

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

# Memorandum

TO : SEE DISTRIBUTION

DATE: January 19, 1976

FROM : PPC/DPRE:Arthur Handly *AH*

SUBJECT: Review of AID Initiatives in Developing Progress Indicators and Systems of Measurement (attached)

Attached for your information and reference is a report prepared in PPC/DPRE which describes a number of AID initiatives aimed at improving the Agency's capability to assess or measure developmental change. The report was prepared at the suggestion of the PBAR Task Force, and is based in part on an inventory prepared for the Task Force last year.

The report is in two parts: (a) an introductory discussion of the implication of the various initiatives, with recommendations for future consideration of the problems identified; and (b) brief descriptions of each of the activities, with commentary.

The introductory discussion seeks to provide an overview of Agency's recent and ongoing efforts as a means of initiating an exchange of ideas among offices and individuals with responsibility in the areas of project design, implementation and evaluation. Our tentative conclusion is that the problem of identifying suitable indicators of progress and of impact on economic and social problems is inherent to the problem of project design itself, and not independent of it. The only course of action which seems to address this problem would be to assure that future evaluation activities be expanded to include a careful review of the progress indicators used, to see whether it can be determined that they indeed reflect the desired progress or impact.

It would be particularly interested in the reactions of the readers of this paper as to its usefulness, the desirability of wider distribution, or the ways in which the Agency could best make use of the work done thus far. Additional copies of the paper are available upon request from PPC/DPRE/PE, extension 29586.



DISTRIBUTION

PBAR:JRoush  
AG/OAS:BCody  
FFP/ES:EFox  
SER/DM:MBrown  
AA/PPC:PBirnbaum  
AA/PPC:AShakov  
AA/PPC:PIsenman  
PPC/RC:EGriffel  
PPC/RC:MJHeyl  
PPC/RC:CMontrie  
PPC/RC:WStettner  
PPC/PDA:CMichalopoulos  
PPC/PDA:DRedding  
PPC/DPRE:AHandly  
PPC/DPRE:NCohen  
PPC/DPRE:RBerg  
PPC/DPRE:RBobel  
PPC/IA:CGulick  
AA/TA:CFarrar  
AA/TA:SButterfield  
TA/PPU:CFritz  
TA/PPU:JGunning  
TA/PPU:DMyren  
TA/UD:WRMiner  
TA/OST:HArnold  
TA/AGR:LHesser  
TA/AGR:LFletcher  
Mr. Albert Brown (ATAC)  
Mr. Richard Ellis (Checci & Co)  
Mr. Donald Mickelwait (DAI)  
Mr. Hiram Phillips (DA)  
Mr. Alfred Fiks (Group Seven Assoc.)  
Mr. John Beyer (Robert R. Nathan Assoc.)

TA/DA:JFrench  
TA/EHR:JChandler  
TA/H:LHoward  
TA/N:MForman  
AA/PHA:HCrowley  
PHA/PRS:CDMcMakin  
AA/NENA:RNooter  
NENA/DP:BLangmaid  
NENA/TECH:DSteinberg  
NENA/TECH:JDalton  
AA/AFR:Scott  
AFR/DP:RHusmann  
AFR/DP:ILicht  
AFR/DS:PLyman  
AFR/DS:SCole  
AFR/DS:AGayuso  
AA/ASIA:Gardner  
ASIA/DP:WLeves  
Asia/TD:CTark  
AA/LA:HKleine  
AG/OAS:ABoucher  
EA/DP:TO"Connor  
LA/DR:DLion  
LA/DP:RSimpson  
LA/DP:GSchwab  
LA/DP:PMorris

# AID-sponsored Activities in the Examination of Measurement Criteria and Performance In- dicators, and Related Topics

## Introduction

A few conclusions have been drawn and recommendations developed based on the attached list of studies and reports. Included are conclusions as to the benefits and costs of identifying suitable indicators, the need for and feasibility of a standardized list of indicators, and the important distinction between performance indicators and goal or impact indicators.

