Research Technical Assistance Center (RTAC)

USAID DRIVE Convening: Finding What Works: Examples of Measuring Local Capacity Development with Indicator CBLD-9

Thursday, September 9, 2021
10:00 - 11:30 a.m.

Meeting Info

Speakers & Participants:
Moderator: Heather Britt, NORC

Panelists:
- Amanda Satterwhite, Senior MEL Specialist, USAID CBLD-9 Working Group
- David Schlinkert, Director of MERL and Director of Communications, Arizona State University, CARISCA
- Patience Aku Bruce, Director of Learning, KNUST, CARISCA
- John Bonnell, Capacity Development Specialist, MSU, MUST-ISP
- Professor Jonathan Makuwira, Deputy Vice Chancellor, MUST, MUST-ISP

Breakout Group Leaders/Support:
- Amanda Satterwhite, USAID CBLD-9 Working Group
- Heather Britt, NORC
- Samantha Downey, NORC
- Thabo Falayi, MUST
- Amy Jamison, MSU
- Jonathan Makuwira, MUST
- Timothy Silberg, MSU
- Alex Monnard, NORC
- Sutherland Miller, NORC
- David Schlinkert, CARISCA
- Patience Bruce, CARISCA
- Rachael Jackson, NORC
- Nigel Gibbs, PRB

Participants: ~95 participants

Agenda Outline:
- Plenary Session
  - Welcome & Introductions
  - Poll Questions
  - Panelist Discussion
- Q&A
- Breakout Group Discussion
- Wrap Up

Plenary Session Notes:

Welcome:
- Celia Laskowski: Welcome to Finding What Works: Examples of Measuring Local Capacity Development with Indicator CBLD-9.
  - Thanks to this DRIVE convening committee, panelists.
  - CBLD-9 is a newer indicator. So this session is meant to be a space of learning, brainstorming, sharing, and asking questions. There are no wrong answers. We're all learning from each other.

Polls:
- Does your project help to build the capacity of one or more local partners?
  - 5+ partners: 38%
  - 1-5 partners: 50%
  - No: 2%
  - I don't know: 11%
- How far has your project gotten in the process of measuring indicator CBLD-9?
  - Monitoring performance: 22%
  - Selected measure: 16%
  - Begun capacity building: 16%
  - Not sure if indicator needed: 20%
  - Not relevant: 4%
  - I don't know: 22%
- Introduction to panelists (listed above under Speakers & Participants)
- Many thanks to all involved. The development of this session has been truly collaborative, in the spirit of this session.

Panelist Discussion: Amanda Satterwhite:
- CBLD-9 Indicator: % of USG-assisted organizations with improved performance (IM-level)
  - Measures whether USG-funded capacity development efforts have led to ***improved organizational performance*** in organizations receiving organizational capacity development support
  - Allows a lot of broadness on how to measure this to suit the sector and context
  - Goal to allow USAID to truly assess the effectiveness of their capacity development efforts
  - Calculated as percentage:
    - Denominator: # of orgs assisted
    - Numerator: # of assisted orgs showing improved performance
  - Aiming to measure performance change vs. simple capacity development efforts
  - Capacity is the ability to perform certain skills (knowledge, ability, etc.) but doesn't necessarily translate to actual use of the skills. So, USAID wants to measure performance so that they can see that the developed skills are actually used (performance).
    - E.g.: Instead of checking the knowledge of nurses on how to communicate healthy practices with expectant mothers, observe and assess actual performance of nurses communicating those practices *or* number of expectant mothers actually doing the healthy practices.
- How is performance defined?
  - Performance should align with local partner performance priorities, *not* based on what USAID or the supporting organization thinks performance should be.

