



VEPR Review Report - Mads Teisen

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Reviewee details Reviewee name: Mads Teisen EES membership number: Email contact: mads.teisen@gmail.com</p> | | |
| <p>Reviewer details Lead Reviewer Full name: Riitta Oksanen Email contact: rl.oksanen@kolumbus.fi</p> <p>Second reviewer Full name: Ian C. Davies Email contact: idavies@capacity.ca</p> | | |
| <p>Review details Date/s of review meetings: 31012017 Medium of review meeting/s: [e.g. teleconference/Skype/in person] Skype meeting, 90 min. Comments: [optional]</p> | | |
| <p>Review focus areas (summarised in 25 words maximum)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Capital Region of Denmark has introduced a M&E system in the entire organization. But there are challenges related to the systematic use of data for learning and innovation. 2. Politicians are directly involved in the M&E system and are expressing a commitment to the use of data. But it is still a challenge to facilitate discussions that are politically relevant. | | |
| <p>Capabilities explored</p> | <p>Learning by reviewee (total 750 words) The review process initially helped me describing my actual practice, and by doing so forced a reflection on why things are done the way they are. It was particularly helpful to discuss what I can change, and what are givens in the political and administrative context I operate in. Thereby the review has helped me in setting realistic targets, and focusing my efforts.</p> <p>Several actual new initiatives have been discussed, many of them possible to test in the Region.</p> | <p>Reviewer comments on reviewee learning (total 500 words)</p> |
| <p>1. 1.1. Assesses the evaluation context and identifies the program logic</p> | <p>Developing the theory of change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The logic model, developed in The Capital Region has never been developed into a full theory of change. My feeling has been, that the organization was not yet mature for this. However, during the review, it was suggested to develop the full theory of change as an internal tool, including all assumptions. I think this might be a good way for the team to develop a common language and a clear | <p>RO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mads has deepened his analysis of his operating environment which is characterized by challenges of balancing between political, professional, management and administrative interests. Differentiation of what Mads can directly influence and what can only be reached through indirect |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>picture of the challenges ahead. Also, the assumptions might show a picture about what can be changed, and what can't.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the thinking behind the theory of change should be developed in the entire team, working with M & E in the Region. There are some good opportunities for this ahead, as the entire model will be re-decided by a new political Council, taking office by January 1th. 2018. • It will be appropriate to do a theory of change workshop for this. Guidelines for this should be explored. • To be able to reach the goals described, I will work on strengthening my evaluation capabilities in the field of program theory. A workshop with program theory expert Patricia Rogers is likely to be available at this year AEA conference in Washington. It will be an opportunity to do this. | <p>influencing is a sound basis for a realistic and focused approach for further development work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mads seeks approaches that build on working in teams. In addition to a general orientation to stakeholder involvement, he has during the process identified the specific skills that he wishes to strengthen, and means to do the professional development in this area. • Mads knows his own institutions well, and is able to identify organizational processes as opportunities for further development. He plans to integrate development processes into situations where changes will take place anyhow. • Mads has demonstrated good capacity to assess the appropriateness of new approaches the were discussed during the review for his own organization. <p>ICD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that through the VEPR conversation Mads began to see that it is up to the evaluation function to adapt to the context rather than the other way around. Mads' insight that using a theory of change process that engages with key actors may be a means to learn from the context rather than attempting to "teach it about the importance of evaluation" is a clear shift in thinking. • I should add that the wording of the "capability" should be adapted to recognize the fact that evaluation lives in a multitude of contexts, i.e. evaluands can be organisations (as is the case here), strategies, themes, etc. The term program logic is not relevant. |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>1.2 Knows how to engage constructively with all stakeholders</p> | <p>Mapping stakeholders and their individual interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review revealed, that it is a challenge to focus attention on outcomes rather than outputs, and it was suggested, that this partially is due to the specific interests of the various stakeholders in the system. A more rigorous mapping of the stakeholders and their individual interest might be helpful to understand the stakeholders • Acknowledging that outcomes often depends on issues that we are not in control of ourselves, the mapping of stakeholders and their interests might be a tool to facilitate the discussion on outcomes with the stakeholders. • The further work on this issue could take place in two steps: 1: Development of a full stakeholder analysis (e.g. according to Prince2 principles). This should be done by the full team responsible for M&E 2: continued discussions in the team on the involvement of different stakeholders <p>To fulfill the tasks described above, I should develop my evaluation capabilities in the field of stakeholder involvement further. In my own teaching and reading, I must elaborate further on network development and evaluation in a multistakeholder environment. The literature on New Public Governance is ideal for this purpose, and it will fit nicely into my teaching. By doing so, I will as well be able to develop my capabilities in integrating evaluation and other social sciences further.</p> | |
