

Appendix 6. Interview guides



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

A. Study Tool for MoH Top-level Policymakers

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Approving policy and programme recommendations?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Commissioning research needed by the MoH/CDH for decision-making?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No

- e) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - f) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

II. MoH EIDM practice

2.1 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I don't know. Why don't you know?

2.2 What factors do you think the MoH take into account when deciding to use research evidence in their decision?

2.3 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and program decisions

- a) Funding
- b) Evidence
- c) Donor interest
- d) Politics
- e) Personal interest
- f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)

2.4 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

III. EIDM incentives and support

This section establishes the existence of processes that incentivise EIDM among MoH staff and researchers at the time of data collection and a year ago.

Motivation

- 3.1 Does the Kenya School of Governance training have a course on evidence informed decisions making?
- a) Yes. Please describe it
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 3.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?
- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
 - a) No. When was it introduced
 - b) I don't know
- 3.3 Is it a requirement for you or staff that you manage to attend a training on how to access, appraise, synthesis and use evidence?
- a) Yes. Which staff? Who conducts the training? and what does it cover?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 3.4 What happens if staff do not attend the training?
- 3.5 Does your performance and promotion assessments include criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?
- a) Yes. What criteria is used? What is the weight in relation to other responsibilities?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 3.6 What happens if staff do not demonstrate that they have produced and used evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?
- 3.7 Has the performance and promotion assessments of criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products become more prominent over time?
- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No. When was this introduced?
 - c) I don't know
- 3.8 Is there a mechanism (checks and balances) in the MoH to ensure decisions are informed by evidence synthesis products?
- a) Yes. What is the expectation for presentation of evidence and what happens if it is not presented?
 - b) No. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?
 - c) I don't know. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?
- 3.9 Has the mechanism for ensuring MoH decisions are informed by evidence improved over time?
- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No. When was this introduced?
 - c) I don't know

Support

- 3.10 Does the MoH have evidence informed decision making guidelines and tools for staff to use?
- a) Yes. Describe the guidelines and tools, and what they support
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 3.11 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?
- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
 - b) No. When was it introduced?
 - c) I don't know

IV. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

- 4.1 What structures does the MoH have to support evidence informed decision making?
- 4.2 Does the MoH Research Unit support the MoH departments and programmes?
- a) Yes. Describe the support provided by the MoH Research Unit and how it advances evidence informed decision making
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 4.3 If yes, has the MoH Research Unit support improved over time?
- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No. When was this introduced?
 - c) I don't know
- 4.4 Have you faced any challenges with the support provided by the MoH Research Unit
- a) Yes. What challenges?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.5 What additional support does your programme or department need from the MoH Research Unit to enhance evidence informed decision making?
- 4.6 Do you have staff in your department whose primary role is to support evidence synthesis activities?
- a) Yes. Describe the staff and their role
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 4.7 Is this a new position?
- a) Yes. When was the position introduced and what informed this?
 - b) No. When was the position introduced?
 - c) I don't know
- 4.8 How does KEMRI facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?
- 4.9 Are KEMRI staff involved in the health sector research priority setting?

- a) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know.

V. Political economy and governance

This section establishes the governance and political economy for evidence informed decision making at the MoH at the time of data collection and a year ago.

5.1 Has the project generated political interest within the health sectorTBD

VI. Testing assumptions

Integration of evidence informed decision making in MoH/ Research institution training curricular

6.1 Do you think you have opportunities to integrate evidence informed decision making in the MoH/post-graduate?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.2 Do you think it will be difficult to get evidence informed decision making integrated as a core course in the MoH/post-graduate?

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Embedding evidence informed decision making in incentive structures

6.3 Do you think you have opportunities to integrate evidence informed decision making in MoH or research staff performance and promotion criteria?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.4 Do you think it will be difficult to integrate evidence informed decision making in MoH/research staff performance and promotion criteria?

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

VII. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

7.1 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have hindered MoH evidence informed decision making capacity?

- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

- 7.2 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?
- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

VIII. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

- 8.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in unexpected benefits?
- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

- 8.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in unexpected challenges?
- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

- 8.3 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?
- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

IX. Additional support

- 9.1 Do you think the MoH needs additional support to facilitate use evidence in MoH decision making processes?
- a) Yes. What support do you need?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

X. Additional information

- 10.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?
- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
 - b) No

Thank you for taking time to participate in this study.



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

B. Study tool for MoH Research Division

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Formulating and/or updating policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Approving policy and programme recommendations?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Commissioning research needed by the MoH/CDH for decision-making?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No

- f) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - k) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

1.8 Are you a nominated research focal?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

II. EIDM practice

2.5 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I don't know. Why don't you know?

2.6 What factors do you think the MoH take into account when deciding to use research evidence in their decision?

2.7 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and programme decisions

- a) Funding
- b) Evidence
- c) Donor interest
- d) Politics
- e) Personal interest
- f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)

2.8 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

III. EIDM incentives and support

This section establishes the existence of processes that incentivise EIDM among MoH staff and researchers at the time of data collection and a year ago.

Motivation

3.1 Does the Kenya School of Governance training have a course on evidence informed decisions making?

- b) Yes. Please describe it
- c) No
- d) I don't know

3.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced
- d) I don't know

3.3 Is it a requirement for you or staff that you manage to attend a training on how to access, appraise, synthesis and use evidence?

- a) Yes. Which staff? Who conducts the training? and what does it cover?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.4 What happens if staff do not attend the training?

3.5 Does your performance and promotion assessments include criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?

- a) Yes. What criteria is used? What is the weight in relation to other responsibilities?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.6 What happens if staff do not demonstrate that they have produced and used evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?

3.7 Has the performance and promotion assessments of criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products become more prominent over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- b) No. When was this introduced?
- c) I don't know

3.8 Is there a mechanism (checks and balances) in the MoH to ensure decisions are informed by evidence synthesis products?

