

Communication Policy Research South (CPR*south*) Evaluation Report

Nilusha Kapugama
Research Manager

LIRNE*asia*,
12, Balcombe Place
Colombo 08
Sri Lanka
nilusha@lirneasia.net

This research was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development Research Centre (Canada) and the Department for International Development (United Kingdom) and as a part of the capacity building programme, Developing Evaluation Capacity for ICT4D (DECI).

The author wishes to thank Dr. Shubh Kumar-Range for her mentorship, the CPR*south* board members for their time in providing feedback and the DECI team for its support in completing the evaluation.

Contents

Introduction	4
CPRsouth: The Conceptual framework	5
<i>A bit of history</i>	5
<i>Theory of Change</i>	6
<i>CPRsouth theory of Capacity Building</i>	7
Evaluation Methodology	8
<i>Key Evaluation Questions (KEQ)</i>	9
<i>Survey methodology</i>	10
<i>Non Survey Methodology</i>	11
Findings.....	11
<i>CPRsouth applicants</i>	12
<i>Participant Profile</i>	12
<i>Awareness of CPRsouth?</i>	16
<i>Mode 1 Vs. Mode 2 applicants</i>	18
<i>Repeat applicants</i>	19
<i>What applicants want</i>	21
<i>The content</i>	22
<i>Networking</i>	24
<i>Outcomes- Have they influenced policy?</i>	24
<i>Interactions post conference</i>	26
<i>Pay to attend CPRsouth?</i>	28
Conclusion	30
Decisions stemming from the evaluation.....	31
<i>Re-scheduling of the conference</i>	31
<i>Revision of the Draft call for papers and applications</i>	31
<i>Improving the quality of the conference</i>	31
<i>Approval to charge a registration fee for paper presenters and young scholars</i>	32
<i>Fund Raising</i>	32
REFERENCES	32
Annex 1 Questionnaires 1-5.....	33
Annex 2: Key Evaluations, Sub Questions and Indicators	40
Annex 3: CPRsouth Abstract Review and Paper Selection Process.....	45

Figures

Figure 1: CPR <i>south</i> Capacity Building approach	7
Figure 2: Participation by country of residence.....	12
Figure 3: Participation by country of origin.....	13
Figure 4: Breakdown of Repeaters vs. First time applicants.....	14
Figure 5: No. of young scholar applicants.....	15
Figure 6: Source of Information about CPR <i>south</i>	17
Figure 7: Mode 1 vs. Mode 2	18
Figure 8: CPR <i>south</i> paper presenters	20
Figure 9: Why apply for CPR <i>south</i> ?	22
Figure 10: Why Network?	26
Figure 11: CPR <i>south</i> network.....	27
Figure 12: Pay to attend CPR <i>south</i> ?	28
Figure 13: No. of paper presenter applicants from countries with higher and lower GDP than Malaysia	29

Tables

Table 1: Country representation at CPR <i>south</i>	12
Table 2: Of selected Paper presenters:	15
Table 3: Female representation among selected Young scholars	16
Table 4: Repeat applicants	20
Table 5: Paper presenter ratings	23
Table 6: Ratings by paper presenters and young scholars.....	24
Table 7: CPR <i>south</i> Outcomes Survey Data - 2007-2009	25
Table 8: Internet Presence of paper presenters	26

Introduction

Communications Policy Research South (*CPRsouth*) is a capacity building effort by LIRNEasia, a regional Information and Communication Technology (ICT) policy and regulation think tank. LIRNEasia was inaugurated in 2005 and since then has conducted policy relevant research in the space of ICTs and related infrastructure, in 13 countries in emerging Asia. Its primary objective is to improve the lives of people in emerging Asia, particularly of the Bottom of the Pyramid (BOP) by catalysing the reform of laws, policies and regulation. In addition, LIRNEasia also engages in capacity building through training and advocacy in order to build “in-situ” capacity. *CPRsouth* takes up the largest share within LIRNEasia’s capacity building activities.

CPRsouth was first conceptualised under LIRNEasia’s 2006-2007 research proposal which was submitted to and approved by International Development Research Centre of Canada (IDRC). The main objective of *CPRsouth* is to create, sustain and facilitate the further advancement of young to mid level ICT policy intellectuals in the South with a particular emphasis on Asia Pacific. It also focuses on field building through the promotion of interest and research in ICT policy and regulation in the same region.

As part of initial conceptualisation of *CPRsouth*, LIRNEasia conducted knowledge mapping exercises as baseline studies for *CPRsouth* (Gamage & Samarajiva, 2006). The studies looked at the knowledge capacity in ICTs in East, South East and South Asia. The findings further emphasised the need for capacity building in the region. *CPRsouth* was initially modelled on the Telecommunication Policy Research Conference (TPRC), the premier telecom conference in the US, and European Communication Policy Research (EuroCPR), TPRC’s European counterpart. However, since *CPRsouth*’s inaugural conference, changes have taken place to suit the Asian (or Southern) context.

The main activity of *CPRsouth* is an annual conference and tutorials. The conference and tutorials are held in a different city in the Asia Pacific region each year. The conference accommodates 21 paper presenters and 30 young scholars¹, selected through a competitive process.

The tutorials, held over two days, focus on topics such as the basics of ICT policy and regulation and information economies, quantitative and qualitative analysis and communication strategies. The sessions are conducted by senior scholars and policy intellectuals in the field of ICT. The *CPRsouth* conference is held over two and a half days. Selected papers are presented in seven plenary sessions. The sessions are moderated by a chair and discussant. The chair and discussant of the respective sessions mentor the presenters over a period of 6 weeks prior to the conference in order to improve the quality of papers. The young scholars are given the opportunity to sit through the conference. In addition the paper session, senior scholars and

¹ 15 from the host country and 15 from the rest of Asia Pacific region.

This research was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development Research Centre (Canada) and the Department for International Development (United Kingdom) and as a part of the capacity building programme, Developing Evaluation Capacity for ICT4D (DECI).

The author wishes to thank Dr. Shubh Kumar-Range for her mentorship, the *CPRsouth* board members for their time in providing feedback and the DECI team for its support in completing the evaluation.

policy intellectuals are brought in as guest speakers and panellists. The conference gives the paper presenters and young scholars an opportunity to network with the seniors in the field.

CPR*south* is run by a 13 member Board who have affiliations to universities, research organisations and funding agencies. LIRNE*Asia* acts as its administrative partner. Currently it's in its fifth year and is funded by IDRC and the Department for International Development (DFID) of United Kingdom.

The progress of CPR*south* has been monitored through the outputs produced by the paper presenters and young scholar attendees. These include tracking the academic and policy interventions made by the attendees. However, the above had limited scope therefore the Board of Directors decided that there is a need for a formal evaluation.

The evaluation is being conducted by the administrative partner as a part of IDRC's evaluation capacity building initiative DECI. The evaluation methodology, Utilisation Focused Evaluation (UFE) will be used. In line with the UFE methodology, the evaluation is being conducted with the consultation of the primary users. Their input was a key factor in determining the primary uses of the evaluation.

The report will begin by examining the conceptual framework of CPR*south* and its theory of change. This will be followed by a description of the methodology used. Then the data obtained through the survey and non-survey methodologies will be analysed. Finally, the report will attempt to see to what extent CPR*south* has succeeded (or not) in achieving its objectives and what is likely to be its future course of action.

CPR*south*: The Conceptual framework

A bit of history

As a prelude to the conceptualisation of CPR*south*, LIRNE*Asia* conducted several baseline studies, in the form of knowledge mapping and networking meetings. According to these studies (Gamage & Samarajiva 2006), infrastructure reforms play a key role in economic development and it identifies three key infrastructures: ICT, energy and transportation. Of the three sectors, the paper goes on to examine the ICT sector in detail. Knowledge capacity, or the "know-how", in economics, law and public administration are deemed essential for the formulation of reform.

