Australia Awards MELF Guidance Note 3: Core Global Indicators

## Overview

All country and regional programs are required to report against a set of Core Indicators on an annual basis. The Core Indicators aim to generate information that supports central reporting and enables the Australia Awards Section to tell a global performance story. Core Indicators support consistency of data collection across the global program. Guidance is provided which outlines the full set of information to be reported against each indicator, and explains terminology and data collection methods to ensure consistency. The Core Indicators are featured in the table below, and are accompanied by Core Indicator Guidance.

Core Indicators comprise only one source of data that will be used by the Australia Awards Section for global reporting, and are targeted at a country and regional program level. A range of other data sources will be drawn on to provide a picture of global performance such as from the OASIS database, On-Award Surveys (ORIMA) carried out by a commercial survey company, and the Global Tracer Facility alumni surveys. All Core Indicators are quantitative. The Australia Awards Section will also draw on a range of qualitative country and regional program data as part of its annual reporting such as information contained in ACQs, reports and case studies. However, this information will be sourced separately by the Australia Awards Section.

All Core Indicators are framed within a Global Performance Target which outlines Australia Awards performance expectations, linked to the achievement of the Australia Awards Strategic Framework (2021). The Indicator Guidance further explains and clarifies aspects of the target, such as the intended scope or timeframe of an outcome. Targets seek to provide a means for DFAT to benchmark progress and assess performance over time. Core Indicators support global reporting and do not preclude other indicators at a country level. It is recognised that Posts develop their own context appropriate indicators for their own learning and reporting purposes.

## Contextualising indicators to diverse contexts

Indicator Guidance has been developed to support consistency of indicator interpretation and data collection methods among country and regional programs. Some indicator terminology may be open to interpretation and have different meanings in different country contexts, such as the word ‘leadership’. The guidance explains the intent of specific words or the indicator more broadly. Country programs are not expected to use the same indicator terminology or phrasing during awardee / alumni surveys or interviews. Rather, questions and language should be contextualised by country programs, and designed to elicit responses that provide information corresponding to the intent of the indicator. Country programs are requested to explain any divergence in definition when submitting data. Broad requirements for data collection and validation measures have been established to ensure consistency. Some flexibility and variations on methods however have been maintained in recognition of the diversity of program contexts.

## Data quality and verification

Country programs are expected to ensure that annual data sets are obtained from a representative sample of awardees/alumni from cohorts within specified timeframes, and that bias is managed to the extent possible in accordance with DFAT’s data quality standards. Four Core Indicators require country programs to capture and validate responses through qualitative examples (3.3, 5.2, 6.4). Collection of such qualitative examples must attempt to ensure that the raw datasets meet a basic level of representativeness and be sufficiently detailed so as to enable verification. Qualitative responses and examples provided by respondents could be validated through: interviews with supervisors or colleagues; case studies; secondary data sources such as online searches; or by assessing factors such as the comprehensiveness of the description, the amount of detail, and the degree of fit between the task or change and the person’s role. If country programs lack the resources required to validate responses, a justification for the divergence and explanation of how the indicator has been measured should be submitted.

## Modalities

Indicators related to the perceptions or experiences of awardees or alumni must be captured and reported on for all modalities (scholarships in Australia and overseas, and short courses in Australia and overseas), with the exception of Target 5: Bilateral Collaboration, indicators 5.1 and 5.2 which only needs to be collected for scholarships and short courses in Australia.

## Cohort / timeframes

Data provided for global indicators should be drawn from data available in the previous 12 months.

Several of the indicators require data associated with ‘the number and percentage of awardees’. Where indicators relate to annual intakes of awardees (1.1, 1.2,1.3, 2.1, 6.1) the percentage should be given in relation to the total number of awardees in the intake period.

Another set of indicators related to ‘the number and percentage of awardees / alumni’ must be obtained through interview or survey of particular cohorts of awardees or alumni (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.3, 6.4). In these instances, the percentage should be calculated as a percentage of those who participated in the survey or interviews, not as a percentage of all alumni. Awards Development Impact Study (ADIS) or other survey processes are typically conducted post award 2-6 months (for short courses) and 18-36 months (for scholarships). Country programs should provide data available in the previous 12 months, along with an explanatory not that includes: post awards survey timeframe and total number of alumni in survey cohort.

Three indicators require data to be provided over the previous 12-month period related to the activities and performance of the country program. These include $ amount and number of GESDI efforts (2.2) and IMR ratings (2.3 and 6.2). Data should align with DFAT’s standard annual reporting cycle.

## Phasing of implementation

2022 will be a pilot year for refining and reporting against the indicator framework. There are 17 core indicators. A tiered system will be used to guide implementation and reporting timeframes. Phasing in of indicators seeks to give country programs sufficient time to integrate specific indicators into their M&E processes, and in turn capture data to be reported the following year. This process will also enable open discussion between country programs and the Canberra Scholarships and Alumni Branch about what is and is not working, and refine indicator guidance throughout the trial period. Exemptions on some indicators may be given to Posts that do not engage Managing Contractors or have sufficient resources to meet data collection and reporting requirements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tier 1** | **Year 1: end 2022 financial year reporting**  Many of the indicators and associated data collection and verification methods have been developed to align with established M&E tools and processes. It is therefore expected that many country and regional programs will be able to report against several of the indicators immediately, without requiring changes to their systems. |
| **Tier 2** | **Year 2: end 2023 financial year reporting**  Some country programs may be able to report against Tier 2 indicators (and are encouraged to do so in Year 1 if the data is available). However, other country programs may need to make relatively small adjustments to their system in 2022 to integrate these indicators, positioning them to report on these the following year. |
| **Tier 3** | **Year 3: end of 2024 financial year reporting**  A set of new indicators have been developed that are not currently integrated into country program M&E frameworks. Additional effort is required to refine these indicators and the associated guidance in collaboration with country programs, before they can then be used by Country Programs. |

The Core Indicator summary framework below is coded according to these three tiers.