- a) Yes. What is the expectation for presentation of evidence and what happens if it is not presented?
- b) No. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?
- c) I don't know. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?

3.9 Has the mechanism for ensuring MoH decisions are informed by evidence improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- b) No. When was this introduced?
- c) I don't know

Support

3.10 Does the MoH have evidence informed decision making guidelines and tools for staff to use?

- a) Yes. Describe the guidelines and tools, and what they support
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.11 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced?
- c) I don't know

IV. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

4.1 What structures does the MoH have to support evidence informed decision making?

4.2 Does the MoH Research Unit support the MoH departments and programmes?

- a) Yes. Describe the support provided by the MoH Research Unit and how it advances evidence informed decision making
- b) No
- c) I don't know

4.3 If yes, has the MoH Research Unit support improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- b) No. When was this introduced?
- c) I don't know

4.4 Have you faced any challenges with the support provided by the MoH Research Unit

- a) Yes. What challenges?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

4.5 What additional support does your programme or department need from the MoH Research Unit to enhance evidence informed decision making?

4.6 Do you have staff in your department whose primary role is to support evidence synthesis activities?

- a) Yes. Describe the staff and their role
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

4.7 Is this a new position?

- a) Yes. When was the position introduced and what informed this?
- b) No. When was the position introduced?
- c) I don't know

4.8 How does KEMRI facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?

4.9 Are KEMRI staff involved in the health sector research priority setting?

- a) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know.

4.10 Do KEMRI staff participate on MoH TWGs or committees?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.
- c) I don't know.

4.11 If yes, does their participation support the MoH TWG evidence synthesis activities?

- a) Yes. How?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

4.12 Do KEMRI staff generate systematic reviews?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.
- c) I don't know.

4.13 If yes, have the systematic reviews been used to inform the MoH decisions?

- a) Yes. How?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

4.14 Has there been an improvement in KEMRI's production of timely systematic reviews addressing the health sector high priority issues over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

- 4.15** What additional support is needed from KEMRI to facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?

Mechanisms

- 4.16** Does the MoH TWG you are part of have staff who synthesise evidence and generate policy briefs including in partnership with partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?

- a) Yes. Describe the staff and how they undertake this role
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

- 4.17** Is this a new post?

- a) Yes. When was it constituted and what informed this?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

- 4.18** Does the MoH TWG you are part of have staff who synthesise evidence and generate policy briefs including in partnership with partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?

V. Political economy and governance

This section establishes the governance and political economy for evidence informed decision making at the MoH at the time of data collection and a year ago.

- 5.1 Has the project generated political interest within the health sectorTBD

VI. Testing assumptions

Training

- 6.1 Do you think the staff that went through the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis or systematic review training have opportunities to apply the skills they gained?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

- 6.2 Do you think the staff that went through the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis or systematic review training will find it difficult to apply the skills they acquired?

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Motivation, support, structures and mechanisms

Research focals

- 6.3 Do you think research focals have opportunities to champion of evidence informed decision making in your department/TWG?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?

- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.4 Do you think it will be difficult to ensure that decisions of your department/TWG are routinely informed by robust evidence synthesis?

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.5 Do you think that it is a role that is valued? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain

- a) Yes. How so?
- b) No. Why do say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do say so?

TWG TORs

6.6 Do you think research focals have opportunities to ensure that decisions of the TWG are informed by evidence as reflected in the revised terms of reference?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.7 Do you think you will be difficult to implement the revised TWG terms of reference. Please explain? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

TWG policy dialogues

6.8 Do you think there are opportunities for your division/unit/programs TWG to hold quarterly policy dialogues? policy dialogues.

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.9 What do you think will be the value of the policy dialogues?

6.10 Do you think it will be difficult to implement quarterly TWG policy dialogues. Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Research conferences

6.11 Do you think there are opportunities to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

- 6.12 Do you think it will be difficult to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

VII. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

- 7.1 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have hindered MoH evidence informed decision making capacity?
- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 7.2 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?
- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

VIII. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

- 8.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits?
- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 8.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in challenges?
- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 8.3 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?
- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

IX. Additional support

- 9.1 Do you think you need additional support to be able to use evidence in your work?
- a) Yes. What support do you need?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

X. Additional information

10.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No

10.2 Could you provide us with your immediate supervisor's name and contact so that we can find out how else the department, unit or program could be supported?

- a) Yes.
Name:
Contact: email and/or phone number

- b) No

10.3 Could you provide us with the name and contact of members of CSOs that you work closely with so that we can find out how else the department, unit or program could be supported from their perspective?

- a) Yes.
Name:
Contact: email and/or phone number

- b) No

Thank you for taking time to participate in this study.



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

C. Study Tool for MoH Heads of Divisions, Units and Programmes (Mid-level Policymakers) - managers of evidence synthesis trainees

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Formulating and/or updating policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Commissioning research needed by the MoH/CDH for decision-making?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes

- ii) No
 - f) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

1.8 Are you a nominated research focal?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

II. EIDM practice

2.1 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I don't know. Why don't you know?

2.2 What factors do you think the MoH take into account when deciding to use research evidence in their decision?

2.3 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and programme decisions

- a) Funding
- b) Evidence
- c) Donor interest
- d) Politics
- e) Personal interest
- f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)

2.4 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

III. EIDM incentives and support

This section establishes the existence of processes that incentivise EIDM among MoH staff and researchers at the time of data collection and a year ago.

Motivation

3.1 Does the Kenya School of Governance training have a course on evidence informed decisions making?

- a) Yes. Please describe it
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced
- d) I don't know

3.3 Is it a requirement for you or staff that you manage to attend a training on how to access, appraise, synthesis and use evidence?

- a) Yes. Which staff? Who conducts the training? and what does it cover?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.4 What happens if staff do not attend the training?

3.5 Does your performance and promotion assessments include criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?

- a) Yes. What criteria is used? What is the weight in relation to other responsibilities?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.6 What happens if staff do not demonstrate that they have produced and used evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?