- - There should be a real partnership between the organization providing support and the one strengthening its performance. It's not a one-off task; it's a journey.
- CBLD-9 Journey:
  - Intervention Planning:
    - Determine local partner's performance improvement priorities: where are they now and where do they want to be?
    - Design performance improvement solution(s)
  - MEL Preparation:
    - Select performance improvement metric(s)
      - Doesn't have to be counting something, but it should be something concrete and specific
    - Assess baseline performance
  - Intervention Implementation:
    - Implement performance improvement solution(s)
    - Measure performance improvement metric(s)
  - Intervention Conclusion:
    - Report performance improvement metric(s)
- What possible tools exist for assessing performance improvement? Are there standardized tools that can be used?
  - No, standardized tools tend to be really long and expensive. They tend to focus on Western organizational performance priorities, not necessarily partner priorities.
  - These tools may be helpful for facilitating a conversation and identifying priorities. But you can choose one or two metrics from the tools and use those, or something completely different. But USAID doesn't recommend using these standardized tools on an annual basis.
- Who assesses performance?
  - It shouldn't *just* be a self-assessment because results may not be reliable or valid. But you don't necessarily need an external evaluator or auditor.
  - There may be qualitative metrics (e.g., quality of research reports/briefs) or quantitative metrics (e.g., number of partnerships, amount of $ spent on partnerships).
  - Key points: Collaborative, feasible for organization,
- Final thoughts: It can feel like a challenging indicator, and it can be, but it's totally understandable and relevant to supported organizations.

Panelist Discussion: CARISCA:
- Tell us about CARISCA:
  - CARISCA is a 5-year project between ASU and KNUST.
- The local partner capacity building priorities are at the heart of this indicator. Patience, what are KNUST's capacity-building priorities?
  - KNUST's goal is to make CARISCA a center of supply chain excellence with world-class curriculum and **locally-relevant academic and applied research**.
  - Provide evidence-based training to our supply chain students and supply chain management practitioners. Done through online courses. Want to introduce 10 new live courses by the end of the project. **Strong supply chain curriculum**.
- Where are you in the performance improvement journey?
  - They spent the majority of the time in Year 1 in Steps 1 and 2 and dabbled in Step 3. By the end of the next year, they'll be firmly in all 4 steps. David and Patience meet bi-weekly to discuss what they're seeing so they can adapt their instruments to best measure what they're trying to do.

- - "Adapt and repeat" arrow really goes back to Step 1 for them.
- Can you talk about one measurement tool you've designed to measure one of your capacity building goals?
  - They hold bi-annual capacity building workshops. In the first year, they sent a survey to see what capacities KNUST faculty wanted to grow in, and they reviewed data on publications, research, etc. They have 10+ ways of taking in data--from meetings and note taking to reviewing survey and interview data. None of their tools are standardized. They use some standardized tools for reference, but then modify it to fit KNUST priorities.
  - In Year 1, they started looking at the capacity needs of supply chain capacity. They wanted to have a baseline assessment to bring out the strengths and weaknesses of faculty members. This helped them plan the capacity needs. They looked at different questions to assess where faculty were at that point and where they wanted to be. This was a big learning process--they discovered that most faculty were publishing but needed more capacity building on how to write good research papers to publish in top journals. They also needed capacity for addressing local problems and working with local stakeholders. They asked questions about the current research they were working on. They reviewed the data and had one-on-one discussions between ASU STAs (senior technical advisors) and KNUST faculty.
- What will you be talking about in your breakout group to engage more deeply in these topics?
  - We're going to talk about non-traditional approaches to measuring capacity development; how you track these things. **They'll get into more specific detailed examples and setting up short-term and long-term objectives and interim measures.**