## Australia Awards Core Indicators

| **No.** | **Global performance target** | **Country program core indicators** | **Tier** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Country programs attract and select increasing proportions of diverse, eligible applicants, placing them in Awards that align with DFAT priority areas | 1.1 Number and percentage of Australia Awards allocated disaggregated by key diversity markers. | **1** | Country program databases |
| 1.2 Number and percentage of awardees who successfully complete an Australia Award course and obtain the course qualification. | **1** | Country program databases |
| 1.3 Number and percentage of total Australia Awards allocated to priority areas at a country level. | **1** | Country program databases |
| 2 | Country programs effectively promote the Australia Awards to vulnerable and minority groups, have demonstrated capacity and processes in place to support GEDSI inclusion, and strive to strengthen systems and practice if standards are not met. | 2.1 Number and percentage of people from vulnerable groups who apply for an Award each year vs percentage of people from each group receiving an Award each year. | **1** | Country program databases |
| 2.2 $ Investment in and number and representative lists of efforts undertaken by country programs that have or are expected to result in greater inclusion of vulnerable groups in the Australia Awards. | **2** | Country program monitoring |
| 2.3 Country rating for disability: ‘The investment identifies and addresses barriers to inclusion and opportunities for participation for people with disabilities to enable them to benefit equally from the aid investment’. | **1** | IMR reporting |
| 3 | Australia Awards is an effective mechanism which contributes to an increasing number of alumni better equipped to influence development outcomes in their home countries across a diversity of sectors. | 3.1 Number and percentage of awardees who report satisfaction with their award. | **3** | On-award survey, ADIS, or interview |
| 3.2 Number and percentage of alumni who report the usefulness of the Award in enabling them to contribute to development. | **3** | ADIS, survey or interview |
| 3.3 Number and percentage of alumni able to provide valid examples of contributions to country objectives, using the skills, knowledge or networks gained from their award.  *\*Indicator to provide gender disaggregated data.* | **2** | ADIS, survey or interview |
| 4 | Country / regional programs build a bigger, stronger network of active alumni by creating meaningful opportunities for quality engagement that contributes to alumni advancement in their home country. | 4.1 Number and percentage of active alumni. | **2** | Country program alumni database and monitoring |
| 4.2 Number and percentage of alumni who report that they have participated in valuable alumni activities. | **3** | ADIS, surveyor interview or alumni event tracking |
| 5 | Australia Awards and alumni engagement increasingly contribute to enduring relationships and mutual cooperation between Australia and the partner country. | 5.1 Number and percentage of alumni who have drawn on bilateral links, established through the Australia Awards. | **2** | ADIS, survey or interview |
| 5.2 Number and percentage of alumni able to provide valid examples of participation in mutual collaborations between their country and Australia, after their completion of the Australia Award. | **2** | ADIS, survey or interview |
| 6 | The Australia Awards contributes to a growing cohort of women leaders who are increasingly able to participate, influence and lead across a diversity of development sectors. | 6.1 Number and percentage of Australia Awards allocated to development sectors where women’s skills and participation are most needed in each country. | **2** | Country program databases |
| 6.2 Country rating for gender equality ‘The investment is making progress as expected in effectively implementing strategies to promote gender equality and women's empowerment’. | **1** | IMR reporting |
| 6.3 Number and percentage of women who experience career advancement partially attributable to their participation in the Australia Awards. | **3** | ADIS, survey or interview |
| 6.4 Number and percentage of women alumni able to provide examples of enhanced leadership or empowerment partially attributable to their participation in the Australia Awards. | **3** | ADIS, survey or interview |

## Core Indicator Guidance

### Global Performance Target 1: Promotion and Selection

***Country programs attract and select increasing proportions of diverse, eligible applicants, placing them in Awards that align with DFAT priority areas.***

The Australia Awards requires the merit-based selection of eligible applicants who meet core selection criteria including potential to contribute to development outcomes, academic competence, professional and personal leadership attributes. Indicators in this area support the tracking of diversity markers and alignment with DFAT priorities. This performance target will also draw on indicators that are grouped within other performance targets related to: diversity of alumni, indicator 2.1 (awardees disaggregated by sex, disability and ethnicity); and the achievement of Australia Awards outcomes, indicator 3.4 (selecting candidates who successfully contribute to development outcomes) and indicator 5.2 (participation in mutual collaborations).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.1 NUMBER AND Percentage of Australia Awards allocated disaggregated by key Diversity markers | **TIER 1** |

Country programs should report the percentage of total awards allocated each year according to each of the following categories:

* + Location
  + Employer
  + Sector of contribution
  + Field of Study

Country programs must provide information according to the sub-categories and classifications outlined in this indicator guidance:

