

# Workshop Report

---

**DECI-2 Team Meeting**  
**Cape Town, South Africa, May 2016**



DEVELOPING EVALUATION AND  
COMMUNICATION CAPACITY IN  
INFORMATION SOCIETY RESEARCH



## DECI-2 workshop

May 3-5, 2016  
Winchester Mansions Hotel  
**Constance Room**



**IDRC**  **CRDI**  
Networked Economies Program



 **NEW ECONOMY  
DEVELOPMENT GROUP INC.**



  
**UKaid**  
For the poorest people

INASSA

June 17, 2016

## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>1. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES &amp; EXPECTED OUTCOMES</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. PREPARATORY WORK</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>3. FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Key Lessons and Issues .....	5
Implications for the Current Project Strategy .....	7
Implications for Knowledge Sharing .....	8
Principles that guide our DECI-2 work.....	10
Highlights of the Partner’s Feedback – ROER4D.....	10
Highlights of the Partner’s Feedback – OCSDNet.....	12
<b>4. OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS</b> .....	<b>13</b>
Improving and Consolidating Our Work .....	13
Improving Our Mentoring.....	13
Review and Simplification of the Hybrid Approach.....	13
Future Approaches for Knowledge Sharing .....	13
<b>5. WORK PLAN</b> .....	<b>14</b>

## Appendices

<b>APPENDIX 1. TORs for Research Papers</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: CAPE TOWN Card Transcripts</b> .....	<b>22</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A gathering was held in Cape Town, that brought together the nine DECI-2 team members, three project partners and two IDRC officials. This gathering was the first and only event where the full DECI-2 team was able to meet, share experiences and contribute to planning for the remainder of the project that ends in December 2017. The workshop was an opportunity to: reflect and find ways to improve and consolidate our work, strengthen our mentoring, simplify our approach, and plan strategically for knowledge sharing. Prior to the event, we commissioned three research papers internally to review progress in relation to our DECI-2 project objectives: capacity development outcomes, partner/project level changes, and produce a learning & dissemination review. Three teams of DECI-2 regional mentors presented the findings, which were followed by presentations by three DECI-2 partners based in South Africa: RIA, ROER4D and OCSDNet.

### Key lessons and issues which emerged:

- **Readiness** is critical for using UFE/ResCom and a nuanced understanding of its practical implications is developing. We will produce a synthesis on its manifestations and relevance in capacity development.
- The **fit between UFE and ResCom**: the two may co-exist as cousins with no need to be combined as one entity. A flexible, modular approach is most promising, where the overlap between the two is allowed to emerge.
- **The value or benefit of this approach** is often not evident at the start. We will address the tension between ‘talking about the value’ vs. awaiting its emergence, by simplifying the approach and describing its benefits in clear terms, with examples.
- **The essence of the approach is helping projects increase the use of lessons and to extend their overall influence during the life of the project, as well as afterwards.** A major benefit is that this learning provides projects with pressure to revise their theory of change, while developing evaluation and communication plans.
- **Mentoring is central to the approach.** Mentoring and facilitation skills are a must, so is confidence and trust – which explains why site visits are important to build the relationship. The terms of reference of the mentor – mentee relationship need to reflect a two-way learning process; they also need to leave the door open for a UFE or a ResCom entry.
- **Effectiveness and efficiency:** In the context of a DECI evaluation, its outcomes (in terms of partners’ gains) take some time to become evident, which makes it challenging to verify effectiveness of DECI support in the short term. Efficiency would need to address the different DECI-2 project objectives separately: capacity development of mentors, service provision to partners, and knowledge dissemination.

### Implications for the current project strategy:

- **Integration with IDRC NE Program:** We need to better understand how Network Economies is structured: global, regional or local partners.

- **Support to partners' / hybrid approach:** We need to find additional ways to build and support readiness. We need to be ready to mentor in UFE, or ResCom, or a combination; depending on project and mentor preferences. Partners should be allowed/enabled to choose whether to start with ResCom or UFE depending on their stages of development or circumstances. More hybrid cases are required to build a sufficient experience base.
- **Results:** A UFE and RESCOM implementation strategy should focus on long-term impact while tracking short-term gains.
- **Mentors:** More learning opportunities are needed between mentors on experiences of mentoring UFE and ResCom. We need to focus our team's time more productively as we shift focus from mentoring to knowledge sharing. More resources are needed to support mentors for attendance at conferences. Mentees (individual or org.) need to be supported to produce materials as well.

Implications for knowledge sharing:

- **Products:** Define focus and audience. What windows of opportunity are there to share what we know? We need to complete and share the case studies soonest. Use materials with mentee and give room to mentee to adapt to his/her circumstances. We must simplify terminology and presentation: "get to the point DECI". Knowledge sharing and engagement means there is a need to develop a community of practice – and everything that goes with it. Produce more publications and participate in conferences. Website needs re-development with better access/mapping and making it more interactive.
- **Develop a communication strategy:** We must address our own 'readiness' before moving forward to reach others. This step also means **clarifying our sharing strategy:** audiences, purposes, methods and media. We need a ResCom for DECI-2: to share knowledge with Researchers; Donors; Networks; Decision makers; and Managers.
- **Content: Hybrid:** We need clarity about the Integration or weaving UFE and RESCOM together. Let's develop UFE and ResCom as separate steps until the need to merge them emerges organically: there is value in allowing them to grow separately.
- **Content: What you learned about mentoring:** Map out different pathways (for different learning styles/levels of confidence) to achieve practical wisdom.
- **Content: What you learned re. organizational change:** Document what "strategic realignment" looked like in partners, whether it came from ResCom, UFE, or both together as a contribution towards adaptive management. We need to do more sharing of what worked / did not, and the dilemmas faced. This analysis could include a review of changes a few months after the mentoring process was completed.
- **Content: Positioning:** Need to reposition the approach as a decision-making framework (for evaluative thinking) to help dynamic projects / organizations embrace strategic realignment / theory of change updating as an expected / planned event / stage. Pitch UFE and ResCom as part of solutions to bigger policy issues rather than focusing on narrow organizational objectives.

## 1. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES & EXPECTED OUTCOMES

### **Capacity Development of our team:**

To document our acquired skills, renewed competencies, and sense of achievement. To consolidate learning among the regional mentors.

*Outcome sought:* FINDING WAYS TO IMPROVE AND CONSOLIDATE OUR WORK.

