Annex 1 - Evaluation Matrix

Below is an evaluation matrix which outlines the key evaluation questions in more detail and identifies the stakeholders these are relevant to and intended source of data.

Impact: Locally produced research is available and used by policy makers to inform national and international poverty reduction strategies and policies in targeted developing countries

Comments relevant to the impact level will be drawn from findings in relation to the sections below. The evaluation will focus on the outcome level.

Outcome: Within targeted developing countries an enabling environment for research communication is owned and driven by a sustainable local network of stakeholder partners.

Indicator: Policy and financial commitments to the research sector in targeted developing countries

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence does INASP have of increases in policy and financial commitments to the research sector in target countries since the programme began (2008)? (doc)	What were the criteria used for the targeted country selection? Are these still relevant? (IV-Martin)	*Sustainability:* To what extent are country level consortia and also country level co-ordinating committees sustainable in financial and technical terms? (I/V-CC - INASP)	*Value for money:* What strategies to promote access and use of research have been most efficient (ie most impact for resources input)? Budget and financial report data. (I/Vs with Martin and country)
What is INASP's and PERii members' view of how PERii has contributed to this change eg theory of change at country and global level? (w/shop and interviews)	How have PERii country groups and INASP built their understanding of policy makers' need and interest in research in each country? (I/V - Alex and Martin)	What additional inputs are needed to achieve sustainability of these structures? (ditto)	How have economy, efficiency and effectiveness influenced choices made in PERii at country and global level? Who has made resource allocation decisions? (Doc, Martin/INASP, country level –consortium and co-ordinating)
How does INASP define an enabling environment? What are the key characteristics? (w/shop)	How have PERii country groups and INASP built their and researchers' understanding of how to reach (build interest in use of research) among policy makers and influencers? (I/V - Alex and Martin)	How do the different structural components at country level relate to each other (country co-ordination teams, consortia, country co-ordinators, other)? (ditto)	Are there ways to make better use of PERii resources in the future? (I/V and global and country)

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What are the key challenges to 'an enabling environment' in each of the 4 evaluation level 1 focus countries? Have these changed since 2008? (doc, W/S, I/Vs)	Who are the key stakeholders for PERii at local, country and international levels? How have they been involved with PERii? (w/shop)	How do they relate to other countries and regions for learning? (ditto CC- I/V) What do country level stakeholders view as the PERii aim in-country? Are they aware of the overall PERii intended outcome and impact as stated in the proposals? What are the main challenges facing production and encouraging uptake of research / evidence? *Learning:* How has INASP promoted a learning and innovative approach in PERii? With what effect at a) country level b) globally within PERii and c) external to PERii participants? (doc and interviews with ex and INASP)	

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
		PERii architecture and structure How effective and appropriate has the PERii structure been to deliver : • Advocacy? • Innovation? • Networking? • Training and capacity building? • Sustainability? • Equity?: find a definition in documentation What are the structure strengths and weaknesses? How could weaknesses be addressed? Focus on country level except advocacy also at global. Build in Qs at output level. What are options for how to structure PERii more effectively in different contexts? (team reflect)	**PERii architecture and structure** How efficient is the PERii structure to deliver: • Advocacy? • Innovation? • Networking? • Training and capacity building? • Sustainability? • Equity? How are value for money questions considered in decision-making by INASP staff, PERii consortia and country co-ordinating committee? See above. Which areas are most resource intensive? Why? What weighting is appropriate for the future to reach the outcome and impact? (team reflect)

Outputs: as stated in the 2011 logframe.
Output 1: Capacity of editors and publishers to disseminate national research content via international databases and Journals Online platforms (JOLs) **Indicators:** Inclusion of national journals in international databases and JOL index size. Citations of research from developing and emerging countries. We need a briefing on this output to be able to develop method.

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence does INASP have of increases in inclusion of national journals, JOL index size and citations since the programme began? (doc and then follow up questions for data) Which components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to this change and how? (I/V - INASP) What were the barriers to dissemination and how have these been overcome? (INASP-I/V)	What evidence is there that the focus on editors and publishers is still valid? (Q- to INASP. F/U in country and interviews.) How does the dissemination of national research contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? (w/shop ToC session and then test in 4 countries) Who uses JOLs and repositories which aim to increase access to grey literature? (list of these on p11 of 2011 annual report)	Is this capacity sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? (In-country. Before that we need clarity on what are the capacity issues and who are the editors, publishers.) What evidence is there of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to build this capacity? (I/V - INASP CP, doc)	What approaches to building editor and publisher capacity have been most efficient? (I/V with lead component person) Which areas are most resource intensive?