The studies showed that while there were some organisations that worked on reform²;

- There was a shortage of ICT policy and regulation researchers connected to Asia
- The quality of their output was not of a very high standard
- The researchers lacked adequate SSCI (Social Science Citation Index) or web presence
- They are not adequately connected to each other either through co-authorship or citations; most of the relationships being those outside the region.

² Information obtained from LIRNE*Asia* 2006-2008 project proposal

CPR*south* was conceptualised to counteract some of these issues identified.

Theory of Change

Capacity Building has been defined as “some kind of external intervention or support with the intention of facilitating or catalysing change” or “purposeful, external intervention to strengthen capacity over time” (Praxis, 2010, pg. 3). Capacity Building can take place at a number of levels: Individual; Organisational; sector, thematic, geographic or issue-based Networks; and Societal (Neilson, 2005) and (Praxis, 2010). Neilson identifies four main ways in which capacity building can be done, Education and Training, Mentoring/Coaching, Networks/Networking and Face to face Interactions.

The available literature largely addresses organisational or institutional capacity building. CPR*south* operates on both an individual and network level capacity building. Therefore where possible the report will refer to the available literature and the theory of capacity building, however, the evaluators believe CPR*south* has its own conceptual framework.

LIRNE*Asia* works in nine to eleven countries in South and South East Asia, depending on its research cycle. The researchers working are those with local knowledge and in-situ expertise of a given country as they are best suited to be catalysts and affect change if necessary. In keeping with the same philosophy, LIRNE*Asia*'s capacity building mission emphasises on developing in-situ expertise. CPR*south* is considered a vehicle through which capacity building can be achieved.

The objectives of CPR*south* have been stated clearly in its charter:


- To facilitate the creation, sustenance and continuous advancement of policy intellectuals capable of informed and effective intervention in ICT policy and regulation processes in specific country and regional contexts in the south broadly constituted to include the Asia-Pacific (AP), Africa (AF), Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and Central Asian regions (CIS).
- To develop capacity, stimulate interest, and promote research and systematic study in information and communication technology (ICT) policy and regulatory issues in the South

Of the above objectives, CPR*south* concentrates more on the first. CPR*south* looks for young and mid level scholars, who aspire to be policy intellectuals. The budding policy intellectuals are then trained in the “know-how” required to propose and implement necessary reform and policies and regulations in their respective countries. The young and mid level scholars may be sourced from multiple disciplines including, economics, law, telecommunication engineering and journalism.

CPRsouth theory of Capacity Building

CPRsouth's attempt to build the technical capacity of young and mid level scholars in the field of ICT is a means to an end as opposed to an end itself. Its main activity, the annual conference and tutorials assists in capacity development of scholars and also facilitates building a network of ICT policy and research professionals. Building a network of researchers influencing ICT policy in their respective countries is the ultimate goal, and *CPRsouth* capacity development could be seen as a bottom up approach.

Figure 1: *CPRsouth* Capacity Building approach



Source: Authors

Up to 21 paper presenters are selected through a competitive process. The selected paper presenters are mentored on both content and presentation over a period of about 2 months.

The papers are presented at seven sessions. The mentors are the chairs and the discussants of the respective sessions. The conference is held over 2 to 2½ days. The paper givers are expected to submit a policy brief in addition to the academic paper. Policy briefs and presentations are two of the key methods in which policy relevant research is communicated to policy makers and regulators. As such the paper givers are also expected to record a video of their presentations and post it on youtube. An expert in communication strategy is selected to give comments and suggestions. The presentations are then revised accordingly. In addition, the policy briefs are also reviewed and commented upon. A more detailed description of the review process is given in Annex 3.

In addition to the competitive paper sessions, the conference also has additional sessions intended to give insight into the “policy process” such as the keynote speeches and panel discussions involving senior scholars, policy intellectuals and practitioners.

Prior to the conference, tutorials are conducted for approximately 30 selected young scholars (15 from the Asia Pacific, 15 from the host country/region). The tutorials focus on areas such as effective communication of research, working with demand and supply side data and the basics of information economics. Prior to the conference, the Young scholars are expected to submit a research proposal. The young scholars present their research proposal to a senior scholar and then discuss the proposal in a group. The young scholars stay on for the main conference.

Evaluation Methodology

A formal evaluation has not been conducted on *CPRsouth*. The administrative partner was given the opportunity to be a part of an IDRC initiative to build capacity in evaluation, DECI. A situational analysis conducted on the programme revealed that the programme will benefit from an evaluation. The evaluation was conducted by a staff member of LIRNEasia, a former project manager of *CPRsouth*, under the mentorship of an experienced evaluator, selected by IDRC.

The evaluation was conducted using the Utilisation Focused Evaluation (UFE) methodology. UFE is a new approach that is specifically geared to designing evaluations that address specific organizational needs and related questions. *CPRsouth* was identified by LIRNEasia to be the focus of the UFE exercise. It has the dual purposes of:

- i) address specific issues of current relevance to *CPRsouth*, that would enable its further development
- ii) build capacity in LIRNEasia for conducting use-focused evaluations in future

The UFE methodology has 10 steps that are required to be adhered to when conducting the evaluation (Patton, 2008).

- Program/Organizational Readiness Assessment
- Evaluator Readiness and Capability Assessment
- Identification of Primary Intended Users
- Situational Analysis
- Identification of Primary Intended Uses
- Focusing the Evaluation
- Evaluation Design
- Simulation of Use
- Data Collection
- Data Analysis
- Facilitation of Use
- Metaevaluation

The programme and the evaluator readiness assessments were conducted and were deemed ready for an evaluation. In keeping with the UFE methodology the primary users and the uses of the evaluation were identified.

The identified Primary Users:

Prof. Rohan Samarajiva	Conceptualised <i>CPRsouth</i> , Board member of <i>CPRsouth</i> and the
------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

	CEO of LIRNEasia, administrative partner for CPRsouth
CPRsouth Board members	Currently consists of 13 members who make all decisions
Project managers	Ranmalee Gamage, Prashanthi Weragoda

The Primary Uses of the evaluation are:

- To document the successes/value creation for key CPRsouth stakeholders. The narrative will then be used for fund-raising to ensure sustainability of the programme.
- To determine if the processes utilised resulting in reaching, attracting and supporting the young scholars and paper presenters.
- To create a Methodology that can be used as a guideline for evaluating similar Capacity Building Initiatives. Capacity Building initiatives are difficult to evaluate.

The evaluators had repeated engagements with the primary users in order to determine the primary uses of the evaluation. The engagements were both face to face³ and virtual.

For CPRsouth, the expected outcomes are the impacts of the policy interventions made by the participants. However, these outcomes are difficult to monitor as impacts of especially policy changes often cannot be attributed to a single action or person. As a solution to this situation, CPRsouth will be looking at the outputs of the participants such as policy interventions and take them as its outcomes.

Key Evaluation Questions (KEQ)

Key Evaluation Questions (KEQ) were developed using the CPRsouth objectives, its intended outputs and outcomes. The KEQ were further refined with input from the primary users in order to specifically address issues related to the identified primary uses.