### **Capacity Development of our partner networks:**

To examine the processes and outcomes among our partner networks and grantee projects, which have been documented in case studies, articles, & presentations.

*Outcome sought:* FINDING WAYS TO IMPROVE OUR MENTORING

### **Innovation in knowledge sharing:**

To review the emerging hybrid framework, and to analyze our outcomes internally *and* with a selection of Africa-based partners (ROER4D, OCDSNet)<sup>1</sup> who have tested the combined approach or who undertook a UFE oriented evaluation (RIA).

*Outcome sought:* TO PRESSURE TEST THE APPROACH COLLECTIVELY AND TO SIMPLIFY IT

### **Strategic dissemination planning:**

To explore the options for fine-tuning the approach and sharing knowledge with practitioners, researchers and policymakers; especially among the IDRC- Networked Economies and UKAid-INASSA's partners.

*Outcome sought:* TO IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL FUTURE APPROACHES FOR KNOWLEDGE SHARING

---

<sup>1</sup> ROER4D = Research on Open Education Resources for Development. OCSDNet: Open and Collaborative Science for Development Network.

## 2. PREPARATORY WORK

In October 2015, we prepared a Concept Note for the workshop. We underlined that DECI-2 combines a capacity development objective (for regional mentors) with mentoring for partner projects in evaluation and communication. It is also an action research project itself. As 2015 was drawing to a close, we had begun reporting on our outcomes – which meant going beyond the preparation and use of evaluation plans and communication strategies. While those remain relevant [and we continue support projects to produce evaluation reports and case studies], an emerging lesson is that the combined UFE/ResCom mentoring has pushed complex and evolving projects to clarify and express their theory of change. In other words, the unified approach worked as a decision-making framework that helped projects adapt to change while developing evaluation and communication plans. We had begun referring to the unified framework as Verifying and Communicating Impact (VeriCom), but we felt the full DECI-2 team needed to review this effort.

We commissioned three research papers to be presented at the Cape Town workshop which related directly to DECI-2's project objectives<sup>2</sup>:

1. **Capacity development outcomes:** a review of the capacity gains by the DECI-2 team.  
*This paper responds to our second research objective (To build capacity among regional evaluation consultants (mentors) in the concepts and practices of both UFE and ResCom).*  
Joaquin Navas (UFE regional mentor in Paraguay) and Charles Dhewa (ResCom regional mentor in Zimbabwe) prepared the study.
2. **Project level changes:** a review of the gains by our project partners, both in terms of capacity development, evaluation and communication planning, and outcomes that our mentoring contributed to.  
*This paper responds to our third research objective – to provide technical assistance to Network Economies (NE; previously Information & Networks) funded projects – researchers, communications staff and evaluators toward improving their evaluation and ResCom knowledge and skills; and to the fourth objective – to contribute towards the completion of UFE evaluations and communication strategies for designated I&N flagship projects.*

---

**1. Meta-level action-research:** To develop and test-drive a combined approach to UFE and ResCom mentoring. **2. Capacity development for regional consultants:** To build capacity among regional evaluation consultants (*mentors*) in the concepts and practices of both UFE and ResCom. **3. Capacity development for project partners:** To provide technical assistance to I&N project researchers, communications staff and evaluators toward improving their evaluation and ResCom knowledge and skills. **4. Assistance to project evaluations and communication planning:** To contribute towards the completion of UFE evaluations and communication strategies for designated I&N flagship projects. **5. Sharing lessons:** To communicate the DECI-2 project findings and training approach to practitioners, researchers and policy makers.

Vira Ramelan (ResCom regional mentor in Jakarta) and Julius Nyangaga (UFE regional mentor in Kenya) prepared the study.

3. **Learning & dissemination review:** an analysis of our past, current and future learning and dissemination materials and strategies. We were interested in exploring mechanisms to further disseminate the DECI-2 approach.

*This paper responds to our first research objective – to develop and test-drive a combined approach to UFE and ResCom mentoring; and to our fifth one – to communicate the DECI-2 project findings and training approach to practitioners, researchers and policy makers).*

Sonal Zaveri (UFE regional mentor in India) and Wendy Quarry (ResCom consultant in Ottawa) prepared the study.

Appendix 1 includes the Terms of Reference for each research paper.

### Team Composition

Using mixed DECI 2 teams (by region and expertise), we were able to increase the level and depth of interaction amongst DECI-2 mentors. Before this event, the DECI-2 mentors had had little opportunity to compare and contrast on-the-ground experiences. These studies engaged them more closely in the reflection and learning process as a group. We have encouraged each team to turn the workshop research papers subsequently into future publications or conference presentations and they could also be used to add to the DECI-2 analysis and research materials.



*DECI-2 team: above from left:* Charles Dhewa, Dal Brodhead, Wendy Quarry, Sonal Zaveri, Ricardo Ramirez, Julius Nyangaga, Joaquin Navas, Bruce Girard



Above: Dal Brodhead, Vira Ramelan, Ricardo Ramirez

### Partner presentations

Early in 2016, we invited three partners that have been supported by IDRC's Network Economies Program – and that have a presence in South Africa – to present at the workshop.

ROER4D<sup>3</sup> is a global network that has worked with DECI-2 for 2 years, OCSDNet<sup>4</sup> is a newer network with less exposure to DECI-2, and RIA<sup>5</sup> is a regional network for which the DECI-2 team implemented an evaluation. We requested that they cover the following:

1. What are the new or renewed evaluation insights and ways of thinking that you have/are witnessing within your team?
2. An overview of how their evaluation findings and/or evaluation case studies were used or how they influenced their future work.
3. Their thoughts on the process: what worked, what did not, what could have been done differently.
4. An update on what happens next with their projects that may have to do with either evaluation and/or research communication.
5. Other comments that they would like to add in conclusion.

### Agenda

We designed the workshop agenda with attention to the following:

- Orientation – an initial preparation day to enable participants to: review the agenda as a group, identify expectations, get settled, connect with each other, read the reference materials, and finalize their contributions.
- Brainstorming as a team first; then inviting local partners to share their experiences working with DECI-2; and then engaging the partners in brainstorming DECI-2's future strategy.
- Engaging with our mentors individually to confirm their level of interest and availability for the remainder of the project.
- Including IDRC officers (from Network Economies and from Evaluation) as observers and contributors to the learning.
- Assigning seating arrangements [first two days only] to maximize interactions among new colleagues.