Output 2: Capacity of librarians and ICT professionals to facilitate access to, and use of, research content
Indicators: Researchers applying institutional training on access and use of e-resources. Usage of institutional online scholarly literature collections for which training has been provided to end users

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence does INASP have of researchers applying training on access and use of e-resources? (doc)

What evidence does INASP have of increased usage of online literature collections for which training has been provided? (doc)

Which PERii components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to a change in librarian and ICT professionals' capacity and how? (doc – evals, I/V with librarians/ICT in-country, w/shop)

What were the challenges to access to, and use of, research content and how have these been overcome? (librarians / ICT I/Vs) | What evidence is there that librarians and ICT professionals are best placed to provide the training? (I/V CP and check in-country in unis.)

How does better access to, and use of, research content contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? (ToC – w/shop)

How was training focus identified? How have participants used training in their work? (doc, I/V) | Is this capacity sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? (in-country)

What evidence is there of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to build this capacity? (doc and CP I/V) | What approaches to building librarian and ICT professionals' capacity have been most efficient?

Which areas are most resource intensive? (I/V with CP) |

Output 3: Researchers' ability to access, use and communicate research content

Indicators: Publication rates for articles in peer reviewed journals by researchers based on target countries. Communication of research outputs (originating in targeted countries) via national and international media.

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence does INASP have of publication rates by researchers based in target countries? (doc) What evidence does INASP have of communication of research outputs via national and international media? (doc) Which components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to a change in researchers' ability and how? (doc and w/shop) What were the challenges to researchers accessing, using and communicating research content and how have these been overcome? (doc and in-country)	What evidence is there that researchers require support in accessing, using and communicating research content? (doc, I/V CP) How does better access, use and communication of research content contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? (ToC – w/shop)	Is this researcher behaviour sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? (Int researcher I/Vs; survey; mechanism - I/V CP) What evidence is there of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to build this capacity? (doc and I/V CP)	What approaches to building researchers' capacity have been most efficient? (doc and I/V CP) Which areas are most resource intensive? (doc and I/V CP)

Output 4: Policy makers and influencers' ability to access and use research content

Indicators: Policy makers and influencers from at least 10 partner countries reported: knowledge of reliable sources; their ability to search online for information; their ability to judge quality, relevance and bias of information following INASP training.

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence does INASP have of a change in policy maker and influencer capacity to <u>access</u> research content? *doc* What evidence does INASP have of a change in policy maker and influencer capacity to <u>use</u> research content? *doc* Which components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to a change in policy maker / influencer ability and how? *ToC / w-shop* What were the challenges to policy makers / influencers in accessing and using research content and how have these been overcome? *in-country – all stakeholders*	What evidence is there that policy makers and influencers require support in accessing and using research content? d*oc and I/V CP and in-country* How does better access and use of research content by policy makers and influencers contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? *T/C and w/shop*	Where there has been behaviour change of policy makers / influencers, is this sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? *INASP need to provide examples of change in the countries we're visiting. Explore in-country. I/V with CP.* What evidence is there of lessons being learned, and practice improved, from efforts to build this capacity? *I/V – CP*	What approaches to building policy maker and influencers' capacity have been most efficient? *I/V - CP* Which areas are most resource intensive? *I/V - CP*

Output 5: Southern partners' capacity to monitor, evaluate and revise their training and capacity development activities using appropriate tools and approaches. This is about sustainability of southern partners' capacity

Indicators: Monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes of capacity development activities by librarians and ICT professionals. Monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes of capacity development activities targeted at policy makers and influencers.

