

Supplementary Annex for the Building Capacity to Use Research Evidence (BCURE) Realist Evaluation: Stage 2 Synthesis Report

This is a Supplementary Annex for the BCURE Stage 2 Synthesis Report. It contains the sampling guidance, topic guides and write up templates used for primary data collection within the Stage 2 Programme Evaluations.

Contents

1.	BCURE Stage 2 programme evaluation sampling guidance	2
2.	Workshop guide for implementing teams at Stage 2	5
3.	Interview topic guides for Stage 2	10
1.1.	General introduction and consent protocols.....	10
1.2.	BCURE programme staff and implementing partners	11
1.3.	BCURE programme participant	12
1.4.	BCURE facilitator, mentor, trainer	13
1.5.	High level stakeholder.....	15
1.6.	Civil society / external stakeholder	17
1.7.	DFID manager	18
1.8.	Prompts for CIMOs and blocking mechanisms	19
4.	Interview write up template for Stage 2.....	25

1. BCURE Stage 2 programme evaluation sampling guidance and framework

This guidance was provided to programme evaluation leads to help develop purposive samples for their country case studies. Programme leads developed and finalized the samples using an Excel sampling matrix, presented below.

Description of stakeholder categories

1. **BCURE programme staff and direct implementing / consortium partners:** individuals managing the programme, in country and in the UK, including consortium partners
2. **BCURE programme participant:** individuals directly participating in BCURE interventions (training, mentoring, workshops, knowledge cafes, policy dialogues, discussions around organisational systems development etc)
3. **BCURE facilitators, mentors and trainers:** individuals hired by the BCURE partner to deliver training and mentoring, facilitate sessions etc
4. **High level stakeholders:** individuals who are not necessarily directly participating in BCURE interventions (although they may be), but who have a high level insight into how the government system operates, the role of EIPM, and the wider influence of BCURE and other influencing factors, e.g. director of a ministry, an MP. Also potentially including line managers of programme participants who can comment on emerging outcomes at organisational level.
5. **Civil society / other external stakeholders:** who can give an insight into the wider role of EIPM in the system, and the influence of BCURE and other influencing factors on EIPM, e.g. director of a research institute.

Number of respondents of each category to interview

As a rough guideline, aim towards the following:

- [If deemed necessary] 2-3 in-person or Skype interviews (in addition to the workshop) with BCURE staff and direct implementing partners, e.g. specialist roles, the M&E manager.
- 1 Skype interview with DFID manager
- At least 12, not more than 15 interviews with BCURE programme participants
- 3 interviews with facilitators, mentors and trainers
- 5-8 interviews with high level stakeholders
- 4 interviews with civil society / other external stakeholders

Detailed guidance for selecting stakeholders

1. BCURE programme staff and implementing / consortium partners

The workshop with BCURE programme staff will be the main source of information from this group. However, additional interviews may be required:

- a. Interviews with project staff / implementing partners in countries other than the case study country should be conducted only where considered necessary to gain a sufficient understanding of the programme. For example, where there is insufficient info from the reports or management, or if the intervention is markedly different (including VY in Ghana or South Africa, maybe ASI as there are so many delays in SL that looking at Liberia or SS would be helpful).
- b. It may be helpful to conduct interviews with core project staff / implementing partners who were unable to attend the CIMO workshop, to gain their perspectives on programme successes and challenges / the main CIMOs for the programme.

- c. It may be helpful to conduct interviews with core project staff / implementing partners who did attend the workshop, in order to further develop and deepen insights from the workshop.

2. BCURE programme participants

- Prioritise the interventions that have the greatest significance within the project (i.e. if training is the main intervention but there is a small networking component, mainly aim to interview people who have attended the training; but aim to speak to a few people who have attended networking events).
- Where possible, aim to speak to some individuals who have participated in multiple different interventions, in order to gain an insight into how interventions have complemented / reinforced one another. However, where relevant also aim to speak to some people who have only participated in one type of intervention.

How to select individuals

- If possible, get full lists of individuals who took part in each of the programme interventions
- Ask the programme whether there are any individuals we should particularly aim to speak to (for example because they were particularly enthusiastic or influential)
- For some interventions, it may be possible to select a range of individuals associated with differential results (i.e. with training, is it possible to select some higher and lower performing individuals? For workshop attendees, is it possible to select some attendees who rated the workshop highly, and some who rated it poorly?)
- Aim to select at least half of the participants without any influence from the BCURE partner, to reduce risk of bias. This could be done randomly, or purposively (i.e. you could aim to select a range of people from different departments, of different genders, and of differing levels of seniority).

3. BCURE facilitators, mentors and trainers

- Aim to speak to facilitators, mentors or trainers who have been directly engaged with some of the participants interviewed (under category 2), to enable triangulation of insights about new knowledge / behaviour change.
- Prioritise facilitators of interventions with the greatest significance within the project.

4. High level stakeholders

- Try to speak to stakeholders in each of the targeted departments / areas of government.
- Selection should be purposive and guided by the BCURE partner (also by the document review)
- It is fine if there is an overlap between high level stakeholders and BCURE programme participants; but ensure this is clearly indicated in the sample and write ups document.

5. Civil society / other external stakeholders

- Try to speak to stakeholders from a range of organisations, ideally who are relatively high level and can give higher level insights above and beyond their specific organisation.
- Selection should be purposive and guided by the BCURE partner (possibly also by the document review)

Stage 2 Sampling Matrix

[Case name] sample and write ups					Respondent details								Interview details						
No.	Respondent type (primary category)	Respondent type (secondary category)	If programme participant - which interventions?	Include/exclude	First name	Family name	Organisation	Job title	Location	Email	Phone	Comments	Date	Time	Location	Details (access, security, parking etc)	Interviewer name	Status	
1																			
2																			
3																			
4																			
5																			
6																			
7																			
8																			
9																			
10																			
11																			
12																			
13																			
14																			
15																			
16																			
17																			
18																			
19																			
20																			

2. Workshop guide for implementing teams at Stage 2

This annex contains the guide for the Stage 2 workshops with BCURE implementing teams. The workshops were open and exploratory, and the guide was intended to help direct the conversation and ensure that important topics had been covered, rather than to be rigidly adhered to. Programme evaluation leads were responsible for adapting and contextualising the guide for their programme.

