



## ANNEX A - TTI Phase 2 Results Framework

The Results Framework aims to provide clarity on what TTI seeks to accomplish in Phase 2. It includes a list of indicators and evidence for each outcome, along with suggested targets, data sources, and timing. The Results Framework will serve as a practical tool for strong program management, and as a means of measuring the effectiveness of the support provided to TTI's grantee organizations.

Three main considerations were taken into account in developing this Results Framework:

1. The need for the Phase 2 Results Framework to build upon the foundation of Phase 1 to ensure continuity throughout TTI's multi-year model;
2. Maintaining the central concepts and elements of the Phase 1 Results Framework, given that the external evaluation of TTI found them to be fundamentally sound and closely aligned to the program's theory of change<sup>1</sup>; and
3. Integrating the views and feedback of TTI team members, IDRC's in-house evaluation experts, EC members, grantees, and the external evaluation team, all of whom were consulted in the preparation of the updated Results Framework.

As a result of these considerations, the high-level structure of the Results Framework has been updated. Its main purpose is to test various aspects of the program's overall theory of change. The indicators and evidence columns combine standard indicators for each grantee, evidence of progress on tailored objectives that each grantee sets for itself, and evidence related to the performance of the program. Given the variety of indicators and evidence within the Results Framework, there are differences in the way that specific indicators are framed, depending on the purpose for which they are intended.

IDRC, in close collaboration with the EC, will commission an external evaluation team very early in the implementation of Phase 2. A key task of the evaluators will be to develop a rigorous evaluation plan for the program in the first few months of Phase 2. While that plan is being developed, adjustments may be made to the Results Framework, especially to ensure that comparative or counterfactual evidence can be usefully incorporated into the evaluation of TTI.

---

<sup>1</sup> Young, Hauck and Engel. 2013. pp. 33 and 42.

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 1:</b> Renew a group of promising think tanks from the Phase 1 grantee cohort and assist them to maintain effective strategies to improve organizational performance and monitor progress</p>	<p>An established group of think tanks with grant agreements outlines measurable organizational objectives for effective and efficient use of TTI funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ quality of proposals received, including the clarity of their tailored objectives</li> <li>▪ explicit linkages existing between grantee tailored objectives, and their technical reports, budgets, and workplans</li> <li>▪ applicant feedback on quality, appropriateness, fairness, transparency, and timeliness of Phase 2 selection process</li> <li>▪ rate of attrition of grantees after approval of funding</li> <li>▪ number and nature of Matching Funds proposals approved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ target to be determined once selection rating system is developed</li> <li>▪ 100% of approved workplans and budgets show linkages with tailored objectives</li> <li>▪ 100% of available MF budget is allocated every year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ scoring matrix for Phase 2 proposals</li> <li>▪ ATR/annually</li> <li>▪ applicant survey/6 months after application deadline</li> <li>▪ EE/end of phase</li> <li>▪ PMR/rolling</li> <li>▪ MF/biannual</li> </ul>

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Provide a combination of core funding and access to capacity development support to enable think tanks, both individually and collectively, to achieve improvements in <b>organizational performance, research quality, and policy engagement</b></p>	<p><b>Organizational performance</b> Think tanks' performance has remained high, or has improved. They are more effective, efficient, relevant to national policy issues, and sustainable over time, and have instituted processes for ongoing self-assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Staffing complement -number of staff recruited and retained by grantees who have appropriate qualifications according to staffing profiles</li> <li>- HR systems and policies that promote fairness and well-being of staff put in place by think tanks</li> <li>▪ perceptions of key policy stakeholders on grantee organizational performance and outputs</li> <li>▪ audited financial statements from each think tank</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 80% of positions in the staffing profile of each grantee are appropriately filled</li> <li>▪ for 80% of grantees, average rating of answers to D3 and D4 in PCS is 3/5 or higher</li> <li>▪ audit findings are positive, or problems are addressed within 12 months</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MQ/annual</li> <li>▪ PMR/annual</li> <li>▪ PCS/ beginning and end of grant</li> <li>▪ FR/annual</li> </ul>
	<p>Think tanks are financially viable, enjoying stable support from a diverse set of funders, both international and local</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ proportion of core funding in total budget</li> <li>▪ development of funding partnerships that are aligned with grantees' organizational strategies</li> <li>▪ planned and actual budgets are reviewed and used in decision making</li> <li>▪ average score of grantee in annual activities and tailored objectives in organizational performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 50% of grantees have unrestricted revenue that accounts for at least 20% of their total annual budget</li> <li>▪ grantees meet their own targets for partnership development</li> <li>▪ grantees have no more than a 20% budget variance for any major line item</li> <li>▪ average scores for activities are 3/4 or higher and show progress year on year; by end of grant, 70% of average scores on tailored objectives are 3/4 or higher across all ratings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MQ/annual</li> <li>▪ MQ/annual</li> <li>▪ PMR/annual</li> <li>▪ scorecard/ annual</li> </ul>