**Location**

* Country
* Region

**Employer**

* Public sector
* Private sector
* international organisations (i.e., UN, INGOs, multilateral banks, etc).
* regional organisations (i.e., Pacific regional organisations, ASEAN)
* national civil society organisations
* Disabled Persons Organisation (DPO)
* University & Higher education
* Unsure

**Sector**

* Education
* Health
* Governance, Law and justice
* Agriculture, Rural development, Food Security
* Humanitarian assistance, disaster risk reduction and social protection
* Transport and Infrastructure
* Environmental and natural resource management
* Other

**Field of Study**

Categorisations for broad Field of Study are taken from ABS classifications. Both the Category (e.g. Education) and Field of Study listed in sub-points (e.g. Teacher Education) should be provided. More information on the detailed study areas encompassed by a Field of Study can be found [here](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/1272.0Main+Features12001?OpenDocument.).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NATURAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES**   * Mathematical Sciences * Physics and Astronomy * Chemical Sciences * Earth Sciences * Biological Sciences * Other Natural and Physical Sciences   **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**   * Computer Science * Information Systems * Other Information Technology   **ENGINEERING AND RELATED TECHNOLOGIES**   * Manufacturing Engineering and Technology * Process and Resources Engineering * Automotive Engineering and Technology * Mechanical and Industrial Engineering and Technology * Civil Engineering * Geomatic Engineering * Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology * Aerospace Engineering and Technology * Maritime Engineering and Technology * Other Engineering and Related Technologies   **ARCHITECTURE AND BUILDING**   * Architecture and Urban Environment * Building   **AGRICULTURE, ENVIRONMENTAL AND RELATED STUDIES**   * Agriculture * Forestry Studies * Fisheries Studies * Environmental Studies * Other Agriculture, Environmental and Related Studies * Pest and Weed Control * Agriculture, Environmental and Related Studies, n.e.c.   **HEALTH**   * Medical Studies * Nursing * Pharmacy * Dental Studies * Optical Science * Veterinary Studies * Public Health * Radiography * Rehabilitation Therapies * Complementary Therapies * Other Health | **EDUCATION**   * Teacher Education * Curriculum and Education Studies * Other Education   **MANAGEMENT AND COMMERCE**   * Accounting * Business and Management * Sales and Marketing * Tourism * Office Studies * Banking, Finance and Related Fields * Other Management and Commerce   **SOCIETY AND CULTURE**   * Political Science and Policy Studies * Studies in Human Society * Human Welfare Studies and Services * Behavioural Science * Law * Justice and Law Enforcement * Librarianship, Information Management and Curatorial Studies * Language and Literature * Philosophy and Religious Studies * Economics and Econometrics * Sport and Recreation * Other Society and Culture   **CREATIVE ARTS**   * Performing Arts * Visual Arts and Crafts * Graphic and Design Studies * Communication and Media Studies * Other Creative Arts   **FOOD, HOSPITALITY AND PERSONAL SERVICES**   * Food and Hospitality * Personal Services   **MIXED FIELD PROGRAMMES**   * General Education Programmes * Social Skills Programmes * Employment Skills Programmes * Other Mixed Field Programmes |

It is expected that this information is partially available in OASIS, however, this indicator may require additional categorisation of existing data in cases where country programs use different sub-categories.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.2 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF AWARDEES WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE AN AUSTRALIA AWARD COURSE AND OBTAIN THE COURSE QUALIFICATION. | **TIER 1** |

Country programs are expected to provide the percentage of awardees that have and have not completed their course and obtained the course qualification. This includes awardees who have successfully complete their original course or a downgraded course. In cases where awardees have not successfully completed the course and obtained qualification, further categorisation of the reason for lack of completion is required.

Data sets include:

* percentage successfully completed original course
* percentage successfully completed downgrade course
* percentage not successfully completed
  + Did not pass examinations or course requirements
  + Unable / chose not to complete

It is expected that this information is partially available in OASIS. However, additional efforts may be required to follow up on PhD candidates who have returned to their home country and are awaiting course results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.3 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AUSTRALIA AWARDS ALLOCATED TO PRIORITY AREAS AT COUNTRY LEVEL | **TIER 1** |

Country programs should report:

* Percentage of total Australian Awards allocated within country priority areas.

Country priorities areas are not expected to be uniform across countries. Reporting must link to established country priorities that are either listed in the Covid-19 Development Response Plan (CDRP) or annual Australia Award country level advertisements.

### Global Performance Target 2: Inclusion

***Country programs effectively promote the Australia Awards to vulnerable and minority groups, have demonstrated capacity and processes in place to support GEDSI inclusion, and strive to strengthen systems and practice if standards are not met.***

The Australia Awards sets a target of an equal number of Australia Awards being awarded to women and men. This target has largely been achieved consistently, with the Australia Awards achieving gender parity. This target however, will remain, and will be continued to be measured. It is expected that country programs develop the processes and capacity required to effectively identify and address the specific challenges or constraints that awardees from vulnerable or minority groups may face (such as women, people of diverse ‘Sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sex characteristics’ (SOGIESC), people with disability, and people from indigenous peoples or minority groups). These may involve family, workplace, employer or educational institution constraints such as harmful social norms, attitudes or structures that hinder full participation in the Award, or ability to apply new knowledge, skills or networks gained. It is also expected that barriers to the participation of awardees with disability are identified and removed, and reasonable adjustments supported. This global target requires that country programs continue to meet these requirements to a high standard, or strive to improve where gaps exist. Information obtained from indicators in Target 6: Women’s empowerment will also contribute to an assessment of this performance target.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.1 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE FROM VULNERABLE GROUPS WHO APPLY FOR AN AWARD EACH YEAR VS PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE FROM EACH GROUP RECEIVING AN AWARD EACH YEAR | **TIER 1** |

