

REVIEW OF USAID EVALUATIONS ON DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE

**Kenneth Bollen
Pamela Paxton
Rumi Morishima**

Executive Summary:

Evaluation research seeks to study implementation and performance of assistance activities. It serves as a powerful analytic tool for understanding “lessons learned” from past activities that can promote informed decision-making about future programming. The usefulness of evaluations depends on the conceptual and methodological basis on which the evaluation data are collected, organized, and examined.

USAID requested this report as part of the SORA project. The main goal is to determine the degree to which information produced by evaluations of its DG activities is suitable “to build a rigorous analytical base on which to make decisions regarding the type, mix, and sequencing of USAID’s Democracy and Governance programs” (from USAID/DCHA/DG Applied Democracy Research, *Goal and Objective Statement*). Toward this aim, the research team assessed whether the evaluations satisfied three key criteria. Specifically we considered whether the evaluations provided:

- (1) Sufficient information on “inputs” (a USAID activity and the resources needed to implement it);
- (2) Sufficient information on the intended consequences of USAID activity, i.e., “outputs,” “outcomes,” and “impacts” (the immediate products of an activity input, short-term results, and long-term results of USAID activities);
- (3) Sufficient information on “confounding factors” (other things that may undermine our ability to describe the relationship between inputs and outputs/outcomes/impacts). This last criterion is important, because we can only attribute an effect to a USAID activity if we have ruled out other factors that might be the real reason for the effect).

The review identifies the following major problems with the evaluations:

- (1) We found a frequent failure to provide, in a consistent, systematic manner, key information about activities, such as funding levels, personnel, timing of project implementation, NGOs that undertook project activities, and funding from other international donor agencies. Overall, the lack of a sufficient number of equivalent activities in these evaluations would hamper any attempt to use these evaluations to compare inputs across different countries and cumulate results in a rigorous, analytical manner.
- (2) We also found that a lack of such information for outputs. The focus of evaluations tends to be on the *immediate* outcomes of very specific activities (e.g., the number of judges trained), rather than on their link to the agency goal and interest (e.g., better rule of law). SORA is interested in the latter.
- (3) Nearly all of the evaluations fail to discuss or rule out other possible explanations for a relation between an USAID activity and its alleged effects. There are four major cases where confounding factors may come into play: (a) the case where a positive political

trend toward democracy and better governance has already been set in motion in a recipient country; (b) the case where other domestic or international agencies supported the same or similar activities; (c) the case where causal order is reversed, i.e., the outcome of interest attracts USAID activity; and (d) the case where inappropriate sampling/measurement procedures introduce bias into analyses. The evaluations give so little attention to these confounding factors that they fail to convince readers, within a reasonable degree of certainty, that the positive changes observed would not have occurred in the absence of USAID.

Based on these assessments, this report makes the following recommendations on the use of the evaluations. The first two are specifically related to the SORA task and the rest are additional recommendations:

- (1) Do not undertake a summary review/coding of the 300+ evaluations identified by the DG Information Unit. Given the time investment required to read, evaluate, and record each evaluation, we conclude that there would be insufficient gain to justify the effort.
- (2) Hold the evaluations in reserve as background information for desk studies or other qualitative analyses as part of the possible future research design. We see the evaluations as potentially serving two purposes for SORA: (a) providing essential background information that is not available from other sources, (b) aiding idea generation for researchers focusing on specific countries or sets of countries.
- (3) All new mission officers should be encouraged to do two separate, but related, searches of evaluations on the DEC website during activity planning stages: (a) a search for all evaluations performed in that country, (b) a search for all similar activities across all countries. This would provide some essential background information to the officer and help reduce institutional memory loss.
- (4) All mission officers receive training in the use of DEC web searches and other technical resources available in Washington.
- (5) Future evaluations should be standardized through the creation of a core, common template so that they consistently include information considered essential to DG programming. This would ensure (a) that mission officers and the DG central office were receiving appropriate information about the successes and failures of various activities, and (b) that the evaluations could be used for more systematic and comprehensive assessments of DG programming in the future. In addition to the core information, we recommend that space be available to capture issues that are specific to each country and activity.

REVIEW OF USAID EVALUATIONS ON DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE

“Activity 2: Reviewing Past Evaluations of DG programs. In cooperation with researchers at USAID, the SSRC, contracted by IRIS, will review selected, critical past evaluations, assessments and reviews of projects and programs USAID has undertaken, using materials provided by USAID.”