Outputs for CPRsouth;

- CPRsouth attracts the attention of ICT policy and regulation scholars throughout the South
- An keen interest and increased demand shown by young scholars to attend tutorials

Outcomes for CPRsouth

- CPRsouth community members engage in policy processes
- Universities and regional entities commit resources to support CPRsouth
- Indicators of connectivity within the scholarly network improve significantly and members' institutions support network

Based on the above desirable outputs and outcomes for CPRsouth, The following four KEQ formulated for the evaluation:

³ CPRsouth to the Board members at the fourth CPRsouth Board meeting held on 8 December 2009 in Negombo, Sri Lanka http://www.cprsouth.org/sites/default/files/Board%20Meeting%20Minutes_0.pdf

- Are the *CPRsouth* pre-conference procedures (call for papers, review and mentoring process) attracting ICT policy and regulation scholars throughout the Asia region?
- Are the procedures used by *CPRsouth* tutorials (call for applications, tutorial topics) attracting young scholars?
- To what extent has *CPRsouth* paper presenters influenced or engaged in the policy process since becoming a member of the *CPRsouth* community and to what extent has *CPRsouth* influenced and or facilitates the community members' current work?
- What activities have the *CPRsouth* Young scholars been engaged with since attending *CPRsouth* and to what extent has *CPRsouth* influenced the Young scholars' current activities?

Each KEQ has a set of sub questions. The KEQ and the corresponding sub questions will be addressed in following section.

A mixed methods approach was adopted for the evaluation. Drawing from the Outcome Mapping (OM) approach of the *CPRsouth* project conceptualization, a combination of implementation and results/outcomes aspects were identified for analysis. A combination of survey and non survey methodology was developed that involved stakeholder analysis, content analysis and quantitative data records from *CPRsouth*. This was also supplemented with Social Network analysis.

Survey methodology

New surveys were sent to all *CPRsouth* stakeholders:

- All *CPRsouth* applicants
- Selected Paper presenters
- Selected Young Scholars
- Members of the Board and mentors
- Supervisors of selected Young Scholars

The questionnaires were drawn up and a simulation was conducted to verify the validity or the usability of the data. The questionnaires were changed accordingly and the surveys were conducted using an online application. The questionnaires were designed to take a minimum of 3 minutes and a maximum of 10 minutes to ensure a highest possible response rate. The questionnaires have been attached as Annex 1.

Data from *CPRsouth* records and surveys:

Outcome surveys:

- *CPRsouth* outcomes survey 2007
- *CPRsouth* outcomes survey 2008
- *CPRsouth* outcomes survey 2009

The outcome surveys examine the academic and policy work done by the *CPRsouth* presenters and young scholars.

- *CPRsouth1* Conference and tutorial evaluations
- *CPRsouth2* Conference and tutorial evaluations
- *CPRsouth3* Conference and tutorial evaluations
- *CPRsouth4* Conference and tutorial evaluations

The conference and tutorials rate the speakers of the event and their content. The conference evaluations are also used to get the audience feedback for the conference best paper competition.

The results from these surveys have previously been used to make changes to the way *CPRsouth* conferences are run and also to assess whether *CPRsouth* objectives are being met.

Non Survey Methodology

In addition to the above, a host of non-survey methods were also utilised.

- *CPRsouth* database maintained by the administrative partner

The database contained information about *CPRsouth* applicants such as age, position, gender, organisation, highest qualifications, countries of residence and origin.

- *CPRsouth* group on Facebook and mailing lists
- Google analytics set up on the *CPRsouth* website
- Feedback given by the past participants through e-mails

The data and information obtained through the survey and non-survey methods will be examined in the next section. The analysis will be done based on the KEQ formulated.

Findings

KEQ one and two focus on assessing the attractiveness of *CPRsouth* to both young and mid level ICT policy and regulation scholars and policy intellectuals in the Asia Pacific Region. In doing so, the processes put in place by *CPRsouth* to attract applicants have to be assessed. The previous applicant numbers speak of the success of the conference so far. However, *CPRsouth* participants are fully funded until *CPRsouth4* and therefore applicant numbers alone cannot be relied upon to assess its attractiveness. Funding conditions, however, for *CPRsouth5* have been changed⁴ so the applicant numbers for *CPRsouth5* would be more informative. Furthermore, the primary users are more interested in finding out the possible sustainability of the initiative.

⁴ Participants of citizens of countries with higher or equal GDP per capita to Malaysia will only be reimbursed 50% of their travel costs. All participants have to bear the cost of processing visas and transport to and from the airport.

The quality of a product is often considered when gauging its sustainability. As such, the evaluation will be looking the quality of the conference and tutorials and the processes used by *CPRsouth* to attain quality.

KEQ three and four attempt to assess whether or not attending *CPRsouth* has been beneficial to the participants and if *CPRsouth* has been able to achieve its objective of building policy intellectuals and if so to what extent. This too will provide an important case for (or against) the sustainability of the programme.

***CPRsouth* applicants**

Participant Profile

The total number of countries represented at *CPRsouth* is 38. The largest number of participants has been from India, Philippines, China and Sri Lanka. This is no surprise as 15 positions reserved for young scholars from the hosting country. A majority of the participants are from developing countries. The tables below give the number of countries represented at each *CPRsouth* conference. The overall female representation is 46%.

Table 1: Country representation at *CPRsouth*

	<i>CPRsouth</i> 1	<i>CPRsouth</i> 2	<i>CPRsouth</i> 3	<i>CPRsouth</i> 4	<i>CPRsouth</i> 5
No of countries represented	25	16	24	24	22

Source: *CPRsouth* Database

The number of countries represented at *CPRsouth* includes the country of origin and the country of residence of the participants. The figures below show the countries represented by country of residence and origin respectively. *CPRsouth* has had participation from a majority of the countries in Asia-Pacific. The darker shades indicate countries with the highest participation.

Figure 2: Participation by country of residence



Source: CPR*south* Database

Figure 3: Participation by country of origin




Source: CPR*south* Database

Abstracts

The number of applicants sending abstracts for the *CPRsouth* conference has been growing steadily up until *CPRsouth3* in Beijing. *CPRsouth4* saw a drop in the number of applicants.⁵ The number of applicants for *CPRsouth5* is higher than that of *CPRsouth4* in spite of the changes in the funding conditions. However, since *CPRsouth3*, the changes in applicant numbers have been marginal. Figure 1 shows that that the number of repeat applicants is showing the same trend as the total number of applicants.⁶ However, over 70% of those who submit abstracts have never submitted a paper to *CPRsouth* therefore there is still an expansion of the network.

Figure 4: Breakdown of Repeaters vs. First time applicants



Source: *CPRsouth* database

⁵ However this may also be attributed to the political situation that prevailed in Sri Lanka at the time of the call for papers

⁶ This does not include those who have applied or selected as Young scholars the previous year, in order to prevent double counting.

Female representation has always remained over 33% with the exception of CPR*south5* paper presenters. A similar situation is seen with regards to the number of PhD holders among the paper presenters. However, it should be noted that a significant number of paper presenters at CPR*south5* were PhD candidates.

Table 2: Of selected Paper presenters:


	CPR <i>south1</i>	CPR <i>south2</i>	CPR <i>south3</i>	CPR <i>south4</i>	CPR <i>south5</i>
Female representation	42%	50%	58%	52%	25%
PhD holders	21%	15%	42%	48%	25%

Source: CPR*south* database

Young Scholars

The number of international young scholars applying however is not as satisfactory and it has been noted by the members of the board and the administrative partner. The numbers of applications received for CPR*south1* is the highest.

Figure 5: No. of young scholar applicants



Source: CPRsouth database

Previous conference participants were surveyed about the possible reasons for their colleagues, students or mentees may have refrained from applying. The “timing of the tutorials” and the “unawareness of the quality and standard of the training (tutorial) programme” were some of the reasons cited with regards to Young scholars applications while the “narrow focus of the subject matter”, “the lack of research outputs” and “timing of the conference” were given as reasons for sending an abstract for CPRsouth.