1. Aims

- For the evaluator to understand fully what interventions have been implemented, and what changes have been observed with different groups.
- To explore the team’s perceptions on how and why the interventions contributed to change, and blockages to change.
- To explore the potential sustainability of the changes.
- To explore the programme’s potential contribution to the changes, and the contribution of other factors.

The workshop will focus solely on the evaluation case study country.

2. Set up and materials

- The session will be informal and participatory.
- With participants’ consent, we would like to record the session to ensure we have an accurate record of the team’s insights.
- It would be helpful to have access to a whiteboard, or a screen / wall where it is possible to put up post-its and flip chart paper.
- We will bring post-its, but if flipchart paper and marker pens are available this would be helpful. If not we can bring these with us.

3. Agenda and process

Session	Details	Notes for evaluator
Session 1: Introduction 10 mins	Introduction Explain the workshop process and the role in the data collection	Before the workshop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get hold of necessary materials – if it is possible to use paper and pens from partners then please do, but if not you’ll need to bring your own. Large post-it notes are recommended, but if not flip chart / writing on the white board should suffice. • Prepare ‘quick reference’ lists / diagrams to use as prompts (not to be presented to / shared with partners), of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The interventions the partner has conducted in the last year ○ The main outcomes that have been achieved, from the document review • Prepare flipchart paper, cards or A3 printouts of the CIMO prompts <i>of relevance to the interventions your BCURE partner is conducting.</i>

		<p>[A3 prompts ready to print out are saved in Dropbox]</p> <p>During introduction session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain purpose of the session – describe aims • Get consent to record • Introductions around the room • Explain how information will be fed into a) programme report and b) synthesis... • <i>...Detail on interventions and changes will help us build on the review of monitoring data that we've already started, to ensure we have a complete picture of what the programme has done and where your main achievements lie. Your perspectives on how and why interventions have led to change will feed into our synthesis report, where we will be pulling out evidence from across the 6 programmes.</i> • Icebreaker – card sort – how do you feel about the evidence-informed decision making landscape in [xx countries] at the moment?
<p>Session 2: What interventions have been conducted, with who, and why?</p> <p>25 mins</p>	<p>Team map out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The interventions conducted since June 2015. 2. Whose behaviour the programme is attempting to change through these interventions. 	<p>Put up interventions on post-its, and stakeholders targeted through interventions (department / role)</p> <p><i>Checking that there are no gaps in our understanding of what has been done.</i></p> <p><i>Clarifying understanding of stakeholder groups – both department and role, and more conceptual (higher vs mid level gov; colleagues from same dept vs people from diverse depts)</i></p> <p><i>How does gender come into your understanding of stakeholder groups?</i></p> <p><i>Looking back to the project plans this time last year – has there been any evolution in terms of your focus or activities?</i></p>
<p>Session 3: What changes have been observed?</p> <p>25 mins</p>	<p>Team map out (for all countries in which the programme is operating):</p> <p>What changes have been observed since June 2015 as a result of the programme?</p> <p>Thinking about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both new changes, and change that is a 	<p>Put up outcomes on post-its</p> <p><i>Where are the gaps?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Both new changes, and change that is a continuation, deepening or reinforcement of change observed last year</i> • <i>Positive, negative, intended and unintended changes</i> • <i>Change for whom: among which groups have the changes been observed?</i>

	<p>continuation, deepening or reinforcement of change observed last year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive, negative, intended and unintended changes • Change for whom: among which groups have the changes been observed? 	<p><u>Gender</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think outcomes are different for women and men? Which women and which men? • Are there any patterns of outcomes that could relate to gender? e.g. reports of confidence or scores, or follow-up or completion rates, or patterns of role/level in hierarchy? • Are there any benefits for women specifically? E.g. in terms of decision making, capacity, self-esteem? <p>Where there ARE gaps, ask for the team’s advice on how to gather evidence of particular changes – who should we speak to, which docs should we look at?</p>
<p>BREAK – 5 mins</p>		
<p>Session 4: How and why have changes happened?</p> <p>1 hour</p>	<p>Team explore and record:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you think are the most significant outcomes at this stage? [Choose up to 3] • Why are they the most significant? <p>For each of the significant changes, team explore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How and why do you think the program has caused, or helped to cause this change... •for whom.... • ... through which resources provided by which interventions or combination of interventions? <p>Unpacking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did the programme provide that was new? (Information, skills practice, opportunities for collaboration, technical support, access to evidence sources, etc?) 	<p>Prompt selection of outcomes using outcome mapping spreadsheet. Have the team selected the outcomes where there is most evidence of change? If not, why not?</p> <p>In advance of the workshop, write up prompts for relevant CIMOs on flipchart / print them out on A3 [A3 prompts saved in Dropbox]. Ask team to comment on them in the context of a general discussion about how and way rather than formulaically. (See photos in folder)</p> <p>Start the discussion by asking: How and why do you think the interventions contributed to this change?</p> <p>20 mins per change. Write up on post-its / flipchart, or annotate our CMO prompts to show how intervention leads to change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is it about the intervention that led to the change – e.g. was it the new information provided through training, or the opportunity to develop collaborations with new stakeholders? • What did the programme provide that was new? (Information, skills practice, opportunities for collaboration, technical support, access to evidence sources, etc?) • What is it about the way the programme is implemented that made a difference? • What is it about this place / context that makes the intervention work?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is it about the way the programme is implemented that made a difference? • What is it about this place / context that makes the intervention work? • Has change happened in the same way for all participants? In what ways it differed, and for whom? What is driving these differences? • What other things (programmes, initiatives, actors, influences, drivers) are at work in the programme context that may have contributed to the observed changes? <p>Where relevant, evaluator will bring existing CIMOs from the evaluation into the discussion, for further exploration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Has change happened in the same way for all participants? In what ways it differed, and for whom? What is driving these differences?</i> • <i>What other things (programmes, initiatives, actors, influences, drivers) are at work in the programme context that may have contributed to the observed changes?</i> <p><i>Bring CIMO prompts into the conversation when the conversation relates to the interventions associated with the CIMO, and ask the team to reflect on them.</i></p> <p><i>Also probe for the programme team’s rationale for targeting these groups, through these interventions. Why were the interventions combined and sequenced in this way?</i></p>
<p>BREAK – 5 mins</p>		
<p>Session 5: Exploring blockages to change 15 mins</p>	<p>Team explores areas where change has been less substantial than hoped, or where potentially negative consequences have been observed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How and why did this happen... • ...for whom... • ...and what was it about the programme that made it work less well in this area? 	<p>Write issues up on post-its</p> <p>What actors and contextual factors have hindered change, for which groups, and why?</p> <p>How did things work differently from how the programme originally thought they would? How have they adapted in response?</p> <p>What would make the programme work more effectively in this area, and why? Why is the programme NOT doing this?</p> <p><i>Bring CIMO blocking mechanism prompts into the conversation when the conversation relates to the interventions associated with the CIMO, and ask the team to reflect on them.</i></p>
<p>Session 6: Exploring longer term change and sustainability</p>	<p>Team explores how change is expected to unfold in the longer term / by the end of the programme:</p>	<p>Group discussion – write up on flipchart</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability of partners? • Looking at the changes observed so far, what do you hope / expect will happen next?