## Utility of Indicators

Despite the large amount of interest in this subject, very little is known which will enable project designers to determine whether the indicators they have chosen are valid reflections of actual progress toward the target sought, or to make optimal choices from among possible indicators. We have lists of indicators, but no authoritative basis for assessing or comparing them.

A comparison with the physical sciences is apt. Scientists can make frequent and continuous measurements and are able to effect a high degree of accurate prediction without being able to, or needing to, define the phenomena (e.g., the state, properties, nature and rate of change) which they are measuring. This is an advantage physical scientists have which is denied to social science. On the basis of the large number of observations physical scientists can make, they have some notion as to how accurate their correlations are. The correlations may not be definable as causal relationships, but they nonetheless permit confident prophecy.

The studies inventoried herein show that while we are able to formulate progress indicators, our knowledge is limited when we seek to explain either the nature or the causes of the phenomena being observed. Thus reporting on such indicators does not enable us to predict whether the target in question could be achieved in some other setting.

Any particular indicator may reflect change induced by different causal factors in different situations. The context is of over-riding importance. It has been pointed out that even an apparently unambiguous indicator such as rate of population growth will have different meanings in different contexts (see article by Harald Fredericksen, in Science, November 14, 1969). It is necessary to know what produced the measured outcome in order to know what we have measured.

What this suggests is that if we are to benefit fully from evaluation of project activities, we may need two kinds of indicators: (1) indicators of change or rate of change; and (2) indicators of the behavior of causal factors. Unless and until AID obtains a satisfactory product from a study which is currently in progress, there will be little we can do for the present to develop the latter, other than to remain aware of the problem. Therefore, our immediate emphasis should be on selecting the best indicators of change.

Certain criteria for selecting indicators have been advanced, notably by PCI (see item B.2). These criteria --- plausibility, independence (measuring results, not inputs), objective verifiability, and targetability (determinable in quantity and time)--- have been widely disseminated but not tested. Other criteria such as reliability, significance, and cost, merit equal consideration.

In our present state of knowledge, therefore, indicators do not have an independent existence. Further research into the subject should be in the context of and part of studies of our experience with development projects.

#### Cost Aspect

It is frequently recommended that each new project, in providing for timely evaluation to assess progress toward achievement of project purpose, include funding for the gathering of data to test the project effect. This would include the gathering of baseline data as well as periodic surveys or observations once the project is under way.

It is important to recognize that such outlays may be necessary if we are going to measure project achievement. Cost of data collection is a basic consideration in selecting indicators, and it is unfortunately often true that in developing countries the amount of valid statistical information ready to be drawn on is minimal. The alternative to such outlays is most likely a complete lack of progress information.

It is also important to realize the savings achieved when use is made of progress indicators. The formulation of indicators determines the data which need to be collected. As a consequence of selecting appropriate indicators, the cost and waste effort of collecting unrelated or redundant facts can be reduced.

In summative evaluation one knows with some certainty the targets and the strategy for achieving the targets. In such a case the indicators will define a relatively narrow field of data to be collected, and costs of data collection will be relatively smaller.

In formative evaluation situations, one is uncertain of what the targets are, and even less certain of the strategy to be followed. In such cases, the indicators necessarily will be more numerous and will define a wider field of data to be collected. Costs of data collection will be relatively higher. As a consequence, research in indicators probably should focus on the formative area where the unknowns are greater and the potential cost savings are greater.

#### "Standard" Indicators

One possible approach would be to provide, as part of the guidance to project designers, a relatively select list of "standard" indicators, whose quality and usefulness is determined by a survey of experience plus a necessary amount of testing. This would, of course, be an ideal arrangement, but the current state of knowledge and the variability of country situations, as described in the preceding sections, suggests that much more modest aims are more appropriate in the short run.