Panelist Discussion: MUST-ISP:
- Give us a quick introduction to MUST-ISP and how long you've been working together.
  - ISP is a professional development program for faculty and university leaders to help them solve problems in their local context. Have had 3 iterations with different colleges in Malawi. MUST is the 2nd iteration.
- What are the capacity building priorities for MUST?
  - To provide a conducive environment for quality education, training, research, entrepreneurship, and outreach to facilitate economic growth in Malawi and beyond
  - All priorities come out of the university's strategic plan. These include teaching/learning and community engagement.
- Where are you in the performance improvement journey?
  - ISP is organized in 2 separate tracks that work together--faculty track and institutional leader track. This allows for human centered design--creation of an enabling environment (institutional leaders) to support faculty growth (faculty growth).
  - Faculty track has been through all 4 steps and is currently at the reporting step.
  - Institutional leader track lives in that gray circle--lots of adaptation, in very practical and personal ways. Some leaders passed during COVID, and the team grieved together and adapted together. These are realities of the world we live in. With Jonathan's leadership, they iterated 3 different interventions to lead to the desired change connected with their strategic plan.
- How has focusing intentionally on capacity/performance improvement changed the way you work?
  - Measuring this helped them to make the strategic plan really specific, leading to new ways of thinking, teaching, learning, and engagement. It has been essential to adapting to the environment. Progress can be difficult to measure. But where you can understand new contexts.

- - Time and resource intensity of this work--This requires a lot of time, preparation, and focus. The issue of resources is very important. It has been critical for MUST to ensure their colleagues from MSU fully understand their context.
- What will you be talking about in your breakout group to engage more deeply in these topics?
  - How focusing intentionally on capacity/performance improvement has changed the way they work

Q&A:

- Some of these questions were answered in the plenary session, some in the breakout groups, and some in written responses after the convening.
- Discussed in plenary session:
  - Since the performance priorities and metrics are being co-developed with partners (presumably once engagement has begun), which is as it should be, is this an indicator where targets can reasonably set in advance (e.g. at the stage of MEL plan preparation), or is this one best left for updates to MEL plans a year or so in to a project, once steps 1 and 2 have been completed with partners?
    - What you're setting targets on is whether and how much you see performance improvement. But the ways performance improves can change over time. So the targets can be set in advance based on what you expect from past experience. Or if you don't expect improvement to occur every year, you can report a target of 0. But if you don't know what to expect, you can hold off for a year on setting targets.

Questions in Chat for Amanda Satterwhite, CBLD-9 Working Group:
- **Becky Furth:** For the purposes of this call, can you define "local partner"? Is it only NGOs or does it also include others in the private sector and/or government?
  - **Heather Britt:** Yes, local partners include NGOs, private sector, government, etc.
  - **Karen Fowle:** For detailed definitions see: https://www.usaid.gov/npi/npi-key-definitions
- **Meg Kinghorn:** Do you have an agreed upon definition of PERFORMANCE?
  - Performance refers to the extent to which an actor is able to effectively and consistently achieve its intended outcomes. To understand performance, it is helpful to understand how it differs from capacity. Capacity is a form of potential; it is not visible until it is used - leading to improved performance. Therefore, performance is the key consideration in determining whether capacity has changed.
- **Maria Rivero:** One trick here is that the indicator is at the level of the organization and not the service providers... How do you manage organizations where service providers vary in their performance?
  - **Karen Fowle:** This indicator is set-up to be applicable to a variety of organization types, for example service providers like health clinics or community organizations. Please see the performance indicator reference sheet (PIRS), page 3 for definitions of organization types.
  - **Amanda Satterwhite:** Note that you should be measuring improvement in performance of the supported org, not performance of the organization delivering the capacity development support.
- **Edmund Malesky:** How is the counterfactual established? What improvement might have happened in the absence of the capacity building effort?
  - **Karen Fowle:** Excellent point that establishing a counterfactual is desirable. However, as this is a performance metric, we don't expect that all activities would establish a counterfactual as part of their measurement framework. Generally if a logical connection can be made between the intervention and the performance goal that is sufficient. For some projects it might be possible to randomize capacity development support. In other cases a quasi-experimental method, like matching, could be used to build a counterfactual. However, we suggest reserving this type of research for new, innovative approaches.

