



Paper on Quality and Measuring the Impact of Development Education

1. Purpose of this Paper

The purpose of this paper is to assist the review carried out by Irish Aid in relation to the priority areas and the effectiveness of Irish Aid support in development education. It is based on consultation with IDEA members and was produced by the IDEA task group on Quality and Impact in development education. With this paper, the task group hopes to contribute constructively to the review process. It is hoped that this paper will allow for further engagement both with the review group and Irish Aid on what is an important issue for future directions of development education in Ireland.

The paper will address this issue in three steps: Firstly, it will provide some general insights into evaluating the impact of DE based on the work that the IDEA task group has undertaken in the last two months on Quality and Impact. It will then, secondly, present some indicators presently used by IDEA members (this is based on a call of the task group to all IDEA members to share the indicators that have been used) and discuss these against the strategic aims of the Irish Aid development education strategy. Thirdly, the paper will make some recommendations in relation to quality and impact and the further process involved in drawing up a performance measurement framework for development education in Ireland.

2. Emerging trends in measuring the impact of development education

There is an emerging literature that gives attention to evaluation – including quality of DE provision and of its impact. Examples (some of which are not translated) include¹:

- *Evaluation en Education au Développement : Une analyse des pratiques et des besoins des ONG francophones de Belgique – des pas vers une capitalisation* ; ACODEV, Belgium, 2009 (French only)
- *Education au développement et à la solidarité internationale. Comment auto-évaluer ses actions?*; EDUCASOL, France: <http://www.educasol.org/spip.php?article53> (French only, a translation is anticipated as part of the DEEEP Summer School this year)
- *Evaluation entwicklungsbezogener Bildungsarbeit: eine Handreichung*; Amnette Scheunpflug; EED, Germany, 2003 (In German only, this very relevant text has been read by IDEA director, an summary of key points could be provided over the summer)
- *Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education*, DEA, UK (2001) (available at http://www.dochas.ie/Shared/Files/4/measuring_effectiveness_of_development_education.pdf)
- *Learning for a Global Society Evaluation and Quality in Global Education*. Global Education Network Europe (GENE), Proceedings of the GENE Conference London, 23-25 September 2003.

¹ The IDEA task group would like to thank Harm-Jan Fricke, UK representative on the DARE forum and chair of the WG on quality and impact for the material provided. His material sent to all members of DARE has informed this paper.

- *How much did I change the world today? Evaluating Development Education: a handbook*; Jane Weaver; [NEAD](#), England, 1993
- *How do we know it's working? A toolkit for measuring Attitudinal Change in Global Citizenship*; [RISC](#), UK, 2008
- *... Are we nearly there? A Self Evaluation framework for global citizenship*, RISC, UK, 2011.
- *Evaluation Methodology for European Commission's External Assistance*; European Commission, 2006 and later dates on the internet:
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/methodology/index_en.htm
- *Evaluating Global Learning Outcomes. A guide to assessing progress in intercultural, environmental and development education projects*. Think Global/CES, UK, 2011.
- *OECD POLICY BRIEF No. 35, BUILDING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF DEVELOPMENT: COMMUNICATORS, EDUCATORS AND EVALUATION*, OECD DEVELOPMENT CENTRE
By Annette Scheunpflug and Ida McDonnell, 2008,
(<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/39/38/41043735.pdf>)

It is evident from this list of publications that the question of quality and impact of development education has become a topical issue across Europe. A number of themes and findings emerge from this growing body of literature, some of which could prove to be very useful for the development of a performance measurement framework for development education here in Ireland. It is also hoped that this year's DEEEP summer school on Quality and Impact will produce relevant result and we would suggest that the development of any performance measurement framework in Ireland will take the outcome of the European discussion of these issues, including the findings of the summer school as this is a meeting of a group of international experts on this topic.