Rather than contrive a list of standard indicators, the Agency might explore actual experience with indicators. One way to do this would be as part of a historical review of a number of projects -- "ex post", as it is commonly referred to -- to see not only what happened in the course of a project's history and to what extent its aims were realized, but at the same time to see what kinds of indicators and measurement techniques were used and what kinds of data were available or were developed to assess progress.

A second approach would be to establish performance indicators as part of each new project design and to undertake not merely to use the indicators to measure progress at regular intervals, but to assess their relevance to the project targets at the same time that we verify the cost of the measurement.

Neither of these courses of action is likely to produce findings in a short period of time. Nor is it likely that AID will be able to collect information on a large number of indicators. In view of the wide range of country settings, and as most of these are changing over time in so many important ways, social statistics gathered over a five-year time period may only appear to be comparable. The wide variation in the contexts from which the observations are taken, could undermine the basis for interpreting or making comparisons among the indicators used. We are a long way from identifying shelf item indicators for project designers to use.

#### Goal or Impact Indicators

In reviewing the attached studies, a clear distinction must be made between performance indicators and impact indicators. The former category is used to measure progress toward achieving the project purpose. The impact indicator shows how, and hopefully how much, the project may have contributed to achieving a sector or national goal.

In the second category, a number of problems have been encountered and not fully solved. In part this is due to the shift in AID's program concerns, and in part to the complex nature of the problem of measurement.

AID's more recent concerns with income distribution and problems of the poorest classes in recipient countries has led to considerable interest in "social" indicators as opposed to indicators of economic gain or productivity. These are indicators of change which may consider to be qualitative, rather than directly quantifiable. The result is a need to assign values, in a more or less arbitrary fashion, to those changes sought. Those values will be expressed in the form of target statements and progress indicators. In assigning these values we run a risk of attributing values which derive from our own culture to programs in countries which maintain a different value system.

A statement from the Iowa State University study (see item B.1) sums it up:

The possibility of divergent paths of social development implies the impossibility of

of generating universal indicators of social development.

After reviewing the many studies on this subject, it still seemed possible that certain human values may exist which would be accepted by all societies and cultures. The objectives of health programs, for example, seem to represent near-universal aims, since health, widely defined, is a statement of human condition.

For practical purposes, these generally desired objectives do not appear useful. It is sobering to realize that health experts differ amongst themselves as to the meaning of health statistics. It is obvious also that while all societies and cultures value health, each of them may assign to it a different priority relative to other national objectives. The practical effect is the same as though each society had its own definition of health objectives.

The problem in dealing with indicators of impact at the goal level reflects the fact that the vertical relationships between purpose and goal levels in the logical framework are, in actual practice, surmised or inferred. We will not have enough observations, even if we examine the entire AID program, to identify statistically a causal link or even a high degree of correlation between project purpose and program goal for any given case. Therefore, the logic of the logical framework is rational, not empirical. Each new project can produce valuable information, to contribute to our knowledge of this linkage. We must regard the Agency's projects as experiments, and seek to learn as much from them as we can.

A further requirement may be necessary if project impact is to be properly assessed. This would be to use a sector analysis for preparing a data base which would be used for selecting indicators which measure the project impact. Particularly in view of current Agency program direction, it is no longer appropriate nor sufficient to append goal indicators to projects which were designed and initiated without an understanding of the economic or social sector in which they were intended to have impact.

### Recommendations

The evidence gathered in the studies made so far into the topic of progress indicators suggests that this is only one link in a chain which represents a continuous process of measurement and verification. The chain is more or less as follows (and applies both to design and redesign of a given activity or to the transfer of experience to the design and

execution of their activities):

1. Predesign studies (may include baseline data gathering);
2. Design or redesign hypothesis/target setting;
3. Indicators (new or reformulated);
4. Collection of progress data;
5. Data analysis;
6. Determination of change or progress;
7. Determination of attribution or causality;
8. Improved design and execution.