- **Becky Furth:** Are there specific tools you expect organizations to use to measure performance improvement such as OPI?
  - Short answer: No!
  - Long answer: There are many questionnaires and assessment tools that assess an array of organizational and/or technical competencies. They may cover internal processes (e.g. financial controls, human resources, etc), sector-specific competencies (e.g. metrics around quality of care in the health sector), or capacities related to an organization's connections and influence within its network. Before discussing how to measure performance improvement, it is important to understand the types of tools that are not appropriate for this purpose:
    - Risk mitigation tools: Some tools, such as the Non-US Organization Pre-Award Survey (NUPAS), exist to assess an organization's financial and managerial capacity to manage donor funds. These tools primarily serve a risk mitigation function for USAID. As such, they are not appropriate choices for measuring improvement in areas of performance that advance an organization's own goals.
    - Tools to catalyze action: Other tools, such as the Organizational Capacity Assessment and Organizational Performance Index, among many other sector-specific and activity-specific index tools, are very helpful for identifying areas for performance improvement. They can be useful to guide discussions with supported organizations when identifying priorities and selecting performance improvement solutions. However, they are not the best choices for measuring performance improvement. Measurement metrics should align with an organization's own objectives, not the predetermined areas included in an index tool. Additionally, completing the questionnaires or assessments involved in these indices can take hours or days to complete, making them burdensome for supported organizations.
  - While it is not appropriate to subject an organization to repeated assessments to measure performance improvement, some of these tools can serve as a starting point for identifying metrics. For example, the **<u>Organizational Performance Index (OPI)</u>** measures four domains of performance: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability. An organization might consider its performance in all domains of the OPI for the purpose of identifying gaps and focusing capacity strengthening efforts, **but select a more limited set of indicators for measuring improvement.** The OU or implementing partner (IP) should assist organizations in selecting a limited set of indicators that are most relevant to the focus of performance improvement.
    - For example, an organization delivering meals to elderly citizens might select a metric of "Percent of meals delivered while still hot" as a measure of effectiveness, or "Number of meals delivered per $100 in donations" as a measure of efficiency.
    - An organization advocating for clean water might select a metric of "Percent of provincial policy decisions on which our comment is sought" as part of relevance, or "Change in number of quarterly volunteers for river clean-ups" as part of sustainability.
- **Elizabeth Hoffecker:** Since the performance priorities and metrics are being co-developed with partners (presumably once engagement has begun), which is as it should be, is this an indicator where targets can reasonably set in advance (e.g. at the stage of MEL plan preparation), or is this one best left for updates to MEL plans a year or so in to a project, once steps 1 and 2 have been completed with partners?

- ○ This is an indicator where partners often select the performance metric and targets in year 2. This allows time for gaps assessments and stakeholder consultations.
  - ○ What you're setting targets on is whether and how much you see performance improvement. But the ways performance improves can change over time. So the targets can be set in advance based on what you expect from past experience. Or if you don't expect improvement to occur every year, you can report a target of 0. But if you don't know what to expect, you can hold off for a year on setting targets.
- **Matthew Bunyi:** Do we lose something in measuring capacity as performance? I feel like there are a lot of cases where we might increase capacity so as to a) prepare for potential programs/interventions or b) increase an organization's own ability to increase its own capabilities/institutional capacity in the future.
  - ○ Performance improvement is a long-term, incremental, and often non-linear process. It's perfectly acceptable (and helpful!) to measure the process of performance improvement, which may include improvements in items we'd usually consider to fall into the bucket of "capacity" rather than "performance" - things like skills, knowledge, or internal processes usually fall into that capacity bucket. This measurement of short-term outputs or outcomes gives us useful information on whether our capacity development activities are proceeding as we expect them to, and generating the early results we anticipate. However, we wouldn't want to count these types of changes under CBLD-9, as that indicator is reserved for performance improvement (i.e. an organization is better achieving its goals, not just its potential to achieve those goals). But it's a great idea to pair performance measurement with measurement of results earlier on in the theory of change.