<p>15 mins</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at the changes observed so far, what do you hope / expect will happen next? • How do you see changes at different levels / among different groups influencing each other? • What is it about your programme that you hope will make the changes sustainable? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you hope this will influence policy and quality? • How do you see changes at different levels / among different groups influencing each other? • What is it about your programme that you hope will make the changes sustainable? <p><i>Longer term CIMOs</i></p>
<p>Close</p> <p>10 mins</p>	<p>Wrap up and final reflections</p> <p>What else do you think we need to know, to really understand how this program has worked here?</p>	<p>Thanks for participation</p> <p>Repeat what we'll do with the info</p> <p>If time and inclination, repeat card picking exercise.</p>

3. Interview topic guides for Stage 2

This annex contains the Stage 2 interview topic guides. The interviews were semi-structured, with and the guides were intended to help direct the conversation and ensure that important topics had been covered, rather than to be rigidly adhered to. Programme evaluation leads were responsible for adapting and contextualising the guides for each of the interviews, using the following guidance:

- *Some stakeholders fit within more than one category, so questions for different stakeholder groups will need to be copied and pasted into a customised topic guide.*
- *Topic guides*
- *For each **individual** stakeholder, you will need to decide which of the CIMOs are most relevant, based on their role and any previous insights from Stage 1 etc. (re-read the Stage 1 interview notes if interviewing the same stakeholder again).*
- *Over the course of the visit, you may gain new insights into how and why particular interventions led to change. Don't wait until the analysis stage to pick these up – incorporate them into the topic guides as you go along.*
- *Add specific questions about particular issues of relevance to your case study (i.e. issues that came up in the document review, or that have been mentioned by previous participants)*
- *Case-by-case judgements need to be made. For example, for high level stakeholders who also participated in the interventions, the evaluator will need to decide what it is most important to discuss in each individual interview, based on weighing up: where we have evidence already and where there are biggest gaps, the unique insight we'd expect the person to be able to give on various issues, etc.*
- *We suggest putting together individualised topic guides for each interviewee the night before (which takes time but is important). This involves cutting and pasting relevant sections into a topic guide document, and adding in any specific questions based on learning from previous interviews (e.g. following up on outcomes mentioned by other people, clarifying points of confusion etc.)*
- *You can bring CIMOs into conversation by saying 'we've seen elsewhere / we have an idea that it works like this – what do you think / does this resonate with you / is that what happened here?' without you having to have the prompts in front of you.*

1.1. General introduction and consent protocols

Introduction

- We are independent researchers investigating the [xxx] project, which is funded by the UK Department for International Development. We want to hear your thoughts on this project.
- The interview will last about 1 hour.

Consent

- Everything you tell us will be confidential, and your name will not be used in any of our reports. However, we would like to use your thoughts and some anonymised quotes from the interview in our findings, if you are happy with this?
- Do you mind if we audio record the interview? This is for the researchers' reference and will allow us to check that we have recorded your views correctly.

- Do you have any questions about the research, or concerns you would like to raise before we start?

Aim of the interview

- We want to get your perspectives on the BCURE programme / the way that evidence is used in decision making.
- We're not just interested in whether the programme is working. We're particularly interested in understanding HOW and WHY it is working well or less well, for different groups of people. So I'm very interested in understanding your perspectives on this and will be asking for your reflections throughout the interview.

Description of project (for participants without much knowledge of it)

- The [xxx][programme aims to [encourage the use of evidence in policy and decision making / insert local description here]
- In [xxx country] [insert local description here: e.g. the University of Johannesburg has been leading the UJ-BCURE programme, providing mentorships, delivering practical workshops, and supporting the Africa Evidence Network.]
- The programme as a whole is funded by DFID and is working across 11 countries in Africa and Asia.
- We are evaluating the programme in order to investigate how effective the programme has been, but also to understand more about how and why different types of approaches can help support evidence informed policy making in different contexts.

1.2. BCURE programme staff and implementing partners

Guide for individuals managing the programme, in country and in the UK, including consortium partners

Involvement and clarifying understanding of the project

- Can you tell me your specific role in this programme?
- It would be helpful to check my understanding of the programme and its main interventions.
 - In the team workshop / through the document review we've identified the main interventions to be [xxxx].
 - *Check whose behaviour the programme is attempting to change through each intervention*
- Looking back to this time last year – has there been any evolution in terms of the programme's focus or activities?
- What do you consider the outcomes of the programme to have been for [each of the main stakeholder groups the programme is working with]? Can you give examples?
- Do you think the outcomes have been the same for all people [within each main stakeholder group]?
- [Where changes relate to shorter term change, or individual change...] do these outcomes that we've talked about connect to the longer term goal of BCURE, to contribute to better use of evidence within the system as a whole? What else needs to happen, to get to this goal?

How and why the changes have come about

- We are very curious about how the programme causes change. How do you think the program has caused, or helped to cause [changes identified by respondent]?
- There are lots of ideas about how these [interventions] actually work, and we think it probably works differently in different places or for different people. One of those ideas is...

INSERT CIMO PROMPTS HERE.

