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[1]; 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: through access to a combination of core funding and technical support, stronger, more effective and, ultimately, sustainable research organizations are better equipped to provide policymakers and other development actors with the objective evidence needed to develop and implement sound social and economic policies. 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.

Acronyms used in the Results Framework

ATR: Annual Technical Report
EE: external evaluation
FR: financial report
MQ: monitoring questionnaire
OF: Opportunity Funds
PCS: policy community survey
PMR: project monitoring report
PO: Program Officer
PR: peer review
SoI: story of influence
TTFF: Think Tank Funders' Forum

---

[1] Young, Hauck and Engel. 2013. pp. 33 and 42.

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
OBJECTIVE 1: 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	An established group of think tanks with grant agreements outlines measurable organizational objectives for effective and efficient use of TTI funding	▪ quality of proposals received, including the clarity of their tailored objectives	▪ 80% of grantees receive a score of 70% or higher on their Phase 2 applications	▪ scoring matrix for Phase 2 proposals
		▪ explicit linkages existing between grantee tailored objectives, and their technical reports, budgets, and workplans	▪ 100% of approved workplans and budgets show linkages with tailored objectives	▪ ATR/annual
		▪ applicant feedback on quality, appropriateness, fairness, transparency, and timeliness of Phase 2 selection process		▪ applicant survey/6 months after application deadline
		▪ rate of attrition of grantees after approval of funding		▪ EE/end of phase ▪ PMR/rolling
		▪ number and nature of Opportunity Funds proposals and other collaborative projects approved	▪ 100% of available OF budget is allocated every year ▪ 3 collaborative projects contribute to a change in policy and/or practice	▪ OF/biannual ▪ SoI /annual

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
OBJECTIVE 2: Provide a combination of core funding and access to capacity development support to enable think tanks, both individually and collectively, to achieve improvements in **organizational performance**, **research quality**, and **policy engagement**	**Organizational performance** Think tanks' performance has remained high, or has improved. They are more strategic, effective, relevant to national policy issues, and sustainable over time, and have instituted processes for ongoing self-assessment and action in addressing organizational needs	▪ Strategic planning cycle built into organizational processes	▪ 100% of grantees have instituted regular strategic planning processes	▪ MQ/annual
		▪ Staffing complement -number of staff recruited and retained by grantees who have appropriate qualifications according to staffing profiles	▪ 80% of positions in the staffing profile of each grantee are appropriately filled	▪ PMR/annual
		▪ perceptions of key policy stakeholders on grantee organizational performance and outputs	▪ for 80% of grantees, average rating of answers to D3 and D4 in PCS is 3/5 or higher	▪ PCS/ beginning and end of grant
		▪ audited financial statements from each think tank	▪ audit findings are positive, or problems are addressed within 12 months	▪ FR/annual
		▪ Ongoing performance management: Systems / commitments in place for increased and continuous rethinking and actions on own identified critical organizational issues such as quality of research, resource mobilization, transparency, communications, policy enagement, M&E and governance	▪ 70% of grantees list all funding sources on their website by the end of the grant	▪ Scan of public information on funding sources/biannual
		▪ Implementation of HR systems and policies that promote fairness and well-being of staff put in place by think tanks		▪ MQ / PMR

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
OBJECTIVE 2: Provide a combination of core funding and access to capacity development support to enable think tanks, both individually and collectively, to achieve improvements in **organizational performance**, **research quality**, and **policy engagement**	**Organizational performance** Think tanks are financially viable, enjoying stable support from a diverse set of funders, both international and local, whilst maintaining their independence	▪ proportion of core funding in total budget	▪ 50% of grantees have unrestricted revenue (excluding TTI) that accounts for at least 20% of their total annual budget ▪ 50% of grantees are not dependent for more than 40% of their total budget on any one donor / project sponsor.	▪ MQ/annual
		▪ development of funding partnerships that are aligned with grantees' organizational strategies, providing them with flexibility and long-term support they need to pursue their strategies, whilst maintaining their independence	▪ grantees meet their own targets for partnership development ▪ 100% of grantees have corporate documents that outline their independence	▪ MQ/annual ▪ Corporate document review on independence/ year 3
		▪ extent to which grantees retain access to core/flexible funding in comparison with overall trends in the TTI cohort		
		▪ planned and actual budgets are reviewed and used in decision making	▪ grantees have no more than a 20% budget variance for any major line item	▪ PMR/annual
	Overall organizational performance	▪ average score of grantee progress towards tailored objectives in organizational performance by grantees and POs	▪ average scores for are 7/10 or higher and show progress year on year; by end of grant, 70% of average scores on tailored objectives are 7/10 or higher across all ratings	▪ ATR/ annual

