

1. KNOWFOR Rubrics

'Rubrics' have been used in this framework to provide an evaluative description of what below adequate, adequate and above adequate programme performance will "look like". Developed in consultation with KNOWFOR partners and informed by the KNOWFOR White Paper looking into evidence-based policy and practice (Clear Horizon, 2014), two separate rubrics have been developed for KNOWFOR. These rubrics describe performance quality in relation to:

- Uptake by intermediaries and policy-makers/practitioners (Level 2)
- Partners planning for knowledge uptake (Level 1.2).

The rubrics will be applied at the project, organisation and programme level.

Theory of Change Level 1.2: Effective design at the project level

Rubric to be scored at baseline and in 2016.

Above expectations	Some of the criteria have been conducted in an exemplary manner, and the all criteria (see below) have been addressed to a reasonable extent.
Project designs/plans fully meet expectations	All of the criteria that are relevant to the project have been addressed to a reasonable extent. Criteria are that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The knowledge uptake pathway is clearly articulated• The project has done some work to identify end user information requirements• Where relevant, partners have been engaged in the project design• The project has an implicit or explicit dissemination plan in place. In the absence of a written plan project managers are able to explain how dissemination is intended to occur. They may be planning to make this explicit• The project has been assessed for gender relevance. Where relevant the project plans are proactive about considering the needs of women and girls• An M&E framework for the project has been developed including selection of appropriate M&E tools
Project designs/plans partially meet expectations	Four or more of the criteria relevant to the project have been addressed to a reasonable extent.
Below expectations	Two or more of the criteria relevant to the project have not yet been addressed.

Theory of Change Level 1.2: Project design across the organisation

Rubric to be scored at base line and in 2016.

Above expectations	<p>The organisationally relevant criteria below are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 75% of new projects ‘meet expectations’ (or above) for project design and from this at least 20% rate as ‘above expectations’. • There has been some cross-transference of good practice - some projects/initiatives or organisations external to KNOWFOR have adopted KNOWFOR’s project design or M&E standards. • Up to 25% of existing KNOWFOR projects are revised to reflect improved design and M&E standards • Those projects rating below expectations are able to provide a sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’ (or above) and are on track to achieve acceptable performance in the long-term.
Meets expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 - 75% of relevant¹ new projects ‘meet expectations’ (or above) for enabling work • At least half of the projects that rate below expectations are able to provide a sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’ (or above).
Below expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 50% relevant new projects ‘meet expectations’ or above for enabling work • Of those projects being rated at below expectations less than half are able provide sound rationale for not ‘meeting expectations’

Theory of Change Level 2: Uptake at the project level

Rubric to be scored in 2016.

Above expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that that the majority of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped as articulated in project plans <p>AND EVIDENCE OF ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanticipated boundary partners are equipped or reached • Knowledge products inform policy debate • Instances of policy being influenced or changed • Instances of practice change
Meets expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that that the majority of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped as articulated in project plans.
Below expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence suggests that substantially less targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) were reached or equipped than was planned

¹ KNOWFOR partner led projects for CIFOR, new projects for PROFOR and the Global Forest Landscape Programme as a whole for IUCN

Theory of Change Level 2: Uptake at the organisational level

Rubric to be scored in 2016.

Above expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More than 50% of projects rate 'meet expectations' (or above) for uptake (Level two project rubric); and from this at least 30% rate as "above expectations".• Those projects rating below expectations are able to provide a sound rationale for not 'meeting expectations' (or above) and most are likely to achieve acceptable levels of uptake in the long-term
Meets expectation	There is evidence that more than 50% of targeted audiences (intermediaries and/or end users) have been reached or equipped at as articulated in project plans
Below expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Less than 50% of projects 'meet expectations' or above for uptake (level two project rubric)• Of those projects being rated at below standard less than half are able provide sound rationale for not 'meeting expectations'

2. Performance at the KNOWFOR LEVEL

Table 1. Theory of Change Level 1 Performance Summary Table

	ToC Level	2014	2016
CIFOR	Level 1.2	Meets expectations	Choose an item.
PROFOR	Level 1.2	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
IUCN	Level 1.2	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
KNOWFOR Overall		Choose an item.	Choose an item.

Table 2. Theory of Change Level 2 Performance Summary Table

	ToC Level	2016
CIFOR	Level 2	Choose an item.
PROFOR	Level 2	Choose an item.
IUCN	Level 2	Choose an item.
KNOWFOR Overall		Choose an item.

3. Guidelines for using rubrics

Rubrics will be used by partners (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN) and DFID to assess the performance of the programme at the end of the programme in 2016. Milestones have also been identified for July 2014. Rubrics have been developed for KNOWFOR at the following levels of the Theory of Change (ToC):

- Uptake at Level Two of the theory of change
- Planning for uptake and gender in project planning at Level 1.2 of the theory of change.

The rubrics are pitched at two levels, for use with an individual project, for use by the organisation. There is also a summary table to bring the results together for all partners.

They will be used separately for each partner organisation (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN) to interpret results and then aggregated at a programme level by DFID to provide an overall judgement on programme performance.

Partners

Instructions for using rubrics by partners:

- Prior to the reporting timeframe (mid-year) refer to your M&E plan to determine what information you will require to assess projects against the rubric, if there are any foreseen gaps it may be necessary to undertake additional data collection.
- Collate and compile available evidence from KNOWFOR funded projects for the Annual Review.
- Focus on one project at a time, examine the results, and rate the project using the project level rubrics. Substantiate why each project has been given the particular ratings (this can be fed back to projects along with suggestions for improvement - the rating process can also be done together with the projects teams if appropriate). Where there is incomplete or insufficient evidence to rate performance, note this in the narrative that accompanies the rubric.
- Complete this task for all projects, then aggregate the results up, and rate the organisational performance using the organisational rubrics. Select the rating that best represents overall performance on balance. Substantiate why have allocated yourselves this rating and consider how you might improve your performance.
- Complete the narrative accompaniment to the rubric providing a justification for ratings given. Refer to evidence summary in the Annual Review.
- Submit completed rubrics to DFID as part of the Annual Review.

DFID

Instructions for using Overall KNOWFOR rubric by DFID:

1. Receive and collate completed rubrics from partners (CIFOR, PROFOR and IUCN).
2. Review assessments made in each rubric referring to the evidence to support ratings in the Annual Review. If necessary, clarify ratings in consultation with partners.

3. Make a performance judgement for 'uptake' (Level 2) and 'enabling' (Level 1.2) separately. Compile separate performance ratings for 'uptake' and 'enabling' for each partner. If partner performance ratings do not conform to criteria make a judgement on overall performance for the rating that best fits and represents.
4. Make an overall performance judgement for 'uptake' and 'enabling' combined. Again, if the ratings do not conform to the criteria (i.e. 'Above expectations' for 'Enabling' and 'Below expectations' for 'Uptake'), make an overall rating based on what best fits (either by averaging or through a discretionary judgement, supported by a clear rationale and evidence).

Repeat steps in successive years as required.

4. References

Shaxson L, J (2005) 'Is your evidence robust enough? Questions for policy makers and practitioners', *Journal of Evidence and Policy*, 1(1): 101-111.