3.7 Has the performance and promotion assessments of criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products become more prominent over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?

- b) No. When was this introduced?
- c) I don't know

3.8 Is there a mechanism (checks and balances) in the MoH to ensure decisions are informed by evidence synthesis products?

- a) Yes. What is the expectation for presentation of evidence and what happens if it is not presented?
- b) No. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?
- c) I don't know. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?

3.9 Has the mechanism for ensuring MoH decisions are informed by evidence improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- b) No. When was this introduced?
- c) I don't know

Support

3.10 Does the MoH have evidence informed decision making guidelines and tools for staff to use?

- a) Yes. Describe the guidelines and tools, and what they support
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.11 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced?
- c) I don't know

IV. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

4.1 What structures does the MoH have to support evidence informed decision making?

4.2 Does the MoH Research Unit support the MoH departments and programmes?

- d) Yes. Describe the support provided by the MoH Research Unit and how it advances evidence informed decision making
- e) No
- f) I don't know

4.3 If yes, has the MoH Research Unit support improved over time?

- d) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- e) No. When was this introduced?
- f) I don't know

4.4 Have you faced any challenges with the support provided by the MoH Research Unit

- d) Yes. What challenges?

- e) No.
- f) I don't know

4.5 What additional support does your programme or department need from the MoH Research Unit to enhance evidence informed decision making?

4.6 Do you have staff in your department whose primary role is to support evidence synthesis activities?

- d) Yes. Describe the staff and their role
- e) No.
- f) I don't know

4.7 Is this a new position?

- d) Yes. When was the position introduced and what informed this?
- e) No. When was the position introduced?
- f) I don't know

4.8 How does KEMRI facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?

4.9 Are KEMRI staff involved in the health sector research priority setting?

- g) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
- h) No.
- i) I don't know.

4.10 Do KEMRI staff participate on MoH TWGs or committees?

- d) Yes.
- e) No.
- f) I don't know.

4.11 If yes, does their participation support the MoH TWG evidence synthesis activities?

- d) Yes. How?
- e) No. Why do you say so?
- f) I don't know. Why do you say so?

4.12 Do KEMRI staff generate systematic reviews?

- d) Yes.
- e) No.
- f) I don't know.

4.13 If yes, have the systematic reviews been used to inform the MoH decisions?

- d) Yes. How?
- e) No. Why do you say so?
- f) I don't know. Why do you say so?

4.14 Has there been an improvement in KEMRI's production of timely systematic reviews addressing the health sector high priority issues over time?

- d) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- e) No.
- f) I don't know

- 4.15 What additional support is needed from KEMRI to facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?

Mechanisms

- 4.16 Does the MoH TWG you are part of have staff who synthesise evidence and generate policy briefs including in partnership with partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
- d) Yes. Describe the staff and how they undertake this role
 - e) No.
 - f) I don't know
- 4.17 Is this a new post?
- d) Yes. When was it constituted and what informed this?
 - e) No
 - f) I don't know
- 4.18 Does the MoH TWG you are part of rely on evidence synthesis and policy briefs produced wholly by partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
- a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.19 Does the MoH TWG that you are part of hold periodic policy dialogues to have an evidence informed discussion on an identified policy or practice challenge and practical actions to address it?
- a) Yes. When was the most recent policy dialogue, what did it focus on and who was involved in organising, funding and participating in it?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.20 Would you say that the use of evidence in MoH TWG decisions has improved over time?
- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know

V. Political economy and governance

This section establishes the governance and political economy for evidence informed decision making at the MoH at the time of data collection and a year ago.

- 5.1 Has the project generated political interest within the health sectorTBD

VI. Testing assumptions

Training

- 6.1 Do you think the staff that went through the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis or systematic review training have opportunities to apply the skills they gained?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

- 6.2 Do you think the staff that went through the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis or systematic review training will find it difficult to apply the skills they acquired?
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Motivation, support, structures and mechanisms

Research focals

- 6.3 Do you think research focals have opportunities to champion of evidence informed decision making in your department/TWG?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.4 Do you think it will be difficult to ensure that decisions of your department/TWG are routinely informed by robust evidence synthesis?
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.5 Do you think that it is a role that is valued? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain
- a) Yes. How so?
 - b) No. Why do say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do say so?

TWG TORs

- 6.6 Do you think research focals have opportunities to ensure that decisions of the TWG are informed by evidence as reflected in the revised terms of reference?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.7 Do you think you will be difficult to implement the revised TWG terms of reference. Please explain? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

TWG policy dialogues

- 6.8 Do you think there are opportunities for your division/unit/programs TWG to hold quarterly policy dialogues? policy dialogues.
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?

- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.9 What do you think will be the value of the policy dialogues?

- 6.10 Do you think it will be difficult to implement quarterly TWG policy dialogues. Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Research conferences

- 6.11 Do you think there are opportunities to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.12 Do you think it will be difficult to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

I. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

- 7.3 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have hindered MoH evidence informed decision making capacity?
- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 7.4 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?
- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

II. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

- 8.4 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits?
- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 8.5 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in challenges?
- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?

- b) No
- c) I don't know

8.6 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?

- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

III. Additional support

9.2 Do you think you need additional support to be able to use evidence in your work?

- a) Yes. What support do you need?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

IV. Additional information

10.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No

10.2 Do you have colleagues who were not involved in the HIGH-Res program and is knowledgeable about how things work in the MoH?

- a) Yes.
- b) No
- c) I don't know

10.3 If yes, could you provide us with their name and contact?

- a) Yes.
Name:
Contact: email and/or phone number

- b) No

10.4 Could you provide us with your immediate supervisor's name and contact so that we can find out how else the department, unit or program could be supported?

- a) Yes.
Name:
Contact: email and/or phone number

- b) No

10.5 Could you provide us with the name and contact of members of CSOs that you work closely with so that we can find out how else the department, unit or program could be supported from their perspective?

a) Yes.