There are a series of trends developing from the literature; we have summarized some of these trends for the purpose of setting the context in which this work is taking place:

a) DE works in a specific context that needs to be taken into account when evaluating impact of DE

In an OECD policy briefing paper Annette Scheunpflug, a recognised expert on evaluation of development education, quotes the development educator Doug Bourn who situates DE in a very specific context: "evaluating and measuring success of the impact of global and development education programmes can only be located within the learning processes and learning. We can and should not lose sight of the relationship between the 'development' agenda and the 'learning agenda'. (OECD POLICY BRIEF No. 35, 2008, pg 14, see also introduction to *Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education*, DEA, London)

It is this specific context that presents a unique challenge in evaluating DE interventions. Across Europe DE is mainly funded through ODA and is therefore clearly situated in an environment that often measures successes in a results framework and in terms of contributing to aims such as poverty reduction, global justice, sustainable development etc.

As an educational response to such challenges, however, DE is clearly located in educational contexts in which very different measurements for impact exist (eg. assessment (formal and non-formal) of learning, skills development etc). As Doug Bourn writes in a recent edition of INDEX "DE's strong political and ideological agenda often creates the problem that evaluation...is being looked at through the lens of development and not in terms of learning outcomes and educational criteria.

This means that DE evaluation is framed within models of measuring progress in terms of changes in behaviour, action taken, numbers of people attending events...Surely a more appropriate approach would be to build into any programme ways to capture and assess what the participants have learned, and how to continuously reflect upon this learning.’ (Bourn, D (2010) ‘Moving from Evaluation to Research in DE’, INDEX (25)).

A performance measurement framework for DE, therefore, needs to establish the link between how learning outcomes contribute to development results. Once such a link is established it is possible to develop indicators for learning outcomes and connect them in a clear line to development results. A recent position paper by the European Development and Awareness Raising Education Forum provides this link by clearly stating why international development needs an informed citizenry:

- **Public support provides legitimacy** for NGOs and governments to take well informed, wise and decisive political action on poverty and global justice
- **Engaged individuals make a difference** through their daily activities (e.g. as a fair trade consumer, volunteer, online activist or voter)
- **Public support opens a space for debate** on root causes of global poverty, thus it allows discussing and implementing systemic changes required to tackle global justice and poverty issues. (This position paper has been published by DEEEP, see website www.deeep.org)

The latter point is echoed in an OECD policy briefing paper: “An engaged and supportive citizenry could be the impetus for the successful reform of development co-operation in OECD countries. OECD governments need political will and support from decision makers to translate the ambitious commitments they endorsed at the UN Millennium Summit (MDGs) and the Paris High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness into concrete policy changes and increased resources for development. [...] In order to win public support and to follow informed public opinion about aid and development both government and non-governmental actors need to better educate citizens about the reform agenda.” (*OECD POLICY BRIEF* No. 35, 2003, pg 11)

Clarifying the contribution of DE to development results in this way would need to be part of the process of developing a performance measurement framework that clearly situates its criteria and indicators for success in the educational context and learning process in which development education happens. The performance measurement framework, therefore, would need to be based on a clear explanation of why Irish Aid in its White Paper has pledged that it “intends that every person in Ireland will have access to educational opportunities to understand their rights and responsibilities as global citizens as well as their potential to effect change for a more just and equal world.” Once the link between this intention and development results is established – and the above paragraphs provide a rationale for such a link – the measurement for success in development education can be developed in clear connection to the context in which development educators work. Measurement of impact and therefore success would then remain in the educational sphere and not be artificially transported into a results chain which was developed for overseas programmes.

b) A performance measurement framework for DE has to take questions of quality into account and distinguish between process and impact evaluation.