- We've seen in some cases that 'evidence champions' within an organisation / system play an important role in getting people to think about or use evidence differently in their work. Have you seen anything like that here? *If yes, probe using 'champion' prompts*
- We've seen that this programme works differently in different places. What is it about this context that makes it work [so well, less well]?
- If you could change something about this program to make it work more effectively here, what would you change and why?
- Apart from the BCURE programme, what else do you think might have influenced the changes we have talked about?
- Do you know of any other initiatives that are working to change how evidence is used in policy making? How do you think they have influenced change?
- What else do you think we need to know, to really understand how this program has worked here?

1.3. BCURE programme participant

Guide for individuals directly participating in BCURE interventions (training, mentoring, workshops, knowledge cafes, policy dialogues, discussions around organisational systems development etc)

Role and involvement in policy / decision making

- Could you please introduce yourself and your role within the organisation?
- Can I briefly check – how would you describe your role in relation to [or how are you involved in] policy and decision-making? Can you summarise that for me please?

Involvement and outcomes

First three questions are framing questions – can cut down if short on time

- Can you tell me what your involvement in (or contact with) this programme has been?
- Can you tell me why you got involved?
- What did you think about [interventions participant was involved in]? Did they pan out how you hoped?

If time is short, please try to prioritise the following three core questions and probe for CIMOs

- What did the programme provide that was new to you?
- What do you consider the outcomes of your participation in the [specific programme intervention] to be for you? *[Choose some of the following prompts]*
 - Have you noticed any changes in how you think about your role in any way? Can you give examples?
 - Have you noticed any changes in how you think about evidence and how it should be used? Can you give examples?

- Has it changed how you think about how people might work together to make better use of evidence? Can you give examples?
- Has it changed how you work? Can you give examples?
- Have you seen any examples of how your working differently has changed the behaviour of others?
- Do you think that the outcomes have been the same for all people who participated in [the intervention]? In what ways have they been different?
 - Why do you think the outcomes are different for these people?
 - Have you noticed any change in the way other participants have been talking about evidence or in the way they work?
- [Where changes relate to shorter term change, or individual change...] do these outcomes that we've talked about connect to the longer term goal of BCURE, to contribute to better use of evidence within the system as a whole? What else needs to happen, to get to this goal?

How and why the changes have come about

- We are very curious about how the [intervention] causes change. How do you think the program has caused, or helped to cause [outcome identified by respondent]?
- There are lots of ideas about how these [interventions] actually work, and we think it probably works differently in different places or for different people. One of those ideas is...

INSERT RELEVANT INTERVENTION CIMO PROMPTS HERE

- We've seen in some cases that 'evidence champions' within an organisation / system play an important role in getting people to think about or use evidence differently in their work. Have you seen anything like that here? *If yes, probe using 'champion' prompts*
- We've seen that this programme works differently in different places. What is it about this context that makes it work [so well, less well]?
- Can you give examples of when the [intervention] worked well and worked less well? How come?
- If you could change something about this [intervention] to make it work more effectively here, what would you change and why?

Wider context, barriers and other influencing factors

- Apart from the BCURE programme, what else do you think might have influenced the changes we have talked about?
 - Do you know of any other initiatives that are working to change how evidence is used in policy making? How do you think they have influenced change?
 - *Probe for other factors using other factors prompts.*
- What else do you think we need to know, to really understand how this program has worked here?

1.4. BCURE facilitator, mentor, trainer

Guide for individuals hired by the BCURE partner to deliver training and mentoring, facilitate sessions etc

Involvement and outcomes

- Can you tell me your specific role in this programme?
- Can you tell me why you got involved?
- What did you think about [interventions participant was involved in]? Did they pan out how you hoped

[If time is short, please try to prioritise the following three core questions and probe for CIMOs]

- What did the programme provide that was new?
- What do you consider the outcomes of your participation in the [specific programme intervention] to be for the participants? *[Choose some of the following prompts]*
 - Have you noticed any changes in how participants think about evidence and how it should be used? Can you give examples?
 - Have you noticed any changes in relationships between participants? Can you give examples?
 - Has it changed participants' ways of working? Can you give examples?
- Do you think that the outcomes have been the same for all people who participated in [the intervention]? In what ways have they been different?
 - Why do you think the outcomes are different for these people?
 - ***Probe for gender and other identify factors that might affect differences.***
 - Have you noticed any change in the way other participants have been talking about evidence or in the way they work?
- [Where changes relate to shorter term change, or individual change...] do these outcomes that we've talked about connect to the longer term goal of BCURE, to contribute to better use of evidence within the system as a whole? What else needs to happen, to get to this goal?

How and why the changes have come about

- We are very curious about how the [intervention] causes change. How do you think the program has caused, or helped to cause [change identified by respondent]?
- There are lots of ideas about how these [interventions] actually work, and we think it probably works differently in different places or for different people. One of those ideas is...

INSERT CIMO PROMPTS HERE

- Can you give examples of when the [intervention] worked well and worked less well? How come?
- We've seen in some cases that 'evidence champions' within an organisation / system play an important role in getting people to think about or use evidence differently in their work. Have you seen anything like that here? ***If yes, probe using 'champion' prompts***
- We've seen that this programme works differently in different places. What is it about this context that makes it work [so well, less well]?
- If you could change something about this program to make it work more effectively here, what would you change and why?
- Apart from the BCURE programme, what else do you think might have influenced the changes we have talked about?

- Do you know of any other initiatives that are working to change how evidence is used in policy making? How do you think they have influenced change?
- What else do you think we need to know, to really understand how this program has worked here?

1.5. High level stakeholder

These questions are aimed towards a high level stakeholder who has not been directly involved in BCURE interventions, but who:

1. *Have a high level insight into how the government system operates, the role of EIPM, and the wider influence of BCURE and other influencing factors, AND/OR*
2. *Are line managers of programme participants who can comment on emerging outcomes at organisational level.*

If the participant has also been involved in specific interventions, you will need to mix and match these questions with some of the questions for programme participants.

Involvement and outcomes

- Can you tell me what your contact with this programme has been?
- What is your general impression of the programme?

Questions for stakeholders with a high level insight into the government system / EIPM

Outcomes

- Over the past couple of years, have you noticed any changes in the way [the government / this department] thinks about or uses evidence in decision making?
 - What kind of changes?
- Can you give me an example of a positive change? An example of a negative change?