Name:

Contact: email and/or phone number

b) No

Thank you for taking time to participate in this study.



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

D. Study Tool for MoH Technical Staff (Mid-level Policymakers)

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Formulating and/or updating policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Commissioning research needed by the MoH/CDH for decision-making?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No

- f) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

1.8 Are you a nominated research focal?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

II. EIDM practice

2.1 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I don't know. Why don't you know?

2.2 What factors do you think the MoH take into account when deciding to use research evidence in their decision?

2.3 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and programme decisions

- a) Funding

- b) Evidence
- c) Donor interest
- d) Politics
- e) Personal interest
- f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)

2.4 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

2.5 EIDM incentives and support

This section establishes the existence of processes that incentivise EIDM among MoH staff and researchers at the time of data collection and a year ago.

Motivation

2.6 Does the Kenya School of Governance training have a course on evidence informed decisions making?

- c) Yes. Please describe it
- d) No
- e) I don't know

2.7 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- f) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- g) No. When was it introduced
- d) I don't know

2.8 Is it a requirement for you or staff that you manage to attend a training on how to access, appraise, synthesis and use evidence?

- e) Yes. Which staff? Who conducts the training? and what does it cover?
- f) No
- g) I don't know

2.9 What happens if staff do not attend the training?

2.10 Does your performance and promotion assessments include criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?

- h) Yes. What criteria is used? What is the weight in relation to other responsibilities?
- i) No
- j) I don't know

2.11 What happens if staff do not demonstrate that they have produced and used evidence synthesis products to inform or make decisions?

2.12 Has the performance and promotion assessments of criteria for producing and using evidence synthesis products become more prominent over time?

- k) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- l) No. When was this introduced?
- m) I don't know

- 2.13 Is there a mechanism (checks and balances) in the MoH to ensure decisions are informed by evidence synthesis products?
- n) Yes. What is the expectation for presentation of evidence and what happens if it is not presented?
 - o) No. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?
 - p) I don't know. How are decisions made and what is your role? What informs the recommendations made, what products are developed and what informs the decisions to approve recommendations or not?
- 2.14 Has the mechanism for ensuring MoH decisions are informed by evidence improved over time?
- q) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - r) No. When was this introduced?
 - s) I don't know

Support

- 2.15 Does the MoH have evidence informed decision making guidelines and tools for staff to use?
- t) Yes. Describe the guidelines and tools, and what they support
 - u) No
 - v) I don't know
- 2.16 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?
- w) Yes. When was it introduced and and what informed its introduction?
 - x) No. When was it introduced?
 - y) I don't know

III. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

- 3.1 What structures does the MoH have to support evidence informed decision making?
- 3.2 Does the MoH Research Unit support the MoH departments and programmes?
- g) Yes. Describe the support provided by the MoH Research Unit and how it advances evidence informed decision making
 - h) No
 - i) I don't know
- 3.3 If yes, has the MoH Research Unit support improved over time?
- g) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - h) No. When was this introduced?
 - i) I don't know
- 3.4 Have you faced any challenges with the support provided by the MoH Research Unit
- g) Yes. What challenges?
 - h) No.
 - i) I don't know

- 3.5 What additional support does your programme or department need from the MoH Research Unit to enhance evidence informed decision making?
- 3.6 Do you have staff in your department whose primary role is to support evidence synthesis activities?
- g) Yes. Describe the staff and their role
 - h) No.
 - i) I don't know
- 3.7 Is this a new position?
- j) Yes. When was the position introduced and what informed this?
 - k) No. When was the position introduced?
 - l) I don't know
- 3.8 How does KEMRI facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?
- 3.9 Are KEMRI staff involved in the health sector research priority setting?
- m) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
 - n) No.
 - o) I don't know.
- 3.10 Do KEMRI staff participate on MoH TWGs or committees?
- g) Yes.
 - h) No.
 - i) I don't know.
- 3.11 If yes, does their participation support the MoH TWG evidence synthesis activities?
- g) Yes. How?
 - h) No. Why do you say so?
 - i) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 3.12 Do KEMRI staff generate systematic reviews?
- g) Yes.
 - h) No.
 - i) I don't know.
- 3.13 If yes, have the systematic reviews been used to inform the MoH decisions?
- g) Yes. How?
 - h) No. Why do you say so?
 - i) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 3.14 Has there been an improvement in KEMRI's production of timely systematic reviews addressing the health sector high priority issues over time?
- g) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - h) No.
 - i) I don't know
- 3.15 What additional support is needed from KEMRI to facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?

Mechanisms

- 3.16 Does the MoH TWG you are part of have staff who synthesise evidence and generate policy briefs including in partnership with partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
- g) Yes. Describe the staff and how they undertake this role
 - h) No.
 - i) I don't know
- 3.17 Is this a new post?
- g) Yes. When was it constituted and what informed this?
 - h) No
 - i) I don't know
- 3.18 Does the MoH TWG you are part of rely on evidence synthesis and policy briefs produced wholly by partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
- d) Yes.
 - e) No.
 - f) I don't know
- 3.19 Does the MoH TWG that you are part of hold periodic policy dialogues to have an evidence informed discussion on an identified policy or practice challenge and practical actions to address it?
- d) Yes. When was the most recent policy dialogue, what did it focus on and who was involved in organising, funding and participating in it?
 - e) No.
 - f) I don't know
- 3.20 Would you say that the use of evidence in MoH TWG decisions has improved over time?
- d) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - e) No.
 - f) I don't know

IV. Political economy and governance

This section establishes the governance and political economy for evidence informed decision making at the MoH at the time of data collection and a year ago.

4.0 Has the project generated political interest within the health sectorTBD

V. Testing assumptions

Training

Administered to mid-level policymakers

- 5.1 Do you think you have opportunities to apply the skills you gained from the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis training?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?