---

<sup>3</sup> Research on Open Education Resources for Development.

<sup>4</sup> Open & Collaborative Science for Development Network.

<sup>5</sup> Research ICT Africa.



Sunday May 1	Monday May 2	Tuesday May 3	Wednesday May 4	Thursday May 5	Friday May 6
Arrival	Pre-workshop team building, orientation, reading, revising presentations	Project Updates and analysis Consolidated exchange of experiences, lessons, outcomes and mistakes	Vericom – review e-Primer, and presentation/ workbook/ template.	Test-driving a knowledge sharing and dissemination strategy with partners	Team wrap-up
		<i>lunch</i>			
		Presentation of research papers	Listening to partners' experiences with DECI Group dinner	DECI Team Work planning	Departures

### 3. FINDINGS

We began by assembling the expectations for this workshop among the DECI-2 team members. They fell into the following categories:

- **DECI-2 learning** – further experiences for testing
- **Growing** – spreading to universities, community of practice, networks
- **Sharing** – publishing, getting known, presenting at conferences
- **Strategy** – who to continue working with, why, and how, partners
- **Simplifying** – boiling it down the hybrid approach, grounding, simplifying it
- **Availability** – full vs. part time consulting by DECI mentors
- **Non-DECI-2 partners** – offering support to other IDRC projects, working with other partners and networks.

The DECI-2 co-principal investigators provided a summary of DECI-1 and DECI-2 (this review and other presentations are available in a Cape Town workshop drop box folder). This review was followed by three presentations summarizing the three commissioned Research Papers. The participants were asked to summarize their analysis of the evidence grouped around three topics: key lessons and issues; implications for the current project strategy; and implications for knowledge sharing.



Appendix 2 includes transcripts of the card contributions.

#### Key Lessons and Issues

##### Readiness

Readiness is critical for using UFE/ResCom and a nuanced understanding is emerging of the concept. It is strategic, dynamic and complex. It can be developed, or sought as a pre-requisite. It has to do with timing, facilitation skills and balance. It depends on context; its needs go beyond the availability of willingness and resources; it needs to be sustained. [It is worth producing a synthesis on its manifestations and relevance in capacity development.](#)<sup>6</sup> If there were to be a DECI-3, its foundations for readiness need to be determined early on.

### **UFE & ResCom**

We need more evidence on the fit between UFE and ResCom. [The two can co-exist as compatible cousins with no need to be treated as one process.](#) UFE and ResCom can piggyback on each other (e.g. UFE raised Key Evaluation Questions and ResCom dovetailed into how the evidence generated could be communicated). We started with silos – UFE and ResCom, now we are combining them! How do we do that at a practical level? What is role of mentors? We lack mentors with both UFE and ResCom skills. We need to assess our mentors own readiness before supporting others. A flexible, modular approach appears most promising, where the overlap between the two areas is allowed to emerge.

### **Value**

Materials are about ‘How To’ but do they convey the ‘value’ of the approach, the ‘benefit’, and the potential for a paradigm shift? Value is discovered towards the end of the process. [The tension between talking about Value \(for early buy-in\) vs. allowing it to emerge \(experience & learning\) has different manifestations](#) and has required different delivery styles (that we need to continue to document). We have addressed the tension between ‘talking about the value’ vs. awaiting its emergence, by simplifying the approach and describing its benefits in clearer terms with examples.

### **What it is; what it achieves**

DECI-2 has been about Mentoring → Method → Shared Learning. The common theme that joins the two DECI-2 areas is USE. Use Evaluation. Use communication... to ensure research has IMPACT. [The central role DECI-2 has played is that it has provided a revised theory of change in a number of cases](#), stemming from both UFE and ResCom work. There is evidence of useful evaluations completed and communications plans developed.

Capacity building (1): DECI-2 stresses the importance of organizational readiness, mentor and mentee readiness; [capacity building as a two-way \(mentee and mentor\)](#); and mentoring by knowing when to step back; building on relationships based upon trust. (2): [supporting the preparation of target audience & audience research, particularly in ResCom.](#)

---

<sup>6</sup> Sonal Zaveri has already prepared a 3-page draft on readiness; and Ricardo Ramírez and Dal Brodhead have added inputs from their Wageningen 2015 presentation.

## Mentoring

Mentor capacity – significant skill/time is required to learn and adapt to client project situations (e.g. to identify the real users of an evaluation). Consequently, **mentor capacity is critical and therefore their selection and initiation into the work is vital** – technical and people skills and facilitation are essential at the outset. A relationship based upon confidence and trust are central to effective mentoring. Extensive mentoring with opportunities for field visits (face-to-face) requires resources.

### Issues requiring further discussion

- Does mentoring of this nature need a team or can it be done solo?
- Are the current the mentor/mentee Terms of Reference sufficient or do they need to be revised?

## Efficiency/Effectiveness, Time and Pace

These topics call for **unpacking efficiency issues** based upon DECI's just-in-time mentoring approach and action research mandate; it is also about the measurement of capacity building. Both UFE and RESCOM processes take time (as they need to adjust to the pace of a project) and **lessons or results may not become visible during the lifespan of a project (many of which don't go beyond 3-5 years).**

### Issues requiring further discussion

- Is there sufficient short-term evidence of change/learning (e.g. mid-course correction for instance or capacity-built) to justify the investment?

## Implications for the Current Project Strategy

### Linking back to the IDRC NE Program

We need to understand how Network Economies is structured: global, regional or local partners? Designing a capacity development/orientation event for N.E./IDRC program officers to orient them as to how the approach could add value to their projects and networks (e.g. present at the Tanzania gathering in September will be considered).

### Ensure DECI has organizational influence

A UFE and ResCom implementation strategy should focus on long-term impact while tracking short-term gains. We need to determine how to best measure/describe the extent of evaluation and communications capacity developed. Initiatives have included documenting/learning about positive experiences through case studies (e.g. in the Cook Islands and Cambodia) where combining UFE and ResCom has had positive impacts. We need to identify more organizations/communities that are frustrated with conventional evaluation and communication methods and plan a strategy to present UFE and ResCom as options. Dissemination → Strategy → 'Infect' institutions.

### Specific support to partners

If possible, identify additional DECI-2 opportunities for engagement and building readiness (e.g. with RIA follow-up). Clarify whether ongoing and/or new partners (at

different levels of a network) will begin with UFE, ResCom, or with integrated strategy. In future, more resources should be allocated to face-to-face/field visits. OCSDNet is considering using DECI to undertake its mid-term evaluation. Mentoring will focus on UFE, ResCom, or a combination, depending on project needs and mentor capacity.