INTRODUCTION

USAID has commissioned literally hundreds of evaluation reports on its democracy and governance (DG) activities in recipient countries. Although the specific activities undertaken differed across country and time period, broadly speaking the aid came in the form of training, technical assistance, or financial support. Our team was asked to review a subset of these past evaluations, assessments, and project reviews that were selected in consultation with USAID. This report provides the results of our review.

As part of the review, the DG staff asked that we determine the degree to which USAID could extract information from these evaluations that would enable them to better design future assistance programs. The hope was that USAID could use these previous evaluations: “To build a rigorous analytical base on which to make decisions regarding the type, mix, and sequencing of USAID’s Democracy and Governance programs” (from USAID/DCHA/DG Applied Democracy Research, *Goal and Objective Statement*). Indeed, such prospective evaluations draw on lessons of earlier programs to anticipate the likely impacts and potential problems of proposed programs (Valadez and Bamberger 1994:76).

In this report, we review over two dozen of these evaluation reports and address their usefulness for USAID and SORA goals. Furthermore, we make our recommendation as to whether USAID should arrange to have all 300+ evaluations reviewed in the same fashion as we have done for the subset of reports in our assessment.

The next section gives background and criteria that guided our review. A section that explains the method of selecting the sample of reports follows. The assessment of these evaluation reports comprises the next section. The last section of the body of the report gives a summary of our findings and discusses our recommendations. We also include several appendices. Appendix A gives more detail on the selection of the sample of evaluations that we reviewed; Appendix B provides the original template used to code each evaluation report, a revised template based on a meeting of all coders on 7/11/03, and a discussion of the revisions. Appendix C gives the filled-in template coding sheets for each of the 25 reports that we reviewed.

INGREDIENTS FOR A RIGOROUS ANALYTICAL BASE

An aim of our review is to determine whether USAID can use past evaluations to create a rigorous analytical base to make decisions about USAID programming. At the risk of oversimplifying, we list three general and necessary ingredients to form a rigorous analytical base: (1) **inputs**, (2) the effects of inputs [(a) **outputs**, (b) **outcomes**, and (c) **impacts**] and (3) **controls for confounding factors**. Below we briefly define how we are using each of these terms:

- (1) **Inputs:** a USAID activity and the resources (e.g., dollars, personnel, equipment) needed to implement it. Thus, as we will use the term, “inputs” includes both the activities of USAID (e.g., training of judges in the new electoral code) and the resources used to implement that activity (e.g., instructional materials, instructors).
- (2) **Outputs/Outcome/Impact:** these three terms refer to the intended consequences of USAID activity, and are classified in terms of their levels and durations. (a) **Outputs** mean the direct products of an activity input and are typically communicated in terms of quantity; (b) **Outcomes** mean short-term results of USAID activities, partially generated by the activity’s outputs; and (c) **Impacts** mean long-term results of USAID’s interests, i.e., each agency objective and a broader level of democracy and governance. For example, in an elections assistance activity, short-term activity inputs might result in the

purchase of 4,000 opaque voting booth curtains (an output). An outcome of this might an election based on an impartial electoral framework. These immediate output and short-term outcomes are expected to lead to longer-term impacts that USAID has set as its agency goal, such as more genuine and competitive political processes, and ultimately, development and consolidation of democracy and governance. Though awkward to list as outputs/outcome/impact, we will do so where our comments hold for all three types of effects of inputs.

- (3) **Controls for confounding factors:** other things that may undermine our ability to describe the relationship between inputs and outputs. Confounding factors take a number of forms, which we will discuss in more detail below.

To further establish a rigorous analytical base, it is useful to highlight three additional characteristics of inputs. First, *sufficient information* must be available on the inputs. That is, specific information on the nature of the activity undertaken must be available, as well as information about dollars spent, personnel committed, etc. (Valadez and Bamberger 1994:77). Second, if we are to combine results across studies, there must be *equivalency or near equivalency of inputs*. In some instances, it is obvious that two activities are different: training of judges vs. training of legislators. In other instances two activities may appear to be the same (both labeled as the training of judges) but actually consist of different inputs. For example, one training program might largely consist of the preparation of booklets to distribute to judges, while the other consists of in-class training. So, we must establish that evaluations are talking about the same thing when they refer to types of activities. Third, to make generalizations across a range of countries, we need a *sufficient number of equivalent* inputs across countries. To continue with the training of judges example: to make a rigorous, analytical conclusion about training of judges across a variety of countries, we need to be able to extract information from each evaluation about the training of judges activity. Thus, as noted earlier, the concepts must be defined similarly (so “training of judges” means the same thing in various contexts). And, we must be able to extract enough instances of the activity out of the evaluations for a rigorous

