

# **International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications**

## **Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information Phase II External Evaluation**

**2008-12**

### **Final Report**



**October 2012**

Teresa Hanley  
Catherine Gould  
Jonathan Harle  
Kelsy Nelson

## Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acronyms</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background to PERii.....	1
1.2 Evaluation aim, key questions and scope.....	1
1.3 Methodology.....	1
1.4 Evaluation team.....	2
<b>2. Progress towards intended results and effectiveness</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1 Output 1: Capacity of editors and publishers to disseminate national research content via international databases and Journals Online platforms (JOLs).....	2
2.2 Output 2: Capacity of librarians and ICT professionals to facilitate access to and use of research content.....	3
2.3 Output 3: Researchers ability to access, use and communicate research content.....	4
2.4 Output 4: Policy makers and influencers ability to access and use research content.....	6
2.5 Output 5: Southern partners' capacity to monitor, evaluate and revise their training and capacity development activities using appropriate tools and approaches.....	7
2.6 Output 6: Availability of information and knowledge required to enable high quality research that is provided by physical and virtual networks of people and systems from within target countries.....	8
2.7 Output 7: Engagement in the building of sustainable country owned systems, peer-to-peer processes and international networks from people in target countries.....	10
2.8 Output 8: Policy and practice of research information, knowledge, systems and networks demonstrating integration into organisational and institutional policy and planning.....	10
2.9 Outcome: Within targeted developing countries an enabling environment for research communication is owned and driven by a sustainable local network of stakeholder partners.....	11
<b>3. Relevance, sustainability and efficiency</b> .....	<b>13</b>
3.1 Relevance.....	13
3.2 Sustainability.....	14
3.3 Efficiency and value for money.....	16
<b>4. PERii principles and approaches</b> .....	<b>19</b>
4.1 Innovation and Learning.....	19
4.2 Networking.....	20
4.3 Advocacy.....	21
4.4 Equity.....	23
4.5 Training and Capacity Building.....	24

<b>5. Implications for the future and recommendations.....</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1 Using PERii distinctiveness for future effectiveness.....	26
5.2 Measures needed to ensure sustainability of outcomes .....	27
5.3 Measures needed to ensure sustainability of in-country structures and delivery mechanisms .....	29
5.4 Monitoring and Evaluation .....	29
5.5 Management and resourcing .....	30
5.6 Recommendations.....	32
<b>6. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>35</b>

**Annexes (as separate files)**

Annex 1 - Evaluation Framework

Annex 2 - Evaluation Tools

Annex 3 - List of documents consulted

Annex 4 - Evaluation interviewees and participants

Annex 5 - PERii logframe

Annex 6 - Evaluation country visit schedules

Annex 7 - Examples of higher education associations and networks

Annex 8 - PERii evaluation Terms of Reference

## Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank all the people who participated in this evaluation for sharing their time, thoughtful reflections on the programme and research communication and patience with our questions! The INASP staff have been extremely helpful and open in this process. And in particular we thank the country coordinators and participants in Bangladesh, Nepal, Kenya and Uganda for their help, hospitality and time during our visits. These contributions have all helped make what we hope is a useful document for the future development of PERii and valuable work of INASP.



## Creative Commons Licence

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License.

## About ITAD

ITAD ([www.itad.com](http://www.itad.com)) is a recognised market leader in monitoring and evaluation and one of few companies globally whose long-term core business has been the design and implementation of complex, multi-stakeholder M&E systems, and the evaluation of projects, programmes and organisations. We design and deliver evaluations that are independent, rigorous and lead to evidence-based conclusions and recommendations. We specialise in large and complex evaluations, which often involve multi-country studies and require us to manage multi-disciplinary and cross-cultural teams. We maintain a diverse and strategic portfolio of contracts that give us exposure to a wide range of organisational, institutional and cultural contexts and provide us with a breadth of expertise and experience. We employ some of the industry's most experienced and highly regarded development professionals who have the ability to win work and lead projects and work frequently with a compact pool of proven associates. Accredited with ISO 9001 and Investor in People™, we have an enviable reputation for technical excellence, independence and integrity.

## Acronyms

ACU	Association of Commonwealth Universities
AAU	Association of African Universities
BIPC	Bangladesh INASP-PERii Consortium (soon to be renamed LiCoB))
BMO	Bandwidth Management and Optimisation
CARLIGH	Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Ghana
CCs	Country Coordinators
CCT	Country Coordinating Team
CNU	Consejo Nacional de Universidades
CUUL	Consortium of Ugandan University Libraries
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EIFL	Electronic Information for Libraries
EIPM	Evidence Informed Policy Making
GINKS	Ghana Information Network for Knowledge Sharing
HE	Higher Education
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IL	Information Literacy
INASP	International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications
JOLS	Journals on Line
KLISC	Kenya Library & Information Services Consortium
LiCoB	The Library Consortium of Bangladesh
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEERU	Monitoring and Evaluating E-resource Use
NeLIC	Nepal Library and Information Consortium
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OA	Open Access
PEEP	Peer Experience Exchange Project
PERii	Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information (second phase)
POST	Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology
R4L	Research4Life (HINARI, AGORA, OARE, ARDI programmes)
SC	Steering Committee
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TOT	Training of Trainers
VFM	Value for Money

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

PERii is the second five-year phase of INASP's Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information. It works with partners to support global research communication. The programme's intended outcome was that within 23 targeted developing countries an enabling environment for research communication would be owned and driven by a sustainable local network of stakeholder partners. The evaluation aimed to identify successes and challenges to date in PERii and try to understand how they can inform the next phase of the programme. The evaluation combined a mixed quantitative and qualitative approach and included country visits to Bangladesh, Nepal, Kenya and Uganda. Team members had a total of 52 days plus 13 days for administrative support. The evaluation took place over September - October 2012.

### Findings

PERii's intended outcome is ambitious. INASP has made impressive gains across the research communication cycle as well as making contributions to the quality of education. It has achieved much, of which INASP staff and PERii participants should be justifiably proud. It has done so at modest cost, with value for money (VFM) considerations at the forefront of all it does, and with a strong concern for equity and sustainability. Overall findings are presented here though of course, given that PERii covers 23 countries, it does disguise some of more specific findings, achievements and challenges at country level.

**Relevance:** The problems and needs that PERii addresses are relevant. They are driven by a sound analysis of relative need at the international level and informed by an analysis of needs from key stakeholders in the country, though at country level analysis is often quite library-centric. There is clearly an appetite for the INASP inputs such as capacity development, negotiation with publishers, information literacy and support in scholarly writing and publishing, evidenced for instance in the demands for small grants in these areas and in the growing number of people registered in AuthorAID. However, greater attention to the broader research communication needs at country level, also to other organisations' activities and strategies in research communication at country level, and to other factors contributing to the problems that PERii seeks to address would increase complementarities and enhance potential impact.

**Sustainability:** A key theme running through PERii has been sustainability and the intention to build sustainable outcomes and structures. Perhaps one of the most marked results of the programme is the level of country ownership particularly of local structures such as consortia. There is still a long way to go to achieve sustainability particularly of outcomes and to achieve financial sustainability at the country level. This will need the involvement and support of a wider range of stakeholders including senior management of institutions and cooperation with other research communication agencies and stakeholders beyond the consortia which are predominantly made up of librarians to date. But there is a strong country-level commitment to ensure aspects of PERii will continue even without INASP input, albeit at a smaller scale due to monetary constraints.

**Efficiency and value for money:** The PERii programme is run in an efficient manner with VFM considerations taken seriously in programme management and implementation. This is seen across the INASP team and also at country level. Investments are used to generate high levels of activity. The Country Coordinator network is one of PERii's strongest elements, and enables a great deal to be achieved at modest cost. The programme is also run by a relatively small team at INASP level. This limits what PERii can itself seek to achieve, and the pace of change. At country level the additional workload on individuals poses a risk for sustainability. Strong management of INASP's own team is critical if it is to realise the potential of PERii.

**Networking:** PERii effectively built networks within countries particularly of librarians at national level through the establishment of the consortia as well as through training events. The common goal of purchasing e-resources collectively helps bind and strengthen this group. PERii also achieved some success in building the international network of country coordinators. There was less evidence of effective networks being developed between librarians and the research community at either institutional or national levels. At

international level there are a number of other examples of networks enabled by PERii across its thematic areas notably by Evidence-Informed Policy-Making (EIPM). The effectiveness of all these networks will be seen in their sustainability but for the moment they are providing effective mechanisms for individuals to share information and experience. In the future INASP could consider how best to monitor and sustain those networks which are producing benefits to their members.

**Advocacy:** PERii has contributed to some significant advocacy achievements at country and international levels e.g. increasing publisher awareness of developing country contexts, and getting libraries and e-resources onto institutions' agenda. INASP and some PERii partners in some countries have established access to key fora for influencing and relevant partnerships to pursue an advocacy agenda, however this is limited to a few countries and instances. Advocacy and communication are critical areas for investment and where a more strategic approach is needed – both to strengthen PERI, and to ensure INASP's continued success as an organisation. The INASP team has been working during 2012 to develop a strategy and plan for the future PERI3, which includes advocacy more explicitly.

**Equity:** The programme's achievements in equity have gone beyond the annual review of country eligibility. The evaluation found the way that INASP have conceptualised and put into practice partnerships with country-level partners to be extremely effective and achieving equity in those relationships. Furthermore, some programme activities have addressed equity issues head-on e.g. in Ghana, the GINKS network has run a five-day ICT workshop for female legislative members to encourage more female participation in the Ghana assembly. However, overall, there may be a need for PERii more frequently to go beyond an equality approach to one based more on equity i.e. consider the need to provide differential access to give equal opportunities.

**Training and capacity building:** Training and capacity development is at the core of PERii. PERii has undoubtedly raised levels of awareness, knowledge and skills among librarians and a range of users around e-resources and some other aspects of research communication. Some training methods were innovative in the sector such as the cascade approach to training. Methods which aim to build sustainable training resources were found to be popular and in demand by all countries. The evaluation found a demand from librarians in partner countries for more pedagogical support on how to train and engage with e-resource users, as well as for the training content itself. However, the evaluation found limited information about the collective impact of PERii capacity development work across a country or theme. Considering the importance of capacity development in PERii, understanding the impact and outcomes of training and other capacity-development activities is something that should be focused on.

**Learning and Innovation:** As well as its training approaches being innovative for the sector, there have been innovations at the fringes of PERii in the components piloted and added during the programme (EIPM and AuthorAID). However, innovation as a principle and approach has not been central to PERii, perhaps because its purpose was not specifically defined in the programme's design. The challenge for the future remains how to apply and embed the innovative approaches that have been on the fringes of PERii across the whole programme more systematically. The evaluation found INASP as an organisation to be very self-aware and honest, as well as consistent in its approaches and understanding of country contexts and sectoral changes despite staff changes. What INASP has learnt through the experience of implementing PERii is well captured in the new concept note. However, even though INASP has produced a number of case studies and where possible adopted a learning approach, there has not been sufficient capacity to exploit this fully across the programme. It should be given more emphasis and resourcing in any future programme.

### **Implications for the future**

The research capacity landscape is complex with initiatives at many levels. PERii is notable for two things: (1) its holistic view of the research cycle and (2) its emphasis on the infrastructure, resources, systems and skills which underpin all research, rather than focusing on specific thematic or disciplinary areas. The capacity needs in research communication and higher education (HE) are significant. INASP should certainly be ambitious — PERii has achieved real impact — but must take care not to overreach itself. Strengthening the

research and HE system within a single country is a huge undertaking, let alone trying this in 23. PERii can achieve greater impact by focusing on its distinctive inputs and approach but linking this more closely to analysis and initiatives of others to improve the research communication cycle in any one country or thematic area.

Use by PERii of the research communication cycle approach is a strength. However, INASP cannot address all aspects of the cycle in all countries, and so to be effective at national level INASP needs a stronger picture of other research communication networks and activities and how these fit into the research communication and cycle and link with PERii (and vice versa). The evaluation found a real appetite from other organisations for closer cooperation e.g. R4L.

To do this, and to respond more effectively, INASP's own in-country networks need to be expanded in scope beyond the dominance of librarians, and it will need to forge stronger links with other peer initiatives. Analysis of needs and design of approach needs to take into account not just the gaps in skills but also the politics of the context. For instance, in relation to research-policy linkage PERii has developed a unique approach with its focus on 'evidence literacy'. However, this skills-based approach does not take on the politics of policy-making which has a significant impact on the extent of its success. Evidence literacy is one aspect of promoting the use of evidence to inform policy but this needs to be set in an analysis of how evidence informs policy, specific challenges at country level and the potential linkage to other initiatives. Similarly, at institutional level to build research communication capacity PERii needs to consider the incentives to academics to undertake and communicate research and to garner the support of senior management of institutions to embed change and support for research communication.

The evaluation concluded that PERii has achieved change and established a strong foundation at country and international levels to take this further as part of a more linked-up approach to build research communication at country and international level. The evaluation identified a set of recommendations, below, which aim to support the development of the future programme drawing on the experience and evidence from PERii.