### **The hybrid (UFE & ResCom)**

Partners will be invited to choose whether to start with ResCom or UFE depending on their stages of development or circumstances. More hybrid examples/cases are required to build a sufficient experience base. The Hybrid approach makes sense, but does individual mentor capacity need to be enhanced? DECI-2 mentors need to identify opportunities (e.g. contracts, assignments, etc.) where they can introduce their adapted versions of the UFE & ResCom approaches. Based upon these experiences, our end of project product format (e.g. a Primer in DECI-1) can be determined.

### **For mentors**

Given DECI's objective of building mentoring capacity, more learning opportunities for the mentors would help to develop regional capacity. Equipping mentors is a challenge given the diverse realities within the institutions and projects being supported. As mentors, do we need to be better trained to deal with complexity? Challenges such as: breaking down silos (e.g. between UFE and ResCom); dealing with complexity (theory and practice); and strengthening facilitation – all of these challenges call for additional training. These are critical if we want to promote an integrated/hybrid model and develop capacity. We need to review our team's time as we balance mentoring with knowledge sharing. More resources are needed to support mentors for conferences.

## **Implications for Knowledge Sharing**

### **Strategy & Products**

DECI-2 needs to further define its focus and audience by further identifying its windows of opportunity to share what we know. We need to complete and share the case studies soonest – they are a part of the learning process. They demonstrate the value of UFE/ResCom for external audiences. We do not need more 'project' materials (such as checklists, etc.); work in progress is sufficient. We should use materials with mentee and give more room to mentees to adapt to his/her circumstances. Terminology and presentation needs to be further simplified: "get to the point DECI". Knowledge sharing and engagement means potentially developing a community of practice – and everything that goes with it. It also means producing more publications and presentations for conferences. Our "evaluation and communication in practice" website needs re-development with better access/mapping and making it more interactive. We could invite our partners to contribute to the website. Should it be resourced to have a searchable knowledge base and facilitated online discussions on selected topics as well as experience-based E-learning modules; and perhaps online resources (resource centre) and materials (infographics, videographics, etc.)?

### **Action Steps – How**

Develop a communication strategy and add to our own ‘readiness’ before moving forward to mentor others. Differentiate simple materials (some audiences just need the basics) vs. more complex ones (for those who require a deeper explanation). This distinction also means **clarifying our knowledge sharing strategy** (e.g. “beavering behind the scenes”) first, then finding formats that invite co-writing/co-production, so (most) partners become co-designers of the integrated approach in their own contexts. We also need a critical mass of DECI-2 team members to become co-authors of articles for journals (assuming this vehicle is a valuable knowledge sharing channel). To strengthen the research aspect of DECI-2, more routine **mentor gatherings to exchange knowledge** and experiences are needed. We may also need to find platforms to support a Community of Interest that provides learning opportunities between mentors as a way to broaden the mentor group.

### **Audiences – For whom**

We need a ResCom plan for DECI-2 to include more details on who to share knowledge with – researchers; donors; networks; decision makers; and managers.

### **New Content – Hybrid approach**

We need clarity to the integration or weaving of UFE and ResCom together – develop UFE and ResCom as separate steps until the need to link them emerges organically: experience indicates that there is value in allowing them to grow separately. We need to clearly articulate the value of UFE and ResCom at different development stages (in either case you can’t wait until the end). We can also examine opportunities to integrate UFE and ResCom into formal educational curricula with academic or professional upgrading programs.

### **Additional Content – Mentoring lessons**

We need to map different pathways for different learning styles and for varied levels of confidence. Just-in-time mentoring requires a set of skills that few practitioners already possess. It will take some practice to achieve a sufficient level of confidence and practical wisdom.

### **New Content – Organizational change**

Document what “strategic realignment” looked like in partners, whether it was facilitated by ResCom or UFE, or both together as a contribution towards adaptive management. More sharing of what worked/did not work, and the dilemmas faced needs to be undertaken using different styles of delivery for conferences, articles, blogs.

### **Content – Positioning the approach**

Position it. Name it → What is it? → Its Niche? Advocacy is needed using materials developed and shared – for different audiences. Position the approach as a decision-making framework to help dynamic projects/organizations embrace strategic re-alignment/theory of change updating as a planned step. Pitch UFE and ResCom as part of a solution to big issues, rather than narrow organizational objectives. Need to determine

how to dovetail into current debates – e.g. SDG: gender, climate change → beyond ICT. Both UFE and ResCom could speak to big contemporary issues like climate change and SDGs that are now influencing global resource allocation.

**Other – Questions**

We need to look/scan what else looks like UFE and ResCom in the development sector. Need to determine how DECI-2 partners and non-partners who have been offered the service perceive the opt-in/opt-out choice. “Theory of change” is frequently mentioned but many organizations have not defined one explicitly. What do we mean by “theory of change”? If the private (consulting) sector adapts UFE and ResCom for profit – what is the consequence?

**Principles that guide our DECI-2 work**

- Evaluation is used as a decision-making framework for learning
- Communication is intended to be used for influence
- Attention is paid to readiness from the beginning
- Training is delivered through just in time mentoring
- Course correction and adaptation are expected and planned
- Utilization is the focus from the initial project design to completion
- Ongoing, collaborative, learning and reflective process is embedded
- Participation and shared ownership is fundamental and builds organizational capacity
- Complexity and evolving contexts are addressed.

