



# ANNUAL REPORT

**Report Period: September 17, 2012 – September 16, 2013**

## **SCALING HIGH-IMPACT INNOVATIONS OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS**

<b>Mercy Corps Contact</b>		<b>Project Summary</b>	
Name	Carol Skowron	Award No.	AID-OAA-A-12-00044
Title	Sr. Program Officer	Start Date	Sept. 17, 2012
Address	45 SW Ankeny Street Portland, OR 97204	End Date	Sept. 16, 2017
Phone	503.896.5861	Report Date	December 17, 2013
Email	cskowron@field.mercycorps.org	Total Award	\$20,451,617

## Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	3
I. Executive Summary .....	4
II. Program Overview .....	4
III. Performance Summary.....	5
IV. Administration .....	12
V. Conclusions.....	14

## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AOR	Agreement Officer's Representative
AMP	Award Monitoring Plan
DIV	Development Innovations Ventures
EF	Everyone Forever
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
IIA	Innovation Investment Alliance
ION	Investment Opportunity Note
IRM	Investment Recommendation Memo
MC	Mercy Corps
MM	Mission Measurement
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
Skoll	Skoll Foundation
Snapshot	Also known as VHLPS, or Very High Level Program Snapshot, has very basic information about the proposed organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## I. Executive Summary

---

The Innovation Investment Alliance (IIA), a partnership between USAID and the Skoll Foundation with support from Mercy Corps, employs a nontraditional program structure to identify and fund high-potential investment opportunities that can catalyze systems-changing impact. As the implementing partner for IIA, in Year 1 Mercy Corps launched the program, made its first investment, and honed the process to select and fund recipient organizations. Roughly six months into implementation, Mercy Corps screened, investigated and evaluated several prospects, and funded one organization, Imazon. The partners then paused to reflect on the experience, restated partnership goals, and adjusted communications and processes to better align with the goals of the project. Mercy Corps is now in the final stages of investigating additional opportunities for funding, and working with the partners to identify key prospects for later funding rounds.

At the end of Year 1, the team has a good working relationship with Skoll and USAID teams and a deeper understanding of their criteria to fund these innovations. In Year 2 we aim to develop several applications for funding and have the majority of the funds tentatively allocated or subgranted by year-end.

## II. Program Overview

---

### 1. Program Summary

The Scaling High-Impact Innovations of Social Entrepreneurs is an alliance between the Skoll Foundation (Skoll) and USAID, to co-invest \$40 million in cutting-edge, rigorously-evaluated innovations that are ready to scale, have sustainable models and can produce systems-level change. As an implementing partner, Mercy Corps screens, investigates, evaluates and proposes high-potential candidates; provides selected subrecipients with funding; and manages implementation on behalf of USAID for their portion of this program. Mercy Corps works closely with Skoll to ensure alignment between the parties.

The goal of the overall alliance is that *high-impact, sustainable innovations proven to produce systems-level change in the developing world are showcased and brought to scale, in conjunction with the alliance partners.*

Two strategic objectives have been proposed for Mercy Corps' work under the alliance:

1. Alliance effectively leverages partners' resources and expertise to more powerfully support organizations at critical points for scale and transformational impact.
2. Social innovations provide and share meaningful data that demonstrates the impact of their approach as well as measures the value and impact of the investment alliance as a whole.

### **III. Performance Summary**

---

Based on goals laid out in the cooperative agreement, success under this program will be measured on three levels:

1. Mercy Corps' management of the partnership activities and USAID's funds distributed to recipient organizations as described in the Award Monitoring Plan (AMP).
2. Aggregate program results across all recipient organizations, which will be measured using the Results Framework. This information will be collected and reported semi-annually.
3. Individual recipient organizations will report against their own Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), reported quarterly.

Mercy Corps is currently working with USAID technical staff to modify our AMP, which was submitted as part of the first annual report to USAID. Mercy Corps now has a better understanding of the motivations of each partner in the Alliance and Mercy Corps' role in successfully driving this program forward. The new AMP is more closely aligned with the aggregate results framework and the revisions that have been made to the investment selection process. The modified AMP will be submitted to the AOR by the end of December 2013 for review and approval.