## Recommendations

<p>1. Programme design, monitoring and evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Build on the effective use of the research communication cycle as a framework to hang INASP PERii inputs to make it a basis for the analysis of country and global situations which informs the priorities, approach and linkages of PERii.</li> <li>⇒ Focus increased effort on partnerships with other initiatives to achieve results.</li> <li>⇒ Develop a clear theory of change which details how PERii components complement one another at all levels.</li> <li>⇒ Develop more specific aims including a clear articulation of the change the programme intends to achieve <i>within the programme funding period</i>.</li> <li>⇒ Identify specific country and international targets or indicators <i>which can be attributed</i> to PERii activities.</li> <li>⇒ Establish a system of regular reviews which look at progress and impact at country level across PERii activities. These could be carried out jointly with other key research communication partners e.g. EIFL, Sida. Track more systematically <u>results</u> of activities e.g. scholarly publications; skills increased and applied; results of networks; usage of e-resources made accessible.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Stakeholders and networks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Extend country networks working with existing networks such as NRENS and research associations where possible.</li> <li>⇒ Consider a national cross-PERii working / advisory group.</li> <li>⇒ Consider links with organisations that can affect infrastructure quality and availability in-country.</li> </ul>
<p>3. Information delivery</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Work to develop an agreed shared strategy for information delivery and associated activities with R4L and EIFL.</li> <li>⇒ Work with other access initiatives to present clearer information to consortia and users so that they have a better understanding of what is /is not included within each initiative. Consider whether a focus on discovery tools is needed.</li> <li>⇒ Expand the scope of Publishers for Development, to engage with publishers over sustainability and affordability of subscription/access models, including INASP's role as intermediary. Increase the capacity and confidence of consortia able and willing to undertake direct negotiations but continue to offer support.</li> </ul>
<p>4. Quality of education and research</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Ensure PERii's existing work (e.g. information literacy) is understood as more than 'library skills', that academics are involved in its development, and that is embedded in institutional approaches.</li> <li>⇒ Consider and articulate the impact that PERii has on the quality of education as well as research communication.</li> <li>⇒ Build in analysis of the obstacles to quality research beyond access to e-resources and skills in scholarly writing e.g. funding, lack of incentives to undertake research in the development of PERii's strategy to support quality research.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Publishing systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Assist consortia, researchers and editors to understand changes in publishing due to open access etc. through the preparation of advice and guidance notes, online seminars, and the inclusion of OA in e-resource and publishing training.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Engage institutional leaders to ensure they understand the meaning and implications of OA and to encourage modifications to institutional policy (e.g. promotions criteria) to reflect this.</li> </ul>
6. Research policy links	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Consider the wider environment including the politics of policy-making and what needs to be in place to ensure that evidence literacy and other PERii inputs achieve results. Consider how to embed PERii's inputs e.g. evidence literacy into a wider approach to building the influence of evidence on policy e.g. through collaborative initiatives (possibly sector specific) and events; through curricula / training programmes of university courses targeting current or future policymakers and their staff; through processes targeting parliamentary research assistants and committee chair-people.</li> </ul>
7. Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Develop clear strategies and plans for advocacy work, including a calendar of key events where international/regional research/HE policymakers might be engaged, and ensure this is more appropriately resourced in staffing and budget.</li> <li>⇒ Building on the RIN studies, develop maps of the research/HE policy environment at national level in partner countries. Rather than 'snapshots' fixed in time, consider these an evolving resource and seek consortia involvement where possible; consider extending this approach to include some element of 'political economy' analysis to identify opportunities for change.</li> <li>⇒ Develop advocacy materials for consortia, focused on key messages and arguments, and build the capacity of consortia members to present these (written and orally).</li> </ul>
8. Training and capacity development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Building on EIPM experience, focus on pedagogy to ensure that training is effective, and work with academic development and other existing units within universities where appropriate.</li> <li>⇒ Develop a cadre of skilled master trainers with access to a dedicated body of training materials, tools and advice.</li> <li>⇒ Consider additional measures to ensure equity across capacity development approaches e.g. between strong and weak universities, between men and women. This might mean extra support for groups with greater obstacles and methodologies to reach and build capacity of groups less easily accessible.</li> </ul>
9. Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Work with consortia to explore alternate funding streams on a country by country basis and as part of country road maps.</li> <li>⇒ Reduce the burden on key people by encouraging consortia to share PERii coordinating duties across teams or working groups. Provide central INASP support specifically to assist consortia development and promotion to expand funding base.</li> <li>⇒ Ensure sustained follow up to activities to embed change.</li> </ul>
10. Management and resourcing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Develop management systems to ensure continuity in key roles and responsibilities in INASP including cover for any extended absences.</li> <li>⇒ Include a clearer definition of the roles and responsibilities within the organisation.</li> </ul>

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background to PERii

PERii is the second five-year phase of INASP's Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information and works with partners to support global research communication. The intended impact of PERii is that locally-produced research is available and used by policy makers to inform national and international poverty reduction strategies and policies in targeted developing countries. The programme's intended outcome was that within targeted developing countries an enabling environment for research communication is owned and driven by a sustainable local network of stakeholder partners.

The research funding and publishing system is changing rapidly. There are new channels for scholarly publication and communication, new ways of measuring research communication and impact emerging as well as new funding models as a result of moves towards open access. The impact of these shifts for African, Asian and Latin American researchers is under-explored and largely unknown. This evaluation looks at both the experience of PERii to date and its achievements and challenges but also considers the learning from PERii for INASP's future programmes in this rapidly changing context.

### 1.2 Evaluation aim, key questions and scope

The evaluation aimed to identify successes and challenges to date in PERii and try to understand how they can inform the next phase of PERI. The evaluation focused on four key evaluation dimensions. These are:

- **Results** – is the programme achieving its intended results?
- **Effectiveness** – is the programme reaching the target stakeholders in appropriate and the most effective ways; are programme outcomes and relevant mechanisms sustainable?
- **Relevance** – is the programme meeting current and future priority needs?
- **Efficiency** – are programme results being achieved through optimum use of resources?

In addition to the four evaluation dimensions above, the evaluation considered key principles and approaches prioritised by INASP namely: innovation and learning, networking, advocacy, equity, and training and capacity development.

The evaluation focused on the outcome and output levels of PERii as summarised in the logframe (see Annex 5). The evaluation focused on the 23 countries counted as partner countries by INASP. The evaluation divided partner countries into three categories and considered these to different levels of depth as outlined in the methodology section below.

### 1.3 Methodology

The evaluation combined a mixed quantitative and qualitative approach. Evaluation tools are attached in Annex 2. The main components of it were:

- Document review including analysis of existing documentation, evaluations, statistics and financial data (see Annex 3).
- Country visits to four participating countries selected in cooperation with INASP to represent a range of progress in PERii activities (evaluation level one countries - Bangladesh, Nepal, Kenya and Uganda).
- A set of telephone interviews with stakeholders in a further six countries (evaluation level two countries - Bolivia, Nicaragua, Ghana, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Vietnam)
- An online survey sent to country coordinators to cover the remaining 13 countries for completion by country coordinators and key members of the consortia partnering PERii. This received a disappointing response with only 11 responses received in total.<sup>i</sup>

- A one-day workshop and follow up survey with key INASP staff including the heads of each key programme component and organisation management.
- Interviews with northern-based publishers, other organisations involved in research communication and related initiatives.

A full list of interviewees and participants in the evaluation is attached in Annex 4.

## 1.4 Evaluation team

INASP commissioned the consultancy company ITAD Ltd to undertake the evaluation. A team comprising Teresa Hanley (team leader), Catherine Gould, Jon Harle and Kelsy Nelson was formed for the task. They brought experience in evaluation, research communication and in-depth knowledge of university systems in commonwealth countries and developments in the sector. Team members had a total of 52 days plus 13 days for administrative support. The evaluation began with a scoping phase in which the team produced an inception report and started the evaluation proper from 24<sup>th</sup> September to complete by 31<sup>st</sup> October.

## 2. Progress towards intended results and effectiveness

In this section, the evaluation considers the progress of PERii towards each of its intended results at output and outcome levels. We focus on the indicators selected by INASP to monitor progress but also consider the effectiveness of PERii more broadly in relation to each of these outputs.

### 2.1 Output 1: Capacity of editors and publishers to disseminate national research content via international databases and Journals Online platforms (JOLs)

#### 2.1.1 Progress and effectiveness

PERii's approach to achieve this output is through:

- Support for online platforms (Journals online- JOLs) including handing these over to local management
- Workshops to train editors
- Publisher advocacy
- AuthorAID to improve authors' ability to write articles

INASP data for the logframe indicators shows good progress against the intended targets:

- a) The Journals on Line index size has increased by over 50% from 2009 to 2011. By the end of 2011 it held 675 titles (246 Asia, 12 Latin America, 417 Africa), which is well over the target increase of 30%. 90% of articles from a selection of ten random articles were available in Google Scholar which compares favourably with the baseline data which showed less than 5% of JOL titles were included in international databases (Scopus, ISI or similar) when joining a new JOL. The availability in Google Scholar is good but it is not known to what extent this is an increase given that the baseline data is from different database sources.

Evaluation interviews with national journal editors and managers of JOL platforms showed that:

- Journal editors appreciate the information that INASP shares about resources available and changes in legislation.
- Training needs are great - more than INASP (and partners e.g. AJOL) can meet.
- Participants were very positive about the content and learning gained from INASP training notably on editing skills and issues such as ethics and dealing with plagiarism as well as how to use JOLs.

Interviewees could cite specific skills which were improved e.g. electronic publishing skill of some Vietnamese journals.

- Knowledge gained by workshop participants is often spread further e.g. “at the last workshop we ran in Ethiopia - medical students there had a journal and they went back and ran training for their faculty.” (Susan Murray, AJOL).

INASP has adopted a learning approach to this area of work. For instance experience revealed that there needs to be more emphasis on capacity building from the beginning of setting up a JOL platform which is now being applied in new JOLs in Ghana and Ethiopia. In addition, there was learning in the hand-over process, which has been managed more closely in Bangladesh than previously in Vietnam and the Philippines.

The training is effective in building skills and creating networks. However, both interviewees and INASP comment on the need for more follow up post-training to embed new skills. In addition, some aspects of change are more to do with attitudes and behaviour than skill. This proves a challenge e.g. in relation to editors uploading materials: “*While more editors are using the online system, it is still difficult to get more of the editors to accept online submissions and load their own articles (it is easier to get my team to do it for them!)*” (INASP staff member). The PERii approach to changing attitudes and behaviour is less clear than the approach to building skills. Greater clarity on this could lead to more impact.

## **2.2 Output 2: Capacity of librarians and ICT professionals to facilitate access to and use of research content**

### **2.2.1 Progress and effectiveness**

PERii's approach to achieve this output is through:

- Information Delivery – providing resources to use and access; providing a reason for investment in capacity
- Library Development – increasing the skills of librarians to train in e-resources and information literacy; producing a new generation of librarians equipped to work in digital environment
- Training to monitor and evaluate e-resource use to inform decision making of e-journals
- BMO – better Internet connectivity for using digital information and e-resources

INASP data for the logframe indicators shows good progress against the intended targets:

- a) Researchers applying institutional training on access and use of e-resources: 93% of sampled past trainees report they had “used the training as part of their work” (n=746 of which 57% M, 43% F), against a target of 70% (source: 2011 logframe)
- b) Usage of institutional online scholarly literature collections for which training has been provided to end users: 190% increase on 2007 figures with 3,140,215 Full Text downloads, against a 20% target (source: 2011 logframe)

Evaluation interviews with national librarians, Information Communication (ICT) professionals, CCs and some senior researchers showed that:

- Librarians have increased their skills through the programme. But there are gaps and many still do not know enough about e-resources particularly how to train others to want and be able to use them. However, overall their belief in these has grown during the programme.
- There are small pockets of success where librarians have been successful in advocating for and implementing information literacy courses with researchers.
- There are some examples of success through cascaded trainings but investment in training librarians is not systematically leading to a better capacity to reach users.

- There is a gap [of communication] between librarians and faculty members affecting the ability of librarians in PERii to promote and train on e-resources.
- There is limited response when librarians have reached out to their faculties though many are trying out different approaches.
- Often the participants of librarians' training are students.
- Infrastructure problems (e.g. bandwidth and IP issues) are negatively affecting access to e-resources which limits the application of learning from training.
- Where government policy encourages e-resource use, usage increases (Kenya).

As a librarian in Nepal reflected: *"in some cases the users come, in most cases the librarian should go to the users"*. Country stakeholders believe that the librarian role will continue to grow into that of a trainer who enables people to access e-resources. To achieve this they will need more guidance on training approaches; *"librarians need skills in how to teach"* (Librarian, Kenya). In addition, they reported that there is a need for respect between researchers and librarians as well as a need for librarians to have an understanding of writing skills and the publication process.