Studies on evaluation and development education show that measuring impact of DE is intrinsically linked to the question of quality. While quantitative measures at output level are also important it is the question of quality at outcome level that seems to present the biggest challenge. This is mainly due to the fact that measuring quality necessitates definitions on what is considered quality in education. A performance measurement framework will have to address this question. In section 3 this paper provides a list of criteria and indicators developed by IDEA members on measuring the quality aspect of their work. It is also essential to reflect on why it is important to measure the quality and impact of DE. Measuring the quality of our work is also about learning what we are doing well and doing it better. In this way, the link between measuring performance is not just about proving the quality of our work but also about improving what we are doing. As such the ultimate goal of a performance measurement framework should be about evaluating what we do with the view to doing it better. Qualitative evaluation in particular can be a powerful tool for building the capacity of the sector, as it encourages DE practitioners to openly share their experiences (both positive and negative) and to learn from each other. As McCollum and Bourn (2001) point out: 'The challenge is not simply to provide appropriate methods and tools for evaluation, but to work in ways that build a collective sense of purpose and commitment... development educators form a dynamic learning community with a responsibility to contribute to an open and supportive culture that shares experiences, allows mistakes and encourages risk-taking' (*Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education*,)

A performance measurement framework that aims to improve the quality of the work undertaken in the sector, therefore, should be designed not just from a donor perspective. Annette Scheunpflug describes this tension in her OECD policy briefing paper on evaluation as follows: "Who funds development education often drives the objectives of the activities undertaken and thus determines "indicators" of success. Typical indicators are increased public support for aid or debt cancellation. But this can cause conflict with educationalists who, for example, consider that successful learning does not necessarily result in more public support or public mobilisation. Success may be a learner who becomes more critical of the aid budget. Similar conflicts also occur in evaluation, which is regularly a donor condition and contributes to the perception that it is used for control rather than lesson learning or a combination of both." (*OECD POLICY BRIEF* No. 35, 2008, pg 11)

Scheunpflugs' remarks resonate with some tensions recently experienced in the Irish DE sector: The Irish Aid DE strategy states clearly that Irish Aid wants "the Irish public [to] have the opportunity to be more deeply informed about development and global justice issues, the role of the government and civil society, and to be more critically engaged with the Irish Aid programme". However, recent funding guidelines quote "public support" as an important measurement for success.

These issues point to the fact that developing a performance measurement framework necessitates a clear statement on what constitutes quality development education. Studies from experts in the field of evaluating development education point to the fact that every good performance measurement framework would have to distinguish between criteria and indicators from the very beginning. Defining criteria means making decisions on quality. "The criteria should be the answer to

the question - what is quality? How can quality be described” For organisations developing performance measurement frameworks Asbrand et al (2003) suggest: “There should be a discussion that leads to a consensus within the group or organisation on what they consider is good global education”. (Barbara Asbrand and Dr Gregor Lang-WOJTASIK PRACTICAL TOOLS FOR EVALUATING GLOBAL EDUCATION, in: *Learning for a Global Society Evaluation and Quality in Global Education*, pg 74 ff.)

We would maintain that such a discussion would need to take place with the DE sector before a performance measurement framework can be completed. Defining the criteria for what is quality development education should be a task that both donors and recipients of funds should develop in partnership. Clarity around criteria for quality DE will then allow the development of relevant indicators that show whether the criteria for quality DE have been met.

Secondly, it is important to manage expectations in relation to developing a performance measurement framework to demonstrate the impact of DE. As a long-term investment into increasing people’s knowledge, skills and attitudes creating a measurable impact will take time. This is particularly difficult for programmes with a limited time span of maximum three years. While organisations and projects should be able to measure their individual impact on their specified target audience it is more difficult for them to do this in relation to the sector. In this case the sector needs help from Irish Aid and/or umbrella groups to establish measurements for the impact of the sector as a whole. Impact understood as the long term changes that interventions are aiming to achieve need to be backed up by tracking exercises, intelligent polling² or longitudinal surveys.

It is therefore vital, that in developing indicators for success a distinction is made between process and impact evaluation. A recent publication of Think Global (former DEA) discusses a very convincing focus on “outcomes” for evaluating global learning outcomes. In their *Guide to assessing progress in intercultural environmental and development education projects*, they promote a method that seems to be very adequate for measuring outcomes in development education. Rather than focussing on the big, and difficult to measure, impact at the end of the project they focus on measuring a set of intermediate learning outcomes which allows the project to put forward a clear project plan and to define progress makers that they are able to measure as they go along with their intervention. For each intermediate outcome the project/programme is required to define the criteria of the progress they want to see (e.g., from “increased awareness of global interdependence amongst young people” to “seeing themselves as agent of change” to “more young people take critical, informed action as active global citizens”) and develop a set of clear indicators to make sure they can check whether these criteria are met.