assessment (e.g., twenty countries had similar training of judges programming). We can be more confident with the experiences gleaned from several evaluations with the same inputs since it is hazardous to generalize from a single activity.

In a similar fashion, we break out the characteristics of outputs/outcomes/impacts. A rigorous analytical assessment of evaluations requires sufficient information to be available about the outputs/outcomes/impacts, equivalency of outputs/outcomes/impacts, and ultimately that a sufficient number of equivalent outputs/outcomes/impacts be available from the evaluations. These characteristics are defined in an analogous manner to those for inputs.

There is, however, one additional characteristic of importance for outputs: the correspondence between the outputs discussed in the evaluation and the SORA goal. USAID officials have, in a variety of meetings, indicated that SORA is emphasizing broader, national impacts (e.g., improved rule of law in Bolivia) rather than exclusively emphasizing immediate, proximate outputs (e.g., how many judges were trained in Bolivia). Thus, a final characteristic of the effects of inputs is that the focus be less on program implementation, and more on the larger impact of USAID programming.

The previous paragraphs have discussed the inputs and outputs/outcomes/impacts of USAID activities. The last ingredient for a rigorous analytic base is to have evaluations that control for confounding factors. First, we must establish that the *context* in two or more different countries is sufficiently similar to permit us to compare inputs and outputs/outcomes/impacts. Indeed, even the same country might have very different conditions in the present than was true years earlier. Two legislative strengthening programs may have equivalent inputs but operate in very different circumstances. For example, one may take place in the context of a recent military *coup d'etat* and the other in the midst of a peaceful transition to democracy. Even with identical

inputs, we would not expect identical outputs/outcomes/impacts.

Second, evaluations must consider *alternative explanations* for the observed relationship between inputs and outputs/outcomes/impacts (Valadez and Bamberger 1994:76-77). That is, to the degree that it is possible we need to establish that other factors besides the USAID activity are not responsible for the effects observed. For example, were other donors present and funding the same or similar activities? Was a transition already in process so it would have occurred even without intervention?

Third, we must establish that USAID activity affected the output/outcomes/impacts rather than the reverse. Put another way, did the *outcome affect USAID activity*? A democratization trend in a country, for instance, might attract USAID to institute activities to further the trend. Attribution in such instances is difficult – if further democratization continues it is difficult to know whether it is the continuation of the existing trend or attributable to USAID.

Any evaluation effort also faces additional methodological confounders. Sampling and measurement issues are two examples. With regard to *sampling*, two general questions are relevant to assessing past evaluations of USAID activities: (1) how were cases selected for the USAID activity? and (2) are these cases representative of the broader population to which USAID wishes to make an inference? Consider an activity geared toward improving legislative performance through the training of representatives. If we select only those representatives who volunteer or express an interest, then it is hard to know whether any effects found are due to the higher motivation of representatives who volunteer or to the effects of the training program. A closely related concern is that these legislators are unlikely to be representative of all legislators, so it will be risky to make inferences from these volunteers to the whole legislature.

With regard to *measurement*, ideally we would like to have the key concepts defined, the

measures of those concepts explicitly defined, and some information supplied on the validity and reliability of the measures. Even if the measures were qualitative descriptions, it would help to know whether there was consistency in the descriptions across observers and to have a sense of the accuracy of the descriptions.

In summary, obviously no evaluation study will fully meet all of the conditions we have described. However, in reviewing the previous evaluations, it is useful to have a standard to which they can be compared. With this standard, we can assess their common strengths and weaknesses and hence address the guiding question of whether these past evaluations provide a rigorous analytical base for designing future USAID activities.