Our conclusion is that the experimental character of developmental activity, particularly in those areas which AID now is emphasizing, will require us to improve this entire process of measurement and verification, and not merely the weak link represented by "indicators". This requirement parallels the need for measurement specifically called for in existing and proposed aid legislation. Specific recommendations for satisfying those requirements include:

1. Acknowledgement that the program is experimental.
2. Build into each project an appropriate amount of funds for information gathering and analysis of project achievement on a regular basis.
3. For a select number of projects, provide funds to study the impact which they have on program goals, and the means of measuring the impact which might be applied more broadly.
4. To help with a search for suitable project indicators, each project evaluation should include an attempt to evaluate the relevance and significance of the indicators used.
5. Part of the resources devoted to examining Agency experience with terminated or terminating projects should be used to evaluate the indicators used during the life of such projects.
6. The Agency should, on a continuing basis, continue

to invest in the development of systems of measurement and verification of impact and should coordinate this effort centrally.

7. In the Project Design and Evaluation Seminar, and in similar training programs, considerable time should be devoted to discussion of indicators, including both project achievement and project impact indicators. The distinction between measuring goal achievement and measuring the impact of a project on that goal must be emphasized.

8. In reviews of project proposals, give increased attention to the logical framework and evaluation plan, with emphasis on (a) proposed indicators of achievement of project purpose and of impact on program goal and (b) adequacy of available information gathering on which indicators can be based. In each case, a careful determination should be made of what kinds and quantities of data can usefully be required as part of the project itself.

The attached list is an inventory of 18 completed, on-going proposed and aborted efforts by AID to amass and examine data on the use of performance indicators in development projects. The list has been divided in three parts: (a) lists of indicators, including specialized lists; (b) analytic studies of the use of indicators and criteria for identifying them; and (c) related studies. Not all shown past documents have been listed, if they appeared to have been duplicated or superseded.

The information provided on each study or report is provided according to the following outline:

1. Name
2. Author (and contract number, if any)
3. Date or state of preparation
4. Agency sponsor or office contact
5. Content
6. Purpose
7. Scope or range
8. Use actually made
9. Comments

A. Lists of Indicators

A.1 1. Computerized Indicator List

2. LA/DP

3. Available on computer -- test runs being made

4. LA/DP

5. A list of approximately 1000 indicators of progress or change.

6. For use by project designers to stimulate ideas for appropriate, project-specific indicators.

7. Comprehensive -- indicators taken from project documentation in all subject areas.

8. Available for agency-wide use. Subsets of indicators being sent to LA and other Missions to assist in preparation of PRPs.

9. The indicators introduced into this system have been collected from as broad a range of documents as possible. They have not been assessed or compared. The project designer who submits necessary information about his project (e.g., PID) will receive a listing of illustrative, potentially relevant indicators which may or may not have been used operationally elsewhere. He will not be given data as to the effectiveness of the indicators, nor will he have a reference to which he can turn in order either to see how well a proposed indicator served its purpose or how closely the situation in which it was used parallels his own.

This system is, however, uniquely comprehensive and can be expected to provide a list of suggestions for performance indicators on very short notice. In its conception, it is operational; its actual usefulness is under study.

A.2 1. Poverty Benchmarks: "The Congressional Mandate: Aiding the Poor Majority".

2. SOG Task Force on Implementation of the Congressional Mandate.

3. Issued April 30, 1975 as AIDTO Circular A-263; also printed as Appendix 5 of Implementation of 'New Directions' in Development Assistance, AID report to the House Committee on International Relations, Committee Print, July 22, 1975.

4. AA/PPC

5. In the context of the Congressional requirement that AID program emphasis be re-directed toward the poor majority, this report includes a discussion of benchmarks by which the Agency sets its standard for identifying the poor majority. The benchmarks include per capita income, diet, life expectancy, infant mortality, birth rate, and health services.

6. Implicitly, these benchmarks provide both program goals and indicators by which project performance can be measured.

7. To the extent the program is defined by the Mandate, the list of benchmarks is a comprehensive list of program objectives.