² “A lesson learnt from evaluations is their (polls) limited potential for assessing the impact of an activity on public awareness and learning. Public opinion polls may provide indicators about awareness, which can be tested for correlations with awareness raising and learning strategies (Fransman *et al.*, 2004). However, they are not always the magic solution to measuring impact because surveys are rarely conducted both before and after the activity due to expense, time and, sometimes, poor planning. In addition, surveys are often embroiled in a political agenda looking for endorsement of policies. They do not always contribute to, or serve as an evaluation tool [...]. Furthermore, cost is often an obstacle to conducting comprehensive and longitudinal opinion surveys.” (OECD POLICY BRIEF No. 35, 2008, pg 27)

This approach also clearly distinguishes between outputs and outcomes each of which have defined criteria assigned with indicators measuring whether these criteria are being met. At project and programme level this approach seems to be the most adequate for measuring the success of development education. Following this approach a performance measurement framework would need to address the following areas:

- Develop both criteria and indicators at output and outcome level
- Allow for progress criteria and indicators so that projects/programmes can show progress by reaching per-defined milestones or progress markers
- Distinguish between criteria and indicators at project/programme level and criteria and indicators for long-term impact. The latter would need to be measured on a long-term basis and at sectoral level and would require input from agencies outside the project/programme structure.

3. Criteria and indicators

In preparation for this paper the IDEA task group has asked IDEA members to provide them with indicators they use to evaluate the success of their interventions. The responses show that there is a breadth of indicators used and that in many cases IDEA members have developed a clear structure of how to evaluate their work: Some of those indicators include (please note that we did not ask IDEA members to provide us with the criteria that are measured by these indicators):

At output level:

Basic quantitative measures of what was delivered by the organisation and what was taken up by target groups include:

- # of schools/groups/individuals participating in a programme/course/event
- # of sessions/meetings held
- % of participants who complete a programme
- # of publications/resources/webpages produced
- # of visits to a website
- # of posts to a blog, facebook page etc.
- # of people who join an organisation

Some indicators at output level also attempt to measure the quality aspect of a programme. At the simplest level, these indicators can be quantitative, such as:

- % of participants who give the programme an overall positive rating (e.g, 'very good' or better) on a written or online survey
- % of participants who state that the programme has been useful in their practice (can be measured short, medium or long-term)
- % of participants who participate in follow-up activities

At outcome level:

There are indicators relating specifically to behavioural change. These qualitative indicators attempt to measure the extent to which a programme caused behavioural change in participants. Ideally, the data would be collected by independent bodies but in practice, it seems to be gathered by asking participants to self-report. It also should be noted that there are some questions around attributing behavioural changes to any particular initiative. Indicators of behavioural change include:

- % of participants who take an action/ join relevant activist groups or campaigns
- % of participants who go on to further study/training in the area
- % of participants who change their consumer behaviour and/or lifestyle choices
- Progress towards 'markers' of desired behavioural changes

Other outcome indicators are related more specifically to learning outcomes: These indicators are much more complex, as they attempt to measure change in relation to a programme's intended learning outcomes in the areas of *knowledge* (complexity of responses, increase in knowledge about an issue, etc.), *skills* (key skills as developed by the NCCA such as critical thinking, information processing etc.) and *attitudes* (reduced stereotyping, acceptance of different (cultural) viewpoints, etc.).

Some organisations have also developed indicators to assess the quality of their work such as how peers and/or external bodies assess the quality of a programme/publication --- e.g, audits of external publications that cite the organisation's work.