SELECTION OF STUDIES FOR REVIEW AND CODING PROCEDURES

As described in the quote of “Activity 2,” our review is based on a sample of selected reports that represents the whole universe of DG evaluations. The sample selection procedure was carefully designed to enhance the validity of our evaluation review. Specifically, we developed a sample by (1) clearly defining the population of evaluations studies; (2) constructing a sampling frame based on a substantively meaningful criterion; and (3) selecting cases according to a set of key criteria, such as time of study, regions, sub-sectors, institutional authors, and so forth. A fuller description of our sample selection appears in Appendix A.

The population of evaluation studies in democracy and governance areas was compiled by relying on The Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC; www.dec.org).¹ The 310

¹ For more detail about the population definition procedure, see Appendix A-1. We thank research analysts of Information Unit of DG Office, USAID, Shamila N. Chaudhary and Beata Czajkowska, for constructing the universe of the DG evaluation studies. The population selection based on the DEC online database was conducted by Chaudhary, who then informed us, for our documentation purposes, of the procedure she had set up and followed.

documents include GAO reports, mid-term evaluations, project completion assistance reports, special evaluations, and final evaluations. We removed those evaluations that were either only marginally related to democracy and governance or could hardly be characterized as evaluations (e.g., simply end of project remarks, a literature review, and so forth), leading to a final population of 240 reports.

Our sampling frame for the 240 reports took twenty-five different combinations of the five DG sub-sectors and the five region categories in order to ensure sub-sector and regional variation (see Appendix A-2). We chose one evaluation within each sub-sector/region cell by incorporating a significant variety of another two key characteristics, (1) time period of study and (2) institutional author. We also included a few evaluation reports of particular interest to USAID, specifically the recent MSI country studies conducted for earlier stages of SORA. Further, whenever possible, we cross-checked with each country's history of evaluation so that there was reasonable variation there as well (for the details of the sample selection procedure and the list of the selected twenty-five evaluations, see Appendix A).

The evaluation team and three USAID staff members each reviewed and coded three to six evaluation reports from the list. The coders were: Ken Bollen, Pam Paxton, and Rumi Morishima from the evaluation team, and Bruce Kay, Beata Czajkowska, and Shamila Chaudhary from the USAID staff. The task was divided so that each coder would have variety in sub-sector/region and institutional author. In addition to the obvious time efficiency benefit, this division of labor has two substantive advantages. First, a team of reviewers with different backgrounds would help check coding reliability and calibrate the initial template. Second, having a few DG staff members familiar with the coding procedure would be useful in relation to USAID's desire to code other evaluations in the future.

The project team developed a common coding instrument for the DG evaluation reports. First, we created a preliminary list of key conceptual and methodological questions in line with the “ingredients for a rigorous analytical base” discussed above. Upon the USAID’s approval in the SORA meeting (6/18/2003), each member of the evaluation team read and coded *Constituencies for Reform: Strategic Approaches for Donor-Supported Civic Advocacy Programs* (CDIE 1996) to discuss possible retention or removal of the initial question items of the coding template. Then, the USAID staff members coded the same report following the first revision of the template and further calibrated their review with us in a conference call on 7/2/2003. Finally, after all coders completed reading all assigned sample evaluation reports, we discussed the use of the past evaluations as a source of data and finalized the template for further coding in another face-to-face SORA meeting (7/11/2003). During this meeting, there was unanimous approval of the recommendations outlined below. Appendix C has the individual summary reviews of the 25 evaluations that were reviewed. Readers interested in specific evaluations can refer to these.

ASSESSMENT

In this section, we present our assessment of the evaluations by *inputs*, *outputs/outcomes/impacts*, and *controls for confounding factors*. Within each, we focus on the important characteristics outlined above.

Inputs

Sufficient information on inputs, as explained above, is something that we checked when reviewing the evaluation reports. We found a frequent failure to provide, in a consistent,

systematic manner, key information about activities. One or more inputs, such as funding levels, timing of project implementation, NGOs that undertook project activities, and funding from other international donor agencies were often missing. For example, dollar figures for specific activities were seldom mentioned, and, when given, were often figures for total expenditures, not broken down by activity (e.g., *The Mid-Term Evaluation of the Democratic Network in Slovakia* notes that \$3,000,000 was spent on 48 activities, without more specific information.) Similarly, personnel effort was rarely mentioned.

Details on activities were more mixed across evaluations. Some provided explicit information and detail (e.g., *Evaluation of Programs for Afghan Women*) while others provided next-to-no information (e.g., *Aftermath: Women and Gender Issues in Post-Conflict Guatemala*). Thus, it was unusual for the evaluation report to provide detailed information on the activities, funding, and personnel that went into the activities being evaluated.