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What are the capacity development activities for policy makers? Who are the Southern partners for these? What evidence does INASP have of a change in Southern partners' capacity to monitor and evaluate their training and capacity development activities appropriately? *doc* What evidence does INASP have of Southern partners' revising their training and capacity development activities, based on M&E data? *doc* Which components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to a change in Southern partners' ability and how? *ToC w/shop* What were the challenges to Southern partners in monitoring, evaluating and adapting their activities and how have these been overcome? *I/V CP and in-country*	What support has been provided by PERii to Southern partners and how has this been tailored to their needs? *doc and I/V – CP* What evidence is there that the training provided has become more relevant to librarians, ICT professionals, policy makers and influencers' needs? *doc (re: how adapted in light of evaluations / changes)* How does appropriate training contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? *ToC / w-shop and country check*	Is the Southern partners' M&E capacity sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? *I/V w. CP and in-country-output 2 and 4 people and country co-ordinator.* What evidence is there of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to build this capacity? *I/V with CP.*	What approaches to building Southern partners' capacity have been most efficient? *I/V with CP* Which areas are most resource intensive? *I/V with CP*

Output 6: Availability of information and knowledge required to enable high quality research that is provided by physical and virtual networks of people and systems from within target countries.

Indicators: Choice of peer reviewed international and national journals in target countries. Source of subscription costs payments for peer-reviewed international and national journals in target countries. Nationally published research available via JOLs that are managed and maintained locally in partner countries

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence do INASP have of the choice and accessibility of information and knowledge in target countries? *doc (note target re: similarity with rest of the world)*	How does availability of information and knowledge contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? *ToC w/shop, case studies*	Which are the physical and virtual networks of people and systems and are these the most effective means of providing the information and knowledge? *I/V CP*	What approaches to ensuring the availability of information and knowledge have been most efficient? *I/V with CP.*
How is the information provided by PERii? eg which networks / other? *doc.*		How else could this information and knowledge be provided beyond the physical and virtual networks in place? *I/V CP*	Which areas are most resource intensive? *IV with CP.*
Which components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to the availability of information and knowledge for high quality research purposes? *w/shop*		Is the capacity [to make things available] sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? *I/V with CP and in-country.*	
What were the challenges to making this information and knowledge available within target countries and how have these been overcome? *I/V CP and in-country*		What evidence is there of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to build this capacity? *I/V with CP.*	

Output 7: Engagement in the building of sustainable country owned systems, peer-to-peer processes and international networks from people in target countries
Indicators: Institutional policies and practice that support staff to engage in research communication work and networks. Researchers / research intermediaries newly active in national and international networks.

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence do INASP have of positive changes to institutional policies and practices in target countries? *Doc*	How do sustainable country-owned systems, peer-to-peer processes and engagement in international networks contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? *ToC / w-shop*	Is the level of engagement achieved to date sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? *Team needs to identify 2-3 networks as proxy through doc review. Failing that ask Martin.*	What approaches to ensuring engagement at country level have been most efficient? *Ditto effectiveness.*
What evidence do INASP have of researchers / research intermediaries being newly active and remaining involved in networks? *doc*			Which areas are most resource intensive? *Ditto effectiveness.*
Who is engaging with who, how and to what end? *doc*		What evidence is there of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to build this engagement? *Pending above. Can ask in CP I/V how in their areas of work they support dev of in-country and international network; patterns of engagement they've observed and how they support or promote engagement.*	
Which components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to the engagement of people in target countries in networks? *w/shop*			
How sustainable are the country level systems and peer-to-peer processes in target countries? *In-country*			
What were the challenges to building this engagement within target countries and how have these been overcome? *I/V CP int.*			

Output 8: Policy and practice of research information, knowledge, systems and networks demonstrating integration into organisational and institutional policy and planning

Indicators: Institutional organisational capacity as a result of improved policies. Examples of new institutional policies to improve research information and communication. Examples of pilots / case studies / best practice documents of systems shared via open access publications.

Progress towards results	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency
What evidence do INASP have of a change in institutional capacity? *doc* What examples do INASP have of new institutional policies to improve research information and communication? *doc* What evidence do INASP have of best practice documents being shared via open access publications? *Doc* Which components and activities of the PERii programme have contributed to this change in institutional capacity and how? w*/shop* What were the challenges to changing institutional capacity and how have these been overcome? What challenges remain? *I/V with CP – eg library dev?*	How does integration of policy to improve research information and communication by institutions contribute to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries? *ToC / w-shop*	Is the level of integration achieved to date sustainable beyond PERii? If not, why not and what would be needed to make it sustainable? What evidence is there of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to achieve integration? *We need examples of these in the four countries pre-travel so we can check there.*	What approaches to ensuring integration at country level have been most efficient? Which areas are most resource intensive? *Check document of relevance of efficiency question - likely to be country level.*