Evaluation tools:

The *tools* used by IDEA members to measure learning outcomes include:

- baseline and end-of-programme activity
- summative evaluation forms
- narrative inquiry
- continuums and scales
- ipsative assessments
- materials produced during the project
- reflective journals
- observation of participants
- focus groups/interviews

Criteria for Quality

At a recent meeting of development educators across Europe the following elements were suggested to define quality and impact of DE, some of which relate to organisational components, others to target groups or audiences.³

³ The listed elements are taken from an report on the outcomes of a workshop on Quality and Impact by the DARE WG at their last meeting in May 2011; See footnote 1 for acknowledgment and reference.

- Organisational elements:
 - ◇ recognition of the **value of and support for DE&AR in the organisation or network** (e.g. the extent to which the purpose, work and ethos of the network or organisation explicitly values and supports DE&AR)
 - ◇ **planning and management** (i.e. the extent to which plan development and management of DE&AR work is done systematically)
 - ◇ **coherence** (i.e. the extent to which DE&AR build on and make use of policies, frameworks, or actions carried out by ‘third parties’)
 - ◇ **monitoring and evaluation** (i.e. the extent to which M&E is planned, executed and used)
 - ◇ **capacity development and learning** (i.e. the extent to which staff development/training and organisational learning about and for DE&AR is used explicitly in an organisation or network)
- Ways of working with external audiences, partners, beneficiaries:
 - ◇ **partnership** (i.e. the extent to which the work makes use of explicit and defined partnership approaches with others)
 - ◇ **participation** (i.e. the extent to which the DE&AR work engages the audience/partners/beneficiaries)
 - ◇ **plurality** (i.e. the extent to which the DE&AR work addresses and builds on different perspectives, for instance - but not exclusively - ‘Southern perspectives’)
 - ◇ **development of knowledge, understanding, skills, values, attitudes** (i.e. the extent to which these are explicitly addressed in the work done)
 - ◇ **sustainability and impact** (i.e. the extent to which DE&AR work done by the network or organisation leads to lasting attention by the audience, partners, beneficiaries, e.g. through informed quality action and/or changes in ideas, behaviour or dispositions)

4. Towards a Performance Measurement Framework for DE

The IDEA task group is conscious of the fact that the performance measurement framework which will be developed by Irish Aid will have to link into measuring the strategic aims set out in the current Irish Aid DE strategy. We feel that some of the above indicators (and the list of quality elements provided by the DARE WG on Quality and Impact) could prove to be useful in developing the performance measurement framework. It is hoped that the framework will allow organisations to develop their own criteria and indicators for success as long as they are connectable to the overall framework (in relation to the Irish Aid supported part of their project/programme). We feel that such a differentiation would be important as DE in Ireland will be delivered by the concerted efforts of small-scale projects, multi-annual programmes, networks, DE sections of NGOs, dedicated development education NGOs, community groups and others. The variety of DE organisations is one of the strengths of the sector here in Ireland and allowing a differentiation between the various forms of DE interventions in terms of measuring their effectiveness according to their aims, objectives and scale will be essential. Especially when talking about impact it is vital to make sure that a framework will show how small scale projects contribute to impact, bearing in mind that impact in education is often measured in decades rather than months.

In relation to the four strategic objectives of the Irish Aid DE strategy it seems to be important that criteria for the success of Irish Aid supported interventions have to be set against the strategic aims of the Irish Aid development education strategy, namely Coherence (SA 1), Quality (SA 2), Integration (SA 3) and Public Awareness (SA 4). For each of these areas there are a number of

criteria and indicators that can be used against these aims. (The review will most likely show, that there are projects in Ireland that do DE work that is not directly related to Irish Aid support and yet those projects contribute to the overall impact of DE. It would be desirable if the performance measurement framework could capture this aspect as well by acknowledging the added value of such interventions to the overall impact)

Below, the IDEA task group has provided some sample criteria and indicators for the four strategic aims of IDEA based on the feedback that we have received from our members. Please note that these are sample criteria/indicators only. We understand that a list of criteria and indicators will be developed by Irish Aid and the IDEA task group on Quality and Impact would be happy to be further involved in the discussion around the development of the criteria and indicators over the coming months. Below we have tried to give illustrative examples of how such criteria and indicators could be developed in accordance with the strategic objective of the Irish Aid DE strategy. This is not an extensive list but an attempt to start a conversation on issues related to Irish Aid objectives as stated in its DE strategy. Under each strategic aim, we have attempted to give some pointers in relation to the main questions that need to be considered.

