

RDI Network Scorecard - Users

The Research for Development Impact (RDI) Network is a collaboration by practitioners, researchers and evaluators working in international development. Monitoring, evaluation and learning is core to the purpose of the RDI Network—to strengthen the evidence-base for development. Over the life of our current three-year program, the insights gathered from this process will provide evidence of changes in capacity within the sector; but importantly, will generate insights about the drivers/inhibitors of change.

Briefing:

This is the scorecard for the *use* of research, if you also produce research internally within your organisation please also fill in the ‘production’ scorecard.

This activity should take no more than 30 minutes, within a group discussion and writing down of your discussion notes and rankings.

This exercise asks you to assess and **mark your organisation across six domains**. These six domains are necessary conditions for sustainable capacity development in research development impact.

1. **Vision:** clarity and authority of leadership in relation to prioritising the production and use of quality research evidence for development in policy and practice;
2. **People:** sufficiency and diversity of human resources to implement the *vision* of ethical research for development;
3. **Skills:** adequacy of academic/technical/management/political capabilities amongst the *people* to commission/conduct/translate/engage on/use ethical, quality and relevant research for development;
4. **Motivation:** adequacy of incentives and motivators to utilise the *skills* in research for development impact;
5. **Systems:** adequacy of structures and processes to coordinate and manage *motivated* and *skilled people* in development research impact;
6. **Resources:** sufficiency of resources to implement quality research for development *systems*.

With regard to the above domains, review the Scorecard below, and **assess each domain in your organisational context** on pages 3-5. You **may only choose one ‘progress marker’ per domain**. Check the progress marker that best fits within your context.

Before you start:

Skills domain: Consider a range of skills in this progress marker, including accessing and drawing from research evidence and expertise.

Context: Capture key points of your discussion around the progress markers to provide contextual insights into your reasons and the processes of change across your organisation during the workshop plenary discussion including evidence or illustrative cases.

Scorecard (use):

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Vision	Leaders are uninformed about, or resist, or do not value use of research evidence	Leaders passively or notionally support and value use of research evidence	Leaders overtly prioritise and value use of research evidence
People	Insufficient staff to carry any responsibility for use of research evidence	Adequate staff (women or men) with notional or shared responsibilities for use of research evidence	Sufficient staff (women and men) with dedicated responsibilities for use of research evidence
Skills	Staff lack skills in use of research evidence	Staff demonstrate adequate competency in use of research evidence	Staff with superior competency in use of research evidence
Motivation	Staff are unmotivated or confront disincentives for use of research evidence	Staff rely on intrinsic motivation for use of research evidence	Staff embrace overt incentives to prioritise use of research evidence
Systems	No structures or processes to manage use of research evidence	Informal structures and processes for managing use of research evidence	Explicit structures and processes to manage use of research evidence
Resources	Low level of resources allocated to use of research evidence	Adequate, albeit unreliable, resources allocated to use of research evidence	High level and dedicated resources allocated to use of research evidence

Please fill in the scorecard on pages 3-5 below.

Scorecard on Research for Development (SORD): *Use of research evidence in policy and programming*

Organisation:

Names:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Vision	Leaders are uninformed about, or resist, or do not value use of research evidence	Leaders passively or notionally support and value use of research evidence	Leaders overtly prioritise and value use of research evidence

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
People	Insufficient staff to carry any responsibility for use of research evidence	Adequate staff (women or men) with notional or shared responsibilities for use of research evidence	Sufficient staff (women and men) with dedicated responsibilities for use of research evidence

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity ('expect to see') (1)	Moderate capacity ('like to see') (2)	Strong capacity ('love to see') (3)
Skills	Staff lack skills in use of research evidence	Staff demonstrate adequate competency in use of research evidence	Staff with superior competency in use of research evidence

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity ('expect to see') (1)	Moderate capacity ('like to see') (2)	Strong capacity ('love to see') (3)
Motivation	Staff are unmotivated or confront disincentives for use of research evidence	Staff rely on intrinsic motivation for use of research evidence	Staff embrace overt incentives to prioritise use of research evidence

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity ('expect to see') (1)	Moderate capacity ('like to see') (2)	Strong capacity ('love to see') (3)
Systems	No structures or processes to manage use of research evidence	Informal structures and processes for managing use of research evidence	Explicit structures and processes to manage use of research evidence

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity ('expect to see') (1)	Moderate capacity ('like to see') (2)	Strong capacity ('love to see') (3)
Resources	Low level of resources allocated to use of research evidence	Adequate, albeit unreliable, resources allocated to use of research evidence	High level and dedicated resources allocated to use of research evidence

Reasons:

Any additional comments:

Thank you and please return to the RDI Network Secretariat

We will be following up in about a year.