**Highlights of the Partner’s Feedback – ROER4D**

REFLECTIONS ON METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a strategy is not a linear but an iterative methodology</li> <li>• Steps provided a useful scaffolding for activities</li> <li>• UFE thinking influenced the ResCom approach: design based, data driven, user-focused audiences. Various interventions to ascertain audiences (e.g. interview with Adoption Studies researchers) to come up with revised and more granular key audiences</li> <li>• An agile, experimental approach is enabled by UFE thinking. Stages followed 4 step process: Planning, Action, Iteration, Reflection cycle (the 12 DECI-2 steps come under these with some more or less important)</li> <li>• Open Research approach has influenced an “open communications” strategy – lends itself to agility and iteration</li> <li>• Design becomes fluid and “in-practice” as well as what is practically feasible. Communications is a perpetual beta!</li> </ul>
NEW / RENEWED INSIGHTS

- Scaffolded process and methodology helps inform others as to the how and the what is happening in communication functions
- Decisions have tended to evolve as a result of reflecting together (importance of team meetings)
- Understanding of why the process is as it is: encourage broader communications within team and from projects (SPs are getting more involved and using ROER4D channels)

#### STRENGTHS

- Face-to-face sessions vital (February 2014 in Cape Town; April 2015 in Banff)
- Two to three monthly Skype sessions to update on progress
- Virtual support (live and via email) for development of specific objectives, mainly RR and DB
- Pacing and timing worked well; supporting without being onerous
- Interactions contributed to developing the Communications planning: intellectual contribution to our project's communications
- Motivating, and added a layer of oversight

#### POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT

- Clarify expectations of what to expect – it was opaque in the beginning and we found out / made our own??
- VeriCom template and integrated approach was confusing because we were not sure what we were meant to do with it – time spent on trying to make it work but not immediately useful for us in our context (with two separate roles)
- Concerned about time and resources in engagement with a process we weren't sure would be contextually appropriate
- Sometimes Zimbabwean and Kenyan-based mentors couldn't join for logistical reasons – not sure who we had to keep informed, so generally we opted for everyone

THOUGHTS ON THE MENTORING PROCESS
-----------------------------------

<p><i>What worked</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great to have experienced evaluators to discuss the evaluation work with, and bounce ideas and strategies off of</li> <li>• Learnt a lot about UFE; great to scaffold evaluation activities on</li> <li>• Regular check-in was helpful</li> </ul> <p><i>What didn't work</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary online interactions were sometimes tricky</li> <li>• Integrating the DECI templates into the ROER4D process was often extra work</li> </ul> <p><i>What could change</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify of expectations – weren't always clear</li> </ul>
---








### Highlights of the Partner's Feedback – OCSDNet

OVERALL
---------

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rough start – needed to be convinced</li> <li>• Challenge to begin developing M&amp;E/Comms structures eight months underway</li> <li>• DECI helped us to identify and consider what tools we already have in place, and to critically consider <b>why</b> we are using them and <b>to what end</b></li> </ul> |
|---|

LESSONS
---------

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UFE framework has a legitimizing effect for sub-project data collection</li> <li>• Transparency is key</li> <li>• Demonstrate accountability to network projects AND funder through feedback loops</li> <li>• Strategy is on-going and iterative; relies on constant reflection</li> </ul> |
|---|

STRENGTHS
-----------

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thoughtful, insightful and timely reflections on stages of M&amp;E/Comms strategy development</li> <li>• Flexibility / openness to feedback</li> <li>• Focus on shared learning</li> <li>• In-person meeting with Ricardo provided clarity on approach</li> <li>• Introduction to similar network (ROER4D)</li> </ul> |
|--|

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT
-----------------------

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools could demonstrate reflexive intention / feedback loops</li> <li>• Tools could be better integrated for online collaboration/sharing (since OCSDNet works virtually)</li> <li>• Consider the “story of DECI;” minimize jargon</li> <li>• Structured milestones for mentorship/strategy development</li> <li>• Clarity on roles of DECI team members</li> </ul> |
|--|



## 4. OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

### Improving and Consolidating Our Work

- Produce a readiness paper/brief that captures the nuances that have been described (Sonal has produced a first draft).
- Ensure we complete the case studies as evidence of our research.
- Revisit the actual mentoring needs of our current partners: ROER4D, OCSDNet, DL4D, and two CyberStewards grantees (Justice Forum, UK; Asociación de Derechos Ciudadanos, Argentina).
- Look into supporting RIA by mentoring an internal communication person.

### Improving Our Mentoring

- Add more regular communication with partners.
- Confirm the two-way mentor/mentee learning expectation.
- Introduce flexibility in terms of working with UFE or ResCom first and then bringing in the other. The hybrid has value in that the two approaches are complementary.
- Plan to work with formats (templates, on-line tools, documents) that suit each partner's project needs and style.

### Review and Simplification of the Hybrid Approach

- Produce a short, visually rich summary of the hybrid approach.
- Minimize jargon.
- Emphasize the principles that guide the approach.
- Emphasize a modular approach: like Lego blocks that can be used differently depending on the nature of the partner's project, its stage of development, its readiness level.
- Focus on the early steps of UFE and ResCom.
- Invite DECI-2 mentors to produce variations of the tool to suit their own mentoring style, partner needs (be they IDRC or non-IDRC).

### Future Approaches for Knowledge Sharing

- Produce our own communication strategy, and on that basis finalize decisions on training and dissemination materials and media.
- Update the website, add interactivity, improve access to resources.
- Test online training options, MOOCs or other.
- Support mentors to publish and present at conferences.
- Involve those interested in publishing a journal article(s).

## 5. WORK PLAN

June 2016 – Feb 2017 (Two reporting periods)

<b>IDRC</b>		Remarks
NE team	RR and/or DB to join NE team & partners meeting in Sep/Tanzania	Will present DECI-2 revised strategy
External evaluation	RR & DB to comment on draft TORs	Inputs provided in late May

<b>Mentoring</b>		Remarks
OCSDNet	JN leads, CD narrative	May: JN contacting Leslie about mid-term evaluation
ROER4D	CD reviews case study: shares as way of planning next steps (plan how to support evaluation process that ends Dec 2016)	End of May; good to send an email to project
DL4D	SZ and VR following up	Ongoing
ADC (Cyber)	JN following up – ends June	Ongoing
Justice Forum (Cyber)	WQ following up	Ongoing
RIA	Follow-up possible.	Sent note to RIA end May

<b>Case Studies</b>		Remarks
ROER4D	CD reviewed, JN to revise, then send to UCT	End of May
ISIF	Revised version sent to Apnic in late May	RR & DB held Skype conference with Sylvia
Privacy	DB/RR to finalize	
Cyber	DB/RR to finalize	
Condatos	JN to send to IDRC – as soon as finalized	

<b>Simplify approach</b>		Remarks
Minimal statement	Drawing and text	RR producing drafts end May and early June
Steps and principles	Minimum sequence, modular, indicate possible overlaps UFE-ResCom	
Readiness	SZ to revise paper	RR, DB to co-author
MOOC version	Massive open online course	Identify advisors to review the fit and suggest next steps

<b>Knowledge-sharing strategy</b>		Remarks
DECI-2 Communication Strategy	WQ to lead	
Primer	Consider as optional collaborative process where multiple DECI-2 mentors co-write a paper	

<b>Knowledge-sharing strategy</b>		<b>Remarks</b>
Article	As above	
Conferences	SZ already requested support for EES Conference (Wageningen, Sept)	

## APPENDIX 1. TORs for Research Papers

### Research Study # 1– DECI-2 Capacity development outcomes

In preparation for our May 2016 team meeting, we will gather evidence of capacity development outcomes by our team and a selection of our partners. This effort responds to Objectives 2 and 3 of this project (see Text Box).