Strategic Aim one: Coherence

Under this objective the examples are trying to illustrate the distinction that is made in the paper between output and outcome criteria/indicators. In line with new research on outcome mapping we would suggest to have progress markers defined (for an example see below under strategic aim 2)

Output:

Criteria	Indicator
Cooperation with DES is enhanced	Number of meetings with the DES Number of times DE is mentioned at the cross-departmental working group
Educational policies contain DE messages	Number of educational policies containing developed messages
Quality Research	Number of research articles on DE

Outcome:

Criteria	Indicator
Cooperation with DES is enhanced (Enhancement is defined as increased awareness and buy-in from people at senior management level and increased commitment to integrate messages)	Senior members of DES attend DE events and are open to conversations and dialogue DE becomes visible in DES communications and policies

Educational policies contain DE messages	Quality and depth of dev ed messages contained in policies
Quality Research	Indicators for research should follow academic standards (peer-reviews, quality of publications, etc.) but also bear in mind that relevance for practice is an important indicator of success for quality DE research.

Other criteria worth considering under this objective in terms of coherence (as success markers for the sector, rather than for Irish Aid) could include:

Planning and management (i.e. the extent to which development and management of DE work is done systematically)

Coherence (i.e. the extent to which DE builds on and makes use of policies, frameworks, or actions carried out by ‘third parties’)

Monitoring and evaluation (i.e. the extent to which M&E is planned, executed and used by projects and programmes)

Strategic Aim two: Quality (linked to high standards)

As this aim is most closely linked with the issue of quality and standards the development of suitable indicators will rely heavily on defining criteria of what constitutes “quality” and “high standards”. We would maintain that such criteria would have to be developed within the wider context of learning outcomes. Possible criteria (some ideas around indicators are given in brackets) for quality development education could be:

Priority: To promote high standards in the design and delivery of DE in Ireland’,

Participation (i.e. the extent to which the DE work engages the target audience. As participatory learning is one of the cornerstones of DE it would be important to measure how this is achieved, see below for an example of progress markers in this area)

Plurality (i.e. the extent to which the DE work addresses and builds on different perspectives, for instance - but not exclusively - ‘Southern perspectives’, this could be deducted from material and resources)

Development of knowledge, understanding, skills, values, attitudes (i.e. the extent to which these are explicitly addressed in the work done and how the learning outcomes are achieved by various programmes).

Example of outcomes framework for **Participation**: A model that allows for stages to happen towards a stated outcome (allowing the measurement of progress and not just Impact). Each stage would have to be defined in terms of what needs to be achieved:

Element :	Participation by the audience/beneficiaries			
Aspect ↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Methodology	'frontal education' and learning is mostly used: "education and learning are being received"			active participation is encouraged in all materials and initiatives: "education and learning are being experienced"
Participation of the audience/target group/beneficiaries in the process	limited needs analysis of the target group/ audience (with limited participation by the audience/target group)			the audience/ beneficiaries define their needs and participates in planning and decisions to address those needs
Engagement as an outcome of the work done	Information on ways to get further involved is offered	engagement is encouraged: tips are given; inspiration and precise ideas are offered	support is offered to beneficiaries to get further involved (e.g. through skills development)	further engagement is at the heart of the project: as an objective and in the practice

Priority: To support the spread of best practice in DE in Ireland (this priority is linked to *support of national networks*, for sample outcomes and indicators for IDEA see appendix)

Partnership (i.e. the extent to which the work makes use of explicit and defined partnership approaches with others)