- b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 5.2 Do you plan to apply the skills you gained from the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis training?
- a) Yes
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 5.3 Do you think you will find it difficult to apply the skills I acquired from the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis training? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain
- a) Yes
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 5.4 Do you think you have opportunities to apply the skills you gained from the HIGH-Res systematic review training?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 5.5 Do you plan to apply the skills you gained from the HIGH-Res systematic review training?
- a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 5.6 Do you think you will find it difficult to apply the skills I acquired from the HIGH-Res systematic review training?
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Motivation, support, structures and mechanisms

Research focals

- 5.7 Have you faced challenges so far as a nominated research focal? Yes/No. Please explain
- 5.8 Do you think you have opportunities to champion of evidence informed decision making in your department/TWG?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 5.9 Do you think it will be difficult to ensure that decisions of your department/TWG are routinely informed by robust evidence synthesis?
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 5.10 Do you think that it is a role that is valued? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain
- a) Yes. How so?
 - b) No. Why do say so?

- c) I don't know. Why do say so?

TWG TORs

5.11 Do you think you have opportunities to ensure that decisions of the TWG are informed by evidence as reflected in the revised terms of reference?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

5.12 Do you think you will be difficult to implement the revised TWG terms of reference. Please explain? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

TWG policy dialogues

5.13 Do you think you have opportunities for your TWG to hold quarterly policy dialogues? policy dialogues.

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

5.14 What do you think will be the value of the policy dialogues?

5.15 Do you think it will be difficult to implement quarterly TWG policy dialogues. Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Research conferences

5.16 Do you think you have opportunities to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

5.17 Do you think it will be difficult to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

VI. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

6.1 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have hindered MoH evidence informed decision making capacity?

- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

6.2 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?

- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

6.3 Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

6.4 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits?

- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

6.5 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in challenges?

- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

6.6 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?

- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VII. Additional support

7.1 Do you think you need additional support to be able to use evidence in your work?

- a) Yes. What support do you need?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VIII. Additional information

a) Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No

Thank you for taking time to participate in this study.



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

E. Study tool for KEMRI Directors and Knowledge Management Officers

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Contributing to formulating and/or updating public institutions' (e.g., MoH) policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes

- ii) No
 - f) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Managing a research institution?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Managing a research department in a research institution?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - k) Managing research projects?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - l) Managing a training institution or department in charge of training?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - m) Conducting systematic reviews
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - n) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes. Please briefly describe what you know about it.
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

II. EIDM practice

2.1 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?

- b) No. Why do you think so?
 - c) I don't know. Why don't you know?
- 2.2 What factors do you think the MoH take into account when deciding to use research evidence in their decision?
- 2.3 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and programme decisions
- a) Funding
 - b) Evidence
 - c) Donor interest
 - d) Politics
 - e) Personal interest
 - f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)
- 2.4 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?
- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
 - b) No. Why do you think so?
 - c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

III. EIDM incentives and support

- 3.1 Is systematic review a core course in graduate and post graduate training?
- a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 3.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?
- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
 - b) No. When was it introduced
 - c) I don't know
- 3.3 Is it a requirement for you or staff that you manage to be trained in systematic reviews?
- a) Yes. Which staff? Who conducts the training? and what does it cover?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 3.4 What happens if staff do not attend the training?
- 3.5 Does your institution's performance and promotion assessment have criteria requiring all or some researchers to facilitate evidence informed decision making?
- a) Yes. What criteria are assessed?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 3.6 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?
- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
 - b) No. When was it introduced
 - c) I don't know

IV. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

- 4.1 Does KEMRI facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?
- a) Yes. Please describe how
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 4.2 Are KEMRI staff involved in the health sector research priority setting?
- a) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.3 Do KEMRI staff participate on MoH TWGs or committees?
- a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.4 If yes, does their participation support the MoH TWG evidence synthesis activities?
- a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.5 Do KEMRI staff generate systematic reviews?
- a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.6 If yes, have the systematic reviews been used to inform the MoH decisions?
- a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.7 Has there been an improvement in KEMRI's production of timely systematic reviews addressing the health sector high priority issues over time?
- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.8 What additional support is needed from KEMRI to facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?

Mechanisms

- 4.9 Does the MoH TWG you are part of have staff who synthesise evidence and generate policy briefs including in partnership with partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
- a) Yes. Describe the staff and how they undertake this role
 - b) No.

c) I don't know

4.10 Is this a new post?

- a) Yes. When was it constituted and what informed this?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

4.11 Does the MoH TWG you are part of rely on evidence synthesis and policy briefs produced wholly by partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

4.12 Does the MoH TWG that you are part of hold periodic policy dialogues to have an evidence informed discussion on an identified policy or practice challenge and practical actions to address it?

- a) Yes. When was the most recent policy dialogue, what did it focus on and who was involved in organising, funding and participating in it?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

4.13 Would you say that the use of evidence in MoH TWG decisions has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

V. Political economy and governance

This section establishes the governance and political economy for evidence informed decision making at the MoH at the time of data collection and a year ago.

5.1 Has the project generated political interest within the health sectorTBD

VI. Testing assumptions

Motivation, support, structures and mechanisms

Research conferences

6.1 Do you think you have opportunities to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.2 Do you think it will be difficult to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.

- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Integration of evidence informed decision making in MoH/ Research institution training curricular

- 6.3 Do you think you have opportunities to integrate evidence informed decision making in the MoH/post-graduate?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.4 Do you think it will be difficult to get evidence informed decision making integrated as a core course in the MoH/post-graduate?
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

VII. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

- 7.1 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have facilitated or hindered links between researchers and MoH and the capacity for researchers to contribute to MoH decision making?
- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 7.2 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?
- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

VIII. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

- 8.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits?
- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 8.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in any challenges?
- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 8.3 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?
- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

IX. Additional support

- 9.1 Do you think your research institutions need additional support to be able to support public-sector decision-making processes specifically as it relates to production of evidence synthesis?
- a) Yes. What support do you need?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

X. Additional information

- 10.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?
- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
 - b) No



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

F. Study tool for Directors of research institutions

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Contributing to formulating and/or updating public institutions' (e.g., MoH) policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings

- i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - f) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Managing a research institution?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Managing a research department in a research institution?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - k) Managing research projects?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - l) Managing a training institution or department in charge of training?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - m) Conducting systematic reviews
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - n) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes. Please briefly describe what you know about it.
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

II. EIDM practice

2.1 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?

- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I don't know. Why don't you know?

2.2 What factors do you think the MoH take into account when deciding to use research evidence in their decision?

2.3 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and programme decisions

- a) Funding
- b) Evidence
- c) Donor interest
- d) Politics
- e) Personal interest
- f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)

2.4 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

III. EIDM incentives and support

3.1 Is systematic review a core course in graduate and post graduate training?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced
- c) I don't know

3.3 Is it a requirement for you or staff that you manage to be trained in systematic reviews?

- a) Yes. Which staff? Who conducts the training? and what does it cover?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.4 What happens if staff do not attend the training?

3.5 Does your institution's performance and promotion assessment have criteria requiring all or some researchers to facilitate evidence informed decision making?

- a) Yes. What criteria are assessed?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.6 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced
- c) I don't know

IV. EIDM structures and mechanisms

- 4.1 Does your institution facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?
 - a) Yes. Please describe how
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 4.2 Are your some of your research staff involved in the health sector research priority setting?
 - a) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.3 Do some of your research staff participate on MoH TWGs or committees?
 - a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.4 If yes, do they support the MoH TWG evidence synthesis activities?
 - a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.5 Do some of your research staff generate systematic reviews on priority health sector issues?
 - a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.6 If yes, have the systematic reviews been used to inform the MoH decisions?
 - a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.7 Has there been an improvement in your researchers' production of timely systematic reviews addressing the health sector high priority issues over time?
 - a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.8 What additional support is needed from your institution to facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making by production of relevant evidence specifically as it relates to systematic reviews?

V. Political economy and governance

This section establishes the governance and political economy for evidence informed decision making at the MoH at the time of data collection and a year ago.

- 5.1 Has the project generated political interest within the health sectorTBD

VI. Testing assumptions

Motivation, support, structures and mechanisms

Research conferences

- 6.1 Do you think you have opportunities to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.2 Do you think it will be difficult to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

Integration of evidence informed decision making in MoH/ Research institution training curricular

- 6.3 Do you think you have opportunities to integrate evidence informed decision making in the MoH/post-graduate?
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.4 Do you think it will be difficult to get evidence informed decision making integrated as a core course in the MoH/post-graduate?
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

VII. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

- 7.1 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have facilitated or hindered links between researchers and MoH and the capacity for researchers to contribute to MoH decision making?
- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 7.2 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?
- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

VIII. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

8.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits?

- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

8.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in any challenges?

- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

8.3 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?

- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

IX. Additional support

9.1 Do you think your research institutions need additional support to be able to support public-sector decision-making processes specifically as it relates to production of evidence synthesis?

- a) Yes. What support do you need?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

X. Additional information

10.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

G. Study tool for Researchers actively supporting MoH staff

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Formulating and/or updating policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Commissioning research needed by the MoH/CDH for decision-making?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No

- f) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- c) Masters
- d) PhD
- e) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes. Please briefly describe what you know about it.
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

1.8 Are you a KT champion at KEMRI?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

II. EIDM practice

2.1 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I don't know. Why don't you know?

2.2 What factors do you think the MoH take into account when deciding to use research evidence in their decision?

2.3 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and program decisions

- a) Funding
- b) Evidence

- c) Donor interest
- d) Politics
- e) Personal interest
- f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)

2.4 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

III. **EIDM incentives and support**

3.1 Is systematic review a core course in graduate and post graduate training?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced
- c) I don't know

3.3 Is it a requirement for you or staff that you manage to be trained in systematic reviews?

- a) Yes. Which staff? Who conducts the training? and what does it cover?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.4 What happens if staff do not attend the training?

3.5 Does your institution's performance and promotion assessment have criteria requiring all or some researchers to facilitate evidence informed decision making?

- a) Yes. What criteria are assessed?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.6 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced
- c) I don't know

IV. **EIDM structures and mechanisms**

Mechanisms

4.1 Do you support the MoH to make evidence informed decision making?

- a) Yes. Please describe how
- b) No
- c) I don't know

- 4.2 Do you participate in health sector research priority setting activities e.g., development of a health sector research agenda?
- a) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.3 Do you participate on MoH TWGs or committees?
- a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.4 If yes, do you support the MoH TWG evidence synthesis activities?
- a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.5 Do you generate systematic reviews on priority health sector issues?
- a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 4.6 If yes, have any systematic reviews you have produced been used to inform the MoH decisions?
- a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.7 Has there been an improvement in your production of timely systematic reviews addressing the health sector high priority issues over time?
- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.8 What additional support do you need to facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making by production of relevant evidence specifically as it relates to systematic reviews?
- 4.9 Does the MoH TWG you are part of have staff who synthesise evidence and generate policy briefs including in partnership with partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
- a) Yes. Describe the staff and how they undertake this role
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.10 Is this a new post (i.e., has this always been in place)?
- a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know
- 4.11 Does the MoH TWG you are part of rely on evidence synthesis and policy briefs produced wholly by partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
- a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know

- 4.12 Does the MoH TWG that you are part of hold periodic policy dialogues to have an evidence informed discussion on an identified policy or practice challenge and practical actions to address it?
- a) Yes. When was the most recent policy dialogue, what did it focus on and who was involved in organising, funding and participating in it?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 4.13 Would you say that the use of evidence in MoH TWG decisions has improved over time?
- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know

V. Political economy and governance

This section establishes the governance and political economy for evidence informed decision making at the MoH at the time of data collection and a year ago.