| <p>1.3 Indicators, rating and monitoring systems”</p> | <p>Using rubrics to develop the indicator “patient satisfaction”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One way to develop the indicator “patient satisfaction” to cover also e.g. relatives and other stakeholder might be the use of rubrics. That should be explored further. • The dataflow on this indicator is not yet stable, and the indicator is vulnerable to drastic changes. | <p>ICD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that the discussion on indicators, and the perverse incentives they can create, highlights the fundamental differences between the functions of monitoring and of evaluation. • Mads expresses clearly a view that the discussion |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>However in the coming year there will come national requirements, that will lead to the change in the indicator, and the adoption of PRO (Patient Reported Outcome). This is an opportunity to take this work further.</p> | <p>around indicators (for monitoring purposes) can be supported by the knowledge evaluation can bring on questions of uses and misuses of indicators, and of how best to address these risks.</p> |
| 1.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was discussed if a further use of incentives could promote “good behavior” in relation to the M & E system, e.g. response rates to surveys. Another thing to explore. • Incentive structures are difficult to work with, as they can easily cause adverse effects (what gets measured gets done). Before going any further on this issue, it will therefore be necessary to do a literature study on positive examples of the use of incentives in similar environments. | <p>ICD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the outset of the VEPR discussions, Mads appeared to place on the evaluation function the unrealistic expectation (in my view) that it “solve all of the organization’s problems”. I was also struck by what I would qualify as a somewhat “directive” approach to getting sometimes reluctant actors to support evaluation. (rather than evaluation supporting actors). Mads showed a very good ability to self-reflect and to exchange on what are clearly fundamental frames of reference to his evaluation thinking and practice. He did so in a manner that I consider highly professional: take the time to think, study, reflect, and see how one’s practice may be improved. |
| 1.4 Manages resources and skills prudently so as to achieve results | <p>Using data visualization, specifically adapted to the needs of politicians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a very good discussion about if we are giving politicians data for management? Or data are adequate for political discussion? What kind of data would be more suited to facilitate political discussions? There are no concrete answers to this, but the issues will need scrutiny in the near future. • Looking forward, again this requires in-depth discussions with the politicians in place. This is difficult, however there will be an opportunity to evaluate the use of data in political decision-making by the end of this year / beginning 2018, when the M& E system is evaluated by the politicians the | <p>RO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue of use of evaluation evidence in political decision making is key in Mads operating environment. Involving politicians or advisers of politicians directly in discussing this is a good way to identify demand. <p>ICD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent questions and insights from Mads on crafting the evaluation messages to the intended recipients. And taking advantage of opportunities to work with evaluation as a communication process |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | concrete way of organizing this will still have to be explored. | |
| <p>Other gains from the VEPR review –</p> <p>Clearer communication on M & E</p> | <p>Finally, there was a good discussion on the need to communicate clearly about the purposes of the M & E system. Is it possible to create an environment that will better support learning and innovation – rather than accountability.</p> <p>It was agreed, that there is a need to communicate clearly about the use of data, what they are used for, and why they are needed.</p> <p>A more interactive way of communication was discussed, and a way forward could be a more intensive involvement of staff in the further development of M & E.</p> <p>Personally, I'll have a great deal to work on in the light of the review. In the past, speaking at the evaluation conferences in Maastricht (EES), Chicago, Denver and Washington (AEA) as well as at the Danish evaluation conference has improved my skills substantially, and if possible, I will continue that.</p> <p>My reading on evaluation literature must be continued and maybe even more focused on the topics mentioned above. And also the professional working groups I participate in will be used. (I'm preparing a lecture for the Danish Evaluations Society on the use of data in public management.)</p> | <p>RO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the topics discussed during Mads' review was the role of institutional resources (evaluation policy, rules and regulations) as means to promote collection of outcome data and to use it in decision making. I'm interested to explore further why so many colleagues (not only in this discussion) see this approach as bureaucracy and unattractive. In best cases regulation is a summary of best practice, continuously developing when new experiences are gained, means to avoid that everyone has to learn the same lessons. • Important lessons on the VEPR process and being a reviewer. Should we have two sessions? One on identifying the issues and a second one for discussing the skills and PDplan? |
| <p>Other comments on the review outcomes or process</p> | <p>The different steps of the VEPR come together in this report. The initial definition of my personal evaluation capabilities, that need strengthening, and the final development plan goes hand in hand. Only at the very end of the process this occurred to me.</p> <p>It is luxurious in a fantastic way, to be allowed in depth discussions and reflections on your work with senior evaluators like the reviewers! Thank you very much!</p> | <p>RO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being Mads' reviewer was a luxury learning opportunity. Many of my professional challenges are similar. Thanks for openness and sharing Mads and Ian! <p>ICD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mads' modesty and willingness to question his mental models on the approach to his evaluation work made this VEPR process an enriching experience for me. Thank you Mads and Riitta. |

Declaration

We declare that the VEPR review for Mads Teisen was completed on 16 March 2017 to the satisfaction in all aspects of the reviewee and the two reviewers.

CONFIRMED by all parties by email.