To report against this indicator, Country programs should report both:

* Number and percentage of people who apply for an Australia Award each year
* Number and percentage of total applicants who receive an Australia Award each year

For the following groups:

* Women
* Men
* People from ‘diverse SOGIESC’ (see definition and explanation below)
* People with disability
* People from ethnic minority groups

Data regarding sex (men and women) and disability is currently entered into and drawn from the OASIS and country program databases. This information is also sought for other Australian Award applicants for other courses including short courses and in-country and regional awards. This information should be captured in accordance with Australia Awards and DFAT standards.

At the global level Australia Awards is also seeking to progressively capture data related to gender and ethnicity. To support this, the group Diverse ‘Sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sex characteristics’ (SOGIESC) is also included. The use of the term SOGIESC builds on the work of Australia Awards South Asia in contextualising GEDSI to the Australia Awards and regional context. The term diverse SOGIESC’ refers to non-cisgendered, non-heterosexual and intersex people (also known as the LGBTIQA+ community). ‘Diverse SOGIESC’ is regarded as more inclusive of specific third-gender groups who do not necessarily identify as transgender[[1]](#footnote-1). Similarly, the Scholarships and Alumni Branch is seeking to track changes in the inclusion of people from ethnic minority groups which is important to the equitable distribution of awards in a country.

While it is preferable that country programs also track changes in the number of people applying and receiving awards from diverse SOGIESC and people from ethnic minority groups, it is acknowledged that there are sensitivities associated with the capture of such data, and teams are bound by ethical standards and do no harm principles associated with data capture. It is therefore at the discretion of each country program to capture and report on these two categories. It is not it is acknowledged that some country programs will not be able to provide this data due to challenges associated with asking people to self-identify as of or diverse SOGIESC or from a particular ethnic group in partner country contexts.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.2 $ INVESTMENT IN AND Number And representative lists of efforts undertaken by country programs that have or are expected to result in greater inclusion of vulnerable groups in the Australia Awards. | **TIER 2** |

This indicator focuses on the policies, procedures and practices of country program in facilitating the inclusion of vulnerable groups into the Australia Awards, rather than capacity building of awardees to support more inclusive development in their home countries. Country programs are requested to provide the number of efforts that have been undertaken annually to support Gender Equality and Social and Disability Inclusion (GESDI) against each of the following areas:

* Policies, strategies, guidelines or procedures – this may include developing or updating of GESDI related documents that set out the Australia Award’s approach to facilitating inclusion and its operationalisation at a country or regional level.
* Research or analytical work – this may include enquiry into how issues of gender, disability or other forms of marginalisation affects the experiences of awardees, undertaken to support more effective targeting.
* Staff capacity development that has resulted in strengthened practice – this may include MC or DFAT staff training, mentoring or other forms of learning that have built the capability of management or implementation teams to engender greater inclusion in the context of the Australia Awards, which have resulted in changes and improvements to practice.
* Provision of support to individuals – this may include substantial support provided to awardees, alumni or potential recipients that significantly enhances their successful participation in the Australia Awards such to prepare an application, address constraints to their participation in their course, or support them to apply the new knowledge and skills on return.
* Support for advocacy efforts of prominent alumni who directly influence the inclusion of vulnerable groups in Australia Awards – this may include engagement or support by the country program to support inclusion initiatives led by alumni.

Country program reporting against this indicator should provide representative lists of key efforts undertaken, coded according to these four categories. While it is not necessary to provide an exhaustive and comprehensive list of all efforts, the lists should give a sense of the types of efforts that have been made, and their results or likely implications. It is expected that this information is available through program monitoring.

Country programs are also requested to provide the total $ amount spent on GEDSI, and percentage of GEDSI allocation of total budget.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.3 Country rating for disability: ‘The investment identifies and addresses barriers to inclusion and opportunities for participation for people with disabilities to enable them to benefit equally from the aid investment’. | **TIER 1** |

Many country programs complete an Investment Monitoring Report (IMR), formerly Aid Quality Check (AQC), of the Australia Awards which encompasses an assessment of the extent to which the investment is disability inclusive. As part of this assessment, a specific rating is required against Statement 2 ‘the investment identifies and addresses barriers to inclusion and opportunities for participation for people with disabilities to enable them to benefit equally from the aid investment’.