#### **1. Management of the Partnership**

##### **A. Process and Selection of Recipient Organizations**

The cooperative agreement was signed in September 2012 and Mercy Corps immediately began startup activities to operationalize the vision that the founding partners had put forth and to deepen what was articulated in the approved cooperative agreement. From the outset, Mercy Corps engaged closely with the partners, and supported all entities to develop a better understanding of the motivations, resources, and expertise that each brings to the project. The most important gap we identified was an elaborated vision of the process to identify and fund innovations. In the opening months, Mercy Corps developed a "minimum viable process"<sup>1</sup> to select appropriate recipient organizations and develop plans to measure success of the program, which could be tested during and adapted after a first round of funding.

Mercy Corps interviewed USAID and Skoll representatives and reviewed available documents, including the DIV APS, background documents provided by DIV to better explain their methodology, and Skoll investment memos to align selection criteria and process. Mercy Corps developed multiple documents outlining the Partner Engagement Process, Basic Screening criteria, Full Application document, the Subaward Agreement

---

<sup>1</sup> This term is borrowed from lean start-up terminology. The idea is to create a basic version of a product, process, or service—the minimum level to accurately reflect what a fully fleshed out version will be—and to test this approach before investing full resources into perfecting a final version. For more information, visit <http://theleanstartup.com/principles>.

Template and Subgrant schedule all of which were shared with USAID for feedback and review. Mercy Corps also held a Steering Committee meeting in November 2012 to align the partners around the strategic objectives and parameters of the fund, and produced a Guiding Principles document that summarized these agreed-upon positions.

The process was tested with the first round of investment, which began with a review of the pipeline in December 2012 and ended with the subaward to Imazon in early April. This subaward was developed on an expedited timeline at the explicit request of USAID, with the objective of funding an award for announcement at the Skoll World Forum in April 2013. Mercy Corps was able to assess and fund the award in time for the forum. However, the deadline resulted in less thorough due diligence of the program, which was justified by the fact that Imazon had already been funded by Skoll and Mercy Corps was able to leverage the prior analysis they had done on the program. Going forward, the path to funding is likely to take longer since the two organizations are assessing the program opportunities from scratch and investing in deeper due diligence for each opportunity. In addition, Mercy Corps also began due diligence on another potential investment (Forest Trends) at the suggestion of USAID, but quickly realized that it was unlikely to meet the fund investment criteria. In the future, a thorough examination of fit at the outset will prevent similar missteps from occurring.

The process of developing of Imazon's award demonstrated that the original approach needed revision to meet the expectations of the partners. In May, in a two-day meeting in Washington DC, Mercy Corps and partners identified and jointly created a revised process for investment selection. Under the new process, senior leadership from both Skoll and USAID are more involved in putting forward candidates for funding consideration, reviewing opportunities, and prioritizing potential investments. There are a series of decision-making "Gates" set up for the group that formally prioritize investment opportunities and Mercy Corps' time allocation in investigating potential deals. At each Gate, Mercy Corps completes a deliverable that summarizes the information gathered to date and a recommendation for moving forward. This new process addresses earlier criticisms that USAID lacked visibility and decision making influence in program prioritization. Additionally, it improves opportunities for engagement between the two partners, and continues to allow Mercy Corps to issue recommendations based on social innovations expertise and research between each "Gate".

Using this process, in the first year Mercy Corps considered 27 organizations for funding, shortlisted 11 and funded one, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Total Number of Organizations in IIA process at the end Year 1**

Total Considered	27
Total Shortlisted	11
Total Snapshots completed	7
Total IONs	4
Total Applications submitted	1
Total Funded	1

Mercy Corps also increased opportunities for Skoll and USAID to work together more closely. During the first year, Mercy Corps organized several committees and regular procedures to ensure frequent and open communication among partners. These include:

- ❖ **Communications Committee:** Oversees communications strategy. Composed of representatives from USAID, Skoll, and Mercy Corps, this committee communicates monthly. The committee was busiest around the release of the Imazon grant, securing four stories to publicize that investment. This committee is expected to be most active around investment releases and again when programs begin generating evidence and solid lessons. Engagement among committee members has been extremely positive and collaborative.
- ❖ **Monitoring and Evaluation Committee:** This group provides technical guidance on monitoring and evaluation requirements for recipient organizations and the Alliance. It provides guidance to external evaluators as well as the objectives and parameters of these evaluations. The committee includes M&E specialists from USAID/DIV, Skoll, Mercy Corps as well as the AOR and Mercy Corps project management staff. For most of Year 1, Mission Measurement also participated, although their contract was discontinued in August 2013. This committee played a dominant role in driving program decisions, which was not surprising given the importance of M&E in the Alliance. However, at times this committee seemed to dominate overall program management and could distract from the bigger picture. This is something Mercy Corps and the committee are aware of, and will continue to find the appropriate balance going forward.
- ❖ **USAID Management Meetings:** Mercy Corps staff and representatives from USAID, including the AOR and staff from DIV, check in with a phone call every other week, as well as providing weekly written updates. This gives Mercy Corps the opportunity to inform USAID of their progress as well receive feedback from USAID. This is an important call to ensure that USAID staff are apprised of upcoming opportunities and for Mercy Corps to solicit advice on investments.
- ❖ **Gate check-ins:** During the investment prioritization process, Mercy Corps, Skoll, and USAID hold phone conversations to discuss and promote investment opportunities. This has been important to ensure equal footing on decision making and to better understand organizational objectives.

Finally, although not an external committee, Mercy Corps convened regular meetings with an internal advisory committee to support the implementation team with operations,

design management and M&E for the project. This enables Mercy Corps to ensure that the partner management and technical approach being used incorporate best practices.

The revised selection process has been involved and required significant time and effort by all parties to reach a satisfactory outcome. However, while the process is at times laborious, it is also contributing to the development of a true partnership between USAID and Skoll (and Mercy Corps). Staff from all three organizations have not only contributed to the conversation, but in order to put forward prospects, have taken lessons from their counterparts' approaches and come away with ideas that will shape their own work.

IIA staff at Mercy Corps and the Skoll Foundation have developed a close and productive working relationship. Each trusts the expertise that the other brings to the investigation. By remaining in close communication and by having a collaborative attitude, the teams are not only able to identify better prospects but also change course when information indicates that a proposed organization would not be a good investment at that time. This has been cultivated through frequent phone and in-person check-ins, both on specific investment opportunities and at a management level.

## **B. Monitoring and Evaluation**

### *Mission Measurement*

In the initial proposal, Mercy Corps selected Mission Measurement (MM) as our M&E partner. The selection of an M&E partner was done at the suggestion of USAID, who recognized the central, and technical, role of M&E in the program. MM was selected after interviewing several organizations, and was found to have the best program fit. MM was tasked with both performing program level M&E activities, and also developing tools and frameworks for the Alliance overall.

In the startup phase, Mission Measurement conducted interviews with stakeholders from all three organizations and reviewed strategy documents from USAID and Skoll to understand each organization's approach and systems for measurement. Based on this research and multiple drafts with feedback, MM completed a results framework for the IIA partnership that identified three ways the program attempts to create systems level change: 1) Demonstrate Impact, 2) Propel Uptake of the Innovations 3) Drive Cost-Effective Delivery. The final version was submitted to USAID and Skoll in early 2013. (See attachment 1 for the results framework).

Mission Measurement also contributed greatly to the evaluation rubric, by developing indicators for measuring prior experience, cost-effectiveness, and evaluation that were folded into the overall rubric for the partnership. In addition to the M&E elements of the rubric, the tool was adapted from a scale analysis previously developed by MM. The rubric was reviewed and received feedback from USAID teams.

Once Imazon was identified as a potential recipient organization, Mission Measurement was tasked with evaluating prior impact, cost effectiveness, and assisting with the development of an external evaluation plan. The development of the external evaluation

plan was very intensive, and M M staff contributed greatly to creating the evaluation plan and connecting Mercy Corps with qualified consultants. Their work during this period went above and beyond allocated time, and was one of the factors that led the organizations to cancel the contract. Mercy Corps began to realize that the process of due diligence and constant discovery is unpredictable, and the work cannot be assigned to a set level of effort (see below for more details).

After Imazon was awarded funding, Mission Measurement was tasked with helping Imazon develop their indicator plan and advising them on data collection. In the process, MM also created templates and tools that will be useful for work with future grantees, including a guide on measuring cost effectiveness and a template for the indicator plan.