Questions in Chat for David Schlinkert & Patience Bruce, CARISCA:
- **Maria Rivero:** How do you manage having different partners, with different performance improvement goals?
  - ○ Hi Maria, thanks for the question. CARISCA's goal is to develop individual project plans for each partner it works with. One of CARISCA's main focus areas in year one, was to work with KNUST to improve KNUST faculty's academic and applied research outcomes.. As CARISCA faculty begin to lead student and consulting projects, we envision creating a general survey that asks each partner about their performance improvement goals and what success looks like when CARISCA first engages with them, follow-up with the partner throughout the life of the project, and complete a post-survey to ascertain if the organization has met their performance improvement goals.
- **Maria Rivero:** In the CARISCA example, how do you make conclusions about the organization (university) by looking at the professors' data? How do you aggregate the professors' data and make a conclusion about whether the organization improved its performance?
  - ○ Great question. In year one, CARISCA created baseline metrics about KNUST supply chain faculty research activity to set a benchmark for comparison. CARISCA's goal is to increase the quantity and quality of KNUST's academic and applied supply chain research. To measure the quality, which may be construed as more subjective than quantity, CARISCA will use the Chartered Association of Business Schools journal rankings to measure the impact factor of KNUST's academic publications. For applied research, CARISCA will keep track of where research translation and policy briefs are published, and work with key stakeholders in the supply chain sector to ascertain if program and policy changes have taken place (which is another USAID indicator). If you have any additional questions, please let me know. david.schlinkert@asu.edu

Questions in Chat for John Bonnell & Prof. Jonathan Makuwira, MSU/MUST-ISP:

- **Maria Rivero:** How do you estimate percentages (CBLD-9 definition), when you only have one or two local partners? For example, how are they doing it in the Malawi case?
    - **MSU/MUST-ISP:** Our initial response is that "it all depends" on the program, context, and USAID oversight team. In short, the percentage is either 0 or 100% when only one partner is involved, which somehow does not capture the richer picture. In the case of the MUST-Innovation Scholars Program, USAID invited us to retrofit the new CBLD-9 indicator to our existing capacity development program.Since our program had only one partner institution, they invited a more nuanced way to estimate the percentage (which may be different for programs utilizing the indicator from the beginning). Units could be conceived as colleges within one university, departments within one college, etc. We (MSU) were measuring "design thinking competency" among a selected team of administrative unit leaders charged by the Deputy Vice Chancellor of MUST to design and implement an organizational change strategy. We measure competency in two ways- cognition and application. We do this because, according to the theory of change, both increased design cognition of institutional leaders as well as their application of policies/programs are likely to increase organizational performance. Following insights from various literature discussing organization change and diffusion of innovation, specifically minimal thresholds / critical mass for change, we established a target of ~60% of leaders with high competency across units for increased performance. We then relied upon an already- existing custom indicator to measure individual competency with application to institutional policies and practices.

General Questions:

- **Arvind Raman:** I have noticed that changing academic culture to unlock HEI potential to impact development likely needs changing policy of Promotions and Appt committee's within departments and colleges. Are there any tangible changes in this "academic DNA" that favor development impact that you can share?
    - **David Schlinkert:** Hi Arvind, this is David from CARISCA. One of the key lessons learned on our project is "structure drives behavior." What a university chooses to incentivize will create the extrinsic motivational infrastructure for faculty. One thing that CARISCA is going to do is create and implement a "course buyout policy" that will relieveKNUST faculty of some of their teaching burden, so they can spend more time working on their research. This idea is not a panacea for changing university policy, but is one step towards increasing opportunities for additional research activity and creating a culture of research in a department.
- **Meg Kinghorn:** Is CLBD-9 relevant for all projects or for organizational capacity strengthening projects?
    - **Karen Fowle:** For projects that have an organizational capacity component and/or goals.
- **FiFi Manuel:** How sensitive is this indicator in measuring progress? e.g. organization A improvesin performance in Year 1 and in Year 2 does not make expected progress. How do you count such an organization?
    - **Karen Fowle:** CBLD-9 is a flexible indicator. The project, at the time of indicator selection and target setting, would need to define performance improvement and how it is calculated. So you might specify that an organization must achieve within 10% of CBLD-9 performance metric target each year, or within 10% of targets on average across all years or maybe you are only measuring the performance improvement metric in year 4 or 5 and

the project needs to meet it in those years. You might also define performance improvement as a year to year % change in some metric (+/- 10%).