RDI Network Scorecard - Production

The Research for Development Impact (RDI) Network is a collaboration by practitioners, researchers and evaluators working in international development. Monitoring, evaluation and learning is core to the purpose of the RDI Network—to strengthen the evidence-base for development. Over the life of our current three-year program, the insights gathered from this process will provide evidence of changes in capacity within the sector; but importantly, will generate insights about the drivers/inhibitors of change.

Briefing:

This activity should take no more than 30 minutes, within a group discussion and writing down of your discussion notes and rankings.

This is the scorecard for the *production* of research, if you also use research internally within your organisation please also fill in the 'use' scorecard.

This exercise asks you to assess and **mark your organisation across six domains**. These six domains are necessary conditions for sustainable capacity development in research development impact.

1. **Vision:** clarity and authority of leadership in relation to prioritising the production and use of quality research evidence for development in policy and practice;
2. **People:** sufficiency and diversity of human resources to implement the *vision* of ethical research for development;
3. **Skills:** adequacy of academic/technical/management/political capabilities amongst the *people* to commission/conduct/translate/engage on/use ethical, quality and relevant research for development;
4. **Motivation:** adequacy of incentives and motivators to utilise the *skills* in research for development impact;
5. **Systems:** adequacy of structures and processes to coordinate and manage *motivated* and *skilled people* in development research impact;
6. **Resources:** sufficiency of resources to implement quality research for development *systems*.

With regard to the above domains, review the Scorecard below, and **assess each domain in your organisational context**. You **may only choose one 'progress marker' per domain**. Check the progress marker that best fits within your context.

Before you start:

Skills domain: Consider a range of skills in this progress marker, including effective partnering in research, engaging on and communicating research with users.

Context: Capture key points of your discussion around the progress markers to provide contextual insights into your reasons and the processes of change across your organisation during the workshop plenary discussion including evidence or illustrative cases.

Scorecard (researchers):

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Vision	Leaders are uninformed about, or resist, or do not value ensuring development research impact.	Leaders passively or notionally support and value ensuring development research impact.	Leaders overtly prioritise and value ensuring development research impact.
People	Insufficient staff to carry any responsibility for ensuring development research impact.	Adequate staff (women <i>or</i> men) with notional or shared responsibilities for ensuring development research impact.	Sufficient staff (women <i>and</i> men) with dedicated responsibilities for ensuring development research impact.
Skills	Staff lack skills in ensuring development research impact.	Staff demonstrate adequate competency in ensuring development research impact.	Staff with superior competency in ensuring development research impact.
Motivation	Staff are unmotivated or confront disincentives for ensuring development research impact.	Staff rely on intrinsic motivation for ensuring development research impact.	Staff embrace overt incentives to prioritise ensuring development research impact.
Systems	No structures or processes to manage and ensure development research impact.	Informal structures and processes for managing and ensuring development research impact.	Explicit structures and processes to manage and ensuring development research impact.
Resources	Low level of resources allocated to ensuring development research impact.	Adequate, albeit unreliable, resources allocated to ensuring development research impact.	High level and dedicated resources allocated to ensuring development research impact.

Please fill in the scorecard on pages 3-5 below.

Scorecard on Research for Development (SORD): *Research impact for policy and programming*

Organisation: _____

Names:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Vision	Leaders are uninformed about, or resist, or do not value ensuring development research impact.	Leaders passively or notionally support and value ensuring development research impact.	Leaders overtly prioritise and value ensuring development research impact.

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
People	Insufficient staff to carry any responsibility for ensuring development research impact.	Adequate staff (women <i>or</i> men) with notional or shared responsibilities for ensuring development research impact.	Sufficient staff (women <i>and</i> men) with dedicated responsibilities for ensuring development research impact.

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Skills	Staff lack skills in ensuring development research impact.	Staff demonstrate adequate competency in ensuring development research impact.	Staff with superior competency in ensuring development research impact.

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Motivation	Staff are unmotivated or confront disincentives for ensuring development research impact.	Staff rely on intrinsic motivation for ensuring development research impact.	Staff embrace overt incentives to prioritise ensuring development research impact.

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Systems	No structures or processes to manage and ensure development research impact.	Informal structures and processes for managing and ensuring development research impact.	Explicit structures and processes to manage and ensuring development research impact.

Reasons:

Progress Domain	Basic capacity (‘expect to see’) (1)	Moderate capacity (‘like to see’) (2)	Strong capacity (‘love to see’) (3)
Resources	Low level of resources allocated to ensuring development research impact.	Adequate, albeit unreliable, resources allocated to ensuring development research impact.	High level and dedicated resources allocated to ensuring development research impact.

Reasons:

Any additional comments:

Thank you and please return to the RDI Network Secretariat

We will be following up in about a year.