As the ACU Spotlight highlights, *"with so many users, designing and delivering effective training programmes is a not inconsiderable task... Academics are particularly hard to reach, too busy or reluctant to attend workshops"*. Lessons learned from PERii and implications for future programming are well captured in the 2012 concept note, which concludes that: *"Strengthening relationships between librarians, IT professionals, academics and senior managers will be critical to improving access to and use of information in research"*. INASP staff are also aware of the challenges, including libraries' *"lack of involvement in institutional strategic planning [and budgeting]"* and *"moving from occasional workshops to information literacy (IL) being embedded into the work of the library / curriculum"*. In addition, *"whilst [INASP] can deliver workshops on bandwidth and optimising available connectivity, [they] cannot increase the overall national capacity"*.

In conclusion, great strides have been made in building the capacity of librarians and ICT professionals to facilitate access to and use of research content, and indeed a stakeholder interviewed from another initiative wondered if increases in their e-resource usage had been caused by PERii training/support activities. However results are not always directly attributable to PERii and *"a reliance on librarians means that we cannot be certain that researchers are being made aware of the resources, or when and how this is being done"* (INASP staff member).

## **2.3 Output 3: Researchers ability to access, use and communicate research content**

### **2.3.1 Progress and effectiveness**

PERii's approach to achieve this output is through:

- Evidence-Informed Policy-Making (EIPM)- By building the skills of researchers in public policy institutions to do private policy research and ensure policy makers understand the evidence
- Information Delivery – Subscriptions/free access negotiated
- Awareness raising e.g. competitions. Country Coordinators (CCs) involved in organising workshops/engagement directly with researchers (more in some countries than others e.g. Bangladesh)
- Library development – Training of librarians to develop digital infrastructure (e.g. institutional repository, library automation, federated searching)
- Academics/researchers trained by librarians to use e-resources
- AuthorAID – Writing courses for researchers to support academic communication of research

- Publishing support – Accessing local content from other similar environments

This output has three distinct, inter-related elements of researchers' ability to access, to use and to communicate research. PERii has made good progress in relation to the indicators identified in the logframe.

- a) Target figure was to increase research outputs productivity by an average of +10% on 2006 figures for representative sample of target countries. INASP figures for 2010 publication rates showed an increase ranging from 49-124% for sampled countries for which data is available.<sup>ii</sup>
- b) In terms of the publication of research INASP cites case studies of Panos reports which describe some of the strategies for reaching the media and some resources pull together research findings in a way to support their coverage in the media, however it is not known if these resources actually increased the media coverage of research.

### 2.3.2 Access

PERii has enabled countrywide, online access licences for 31,000 journals, 7,500 books and reports which has resulted in 3.14 million full-text downloads in 2011 alone. This is significant access. The level of downloads, while more of an indicator of usage, does give some indication of the extent to which making resources available amounts to access for students e.g. without access to computers journals being available does not amount to access. The evaluation interviews confirmed that most universities in the consortia would not be able to afford this access without PERii and the consortia structure. Interviewees named some of the benefits of such access which included rises in rates of course completion, affordability of courses for students and the ability of universities to manage expansion with more students and multiple sites.

In the evaluation a recurrent theme was the importance of off-site access for researchers which many universities are now facilitating and INASP ICT training has helped with in some instances. However, the most frequent complaint regarding access to these resources was the inadequate infrastructure, both computers and other devices, as well as bandwidth. This resonates with the findings of the Arcadia/Growing Knowledge study<sup>iii</sup> and was common across both Africa and Asia at least.

### 2.3.3 Usage

The overall figures for usage are impressive. INASP reports that for usage of online scholarly literature collections for which training has been provided to end users there has been a 190% increase on 2007 figures with 3,140,215 full-text downloads. However, the picture is more mixed at country level. For instance, in Uganda the consortium reported falling usage figures which they was unable to explain.

Furthermore these figures need to be considered relatively not absolutely. It can be more revealing to look at country and institution and even user if possible detail. For example:

- In 2011 Tanzania had just over 6,400 full-text resources available to it, and made just under 65,000 full-text downloads amongst the 93 institutions registered as part of PERii. This equates to an average of less than 700 downloads at each of these institutions, a relatively small number per potential user.
- Looking at this another way, in 2007 (the last year for which comparable data could be found) Tanzania had around 50,000 tertiary students (full and part time) and around 2,100 academic staff, but in the same year recorded around 71,000 downloads. This would indicate just over one download per tertiary student or academic, on average, that year.<sup>iv</sup>
- Uganda, with around 137,000 students and 4,100 academic staff (2006) recorded around 42,000 downloads in 2006, and just under 250,000 in the following year, so from 0.3 downloads per person in 2006, to just under two, on average, in 2007.<sup>v</sup>

These figures illustrate the very real complexity of trying to measure the use of digital resources, but nevertheless give some indication of usage. They may provide the basis for more useful statistics to gather in the future.

Many universities in PERii have schemes in place to increase usage including training for all new students, but in a number of universities this training is relatively limited to a two to three-hour session in the student's first week. Libraries in Uganda and Kenya commented on their efforts to promote usage through marketing and were appreciative of the marketing training provided through INASP and its potential to increase use.

It is difficult to know how research being accessed is used. There are plans in some countries (e.g. Malawi) to explore this in more depth through research of their students' dissertations and theses to see to what extent downloaded material is being used.

### **2.3.4 Communication of research**

Identifying the extent to which PERii has increased the communication of research is one of the most difficult areas to assess. In the case of grants to participate in conferences these are certainly giving researchers who otherwise would not have had it, the opportunity to present their work. The pilot evaluation found that AuthorAID workshops were highly rated by participants and that these built both the skills and confidence of participants to embark on seeking publication. The majority of participants also went on to share their training with colleagues. There is clearly an appetite for support in scholarly writing and publishing evidenced in the growing number of people registered in AuthorAID as mentees (over 4,000 and with nearly 900 potential mentors).

However, the evaluation was not able to obtain figures to assess whether there has been an increase in the communication of research. A recent survey of AuthorAID experienced a very low response rate so could not provide any conclusive evidence. The (limited) interviews with AuthorAID mentees in this evaluation identified some examples of researchers publishing and feeling the benefit of the mentoring programme and use of the AuthorAID website. But the scale of this increase is not clear.

In the evaluation interviewees had mixed views regarding whether the rate of research being undertaken and communication of research was rising. However a common theme that emerged was the need for more incentives for academics to undertake research. Existing policies by universities linking promotion to research and in under and post-graduate courses were reported to the evaluation to be inadequate and often side-lined. In particular, interviewees cited the obstacles placed by financial constraints on academics resulting in their decisions to increase their teaching workload and to undertake consultancy work which provides more immediate financial rewards than research.

## **2.4 Output 4: Policy makers and influencers ability to access and use research content**

### **2.4.1 Progress and effectiveness**

PERii's approach to achieve this output is through:

- EIPM: By building the skills of policy makers/staff and giving them access/ability to use research *"The [EIPM] facilitation workshops ... are very effective at sensitising participants to a completely different way of training and the importance of the core message – that policy makers need to be 'evidence-literate' and understand how to critically engage with research in order to use research in policy making. This kind of training is particularly important when we are seeking behaviour change"* INASP staff member.
- Information Delivery: encouraging the production of more appropriate resources, policy makers need distilled information.

INASP data for the logframe indicators shows good progress against the intended targets:

- a) Policy makers and influencers from at least 10 partner countries reported: knowledge of reliable sources; their ability to search online for information; their ability to judge quality relevance and bias of information following INASP training: 406 policy makers and influencers trained (56% M, 44% F)

from 8 countries. Based on data collected during impact analysis of past trainees (n=239 for this programme area), 85% of those contacted reported an increase in their capacity following training (or 203 according to the evaluation team calculation), compared with a target of 200 (source: 2011 logframe)

An earlier evaluation of the INASP/IDS training programme (EIPM) confirmed that the programme had reached relevant stakeholders and had a wide reach. It confirmed trainees felt they learned new skills and ideas<sup>vi</sup>. Evaluation interviews with national librarians, CCs and some senior researchers confirmed the need for these types of activities:

- In Bangladesh, “the government say they’ll use research in policymaking but there is instability and other problems which take priority” (Senior Researcher).
- In Ghana, “policy makers are not using research. Even their own research department does not have good capacity to access and assess research and to link to policy” (member of GINKS).
- Also in Ghana, a small grants recipient has tested the strong perception that policy is not based on research. Initial findings confirm that relevant research exists [for the Health Bill] but is not used. *“There is a need to bring together researchers and policy makers so they understand each other and each others’ processes better”* (Researcher, Ghana).
- And in Malawi, “policy makers don't have time to access information and their assistants are not always that well qualified either” (Malawi CC).

There have been a number of challenges which have affected the effectiveness of the programme including: demand for high per diems and sitting fees from policy makers in some countries; identifying trainers with not just the skills but the remit to provide training to policy makers; and convincing policy-making institutions of the need to embed training capacity in-house (INASP EIPM lead). In addition *“influencing the motivation of policy makers to use research is beyond the scope and remit of PERii”*.

Furthermore, the programme has also been run separately from the core country structures, leading the CCs in some of African countries in which it took place not being fully aware of activities and achievements.

That said, the evaluation has heard from several sector experts that the programme is an effective, relevant and innovative one and there is much scope for it to be rolled out across other PERii countries in any future programme.

## **2.5 Output 5: Southern partners’ capacity to monitor, evaluate and revise their training and capacity development activities using appropriate tools and approaches.**

This was a new output in 2009 as agreed at the donor meeting with DFID, Sida and NORAD.

### **2.5.1 Progress and effectiveness**

PERii's approach to achieve this output is through:

- AuthorAID – making available materials from workshops on the website
- EIPM – by developing training skills of southern partners during training of trainers (TOT)
- Information Delivery – encouraging publishers to provide stats and sending these with commentary and questions to CCs with points for further action
- Library development- training in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) skills and joint work on some small scale research projects

INASP data for the logframe indicators does not directly show progress against the intended targets (beyond the production of targeted number of documents):

- a) M&E of the outcomes of capacity development activities by librarians and ICT professionals: 8 case studies have been published by INASP and partners
- b) M&E of the outcomes of capacity development activities targeted at policy makers and influencers: 1 case study has been published by INASP and partners

Evaluation interviews with librarians, CCs, ICT professionals and training facilitators showed that:

- End of training workshop questionnaires and observation are the two main forms of M&E carried out by Southern partners (e.g. Malawi, Vietnam, Nepal, Bangladesh, Kenya).
- Follow-up workshops are useful for understanding what trainees have done since the initial workshop (Nepal).
- M&E of e-resource use varies across countries. Usage statistics are used in Kenya and in Bangladesh and the CCs are particularly sensitive to the power of these statistics for advocating to institutional authorities with plans to run a MEERU course next year in Bangladesh. The Malawi CC noted a need to improve tracking of usage.
- Not enough POST training has been done to make it worthwhile to evaluate at this stage (Uganda parliamentary librarian).

The evaluation found evidence of M&E capacity-building activities with partners in the documents provided by INASP, for example:

- Two training workshops held in Rwanda on the M&E of e-resources with 50 participants from the Ministry of Education, 10 High Education Institutions (Universities and Colleges), and organisations promoting ICTs in Education and Research Institutions.
- A Higher Education Committee Pakistan presentation sharing their experience with other CCs on M&E work.

In Kenya, the Kenya Library and Information Services Consortium (KLISC) in collaboration with INASP:PERii have presented three Monitoring and Evaluation of E-Resource Usage (MEERU) workshops for member institutions nationally and carried out a survey of the impact of training and marketing activities

However, the M&E of e-resource usage or training activities (whether AuthorAID, EIPM or Library-development related) has not been addressed consistently across partner countries and there is an over-reliance on surveys. There are examples of Southern partners taking their own initiative, for example in Bangladesh an Impact Study of the consortium's activities is to be undertaken and presented to organisational heads.<sup>vii</sup> The evaluation found limited evidence of training design being improved upon using learning generated by M&E. The evaluation also heard from stakeholders that they feel they need further training in M&E. With such a high proportion of PERii training being organised and managed by local partners it is critical in any future phase to place significant emphasis on supporting and encouraging M&E.

## **2.6 Output 6: Availability of information and knowledge required to enable high quality research that is provided by physical and virtual networks of people and systems from within target countries**

### **2.6.1 Progress and effectiveness**

The ways that PERii seeks to achieve this output is through:

- Making information available through better internet connectivity enabled by Bandwidth Management Optimisation
- Providing information via JOLs
- Providing an AuthorAID meeting platform for information and skills development

- Negotiating affordable online resources and supporting consortium development to make online resources available

The programme has made some progress towards the targets set in the programme logframe.

- a) Choice of journals in target countries – INASP reports an 85-100% comparable overlap on the peer-reviewed journals available in PERii countries. This is an increase from the baseline figure of 80%. It compares favourably with the access in high income countries' education institutions. However, this figure needs to be treated with caution given that the research quoted is from a small sample and drawn from Africa only.<sup>viii</sup> There are also significant differences at subject level.

The evaluation survey and interviewees found a high degree of satisfaction with the selection of journals available. However there was some dissatisfaction with some articles in journals (or journals within publisher collections) not being available for free upon subscription. It is not clear if this is consistent with the experience in high income countries too, but certainly is something that is not well understood among all consortia and members and which causes problems for librarians encouraging use of e-resources to users who then find the articles they want blocked.