When reviewing the selection and application process used with Imazon, there were a number of ways that the actual work required in the due diligence stage did not match expectations and required that Mission Measurement provide a greater level of effort than had been estimated. In July 2013, Mercy Corps and MM reviewed the contract and determined that the monitoring and evaluation work in the remaining stages would be best met through other arrangements. There was mutual agreement to end the contract after a few remaining tasks were completed.

Mercy Corps determined that given the iterative nature of the work to assess potential grant recipients and the regular monitoring and reporting on program activities required, the tasks would be better met by a Mercy Corps staff member dedicated to M&E for this project. Mercy Corps has recruited and hired a new Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, who will begin work in December 2013.

#### *Selection of External Evaluator for the Imazon program*

Based on conversations with USAID, it was determined that to move forward with funding, Imazon's grant would need to be paired with funding for a rigorous, external evaluation to better determine the elements of the Imazon methodology that contribute to the reduction of deforestation. Mission Measurement led the early phase of this methodology selection, which included multiple conversations with various academic evaluators and Imazon to determine the appropriate methodology and research questions. These conversations were set up with the help of the DIV team. Mercy Corps then took over recruiting and management of the external evaluator.

Mercy Corps conducted a competitive process to select an organization to conduct the evaluation of Imazon's work under Phase 1 of their project. Unfortunately, many of the academics we spoke with in the early stages of forming the methodology were not competitive or appropriate for performing the evaluation, and Mercy Corps needed to initiate a search from scratch (as well as validate the methodology at a greater level of detail than had been done in the lead up to Imazon's award). After many weeks of advertising the position and sending notices to contacts through Mercy Corps, USAID, Skoll, and our M&E networks, we received two high quality bids for this work. The evaluation that was proposed in the contract uses some very new methodologies and requires experience in issues around forest management and deforestation. These two

areas of specialization are very specific, and it is not surprising that there were few bids for this work. The applicants were scored and TerraCarbon won on the strength of their experience in the sector and the team that they fielded.

TerraCarbon conducted an initial assessment of the available data and an analysis of the suggested methods to evaluate the impact of Imazon’s initiative. In October they traveled to Brazil to meet with Imazon, representatives of the Green Municipalities program, and other stakeholders. They are preparing a detailed workplan and budget for Phase 2, which will be approved separately. The draft Phase 1 report is due on or before February 13, 2014 and will be shared with USAID.

### C. Knowledge Management and External Communications/Visibility

Another major component of the Alliance is the capture and dissemination of knowledge to benefit the social innovation community at large. During the first year, most communications efforts revolved around Imazon, and the approach that they employ to combat deforestation. A few stories and panels also highlighted the value of the Alliance partnership model. To this end, the Alliance secured stories in over seven outlets, representing more than 1,200 page views, most notably *The Economist*, *Christian Science Monitor*, and *NextBillion*, and participated in conferences including the Skoll World Forum and the ANDE Metrics Conference. Although Mercy Corps has made healthy efforts to disseminate lessons learned during the first year of work, the focus on knowledge sharing in the community will greatly increase once new lessons and evidence from program investments are captured, likely beginning after the first year of each program. In the meantime, most of the knowledge dissemination will center on investments, profiles of the organizations, and operational elements of Alliance management (including M&E strategies). To anticipate future ramp up efforts of knowledge dissemination, and to develop more of the “operations” stories over the next year, a percentage of time of our new Assistant Program Officer hire is dedicated to develop this type of content.

Data on the dissemination of information on this project by all three partners is displayed in Table 2.

**Table 2: Summary of IIA communications Year 1**

Number of unique stories	4
Number of outlets posting the stories	7
Unique page views*	1242
Number of conference presentations	3

## 2. Aggregate Program Results

During the first year, one investment had been made by the Alliance—a \$3.4m investment into Imazon. They made excellent progress on the first phase of the project, in which they are working on the decentralization of environmental management and

control at the municipal level, and testing the decentralization process in 10 pilot communities. In addition, Mercy Corps has spent much of the second half of the first year investigating the next round of investments, which we expect to be funded in early 2014.