How and why the changes have come about

- Why do you think these changes are coming about / why do you think things are not changing?
 - *Use this question to start an in-depth investigation of how and why evidence use is (or is not) changing, using the **'higher level' CIMO and 'other factors' prompts** to probe for specific factors that the respondent touches on in their answers, or that have cropped up as important in the country context either during Stage 1 or in previous interviews.*
 - *Keep asking 'why' questions! 'Why do you think that is', 'Why are they doing that?' 'Why is that they have started to think in this way?'*
 - *There might be obvious drivers and factors that relate to the higher-level CMOs, like presidential agenda, or cabinet has a transparency drive, or a new director.*
- We know change doesn't happen in the same way for everyone – how have different groups reacted differently? [*e.g. to the Director's new agenda?*]
- We've seen in some cases that 'evidence champions' within an organisation / system play an important role in getting people to think about or use evidence differently in their work. Have you seen anything like that here? ***If yes, probe using 'champion' prompts***

- Do you think the BCURE programme is influencing any of these changes? In what ways?
Probe for specific intervention CIMOs that crop up here.
- Apart from BCURE, do you know of any other initiatives that are working to change how evidence is used in policy making? How do you think they have influenced change?
- Is there anything that you see as blocking change, in relation to how people think about or use evidence in decision making?
 - Use this question to start an in-depth investigation of how and why particular factors are 'blocking' evidence use in policy making. Keep asking 'why' questions! 'Why do you think that is', 'Why are they doing that?' 'Why is it not possible to do this?'
 - Use the **'barriers' prompts** to probe for specific factors that the respondent touches on in their answers, or that have cropped up as important in the country context either during Stage 1 or in previous interviews.

Questions for line managers of programme participants

Outcomes

- What did you think about [interventions staff members were involved in]? Did they pan out how you hoped?
- What did the programme provide that was new?
- What do you consider the outcomes of taking part in the [specific programme intervention] to be for the participants? *[Choose some of the following prompts]*
 - Have you noticed any changes in how participants think about evidence and how it should be used? Can you give examples?
 - Have you noticed any changes in relationships between participants? Can you give examples?
 - Has it changed participants' ways of working? Can you give examples?
- Do you think that the outcomes have been the same for all people who participated in [the intervention]? In what ways have they been different?
 - Why do you think the outcomes are different for these people?
 - Have you noticed any change in the way other participants have been talking about evidence or in the way they work?
- Can you give examples of when the [intervention] worked well and worked less well? How come?

How and why the changes have come about

- We are very curious about how the [intervention] causes change. How do you think the program has caused, or helped to cause [change identified by respondent]?
- There are lots of ideas about how these [interventions] actually work, and we think it probably works differently in different places or for different people. One of those ideas is...

INSERT CIMO PROMPTS HERE

- We've seen that this programme works differently in different places. What is it about this context that makes it work [so well, less well]?
- If you could change something about this program to make it work more effectively here, what would you change and why?

- What else do you think we need to know, to really understand how this program has worked here?

1.6. Civil society / external stakeholder

Guide for individuals from civil society or external to the programme, who can give an insight into the wider role of EIPM in the system, and the influence of BCURE and other influencing factors on EIPM

Involvement and outcomes

- Can you tell me what your contact with this programme has been?
- What is your general impression of the programme?
- Are you / is your organisation working to influence how people think about or use evidence in policy making? What kinds of things do you do / what is your approach?

Outcomes

- Over the past couple of years, have you noticed any changes in the way [the government / this department] thinks about or uses evidence in decision making?
 - What kind of changes?
- Can you give me an example of a positive change? An example of a negative change?

How and why the changes have come about

- Why do you think these changes are coming about / why do you think things are not changing?
 - *Use this question to start an in-depth investigation of how and why evidence use is (or is not) changing, using the 'higher level' CIMO and 'other factors' prompts to probe for specific factors that the respondent touches on in their answers, or that have cropped up as important in the country context either during Stage 1 or in previous interviews.*
 - *Keep asking 'why' questions! 'Why do you think that is', 'Why are they doing that?' 'Why is that they have started to think in this way?'*
 - *There might be obvious drivers and factors that relate to the higher-level CMOs, like presidential agenda, or cabinet has a transparency drive, or a new director.*
- We know change doesn't happen in the same way for everyone – how have different groups reacted differently? [*e.g. to the Director's new agenda?*]
- We've seen in some cases that 'evidence champions' within an organisation / system play an important role in getting people to think about or use evidence differently in their work. Have you seen anything like that here? *If yes, probe using 'champion' prompts*
- **Do you think the BCURE programme is influencing any of these changes? In what ways? Possibly probe for intervention CIMOs if the participant makes reference to specific interventions.**
- Apart from BCURE, do you know of any other initiatives that are working to change how evidence is used in policy making? How do you think they have influenced change?
- Is there anything that you see as blocking change, in relation to how people think about or use evidence in decision making?

- *Use this question to start an in-depth investigation of how and why particular factors are ‘blocking’ evidence use in policy making. Keep asking ‘why’ questions! ‘Why do you think that is’, ‘Why are they doing that?’ ‘Why is it not possible to do this?’*
- *Use the **‘barriers’ prompts** to probe for specific factors that the respondent touches on in their answers, or that have cropped up as important in the country context either during Stage 1 or in previous interviews.*
- What else do you think we need to know, to really understand the role that evidence plays in policy making in this context?

1.7. DFID manager

- *[If lead evaluator is new to the programme] It would be helpful for me to understand your role as DFID manager, and your engagement with the programme.*
- What are your general perceptions of programme performance over the last year?
- What do you see as the main successes?
 - *Why do you think this has been a success? What is it about the programme’s design / implementation that has made this work?*
 - *Do you have a sense of who has benefitted most from the programme? In what ways have outcomes been different for different stakeholders?*
- What do you see as the main weaknesses?
 - *What do you think went wrong? What should the programme have done differently?*
- What are the main challenges the programme has faced?
 - *Use this question to investigate DFID perceptions of how and why particular factors are ‘blocking’ evidence use in policy making. Keep asking ‘why’ questions! ‘Why do you think that is’, ‘Why are they doing that?’ ‘Why is it not possible to do this?’*
- Apart from BCURE, do you know of any other DFID initiatives (or other initiatives) that are working to change how evidence is used in policy making in this context?
- What do you think we need to know or need to find out, to really understand how this program has worked here?
- What are you particularly interested in finding out from the evaluation?