The rating provided should be based on evidence and made in accordance with IMR reporting guidance. The IMR assessment guidance presented below has been adapted and contextualised to the Australia Awards context and serves as a guide.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Satisfactory or above (4 or higher) | Unsatisfactory (3 or lower) |
| * Q1: Australia Awards are promoted to Disabled Peoples Organisations (DPOs) and people with disability, with associated ICT and communication methods made accessible. * Q1: People with disability are engaged in Australia Award reflection and decision-making processes, such as reference groups or committees. * Q2: Disability inclusive measures are evident in design documents, and are informed by an analysis of the barriers to inclusion in relevant locations/sectors. * Q2: Reasonable adjudgments are made to ensure accessibility measures on Award (e.g. travel, accommodation, educational facilities and learning environments). * Q2: Adequate budget provided for disability inclusive measures, including to provide for reasonable adjustments and address barriers. * Q2: Engagement of quality disability inclusion TA which removes barriers and ensures people with disabilities are supported in the application process, and appropriate adjustments are made on Award to support their successful participation in and completion of their Award. * Q2: M&E frameworks collect and analyse disability-disaggregated data against indicators that track equality of outcomes for awardees with disability and reports qualitative information on the effectiveness of support provided. | * Q1: No or superficial discussion of opportunities to promote the Australia Awards to people with disability or DPOs, or use of accessible ICT communication methods. * Q1: No evidence of engagement with people with disability in Australia Awards reflection and decision making. * Q2: People with disability are engaged in Australia Award decision making, such as reference groups or committed. * Q2: No or low quality disability analysis undertaken at the start of the investment, or undertaken too late to influence implementation plans. * Q2: No or inadequate budget provided for disability inclusive measures including for reasonable adjustments and accessibility measures. * Q2: Lack of appropriate and quality inclusion TA to identify and respond to the support needs, adjustments and accessibility measures required by awardees. * Q2: No or insufficient evidence that people with disabilities are able to benefit from the investment, or that country programs are able to adequately address barriers and support reasonable adjustments that enable people to obtain the Award. * Q2: M&E frameworks do not collect and analyse disability-disaggregated data against indicators that track equality of outcomes for awardees with disability or report qualitative information on the effectiveness of support provided. |

When determining a rating, ideally country or regional Australia Award disability inclusion strategies will have outputs and outcomes for measuring disability inclusion that are tracked and measured against to assist the assessment and rating process. When this is not the case, a best judgement should be formed based on evidence, with a justification required for the rating to be provided in the narrative. When reporting against this indicator to the Australia Awards Section, Country programs should only provide the numerical rating against Statement 2. Posts that do not complete an IMR for the Australia Awards are encouraged to provide a rating in this area using the guidance outlined in this indicator, however this is not a requirement.

### Global Performance Target 3: Influencing Development

***Australia Awards is an effective mechanism which contributes to an increasing number of alumni better equipped to influence development outcomes in their home countries across a diversity of sectors.***

It is acknowledged that a range of factors are likely to affect the ability of alumni to successfully apply the new knowledge, skills and networks to contribute to development outcomes. Within its scope of control, the Australia Awards is expected to continue to ensure Awards are high quality, relevant and useful to awardees’ home country contexts. The Australia Awards are expected to build the technical knowledge and skills of awardees in their areas of specialisation (measured through Performance Target, indicator 2, related to obtainment of course qualifications) and the influencing skills of awardees which is key to application. Outcome 1 is expected to occur in the longer term (approximately 3-5 years+ after award), and is more relevant to scholars. While it is not expected that the majority of alumni will be influencing development outcomes within a two-year period after completing their Award, this performance target still seeks to capture progress and contributions towards this outcome in the more intermediate timeframe (1-2 years+) and beyond.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.1 Number and PERCENTAGE OF AWARDEES WHO REPORT SATISFACTION WITH THEIR AWARD | **TIER 3** |

This is an output level indicator which provides a measure of the performance of country programs in delivering the Australia Awards, and is more directly with their sphere of control.

Country programs should report five data sets against this indicator, which capture key elements of Awardee satisfaction:

Number and percentage of Awardees who report:

* That their award was relevant to their employment and country context
* That they received good quality training, education or professional development
* They their award enabled them to build useful links and networks.
* That their award has helped them to build their soft skills (including influencing skills)
* That they were satisfied with the quality of preparation and on-award support provided

This data is available from in ORIMA for scholarship students studying in Australia. However, Australia Awards is now seeking to capture this data for all other modalities including overseas scholarships and short courses both in Australia and overseas. This is a new indicator, and more detailed guidance will be developed for this indicator with the Australia Awards M&E Working Group over the pilot year. The group will explore ways to capture and this data (i.e. through the use of a Likert scale, with awardees self-reporting such as through surveys or interviews). Data collection methods should be designed to elicit information on the extent to which awardees perceive that their course topics were relevant to their work duties, tailored to their needs and priorities, and have or are likely to be applicable and useful in their home contexts. Further definitions and explanations will be developed for each of the five data sets.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.2 Number and percentage of alumni who report the usefulness of the Award in enabling them to contribute to development. | **TIER 3** |

Country programs should report two data sets against this indicator:

* Number and percentage of alumni who report that the Award was best way to build their skills, networks, capacities or positioning to contribute to development

Negative responses should be reported and coded according to the following categories:

* Better off studying a different course or at a different institution through the Australia Awards
* Better off staying in the home country and taking up local opportunities
* Better off participating in internationally supported study by a different country

* Number and percentage of Awardees in a role that is relevant to study

Negative responses should be reported and coded according to the following categories:

* Unable to find a suitable job
* Employers not seeking those skills
* Changed career focus