- **Caitlin Madevu-Matson:** Thanks so much for the presentations and examples. One additional question for the response to go out- in many of the capacity enhancement metrics I have used, the numeric values may not progress in a linear manner. E.g. at baseline an organization may be at level 3 but on follow up, it is at level 2 (due to improved understanding of the metric perhaps, or context factors). How do we account for that in reporting on CBLD-9?
    - ○ Absolutely! Progress in capacity development is not always linear, and the context matters. As you note, moving backward in organizational performance during a period of growth, especially rapid growth, is extremely common. A temporary decline in scores canreflect a transitional stage that is followed by improved performance as new ways of working are adopted. For example, a well run start-up can encounter significant organizational performance challenges as it transitions to a small and then a
    medium-sized firm. Further, organizations that use self-assessment approaches may score themselves higher at the outset, but later score themselves lower as their assessment of their own capacity becomes more nuanced or realistic (again, as younoted in your question).
    - ○ To the extent possible, reflect a realistic view of the pace and trajectory of performance improvement when you set activity targets. It's perfectly acceptable for the first couple of years to have a target of zero or no change, or for there to be no year-to-year change in later years of the activity. For years when targets (and/or actual reported CBLD-9 results) don't increase, make use of indicator narratives to explain organizational characteristics and contextual factors that affect the pace and direction of performance change. You can also consider sharing the feedback of the supported organizations re: the CD support they are receiving in these indicator narratives, or in other reports to USAID.
- **Fred:** To really help us understand how to implement CBLD-9, you need to walk us through its PIRS
    - ○ **Karen Fowle:** Good timing. We have M&E office hours for partners scheduled Sept 16 and Oct 26. We can walk through the PIRs at that time.

Breakout Group Discussion Notes:

Choosing Performance Improvement Measures (with Amanda Satterwhite):
- **Exercise:** This breakout group practiced brainstorming performance improvement measures with a case study:
- **Case study:** A higher education partnership activity works to increase the quality and quantity of research at local universities. The activity facilitates a human centered design process to guide universities in identifying - and creating action plans to address - pain points that diminish research quality and quantity in the areas of administrative policy, faculty hiring and tenure policies, and integration of research in student curricula. It then provides coaches for these universities as they implement their action plans. Additionally, it creates peer-to-peer learning opportunities for universities to meet and share their challenges and successes with each other.
- **Brainstorming:** How could we measure performance improvement in the case study program?
  - **Quantitative Measures:**
    - Average # of days for grants review at contract office
    - Improved scores in research proposals submitted by faculty, students, and/or research staff to a research award process administered by the university or intervention.
    - # of publications submitted to peer-reviewed journals
    - # of research papers accepted in peer reviewed journals
    - # of peer reviewed publications
    - # of faculty members publishing OR specifically faculty achieving 1stpeer-reviewed publication
    - # of journals considered to be worthy
    - Journal impact factor for published papers
    - # of research studies submitted for IRB approval
    - Average # of days for IRB review at Research integrity office
    - # of courses or class sessions incorporating research-related competencies for students (re: curriculum)
    - # of classes with research learning objectives being taught
    - # of faculty who report feeling confident about research design and publishing processes
    - # of faculty who report feeling they have adequate support in sourcing funding for research.
  - **Qualitative Measures:**
    - Satisfaction of external examiners of students' Theses
    - HCD solutions designed to address research pain points
    - HCD learning & application to faculty/leadership work (assessed with interviews)
    - Level of satisfaction with peer-to-peer learning
    - Reported barriers to publishing by faculty (e.g. do they change over time?)
    - Coaches' perceptions of the effectiveness of action plan implementation
    - Coaches' narrative descriptions of improved practices resulting from plan implementation
    - Types/range of journals to which research studies have been submitted
    - Successful strategies used by faculty for publication

