**MRAi / DTES RAP Logic model**

**Note: for the purpose of the logic model the RAP is the focus of the evaluation (‘the program’) within the wider MRA initiative**

**MRAi Goals**

1. Increase the accessibility and impact of research by providing easier online access to information about the DTES.
2. Identify community-generated materials (such as program reports, research and evaluation documents, and organizational histories) and increase their availability in and beyond the DTES.
3. Create opportunities for community organizations, community members, researchers, students, and others to share information and learn from one another

**Key DTES RAP Objectives** (From Communications Plan)

1. DTES community organizations and residents use the portal and find it useful
2. UBC research community uses the portal and finds it useful.
3. Ensure the medium/long term future of the portal (e.g. on-going communications support, etc.).
4. Encourage an on-going culture shift with regard to community-based research and engagement at UBC.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inputs** | **Activities** | **Audience** | **Outputs** | **Short term outcomes** | **Long term outcomes** |
| *Definition:*  All resources put into a program. Resources you need to implement: funds, expertise, relationships, technology | *Definition:*  What program needs to do to produce its outputs; e.g. reach to key user groups through a variety of dissemination mechanisms. Includes:  products and services;  publications and resources; training and events. | *Definition:*  Primary: the main target audience  Secondary: groups who are impacted or influenced but not the direct recipients of the program | *Definition:*  What results from the activities (documentation of progress) in terms of reach and engagement, and usefulness (user satisfaction and quality). Synonymous with performance indicators, usually numerical. | *Definition:*  Desired results: what we achieve, e.g. new / increased knowledge of what is available (awareness leading to intention to use); adoption of knowledge for decision-making and application to practice / policy | *Definition:*  Changed behaviours, systems, communities, policies, health outcomes |
| *MRAi / RAP:*  MRAi committee  DTES community organizations and individuals  UBC Library including funding and IT support  UBC Learning Exchange  including funding & space | *MRAi / RAP:*  Phase 1: dissemination of information about the RAP by e-mail to those with previous connection to RAP development  Phase 2: activities to create RAP users for each target audience type  See Appendix A for activities by audience | *MRAi / RAP:*  Researchers engaged in research in the DTES;  UBC undergraduates;  Graduate students; engaged in the DTES;  DTES Community organizations;  DTES residents | *MRAi / RAP:*  Examples include: metrics about RAP use by each target audience; metrics on type of help provided and feedback on usability; participation in events / demos  See Appendix B for potential indicators | *MRAi / RAP:*  Consequence of increased availability of research and community generated materials about the DTES; changes that occur as a result of opportunities for sharing of information.  See Appendix B | *MRAi / RAP:*  Culture shift with respect to community-based research and engagement at UBC  Changes in DTES as a consequence of information sharing |

**Appendix A:**  **MRAi / DTES RAP Key audience groups and engagement / communications strategies (link to Activities in evaluation plan)**