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
OBJECTIVE 2: Provide a combination of core funding and access to capacity development support to enable think tanks, both individually and collectively, to achieve improvements in **organizational performance**, **research quality**, and **policy engagement**	**Research quality** Think tanks consistently produce quality research – i.e., research that is judged by users to be: a) of high scientific merit: technical quality, appropriateness, and rigor of the design and execution of the research; b) relevant to what key users need and deem to be useful for policies and practice - addressing problems that are already policy priorities and/or focusing on issues likely to emerge in the near future c) credible in terms of respect by external stakeholders for the organizations and individual researchers producing research findings	**a) Scientific Quality** ▪ external peer review of grantee publications that assesses methodological quality, relevance, and appropriateness of outputs for research intended to inform policy	▪ peer review scores of 80% of grantees show high or rising quality over time	▪ PR / annual
		b) Relevance ▪ see Policy Engagement Outcomes and Indicators		
		c) Credibility ▪ instituted quality assurance processes for research ethics and scientific quality across full range of grantee research outputs	▪ 100% of grantees have instituted and applied quality assurance processes by end of grant	▪ PMR/annual
		▪ policy actors' opinions of the quality of grantee research	▪ 70% of respondents score PCS question D3 (a, l, m) and D4 with 3/5 or higher	▪ PCS / beginning and end of grant
	Overall research quality	▪ average score of grantee progress towards tailored objectives in research quality by grantees and POs	▪ average scores for are 7/10 or higher and show progress year on year; by end of grant, 70% of average scores on tailored objectives are 7/10 or higher across all ratings	▪ ATR / annual

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
OBJECTIVE 2: Provide a combination of core funding and access to capacity development support to enable think tanks, both individually and collectively, to achieve improvements in **organizational performance**, **research quality**, and **policy engagement**	**Policy engagement** National, regional, and international policy actors including peers, practitioners and implementing agencies, view think tanks as credible and appropriately focused producers of high quality, objective research and analysis on important current and near-future policy issues	▪ perception of peers, practitioners and other policy actor of grantees' ability to inform and influence policy (e.g. grantees focus on high priority issues, provide informed critique of public policy, quality and expertise of researchers, objectivity, and quality of recommendations)	▪ 70% of respondents score PCS question D7 and D8 with 4/5 or higher	▪ PCS / beginning and end of grant
		▪ examples of research ideas/findings that policy actors are incorporating into their work		▪ PCS /beginning and end of grant ▪ SoI/annual
	Policy engagement 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	▪ type and extent of dissemination of grantee research findings and outputs		▪ MQ/annual
		▪ documented efforts to promote research uptake	▪ number of grantees who have explicit research uptake strategies increases annually	▪ MQ/annual
		▪ increase in familiarity among policymakers of supported think tanks	▪ 70% of respondents score PCS question on familiarity with think tanks at 4/5 or higher	▪ PCS /beginning and end of grant
		▪ Policy actors' perceptions of quality of engagement with grantees (e.g. effective engagement with policymakers, dissemination of research / recommendations, value of in-person events)	▪ 70% of respondents score PCS question D3 and D4 with 4/5 or higher	▪ PCS /beginning and end of grant

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
OBJECTIVE 2: Provide a combination of core funding and access to capacity development support to enable think tanks, both individually and collectively, to achieve improvements in **organizational performance**, **research quality**, and **policy engagement**	**Policy engagement** Research produced by think tanks informs policy debates and influences policy development	▪ number of Stories of Influence (SoI) that demonstrate grantees are informing policy debates	▪ 100% of grantees produce annually one SoI supported by evidence	▪ PMR/annual
		▪ extent to which grantee advice is sought by government officials and other stakeholders		▪ PCS/beginning and end of grant
		▪ Involvement of researchers in targeted meetings with policymakers, formal testimony to government, and sitting on task forces and working groups		▪ MQ / annual
	Overall policy engagement	▪ average score of grantee progress towards tailored objectives in policy engagement by grantees and POs	▪ average scores for are 7/10 or higher and show progress year on year; by end of grant, 70% of average scores on tailored objectives are 7/10 or higher across all ratings	▪ ATR/ annual
OBJECTIVE 3: 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	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	▪ requests for, downloads of, and feedback TTI's knowledge products	▪ requests and downloads show an annual increase	▪ website/ biannual feedback log/ rolling
		▪ extent to which nature and quality of content is valued by think tanks at TTI exchanges	▪ 80% of participants at TTI exchange provide positive feedback on event ▪ non-TTI grantee attendance increases with each TTI exchange	▪ TTI Exchanges, 2015 and 2018

OBJECTIVES	OUTCOMES	INDICATORS and EVIDENCE	TARGETS	SOURCE and TIMING
		▪ participation of funders in Think Tank Funders' Forum (TTFF)	▪ present membership of TTFF continues or expands in Phase 2	▪ TTFF/biennial
		▪ number and nature of public engagement activities by TTI team	▪ TTI team has 4 public engagement activities each year (1 / quarter)	▪ comms log/ rolling
		▪ Number of enquiries, or informational requests from external stakeholders		▪ comms log/ rolling