Talking on informal basis to some of the potential young scholar applicants also revealed a general sense of suspicion about the motivation behind the provision of funding for capacity building and a lack of understanding about who is eligible for applying. In comparison to the selected paper presenters, the representation of females among the young scholars is lower.

Table 3: Female representation among selected Young scholars

	CPRsouth1	CPRsouth2	CPRsouth3	CPRsouth4	CPRsouth5
Female representation	35%	38%	55%	44%	35%

Source: CPRsouth database

Awareness of CPRsouth?

A frequent question when referring to CPRsouth applications, (or the lack there of) is, “are the potential applicants aware of CPRsouth”, or “are the processes used to inform potential applicants working”.

Potential applicants are notified of the conference and tutorials through a call for papers and call for application which is sent out every March through multiple channels. These can be listed as;


- The CPRsouth mailing list
- CPRsouth website
- LIRNEasia website

- Selected online newsletters and blogs

In addition, the CPR*south* board members have access to a large pool of potential applicants through their organisations and affiliations.

Of the above methods, a majority of the applicants had heard of CPR*south* through the mailing list or a forwarded e-mail, followed by a recommendation by a previous participant at the conference, as show in figure 3. A lesser number of applicants cited bulletin boards, newsletters and blogs as their source of information. The total number of respondents is 96. The respondents were allowed to select multiple answers.

Figure 6: Source of Information about CPR*south*



Source: CPR*south* evaluation survey, 2010

The CPR*south* mailing list initially consisted of approximately 2500 scholars (predominantly from universities) in the field of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) research, policy and regulation. The list was populated by data sourced from google and scholar.google. The mailing lists of International Telecommunication Society (ITS) and International Communication Association (ICA).

The e-mails that reach the intended recipients are often forwarded to other potential applicants. However, as in the case of mailing lists, the e-mails are spammed by some servers. Furthermore, approximately 20% of the mails sent out get bounced. The bounced mails are either deleted or updated prior to the next year's mailing, however, the following year the pattern can be seen. A possible explanation maybe the list containing a significant number of student who may have left the universities and the time lag involved in the updating of information and the mailing periods. Therefore the awareness of CPR*south* maybe low among the targeted audience. In order to counteract this, the administrative partner has begun to

use the websites, bulletin boards and blogs more extensively. In addition, advertising on social networking tools such as Facebook and Twitter are also being used for the first time for CPRsouth5.

Google analytics showed that while the advertisement on facebook brought in a large volume of traffic to the CPRsouth website, the bounce rate was very high, around 92%. The messages and updates posted by past conference attendees on their profiles, websites, blogs and the CPRsouth group on facebook proved to be much more fruitful.


Implications for USE: The applicant numbers for CPRsouth conference is satisfactory but should continue to improve. However the young scholar applicant numbers are a cause for concern. The viability of the mailing list has been questioned by the Board members. However, the data indicates that it is of value. However, a re-structuring of the mailing list is recommended. A possible solution may be to restrict the e-mails to programme administrators as opposed to the entire batch of students. This may reduce the risk of spamming and the need to update the list. The use of Facebook advertisement was not as successful as anticipated as targeting proved to be difficult. The posting of the Call for applications and abstracts on the blogs and websites of previous participants should be further encouraged as it also works as a form of endorsement.

Mode 1 Vs. Mode 2 applicants

The objective of CPRsouth is to build and nurture policy intellectuals that can in turn influence the policy process in their respective countries. As such CPRsouth would like to see the presence of those who fit into a mode 2 category who are “problem-focused and interdisciplinary” as opposed to mode 1 who’s knowledge production is “investigator-initiated and discipline-based” (Gibbons et al, 1994).

The number of mode 2 applicants has never risen above 19%. An initial concern was that the double blind paper selection process maybe too lengthy and unfairly biased toward mode 1 applicants. However, 24% of the selected paper presenters at CPRsouth4 were mode 2, which was proportionately higher in comparison to the 19% that applied.

Figure 7: Mode 1 vs. Mode 2



Source: CPRsouth database

The comparatively lower number of mode 2 applicants may be explained by fact that the subject matter isn't of interest to those in private organisations, government and other non-governmental organisations. However, the ICT industry, particularly telecommunication is often subjected to regulation. As such it is necessary for those working in the industry to knowledge of how to engage in the policy process and how to formulate policy. The repeated participation by those from these organisations also depicts the relevance of the subject matter.

However, the individuals also maybe getting more on the job training therefore the training may not be as pertinent as it is to the mode 1 individuals who are predominantly in an academic environment. Furthermore, being a part of the government or a private institution, the individuals may have constraints in setting aside time to prepare a paper, in comparison to those in a mode 1 environment. However, creating more awareness of the may bring about more mode 2 applicants.

Implications for USE: Considering the constraints faced by mode 2 applicants, the level number of application is satisfactory. However, if more applicants need to be attracted then a more direct approach may be needed when publicising CPRsouth among mode 2 individuals. This is easily done through the previous CPRsouth mode 2 participants. The language of the calls for papers and application may also need to be changed to attract the mode 2 population.

Repeat applicants

Another indicator CPRsouth looks at is the number of repeat paper presenters. The number has been increasing and this maybe another indicator of the quality of the conference.

The *CPRsouth* best paper competition began at *CPRsouth3*, where the highest scoring papers of the seven sessions are shortlisted and then judged by a panel of judges and the audience. Both repeaters at *CPRsouth3* were shortlisted for the best paper competition, while four of the seven sessions were topped by repeaters at *CPRsouth4*.

Table 4: Repeat applicants

	<i>CPRsouth1</i>	<i>CPRsouth2</i>	<i>CPRsouth3</i>	<i>CPRsouth4</i>
Applicants accepted	19	20	19	21
Repeat applicants accepted	-	5	2	9
Repeat applicants as % of paper givers	-	25%	10.50%	43%

Source: *CPRsouth* database


The situation of repeat applicants can be viewed in two angles. The repeaters often produce better papers, therefore the content quality of each conference is enhanced. However, this would also mean that the network will not expand as rapidly. As a solution to the above issue it has been suggested that applicants of *CPRsouth5* who were past paper presenters be penalised 5% of their marks as they have already received training.

The outcome of this is yet to be seen.

Young scholars are only allowed to participate in *CPRsouth* once as young scholars. If they are interested in participating in future conferences, they have to do so as paper presenters.

The diagram below shows the all the *CPRsouth* paper presenters. The inner circle in orange nodes shows the repeat paper presenters while the red nodes depict the ‘graduates’ from young scholars o paper presenters. The single yellow node represents a paper presenter, who presented at *CPRsouth1* and later became a *CPRsouth* board member.

Figure 8: *CPRsouth* paper presenters



Source: CPRsouth Database


What applicants want

In order to attract applicants, it is important to identify what the applicants want or why do they apply for a conference. The survey results show that a majority of the CPRsouth paper presenter applicants applied because “Communication Policy was their area of research”, followed by the “relevance of communication policy to my research”. The situation was different as far as the young scholar applicants were concerned. The overwhelming response was the “Opportunity to network with senior scholars in ICT policy research”. This was followed by the desire to “gain skills in policy intervention”.

The differences in the reasons for applying do not come as a surprise. The paper presenters have already selected their preferred field and are interested in getting their research reviewed and published and also gaining more knowledge about the subject. Therefore the paper presenters will be more interested in the content of the conference. Whereas the young scholars maybe still dabbling with selecting a specific field, therefore more interested in gaining more skills and information through networking and mentoring.

A quality of a conference is often reflected in the quality of the content and the networking opportunities it provided.

Figure 9: Why apply for CPRsouth?



Source: CPRsouth evaluation survey, 2010

The survey was conducted among the CPRsouth applicants only. A total of 96 responses were received. The respondents were allowed to select multiple responses.