5.1 Has the project generated political interest within the health sectorTBD

VI. Testing assumptions

Motivation, support, structures and mechanisms

Research conferences

- 6.1 Do you think you have opportunities to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 6.2 Do you think it will be difficult to co-organise, with researchers and other stakeholders, conferences aligned to health sector priorities.
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

VII. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

- 7.1 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have facilitated or hindered links between researchers and MoH and the capacity for researchers to contribute to MoH decision making?
- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

- 7.2 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?
- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
 - b) No
 - c) I don't know

VIII. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

- 8.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits?

- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

- 8.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in any challenges?

- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

- 8.3 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?

- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

IX. Additional support

- 9.1 Do you think your research institutions need additional support to be able to support public-sector decision-making processes specifically as it relates to production of evidence synthesis?

- a) Yes. What support do you need?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

X. Additional information

- 10.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No

- 10.2 Do you have colleagues who were not involved in the HIGH-Res program and is knowledgeable about how things work in your organisation?

Yes.

- a) No
- b) I don't know

- 10.3 If yes, could you provide us with their name and contact?

- a) Yes.
Name:
Contact: email and/or phone number
- b) No

10.4 Could you provide us with your immediate supervisor's name and contact so that we can find out how else the department, unit or program could be supported?

a) Yes.

Name:

Contact: email and/or phone number

b) No



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

H. Study Tool for Development partners and CSO

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Formulating and/or updating policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Commissioning research needed by the MoH/CDH for decision-making?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No

- f) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes. Please briefly describe what you know about it.
- b) No
- c) I don't know

II. EIDM practice

2.1 Do you think use of evidence by MoH staff has improved?

- a) Yes. How and what do you think resulted in this?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I don't know. Why don't you know?

2.2 What factors do you think are important for evidence to be considered in MOH decision-making processes?

2.3 Please rank the extent that each of the following factors influences MoH policy and program decisions

- a) Funding
- b) Evidence
- c) Donor interest
- d) Politics
- e) Personal interest
- f) Tacit knowledge (gained through practical experience, social networks, mentorship etc.)

2.4 Do you think the prominence of evidence among the other factors has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and why do you think so?
- b) No. Why do you think so?
- c) I wouldn't know. Why don't you know?

III. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

- 3.1 How does KEMRI facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?
- 3.2 Are KEMRI staff involved in the health sector research priority setting?
 - a) Yes. Describe how they are involved?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 3.3 Do KEMRI staff participate on MoH TWGs or committees?
 - a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 3.4 If yes, does their participation support the MoH TWG evidence synthesis activities?
 - a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 3.5 Do KEMRI staff generate systematic reviews?
 - a) Yes.
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know.
- 3.6 If yes, have the systematic reviews been used to inform the MoH decisions?
 - a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 3.7 Has there been an improvement in KEMRI's production of timely systematic reviews addressing the health sector high priority issues over time?
 - a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 3.8 What additional support is needed from KEMRI to facilitate the MoH evidence informed decision making?

Mechanisms

- 3.9 Does the MoH TWG you are part of have staff who synthesise evidence and generate policy briefs including in partnership with partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?
 - a) Yes. Describe the staff and how they undertake this role
 - b) No.

c) I don't know

3.10 Is this a new post (i.e., has this always been in place)?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

3.11 Does the MoH TWG you are part of rely on evidence synthesis and policy briefs produced wholly by partners (e.g., CSOs and donors)?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

3.12 Does the MoH TWG that you are part of hold periodic policy dialogues to have an evidence informed discussion on an identified policy or practice challenge and practical actions to address it?

- a) Yes. When was the most recent policy dialogue, what did it focus on and who was involved in organising, funding and participating in it?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

3.13 Would you say that the use of evidence in MoH TWG decisions has improved over time?

- a) Yes. How and what has resulted in this?
- b) No.
- c) I don't know

IV. Contribution of other factors and the HIGH-Res project

This section establishes the contribution of the HIGH-Res project on improving EIDM knowledge and skills of MoH staff and researchers, processes, structures, mechanisms and resources that motivate, support and facilitate EIDM at the time of data collection.

4.1 Recently have there been efforts in the public sector or your institution or external initiatives that have hindered MoH evidence informed decision making capacity?

- a) Yes. What efforts are these?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

4.2 Do you think the HiGH-Res project has contributed to improving the MoH evidence informed decision making practice?

- a) Yes. How has it contributed?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

V. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

5.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in unexpected benefits?

- a) Yes. What unplanned benefits?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

5.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in unexpected challenges?

- a) Yes. What unexpected challenges?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

5.3 Are you aware about the Cochrane Kenya?

- a) Yes. What are your thoughts of how it can contribute to enhancing the health sector evidence informed decision making?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VI. Additional support

6.1 Do you think the MoH needs additional support to be able to use evidence in your work?

- a) Yes. What support do you need?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VII. Additional information

7.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

I. Study Tool for County Top decision-makers

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Contributing to formulating and/or updating public institutions' (e.g., MoH) policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes

- ii) No
 - f) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Managing research projects?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

1.8 Are you a nominated research focal?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

II. Individual knowledge/skills

Support

2.1 Does the CDH have evidence informed decision making guidelines and tools for staff to use?

- a) Yes. Describe the guidelines and tools, and what they support
- b) No
- c) I don't know

2.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced?
- c) I don't know

III. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

- 3.1 Does KEMRI support the CDH to make evidence informed decision making?
- a) Yes. Describe how
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 3.2 What additional support is needed from KEMRI to facilitate the CDH evidence informed decision making?
- 3.3 What structures does your county have to support evidence informed decision making?
- 3.4 Does your county have a dashboard that provides access to up-to-date evidence for informing county health decisions?
- a) Yes. Describe the dashboard?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 3.5 Is the county dashboard new?
- a) Yes. When was it established, by whom, what informed its establishment and how were you involved?
 - b) No. When was the position introduced?
 - c) I don't know
- 3.6 Has the county dashboard improved the county health department's evidence informed decision making?
- a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why don't you think so?
 - c) I don't know. Why don't you know

IV. Testing assumptions

County dashboard

- 4.1 Do you think you have opportunities to use the County dashboard as a sources of evidence to support decisions of the CHD.
- a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.2 Do you think it will be difficult to sustain the use of the County dashboard.
- a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

V. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

- 5.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits beyond improving CDH staff evidence synthesis skills?
- a) Yes. What unexpected benefits?