#### DECI-2 objectives related to capacity development

2. **Capacity development for regional consultants:** To build capacity among regional evaluation consultants (*mentors*) in the concepts and practices of both UFE and ResCom.
3. **Capacity development for project partners:** To provide technical assistance to I&N project researchers, communications staff and evaluators toward improving their evaluation and ResCom knowledge and skills.

For **objective #2**, we already have presentations on mentoring and readiness by the co-PIs. For **objective #3** we have evidence of outcomes in the forms of conference presentations and papers by Jenny Phillips of Cyberstewards on UFE, and by Sukaini Walji of ROER4D on ResCom. **This document focuses on #2 with attention to the DECI-2 team.**

*For DECI-1 we gathered evidence using the following questions:*

- What was most helpful in UFE?
- What was most challenging?
- What were the conditions or enabling factors?
- What would you do differently next time?
- How has UFE changed your practice?
- What worked in our mentoring?
- What to change in our mentoring?

*Possible grouping for DECI-2 to build on our experiences to date:*

- a) **Readiness** questions on UFE and ResCom, and on partners' expectations, context
- b) **Implementation** questions that focus on the approaches and the interrelationship between UFE and ResCom
- c) **Strategic implications** with regards to changes or clarifications in project direction, strategies or theories of change (TOC)
- d) **Mentoring** questions on our *delivery* of capacity development
- e) **Capacity** question on how we have changed our practices
- f) **Dissemination and dialogue initiatives** – their reach and other possibilities to promote learning.

For **(c)**, we have a hypothesis that the unified UFE-ResCom approach (Vericom) has affected the strategies of certain networks and projects. We see Vericom becoming a solid approach/framework in the near future.

For **(d)** we have a hypothesis: the DECI-2 experience has brought about a practical wisdom to our team, and to some extent to some of our partners.

#### *Next Steps*

1. Discuss the proposed contents of the Capacity Development Paper
2. Request one or more Regional Mentors to work on producing a draft paper
3. Co-PI's to provide support to the process and to comment on drafts
4. Paper to be distributed before the Cape Town meeting
5. Presentation to be made at Cape Town meeting for group discussion (will serve as input to our Technical Report)
6. A paper for publication

#### **a) Draft READINESS questions**

- What are the **readiness** items/issues *that you now seek* when working with a partner on UFE and/or ResCom?
- Can you share examples of how you helped partners increase their readiness?
- Can you share examples of events / factors that limited your or the partners' readiness?

#### **b) Draft IMPLEMENTATION questions**

- What are the three most important lessons you have gained personally from mentoring partners in UFE or ResCom?
- What are the main challenges you have faced as a DECI-2 mentor?
- What are the benefits you perceive/ expect of combining UFE and ResCom?
- To what extent does your experience show value in the intersection between UFE and ResCom?

#### **c) Draft STRATEGIC questions**

- What evidence do you have that your mentoring has enabled the partners to adjust their project strategy?
- Can you share a story or anecdote to illustrate how the UFE or ResCom mentoring provided a 'aha moment' or clarity for the partner?

#### **e) Draft MENTORING questions**

- What have been the highlights / strengths in the way you delivered your mentoring?
- What would you rather do differently?
- How could the mentoring process / team work be modified/ improved?

#### **f) Draft CAPACITY questions**

- List up to three new capacities that you gained through the DECI-2 process.

- What capacities do you hope to still build on?
- Please read the [‘practical wisdom paper’](#) and comment if/ how this notion resonates with your experience.

**g) Draft DISSEMINATION questions**

- What stakeholders or partners do plan/wish to expose to the DECI-2 experience?
- Through what methods, media or venues do you wish to do this?

**h) Other comments?**

Total of 12 days, 6 for Joaquin and 6 for Charles

**Research Study # 2 – DECI-2 Changes affected at the project level**

In preparation for our May 2016 team meeting, we will review the extent to which DECI-2 has contributed to partners’ outcomes. This effort responds to Objective 3 and 4 of this project (see Text Box).

**DECI-2 objectives related to learning and dissemination**

3. **Capacity development for project partners:** To provide technical assistance to I&N project researchers, communications staff and evaluators toward improving their evaluation and ResCom knowledge and skills.
4. **Assistance to project evaluations and communication planning:** To contribute towards the completion of UFE evaluations and communication strategies for designated I&N flagship projects.

For **objective #3** we have already interviewed several partners to document their views on capacity changes and/or we have documentation produced by them on their experiences:

- Jenny Phillips, UFE, Cyberstewards
- Masashi Nishihata, Cyberstewards
- Mike Respoli (ResCom) & Harmit; Carly Nyst (UFE), Privacy International
- Sukaina Walji, ResCom & Sarah Goodier ( ROER4D
- Maureen Hilyard and Ano Tisam, Cook Islands, ISIF grantee
- Barnabas and Francesca Feruglio, Nazdeek, India, ISIG grantee
- Jacqueline Chen, OpASHA, Cambodia, ISIF grantee

We will suggest additional people to interview including: Sylvia Cadena (ISIF), Fabrizio Scrollini (Open Data), Leslie Chan and Becky Hillyer (Open Science).

For **objective #4**, we are seeking to document the projects teams’ views on how the UFE and/or ResCom mentoring process has contributed to shifting/improving the project strategy, performance and/or outcomes.

**This review focuses on analyzing existing interviews and presentations to summarize capacity development outcomes among our partners, as well as partner project outcomes that may have been influenced by the DECI-2 mentoring.**

*Possible guiding questions:*

- What is the evidence at hand indicating capacity gains in evaluation and communication among our partners?
- What are the missed opportunities in the capacity development?
- What were the main readiness enablers for the gains and the barriers for the missed opportunities?
- What is the evidence at hand showing changes in project strategies, performance, outcomes, or other changes for which the DECI-2 mentoring may have been a contributor? What are the patterns emerging at the network level Vs the sub-project /grantee levels?
- What are the readiness requirements or other factors that DECI-2 mentor need to focus on for the remaining months of the project?