8. The benchmarks presumably represent the program guidance on the basis of which most or all current and future activities will be planned.

9. These guidelines can be tested only after a year or two of program planning and implementation. The constraint in developing indicators based on these benchmarks will most probably be cost. They call for a form of census for which there may be no precedent in many developing countries.

A.3 1. Strategies for Small Farmer Development: an Empirical Study of Rural Development.

2. Development Alternatives, Inc. (Contract AID/CM/ta-C-73-41)

3. Report issued May, 1975.

4. Office of Development Administration, TAB (TA/DA)

5. A study of 36 rural development projects in Latin America and Africa.

6. To assess the importance for rural development activities of sustained involvement in (i.e., contribution to) the activity on the part of the supposed beneficiaries.

7. While limited to rural development projects, this study is thorough and carefully analytic. In examining the reasons for each project's success, the authors have had to define success and have specified those indicators which establish the degree of successful achievement.

8. The report is currently being used to develop projects in several countries where local participation is a critical aspect.

9. This study is limited in scope, but it deals thoughtfully with the means of assessing progress in an important area. The indicators of success differ materially from the 'benchmarks of poverty' referred to in A.2, in that they emphasize the means to overcome poverty rather than defining the condition to be overcome. Since the purpose of the project is to establish whether participation or community self-help programs contribute to rural development, the report engages in a certain amount of circular reasoning when it uses 'self-help capability' and increased knowledge as indicators. On the other hand, given a certain political-cultural bias on AID's part, these indicators may represent a closer approximation of U.S. objectives in developing countries than statistics which reflect material well-being and available social sciences.

A.4 1. Suggested Health Sector Social Indicators (memo from Joe H. Davis, TA/H)

2. Health Division, TAB

3. September 27, 1971

4. Program Office, TAB

5. A list of indicators on the WHO definition of health: "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being".

6. This was the Health Division's contribution to a TAB effort to develop a list of "social indicators" for general Agency use.

7. Despite the background and purpose, this list is a comprehensive list of social objectives to which virtually any society might aspire. Indicators are categorized as:

a. Absolute social indicators, which directly measure social welfare;

b. Absolute indicators whose value is reflected in directly measured indicators;

c. "Relative indicators", on which no agreement exists concerning optimal values; and

d. "Autonomous indicators", whose optimal value is locally determined.

8. The memo has not been widely circulated.

9. This is another list of goal achievement indicators but though succinct, it is more comprehensive than any other such list which has been produced by AID. It is based on a 1970 article by Kamrany and Christakis which appeared in Economic Planning Service, and for the most part reflects a cross-cultural approach. Many of these indicators are objectives which might seem more appropriate to an industrialized society, which is accustomed to taking frequent soundings as to the material and psychological well-being of its populace.

- A.5
1. Evaluation Plan of Thirty Child-Feeding Programs
  2. Checchi and Company
  3. Draft final report in hand
  4. Office of Nutrition, TAB
  5. To determine effectiveness of child-feeding programs, a list of indicators is used which includes height and weight, food intake, school attendance, and performance on standardized tests.
  6. The data are taken from thirty projects in three countries: they are to be tested in a fourth.
  7. Indicators were selected for a relatively narrow purpose.
  8. To be used for child-feeding programs.
  9. Despite limited purpose for which these indicators were developed, they should be carefully reviewed as possibly serving as goal level indicators. The socio-cultural-economic complex of factors which can affect these outcomes reflect every aspect of a country's development problem.