This is a new indicator, and more detailed guidance will be developed for this indicator with the Australia Awards M&E Working Group over the pilot year. This indicator is to be obtained through alumni self-reporting such as through surveys or interviews. The first data set requires alumni to reflect on the overall role of the Award in contributing to their career trajectory and ability to influence change in their workplaces, vis-à-vis other alternatives or choices available. For example, some alumni may perceive that they would have been better off staying in their own country rather than going on Award as their peers who stayed in their roles or took up other opportunities have experienced better career advancement. A response should be counted if a respondent indicates that if given the chance again, they would have either chosen not to take up an Australian Award, or would have selected a different course or university. This indicator aims to seeks to give a sense of the continued competitiveness of the Australia Awards, vis-à-vis other local and international opportunities available to awardees. The second data set seeks to assess the ongoing relevance and applicability of an award.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.3 number and Percentage of alumni able to provide valid examples of contributions to DEVELOPMENT, using the skills, knowledge or networks gained from their Award. | **TIER 2** |

This indicator requires country programs to report the percentage of alumni who are able to provide one or more examples of the following:

* knowledge transfer - including training or passing on new skills and knowledge to others
* Direct practice – including immediate application of skills
* Policy and implementation – including contributing to the development or implementation of policies, guidelines, practices or standards, or to strategic management.

Indicator reporting should be coded to the categories list above. Country programs should provide the overall percentage of alumni that meet the criteria, along with a further breakdown of percentages reported against each of the three areas, noting that respondents may identify more than one category.

‘Contributions to Development’ includes contributions alumni make within their regions/states, their organisations and their communities. They may also advance country objectives such as those outlined in CDRPs, or other national partner government policies and plans, such as those outlined in national development plans or strategies. This data should be captured through alumni self-reporting such as through surveys or interviews with alumni, or other forms of engagement tracking or monitoring. Questions and data collection methods should be designed so as to elicit examples that provide sufficient detail regarding how alumni have contributed to advancing country objectives, and what the specific contribution has been. Country context specific methods should be used to validate data. For example, qualitative examples of how alumni are contributing to country objectives through the actions listed above could be provided and validated including through interviews with supervisors or colleagues, case studies, or secondary data sources such as online searches. Reliability of the response could also be validated by assessing factors such as the comprehensiveness of the description, the amount of detail, the degree of fit between the task and the person’s role and seniority level. Country program reporting against this indicator should provide representative lists of new or policies, guidelines, practices or standards gathered.

### Global Performance Target 4: Alumni Network

***Country / regional programs build a bigger, stronger network of active alumni by creating meaningful opportunities for quality engagement that contributes to alumni advancement in their home country.***

It is expected that country programs continue to grow the alumni network and create ongoing opportunities to engage alumni that are relevant and interesting to alumni and the contexts they are working in. It is expected that alumni activities facilitate quality engagement from which alumni derive value and use in their workplace or initiatives they are involved in. It is expected that over time, the number of active alumni engaged in and benefiting from well-designed alumni activities will grow.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.1 Number and percentage of Active alumni | **TIER 2** |

This indicator seeks to capture data stored on alumni databases managed by country programs. Country programs should report three data sets against this indicator:

* Number and percentage of alumni who remain active on an alumni network
* Number and percentage of alumni who have participated in alumni activities over the period
* Number and percentage of alumni who receive a small grant (including amount and the sectors)

Alumni who ‘remain active on an alumni network’ includes people who are registered on a country / regional data-base, and have not requested to opt-out. They may participate by receiving updates and information, engagement in social media, or play a more active role in activities.

Alumni ‘activities’ is used broadly and includes diplomatic or networking events, annual reflection workshops, conferences, professional development events or opportunities, social gatherings, face to face or online information sharing or networking.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.2 Number and Percentage of alumni who report that they have participated in valuable alumni actvities who report that they have participated in valuable alumni activities | **TIER 3** |

This indicator seeks to capture the value and usefulness of alumni activities, going beyond the number of people participating as captured above (under indicator 4.1). Alumni ‘activities’ is used broadly and includes diplomatic or networking events, annual reflection workshops, conferences, professional development events or opportunities, social gatherings, face to face or online information sharing or networking.

This indicator is to be obtained by alumni self-reporting either through survey or interview methods that are instituted on follow up of specific alumni activity monitoring or through standard alumni surveys and interview methods that ask alumni if they have participated in any alumni activities and to provide illustrative examples.

Alumni responses should only be counted if alumni report that they find the activity to be valuable, and are able to provide a clear response or example of what they gained through the alumni activity, including one or more of the following:

* + Ideas, solutions, information
  + Influential connections
  + Professional development
  + Other

Indicator reporting should be coded to the categories list above. Country programs should provide the overall percentage of alumni that meet the criteria, along with a further breakdown of percentages reported against each of the three areas, noting that respondents may identify more than one category.

### Global Performance Target 5: Bilateral Collaboration

***Australia Awards and alumni engagement increasingly contribute to enduring relationships and mutual cooperation between Australia and the partner country.***

It is expected that scholarships and short courses in Australia contribute to links and collaboration between alumni and Australia. Short courses are more likely to contribute to useful links, whereas scholarships are expected to lead to deeper and more enduring forms of collaboration. The other modalities (overseas scholarships and short courses) are not expected to contribute to this performance target. Some links are expected to endure over time in DFAT priority country areas, where the Australian government has a significant presence, aid program and high investment in made in facilitating country or regional alumni activities. Links may indeed become weaker over time in countries where Australia is not strongly engaged.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.1 number and Percentage of alumni who have drawn on bilateral links, established through the Australia Awards | **TIER 2** |

This indicator refers to links or networks developed through the Australia Awards, including:

* University staff - lecturers etc
* Australian alumni
* Other International student alumni
* Australian businesses or private organisations
* Non-Government Organisations
* Australian government/public sector organisations
* The Australian High Commission, Embassy or Consulate in your country
* Church/religious community groups
* Australian alumni associations
* Friends or family
* Other

Indicator reporting should include the percentage of total alumni respondents who have used the link, and a further breakdown of percentages against each sub category, noting that one respondent may identify multiple categories. ‘Drawn on’ is defined as links that have been used by alumni in their profession or employment in their home countries, or more broadly to support their involvement in community initiatives or other bilateral collaborations.