The content

The content of the CPRsouth conference is provided by the papers being presented and the panel discussions and keynote speeches involving senior scholars and policy intellectuals.

The papers are selected through a double blind review process. The reviewers include Board members of CPRsouth who are renowned scholars and policy intellectuals in the field of ICT with expertise in the Asia Pacific region and selected senior scholars and policy intellectuals from other regions. The Board Members and senior scholars mentor the paper presenters on one on one basis for a period of about 6 weeks prior to the conference in improving the quality of the conference papers. In addition the presenters are also coached on their presentation skills and have to prepare a policy brief of their paper with a suitable audience in mind.

The quality of the papers was a concern that was cited at *CPRsouth1* where the papers were selected only through abstracts. In order to rectify the situation, the current, more stringent selection process was put in place from the second conference in Chennai in 2007. Of the reviewers, those who had reviewed two or more *CPRsouth* paper processed were surveyed about the quality of papers presented. All responders agreed that there was a steady improvement in the quality of papers presented at *CPRsouth* over the last four years. However, majority of the reviewers noted that in comparisons to other conferences of similar subject matter there was room for greater improvement in the quality of papers.

The reviewers noted that the *CPRsouth* model of mentoring and coaching and method of selecting papers is unique and it has led to the improvement of the papers being presented. The paper presenters were asked to rate the quality of papers presented and the mentoring that they received in comparison to another conference they had previously attended⁷. While the paper quality of the other conferences was rated higher than *CPRsouth*, the mentoring received at *CPRsouth* was rated higher than other conferences. This mirrors the comments given by the review committee members.

Table 5: Paper presenter ratings

	Quality of papers		Mentoring	
	<i>CPRsouth</i>	Other	<i>CPRsouth</i>	Other
Excellent	21%	25%	50%	33%
Good	43%	58%	36%	25%
Satisfactory	36%	17%	14%	33%
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	8%
Abysmal	0%	0%	0%	0%

Source: *CPRsouth* evaluation survey, 2010

Mentoring provided at *CPRsouth* is what sets it apart from other conferences held on the same subject matter.

A part from the paper sessions, the conference has at least two panel discussions in which the panellists are either the Board members or other selected scholars and two keynote speeches. The panel discussions and the keynote speeches regularly get higher ratings from the audience in comparison to the paper sessions in terms of quality of content.

The content of the tutorials is made up of the lectures conducted by the senior scholars on subject related matters such as basics of information economics from a scholarly perspective and communication strategies to achieve policy change and how to write a policy brief from a more policy oriented angle. In addition, the conduct lectures during the tutorials and discuss research proposals submitted by the young scholars.

⁷ Of the 55 paper presenters emailed, 25 responded. Of that, only 15 were able to name a similar conference.

Networking

The ability to network with Senior Scholars is dependent upon those who attend the conference. As mentioned above, CPRsouth is attended by some of the most senior scholars and policy intellectuals. Both young scholars and paper presenters were asked to rate the opportunity to network and the feedback is encouraging⁸.

Table 6: Ratings by paper presenters and young scholars

	Networking	
	CPRsouth	Other
Excellent	33%	10%
Good	48%	43%
Satisfactory	15%	43%
Unsatisfactory	4%	5%
Abysmal		

Source: CPRsouth evaluation survey, 2010

Networking takes two forms, one among peers and other with the senior scholars. The one to one mentoring for both paper presenters and young scholars gives an additional opportunity for them to network with the senior scholars.

Implications for USE: As the above shows, the efforts made to mentor the CPRsouth paper presenters and young scholars is what makes CPRsouth unique from other similar conferences. More efforts are currently being made in order to enhance this feature. The services of an expert has been retained in order to give feedback on the policy briefs for the paper presenters, prior to its final submission. Furthermore, the initial work is currently being done to set up an internship programme that will give a select number of the young scholars a chance to work with some of the Board Members and senior scholars of CPRsouth.

It is also recommended that the current conference (event) evaluation form be changed to capture more feedback about the processes used by CPRsouth as response rates will be much higher than surveying participants later on.

Outcomes- Have they influenced policy?

The objective of CPRsouth is to create or nurture policy intellectuals who can engage in the policy process. Therefore, the post CPRsouth activities of both paper presenters and young scholars are tracked through an annual survey, scholar.google and the Social Sciences Research Network (SSRN). It is understood that a multitude of factors would have contributed to their

⁸ Of the 55 paper presenters emailed, 25 responded. Of that, only 15 were able to name a similar conference. Of the 85 young scholars e-mailed, 28 responded. Of those responded, only 10 were able to name a similar conference.

work, and CPR*south* may have only played a minimal part in it by way of giving the participants the tools such as communication training, policy brief writing or analytical skills. CPR*south* also attempts to look at the interactions between the participants post conference.

The outcome survey is conducted every October and the paper presenters are asked to give information about the academic or policy related activity they have been engaged in. The table shows the summary of the responses. The responses show that both paper presenters and young scholars have been engaged in policy related activities as well as academia. The number of op-ed pieces written by the respondents remain consistently low. It also may be fair to assume that the work would have been done in conjuncture with a team or a colleague or supervisors. Furthermore a majority of them come from organisations that are established, either as universities, private companies, government or research institutes. Therefore analysis into whether or not the backgrounds of the young scholars played a key role in their future were was inconclusive.

Table 7: CPR*south* Outcomes Survey Data - 2007-2009

	Outcomes Survey 2007 Response rate - 49%		Outcomes Survey 2008 Response rate - 41%		Outcomes Survey 2009 Response rate - 38%	
	Paper presenter	Young scholar	Paper presenter	Young scholar	Paper presenter	Young scholar
# of respondents who wrote Policy Papers / brief			11	7	11	11
# of respondents who made Policy submissions / Presentations	2	1	12	5	9	10
# of respondents who wrote Op-ed pieces in the media	1		2	1	4	1
# of respondents who gave Interviews to the media	1		4	2	1	1
# of respondents who Participation in blogs			6	5	6	3
# of respondents who had Journal Publications	4		9	5	7	3
# of respondents who presented Conference papers	5	4	13	7	13	8
# of respondents who submitted their Theses	2		2	2	3	3
# of respondents who submitted Theses proposals		1	3	6	3	4
# of respondents who received Grants	1		5	4	4	6
# of respondents who submitted Grant Proposals		1	7	4	7	5

Source: Outcomes surveys 2007, 2008, 2009

In addition to the outcomes survey, a scholar.google search conducted in January 2010 to check the internet presence of the paper presenters with regards to their academic work. The policy work is more difficult to track online. The output of the presenters is also an indication of the calibre of presenters CPR*south* has at the conference.

Table 8: Internet Presence of paper presenters

	CPRsouth1	CPRsouth2	CPRsouth3
No. of paper givers with Academic outputs	12	7	8
No of Academic outputs	24	16	16

Source: Google search


However, it showed that the internet presence of the paper presenters was less than expected. Their *CPRsouth* papers could be found online as they were uploaded to SSRN however, other academic outputs which we knew were in existence, could not be found on the internet. Internet presence is important, especially in academia for citations.

It is recommended that the presenters and young scholars are encouraged to post their outputs online. In addition, their CVs be made available on the CPRsouth.

Interactions post conference

As mentioned above, the opportunity to network during the conference is important. Most participants use the opportunity for information exchanges, followed by looking for opportunities to collaborate on work. A considerable number also looked for feedback on their PhD thesis. The total number of respondents was 53. Respondents were allowed to select more than one response.


Figure 10: Why Network?