### **A. Funded Programs**

Imazon has presented its workplan and established terms of technical cooperation in 10 pilot municipalities. Technical agreements to formalize participation were signed in seven locations and, as of November 2013, three more are under consideration by municipal legal departments. Progress was made on assessing the state legal framework for populating the land registry, developing the environmental management guide, reviewing the legal framework at the municipal level, and collecting information on the costs and benefits of decentralized environmental management. They continue to scale up capacity building activities for state and municipal level actors. They have also established technical abilities (to generate base maps and validate CAR, monitor and control deforestation). At the end of the first 6 months of the program, Imazon had obtained buy-in for the program, established agreements, developed procedures, developed guides and successfully launched the initiative. In all areas their progress is tracking either at or ahead of their work plan.

### **B. Potential Programs**

Mercy Corps also made substantial progress on three additional funding opportunities: VisionSpring (VS), Everyone Forever (EF), and Evidence Action (EA).

The Vision Spring opportunity, a candidate organization with funding both from Skoll and USAID, started out as three separate, but related grants to expand vision services to low-income consumers: Bangladesh, Rwanda, and Central America. After deeper analysis into the Bangladesh opportunity, Mercy Corps and USAID determined that their lack of a sustainability model presented a significant divergence from USAID priorities. However, the partners will likely fund a learning component of operations in Bangladesh. The partners are also moving forward with the other opportunities.

Everyone Forever is an opportunity to support three organizations-- Water for People, IRC Centre for Water and Sanitation, and Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor --to improve water services in Uganda, Rwanda, Ghana and Honduras. In this concept, the three organizations will implement complementary activities to achieve full coverage as well as embed policy and practice that will maintain the services longterm. We are exploring funding from USAID to cover two countries, with an emphasis on testing and packaging tools and practices that will be widely shared among practitioners, with the goal of helping to shift the sector towards a service delivery approach.

Evidence Action is a DIV grantee, focused on ensuring access to safe water through the use of chlorine dispensers. The program would fund scale up in Uganda, and, in

particular, close integration with EF in Uganda, testing new marketing schemes to drive adoption, and exploring opportunities to work more closely with government.

#### **IV. Administration**

---

With the decision to replace Mission Measurement with an internal staff member, Mercy Corps moved to hire an internal M&E advisor to guide M&E due diligence, technical assistance, relationships with external evaluators, and overall management of M&E work on the program. After a lengthy search that produced submissions from well over 100 candidates, Mercy Corps selected Kevin Hong, a Columbia graduate with extensive experience in multiple M&E methodologies and innovation work. This hire was made in November with the approval of USAID.

In addition to Kevin, Mercy Corps also hired an Assistant Program Officer, Rachel Huguet, realized through cost savings by reducing the budgeted time of the Senior Program Officer on this grant. Rachel is assuming many of the administrative and subgrant management tasks associated with the cooperative agreement.

During the program year, the most senior Mercy Corps point of contact, Steve Zimmerman, departed the agency. His replacement is Ann Mei Chang, formerly a Google executive and Franklin Fellow with the State Department. If any further changes occur to this point person or the Steering Committee contact, Mercy Corps will alert the USAID management team.

Amy Sproston, responsible for compliance with USAID regulations for this grant, is making a site visit to Imazon in Brazil to review records and procedures and to work with them on any reporting and compliance questions or issues that may arise.

### **1. Challenges and Lessons Learned**

#### **A. Lessons Learned**

*A collaborative design process helped to build trust and partner satisfaction.* While Mercy Corps' original direction had been to design and manage the funding process based strictly on the original RFA (which directed MC to manage nearly all activities and look to USAID for final approvals), efforts to design and run the program in this regard harbored partner frustration and created challenges to expeditious funding. Although interviews and document reviews had rigorously been conducted to get buy-in into the process, it wasn't until USAID had an active hand in designing the approach—in equal coordination with both Skoll and MC—that an approach that all partners were satisfied with emerged. For any new design elements on this program—or similar USAID programs where there is significantly new process design that influences USAID management—we would suggest an interactive workshop to allow for USAID input into design at a deeper and more engaged level than occurs with written correspondence. We

also would suggest holding the workshop after sufficient work has been done to generate reactions to tangible elements of program implementation.