1.8. Prompts for CIMOs and blocking mechanisms

“There are lots of ideas about how [this intervention] actually works, and we think it probably works differently in different places or for different people. One of those theories / ideas is...”

Training or workshop interventions, which aim to provide new information and skills through practice

<p>CIMO 1</p>	<p>[Training / workshop] crystallises people’s awareness of evidence-informed policy making, or perhaps helps them to put labels to what they’re already doing in their work, but doesn’t actually lead to direct behaviour change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • We are wondering if this happens when the training is not so directly relevant to participants, meaning they don’t have the opportunities to put the skills into practice? • Or where participants start with a lower understanding of evidence-informed policy making?
<p>CIMO 2 & 3</p>	<p>[Training / workshop] acts as an ‘eye-opener’ or even a ‘game changer’, making participants see that what they are learning is immediately applicable to their own work, and so they go and put it into practice in their day to day work (possibly even feeding into policy change)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What is it about the way the [training / workshop] was implemented that made a difference to how it worked? • What kind of people need to be in the room for this to happen? Does it matter what kind of professional background or previous experience they have? • Does training need to be practical and interactive for this to happen? • Do there need to be external pressures or motivations encouraging evidence use for this to happen? • Or do people need to already have interest in or enthusiasm for the idea of evidence-informed policy making?

Mentoring interventions, which aim to provide new information and skills through practice

<p>CIMO 4 & 5</p>	<p>Mentoring helps to embed new skills gained through training, helping people put their new skills into practice</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Mentoring allows the mentor and the mentee to learn <u>from each other</u> through sharing their own particular experience and skillsets, while working on a particular technical issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What is it about the mentoring that helps to embed skills in this way? • What skills and attitudes does the mentor need to make this happen? • What skills and attitudes does the <u>mentee</u> need to make this happen? • Does there need to be a match in seniority between mentors and mentees? • What type and length of mentorship works best for this? • What kind of organisational support is required to help this happen?
------------------------------	--

Networking interventions, which aim to provide opportunities for dialogue and collaboration, and access to people who can provide new information, evidence etc.

<p>CIMO 7 & 8</p>	<p>Bringing together people from different sectors, organisations etc puts them in a situation where they openly discuss and share ideas about evidence and policy making, which helps</p>
------------------------------	--

	<p>improve relationships between these stakeholders. And this means that policy makers know who to contact in order to access evidence and decide to actively seek it out in future.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Bringing together people from different sectors, organisations etc allows them to learn from each others' various skills and experience in a collaborative way, which increases their knowledge about evidence-informed policy making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What is it about the way the event was implemented that made a difference to how it worked? • Which people, from which sectors, does this work well and less well with? • Do you need senior as well as junior people in the room? • What attitudes and previous experience / pre-existing relationships do the participants need to have, in order for this to happen? • How does the event need to be structured and facilitated in order for this to happen?
--	---

‘Learning by doing’ interventions, which aim to provide information about and practice in doing EIPM through working on concrete policy processes or products.

CIMO 9	<p>Providing direct support within a specific policy process enables ‘learning by doing’ through co-producing a policy product or working together on a specific policy process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What is it about the nature of the collaboration that makes this ‘learning by doing’ work? • What role does the BCURE team play in the process and how does that help make this work? • Who leads the process? How important is it for participants to feel a sense of ownership? • <i>Probe for link to CIMO 14 – demonstration effect</i>
---------------	---

Technical support interventions, which aim to provide support or develop new organisational / institutional tools or systems

CIMO 13	<p>Tools or systems to support evidence-informed policy making work through facilitating people to do their jobs better or more easily.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • We are wondering whether this can result in people increasingly valuing evidence, when they see the benefits it can bring to their work? • What is it about the tool / system that helps people do their jobs better? • Is it important how the tool or system was designed, and who was involved? • We are wondering if this works only where less radical change is required?
CIMO 15	<p>Tools or systems to support evidence-informed policy making provide positive or negative incentives to encourage and reinforce people’s decisions to use evidence in their work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What needs to happen within the organisation for these incentives to result in change? We are wondering if they need to have a certain level of backing or authority?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kind of incentives are needed? • Are there any unintended consequences of this? For example, can it lead to people using evidence in a superficial way?
CIMO 12	<p>New systems or tools developed specifically to promote evidence use in policy making work are used as an 'entry point', designed around a high profile policy process or issue, and used as a starting point to establishing <i>broader systems</i> to support good policy making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think that is what is happening here? • Why does evidence-informed policy making work as this kind of 'entry point'?

Champions	
CIMO 10 Transformational leaders	<p>Senior people get enthusiastic about evidence-informed policy making and start to act as 'transformational leaders', using their influence to support the use of evidence and convince other senior people to support it, and initiating reforms to promote it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What is it about someone that makes them a transformational leader? What personal qualities do they need? What kind of position in the organisation do they need? • What kind of support would help make transformational leaders do this more effectively?
CIMO 11: Junior champions	<p>People in less senior positions act as champions, pushing change from below through modelling how evidence can be used in decision making. This demonstrates the value of evidence to other people, who gradually start to change their own behaviour and practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • Which individuals and groups do these more 'junior' champions have influence over? • What is it about someone that makes them a more 'junior' champion? What personal qualities do they need? What kind of position in the organisation do they need? • We are wondering if individuals like this might eventually become 'transformational leaders' as they progress up the ladder – have you ever seen this? • What kind of support would help make these individuals play this role more effectively?
<p>Higher level CIMOs</p> <p><i>These CIMOs are about longer term change. They about how changes sparked by interventions combine and reinforce one another to contribute to more systemic change over the longer term.</i></p>	
CIMO 6 Critical mass	<p>Training and other types of interventions eventually build up a 'critical mass' of people who have new knowledge about and enthusiasm for evidence-informed policy making. Over time this slowly disseminates throughout the organisation and results in changes to practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What is it about the way the programme is implemented that results in this 'critical mass' building up? • Do you have any sense of many people need to be reached in order for this dissemination to happen? • Which people need to be involved in interventions for it to lead to eventual change? • <i>How</i> does this learning eventually disseminate through the organisation?