B. Analytic Studies

- B.1 1. Methodology for Indicators of Social Development
2. Iowa State University (Contract AID/CSD 3642)
3. Reports dated 1972-1975. Fifth volume printed September 1975.
4. Program Office, TAB
5. A five-volume study which includes historical discussion of social indicators, the concept of social development, operational aspects of indicator use, as well as an analysis of AID experience with indicators. It puts forth a general approach to an integrated set of social development indicators and applies this approach to the health sector. The fifth volume applies this approach to Thailand.
6. The study seeks to develop a method whereby a developing country can construct indicators of social progress suited to its own definition of development.
7. The range of topics concerned in this extensive study is suggested by the summary of its content given under item #5.
8. Pending distribution of the final report, impact of the study on AID programming methods cannot be fully assessed. There has as yet been no formal reference made to the I.S.U. findings in Agency instructions to program and project designers.
9. The shifting purpose of this study over the prolonged period has resulted in an extended report, containing much that is of interest, but one which is not easily read, which is hard to abridge, and which is consequently not easily put in a form which can be utilized by program designers and planners. The approach is so comprehensive that to implement it would require a major shift in Agency emphasis, as well as considerable investment of resources on the part of both donor and recipient in order to gather information of the type and quantity called for. The primary conclusion of the study is the importance of information on which to base decisions.

B.2 1. Progress Report: AID Use of Development Indicators

2. Practical Concepts, Inc. (PCI)

3. March, 1974

4. Program Methods and Evaluation Office, PPC (DPRE/PE)

5. Summary of a 1972 study of 204 projects in which 1,154 goal and purpose indicators were studied.

6. To help project designers select indicators which meet the standards of (a) plausibility, (b) independence -- measurement of the result sought, not of the input; (c) objective verifiability, and (d) being 'targeted' (i.e., quantified and assigned deadlines).

7. This is probably as thorough a review as has been made of AID use of indicators.

8. The wide distribution given to the summary of this report presumably has led to some change in selection of indicators used; it is too soon, however, to verify whether the indicators adopted over the last year have been markedly closer to the standards set by the authors of the report.

9. The basis for assessing the indicators is an arbitrary one; rather than measure indicators against a standard which is itself untested, the follow-up study on the impact of the Agency's design and evaluation system now under consideration should incorporate a review of the role of the indicators in showing the project success as well as in contributing to that success by enabling sound decision-making.

B.3 1. Preliminary Design of an Evaluation Methodology beyond the specific project level.

2. American Technical Assistance Corporation (ATAC)

3. Draft of first phase received July 1975; final version due January, 1976.

4. Program Evaluation Division, PPC/DPRE

5. A methodology for evaluating how projects contribute to program goals.

6. To analyze the feasibility of extending the AID evaluation system to permit evaluation of project impact/contribution to higher level goals.

7. By definition, this study purports to cover the total range of AID activities, to assess their contribution to longer-range U.S. and developing country objectives.

8. The first phase draft report is being intensively revised.

9. While it is too early to comment of the usefulness of this study, it should be a unique review of the means whereby we can find indicators of achievement at the goal level. Several other indicator studies listed here (see A.3, A.4, A.5) identify indicator of social development or social welfare which might be regarded as the ultimate aim of development programs. Nothing in the ATAC first draft seems to incorporate these welfare indicators.

B.4. 1. Evaluation Plan for DEIDS (Development and Evaluation of Integrated Delivery Systems Program): Chapter 5, "The Development Indicators" (Contract AID/CM/otr-C-73-201).

2. American Institutes of Research (AIR)

3. July 1974

4. Office of Health, TAB

5. A methodology for an intensive evaluation of a project for delivery of health services in Ecuador, with a series of recommendations for evaluation of all such DEIDS projects. Chapter 5 discusses how to select indicators which will determine whether a desired outcome took place. Examples of useful indicators are given.

6. To test evaluation methods by means of an intensive case study.

7. The study is concentrated on a very specific topic. The chapter on indicators, however, sets forth principles for their selection and use which can have broader application. These seven criteria (overtness, unobtrusiveness, quantifiable, continuity over time, verifiability, low cost, and potential general applicability) compare favorably with other efforts to set standards for indicators (see B.2).