[Audience groups taken from MRAi public engagement scoping: recommended foundations for audience, collection, public engagement and communications (Jan 2019) and Key audience and user profiles May 2019)]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Audience** | **Researchers** | **Students** | **Community groups** | **DTES residents** |
| Description | All researchers engaged in research in the DTES, including UBC faculty or research centres, researchers at other universities and research focused organizations (e.g. government, think tanks, journalists) | UBC undergraduate students.  Graduate students engaged in research / projects in the DTES from UBC and other universities | Formal organizations (e.g. non-profits, charities) and informal community groups (e.g. advocacy groups, community networks) in the DTES | People who live in and / or have connections to the DTES. |
| Target % of traffic | 25% | 25% | 40% | 10% |
| Engagement to create a group of RAP users: direct | * Engage with research groups that work with the LE. * Promote RAP through contacts with researchers in the Directory. * Targeted communications at various research centres, e.g. BC Centre for Disease Control, BCCSU * Community Based Research Canada (Karine), Granting agencies * Identify other groups apart from health (e.g. Public Humanities Hub – Mary Chapman) * Consider holding a webinar in November (?), identifying people through our contacts. | * Incorporate information about DTES-RAP into LE orientation materials. * Present to other classes where the RAP may be relevant but not central to the class. * Engage with UBC Faculty of Grad Studies. * Eventually engage with classes at SFU. * Public Scholars Initiative | * Create a formal ‘reference group’ of DTES organizations who have been involved and expressed interest to build a user group. | * Engage with patrons at the Learning Exchange. |
| Engagement to create a group of RAP users: indirect  (Note: librarians are an important meta group aligned with a specific user group) | * Engage with research assistants and knowledge brokers and other staff. * Engage with VPRI office. * Engage with university librarians. * Engage with government and media librarians [perhaps at some point down the road]. | * Identify and work with 4-5 instructors to incorporate the RAP into class curriculum, especially library students who can become agents of change. (e.g. Heather O’Brien’s Scholarly Communications class, Julia Bullard’s metadata class, Evan Mauro’s class). * Reach out to university librarians at UBC, SFU, and other PSI. | * Engage with non-university librarians (e.g. VPL at Carnegie, Strathcona, Central, etc.) | * Engage with non-university librarians (e.g. VPL at Carnegie, Strathcona, Central, etc.) |
| Potential benefits to users of their use of the RAP | * Tri-Council policy compliance * Official recognition (e.g. “badge” to say their work is featured in an open access portal). * Ongoing repository for their research | Instructors: provides them with assignments that make a difference and a tangible example of what they are teaching that can be used in a variety of ways.  Students: streamlined way to find out what research has already been done. | * Opportunity to influence future directions, access to decision-makers. * Opportunities to connect with other user groups (researchers and librarians, for example). * Preserve and make public some of their materials * Access to information for grant making etc |  |
| Performance measures / indicators  (Note: success will be judged by an increase in sharing, referrals to others (reach) and success in finding information for proposals etc) | * Track traffic to RAP from emails. * Periodic polls or surveys—online, in person, or by phone. * Help desk enquiries. Track help interactions across user groups * Increase in independently uploaded / shared materials * Attendance at webinar | Provide instructors with unique URLs for each class so that we can track usage like we did for soft launch emails. | * Messages with qualitative feedback. * Attendance at demo events. * Participation in a formal “user group.” |  |
| Communication strategy | Promote RAP to researchers thru email messages about RAP directory.  Develop “badge” for researcher websites (Find my work **here** in the DTES RAP) with embedded, trackable link to the RAP, such as the Grad Supervisor pages: <https://sala.ubc.ca/people/faculty/patrick-condon> | Incorporate information about DTES-RAP into LE orientation materials.  Support instructors with materials to help teach about the RAP.  Add links to appropriate websites, subject guides, resource guides, study guides where students might be looking for information. |  | Incorporate information about DTES RAP into LE activities and programs where appropriate. (Digital literacy classes? TechCafes? Kx events?) |
| Posters in community org offices, in the Learning Exchange, and in the neighborhood. | |
| Email researchers, students, community orgs, librarians and others on original email list to opt-in to regular updates about the RAP, to offer demos, etc. | | | |
| Offer DTES RAP / MRAi newsletter that all groups can sign up for. Can highlight most recent additions to the News and Help pages, as well as “hot topics” and other blog info. | | | |
| Host events (demos, metadata-thons, etc.). | | | |
| Develop a printed “card” to give out at demos, to classes, and to offer at other in-person moments. | | | |

**Appendix B: Examples of Indicators for Outputs and Outcomes that might be relevant** (from Guide to monitoring and evaluating knowledge management in global health programs: <https://www.msh.org/sites/default/files/km-monitoring-and-eval-guide.pdf>)

**Outputs: Reach and Engagement**

# of individuals reached by audience type

# of delivery mechanisms used to disseminate information about the RAP (by type)

# article / file downloads

# page views

# page visits

# links to other websites

# people who make comments or contribution

# media mentions resulting from promotion

**Outputs: User satisfaction**

# of intended users that visited the RAP

# of intended users who are satisfied with the RAP

User rating of usability of the RAP

User rating of content of RAP and its relevance

# of intended users who recommend the RAP to a colleague

**Outputs: Quality**

Average pageviews per RAP visit

Average duration of RAP visits

Articles that are of most interest / relevance (topics / formats)