Recognition of the value of and support for DE in the organisation (NGO, One World Centre, academic institution/department or community group etc.) or **networks** (e.g. the extent to which the purpose, work and ethos of the network or organisation explicitly values and supports DE)

Networks and Shared learning (i.e. the extent to which joined learning initiatives are happening and evidence of shared learning and communication (platforms, fora, learning communities))

Capacity development and learning (i.e. the extent to which staff development/training and organisational learning about and for DE is used explicitly in an organisation or network)

Professional pathways (both through third level and in-service) could be seen as a criterion under this priority.

Strategic aim 3: Integration

The Reading International Solidarity Centre (RISC) has developed a very comprehensive guide to evaluate how far schools or colleges (and this could be adapted to other, non-formal education, sectors) are on their way to integrating or embedding DE. Their criteria include:

Teaching and Learning

- Curriculum (to what extent are global issues reflected and embedded in the curriculum, to what extent does a global perspective features in curriculum planning and cross/extra-curriculum considerations)
- Events and activities (to what extent do messages that are given challenge stereotypes and misconceptions, how well are audiences enabled to explore possible actions, how are events linked to charity (fundraising) rather than justice, how well are such events evaluated)
- Links and partnerships (how are schools linked with other schools, are linking schemes reciprocal and founded on mutual respect, jointly planned, etc.)

Staff Development

- To what extent are staff encouraged and supported in integrating DE (is it an individual teacher or does the support range across all levels of management)

Resources

- To what extent do resources used reflect DE methodologies and concepts and allow a critical engagement with global issues

Ethos

- To what extent does the institution reflect global issues in policies and practices, how are target groups involved in decision making processes and how are they engaged in actions on global justice issues

Communications

- To what extent do the communications issued by institutions reflect DE messages and concepts

In terms of criteria for quality we would include the criteria of **Partnership, Participation, Plurality, and Development of knowledge, skills and attitudes** (see explanation under strategic aim 1).

In terms of indicators we would argue strongly that such criteria would need to have progress markers, that is indicators that show that institutions or organisations make progress in the area of integration. While embedding DE into different educational environments is the ultimate goal, it would be essential that a performance measurement framework allows organisations, projects or programmes to show, how they are contributing to this goal by achieving certain stages on the way. (For examples of such progress markers, see the RISC resource “... Are we nearly there” (RISC, 2011)

Strategic Aim 4: Public Awareness

This strategic aim is the one closest related to Impact. As argued throughout the paper in relation to the public awareness aim, any measurement of development education interventions would need to take into account the issues of contribution/attribution and context.

In terms of **contribution/attribution** it is important to point out that the White Paper on Irish Aid places development education in the context of public engagement together with other interventions such as volunteering, public information on Ireland’s Aid programme, communications, etc. It would be important to develop criteria and indicators for development education within that **context** and clarify the role that DE will have to play in achieving impact in terms of a deeper engagement and greater awareness by the public of development issues. The question the framework would need to answer is what is the role of DE in raising public awareness of the underlying causes of global poverty and inequality.

In this context criteria and indicators would need to be developed to measure the **sustainability and impact** of DE. (i.e. the extent to which DE work done by the network or organisation leads to lasting attention by the audience, partners, beneficiaries, e.g. through informed quality action and/or changes in ideas, behaviour or dispositions)

5. Recommendations:

The IDEA task group would welcome further engagement on the issues raised in this paper. It is hoped that the illustrative examples given under 4 will be of help for the development of a performance measurement framework. Apart from the offer to work with Irish Aid on developing a framework that will be beneficial to both donor requirements and capacity development of the sector this paper has made the following recommendations:

- Not to work in isolation by linking the development of the performance measurement framework to the outcomes of the summer school and international studies on this topic
- To develop criteria and indicators for the performance measurement framework in collaboration with the DE sector
- To identify clear ways to measure impact within **and** beyond projects/programmes/organisations. To invest in cross-sectoral and longitudinal studies at sectoral level that go beyond project/programme level.