- b) Subscription costs – 99% of subscription costs in 2011 were paid for by partner country consortia using locally-raised or managed funds. The total value of all subscriptions paid for under the programme is an impressive US\$1,946,358. This represents an increase in the proportion and contribution made by consortia year on year. However, in certain countries a significant portion of subscription costs are contributed by Sida in PERii countries. For example in Uganda Sida funding constitutes 75% of the contribution for subscriptions. The Sida funding will end in 2014. While the consortium is very much aware of this situation and concerned about it there is no plan in place yet for how this funding will be sustained post-2014.

A further challenge is that while the consortia raise up to 99% of their own funds a significant number experience delays in receiving payments from their members. Until now this has been managed by either the host institution under-writing contributions at times e.g. in the case of University of Nairobi for the Kenya consortium or by INASP negotiating or managing staggered payments to publishers e.g. in the case of Bangladesh.

- c) In terms of nationally-published research available via JOLs, PERii is well on track to reach its target of four online platforms that are managed and maintained locally in partner countries. The PERii programme has already three JOLs hosted locally; AJOL, VJOL and PhilJOL. There is good progress in transfer to local management with BanglaJOL and NepJOL. In addition, work is underway to support two new country-based JOLS in Ethiopia and Ghana. Interviewees reported that in 2010-11 there were problems with VJOL which are now resolved due to the securing of government funding, part of its new science and technology strategy. Interviewees also pointed to problems with accessing research via AJOL which has a funding model that includes charging users after their first three free downloads per month. This raises questions about the ability of JOLs to be financially viable and also ensure access to resources suggesting the national model may be the way forward given the success of some countries to secure funding from their governments who are keen to profile their research and achievements as part of wider education and economic policies.
- d) INASP has been very effective in negotiating reduced subscription costs from publishers. INASP has also been effective at supporting consortia at country levels. However, the strength of these countries varies to a large extent as does their sustainability (discussed further later). In addition it is difficult to untangle the roles that Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL) and PERii have played in consortium development to be able to attribute the consortia to PERii at least in Uganda, Kenya and Nepal where EIFL was active running consortia training events during 2009-11. Consortia members themselves do not always distinguish the provider of training and certainly the benefits for consortia are a result of the range of inputs.

## **2.7 Output 7: Engagement in the building of sustainable country owned systems, peer-to-peer processes and international networks from people in target countries**

### **2.7.1 Progress and effectiveness**

The ways that PERii seeks to meet this output is by:

- Support of library consortia and provision of peer exchange and work/study visits for librarians
- Provision of an AuthorAID mentoring platform
- Building links between IT and libraries in institutions
- Public Support Ownership of JOLs and local management
- Building links between country coordinators

In terms of targets to increase the numbers of people actively engaged in international networks, PERii has made significant advances but fallen short of the ambitious targets it set itself. The evaluation did find that while more men than women were supported to participate in international networks, the representation of women was encouraging e.g. in 2011 41% of people to be involved in INASP activities for the first time were women.

In addition to direct support to engagement in networks, INASP has facilitated introductions and links that have been fruitful. For instance the Kenya National Research and Education Network (NREN), KENET is grateful to INASP for making links between it and the OECD which has enabled it to participate in international conferences on research communication and technology and bring back learning to its own consortium.

Furthermore the AuthorAID website has generated success in building a community of researchers from around the world to discuss scholarly writing and communication. By 2012 researchers from 180 countries had visited the site which has now reached an average of approximately 7000 visits per month and highs of nearly 10,000 in some months. There have been an increasing number of discussions on the website and increasing participation in them reaching 243 topics in 2011 with 952 messages, a 181% increase on 2010 figures.

The PERii logframe reporting cites examples of institutional policies supporting research communication. Given the overlap with output 8 these are dealt with below.

## **2.8 Output 8: Policy and practice of research information, knowledge, systems and networks demonstrating integration into organisational and institutional policy and planning**

### **2.8.1 Progress and effectiveness**

PERii's approach to achieve this output is through:

- Information Delivery – publishers optimising their sites for low bandwidth environments
- Public Support – local management of JOLs and AA courses
- BMO/network policies support access to digital environments

INASP data for the logframe indicators shows good progress against the intended targets.

- a) Institutional organisational capacity as a result of improved policies: 100% of 23 surveyed institutions reported enhanced capacity following programme and policy development (2011 logframe).
- b) Examples of new institutional policies to improve research information and communication: 10+ new policies identified (2011 logframe).

- c) Examples of pilots/case studies/best practice documents of systems shared via open access publications: More than five OA case studied published (2011 logframe).
- d) In relation to output 7 INASP cites five case studies which explore successful institutional policies and practice to support research communication.<sup>ix</sup> In addition, INASP staff visited a sample of 18 institutions in five countries in 2010 to investigate if and how organisational capacity is enhanced by PERii. All visited institutions did report enhanced capacity.<sup>x</sup>

The evaluation found some examples of success at institution level particularly in relation to policy enabling the increased access and use of e-resources:

- “University management is very helpful... supportive of budget. We have been able to influence because we have librarians in both the academic division committee and also in the learning resources committee. These committees include deans so it is a good forum to influence” (Librarian, Kenya).
- “The coordination of PERii participated in a meeting of CNU about Strategic Plan for higher education in Nicaragua. In the proposal was included the necessity of the subscription or e-resources for the development of research” (2011 country report Nicaragua).

There was also evidence of success in encouraging publishers to redevelop their websites for low bandwidth environments, with Cambridge University Press releasing a modified version of CJOmobile following Publishers for Development advocacy, and Springer, CABI and Taylor and Francis all exploring modifications to their own sites (PfD 2011 and 2012 conferences, correspondence with staff).

There are a number of countries and institutions where information literacy and other relevant courses are now part of institution curricula and policy. For example, in Kenya attention to information literacy is identified in the new bill on science and technology policy; access to e-resources is a key element in university licensing in Kenya and Uganda. However, there is not a clear link between these results and PERii activities, particularly as a number of organisations are involved in the research communication field in each country and could also have been influential.

The evaluation found some challenges common across some or all countries:

In countries where there is the existence of more than one consortium (e.g. Bangladesh and Nicaragua) for some members it is a challenge to convince their institutional authorities of the benefit of both. In these cases, consolidation of consortia would be appreciated.

Another issue has been the lack of influence and decision-making authority of librarians within their institutions, affecting institutional willingness to pay for e-resources (and resulting in some non-payments of subscriptions). In Uganda, the Consortium of Ugandan University Libraries (CUUL) consortium tries to advise on how to increase influence and encourages institutions to be proactive, as does the consortium in Vietnam. *“We as librarians need to make our presence felt”* (librarian, Uganda).

The evaluation finds that it is vital to have advocacy at the institutional level to embed policies and practice to encourage research communication. Beyond ad hoc attempts made by keen and motivated individuals and consortia to do this, PERii does not seem to have addressed this level systematically. Advocacy to institutions around e-resources was identified by country stakeholders as a priority for the future and a representative from a similar initiative identified that *“Stimulating information use requires policy shift in institutions”*. This would need to be addressed in any future similar programme.

## **2.9 Outcome: Within targeted developing countries an enabling environment for research communication is owned and driven by a sustainable local network of stakeholder partners**

### **2.9.1 Progress and effectiveness**

The PERii approach to this outcome is through the activities and eight outputs outlined above. This is an ambitious outcome and one for which it is difficult to measure progress. The PERii logframe indicators for

this outcome are the policy and financial commitments to the research sector in targeted developing countries. INASP has commissioned four reports exploring trends in four countries: Pakistan, Bangladesh, Uganda, and Kenya. However these reports do not make direct connections to the PERii programme but rather track trends at country level. In addition, the PERii plan is based on a rather optimistic set of assumptions — that policy-makers have the political freedom and will to adopt research evidence, have the political freedom and will to invest in the research environment and that researchers will undertake relevant pro-poor (rather than other kinds of) research. These assumptions are not borne out by research in other parts of the sector e.g. ODI research on research into policy (RAPID programme) which highlights the politics around the relationship of evidence and policy-making around the world.

In relation to the ownership of sustainable local networks of stakeholders, the evaluation finds that there is significant ownership of elements of the PERii programme at country level, notably for the consortia and its role in accessing e-resources and providing training. However, it does not find that discussions on research communication and the broader enabling environment more generally resonated with consortia as part of PERii or necessarily INASP's role.

INASP does have links with a range of stakeholders who are key to the enabling environment for research. These are over and above librarians and include publishers in the North and Global South, journal editors, ICT technicians, some senior management of universities, some NRENs, with academics particularly through AuthorAID and the small grants processes and other organisations working in the sector. But principally INASP and the PERii programme tended to be associated with libraries and librarians. INASP work on scholarly writing e.g. AuthorAID was less well known even by consortia members and its work on information literacy for policy makers and their staff less known too.

In discussions there was a great deal of interest in research, research communication and what would constitute an enabling environment. In the case of consortia this focused on the role that librarians could play. PERii is also supporting the development of other elements of a sustainable environment e.g. online platforms, building the information literacy skills of parliamentarians and their staff. But the connections between these groups and their common contribution to an agenda to build an enabling environment seems to be a perspective and concept held by INASP only.

The evaluation concludes that PERii has undoubtedly done impressive work and made progress in strengthening the enabling environment in many countries and at international level to some extent. However, it would be more helpful to identify the specific aspects of the enabling environment that PERii seeks to address either in a particular country or globally to enable progress to be identified. An analysis of what are the key impediments to an enabling environment in each country, and even institution would be helpful. This can be done collectively to build a common sense of that among network(s) of stakeholders at country and possibly global level with a plan for how this will be built, by whom and through what processes.

### **3. Relevance, sustainability and efficiency**

In this section we consider in more detail the overall PERii programme in relation to three key evaluation dimensions: relevance, sustainability and efficiency.

#### **3.1 Relevance**

##### **3.1.1 Approach**

The evaluation considered:

- the criteria for countries which were selected for participation in PERii, and
- the process by which needs in-country were identified by INASP and other programme stakeholders.

An overview of the evaluation's analysis of the relevance of the PERii approach is below. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the strategies to address these needs is discussed in other parts of the report.

##### **3.1.2 Country selection**

Targeting of countries has been through criteria of wealth and development considering the World Bank ranking and ranking in the Human Development Index. Through evaluation team visits, interviews and review of documentation it is clear that the countries in which INASP is working through PERii are in need of support in terms of development, education and research communication. Given the large number of countries that fit this criteria, INASP has tried to expand the reach of the programme beyond the 23 partner countries and included "network countries". The evaluation did not look in any detail at the approach to network countries but if it is not placing demands on the capacity of the INASP team then this is likely to be providing additional benefit.

One aspect that is important, and the evaluation did not find systematic analysis of in identifying partner countries, is the existence of other organisations working on research communication and how that might affect the INASP programme. Their strategies might be providing similar or complementary support and thus need to be considered in INASP partner country identification and PERii programme approach. However, on a day-to-day level INASP staff tended to have good knowledge of who is working in their different work areas and in which countries.

##### **3.1.3 Identification of needs PERii addresses in-country**

The PERii programme relates to the entire research communication cycle. Many factors need to be in place for it to be effective. PERii seeks to address a range of these. The evaluation found evidence of need for the range of PERii inputs which match INASP's own analysis such as:

- lack of funds in universities to purchase resources without the consortia;
- training needs for researchers, librarians and parliamentary staff;
- bandwidth issues limiting the effectiveness of internet-based resources and activities;
- limited use of research and evidence in parliamentary debate and decision-making;
- challenges to access, production and dissemination of research in partner countries;
- challenges to the dissemination of research to local and global audiences;
- limited support from senior management of some universities to research communication, and from government to research communication; and
- growing student numbers and thus demands for resources.

However, there are also many other needs affecting research communication such as infrastructure issues, attitudes of academics and students to using e-resources, funding challenges for the sustainability of online platforms, lack of incentives to researchers to produce research and the politics of policy-making which impact on the interest in and use of evidence in policy making. There is less evidence of how these and other relevant factors which contribute to the problems that PERii seeks to address are considered in the programme design and in the selection of needs to address.

### **3.1.4 Process of need prioritisation- country level**

The activities in PERii are largely determined by country-level consortia, which draw up a plan for activities for which they want support from INASP. They also make the prioritisation of the list. There is some input from the INASP team according to developments in the research and research communication sector as well as in response to their own assessment of needs in particular countries. This system has worked well and has enabled country-level programme activities to be largely driven by an in-country assessment of needs.

At country level there is evidence that at least in some countries there are quite in-depth consultation processes to identify needs and so inform the shape of PERii activities. For instance in Ethiopia the CC reported the following processes:

“Apart from the annual meeting of librarians to collect the specific needs of institutions for research information, we also do mini surveys and conduct discussions with institutional research leaders. 1. I maintain frequent contact with various stakeholders in the Country to find out the kind of support they need 2. I do presentations about the services and products of PERii at various scientific meetings and workshops 3. I conduct E-resources use and other ICT skills trainings to develop capacity at various institutions”

### **3.1.5 Conclusion**

The problems and needs that PERii addresses are relevant. They are driven by a sound analysis of relative need at the international level and informed by an analysis of needs from key stakeholders in the country. However, greater attention to other organisations’ activities and strategies in research communication at country level and also to other factors contributing to the problems that PERii seeks to address could be beneficial. Locating PERii strategies in relation to other interventions could also identify synergies and strengthen the approach.