Turning next to the equivalency of the inputs, cumulating results from the evaluations is hampered by the fact that the activities differed considerably from one evaluation to the next. Activities are sometimes quite specific to context so it is difficult to find equivalent activities across countries. For example, due to apartheid, South Africa undertook “training historically disadvantaged legal professionals” – an activity quite specific to that context. Similarly, Croatia undertook polls to advise party leaders on coalition building.

The problem is deeper, however. Even when activities appear similar across evaluations on the surface, they may actually differ. For example, while both Senegal and Croatia undertook voter education campaigns, in Senegal the focus was on “how-to” vote campaigns, while in Croatia the focus was on getting out the opposition vote.² Even within a single evaluation, there

² *Project Assistance Completion Report for the Senegal Elections Assistance Project* (p.4) and *USAID/Croatia Democracy and Governance Activities Impact on Political Change 1995-2000* (p.8).

is not always comparability in definition across countries. Within *Constituencies for Reform*, for instance, NGO capacity strengthening is pursued by “building sectoral coalitions of NGOs” in Bangladesh (p.43), and training businessmen in “modern managerial techniques and in the value of business associations” in Thailand (p.37).

Based on the above, we conclude that the two problems of insufficient information on activities and the lack of a sufficient number of equivalent activities in these evaluations are major obstacles to constructing a rigorous analytical base from existing evaluations.

Outputs/Outcomes/Impacts

The problems of insufficient information, equivalency, and the lack of a large number of equivalent cases apply to outputs/outcomes/impacts as well. Here, rather than repeating these characteristics on a case-by-case basis, we instead focus on problems that are unique to outputs/outcomes/impacts. Regarding equivalency of outputs/outcomes/impacts, an important issue is that while two evaluations may have ostensibly the same output/outcomes/impacts, they may actually focus on different levels of observation. One may concentrate on effects relevant to individuals while another focuses on institutions. Thus, the outputs/outcomes/impacts are not actually comparable.

Another common problem with the presentation of outputs/outcomes/impacts is that the focus tends to be the *immediate* outputs of very specific activities. Thus, evaluations do not often draw the link between very specific outputs (e.g., 200 judges were trained) and the intermediate outcomes and long-term, overarching impacts of interest to USAID through its SORA project (e.g., better rule of law). As an example, the *Project Assistance Completion Report for the Senegal Elections Assistance Project* focuses on the immediate outputs of USAID

funding: “200,000 how-to-vote brochures with illustrations were produced...” (p. 6). This is despite the explicitly stated goals of the project, including “a 25% increase in the number of voters participating in the elections” (p. 6). Despite the ready availability of international voter turnout information over time (e.g., The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), <http://www.idea.int/vt/index.cfm>), the evaluation does not consider outcomes and impacts at the relevant level, instead focusing on very specific and immediate outputs.

Based on these considerations, our conclusions with regard to outputs/outcomes/impacts are similar to those made for inputs: there are not a sufficient number of equivalent outputs/outcomes/impacts at the relevant level of generality and often there is insufficient information on outputs/outcomes/impacts to permit the construction of a rigorous analytical base.

Confounding Factors

Another class of issues facing the construction of a rigorous analytical base concerns the factors that may confound the relationship between input and output/outcomes/impacts. One such factor is context. While the evaluations typically provided background information about their country or countries, this information was not always integrated into the evaluation itself. For example, *The Transition to Sustainable Democracy in South Africa and the strategic Role of USAID: Case Studies in Program Impact* provides a great deal of information since the 1994 free elections but in the impact evaluation the background information is not systematically taken into account.

Next, if we want to attribute an outcome and an impact to a USAID activity, we need to consider whether some other factor might be the real reason for the outcome and the impact. A

serious limitation that was present in nearly all of the evaluations was that they did not rule out other possible explanations for any relation between an USAID activity and an outcome and an impact. In the *Evaluation of the Zimbabwe American Development Foundation Project*, author Tonya Himelfarb claims that ZADF/Pact (sponsored by USAID) has strengthened targeted civil society organizations to advocate with Parliament (p.1). Even if we accept that the targeted civil society organizations are better able to advocate with Parliament, we need to consider other possible reasons for this change. It could be that some other international or domestic agency besides USAID was responsible for this effect, or there may have been other changes in the local situation that made success more likely.