**Outcome indicators: Learning (awareness, attitude, intention)**

# of intended users who report the RAP provided new knowledge

# of intended users who report RAP reinforced or validated existing knowledge

# of intended users who can recall correct information about a research project

# of intended users who report that information from the RAP changed / reinforced their views, opinions or beliefs

# of intended users who intend to use the information and knowledge gained from the RAP

**Outcome indicators: Action (decision-making, policy, practice)**

# of intended users applying knowledge from RAP to make decisions (organizational or personal)

# of intended users applying knowledge to improve practice (in program, service delivery, training / education and research)

# of intended users applying knowledge to inform policy

**Appendix C: Data collection methods that might be relevant** (from Guide to monitoring and evaluating knowledge management in global health programs: <https://www.msh.org/sites/default/files/km-monitoring-and-eval-guide.pdf>)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Method** | **Description** | **Strengths & weaknesses** | **Relative cost** |
| Routine records | Administrative documents kept in storage for a set amount of time. | Do not require additional research. Information may not be current. | Low |
| Web analytics | Software that tracks which pages visitors view, amount of time spent on the site, resources downloaded, geographic origin of users & whether visitor is new or returning. | Fast and easy way to track visitors to a website but important to keep context in mind when analyzing these data (e.g. time of year). | Low |
| Usability assessment | Examines how well users are able to learn or use a product by observing how they perform specific tasks. | Cost-effective and quick method for determining usability. Only a small group of users is needed but technical issues and skill level of participants may affect results. | Low |
| Pop-up questionnaires | Short surveys that appear in a separate window on websites. | Allows for targeted and rapid collection of information from website users but response rates may be low and the sample is biases because only certain users will participate. | Low |
| Bounce-back questionnaires | Questionnaires distributed inside print publications through postal mailing lists consisting of both multiple choice and open-ended questions. Clients can either mail back the completed questionnaire or submit online. | Advantages include collection of both qualitative and quantitative data, cost effectiveness, and potential on-line administration. However, response rates are low and recipients may experience survey fatigue from receiving too many requests. | Low |
| Surveys | Structured questionnaires that include close-ended and some open-ended questions. Can be administered in person, over the phone or online. | Cost effective, quick, provide precise and easily analyzed data, and maintain the confidentiality of participants. Limitations: survey available only to those with internet access (if online survey), response rate cannot be determined and self-selection of participants biases the sample. | Medium |
| In-depth interviews | Semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions designed to elicit in-depth responses from participants. Interviews can be conducted in person or over the phone | Provide detailed information and give opportunity to ask follow up questions. But take time to plan, coordinate and conduct, results are subjective and not necessarily representative of the population and depending on sample size, analysis can be time consuming | Medium |
| Focus group discussion | Interview with a group of stakeholders. | Can yield nuanced responses, insight into how opinions and behaviours are formed and information about the intended users’ attitudes and beliefs, and allows for more rapid collection of information than individual interviews. But they are expensive and take time to plan and conduct, some groups may be difficult to direct, participants may give into group dynamics, and opinions of the group do not necessarily represent those of the larger population. | Medium |
| Net mapping | Interviewer works with a group of stakeholders to discuss a topic or question and create a map of actors connected to the topic. Map specifies links among actors and the informant’s perception of the amount of influence that each actor has. | Relatively inexpensive. Helps identify bottlenecks and opportunities in a network. Drawbacks include difficulty of scheduling sessions with stakeholders and the subjective nature of the information from participants. | Medium |
| Content analysis | Study of users’ text, recorded speech and photographs on a specific topic. It can reveal communication trends and patterns and the attitudes and beliefs of individuals and groups | Useful for learning about intended users but requires much time and the findings will not necessarily be representative of the larger population. | Medium |
| Case studies | Study of an event and how and why it occurred, through interviews, participant observation and records to explore a specific topic or event. | Provides a comprehensive examination of an issue. It is costly, narrow in focus and takes time. | High |
| Social network analysis | Study of discussions on a specific topic on internet social media sites to determine how people connect, their views on issues and trends in opinions over time. | Assists with learning how users perceive your organization and can inform strategies to make your own social media sites more interactive. But often expensive and time consuming. | High |