## **3.2 Sustainability**

### **3.2.1 Evaluation Approach**

In considering sustainability, the evaluation looked at:

- The extent to which country-level consortia and country-level coordinating committees are sustainable in financial and technical terms
- Whether changes in stakeholders’ capacity resulting from the PERii programme are sustainable beyond PERii
- How sustainable the country-level systems and peer-to-peer processes in target countries are
- Whether the level of engagement achieved in networks is sustainable beyond PERii
- Whether the level of integration of PERii activities into institutions is sustainable

### **3.2.2 The PERii goal of sustainability**

As outlined in the PERii proposal, “the ultimate goal of PERii is to strengthen or build local capacity, so that the activities become country owned, driven, managed and implemented”. The PERii programme design built on INASP’s PERI experience to date and included a theory of how this ownership would be built through: embedding PERii activities in national frameworks; ensuring country follow-on from any INASP-initiated activity; and addressing emerging needs over time, building capacity at the institutional rather than the individual level. The ambition was to achieve not only sufficient in-country capacity for independence

but ultimately interdependence, “where countries or institutions provide guidance and support to similar countries/institutions” (PERii proposal 2008-2012).

This would contribute to the stated programme Outcome: “Within targeted developing countries an enabling environment for research communication is *“owned and driven by a sustainable local network of stakeholder partners”* (PERii logframe, author’s own emphasis).

### 3.2.3 PERii approaches to sustainability

The evaluation found efforts to strengthen the sustainability of structures, processes and activities at country-level to be a common thread throughout the five-year programme. INASP have consistently addressed it in their interactions with country teams, including it: on the agendas of annual Steering Committee meetings with the CCs; as a section for CCs to report progress against each year; and in staff visits to PERii countries, for example the support provided for the development of a Country Coordinating Team (CCT) in the 2011 INASP visit to Nepal. However, repeated calls for, and commitments to, support countries more systematically in their plans for sustainability have not been followed up due to staff changes and reduced capacity.<sup>xi</sup>

INASP are taking a phased ‘reduction in funding’ approach with donor Sida, specifically for subscriptions to e-resources in countries such as Uganda, Honduras and Nicaragua, and have advocated with the World Bank in Washington on “*the importance of locally mobilised funds being well managed and at locally sustainable levels*” (Annual Report, 2011). They have also placed much emphasis on value for money (VFM) and efficiency “*to ensure that our activities are replicable, appropriate and, in time, sustainable in the low-resource environments in which they happen*” (Concept note, 2012).

### 3.2.4 Achievements and Challenges

Sustainable access to e-resources, beyond PERii, was found to be a common concern and goal across the ten evaluation level 1 and level 2 countries and emphasised by survey respondents too. Consortia have either been formed,<sup>xii</sup> or are in the process of being formed (e.g. in Bolivia) to this end and are functioning well as a mechanism for like-minded institutions to gain access that they could not otherwise afford. The evaluation noted a sense of ownership from stakeholders interviewed for achieving sustainability of these structures, as well as a keen awareness that external financial support, both directly from donors and through INASP negotiations with publishers, is time-limited. This highlights real success in an attempt to develop capacity to build capacity from within partner countries compared with “*the reality in consortia models [being] often that Northern organisations direct and manage*” (UKCDS capacity building report).<sup>xiii</sup>

In terms of sustainability of country-level consortia, much progress has been made in Bangladesh, where institutional member contributions currently cover 19 paid-for subscriptions plus technical support to the members, and a new consortium constitution includes a clause “*to ensure that member institutions contribute meaningfully towards sustaining the Consortium*”. However, 18 subscriptions are free of charge<sup>xiv</sup> and interviewees emphasised the need for the consortium to continue to grow in members in order to access further e-resources currently beyond their financial means. There has been some discontent with the current funding structure,<sup>xv</sup> however those same members accept that the range of e-resources via the consortium is greater than they could achieve as one institution alone. As the CC reflects, “*we have developed a good, reliable environment here*”. In Nicaragua, the CC reported the financial support from CNU (the body that functions like the consortium there) for e-resources that was gained this year as a real achievement.

Stakeholders interviewed and surveyed from other country consortia (including those in development) reported less and varied progress in achieving sustainability and the need for a gradual and planned approach for PERii and its donors reducing levels of resources and negotiation support. In Vietnam and Malawi, where PERii financial support has been reduced, the e-resources available to member institutions have actually decreased. While in Uganda and Bolivia, there is a high level of availability of e-resources but this is paid for primarily by Sida. Other challenges across most or all ten evaluation countries include:

- lack of institutional budgets for e-resources and inability to pay on time;
- lack of awareness by non-members of the consortium's existence;
- high workload for tasks that are voluntary on top of day job notably commented on by some African country coordinators and consortia members;
- lack of government (financial) support; and
- publishers driving up prices when negotiating directly with institutions.

In terms of the sustainability of publishers providing free or subsidised e-resources to partner countries, all publishers interviewed expressed appreciation for the access they gain through PERii to developing countries that they would not otherwise reach. A couple mentioned a desire now to move towards working directly with country consortia but also recognise the limitations of national funding for this approach. A representative from a similar initiative to PERii, praised the programme, saying *"PERii goes a step further – it negotiates with publishers, but tells libraries/countries you've got to organise yourselves in country. It expects countries to have greater ability to manage things themselves"*. Following training on negotiating with publishers, CARLIGH, the consortium in Ghana, now deals directly with some publishers but as the Vice Chair noted: there continues to be a need for *"INASP as link with publishers and to provide some support in negotiation"*.

Regarding the sustainability of capacity built through PERii activities, this is of course much more intangible and harder to measure. The TOT and cascaded training approach has certainly begun the process of embedding capacity at the local level, with 72% of training events locally facilitated in 2011 (2011 Annual Report), though the quality of locally-owned training and its effectiveness in developing sustainable capacity is largely unknown and was difficult for the evaluation to assess in-depth in this time frame. The country JOLs, as planned are one-by-one being handed over for local management, with handover currently underway in Bangladesh. Government support is often needed to ensure their sustainability to avoid resulting in models such as AJOLs where some funds are generating by charging for access which undermines to some extent their purpose.

### **3.2.5 Conclusions**

Perhaps one of the most marked results of the PERii programme, as captured by an INASP staff member is that there is *"partner country ownership of achievements"*. This does not mean to say that there is ownership of the overall PERii programme by partner countries (including the PERii logframe) but there is an ownership of local structures and approaches. Country-level consortia, such as KLISC in Kenya and NeLIC in Nepal, are not synonymous with the programme and would continue to exist without PERii, albeit with fewer e-resources. Sustainability, in the words of the Coordinator of NeLIC *"will take time... We're still in the growing phase – until our consortium is sustainable"*.

INASP staff demonstrate a good understanding of, and sensitivity to, the different approaches taken and progress made in each of the partner countries and are committed to *"help them to slowly evolve into fully fledged national consortia"*.

## **3.3 Efficiency and value for money**

### **3.3.1 Evaluation approach**

In considering efficiency the evaluation looked at:

- costs of programme activities in relation to management and administration costs;
- expenditure in-country in relation to activities and as far as possible results; and
- the extent to which VFM was considered in programme management.

### 3.3.2 Costs

Management and administration of PERii amounts to 9.2% of the total budget based on the five-year budget figures.<sup>xvi</sup> In addition, a further 10% is allocated to staff support.<sup>xvii</sup> Given that staff play a significant role in programme implementation as trainers, advisers and sources of information this is a fair use of resources.

### 3.3.3 Costs and results at country level

The evaluation analysed PERii expenditure in three countries for 2011: Bangladesh, Kenya and Uganda. It considered the budget allocated to each country by INASP over and above any support for subscriptions and the range of activities carried out with these resources. Analysis found that there was a high level of activity for relatively modest investments in the country. For example in Bangladesh the in-country costs for activities in 2011 was less than £10,000 and the programme implemented nine training events as well as other activities. In-country expenditure was much higher in countries with active EIPM activities. For instance in Uganda EIPM made up 93% of in-country budgets and in Kenya EIPM made up 80% of all in-country costs. Again in these the level of programme activities is high for the budget. The level of activity for the level of investment represents good VFM (if the quality of activities is also good).

Individual activities' unit costs also seem to be reasonable with figures indicating workshops are generally around £5,000 with participant numbers ranging from 20-50. The intention is often that learning is shared post-training thus increasing its impact. This represents good potential VFM.

There are a number of efficient approaches developed at country level e.g. the Bangladesh model of each member of the consortium making a contribution which enables the employment of an ICT trouble-shooter and thus more effective use of e-resources the consortium pays for.

The provision of e-resources to researchers is provided in an extremely efficient way by the INASP team and consortia, through the negotiated reduction in price, collection of subscriptions by largely volunteer consortia resulting in a large number of resources accessible by institutions. PERii provide countrywide, online access licences for 31,000 journals, 7,500 books and reports which in 2011 alone 3.14 million full-text downloads were accessed.

The element which is less efficient is the collection of subscriptions from institutions which is time consuming for the CCs due in many countries to delays in payment. In addition, direct negotiation by country consortia with publishers is increasing the collective time used in the programme to gain access to e-resources. It is hoped it will increase its sustainability by decreasing dependency on INASP but it is at a cost to the countries in terms of time and in some instances finances when e.g. consortia reported to the evaluation that publishers (try to) increase charges. Consortia consulted identified the need for further training in negotiation skills to increase their effectiveness and efficiency in this process.

### 3.3.4 Value for money in decision-making

The evaluation found substantial evidence of VFM considerations being a key part of decision-making in PERii both in INASP as well as by consortia. The INASP staff leads for all PERii components provided examples of where resource considerations had influenced their decisions about activities and influenced the choice of approach. The INASP use of its small grants typifies its prudent use of resources:

*"We get loads of proposals and are obliged to ask for budgets to be cut down on as trainers ask for per diems (which we won't pay in most cases), overinflate costs, etc. We are very value for money oriented and expect training course costs to be kept low. We match this by keeping our own costs low – so, for instance, INASP staff currently have the same daily subsistence allowance as local partners (£10 per day) and have to provide receipts for all costs (so it's not a per diem)"* (INASP staff member).

### 3.3.5 Conclusion

The PERii programme is run in an efficient manner with VFM considerations taken seriously in programme management and implementation. This is seen across the INASP team and also at country level. Investments

are used to generate high levels of activity. The programme is run by a relatively small team at INASP level and through volunteer structures at county level. This has implications for the pace, scale and impact of programme activities that needs to be built into programme planning for the future.

## 4. PERii principles and approaches

In this section the evaluation considers the achievements, strengths and challenges of PERii in relation to key programme principles and approaches identified by INASP.

### 4.1 Innovation and Learning

#### 4.1.1 Evaluation Approach

In considering innovation and learning, the evaluation looked at:

- How INASP has promoted a learning and innovative approach in PERii, and with what effect
- How effective, appropriate and efficient the PERii structure has been to deliver innovation
- How country-level stakeholders relate to other countries and regions for learning
- What evidence there is of lessons being learned and practice improved from efforts to build capacity

#### 4.1.2 Achievements in Innovation

PERii intended to “instigate and support innovative approaches to enabling and strengthening access to, use, dissemination and communication of research information via case studies, pilots and sharing of best practice with its community” (PERii proposal 2008-2012). There have certainly been innovative approaches taken by INASP in the PERii programme, including the TOT / cascading training to build sustainable capacity, which is rarely seen in this sector – compared with the one-off workshop status quo. There have also been innovations at the fringes of PERii in the components piloted and added during the programme. INASP staff highlight in particular:

- EIPM: The pedagogical approach to learning, developed by INASP and IDS in particular the approach to evidence literacy
- AuthorAID: *“the combination of website, workshops and mentoring is an innovation in that they have not been combined before in this way”* (INASP staff member). Also the recent introduction of e-learning, for which there were 400 applicants (first course)

Results were inconclusive at country level – some stakeholders referred to INASP introducing new ideas whilst others suggested INASP need to be more open to them. Many though did comment on the role of PERii introducing them to new ideas and enabling them to try new approaches, an incremental approach to innovation.

#### 4.1.3 Achievements in Learning

The annual Steering Committee meetings involving all INASP staff and CCs have been the main vehicle for identifying learning from experiences across the programme and building a shared understanding. Many one-off and ongoing peer-support activities have resulted from the CCs networking with one another at these events, including:

- The Bangladesh CC being in touch with Helena Asamoah-Hassan (Ghana) who sent him their network’s constitution and *“helped me develop ours”*.
- Exchange of experiences between the Latin American partner countries, *“because each country has its own advances”*. There has also been participation of stakeholders across countries in the capacity building activities of Honduras, Bolivia, Cuba and Nicaragua.