8. The proposed project, never agreed to by the Government of Ecuador, has been under way in Thailand since fall, 1974. It is scheduled for evaluation in late 1975.

9. The criteria for indicator selection appear to be particularly valuable, apart from the complexity of the proposed evaluation system which has been designed for a narrower purpose.

C.1 Policy Questions

- C.1.a 1. Income Distribution and Public Policy  
Institute 2. Princeton University and the Brookings  
3. 1974  
4. Civic Participation Division, PPC/PDA  
5. A series of eleven papers to assess the impact of various programs and policies on income distribution in developing countries.  
6. To enable AID to develop program planning guidelines which could have an impact on distribution of income in aid receiving countries.  
7. A wide number of topics is covered--wage policy, fiscal policy, education, industrialization, anti-poverty programs, health and nutrition. Traditional measures of income are used by all authors except for the paper on health and nutrition (Ofstedal and Levinson). The indicators here are delivery of health (nutrition) services, not improved health status, as proposed in other studies (see A.4 and A.5).  
8. These studies are highly analytical and aimed at the policy level; while no guidance for project design has been developed on the basis of these papers, the papers themselves have been distributed to USAID Missions at their request. Publication in book form is anticipated.  
9. Income distribution is a social objective, the measurement of which . . . exceed the policy aims of developing country governments, . . . consequently be either unsuited to or beyond the reach of . . . D programs. The problem is related to the . . . erent interest in improving living conditions for the poor ma . . . ity, but these papers do not close the gap between that aim and AID inputs.

C.1.b 1. Evaluating the Impact of Rural Development Programs

2. Robert E. Krug and Steven M. Jung, American Institutes of Research (Contract AID-493-037-T)

3. June 1974

4. USAID/Thailand

5. An analysis of technical assistance efforts in Thailand which were to help the Office of Accelerated Rural Development to effect social change.

6. To develop a program design methodology based on impact assessment.

7. Limited to rural development objectives, but also to local investment behavior as a primary indicator of rural development.

8. Testing of the hypothetical indicator has not occurred, as the contractor selected for the job (R.I. Barbour) rejected the hypothesis.

9. The notion of investment decision as a measure of economic development (and self-sustained growth) is a very respectable one. It may reflect a cultural bias in favor of westernized social structures, and may not be demonstrably applicable to social change. This proposed study is specialized, but the kinds of "political" and "social" investment described by AIR suggest broader concepts of development. The indicator seems to have met several of the criteria developed in other studies (see B.2, B.4).

- C.1.c
1. (no title)
  2. (see below)
  3. Proposed for FY 1976 research budget
  4. Office of Policy Development and Analysis, PPC
  5. To be a study of benefit incidence of development activities.
  6. To learn what has been the impact, direct, indirect and even third order, of development activities; adverse as well as beneficial impact to be included.
  7. No limits have been defined to this proposal.
  8. At proposal stage.
  9. Study may encounter one of the main difficulties cited by ATAC in its study of evaluation beyond the project level (see B.3): how to attribute change (improvement or otherwise) to development projects.

C.2 Special Project Studies

- C.2.a
1. Factors which influence nutrition
  2. Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama (INCAP)
  3. Final report due January 1976
  4. Office of Health, TAB
  5. Correlation of environmental and socio-economic data with nutritional data gathered from 22,000 households, at 190 sites in six Latin American countries.
  6. The results should be of value in planning for nutritional improvement.
  7. In view of the large number of observations from many geographic sites, the study stands apart from the other attempts to measure development listed here.
  8. Usefulness will depend on results of the study.
  9. If measurements of nutrition were accepted as culture-free indicators of achieving social goals, this study might prove of considerable importance. However, the degree of correlation between social factors and physical well-being may vary greatly among societies. This study benefits from a uniquely broad data base; unfortunately the data are limited to a single observation of each household, so that no change over time can be measured.

C.2.b 1. Some Practical Concepts for Assessing Organizational Viability.