<p>CIMO 14:</p> <p>Demonstration effect</p>	<p>Developing concrete processes or products that demonstrate evidence-informed policy making in action (e.g. policy briefs, processes that involve weighing up evidence), creates a ‘demonstration effect.’ Other people see the positive potential of using evidence in their work, and get enthusiastic about it, and go on to change <i>their</i> behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any examples where you have seen this happening? • What is it about the policy processes or products that helps them lead to a ‘demonstration effect’? • What does this enthusiasm lead to? How do people change their behaviour? Have you seen it lead to increased kudos and resources for evidence-informed policy making in the organisation? • What needs to be in place for this demonstration effect to happen? For example, do certain people need to get involved? Do certain systems need to be in place within the organisation?
---	---

Other enabling (I)CMOs: reference list

These prompts relate to mechanisms (and the contextual factors that enable them) **outside** of the BCURE programme that may contribute to longer term or higher level change. The (I) is in brackets because these mechanisms don’t necessarily require an intervention to ‘spark’ them.

These may also create a conducive context for BCURE programme resources to spark mechanisms which influence the decisions of government stakeholders. In some cases, the programme might help establish some of these factors, through the combined work of different interventions over time.

<p>15. Donor focus on evidence</p>	<p>Donor resources are targeted towards issues that are supported by good quality international evidence, which provides an opportunity and an incentive for high level stakeholders to enact policies that are evidence-informed.</p>
<p>16. Civil society</p>	<p>An active civil society and media which cares about whether policy is evidence informed can vocally ask for justifications of policy decisions, providing an incentive to high level policy makers to request evidence and make decisions that are based on evidence.</p>
<p>17. Structural changes in government</p>	<p>Structural changes in government (e.g. decentralisation) create new incentives for high and mid-level stakeholders to produce, request and use evidence in decision making, for example if people have new responsibilities for policy making.</p>
<p>18. Situations of uncertainty, complexity, or failing policies</p> <p><i>Does use of evidence here extend beyond a discourse (in which political actors say they are using evidence) to actually result in decisions that the</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In situations of uncertainty, or where policies are perceived by high level stakeholders to be ineffective, new evidence can break inertia or path dependency, by presenting high level stakeholders with a solution they perceive could lead to an expedient outcome (either politically beneficial, or more effective). This can push them to use this evidence in order to shape new policies or processes. • Where ministries are facing complex, high profile challenges, this can provide an incentive to high level stakeholders to discuss and use evidence when making decisions, because they perceive evidence as being able to help make ‘better’ decisions.... OR because they perceive that being seen to weigh up evidence will be viewed (by wider government actors / civil society and the media) as more professional / credible.

<p><i>evidence suggests is more effective?</i></p>	
<p>19. Concept of EIPM becoming ingrained in political discourse</p>	<p>The idea / concept of ‘evidence-informed policy making’ can be an ingrained part of the political discourse, meaning it is no longer seen as acceptable for mid-level policy makers to present products / advice that do not draw on evidence; or for high level stakeholders to make decisions that are not based on evidence. This creates a strong incentive for these stakeholders to use evidence in their work and decision making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What <u>level</u> and <u>type</u> of evidence use is seen as necessary / acceptable within the political discourse? • Can this create incentive for high level stakeholders to use evidence <i>symbolically</i> or <i>politically</i> in decision making, rather than genuinely considering it when making decisions? And if so, does this mean that policy processes or products are lower quality than they would have been, if evidence had been genuinely considered.
<p>20. Valuing evidence as an organisational norm</p>	<p>Where a number high level stakeholders are committed to and enthusiastic about evidence use in decision making, this results in the development of a new organisational value or norm in which evidence is viewed as a ‘good thing.’ They then decide to invest resources into organisational or institutional systems or tools to support evidence use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the tangible markers that there is a norm shift? • What factors makes a shift sustainable?
<p>21. Policy and service delivery mandates can create opportunities for EIPM</p>	<p>Where there is a mandate for developing a national policy framework, or policy implementation frameworks, this can create an incentive for high level and mid-level stakeholders to use / act on evidence, as mandates relate to performance and may be monitored through formal processes.</p>

Blocking (I)CMOs: reference list

These prompts relate to mechanisms that might operate in particular contexts to **block** mid level decision makers from accessing evidence or using it to inform products or advice they produce; or high level stakeholders from deciding to request evidence, or use it to inform their decision making. In turn, this blocks the development of policy products or processes that draw on evidence.

<p>22. Political incentives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political incentives to act on policy agendas within the short period between elections results in high level policy makers engaging in fast, reactive policy making, which means there is not enough time for them to request or wait for evidence to guide their decisions. • Incentives to retain public popularity provide motivations to high level stakeholders to enact policies that will be popular with the public. Where these motivations are strong (and where there are limited counteracting incentives to encourage evidence-based decision making) they provide little incentive to policy makers to request evidence or make evidence-based decisions. • Where there are entrenched political, material and personal vested interests, these incentivise high level stakeholders to derail or refuse support to policies that are based on evidence. • In a context where evidence is used (by other government stakeholders) to critique decisions for political reasons (rather than to add value to debates), high level policy makers may ignore it because they have incentives to defend their current standpoint in order to protect their position, even if the evidence is of good quality and making a valid point.
--	--