Peer exchanges have also been beneficial to learning e.g. Uganda CUUL was inspired to set up working groups after hearing of this practice in Kenya, and subsequently gained a small grant to implement this. However, almost all INASP staff reported that learning activities have been limited by the disruption of staff

and management changes and resulting reduction in capacity, specifically: the Peer Experience Exchange Project (PEEP); collection of M&E baselines and evidence; and follow-up activities.

The evaluation team have found INASP as an organisation to be very self-aware and honest, as well as consistent in its approaches and understanding of country contexts and sectoral changes despite staff turnover, though these are often not documented. What INASP has learnt through its experience of implementing PERii is well captured in the new concept note. It is also viewed as an expert in the sector by evaluation country stakeholders and external peers.

#### **4.1.3 Conclusions**

With regards to learning, even though INASP has produced a number of case studies and where possible adopted a learning approach, there has not been sufficient capacity to exploit this fully across the programme. It should be given more emphasis and resourcing in any future programme.

Innovation as a principle and approach has not been central to PERii, perhaps because its purpose was not specifically defined in the programme's design. The challenge for the future remains how to apply and embed the innovative approaches that have been on the fringes of PERii across the whole programme more systematically.

## **4.2 Networking**

### **4.2.1 Evaluation approach**

The evaluation considered the achievements, strengths and challenges PERii faced in relation to *enabling* networking both at the national and international level. Consideration of INASP's work with other networks is mainly discussed in other sections.

### **4.2.2 Findings**

The evaluation found that PERii has significantly aided the development of strong networks at country level. This has been through support for the creation and development of consortia and also through training. INASP staff scored INASP and PERii highly in this area of work. They cited examples of networking between librarians, editors, researchers resulting from AuthorAID, training workshops, consortia, and steering committee meetings. In the survey and interviews many country level evaluation participants also commented on the value of the networks that have been enabled through PERii. Evaluation interviewees had many examples of where networking had aided them in their work and achieved considerable success.

Examples of success in networking include:

a) At national level:

- KENET in Kenya- this has helped to bring the ICT/NREN community together with the content/library community and has helped both parties further their aims and objectives.
- Ghana Information Network for Knowledge Sharing (GINKS) – a network of ICT capacity building professionals, who, through working with INASP have extended their remit to understanding the information needs and skills of their target audiences and providing capacity building interventions that respond to this need.
- Zimbabwe Evidence Informed Policy Network – a new network of research uptake and policy professionals trying to promote a culture of evidence-informed policy making in Zimbabwe.

However, the evaluation also found that networks tended to be being supported between people of a similar profession. There was less evidence of effective networks being developed between librarians and the research community at either institutional or national levels.

b) At international level:

The most significant international network is that of the PERii country coordinators. Good links have been established especially at regional level through the annual steering committee meetings and also cascade training methods and peer exchanges. In Latin American PERii countries in particular there is a high degree of regional cooperation. Other examples include:

- INASP reported the cross-country working group for trouble-shooting access issues- INASP brought together a cross country working group to discuss access issues which has resulted in more trouble shooting being handled in-country and thus being sustainable, though this was not referred to in the evaluation country visits (but not explicitly asked about either).
- A network of trainers of policy makers working in Asia that was formed as a result of our TOT in Malaysia (2012).
- A network of African science journalists that was formed at the end of a training programme we organised in science literacy and communication in Kenya (2012)
- AuthorAID – participants from workshops continue to work together and hold informal study groups and also discussion lists on the website indicate some elements of a community of practice.

#### 4.2.3 Conclusions

PERii has been effective at building networks within countries particularly of librarians at national level through the establishment of the consortia. It also achieved some success in building the international network of country coordinators, though the turnover in personnel means that this is a less stable group and is probably dependent on having the annual meeting to sustain existing and make new contacts.

At international level there are a number of examples of networks enabled by PERii across its thematic areas. EIPM particularly appears to have sparked the establishment of new networks, despite this not being an explicit aim. The effectiveness of all these networks will be seen in their sustainability but for the moment they are providing effective mechanisms for individuals to share information and experience. In the future INASP could consider how best to monitor and sustain the networks which are producing benefits to their members and have a long-term role.

### 4.3 Advocacy

#### 4.3.1 Evaluation approach

The evaluation considered PERii's achievements, strengths and challenges in relation to advocacy along with the appropriateness of the PERii structure and ways of working to achieve advocacy success.

#### 4.3.2 Findings

Advocacy can take place at many levels including the organisational, national, regional and global. The evaluation found examples of success in advocacy at the organisational, national and international levels. Some examples are below.

**Organisation level** – interviewees reported that PERii competition winners have used their grants to explain to institutional administration the role and recognition given to the library – *"just collecting funds from the bursar has given an opportunity to say that an international organisation thinks their library is doing good work"*

**Country level** – in Uganda the consortium achieved success in gaining a seat at the Vice Chancellors Forum which provides an opportunity to put relevant issues on the agenda. In Ethiopia the advocacy to convince policy makers resulted in contribution to the annual e-resource subscription funds from the AAU.

**International** – successfully advocating to publishers for fair prices for developing countries, though the sustainability of these prices is questionable as publishers see the approach as a market entry approach and there is already evidence they will try to increase prices when dealing directly with consortia.

Gaining access to key fora - INASP participation and role in International Conference on Evidence-Informed Policy Making organised by INASP and other partners in Nigeria (2012) provided a good opportunity to promote awareness of the need to build skills of policy makers to use research. In addition, the initiative Publishers for Development in which INASP is a key partner with ACU, provides opportunities for country representatives and publishing colleagues to meet face to face to discuss challenges, opportunities, needs etc. An example of success is the 'Bandwidth challenge' which has been successful in getting publishers to look at their resources from a low-bandwidth perspective.

### 4.3.3 Challenges

The evaluation also found a number of challenges. A repeated refrain from interviewees was for more advocacy to achieve support for libraries and e-resources from their own management. However, there did not seem to be an effective approach to undertake this in many institutions. Much of the messaging that did take place tended to be a one-way cry for more resources by librarians rather than engaging management in a broader research communication discussion.

Staff at INASP pointed to the increasing attention given to advocacy by INASP over the course of PERii. But they gave lower grades to PERii and INASP for advocacy compared to other activities such as training and capacity building. Also, the PERii approach to advocacy has been complicated by the tendency of INASP to take a lower profile in advocacy preferring to support country level participants in their advocacy efforts. However, at international level this may reduce their influence in some circles.

At international level INASP has successfully opened up opportunities for advocacy e.g. by forging partnerships in the Publishers for Development and with ACU. However, the impact of INASP advocacy efforts is harder to identify. In addition, in the absence of a collective advocacy strategy and plan either for INASP or more broadly within PERii it is difficult to judge the success of PERii advocacy.

There is any number of issues which link to the PERii programme aims and potential success. Those which recurred during the evaluation included:

- advocacy to researchers around open access and online publications as appropriate places to publish. In both Uganda and Kenya interviewees pointed to the lack of trust in online and open source publications with many fearing their research will be plagiarised once it is online;
- the position and resourcing of libraries particularly in some private universities e.g. in Uganda;
- motivation to carry out research - the structure for academics which currently does not adequately reward research to make it attractive over and above further teaching;
- advocacy to governments to support consortia purchases of e-resources financially; and
- advocacy for inclusion of e-books in publishers' offers at much lower rates.

### 4.3.4 Conclusion

The PERii programme has contributed to some significant advocacy achievements at country and international levels e.g. increasing publisher awareness of developing country contexts, getting libraries and e-resources onto institutions' agendas. INASP and some PERii partners do have access to key fora for influencing and relevant partnerships to pursue an advocacy agenda. But there is not a collective plan at present. In addition, a recurrent challenge at both country and INASP levels is capacity for advocacy. In the words of a member of the Kenya consortium: *"We need to do more advocacy. KLISC has potential. But it needs to be driven. Who will drive? We are overwhelmed already"*. If advocacy is to be successful it will have to be well resourced and planned across PERii. There are many existing fora, networks and associations through which PERii might engage; some examples in the HE sector are given in Annex 7.

## 4.4 Equity

### 4.4.1 Evaluation Approach

In considering equity, the evaluation team looked at:

- How effective, appropriate and efficient the PERii structure has been to deliver equity

### 4.4.2 Achievements and Challenges

As stated on its website<sup>xviii</sup>, *“INASP works to ensure that participation in PERii activities is open to as many people as possible and that decisions on that participation are made in a transparent and fair manner”*. Equity within PERii was further defined at the INASP staff evaluation workshop as: *“All researchers in the same country having equal access to information; Right for developing world researchers to have their information regarded in the same way as a researcher from the UK/US etc.; Funding goes to institution and not just the researcher; Equitable selection process as a country must meet criteria/standards”*.

The programme’s achievements in equity have gone beyond the annual review of country eligibility. The evaluation team found the way that INASP have conceptualised and put into practice partnerships with country-level partners (not only the CCs and CCT members) to be an extremely effective and best practice way to achieve equity in those relationships:

- As reported in the 2009 PERii review meeting minutes, INASP *“works with its partner country coordinating teams as professional colleagues, rather than as ‘recipients’ or ‘beneficiaries’”*
- According to INASP staff members: *“People have opportunities and choices available to them”; countries “make their own decisions and chart their own course”; with the effect that “all the partner countries feel that they are treated equally/fairly and do not feel that they are being overlooked in terms of support”*
- The Kenya CC finds *“INASP transparent in decision making. Resources [are] open to all if [they] fit priorities and [we] can show benefits”* while the Bangladesh CC appreciates INASP’s shared financial approach of *“you give [money] and we’ll give some”*

Within partner countries, the consortium (or equivalent) is often perceived as more inclusive than other national bodies, being open to both public and private universities for example. In some cases, training has been explicitly made accessible to stakeholders beyond the capital cities, for instance in Nepal where regional trainings have resulted in full coverage of different regions. And in Ghana, the GINKS network has addressed equity in their programming, running a 5-day ICT workshop for female legislative members to encourage participation in the Ghana assembly.

In terms of gender the INASP team is clearly aware of aiming for gender equality. They have carried out their own analysis of trends in their programmes. But this has found some worrying trends in parts of the programme notably in AuthorAID where data suggests that workshop participants are predominantly male and in small grants distribution: over 4 out of every 5 small grants are received by men. In addition there seems to be some repetition in the recipients of small grants and over-reliance on some individuals in-country. This is something to watch in the future. There may be a need for PERii to go beyond an equality approach to one more based on equity i.e. consider the need to provide differential access to give equal opportunities.

### 4.4.3 Conclusions

The development and maintenance of equitable relationships has been a major achievement of the programme. Face-to-face contact between INASP staff and country stakeholders was quoted again and again as an enabling factor by both parties. It would be a real shame for INASP to lose its partnership culture and way of working if becoming more strategic and professional.

## 4.5 Training and Capacity Building

### 4.5.1 Evaluation Approach

In considering training and capacity building, the evaluation team looked at:

- How effective, appropriate and efficient the PERii structure has been to deliver training and capacity building
- How the training focus was identified and how participants have used training in their work
- What evidence there is that librarians and ICT professionals are best placed to provide the training
- What evidence there is that the training provided has become more relevant to librarian, ICT professionals, policy makers and policy influencers' needs
- How appropriate training contributes to an enabling environment in the evaluation focus countries

### 4.5.2 Achievements and Challenges

PERii set out to “[train] stakeholders in practical and strategic aspects of research communication through cascaded learning events” (PERii proposal). INASP recognised that “meeting the needs of country partners [was] not simply a quick fix, but a long-term activity that focuses on building capacity in-country. The cascading training methodology focuses on building the skills of trainers and specialists with the intention of training others within their country, region or institution. The ripple effect of this method allows [training] activities to extend far beyond the initial workshop” (Ideas on the Move case study 2010).

An impressive number and wide range of training events have taken place in all ten evaluation countries, for example in Cuba 22 workshops held under the auspices of PERii / INASP have trained more than 500 people and involved more than 200 institutions. The Cuba CC via a survey response noted as a key achievement of PERii:

*“The implementation of training workshops in all of the country with excellent facilitators and the success of capacity building and development of skills in scientists, librarians, editors, teachers and students to access, organise and manage information available through PERii and in the development of scientific writing skills to publish in international journals of high impact [factor] and thus increase the visibility of Cuban science”.*

The evaluation team heard instances of the ‘ripple effect’ of earlier training within institutions from stakeholders interviewed, particularly of librarians reaching out to their faculty members. A local facilitator interviewed in Nepal (who had received TOT in Ghana) reported that PERii training events in Nepal had had a ‘multiplier effect’; and the model of an initial training with a follow-up workshop 6 months later was found to be an effective way of ensuring practice of new skills in the intervening months. In Uganda, Kenya and Vietnam the evaluation team received requests from librarians for more TOT to build a stronger pool of trainers and skills in training itself. But this was not found across the board and it seems the focus on building librarian capacity has not yet translated to end user (researcher) capacity to access and use e-resources. Indeed the evaluation found a demand from librarians in partner countries for more pedagogical support on how to train and engage with e-resource users, as well as for the training content itself.