*Having a point person and internal hierarchy is important.* The Alliance program is an interesting experiment in USAID cross-departmental management, with representatives at multiple levels from the DIV and GP teams, and input from sector specialists. For this cooperative agreement, the USAID management structure has ranged from having one point person making decisions to an extremely democratic decision-making process involving many individuals. For Mercy Corps, the existing structure of a primary operational point person and a clear final decision-maker, with deep input and participation from others within the two teams, has emerged as the right balance to sow collaborative management while also ensuring decisions are made. This is an important structural lesson for other inter-departmental ventures within the agency.

*Date your partner before you marry.* While we have seen immense progress over the past year between USAID and Skoll, and anticipate that the Alliance will result in a successful and replicable partnership model, there have been growing pains as the partners have needed time to learn about each other, re-evaluate program priorities, and adjust expectations. Many of these hurdles could have been addressed if the partners had tangibly discussed goals and sample programs before entering into the agreement, particularly in an industry where jargon can mean multiple things to different people. For example, “scale” is assessed very differently in Skoll and DIV, with Skoll evaluating “pull factors” (ie, potential for uptake by system-level actors and/ or potential clients) and DIV assessing “push factors” (ie, a track record of uptake at smaller levels of implementation). Had the partners initially invested time in talking through important factors to them—both in their definitions and how they assess them—and also provided tangible examples of ideal investments and rationale for selection, much of the bumpiness in earlier phases could have been avoided.

## **B. Challenges and Outstanding Questions**

*Managing an entirely different process from the USAID norm.* The process used for selection is completely different from the usual USAID selection approach in which USAID solicits proposals, evaluates programs based on those proposals, and scores programs compared to other entries. IIA uses a process by which early investigation and development of an idea leads to a fully completed application by one or two organizations. Despite buy-in to this approach at an individual level, it is in conflict with USAID’s need for complete information before decision-making. The hope is that as the partners become more comfortable with each other and can optimize opportunity selection and design, this uncertainty will be less of a concern. However, it is a constant theme that dictates how Mercy Corps allocates time, engages with potential grantees, and manages relationships.

*How do we make selecting and funding recipient organizations more efficient?* Because we are dealing with multiple variables—two separate internal decision-making bodies, a new type of program for USAID, and programs that change and evolve as we dig deeper

during due diligence—it has been challenging to predict and manage time to get to final approvals and funding. While being too strict with gates and deadlines is unrealistic, we need to integrate strategies for expediting deals over the next year.

*How do we approach potential recipient organizations, gather information, and investigate the potential investment without creating expectations for funding?*

Although the process incorporates relatively light engagement with organizations commiserate with their stage of prioritization, in reality it is impossible to meet partner expectations for information without deep and frequent conversations with the prospects. In the event that funding is eventually approved, this is time well-invested. In the case that no decision is made to move forward, there may be deep frustration on the side of the applicant and partner relationship holders. Determining the right approach will require a better understanding of USAID information requirements at each stage, recognition from USAID (and/or Skoll) that this process is very different and some information requirements may need to be postponed until later stages, and getting technical teams in the right mindset to provide program input.

*Evaluation is a central issue in the ability to fund.* USAID has expressed a strong preference for designing external evaluation as part of the proposed project design pre-award. However, guidance around which organizations need to incorporate external evaluations is unclear. Furthermore, how to select and contract for the external evaluator in a time frame appropriate with award release and program development is not clear. We hope to work closely with USAID teams to optimally balance these considerations.

## **V. Conclusions**

---

The Innovation Investment Alliance is a bold experiment to leverage the knowledge and expertise of pioneering institutions at the forefront of testing new approaches to attain systems level change for entrenched development issues. In the startup year, Mercy Corps worked closely with both partners to develop a solid basis for drawing on this expertise, diligently describing and investigating opportunities, and developing prospects for funding. It is not surprising that it was necessary to refine approaches and processes, to revisit assumptions and priorities, and to pause or reject some proposals along the way. All partners learned not only how to better find the middle ground that will be acceptable to the group, but have opportunities to think about how to move the needle in international development.

The next year will be critical to ensuring that the majority of awards are released and the program is on track for a five year close. At the close of Year 1, only one award has been released—although multiple other awards are in the pipeline. Mercy Corps and the partners will need to maintain an aggressive pace of selection, due diligence, and funding to ensure that the bulk of program funds are allocated according to schedule.

## **Annexes**

- 1. Results Framework**
- 2. Comprehensive Evaluation Rubric**
- 3. Active Excel**