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
	<p><b>Research quality</b> Think tanks consistently produce quality research – i.e., research that is evidence-based, robust and rigorous; relevant and up-to-date; situated in relation to existing research literature and findings, nationally and internationally; and with clear links to policy actors through various methods of dissemination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ instituted quality assurance processes for research ethics and scientific quality across all range of grantee research outputs</li> <li>▪ external peer review of grantee publications that assesses methodological quality, relevance, and appropriateness of outputs for research intended to inform policy</li> <li>▪ policy actors’ opinions of the quality of grantee research</li> <li>▪ number of grantee publications by type</li> <li>▪ average score of grantee in annual activities and tailored objectives in research quality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 100% of grantees have instituted and applied these by end of grant</li> <li>▪ peer review scores of 80% of grantees show high or rising quality over time</li> <li>▪ 70% of respondents score PCS question D3 (a, l, m) and D4 with 3/5 or higher</li> <li>▪ average scores for activities are 3/4 or higher and show progress over time; by end of grant, 70% of average scores on tailored objectives are 3/4 or higher across all ratings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PMR/annual</li> <li>▪ PR / annual</li> <li>▪ PCS / beginning and end of grant</li> <li>▪ MQ / annual</li> <li>▪ scorecard / annual</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Policy engagement</b> National, regional, and international policy actors including peers, practitioners and implementing agencies, view think tanks as credible producers of high quality, objective research and analysis on important policy issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ perception of peers, practitioners and other policy actor of grantees’ ability to inform and influence policy</li> <li>▪ examples of research ideas/findings that policy actors are incorporating into their work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 70% of respondents score PCS question D7 and D8 with 4/5 or higher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PCS / beginning and end of grant</li> <li>▪ Sol/annual</li> </ul>

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 2:</b> Provide a combination of core funding and access to capacity development support to enable think tanks, both individually and collectively, to</p>	<p>Think tanks actively engage with policy actors, communicate research results effectively and in appropriate formats, and stimulate policy actor demand for think tank research outputs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ type and extent of dissemination of grantee research findings and outputs</li> <li>▪ documented efforts to promote research uptake</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ number of grantees who have explicit research uptake strategies increases annually</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MQ/annual</li> <li>▪ MQ/annual</li> </ul>



OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Facilitate and share learning about strategies for building and managing successful, sustainable think tanks with a wide range of policy research organizations and interested stakeholders</p>	<p>Southern think tanks, within and beyond the TTI Phase 2 cohort, are exposed to and, as appropriate, adopt good organizational, research, and policy engagement practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ requests for, downloads of, and feedback on good practice guidelines for managing think tanks from both TTI grantees and non-grantees</li> <li>▪ extent to which nature and quality of content is valued by think tanks at TTI exchanges</li> <li>▪ participation of funders in Think Tank Funders' Forum (TTFF)</li> <li>▪ number and nature of public engagement activities by TTI team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ requests and downloads show an annual increase</li> <li>▪ 80% of participants at TTI exchange provide positive feedback on event</li> <li>▪ non-TTI grantee attendance increases with each TTI exchange</li> <li>▪ present membership of TTFF continues or expands in Phase 2</li> <li>▪ TTI team has 4 public engagement activities each year (1 / quarter)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ website/ biannual feedback log/ rolling</li> <li>▪ TTI Exchanges, 2015 and 2018</li> <li>▪ TTFF/biennial</li> <li>▪ feedback log/ rolling</li> <li>▪ comms log/ rolling</li> </ul>