Source: CPR*south* evaluation survey 2010

However, do these interactions go beyond the exchange of business cards? The responses show that nearly 80% of those who responded to the survey have kept in touch with either a peer or a senior scholar they met at CPR*south*. However, the interactions are frequently between two or three individuals. However, only about 24% has had any collaborative work done with each other. The collaborative work includes co-authoring of papers, internships under senior scholars and projects. Some of these are still in discussion stages. The diagram below depicts the level of connectivity between the participants. Each of the nodes in the diagram represents a participant at CPR*south*. If any interaction has taken place between two participants, it is represented by a link between the two nodes. The diagram shows most of the participants are in touch with either one or two other participants. However, these interactions could also be one off and not repeated.

Figure 11: CPR*south* network



Source: CPR*south* evaluation survey 2010

However, in spite of the interactions, citations among the participants remain low, at approximately 20%.


The senior scholars too were asked about the networking opportunities at the CPR*south*. The responses were positive with the reviewers regarding the opportunities to be equal to that of other conferences they attend. Among some of the outcomes of the networking opportunities were recruitment of students into academic programmes, employment opportunities and collaborations between organisations for joint programmes. Furthermore, the senior scholars claimed that the participation at the CPR*south* has widened their interests and knowledge, both in terms of subject and regional comparisons.

Pay to attend CPR*south*?

CPR*south* paper presenters and young scholars were inquired as to whether they considered attending CPR*south* to be an asset to their work/education. In response over 98% of the respondents (both presenters and young scholars) said that attending CPR*south* had been an asset.

Therefore clearly CPR*south* is serving a purpose. However, the participants were also asked if they or their organisations would pay to participate at CPR*south*, and if so how much would the contribution be. The majority indicated that at least a minimum sum of USD 200 can be paid either by themselves or their organisations. Not surprisingly, about 27% of young scholars indicated that they or their organisations will not be able to pay for attending CPR*south*. The total number of respondents was 53.

Figure 12: Pay to attend CPR*south*?



Source: CPR*south* evaluation survey 2010


However, this might not be an indication of the willingness to pay but more a case of ability to pay. The survey results also showed that over 50% of the respondents had not attended a similar conference as CPR*south*. This may mean that either the participants lack the financial capability to attend any other conference or they lack the ability to qualify for any other conference.

Of the other conferences mentioned by participants who attended them, very few, such as ICA, provide funding and often charge a registration fee in addition to travel and accommodation costs. Even if funding is provided, it is only partial funding for a select group of participants. Therefore if a young researcher, particularly from a developing country is not given any financial assistance, at least by the organisation they are affiliated to, they may find it difficult to finance it on their own.

Same question was posed to the supervisors of the young scholars and while they agreed that CPR*south* had been a benefit to their students or mentees, funding for them through their organisation would prove to be difficult.

CPR*south* participants will not be fully funded from 2010 onwards. Only 50% of the travel costs will be reimbursed for participants coming from countries where the GDP is either higher or equal to that of Malaysia. The number of applicants coming from countries with a higher GDP than Malaysia dropped. There was a marked drop in applicants from Europe. However, this also maybe a reflection upon the condition that research has to be relevant to Asia Pacific region as opposed to the entire South.

Figure 13: No. of paper presenter applicants from countries with higher and lower GDP than Malaysia



Source: CPRsouth database

Implications for USE: As the above data shows, both individuals and organisations are willing to pay for CPRsouth. However, the average cost they are willing to pay is only XX% of the actual cost of set aside for a young scholar and XX% for a paper presenter. This is also a reflection upon the financial situations of the participants or their organisations. Asian institutions may either not have the capability or the culture of paying for the participation in such events. This makes the need for funding events such as CPRsouth all the more imperative.

Conclusion

The above data shows that CPRsouth has made headway within the last five years. In addition to CPRsouth, two other networks have emerged in Africa and Latin America, namely CPRafrica and ACORN-REDECOM respectively. The two networks replicated CPRsouth and function very similarly to CPRsouth.

Organisations such as TPRC and EuroCPR receive sponsorships from private companies. However, this hardly comes as a surprise as both conferences focus on US and European telecom policies and bring the policy makers to the conference. This is viable due to the existence of the governing structures of the US and the European Union.

Asia on the other hand has no such centrality and the governing structures vary significantly across region. In addition issues facing each country are different. Therefore the method adopted is to train those with “in-situ” knowledge, to engage in the policy process and help make the necessary changes from within. Furthermore, CPRsouth conference also acts as a location where individuals can learn from one another’s experience and replicate in their own countries/ regions where applicable.

Decisions stemming from the evaluation

The evaluation findings were presented to the primary users during the annual CPR*south* board meeting. The report was well received and the primary users held extensive discussions based on the results.

Some of the decisions arrived at summarised below.

Re-scheduling of the conference

The number of abstracts and young scholar applications received was highlighted by the report and was taken up for discussion. The general consensus among the board was that the applicant numbers were below desirable levels. The board recognised that the timing of the conference may not be ideal as examinations are held in December in a majority of the Universities CPR*south* participants come from, resulting in a less than desirable applicant rate. Similar sentiments were echoed by some of the respondents to the evaluation survey.

Furthermore, the quality of the paper presented as also discussed by the board members. The evaluation results showed that in spite of CPR*south* scoring well on the mentoring and networking it still was performing below par as far as quality of the conference. The members noted that the low applicant rate was also a contributory factor to the quality of the conference.

As such, the administrative partner, LIRNE*asia* was asked to look at the possibility of holding the conference at another time of the year.

Revision of the Draft call for papers and applications

The members of the board also raised their concerns as to whether or not CPR*south* is being advertised extensively enough to the desired audience. They called for a revision in the call for papers and young scholars so that it might attract more applicants. The board stressed that prominence had to be given to the mentoring processes within CPR*south* in the call for papers and applications as it was identified as a strength of CPR*south*. In addition the board stressed the need to highlight the subject areas covered by at the conference.

It was agreed that the next (CPR*south*6) call for papers and applications will be circulated among the board members for comments and amendments.

Improving the quality of the conference

As mentioned above, the evaluation survey showed that while CPR*south* excelled in terms of networking and mentoring, quality of papers needed improvement. In addition to trying to attract more applicants, the board also discussed other ways of improving the quality of the conference. Among these were increased participation by board members, in the form of panel discussions or presentation of papers.

Approval to charge a registration fee for paper presenters and young scholars

Based on the results of the evaluation survey, a board paper was drawn up to seek approval to charge a registration fee from young scholars and paper presenters. The results from the evaluation survey were used as evidence for introducing the fee. The proposed registration fees were USD 200 from paper presenters and USD 150 from young scholars. The board expressed concern about the ability of young scholars to pay a fee. The administrative partner clarified that as opposed to charging a fee, it can be deducted from the travel reimbursement. In addition, the members were concerned whether or not the induction of the fee will deter potential applicants.

After deliberation, the board agreed to a reduced registration fee of USD 150 for paper presenters and USD 100 for young scholars. The motion was approved for only one year (CPRsouth6) and will be up for review at the 6th board meeting in Bangkok.

Fund Raising

Utilising the evaluation for fund raising for CPRsouth was always a primary goal. The CPRsouth financial sub-committee and the board as a whole requested the administrative partner, LIRNEasia to prepare a brochure with the CPRsouth evaluation findings as a means of opening the dialogue with funding agencies to obtain funding for future CPRsouth work.

The brochure is currently being prepared.