The purpose of the link should also be captured and coded through indicator reporting according to the following categories:

* Sharing knowledge and learning opportunities with colleagues or students
* Academic collaboration (i.e., writing a paper, applying for research grant)
* Professional/business collaboration
* Community support and development
* Social interaction
* Professional Development
* Mentoring
* Asking for materials/resources/advice
* Other purpose

Information can be obtained from standard data collection methodologies such as ADIS or interviews. This indicator only needs to be collected for awardees and alumni who have studied in Australia.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.2 number and Percentage of alumni able to provide valid examples of participation in mutual collaborations between their country and Australia, after their completion of the Australia Award. | **TIER 2** |

This indicator requires country programs to report the percentage of alumni who are able to provide one or more examples of the following:

* joint projects or partnerships - including development or business / private sector related
* research – including engagement in a joint research project with an Australian university or research institute
* community initiatives – including bilateral collaborations supported by community grants or initiatives such as with Australian groups (such as rotary, schools or universities or ANGOs)
* Other

Indicator reporting should be coded to the categories list above. Country programs should provide the overall percentage of alumni that meet the criteria, along with a further breakdown of percentages reported against each of the three areas, noting that respondents may identify more than one category.

This data should be captured through alumni self-reporting such as through surveys or interviews with alumni, or other forms of engagement tracking or monitoring. Questions and data collection methods should be designed so as to elicit examples that provide sufficient detail of the specific connection with Australia, , so as to enable verification of the validity of the response. Country context specific methods should be used to validate qualitative examples of how alumni are contributing to collaboration between the two countries including through interviews with alumni, case studies, secondary data sources and triangulation with award experience and alumni activities that have centred on promoting Australia’s interests in development, economic and diplomatic engagement in that country or region. Reliability of the response could also be validated by assessing factors such as the comprehensiveness of the description, the amount of detail, the degree of fit between the example of collaboration and the person’s role.

Country program reporting against this indicator should provide representative lists of collaborations, coded according to these categories. While it is not necessary to provide an exhaustive and comprehensive list of all collaborations, the lists should give a sense of the types of collaborations occurring. This indicator only needs to be collected for awardees and alumni who have studied in Australia.

### Global Performance Target 6: Women’s Leadership

***The Australia Awards contributes to a growing cohort of women leaders who are increasingly able to participate, influence and lead across a diversity of development sectors.***

The Australia Awards strives to support women to fulfil their leadership potential and increase the number of women who hold positions of influence and are able to drive big ideas and reforms in their countries. It is expected that country programs work across their specific contexts to develop tailored strategies that help women to build their technical and influencing skills and readiness to take on leadership roles in their workplaces. While it is expected that this will contribute to women advancing in their careers and becoming stronger change agents, this performance target recognises that this outcome will be more strongly influenced by the context rather than the Award. It is acknowledged that different enabling environments will afford higher or lower levels of women’s empowerment, and that the Australia Awards may be a relatively limited or significant factor in women’s advancement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 6.1 Number and Percentage of Australia awards allocated to sectors where women are under-represented. | **TIER 2** |

The Australia Awards Global Strategic Framework (2021-24) states ‘All Australia Awards investments will have an objective of empowering women, and will effectively address gender equality issues’ including by ‘targeting development sectors where women’s tertiary skills and increased participation in policy development, decision-making and technical implementation aspects of development are most needed in each country’.

It is expected that each country program undertakes a mapping of sectors in which women are under-represented as part of a gender analysis, which is carried out as part of a program design or a supplementary process. The list of sectors may be updated or revised as required by changes in context. The number and range of listed sectors will be dependent on the context, whereby some countries may list only a few sectors, and others may list the majority of sectors. However, it should be noted that the purpose of the mapping is to support a more focused targeting of particular sectors.

Country programs are expected to report the total percentage of Australia Awards allocated to women awardees that align with the countries listed in the mapping. The information should be presented by providing the list of sectors, and the number and percentage of awards allocated to women within each of the sectors. It should also include a percentage for other sectors (i.e., Awards granted to women that do not align with the mapping).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 6.2 Country rating for gender equality ‘The investment is making progress as expected in effectively implementing strategies to promote gender equality and women's empowerment’. | **TIER 1** |

Many country programs complete an IMR of the Australia Awards which encompasses an assessment of the extent to which the investment is making a difference to gender equality and empowering women and girls. As part of this assessment, a specific rating is required against Statement 3 ‘the investment is making progress as expected in effectively implementing strategies to promote gender equality and women's empowerment’.