- b) No
- c) I don't know

5.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in any challenges?

- a) Yes. What challenges?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VI. Testing assumptions

6.1 Do you think CDH staff trained in evidence synthesis have opportunities to apply the skills you gained from the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis training?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.2 Do you think CDH staff trained in evidence synthesis will find it difficult to apply the skills I acquired from the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis training? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain

VII. Additional support

7.1 Do you think you need additional support to be able to use evidence in your work?

- a) Yes. What support do you need?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VIII. Additional information

8.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No

Thank you for taking time to participate in this study.



African Institute for Development Policy
Bridging Development Research, Policy & Practice

KENYA: 6th floor, Block A, Westcom Point Building, Mahiga Mairu Road off Waiyaki Way, Westlands

P.O. Box 14688-00800, Nairobi, Kenya

Phone: +254-20-203-9510; +254-735-249-499

MALAWI: Petroda Glasshouse, Area 14, Plot number 14/191, P.O. Box 31024, Lilongwe, Malawi.

Phone: +265-995 495 143

Email: info@afidep.org Website: www.afidep.org

J. Study Tool for County decision-makers trained in evidence synthesis

I. Background information

This section gathers background information of the participants including the type of participant (policy maker or researcher), position, their day to day roles and whether they were engaged by the project. This section will be administered to all the participants.

1.1 Position of the participant

1.2 Number of years in the position

1.3 Number of years in your profession (policymaker, researchers or CSO)

1.4 Using the scale 1 (not really) to 5 (To a significant extent), to what extent does your work involve the following

- a) Formulating and/or updating policy documents?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- b) Approving policy and programme recommendations?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- c) Designing and/or implementing programme activities?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- d) Preparing policy briefs?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
- e) Commissioning research needed by the MoH/CDH for decision-making?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No

- f) Chairing MoH/ CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - g) Participating in MoH/CDH technical working group meetings
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - h) Organising policy dialogues i.e., meetings involving a wide range of stakeholders (policymakers, researchers, CSOs among others) during which policy challenges and solutions are identified/discussed in relation to existing evidence and evidence gaps
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - i) Organising conferences
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - j) Conducting research?
 - i) Yes
 - ii) No
 - k) Other
-

1.5 What is your level of education?

- a) Bachelor
- b) Masters
- c) PhD
- d) Other

1.6 Have you ever heard of the HIGH Res project?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

1.7 If yes, how were you engaged?

1.8 Are you a nominated research focal?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

II. Individual knowledge/skills

Support

2.1 Does the CDH have evidence informed decision making guidelines and tools for staff to use?

- a) Yes. Describe the guidelines and tools, and what they support
- b) No
- c) I don't know

2.2 If yes. Was this introduced recently, within the past five years?

- a) Yes. When was it introduced and and what informed its introduction?
- b) No. When was it introduced?
- c) I don't know

III. EIDM structures and mechanisms

Structures

- 3.1 Does KEMRI support the CDH to make evidence informed decision making?
 - a) Yes. Describe how
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 3.2 What additional support is needed from KEMRI to facilitate the CDH evidence informed decision making?
- 3.3 What structures does your county have to support evidence informed decision making?
- 3.4 Does your county have a dashboard that provides access to up-to-date evidence for informing county health decisions?
 - a) Yes. Describe the dashboard?
 - b) No.
 - c) I don't know
- 3.5 Is the county dashboard new?
 - a) Yes. When was it established, by whom, what informed its establishment and how were you involved?
 - b) No. When was the position introduced?
 - c) I don't know
- 3.6 Has the county dashboard improved the county health department's evidence informed decision making?
 - a) Yes. How?
 - b) No. Why don't you think so?
 - c) I don't know. Why don't you know

IV. Testing assumptions

County dashboard

- 4.1 Do you think you have opportunities to use the County dashboard as a sources of evidence to support decisions of the CHD.
 - a) Yes. What opportunities?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?
- 4.2 Do you plan to use the County dashboard as a as a source of evidence to support decisions of the CHD?
- 4.3 Do you think it will be difficult to sustain the use of the County dashboard.
 - a) Yes. What difficulties do you anticipate?
 - b) No. Why do you say so?
 - c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

V. Additional unexpected consequences (Benefits and challenges)

5.1 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in other benefits beyond improving CDH staff evidence synthesis skills?

- a) Yes. What unexpected benefits?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

5.2 Has the HIGH-Res programme resulted in any challenges?

- a) Yes. What challenges?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VI. Testing assumptions

6.1 Do you think CDH staff trained in evidence synthesis have opportunities to apply the skills you gained from the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis training?

- a) Yes. What opportunities?
- b) No. Why do you say so?
- c) I don't know. Why do you say so?

6.2 Do you think CDH staff trained in evidence synthesis will find it difficult to apply the skills I acquired from the HIGH-Res rapid evidence synthesis training? Yes/No/I don't know. Please explain

VII. Additional support

7.1 Do you think you need additional support to be able to use evidence in your work?

- a) Yes. What support do you need?
- b) No
- c) I don't know

VIII. Additional information

8.1 Do you have anything else you would like to add to what we have discussed?

- a) Yes. Please, go ahead.
- b) No

8.2 Do you have colleagues who were not involved in the HIGH-Res program?

- a) Yes.
- b) No
- c) I don't know

8.3 If yes, could you provide us with their name and contact?

- a) Yes.
Name:
Contact: email and/or phone number
- b) No

8.4 Could you provide us with your immediate supervisor's name and contact so that we can find out how else the department, unit or program could be supported?

a) Yes.

Name:

Contact: email and/or phone number

b) No

Thank you for taking time to participate in this study.