REFERENCES

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P & Trow, M (1994). *The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage

Neilson, S (2005), *Evaluating Capacity Building: Building a results framework for a development agency*, presented at the CES/AEA Conference

Patton, M. Q. (2008), *Utilization Focused Evaluation*, 4th Edition, Sage, California

Simister, N and Smith, R (2010), *Monitoring and Evaluating Capacity Building: Is it really that difficult?*, Praxis Paper 23, INTRAC, Available at http://www.efc.be/CapacityBuilding/Documents/Praxis_Paper_23_Monitoring_and_Evaluating_Capacity_Building_is_it_really_that_difficult.pdf

Samarajiva R and Gamage, S (2007) *Bridging the Divide: Building Asia-Pacific Capacity for Effective Reforms*, The Information Society, v.23 n.2, p.109-117,

CPRsouth database

Annex 1 Questionnaires 1-5

Categories the questionnaires will be sent to-

- All paper presenter and Young scholar applicants
- All Board members and paper reviewers
- All paper presenters
- All young scholars
- Supervisors of the Young scholars

Questionnaire 1 - For all Paper presenter and young scholar applicants of *CPRsouth* (Not selected for the conference)

1. How did you hear about *CPRsouth*?
 - a) E-mail alert from *CPRsouth*
 - b) A forwarded E-mail alert from a Colleague or supervisor
 - c) Notice on *CPRsouth* website
 - d) Notice on other website
 - e) Discussion board
 - f) Recommended by a colleague who had participated at *CPRsouth*
 - g) Other
 - Please specify.....
2. Do you know anyone who had received a notice for the *CPRsouth* Conference and decided not to apply?
 - a) Yes
 - If yes, then why?
 - b) No
3. Have you applied to *CPRsouth* more than once?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
4. What are your reasons for applying for *CPRsouth*? You can mark more than one response
 - a) My area of research is Communication Policy
 - b) I'm interested in pursuing Communication Policy as my area of research
 - c) Relevance of Communication Policy Research to my own area of research
 - d) Opportunity to network with senior scholars in ICT policy research
 - e) Gaining skills in policy interventions

Questionnaire 2- For members of the Board and paper reviewers of *CPRsouth*

1. How would you rate the quality of papers from *CPRsouth*1-4?
 - a) Greatly Improved
 - b) Improved
 - c) No Change
 - d) Deteriorated
 - e) Greatly deteriorated

2. Has participation in CPR*south* widened your areas of interest?
 - a) Yes
 - If yes, please give details.....
 - b) No

3. Do you know anyone who had received a notice for the CPR*south* Conference and decided not to apply?
 - a) Yes
 - If yes, then why?
 - b) No

4. Name the academic association, in your experience, is the most similar to CPR*south*?
.....

5. How does CPR*south* compare with the association mentioned above in the following categories? (1=abysmal, 5= excellent)
 - a) **Sense of Community:**

CPR <i>south</i> :	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

 - b) **Quality of Papers presented**

CPR <i>south</i> :	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

 - c) **Networking Opportunity**

CPR <i>south</i> :	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

 - d) **Mentoring process for Young scholars and paper presenters**

CPR <i>south</i> :	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

Questionnaire 3 For CPR*south* Paper presenter Participants

1. How did you hear about CPR*south*?
 - a) E-mail alert from CPR*south*
 - b) A forwarded E-mail alert from a Colleague or supervisor
 - c) Notice on CPR*south* website
 - d) Notice on other website
 - e) Discussion board
 - f) Recommended by a colleague who had participated at CPR*south*
 - g) Other
 - Please specify.....

2. Do you know anyone who had received a notice for the *CPRsouth* Conference and decided not to apply?
 - a) Yes
 - If yes, then why?
 - b) No

3. Have you applied to *CPRsouth* more than once?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

4. What are your reasons for applying for *CPRsouth*? You can mark more than one response
 - a) My area of research is Communication Policy
 - b) I'm interested in pursuing Communication Policy as my area of research
 - c) Relevance of Communication Policy Research to my own area of research
 - d) Opportunity to network with senior scholars in ICT policy research
 - e) Gaining skills in policy interventions

5. How have you used the *CPRsouth* networking opportunities?
 - a) Information exchanges
 - b) Collaborations in terms of work
 - c) To enter academic programmes
 - d) Other

6. Please give details of the above.....

7. Have you maintained contact with anyone you met at *CPRsouth*?
 - a) Yes
 - please give details (names and reason for being in touch)
.....
 - b) No

8. Have you collaborated on work with anyone you met at *CPRsouth*?
 - a) Yes
 - please give details (names and details of work)
.....
 - b) No

9. How does *CPRsouth* compare with the association mentioned above in the following categories? (1=abysmal, 5= excellent)

e) Sense of Community:

<i>CPRsouth</i> :	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

f) Quality of Papers presented

<i>CPRsouth</i> :	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

g) Networking Opportunity

CPRsouth:	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

h) Mentoring process for Young scholars and paper presenters

CPRsouth:	1	2	3	4	5
Other academic association:	1	2	3	4	5

10. Do you consider attending CPRsouth to be an asset to your work/career

- a) Yes
- b) No

11. The average amount spent by CPRsouth per participant is:

paper presenter: USD 1956
young scholar: USD 2934

If you consider attending CPRsouth to be an asset to your career/work, how much will you/your organisation be willing to contribute to participate in the conference?

- a) USD 0
- b) USD 100-200
- c) USD 200-300
- d) USD 300-400
- e) USD 400-500
- f) USD 500-750
- g) USD 750-1000
- h) USD 1000-1500

Questionnaire 4: For CPRsouth Young Scholar Participants

1. How did you hear about CPRsouth?

- a) E-mail alert from CPRsouth
- b) A forwarded E-mail alert from a Colleague or supervisor
- c) Notice on CPRsouth website
- d) Notice on other website
- e) Discussion board
- f) Recommended by a colleague who had participated at CPRsouth
- g) Other
 - Please specify.....

2. Do you know anyone who had received a notice for the CPRsouth Conference and decided not to apply?

- a) Yes
 - If yes, then why?
- b) No

3. What are your reasons for applying for CPRsouth? You can mark more than one response

- a) My area of research is Communication Policy
 - b) I'm interested in pursuing Communication Policy as my area of research
 - c) Relevance of Communication Policy Research to my own area of research
 - d) Opportunity to network with senior scholars in ICT policy research
 - e) Gaining skills in policy interventions
4. How have you used the *CPRsouth* networking opportunities?
- a) Information exchanges
 - b) Collaborations in terms of work
 - c) To enter academic programmes
 - d) Other
5. Please give details of the above.....
6. Have you maintained contact with anyone you met at *CPRsouth*?
- a) Yes
 - please give details (names and reason for being in touch)
.....
 - b) No
7. Have you collaborated on work with anyone you met at *CPRsouth*?
- a) Yes
 - please give details (names and details of work)
.....
 - b) No
8. How does *CPRsouth* compare with the association mentioned above in the following categories? (1=abysmal, 5= excellent)
- a) Sense of Community:**
- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>CPRsouth</i> : | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other academic association: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- b) Quality of Papers presented**
- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>CPRsouth</i> : | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other academic association: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- c) Networking Opportunity**
- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>CPRsouth</i> : | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other academic association: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- d) Mentoring process for Young scholars and paper presenters**
- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>CPRsouth</i> : | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other academic association: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
9. Do you consider attending *CPRsouth* to be an asset to your work/career
- a) Yes

b) No

10. The average amount spent by CPR*south* per participant is:
paper presenter: USD 1956
young scholar: USD 2934

If you consider attending CPR*south* to be an asset to your career/work, how much will you/your organisation be willing to contribute to participate in the conference?