What was not clear to the evaluation team is the quality, frequency and penetration of the training events, nor their effectiveness. In the BMO component area, *“supporting locally designed and run workshops was generally restricted to just a few leading examples each year due to budget and strategic priorities in other programme areas”* (INASP staff member). There is a gap in the evidence for what has been the change in individual and institutional capacity within each country during the programme, and how PERii has contributed to these changes. This is in part due to a lack of baseline and follow-up data collection beyond evaluations of the workshops themselves. The latter was identified in the 2009 annual report as a limiting factor to be addressed through more in-depth observational research and a series of impact assessment collaborative research activities; which were undertaken but only in a limited capacity - in terms of methodological design and numbers of countries and beneficiaries engaged. This seems to have been the

result of insufficient staff capacity within INASP. Considering the importance of understanding the impact and outcomes of the programme in this area, this is an area that should be addressed going forward.

Training and capacity building within the PERii programme were judged by all INASP staff consulted to be highly effective in parts or extremely effective overall. And stakeholders in all ten evaluation countries when asked (more generally) what they would like to see in the future, responded with 'more training'. External stakeholders interviewed identified the capacity building activities as one of the differentiating factors of PERii from other similar initiatives. There is clearly a perceived high value in the training content and approaches.

#### **4.5.3 Conclusions**

As highlighted in the Arcadia report: *“Developing skills is not always, or only, a matter of training. Instead, it is relies on changing users’ behaviour”*. Whilst the training methods employed by PERii have been identified as innovative (see previous section), going forward it will be important for any future similar programme to consider specific capacity needs of target groups and tailor capacity development solutions to those, rather than relying on training as the default solution.

## 5. Implications for the future and recommendations

In this section we consider the implications of the findings of the evaluation for future shape, direction and approach of INASP to achieve the outcome within targeted developing countries of an enabling environment for research communication is owned and driven by a sustainable local network of stakeholder partners.

### 5.1 Using PERii distinctiveness for future effectiveness

#### 5.1.1 Distinctiveness of PERii and INASP approach

The **research capacity landscape** is complex and often confusing, with initiatives at many levels. PERii is notable for two things: (1) its holistic view of the research cycle and (2) its emphasis on the infrastructure, resources, systems and skills which underpin *all research*, rather than focusing on specific thematic or disciplinary areas.

However, in a number of areas where PERii works there are also other organisations. The evaluation team considered where PERii has a distinctive contribution which we highlight below and the implications of this along with other evaluation findings for the future direction and approach of PERii.

#### a) E-resource access and information capacity:

Other organisations active in this area include Research4Life (R4L), EIFL, ITOCA, BLDS/IDS. Of the ‘access initiatives’ PERii is notable for its unification of content delivery, library development and information capacity, supporting consortia to negotiate directly, and advocacy engagement with publishers. EIFL training concentrates on repository development while R4L is limited to content provision.<sup>xix</sup> It is notable that INASP has considerable ‘capital’ with R4L and there is a real appetite for collaboration at a significantly higher level.

However, duplication of effort or of resources provided increases the burden on consortia and complicates relationships with publishers though the evaluation found consortia value the reliability of INASP and the costs and publishers included in its lists. There is still an evident need for PERI to negotiate for affordable access, both to assist consortia who lack the capacity to take on this role and to act as a ‘cushion’ for publishers who wish to make resources available but at minimal additional transaction costs; but there is also a need to streamline activities with other organisations active in the area.

#### b) Research-policy links

Other organisations active in this area include ODI, DRUSSA, SciDev, PANOS, IDS, 3ie. PERii has nevertheless developed a unique approach with its focus on ‘evidence literacy’. However, this skills-based approach does not take on the politics of policy-making which has a significant impact on the extent of its success. Evidence literacy is one aspect of promoting the use of evidence to inform policy but this needs to be set in an analysis of how evidence informs policy, specific challenges at country level and the potential linkage to other initiatives.

#### c) Publishing and communicating research

PERii is possibly the only ‘access initiative’ with a focus on authorship – others emphasise repository development rather than journal publishing for example. Other organisations exist which offer training in writing skills but many are commercial and publisher initiatives are ad-hoc. The mentoring approach of AuthorAID is also notable though its success to date is unclear. Some publishers (e.g. Taylor and Francis) seek to develop indigenous journals through co-publishing arrangements, but there are no obvious initiatives which provide the level of support of the JOL programme.

The research funding and publishing system is undergoing profound change. The implications for developing countries are still uncertain, but there are clear dangers as well as considerable opportunities for PERii partner countries. Many academics are very uncertain about open access (and the online publishing environment more broadly) and university leaders often take a relatively conservative approach to

publication. However, the evaluation heard repeated calls to increase support to publishing at local levels to increase access to and dissemination of local research. There is potential here for PERii to do more.

#### **d) Quality of education and research**

PERii's work on e-resource access and information access is important for improving the quality of teaching and learning as well as research. The ecology of the research system is tightly bound up with growing pressures to expand undergraduate (and to some extent taught postgraduate) access to HE. Coupled with limited research activity this means that students are likely to be the major beneficiaries of e-resource access. However, so far PERii has been framed in terms of its impact on research rather than education.

#### **e) Enabling environments and advocacy**

Research funding and policy at national, regional and international levels have an important bearing on what PERI can achieve, a country's receptiveness to particular approaches, opportunities for PERI (INASP staff or country partners) to have influence, and where PERI should concentrate its efforts to be most effective. While recognising INASP's preference for working via country consortia, INASP needs to build its profile as an organisation in its own right. In some cases PERii may be able to influence change via consortia (e.g. national advocacy work, consortia members seeking to influence institutional policy) however in many cases INASP will need to create the channels to enable this engagement by convening institutional leaders, engaging with them via targeted publications or events, or working with other initiatives and associations to communicate key messages.

#### **f) Stakeholders**

PERii has a strong focus on librarians and library development and consortia are primarily e-resource and library development groups. PERii needs to forge stronger connections with academics, institutional leaders and senior managers, heads of graduate schools and other management as well as officials in national agencies responsible for education and research policy.

## **5.2 Measures needed to ensure sustainability of outcomes**

### **5.2.1 The outcomes of PERii**

The INASP staff team at the evaluation workshop defined an enabling environment as:

- 1) Access to research information as part of a global research community across universities/institutions
- 2) Local ownership and structures (e.g. library consortia); local capacity developed to solve issues, find solutions and make informed decisions
- 3) Policy, resource and commitment at national, political and institutional level to do research
- 4) Capacity equally spread across a range of organisations and individuals
- 5) Countries are networked to external agencies, organisations and systems
- 6) Funding across relevant institutions
- 7) Ability to respond quickly to change in fast paced environments
- 8) Key people: enablers that spot opportunities; visionaries, who can make informed choices; with 'dis-enablers' or 'superblockers' circumvented

Aspects 3) and 6) above were identified in the staff survey as being beyond the scope of PERii: "the growth and management of active research capacity i.e. having enough researchers, motivating them to do research rather than consultancy, encouraging their careers etc" and "how donor funding is distributed to countries/institutions and how much is provided".

### 5.2.2 Implications of evaluation findings for future programme design and structure

To contribute to / help ensure:	Any future programme would need to:
1. Access to research information across universities/institutions	Consider the infrastructures currently restricting access & work with other actors to improve these Support the growth of country-level consortia to include a higher proportion of the HE institutions Together, find a way of targeting and reaching the end users to use e-resources more effectively
2. Local ownership and structures	Continue an equitable approach to partnership with national stakeholders Consider the local context of each country and lessons learned from other countries of what has and hasn't worked and why
3. Policy, resource and commitment at national, political and institutional level to do research	Consider whether this can/should be built into programme design, either through working with other national/regional/international partners, or directly
4. Equal spread of capacity across a range of organisations and individuals	In countries where the host institution is dominant, take measures to ensure that programme opportunities are open to all and in particular consider the needs of weaker institutions
5. Countries are networked to external agencies, organisations and systems	Work with consortia and other in-country stakeholders to improve their capacity to network with and advocate to external stakeholders Identify a direct relationship development and exit strategy for key relationships such as publishers
6. Funding across relevant institutions	Continue to advocate to stakeholders such as the World Bank to ensure the sustainability of country-level solutions (and reduce the type of grants that undermine this)
7. Ability to respond quickly to change in fast paced environments	Stimulate and reward response to change at the country level Maintain flexibility in future programme design
8. Key people: enablers that spot opportunities; visionaries, who can make informed choices; with 'dis-enablers' or 'superblockers' circumvented	Continue to identify the 'enablers' and 'dis-enablers', learning from PERii experiences. Be proactive in using but not over relying on the former, and assertive in strategies for dealing with the latter to limit negative impact on effectiveness

## 5.3 Measures needed to ensure sustainability of in-country structures and delivery mechanisms

### 5.3.1 Implications of evaluation findings

This evaluation is conclusive in the relevance and effectiveness of current in-country structures and delivery mechanisms to achieve access to e-resources and local JOL management (where applicable), and in the justification to continue to take measures to sustain aspects of these until they can be fully independent. Where the in-country structures and delivery mechanisms are currently less effective is the local organisation of the training and capacity building events and processes – partly due to their membership profile.

According to the INASP team at the evaluation workshop, PERii will have achieved sustainability when:

- Subscription is paid for [and consortia are] able to mobilise funding
- Institutions train librarians and are able to train others
- Researchers can access and use local and international research and e-resources
- Researchers are able to publish their work in international and local journals
- Country JOLs are managed by sustainable local organisations
- Consortia run all of their own library training for members
- Librarians have appropriate skills for working in digital library environment
- Capacity for improvement of national research – knowledge system is located within stable institutions in the country
- Researchers have access to the information they need and it's provided and managed and resourced locally
- International publisher understanding of in country realities
- Publishers commit to affordable pricing plans for time periods when countries will develop

Suggestions made by evaluation participants for how to support in-country structures and mechanisms to reach these levels of capacity are below:

- Support consortia to become higher profile within their country with relevant stakeholders and key messages (Uganda consortium member)
- Provide support on the writing of proposals and grant management (Uganda consortium member) as well as in navigating the local funding landscape
- Continue to equip national staff with the confidence and skills to negotiate with publishers (Kenya CC) and support consortia to gradually take on direct negotiation whilst working with publishers to ensure prices agreed are sustainable
- Support consortia to seek government funds only if a sustainable model in that country (for example in Bolivia the objective is that universities pay rather than the government, whilst in Uganda the consortium are keen *“to get the government to come on board”*)
- Continue to have a flexible approach to the design of structures and processes and support the development of different models that are relevant to each country context (SC meeting minutes, 2009 and 2010)
- Support consortia and CCTs to identify sustainable staffing solutions that will work for them
- Enable and incentivise 'strong PERii countries' to support the 'weak ones' (Ghana CC), spending time investigating how to share best practice amongst CCs and consortia more effectively (INASP staff member)
- Have a clear exit strategy for each country from the very beginning of the programme

## 5.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

The evaluation found that the approach to M&E in PERii had three key elements:

- a) Seeking to build capacity of southern partners to monitor and evaluate

- b) Monitoring INASP's own activities notably of training activities and workshops but also of pilot initiatives such as AuthorAID and Evidence Informed Policy Making activities
- c) Undertaking small-scale pieces of research which helped to build understanding of trends and change in research communication

This evaluation found some significant gaps and weaknesses in INASP monitoring of PERii. These relate in particular to the logframe. In a number of instances the logframe indicators:

- a) Are unable to show progress towards an output or outcome e.g. monitoring the number of downloads of scholarly materials is important but does not explain how it is used nor the impact that has.
- b) Do not enable monitoring of PERii as opposed to monitoring of change in the research communication environment more broadly, which may or may not be attributable to PERii. This does not enable INASP and partners to learn which approaches are most effective e.g. the outcome indicators of financial and policy commitments to the research sector at country level
- c) Are not representative of the whole programme area e.g. case studies which can be a helpful part of monitoring but need to be linked to broader quantitative analysis to know the case is not just the exception but rather adds depth to understanding the trends that quantitative data provides; statistics based on samples from African institutions should not be used to generalise across the board.
- d) Include statistics which have questions around their strength e.g. citations are to some extent controlled by authors who self-cite or cite within their own networks.
- e) Are difficult for INASP to monitor without substantial resourcing e.g. researchers and intermediaries newly active in networks.

INASP is highly committed to learning and has a very open, transparent organisational culture which supports learning by it and its partners. INASP staff comment on the workload and time taken to monitor and follow programme activities. However, these do not seem to have been brought together in ways that enable monitoring of programme progress and impact overall. To some extent this is due to the way that the programme aims, outcome and outputs are articulated which are very broad and do not always state the intended change that the programme itself intends to bring about at country or global levels.

## 5.5 Management and resourcing

The evaluation found that PERii has achieved a high level of activity for the resourcing allocated to it. It also found that INASP had introduced a number of systems over the lifetime of the programme to increase the programme's coherence and team approach to it. These include developments in planning and sharing information within the team. They also include the adoption in PERii of the research communication cycle as a framework with which to relate the different components of the programme. Many INASP staff refer to use of the research communication cycle as one of the significant developments in INASP's work and in PERii which have helped to build coherence in the programme and more of a shared understanding of how the different components link together.