How Assessing Capacity Building Can Change the Way We Work (with MSU/MUST-ISP Team):
- **Exercise:** Participants in this group shared stories of intentional capacity building within their programs, focusing on the ways in which measuring change impacted their strategies.
- **Discussion:**
  - **MUST-ISP Example:**
    - We wanted to create an ecosystem that supports faculty to innovate (allows them to experiment, fail, learn). To improve performance, we conducted a training with applied projects; application opportunities are key. As a result of our focus on organizational capacity, a group of faculty act as a community of practice and strengthen group performance (speak the same language).
  - **How did other teams choose which organizational capacities to address?**
    - **Caitie:** In Uganda, it requires a multi-lens system approach, looking within colleges for cases for change and innovation, looking at administrators and directors, providing outside perspectives and finding who is a good entry point in terms of experience, expertise and interest.
    - **Anne:** Working with PACT, which specializes in capacity development, we used a capacity development index - a form of rubric that lets partners ID what they want to be doing, where they want to be at certain determined stages.
  - **How are results actually measured?**
    - **Timothy:** We look at CBLD-9 as two indicators: 1) Competency and proficiency, which is measured qualitatively through interviews with several people (e.g., heads of department). 2) Policy and application of policy. That's examined through 5 separate stages, which are looked at in terms of how they have been applied and engaged with each of the 5 stages. The measure is based on engagement in these 5 various stages.
    - **Jonathan:** From the admin track perspective, we track by ensuring that individual planning for activities have sections for innovation aspects.
    - **Anne:** At PACT, what we're measuring really depends on the partners - financial management, HR policy, MEL and use of results, etc. After that, resources would be brought in to accomplish this.
  - **What challenges have you faced in measurement?**
    - **Anne:** 1 thing: Partners score themselves quite high initially and then, as they learn more about the extent to which things could be improved, they score themselves lower in many cases. This explains the potential dip in score that is sometimes observed in the early/middle of the process.
    - **Caitie:** Great point, Anne! I've found that in some projects when self assessing, scores can be quite high initially. As we learn more, sometimes we realize we know less/perform less well than we thought and our scores can actually go down. It's in some ways a very positive thing (self/org awareness!) but at the same time, it's challenging to reflect "success" in this instance

Non-Standardized Approaches to Measuring Performance Improvement (with CARISCA Team):

- **Exercise:** Using the table below, this group listed research-related organizational capacities that they wanted to impact with their programs and then discussed what performance improvement and measurement would like for each of those activities.
- **Discussion:**

Desired capacity	What would performance improvement look like for this capacity?	How could you measure performance improvement for this capacity?
One of CARISCA's goals is to create high-quality locally relevant research for both academic and non-academic audiences	KNUST SCM department is able to publish in top-tier journals, and influence policy through research translation	Short-term: Feedback on research project proposals Research project management andkey deliverables/milestones Policy brief (trips to the North) Number of research convenings, policy papers, and their impact ASU STA feedback on progress Feedback from stakeholders after deliverables submitted Long-term: Peer-reviewed publications increase in quality and quantity New research partners/collaborators Research sustainability
Ability of partners to use Earth observations in their research or decision-making	Earth observation data incorporated into an existing tool that is used by an organization or co-development of a new tool that the organization can usein their research or to make decisions.	
Local partners ability to support Health Information systems enhancement and scaling	Greater engagement with MOHs in health information system interventions	
Infrastructure to support research and community collaboration	How much can you detach from individual projects to truly see impact	
Connect better or be more integrated with other stakeholders/researchers		Social network analysis, questionnaires
Produce more policy relevant research that considers policy makers needs		

- **Additional Notes:** In LASER, we use Outcome Mapping to assess changes in behavior of our program's partners -- it seems to me that this qualitative tool would be a good source of info for feeding into CBLD-9 [Fred Rossi]