- a) USD 0
- b) USD 100-200
- c) USD 200-300
- d) USD 300-400
- e) USD 400-500
- f) USD 500-750
- g) USD 750-1000
- h) USD 1000-1500

Questionnaire 5: Questionnaire for the supervisors of Young Scholars

1. Are you aware of the work being done by CPR*south*?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

2. Do you consider attending CPR*south* to be an asset to your student/mentee?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

3. The average amount spent by CPR*south* per participant is:
paper presenter: USD 1956
young scholar: USD 2934

If you consider attending CPR*south* to be an asset to your student's/mentee's career/work, and if your institution has funding to support the participation of your student in training programmes, how much will your institution be willing to contribute?

- a) USD 0
- b) USD 100-200
- c) USD 200-300
- d) USD 300-400
- e) USD 400-500
- f) USD 500-750
- g) USD 750-1000
- h) USD 1000-1500

Annex 2: Key Evaluations, Sub Questions and Indicators

Key Evaluation Questions Outputs	Sub Question	Questions	Methodology	
<p>Is the manner in which the CPRsouth conference process (call for papers, review and mentoring process) is conducted resulting in attracting ICT policy and regulation scholars throughout the Asia region to participate in the conference?</p>	<p>What was the source of information about CPRsouth?</p>	<p>How did you hear about CPRsouth?</p>	<p>Included in Questionnaires 1 which will be sent to all paper presenter and young scholar applicants.</p>	
	<p>Do you know anyone who has decided not to apply for CPRsouth? If so why?</p>	<p>Do you know anyone who has decided not to apply for CPRsouth? If so why?</p>	<p>Included in Questionnaires 1, 3 will be sent to all paper presenter and young scholar applicants as well as the Board members and other paper reviewers</p>	
	<p>Is there a growth in the network (new applicants vs repeaters)?</p>		<p>Sourcing from existing data in the CPRsouth database</p>	
	<p>Is there an improvement in the quality of papers presented at CPRsouth?</p>	<p>How would you rate the quality of papers from CPRsouth1-4?</p>	<p>Included in Questionnaire 3 will be sent to the Board members and other paper reviewers.</p>	
	<p>How has the networking opportunity (information exchange, collaboration for new work, opportunities to enter in to MSc, PhD programmes) been of use to them?</p>	<p>How would rate the networking opportunities provided by CPRsouth?</p>	<p>Included in Questionnaires 2 which will be sent to all paper presenters</p>	
	<p>What are the conditions/reasons for participation at the tutorials and conference?</p>	<p>Have the networking opportunities been used for</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Information exchanges 2) Collaborations in terms of work? 3) To enter academic programmes? <p>If so, please give details of the above</p>		
	<p>What type of backgrounds (type of organizations/education) do the participants hale from?</p>	<p>What are your reasons for applying for CPRsouth?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) My area of research is Communication Policy 2) Relevance of Communication Policy Research to my own area of research 3) Opportunity to network with senior scholars in ICT policy research 4) Gaining skills in policy interventions 	<p>Included in Questionnaires 2 which will be sent to all CPRsouth Paper presenters</p>	
		<p>What is the applicants background, prior to applying to CPRsouth</p>	<p>Data obtained from the CPRsouth database</p>	

This research was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development Research Centre (Canada) and the Department for International Development (United Kingdom) and as a part of the capacity building programme, Developing Evaluation Capacity for ICT4D (DECI).

The author wishes to thank Dr. Shubh Kumar-Range for her mentorship, the CPRsouth board members for their time in providing feedback and the DECI team for its support in completing the evaluation.

<p>Are the procedures used by CPRsouth (call for applications, tutorial topics) attracting young scholars?</p>	<p>What was the source of information about CPRsouth?</p> <p>Is there a growth in the network (new applicants vs repeaters)?</p> <p>What are the conditions/reasons for participation at the tutorials and conference?</p>	<p>How did you hear about CPRsouth?</p> <p>Do you know anyone who has decided not to apply for CPRsouth? If so why?</p> <p>What are your reasons for applying for CPRsouth?</p> <p>1) My area of research is Communication Policy 2) Relevance of Communication Policy Research to my own area of research 3) Opportunity to network with senior scholars in ICT policy research 4) Gaining skills in policy interventions</p> <p>What are the type of organizations</p>	<p>Included in Questionnaires 5 which will be sent to all young scholars</p> <p>Included in Questionnaires 5 which will be sent to all young scholars</p> <p>Sourcing from existing data on database</p> <p>Have a look at the applications and CVs in conjuncture with Questionnaire 2, 5 that will be sent to all CPRsouth Young scholar applicants and participants.</p>
	<p>Is there diversity in the organisations (and the type of organisations - academic/research/private/govt/NGO and (or) well established/not well established) they come from?</p> <p>How has the networking opportunity (information exchange, collaboration) been of use to them?</p>	<p>Have the networking opportunities been used for</p> <p>1) Information exchanges 2) Collaborations in terms of work? 3) To enter academic programmes? If so, please give details of the above</p>	<p>Sourcing from existing data</p> <p>Included in Questionnaires 5 which will be sent to all young scholars</p>
<p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has CPRsouth members influenced or engaged in the policy process since becoming a member of the CPRsouth community and to what extent has CPRsouth influenced and 	<p>What Academic and policy (policy briefs presented, seminars, Op-ed pieces, News articles, meetings and presentations to policy makers) outputs have the Paper presenters produced?</p> <p>Were Senior scholars introduced any new topics of interest during the conference?</p>		<p>Sourcing from the existing data available on the internet. The questionnaire is optional.</p> <p>Questionnaire 3 will be sent to the board members and other reviewers</p>

<p>or facilitates the community members' current work?⁹</p>	<p>To what extent do the community members benefited from the networking done during and after the conference and do the community members continue to network with each other after the conference in the form of projects or as students/staff in faculties?</p>	<p>How many members of the CPRsouth community have you been in touch with? Has anyone from the community collaborated with you on work? Has any CPRsouth participants cited you in their work? Have you cited CPRsouth participants cited your work?</p>	<p>Included in Questionnaire 2 which will be sent to all CPRsouth Paper presenters</p>
<p>What activities have the CPRsouth Young scholars been engaged with since attending CPRsouth and to what extent has CPRsouth influenced the Young scholars' current activities?¹⁰</p>	<p>What Academic (research) and Policy outputs have the Young scholars produced? Have they continued in the field of ICTs? To what extent do the community members benefited from the networking done during and after the conference and do the community members continue to network with each other after the conference in the form of projects or as students/staff in faculties? Do the organisations they are attached to, recognise the work done by CPRsouth?</p>	<p>Request or CVs or try and obtain the latest on the internet. Request or CVs or try and obtain the latest on the internet. Included in Questionnaire 5 which will be sent to all CPRsouth Young Scholars</p>	<p>Sourcing from the existing data available on the internet. Request or CVs or try and obtain the latest on the internet. Included in Questionnaire 5 which will be sent to all CPRsouth Young Scholars</p>
<p>Are the supervisors aware of the annual conference and tutorials, CPRsouth? Would you recommend CPRsouth to your students/supervisees? Would you recommend it to your students/supervisees to attend? If your organization has funds to send your supervisees for training programmes, would you</p>	<p>Are the supervisors aware of the annual conference and tutorials, CPRsouth? Would you recommend CPRsouth to your students/supervisees? Would you recommend it to your students/supervisees to attend? If your organization has funds to send your supervisees for training programmes, would you</p>	<p>Questionnaire 6 will be sent to the supervisors of the Young Scholar applicants.</p>	<p>Questionnaire 6 will be sent to the supervisors of the Young Scholar applicants.</p>

⁹ “Work” encompasses projects, academic work, other collaborations, networking
¹⁰ The influence of CPRsouth will be looked at in conjuncture with the Young scholars’ existing background.

		<p>recommend CPRsouth?</p>	
--	--	----------------------------	--

Annex 3: CPRsouth Abstract Review and Paper Selection Process