Almost all staff surveyed reported that the main change during the lifetime of PERii has been the development of a holistic approach and greater synergy between different components. *"This has definitely led to better working across programme areas but am sure there are always ways it could be improved"* (INASP staff member). However, the evaluation found little evidence of this holistic approach translated at country-level, with the exception perhaps of Latin America but this would require further investigation. There is a heavy bias in PERii towards activities supporting librarians mediating access of researchers to e-resources. This is in part perhaps because components such as EIPM and AuthorAID were added later and are perceived as separate to PERii by country stakeholders; *"EIPM is very very separate"* in Uganda as well as Kenya.

INASP has trialled various methods to develop team approaches to countries, aware to some extent of the overload that some CCs experience by relating to so many staff and also that the INASP team may not be maximising its knowledge of and inputs to particular countries. Not all of these have been successful (e.g. country lead- person model) but INASP sustained its learning approach to trial different ways. There are now plans underway in INASP to develop three-year country level plans with team approaches to maximise the synergies between programme components at country level.

The INASP team has been extremely flexible in terms of working approaches and they have managed to sustain the bulk of programme activities during a relatively turbulent time of organisational change and staff turnover. Extended periods of absence by key staff due to maternity leave and ill-health often has resulted in gaps in staffing because no cover was organised for these extended absences. This caused a lack of continuity in following up on plans and experience. It has also meant that some staff have been covering two jobs for extended periods which has also had an impact on key areas of work e.g. M&E. The hierarchy within INASP was highlighted by staff as an issue, albeit an improving one. Programme Officers felt some staff are not always valued and rewarded for their experiences and level of contribution.

Furthermore, while there have been discussions in house about filling some key technical areas that are highly relevant to research communication and INASP's niche, these remain unfilled on e.g. bandwidth management and open access.

## 5.6 Recommendations

<p>1. Programme design, monitoring and evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Build on the effective use of the research communication cycle as a framework to hang INASP PERii inputs to make it a basis for the analysis of country and global situations which informs the priorities, approach and linkages of PERii to build an enabling environment for research communication.</li> <li>⇒ Focus increased effort on partnerships with other initiatives to achieve results.</li> <li>⇒ Provide a clear theory of change which details how PERii components complement one another, overall and also at national level.</li> <li>⇒ Develop more specific aims including a clear articulation of the change the programme intends to achieve <i>within the programme funding period</i>.</li> <li>⇒ Identify specific country and international targets or indicators <i>which can be attributed</i> to PERii activities.</li> <li>⇒ Establish a system of regular reviews which look at progress and impact at country level across PERii activities. These could be to review PERii impact in particular or be carried out jointly with other key research communication partners e.g. EIFL, Sida to consider the collective impact of their support to research communication. Track more systematically <b>results</b> of activities e.g. scholarly publications as result of mentoring; skills increased from training; actions and results of networks; usage of e-resources made accessible.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Stakeholders and networks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Extend country networks further beyond librarians, working with existing networks such as NRENs and research associations where possible. Extend PERii networks to encompass academic development units, graduate schools, teaching and learning units (where they exist).</li> <li>⇒ Consider a national cross-PERii working / advisory group.</li> <li>⇒ Consider links with organisations that can affect infrastructure quality and availability in-country.</li> </ul>
<p>3. Information delivery</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Work to develop an agreed shared strategy for information delivery and associated information capacity activities with R4L and EIFL.</li> <li>⇒ Work with other access initiatives to present clearer information to consortia and users so that they have a better understanding of what is and is not included within each initiative, and any exclusions within publisher packages. Consider whether a focus on discovery tools is needed.</li> <li>⇒ Expand the scope of Publishers for Development, to engage with publishers over sustainability and affordability of subscription/access models, including INASP's role as intermediary. Increase the capacity and confidence of consortia able and willing to undertake direct negotiations but continue to offer support.</li> </ul>
<p>4. Quality of education and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Ensure PERii's existing work (e.g. information literacy) is understood as more than 'library skills', that academics are involved in</li> </ul>

research	<p>its development, and that it is embedded in institutional approaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Consider and articulate the impact that PERii has on the quality of education as well as research communication.</li> <li>⇒ Build in analysis of the obstacles to quality research beyond access to e-resources and skills in scholarly writing e.g. funding, lack of incentives to undertake research in the development of PERii's strategy to support quality research.</li> </ul>
5. Publishing systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Assist consortia, researchers and editors to understand changes in publishing due to open access and other developments through the preparation of advice and guidance notes, online seminars, and the inclusion of OA in e-resource and publishing training.</li> <li>⇒ Engage institutional leaders to ensure they understand the meaning and implications of OA and to encourage modifications to institutional policy (e.g. promotions criteria) to reflect this.</li> </ul>
6. Research policy links	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Consider the wider environment including the politics of policy-making and what needs to be in place to ensure that evidence literacy and other PERii inputs achieve results. Consider how to embed PERii's inputs e.g. evidence literacy into a wider approach to building the influence of evidence on policy e.g. through collaborative initiatives (possibly sector specific) and events; through curricula / training programmes of university courses targeting current or future policymakers and their staff; through processes targeting parliamentary research assistants and committee chair-people that consider their role and influence (and its limits).</li> </ul>
7. Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Develop clear strategies and plans for advocacy work, including a calendar of key events where international/regional research/HE policymakers might be engaged, and ensure this is more appropriately resourced in staffing and budget.</li> <li>⇒ Building on the RIN studies, develop maps of the research/HE policy environment at national level in partner countries. Rather than 'snapshots' fixed in time, consider these an evolving resource and seek consortia involvement where possible; consider extending this approach to include some element of 'political economy' analysis to identify opportunities for change.</li> <li>⇒ Develop advocacy materials for consortia, focused on key messages and arguments, and build the capacity of consortia members to present these (written and orally).</li> </ul>
8. Training and capacity development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Building on EIPM experience, focus on pedagogy to ensure that training is effective, and work with academic development and other existing units within universities where appropriate.</li> <li>⇒ Develop a cadre of skilled master trainers with access to a dedicated body of training materials, tools and advice.</li> <li>⇒ Consider additional measures to ensure equity across capacity development approaches e.g. between strong and weak universities, between men and women. This might mean extra support for groups with greater obstacles and methodologies to reach and build capacity of groups less easily accessible.</li> </ul>

9. Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>⇒ Work with consortia to explore alternate funding streams on a country by country basis and as part of country road maps.</li><li>⇒ Reduce the burden on key people by encouraging consortia to share PERii coordinating duties across teams or working groups. Provide central INASP support specifically to assist consortia development and promotion to expand funding bases.</li><li>⇒ Ensure sustained follow up to activities to embed change.</li></ul>
10. Management and resourcing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>⇒ Develop management systems to ensure continuity in key roles and responsibilities in INASP including cover for extended absences.</li><li>⇒ Include a clearer definition of the roles and responsibilities within the organisation.</li></ul>

## 6. Conclusion

PERii has made impressive gains across the research communication cycle, and has achieved much of which INASP and its staff should be justifiably proud. It has done so at modest cost, with VFM considerations at the forefront of all it does, and with a strong concern for equity and sustainability.

The capacity needs in research communication and higher education are significant. INASP should certainly be ambitious – PERii has achieved real impact – but must take care not to overreach itself. Strengthening the research and HE system within a single country is a huge undertaking, let alone trying this in 23.

The national research communication cycle approach is a strength and is important for sustainability. INASP cannot address all aspects of the cycle in all countries, and so to be effective at national level INASP needs a stronger picture of other research communication networks and activities and how these fit into the research communication and cycle and link with PERii (and vice versa). To do this, and to respond more effectively, INASP's own in-country networks need to be expanded in scope beyond the dominance of librarians, and it will need to forge stronger links with other peer initiatives.

The CC network is one of PERI's strongest elements, and enables a great deal to be achieved at modest cost. While this needs to be understood as part of a country's strategy, rather than solely a PERii network, the burden placed on particular individuals is often significant. This limits what PERii can itself seek to achieve, and the pace of change, and is a real risk for national sustainability. Similarly, stronger management of INASP's own team is critical if it is to realise the potential of PERii.

Learning better about its successes – and failures – presents a real opportunity for INASP, whilst also being essential for the project planning processes of PERii (particularly to develop appropriate M&E processes and indicators); to do so INASP will need to invest in its internal capacity

Advocacy and communication are critical areas for investment and where a more strategic approach is needed – both to strengthen PERii, and to ensure INASP's continued success as an organisation. The INASP team has been working during 2012 to develop a strategy and plan for the future PERI3. A number of the areas highlighted in this evaluation are already under consideration in that plan and so should serve to establish a strong strategy for a future programme.

---

<sup>i</sup> Responses were received from: Ethiopia; Cuba; Lesotho; Nicaragua; Pakistan; Rwanda; Tanzania and Zambia

<sup>ii</sup> Bangladesh 2,066 (+100%); Kenya 1,472 (+49%); Malawi 202 (+59%); Pakistan 6,985 (+124%); Rwanda TBC; Tanzanian TBC

<sup>iii</sup> J. Harle 'Growing knowledge: access to research in east and southern African universities', 2010

<sup>iv</sup> J. Harle 'On not forgetting the foundations of research: capacities and cultures of research and the implications for the use of digital resources in African universities', forthcoming in *Dis/Connects? African Studies in the Digital Age* (based on data shared by Anne Powell at INASP)

<sup>v</sup> *ibid*

<sup>vi</sup> "the programme has had a wide reach, by directly training 23 participants from diverse countries, which in turn have trained approximately 459 individuals. Among the profile of people trained are elected district assembly women, members of parliament, journalists, members of NGOs, social workers, librarians and members of ministries" (External Review of Evaluation of INASP/IDS Training Programme) "83.3% of the respondents said that they have acquired, thanks to the training, new ideas of how to train policy makers to access and use research. On the same question asked to secondary and tertiary trainees, 70.6% of respondents also selected this option..." (External Review of Evaluation of INASP/IDS Training Programme)

<sup>vii</sup> However, this impact study has been planned since the 2011 AGM, though commitment was re-established in the recent consortium AGM in September 2012.

<sup>viii</sup> J. Harle & M. Belcher 'The Availability of Academic Journals in Selected African Universities' unpublished paper (2011)

- <sup>ix</sup> Information literacy training included in institutional wide curricular at the University of Zimbabwe; New Skills Bring New Opportunities: A reflection on the information literacy programme at the University of Zimbabwe [ <http://www.inasp.info/new-skills-bring-new-opportunities-full> ]
- Why Re-invent the Wheel? Sustainable development through sponsorship and network-based training [ <http://www.inasp.info/media/www/documents/2010-00-Why-re-invent-the-wheel-Training-p.pdf> ]
- A Network of Knowledge and Support: The development of a network of information literacy experts [ <http://www.inasp.info/media/www/documents/2010-ZA-InfoLit-Network-p.pdf> ]
- Building from the Bottom Up: Developing and sustaining the Bangladesh INASP-PERii Consortium (BIPC) [ <http://www.inasp.info/media/www/documents/2010-BD-BIPC-p.pdf> ]
- <sup>x</sup> Rural Empowerment Network (Uganda) improved capacity and methods for managing researcher and extension working information services [ <http://www.inasp.info/inasp-ren-report> ]
- University of Matanzas (Cuba) enhanced capacity of the institution through information literacy training for staff. The University Librarian outlined how they were supported by their University Rector for an IL component to be added to curriculum and made mandatory for all students. Thereby enhancing the information handling skills of the institution.
- Universidad Nacional Agraria (Nicaragua) enhanced capacity of the institutions access to and use of research information through improved physical facilities (ICT labs and research information stations across the institution) and researcher observation and discussion. Collaborated by discussions with the Vice-Rector who also referred in particular to the access to high quality resources and information which is helping to enhance research [ <http://www.peri.net.ni/pdf/bibliometrico/espanol.pdf> ]

<sup>xi</sup> For example at the 2010 SC meeting, participants identified that country-specific sustainability plans would be useful. The 2011 Annual Report included plans for 2012 to develop an approach to sustainability, which would involve agreeing time-limited action plans with in-country consortia with regular reviews. Various attempts to develop 'road maps' with countries have been aborted.

<sup>xii</sup> Note that PERI / PERii was not in all cases the main support for consortium development, for example in Nepal and Uganda, the consortia were formed with support from EIFL

<sup>xiii</sup> I. Vogel, 2012, Research Capacity Strengthening: Learning from Experience

<sup>xiv</sup> Subscription figures quoted are from Bangladesh Country-wide Subscription Details provided by the CC

<sup>xv</sup> Some members would prefer to only pay for those resources that are relevant for them to access rather than contribute to the full package and suggest that members are grouped according to their resource needs.

<sup>xvi</sup> UK£ 1, 086,563 for management and administration of a total programme budget of £11,758,588 – INASP 5 year budget.

<sup>xvii</sup> £1,157,563 for five years

---

<sup>xviii</sup> [www.inasp.info/perii](http://www.inasp.info/perii)

<sup>xix</sup> R4L does provide some training and capacity development but this differs from region to region and from agency to agency. In Africa ITOCA provides this.