- Using evaluation to share practice and improve performance and learning.
- To develop clear outcome indicators that also allow for process and not just result/impact to be measured.
- To consider possibilities for introducing Southern perspectives into the performance measurement framework (e.g. engaging with Southern 'critical friends' in exploring how we ascribe value to our DE endeavours)

IDEA task group on Quality and Impact, June 2011

Appendix ONE

IDEA – Draft indicators (Strategic Plan 2011-2014).

AIM 1: To strengthen the capacity and professional development of the sector	
OUTCOMES	POSSIBLE INDICATORS
Improved capacity of those in DE sector to deliver services effectively	Percentage of those in DE sector who say their knowledge/skills have increased (<i>Means Of Verification – surveying members/members' networks</i>)
Added value to members through IDEA's training, networking & communications activities	Percentage of those who say IDEA interventions are useful/have improved the quality of their work (<i>members survey, event questionnaires etc</i>)
DE research community established and thriving	Perceptions of those who are engaging with research community (research group/members survey) Number and quality of new research activities
Increased number of people are engaging with the issue of raising standards of practice	Debate within the sector [discussion at conferences, think pieces, articles etc] (<i>IDEA staff/NC/working group member perceptions</i>) Percentage of members who say there is greater understanding across the sector of what quality development education looks like (<i>members survey</i>)

AIM 2: To raise awareness of, and make the case for, development education	
OUTCOMES	POSSIBLE INDICATORS
Increase in, and stronger relationships built with a broad range of stakeholders Relevant stakeholders are better informed about development education issues (targets identified quarterly)	Numbers of meetings and communications with stakeholders targeted Extent of interest from new stakeholders <i>(perceptions of staff, NC & working groups and members)</i> (See also policy outcomes under Aim 3)
Increased profile for IDEA, development education and members work	Number of references to IDEA/development education/members work in speeches, articles, frameworks, publications etc <i>(analysis by staff)</i> Number of articles relating to development education in range of media
More robust evidence base for the impact of global learning	Number and quality of pieces of evidential research, depth and breadth of case studies etc <i>(Analysis of IDEA & non IDEA led research/case studies)</i>

AIM 3: To create a policy enabling environment for development education	
OUTCOMES	POSSIBLE INDICATORS
<i>IDEA develops new relationships with key policy makers and strengthens existing ones (targets identified quarterly)</i>	Interest of/engagement with policy makers <i>(Perceptions of staff/NC)</i> Number of meetings and communications with policy makers
<i>Key national and European policies on specific areas are influenced (issues identified annually)</i>	<i>DE ideas/initiatives taken up by others and feature in speeches, frameworks, policy documents etc (Analysis by staff)</i> DE specialists invited to speak at events, input into policy planning etc <i>(Perceptions of staff/NC/working groups)</i>
<i>Members have the knowledge and skills (and feel better able) to influence the national policy agenda</i>	Percentage of members who feel, and are, better equipped to undertake policy engagement work <i>(survey of members)</i>

AIM 4: To strengthen IDEA's capacity to work effectively	
OUTCOMES	POSSIBLE INDICATORS
Well functioning administrative, HR, finance, and governance structures	Evidence of relevant policies in place, and being implemented Perceptions and levels of satisfaction of staff

	and NC
Members are engaging in IDEA's strategic decision making	Perceptions of IDEA working group members Percentage of members satisfied with levels of engagement (<i>members survey</i>)
Organisational capacity to deliver activities necessary to achieve aims and objectives	Timeliness, and quality of, outputs and activities delivered Evidence of monitoring framework and it being used for continual improvement and organisational learning. Percentage of members satisfied with products, services etc (<i>members survey, product/service user questionnaires</i>)
Increased knowledge and skills of IDEA staff	Staff perceptions of levels of improvement
IDEA diversifies its funding base	Evidence of IDEA exploiting opportunities to raise additional funding Amount of additional funding from new sources (2011-2011)