*Next Steps*

1. Invite Julius and Vira to team up to review the guiding questions and suggest improvements
2. Co-PI's to provide support to the process and to comment on drafts, especially linking with existing documentation (interviews and presentations)
3. Prepare a summary presentation before the Cape Town meeting
4. Presentation to be made at Cape Town meeting for group discussion
5. Finalization of paper to provide input to next Technical Report and as a paper for publication.

*Approximate level of effort:*

- a. Finalize the questions and distributing the work: 1 day each
- b. Scheduling interviews and reviewing existing documentation: 1 day each
- c. Interviews (30 min/ interview): 1 day each
- d. Review, analyze jointly and draft presentation: 2 days each
- e. Writing for publication: 1 day each

Total of 12 days, 6 for Vira and 6 for Julius

Approximate timing: February and March: produce a full draft by early April.

---

### Research Study # 3 – DECI-2 Learning and dissemination review

In preparation for our May 2016 team meeting, we will review how we can integrate learning and dissemination. This effort responds to Objectives 1 and 5 of this project (see Text Box).

#### DECI-2 objectives related to learning and dissemination

1. **Meta-level action-research:** To develop and test-drive a combined approach to UFE and ResCom mentoring.
5. **Sharing lessons:** To communicate the DECI-2 project findings and training approach to practitioners, researchers and policy makers.

For **objective #1**, we have developed learning support materials (modules, checklists, reporting templates, webinars). As we have started to integrate evaluation and communication into a hybrid approach, we have begun producing additional materials that address objective #5: the VeriCom documentation (2015), a draft e-Primer, and a working draft for a journal article.

**This review focuses on revisiting what we have produced, reviewing whether the materials can become effective learning tools, reviewing our dissemination products and suggesting a strategy for the remainder of the project.**

#### *Possible guiding questions:*

- a) We have been test-driving UFE and ResCom by mentoring research networks and select sub-projects. To what extent have our materials been effective tools to support action-research? What has worked; what has not; and what are the possible explanations?
- b) We have sought to produce online reference tools, especially webinars and modules. Under what conditions have they been useful? What have been the limitations and barriers to effective use?
- c) We have begun integrating a hybrid approach under the VeriCom title through a draft e-Primer (for practitioners) and a draft journal article (for researchers). What are the merits and limitations of the drafts? What actions are needed to make them more relevant to each audience group?
- d) We have a static website with no social media or blog components: what variations and opportunities are worth integrating during the remainder of the DECI-2 project?

#### *Next Steps*

1. Invite Sonal and Bruce to team up to cover this preparatory activity, including a review of the guiding questions.
2. Co-PI's to provide support to the process and to comment on drafts
3. Prepare a summary presentation before the Cape Town meeting



4. Present the findings and suggestions at the Cape Town meeting for group discussion
5. Consider taking an active role in revising the e-Primer and co-writing the article (after May)

Approximate level of effort:

- a. Finalize the questions and distributing the work: 1 day each
- b. Read, review, analyze jointly: 2 days each
- d. Prepare a short presentation: 1 day each

Total of 12 days, 6 for Sonal and 6 for Wendy

Approximate timing: February and March: produce a full draft by early April.

## APPENDIX 2: CAPE TOWN Card Transcripts

<b>Key Lessons and Issues</b>
<b>READINESS</b>
Readiness is critical for using UFE/ResCom – More nuanced understanding is emerging – need to ‘structure’ it
If there were a DECI-3, its foundations for Readiness start now – the external evaluation could help pinpoint design options
Readiness is strategic yet complex... it is worth producing a synthesis on its manifestations and relevance in capacity development (Title: ‘Nudge & Push’ for change) ☺
How to develop Readiness? Does opt-in help or hinder? (or does it depend on the particular situation)
Mentor Readiness and facilitation skill
Readiness depends on context and value of the activity. Not only willingness and resources. It is therefore dynamic – a question of balance
Readiness: a key prerequisite. Criteria? Timing? Sustaining it?
<b>UFE &amp; RESCOM</b>
We need to assess our own readiness before promoting to others. Need more evidence on fit between UFE and RESCOM)
Lack of mentors with <u>both</u> UFE and ResCom skills
We started with silos – UFE and ResCom, now we are <u>combining</u> them! How do we do that at a practical level? What is role of mentors?
May co-exist as cousins with no need to be one entity.
<b>VALUE</b>
Materials are about ‘How To’ but do they convey ‘value’ of the approach. ‘Benefit’, paradigm shift
The tension between talking about Value (for early buy-in) vs. allowing it to emerge (experience & learning) has different manifestations / delivery styles (that we need to document)
Value is discovered towards the end
<b>WHAT IT IS</b>
The central role of a (revised) theory of change for both UFE and ResCom
Mentoring → Method → Shared Learning
The theme that joins DECI-2 areas is <u>USE</u> . Use Evaluation. Use communication... to ensure Research Has IMPACT
<b>WHAT IT ACHIEVES</b>
Capacity building key issues /lesson (1) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Importance of organizational readiness, mentor and mentee readiness</li> <li>2. Capacity building is 2-way mentee and mentor</li> <li>3. A mentor has to know when to step back</li> <li>4. Trust</li> </ol>

<b>Key Lessons and Issues</b>
Key lessons and issues (2) Particularly in ResCom helped prepare target audience   audience research
<b>MENTORING</b>
Mentor capacity – more time to learn and adapt to client project
Mentor capacity (and therefore selection and initiation into the work) is critical – technical & people skills & facilitation
Level of confidence = key issue / lesson in mentoring
DECI – MENTOR – Mentee TOR Review
Mentoring: Team work or solo?
Trust as a key issue in mentoring
Extensive mentoring with opportunities for <u>field visits</u> (face to face) requires resources
There is lesson in DECI about real life challenges of identifying users of evaluation
<b>TIME/PACE</b>
Both UFE and RESCOM lessons may not be visible during the <u>lifespan</u> of most projects that don't go beyond 5 years
Slow progress in the beginning vs time limitation
<b>EFFICIENCY / EFFECTIVENESS</b>
Measurement of capacity building
Unpack efficiency issues from DECI's just in time mentoring approach and action research