2. Practical Concepts, Inc. (PCI) (Contract AID/CM-otr-73-200, Work Order No. 2)

3. December 1974

4. Program Evaluation Division, PPC/DPRE

5. A technique for assessing the capacities and functions of institutions and organizations in developing countries.

6. To enable AID to determine the extent to which host country institutions can be relied on to assume continuing responsibility for critical development activities which AID has support.

7. Diagnostic approach intended to be applied to institutions of any size or function.

8. Validity of method and operational utility need to be established. These have been seriously questioned in a meeting with a panel of social scientists in Washington in October, 1975.

9. The study attempts to go beyond the analysis of institutional maturity by Milton Esman; emphasis is made in the report to distinguish between his work and that of PCI.

C.2.c 1. Criteria for testing University Network Operations.

2. University of California at Los Angeles

3. Final report due at the end of 1975

4. Office of Education and Human Resources, TAB

5. A study of systems for exchanging research data among universities in developing countries.

6. To test criteria for measuring the effectiveness of research networks; to enable AID to assess the performance of University contractors or grantees in the research field.

7. Limited to the performance of U.S. universities in assisting ldc university research programs.

8. Usefulness will be tested after the study is done.

9. It is likely that the indicators developed for the purpose of this project can be applied to other subject areas.

c.3 Technical Studies

- c.3.a
1. (no title)
  2. (see below)
  3. Proposal in clearance.
  4. Office of Education and Human Resources, TAB
  5. A typology of developing countries, which will be categorized according to similar or shared characteristics.
  6. To facilitate transfer of experience among characteristics.
  7. No limits have been set to the content of this study.
  8. Project not yet undertaken.
  9. None

C.3.b 1. Applications of Randomized Experiments to Planning and Evaluating AID Programs.

2. Robert F. Boruch and Henry W. Riceken (Contract AID/CM/ta-C-1055).

3. October 1974

4. Office of Policy Program Utilization, TAB

5. Discussion of ten experiments in social measurement using random selection and control observations. The "response variables" (dependent variables) in each case are the indicators of success.

6. To explore ways in which experimental methods can be applied to planning and design of AID projects.

7. To illustrate the use of experimental methods, evaluations of projects in the U.S. and overseas (Taiwan, Korea, as well as Canada and Britain) are used. The focus is on the methods, not the subject. The authors suggest use of such methods in dealing with education and health programs.

8. There has been as yet no general adoption of the experimental method in AID programs following publication of the study.

9. The use of indicators is implicit in experimental research. In setting up the experiment it is necessary to establish at the outset what it is you are going to measure as an indicator of the result of the experiment, ie., how you test your hypothesis. This study recommends the introduction of controlled experiments as a means of evaluating AID projects, but it does not discuss selection and use of indicators.

- C.3.c 1. Development of "modules" for use in household surveys.
2. University of Michigan
  3. First draft received September 1975.
  4. Office of Policy Development and Analysis, PPC.
  5. A proposed categorization of data which is gathered by household surveys.
  6. To facilitate and reduce cost of household surveys by organizing possible questions into "modules", each of which is applicable for surveys of a particular sort. The result will be to reduce (a) unnecessary questions, (b) duplication.
  7. Limited to those developmental activities where impact is to be felt at the household level. However may be of value where program goals are defined in terms of social or individual welfare.
  8. Draft report reviewed in September 1975.
  9. This specialized study will serve a purpose, and in addition may provide guidelines for selecting indicators of advanced family or individual well-being.

- C.3.d
1. (no title)
  2. (see below)
  3. October 1974 (Policy Determination 62)
  4. Office of Policy Program Utilization, TAB
  5. A comprehensive review of the Institutional Grants Program (211d).
  6. Among other purposes, to provide new criteria for selection of grantees and for revision or extension of grants.
  7. Limited to Institutional Grants Program.
  8. The system of evaluation is in full operation.
  9. The indicators or criteria used for these evaluations seem to be of particular value for this activity.