a very niche area they're working on, though far more likely the former) • I use social media to help me find research evidence (there is a few among conservative information seekers that social media is frivolous and inappropriate for serious research – this, of course, is a dangerously false assumption)	useful then to look at behavioural change.	

<Options given for each statement are: strongly disagree; Disagree; No opinion; Agree; Strongly agree.		
3: Information accessibility and barriers		
4. We would like to know more about which medium you use to access the internet. Using the drop down menu, could you please assign a rough percentage of how much of your internet use over the past month has been through each of the below. Options: Desktop Computer Laptop Tablet Smart phone Other devices: Please specify below If you have chosen 'other' then please specify here	N/A	This question is to establish how your respondents access their information and, perhaps most importantly of all, to trace how much this is changing. Knowing this enables you to tailor workshops accordingly: i.e. when introducing your workshop to new software, the trainer is aware of whether they're using phones and tablets or their desktops.
5. How often on average do you access the internet in a typical week? Everyday Almost every day (4-6 times a week) A few times a week (2-3 times a week) I do not access the internet weekly	N/A	Our workshops rely on a certain level of access to the internet. Can we assume this level of access is there? Or is internet access sporadic or painfully slow for some of our participants? Is this changing? These are the sorts of questions answers here will give us.
6. Below are some examples of barriers to the effective use of information that we have encountered from previous workshops. Please indicate whether you feel these apply to you. Technical constraints (e.g. speed of internet access) Inadequate ICT infrastructure / equipment Low awareness or promotion of information resources Lack of incentives and policies to use current research Insufficient time to source Information Lack of availability of local content (i.e. locally relevant	N/A	

research or sources) Lack of availability of international content (e.g. e journals) Other: please specify below		
N/A	Post-workshop feedback	
	5. We would like to gather some feedback about the venue. Please rate the venue in terms of the following attributes between 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest): Location Room layout Food and refreshments Overall comfort during workshop Include option for open response, such as: Please feel free to add any further thoughts on venue	
	6. Could you please tell us how you feel the workshop could have been improved? This information will help us design future workshops of this kind.	
	7. What, if anything, do you propose to do differently as a result of participating in this workshop? Please use examples relating to the use of evidence to inform decision making in your work. (Open response question)	
	8. Would you recommend this workshop to a colleague or a friend? (Open response question)	
Profile questions		
1. *Your full name [free text]	*Your full name [free text]	
2. *Gender [single option] a. Male	n/a	

b. Female		
3. *Primary email address (your preferred email for communication)	*Primary email address (your preferred email for communication)	
4. Secondary email address (if you have one)	n/a	
5. *What is your main job function? [Single option] a. Library trainer b. Assistant librarian c. E-resources librarian d. Library assistant e. Systems administrator f. University librarian g. Researcher h. Other *(please specify)*:	n/a	
6. *How long have you worked in this role? [drop-down list] a. Less than 6 months b. 6-12 months c. 1-5 years d. 6-10 years e. More than 10 years	n/a	
7. * Name of your employer or institution. (If you are self-employed, please state so in the available space [open-ended]	n/a	
8. *Type of employer or institution [single option] a. University library b. University departmental library c. Not-for-profit research institute library d. Not-for-profit research institute e. Higher education institute library f. College library g. Other (please specify):	n/a	
9. Permission to release information: whilst we may share information from this form, we assure you		

we will only do so as you indicate below: Options: • I give IDS permission to use my responses along with my name and affiliation in promotional material or reports • I give IDS permission to use my response only. My name and affiliation should not appear next to the quote(s) • Please do not use any of my responses in external reports • Please do not use any of my responses for promotional purposes		

Appendix 5: Sample Capacity Development Plan

AURA PROGRAMME CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (Institutional & Individual)			
Name of Project Coordinator		Location (Country)	
Name of Partner Institution (PI)		Training Quality Coordinator	
ALIRT Team Contact Person		Contact details (Project Coordinator)	
Organisation's overall Comments / Narrative:			

1. THE WORK PLAN

SECTION 1.1 CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT MATRIX				
Objective [x]				
Result (Outcome) [x]:				
Project Coordinator's Comments / Recommendations: • [Please include any specific comments that relate to this objective. For instance: link to strategic objectives, recommendation is based on observation of need etc.]				
Logistics				
Activities	Learning Recipient Who will receive the learning intervention?	Trainer(s) Who should deliver the learning intervention?	Mode of delivery *Specify different modalities acceptable to think tank*	Duration *Specify the time TT can allocate*
1.1			*Possible modalities include: Face to face training, virtual learning event: online discussion, virtual learning event: webinar, consultancy, e-learning resource, request for information or other (please specify)*	
1.2				
1.3				
1.4				
1.5				

If you have more than 1 objective, copy and paste the empty table below to define additional objectives and activities.

SECTION 1.1 CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT MATRIX				
Objective [x]				
Result (Outcome) [x]:				
Facilitator Comments / Recommendations: • [Please include any specific comments that relate to this objective. For instance: link to strategic objectives, recommendation is based on observation of need etc] •				
Logistics				
Activities	Learning Recipient Who will receive the learning intervention?	Trainer(s) Who should deliver the learning intervention?	Mode of delivery *Specify different modalities acceptable to think tank*	Duration *Specify the time TT can allocate*
x.1			*Possible modalities include: Face to face training, virtual learning event: online discussion, virtual learning event: webinar, consultancy, e-learning resource, request for information or other (please specify)*	

x.2				
x.3				
x.4				
x.5				

Go to section 2.0 – Calendar of activities

SECTION 2.0 CALENDAR OF ACTIVITIES

This section should indicate the dates the partner institution is NOT available to participate in the capacity development programme.

Objective 1 *[Please map the calendar of activities to the objective specified in section 1.1]*							
	[insert timeframe]						
	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]
1.1 [Name activity or leave blank]							
1.2							
1.3							
1.4							

If you have more than 1 objective, copy and paste the empty table below to define another calendar of activities.

Objective 2 *[Please map the calendar of activities to the objective specified in section 1.1]*							
	[insert timeframe]						
	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]	[MM/YY]
2.1 [Name activity or leave blank]							
2.2							
2.3							
2.4							

End of document.

Please send to your training quality coordinator and s.duvigneau@ids.ac.uk

Appendix 6: Reflection Meetings Record

Facilitator Meeting's Record (Draft for discussion)

Name of Project Coordinator / TQC		Date of Meeting
Name of Grantee		Location
Present at discussion		Time

Review of last meeting / evidence supporting uptake
Key issues / actions / blockages
Progress against Capacity Development Plan / Successes
Reflective Comments / Stories / Insights *(Comment on how the relationship is developing and any challenges or successes, highlight any changes in the organisational processes or attitudes)*
Date of next meeting

Submit a copy with the Training Quality Coordinator no longer than 3 days after meeting