<b>Implications for Current Project Strategy</b>
<b>TRACKING DECI RESULTS</b>
Evaluate DECI's Communications
How do we measure/describe "the extent of Capacity Development?"
UFE and RESCOM implementation strategy should focus on long-term impact while tracking short-term gains
<b>LINKING BACK TO IDRC N.E. PROGRAM</b>
Understand how network economies is structured: global, regional or local partners?
Design a capacity development / orientation event for N.E./IDRC program officers to appreciate how the approach could add value to their projects / Networks (Tanzania Sep?)
<b>ENSURE DECI HAS ORGANIZATIONAL INFLUENCE</b>
Dissemination → Strategy → Infect institutions
Need to identify organizations / communities that area fed up with conventional evaluation and communication methods and present UFE and RESCOM as options
Learning about positive experience, Cook Island and Cambodia, or combining UFE and RESECOM keeps up the spirit to do more

<b>Implications for Current Project Strategy</b>
<b>SPECIFIC SUPPORT TO PARTNERS</b>
If possible, experiment with other approaches to engagement and building readiness
Support open science, do mid-evaluation
More resources should be allocated to face-to-face / field visits
Decide quickly whether ongoing, new partners (at different levels of a network) will likely start at UFE, RC, or integrated
<b>THE HYBRID</b>
Hybrid makes sense but has every mentor used it? Need to work on this if we decide to include it.
More deliberate hybrid cases required to build sufficient experience base
DECI-2 mentors to identify opportunities (contracts, assignments etc.) where they can introduce <u>their</u> version of the UFE & RESCOM approaches first, <u>then</u> we revisit the notion / format of the primer.
Organizations should be allowed/enabled to choose whether to start with ResCom or UFE depending on their stages of development or circumstances
<b>FOR MENTORS</b>
Capacity building for mentors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not to work in silo</li> <li>- How to deal with complexity</li> <li>- Facilitation skill</li> </ul>
More resources to support mentors for conferences
As mentors, are we trained to deal with complexity? How well? Do we need more exposure to complexity theory and practice
Implications for current project strategy – More learning opportunities between mentors on experiences of mentoring UFE and ResCom
Mentees (individual or org.) need to be supported to produce material as well – more “inclusive” development of concept/framework
We need to focus our team’s time more productively as we shift focus from mentoring to knowledge sharing
How can we bust the silos of UFE and RESCOM from mentors’ point of view? Critical if we want to promote hybrid and develop capacity
VeriCom process needed for DECI-2

<b>Implications for Knowledge Sharing</b>
<b>PRODUCTS / PROJECTS</b>
Case study that demonstrate value of UFE/RESCOM (for external audience)
We need to complete and share the case studies soonest – (They are a part of the process)
What are windows of opportunity to share what we know? (We do not need ‘project materials!’) work in progress is fine
Implication for current project strategy – use materials with mentee and give room to

Implications for Knowledge Sharing
mentee to adapt to his/her circumstances
Produce more publications
Participate in conferences
Simplify terminology and presentation. Get to the point DECI
Knowledge sharing <u>and</u> engagement means developing a community of practice – and everything that goes with it
Facilitated online discussion with selected topics, e.g.: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction</li> <li>2. Apply experience</li> <li>3. Integration with other methods</li> </ol>
Website ----- develop    Map/Access    Define focus and audience
Develop online resource (resource centre) and attractive materials (infographics, videographics, etc.)
More interactive website. Do we need a searchable knowledge base? E-learning modules.
Perhaps learning materials should be experience-based.
HOW
We need a critical mass of DECI-2 team members to become co-authors of an article for a journal (assuming this is a valuable knowledge sharing channel)
Clarify our sharing strategy (e.g. “beavering behind the scenes”) first, then find formats that invite co-writing / co-production so (most) partners become co-designers of the approach in their own context
More routine mentor gathering to exchange knowledge and experience
What material for simple and complex communication
Implications for knowledge sharing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assess our own ‘readiness’ before moving forward to reach others</li> <li>- Develop a common strategy for so doing</li> </ul>
Implications: need to fund a ‘home’ to support longer term mentor/mentee relationships and to provide learning opportunities between mentors
Dissemination strategy → team learning capacity development
Planning to document the process, change, and learning better
Presentation /promotion → simplify the complexity
FOR WHOM
RESCOMM for DECI-2
Who to share knowledge with needs detailing – has implications for use of UFE& Rescom <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Researchers; Donors; Networks; Decision makers; and Managers</li> </ul>
CONTENT: HYBRID
Integration – weaving UFE and RESCOM together
Let’s develop UFE an RESCOM as separate steps until the need to merge them emerges organically. There is value in allowing them to grow separately.
Need to integrate UFE an RESCOM in formal educational curriculum

<b>Implications for Knowledge Sharing</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document process carefully as it moves along re the 'fit' between UFE and RESCOM</li> <li>- Improve accessibility and labeling</li> </ul>
More clearly articulate the value of UFE and Rescom for different stages. (can't wit 'til the end.)
<b>CONTENT: WHAT YOU LEARNED ABOUT MENTORING</b>
Map out different pathways (for different learning styles/levels of confidence) to achieve practical wisdom
Document what you've learned are your signals to take a next step in a "jus in time" mentoring process to help others not waste time.
<b>CONTENT: WHAT YOU LEARNED RE: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE</b>
Document what "strategic realignment" looked like in partners, whether it came from RC, UFE, or both together as a contribution re adaptive management
More sharing of what worked/did not work – dilemmas faced – different for a (conferences, articles, blogs)
<b>CONTENT: POSITIONING</b>
Position it as a decision-making framework to help dynamic projects / organizations. Embrace strategic re-alignment / theory of change updating as an expected / planned event / stage
Pitch UFE and Rescom as part of solutions to big issues rather than narrow organizational objectives.
Advocacy – materials need to be developed and shared – for different audiences
Position it, Name it → What is it? → Niche?
How do we dovetail into current debates – e.g. SDG: gender, climate change → beyond ICT
Both UFE and RESCOM should speak to big contemporary issues like climate change and SDGs that are now influencing global resource allocation
<b>OTHER</b>
How do DECI-2 partners and non-partners who have been offered the service perceive the opt-in/opt-out issue?
"Theory of change" is mentioned a lot. However, most organizations don't even have one. What do we mean by 'theory of change'?
What happens if private sector business adapts UFE and RESCOM for profit???
Need to look/scan what else looks like UFE and RESCom in the development sector.