# ESRC research skills strategic leadership hub funding opportunity (expressions of interest stage)

# Guidance on Developing a Logic Model

ESRC has asked applicants to the research skills strategic leadership hub funding opportunity (EoI stage) to include a logic model in their application. Articulating the outcomes and impacts that the hub will contribute to in this way helps us to understand how this will be achieved and the difference it will make as well as ensuring that your proposal is properly supported, resourced and evaluated. This document provides guidance on what ESRC expects, examples of content and additional resources. This is a new approach, and ESRC will seek feedback on how this requirement works for applicants, the commissioning panel, and ESRC.

Logic models set out how a programme or policy is expected to work. They are widely used across UKRI and in government, and can be useful tools in planning programmes, engaging with stakeholders and planning evaluation. They address the following questions:

* What are we trying to change?
* What are we doing to bring about that change?
* How and why do we believe our activities will bring about the change we want to see?

Please note that we are requesting a logic model for this opportunity instead of a Theory of Change. Whilst similar, they differ in terms of their content and level of detail and a high-level logic model is sufficient for this funding opportunity. Like a programme plan or a budget, logic models are planning tools, and their value is as much in the thought and development process as in the resulting document. The choice of tool will depend on many factors including the stage of development and the nature and scale of the expected changes. They should be living documents which can be revised and updated as the hub develops and will inform ongoing monitoring, evaluation and learning. ESRC does not prescribe a particular format or template, but we would suggest that applicants use the following headings:

* Inputs. What resources will the hub need? e.g. funding, existing knowledge, data, skills/expertise of the team, networks, partnerships, technical infrastructure
* Activities. What will the hub do? e.g. training and capacity building, stakeholder engagement; building networks of TCB providers
* Outputs. What will the hub produce or deliver? e.g. new knowledge, publications, TCB resources, events, publicity; a co-ordinated network of TCB providers
* Outcomes. What changes will the hub contribute to? e.g. use of methods, increased stakeholder awareness, streamlined and inclusive access to research skills TCB, upskilling/professional development across the lifecourse, higher-quality and innovative research
* Impacts. What will be the wider scientific, economic and social effects? e.g. a culture of lifelong learning, economic/social change, pipeline of skilled researchers in the social sciences

An example of a generic template is provided below but applicants can use an alternative. We expect proposals to add relevant specific detail. It may be helpful to arrange related activities, outputs and outcomes in rows, and to group them by type (e.g. data collection, stakeholder engagement) or by lead or work package.

We expect the strategic leadership hub to have significant impact, but we want to see evidence of thought and realism about how the hub activities and outputs will contribute to the expected outcomes, and what success will look like. It is not possible to predict or guarantee every impact, but there needs be clarity about the expected scale and nature of the outcomes, and how and when we will see them. It is helpful to identify outcomes that are likely to be achieved and evidenced during the initial funding period of the hub (e.g. improved evidence or stakeholder knowledge), as well as how these will contribute to wider and/or longer-term impacts.

# Outline generic logic model template

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inputs** | **Activities** | **Outputs** | **Outcomes** | **Impacts** |
| What resources are needed? | What will time be spent on? | What will be produced or delivered? | What and who will change? | What will be the wider scientific, economic and social effects? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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