The rating provided should be based on evidence and made in accordance with IMR reporting guidance. IMR assessment guidance presented below has been adapted and contextualised to the Australia Awards context and serves as a guide.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***High (rating 5-6)*** | Appropriate strategies for gender equality and/or women’s empowerment are clearly stated within the program’s implementation plan and evidence of good progress in implementation is as expected at this point in time. |
| ***Satisfactory (rating 4)*** | Strategies for gender equality and/or women’s empowerment are appropriate and being implemented but could be improved. Any deficiencies are not in a major area. |
| ***Unsatisfactory (rating 3)*** | The investment has implemented activities on gender equality and/ or women’s empowerment or has women’s participation without targeting, but activities are isolated or not linked to a coherent gender equality strategy. Alternatively, the gender equality strategy is not being implemented as expected at this point in time. |
| ***Low (rating 1-2)*** | There is no strategy for gender equality and women’s empowerment and no evidence of programming for gender results |

The rating requires an assessment of gender equality and women’s empowerment within the socioeconomic and political context of the investment. It indicates if a gender strategy exists for the investment and if so, the strengths and weaknesses and its implementation. In the context of the Australia Awards, it is expected that strategies will relate to the processes in place to support gender parity and the inclusion of women in the Australia Awards as outlined in indicator 2.2 (i.e. supporting women to participate and address family or workplace constraints to application), and the building of women’s technical and influencing skills. A range of other indicators outlined in this framework can be drawn on and cross-referenced to inform on the assessment of effectiveness of implementation including Indicators 6.3 and 6.4, and gender disaggregated data for indicator 3.3.

When determining a rating, ideally country or regional Australia Award gender strategies will have clear outputs and outcomes for measuring women’s empowerment that are tracked and measured against to produce the rating. When this is not the case, a best judgement should be formed based on evidence, with a justification required for the rating to be provided in the narrative. When reporting against this indicator to Australia Awards Section, country programs should only provide the numerical rating against Statement 3. Posts that do not complete an IMR for the Australia Awards are encouraged to provide a rating in this area using the guidance outlined in this indicator, however this is not a requirement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 6.3 number and Percentage of women who experience career advancement partially attributable to their particiaption in the Australia Awards. | **TIER 3** |

The specific measure or combination of measures used to capture against this indicator should be identified by each country program. How career advancement is defined and determined may differ according to countries, with some measures being more appropriate than others. For example, the obtainment of a promotion may be an appropriate indicator in one context, whereas in another, employees may receive promotions according to a standard cycle, regardless of performance and therefore may be a less appropriate indicator.

Some examples of measures that could be used include:

* promotion or salary increase
* movement into a position with greater decision-making power
* increased financial, technical or operational responsibility
* move into positions that may be perceived to be male dominated such as senior public service roles.

It is recommended that expertise such as from local women’s organisations, locally engaged female staff or gender advisers is sought when determining and developing the most appropriate measures. It is also at the discretion of country programs to determine the most appropriate methods to capture corresponding data, such as through surveys, interviews or other forms of workplace tracking.

If available, country programs should report two data sets against this indicator:

* percentage of female alumni experiencing careers advancement; and
* percentage of female alumni experiencing career advancement vs percentage of male alumni experiencing career advancement.

While not a feature of the Australia Awards global Core Indicators, it is expected that many country programs will also track the career advancement of men and women, using the same measures. In such instances, this comparative data should be provided to enable the Australia Awards Section to assess changes in women’s advancement vis-à-vis the advancement of male alumni operating in the same country contexts.

Data collection should seek to explore the extent to which women attribute any advancement to a contribution from their Australia Award, such as through in adding a follow up question. Data should only be reported if women perceive there to be a correlation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 6.4 Number and Percentage of women alumni able to provide examples of enhanced leadership or empowerment attributable to their participation in the Australia Awards and representative lists | **TIER 3** |

In the context of the Australia Awards, the working definition of women’s leadership is: ‘A political process of women mobilising people and resources in pursuit of shared and negotiated goals within government, private sector, and civil society (Kenway, Bradley and Lokot, 2013: iii)’. This definition emphasises the influencing role that women play in a change process, whereby a leader may be a quiet influencer in a small group of people, rather than a strong or dominant leader. Women’s empowerment is conceptualised as building “power within” such as confidence, “power to” express, act and influence, and “power with” such as through forming or mobilising others.

This indicator requires country programs to report the percentage of women alumni who are able to provide one or more examples of the following:

* effective influencing in the workplace, such as effecting key decisions or changes
* taking on of leadership roles, such as supervising, mentoring, mobilising or guiding others
* increased confidence, expressed through a greater level of sharing of views and ideas in the workplace, or greater confidence to make decisions, or willingness to raise and seek to address challenges to their leadership within the workplace.

Indicator reporting should be coded to the categories list above. Country programs should provide the overall percentage of alumni that meet the criteria, along with a further breakdown of percentages reported against each of the three areas, noting that respondents may identify more than one category.

This data should be captured through alumni self-reporting such as through surveys or interviews with alumni. Questions and data collection methods should be designed so as to elicit examples that provide sufficient detail about the changes that have occurred within respondent, or how their actions have influenced change, so as to enable verification of the validity of the response. Data collection should seek to explore the extent to which women attribute change to a contribution from their Australia Award. Data should only be reported if women perceive there to be a correlation.

Country program reporting against this indicator should provide representative lists of actions or experiences reported, coded according to these three categories. While it is not necessary to provide an exhaustive and comprehensive list of all the responses provided, the lists should give a sense of the types of actions and changes occurring.

1. The definitions and explanatory notes have been sourced from the Australia Awards South Asia Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion Approach and Action Plan 2021–2022. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)