23. Donor influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor influence may block high level stakeholders from acting on evidence, by focussing attention and resources on policies that are donor priorities, rather than based on evidence about national needs.
24. Availability of relevant evidence <i>Some programmes are aiming to remove these blocking mechanisms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there is a (perceived) lack of relevant evidence relating to the sector (particularly outside of the health field).... Where mid-level policy makers do not have access to journal subscriptions.... Where there is an absence of frameworks, plans or investment to help produce and retain knowledge for policy making (e.g. national research agendas, evaluation frameworks)... <p>...This may block mid-level policy makers from accessing and using the most relevant evidence when creating policy documents / developing advice, and subsequently block high level policy makers from drawing on the most relevant evidence when making decisions – resulting in policy processes or products that are not as high quality as they could be.</p>
25. Civil society and the media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where an issue is high profile, high level government stakeholders may not want to ask / authorise their juniors to gather evidence about it, because negative evidence might be used by civil society or the media as a ‘weapon’ to attack the government. Evidence is therefore seen as a ‘threat.’
26. Crises and regime changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crises stop high level stakeholders from requesting or acting on evidence, when they associate evidence with long term solutions and a longer decision timeframe, and when they perceive that decisions cannot be delayed in a crisis.
27. Path dependency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inertia, confirmation bias and path dependency can block mid and high level stakeholders from considering evidence that goes against the status quo.
28. Perceptions of the relevance / trustworthiness of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research might not be used because mid or high level stakeholders perceive it as not relevant to current policy issues. Mid-level policy makers therefore decide not to use it when creating policy documents or developing advice, and /or high level policy makers decide not to use it when drawing on evidence to making decisions. Research may not be trusted because of who is giving the message and their associations to different political actors. Mid-level policy makers therefore decide not to use it when creating policy documents or developing advice, and /or high level policy makers decide not to use it when drawing on evidence to making decisions.
29. “Missing foundations”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there are insufficient institutional or procedural structures or resources to formalise policy or decision-making (e.g. a lack of quality assurance?) this means that high level stakeholders have incentives to make decisions in ad hoc, unregulated or uncoordinated ways, in response to media, high-level directives or other drivers, rather than part of a coherent or systematic government plan. This results in lower quality policy. The issue of missing foundations seems particularly acute in fragile contexts.
30. EIPM is not an organisational value / norm	<p>Where routine evidence use as part of day to day work is not a value or a norm in an organisation / institution, it is not seen as a legitimate part of work or what people get rewarded for. Lacking this incentive, mid-level policy makers therefore do not decide to allocate time to evidence use when developing policy documents or advice and /or high level policy makers decide not to ask for it / spend time considering it when drawing on evidence to making decisions.</p>

4. Interview write up template for Stage 2

Case study and country	
Interviewee name	
Unique interview number <i>(Harvard: 1; VakaYiko: 2; UJ-BCURE: 3; SECURE: 4; ASI: 5; ECORYS: 6; Impact Case: 7)</i>	First number should be the case reference number as detailed opposite, and the second number the unique interview number for your case. This should match the numbering in the sample and write up spreadsheet. E.g. 3-4 (UJ-BCURE interviewee number 4).
Stakeholder type	
Position and organisation	
Interviewer name	
Date of interview	

Please name the interview notes using the following convention, to make it easy for us to find and compile them later: 'Unique code_Surname_date'. E.g. '3-1_Smith_090516'. Please save the audio file using the same format.

Write up the key findings from the interview under each topic guide area below.

- Include your comments and reflections in square brackets, if possible including ideas about whether something is a contextual factor [C], mechanism [M] or outcome [O]
- Include (and highlight) brief guidance and timestamps for the research assistants to help them flesh out your notes with more detail and quotes.

1. Individual profile

Role within the organisation

2. Involvement in the programme

Involvement and reason for involvement in the programme

3. Implementation background and challenges

This sub-heading is mainly relevant for project staff interviews

4. What has changed (or not changed) and why?

EQ 1. Individual change

a) What outcomes were achieved?

- List *changes observed or anticipated* by respondent that relate to individual level change (in knowledge, skills, confidence, commitment, attitudes, behaviour)

b) How and why did BCURE contribute to change?

- List how and why BCURE contributed or is expected to contribute to these changes, making links to our CIMOs where relevant.

c) How sustainable were the outcomes?

- Any information relevant to assessing sustainability of the changes

d) Other factors that contributed to change

- Any information about other factors that contributed to the observed changes

EQ 2. Interpersonal change

a) What outcomes were achieved?

- List *changes observed or anticipated* by respondent that relate to interpersonal level change (changes in relationships or networks between individuals or groups)

b) How and why did BCURE contribute to change?

- List how and why BCURE contributed or is expected to contribute to these changes, making links to our CIMOs where relevant.

c) How sustainable were the outcomes?

- Any information relevant to assessing sustainability of the changes

d) Other factors that contributed to change

- Any information about other factors that contributed to the observed changes

EQ 3. Organisational change

a) What outcomes were achieved?

- List *changes observed or anticipated* by respondent that relate to organisational level change (changes at an organisational level, above the level of an individual).

b) *How and why did BCURE contribute to change?*

- List how and why BCURE contributed or is expected to contribute to these changes, making links to our CIMOs where relevant.

c) *How sustainable were the outcomes?*

- Any information relevant to assessing sustainability of the changes

d) *Other factors that contributed to change*

- Any information about other factors that contributed to the observed changes

EQ 4. *Institutional change*

a) *What outcomes were achieved?*

- List *changes observed or anticipated* by respondent at an institutional level (the level above specific organisations, e.g. change at cross-departmental level).

b) *How and why did BCURE contribute to change?*

- List how and why BCURE contributed or is expected to contribute to these changes, making links to our CIMOs where relevant.

c) *How sustainable were the outcomes?*

- Any information relevant to assessing sustainability of the changes

d) *Other factors that contributed to change*

- Any information about other factors that contributed to the observed changes

EQ 5. *Policy change*

a) *What outcomes were achieved?*

- List *changes observed or anticipated* by respondent at a policy level (i.e. changes in policy processes or products; improvements in the quality of policy)

b) *How and why did BCURE contribute to change?*

- List how and why BCURE contributed or is expected to contribute to these changes

c) *How sustainable were the outcomes?*

- Any information relevant to assessing sustainability of the changes

d) *Other factors that contributed to change*

- Any information about other factors that contributed to the observed changes

5. Reflections on broader blocking and enabling mechanisms

- Any reflections on features of the wider context that block or enable EIPM. Make links to our blocking / enabling CIMOs where relevant.

6. Other thoughts or insights

- Any other information the respondent thinks we should know?
- Any broader insights into how evidence is used or thought about within the system?

7. Researcher observations

Include any reflections that seem interesting, including on:

- Respondent's attitude (towards the programme, the interview, EIPM)
- Potential issues that may affect how much weight to give the claims made by the respondent, including:
 - Any reasons you know of that the respondent might have for responding a certain way?
 - The plausibility of the claims made by the respondent, based on what you already know?
 - Any apparent inconsistencies in the respondent's account, or difficulty in providing examples to support claims?