One situation that was common in several of the USAID activities was that a country was embarking on a transition toward democracy or better governance and that USAID provided training, technical assistance, or financial support to support these changes. From the perspective of showing support for what is deemed a positive change, instituting an USAID activity makes perfect sense. However, this does complicate any attempt to assess the impact on democracy or governance that is due to the efforts and resources of USAID. It is hard to know whether the changes would have occurred even in the absence of USAID. Unfortunately, the evaluations that we read did not seriously consider this possibility in their reports, but typically attributed effects to USAID.

A second frequent situation was the case in which other domestic or international agencies supporting the same or similar activities were identified. A natural question to ask is whether an activity would have succeeded even without USAID efforts given that other donors were providing support. Some reports did mention whether there were donors involved besides USAID, but it was rare for the evaluation to systematically try to separate the USAID effect from

other donors. We could raise other speculations on alternative explanations, but our point is that the authors of the evaluations should have given more attention to methods of controlling for other factors that might explain the link between the USAID activity and the outcome and the impact.

A third general confounding factor in the evaluations is when the outcome and the impact of interest attract USAID activity. In general, the timing of events is difficult to determine from the evaluations, so it is hard to assess whether USAID activity precedes the outcomes and the impacts. However, there is scattered evidence for this type of confounding. For example, oppositional political parties in Croatia desired and in fact began to form an oppositional coalition. After formation had begun, USAID tried to strengthen their party coalition by helping them poll citizens' attitudes on coalitions. Thus, strengthened political parties helped draw USAID activity in that area.

Finally, there were substantial sampling and measurement problems in the evaluations as a whole. In all but a few cases, there was simply no discussion of how sampling occurred (if at all) and what the effects of sampling might be on the outputs/outcomes/impacts. The most common discussion of sampling referred to the choice of case studies in multi-country evaluations. With regard to measurement, concepts are seldom explicitly defined, alternative measures not considered, and reliability/validity of measures not reported. Readers are invited to peruse Appendix C, in which detailed information on sampling and measurement for each evaluation is provided.

It is also worthwhile to note that, although based on a less systematic review of USAID evaluations, Carothers (1999:281-287) comes to several similar conclusions.

Contributing Factors to the Problems

The preceding sections found that the evaluations treatments of inputs, outputs/outcomes/impacts, and confounding factors were not adequate to permit the construction of a rigorous analytical base. We see three factors as contributing to the problems. First, the evaluations simply try to cover too much in too little space. In addition, they had too little time to permit a thorough assessment. In the Technical Support Services, Inc.'s *Evaluation of Local Government Activities in USAID Programs in Central/Eastern Europe* they list over 25 activities that they are to evaluate (pp.50-52) in four countries. They spent two weeks in Poland and one week each in the other three countries. The information that they extracted in such a short period of time is truly impressive. But how deeply can the assessment team dig into the issues surrounding each of these activities when there is so little time available to cover a large number of activities in four countries? The scope of the work and the time frame for the work poses challenges to many of the evaluations that we reviewed (see also Clapp-Wincek and Blue 2001: iv).

Second, the evaluations are inconsistent in the way in which they present information. There is no common set of issues addressed, no common understanding of what information is important to include (e.g., dollars spent, personnel, date activity began), and no common attempt to present inputs and outputs/outcomes/impacts. This makes the task of reading evaluations difficult, as the information must be reorganized in every case to determine whether it matches information from other evaluations. Further, it makes the task of extracting information from the evaluations nearly impossible.

One final challenge for all the evaluations is that the incentive structure pushes all stakeholders toward a positive assessment of the USAID effort. It is natural that the

implementer of an USAID activity would like to see a positive outcome. NGOs or others who are the recipients of USAID support have an incentive to want a successful activity. To the degree that a positive assessment would increase the chance of future contract work, the evaluating organization also has an incentive that pushes toward a favorable assessment even if they did not implement the activity. We want to be clear that we are not questioning the integrity of any of the parties that are involved in the evaluations. Indeed some reports were quite candid in pointing out failures of activities. For example, Technical Support Services Final Report on *Local Government Activities in USAID Programs in Central/Eastern Europe* is candid about the failures of the privatization program in Bulgaria (p.59-60). Other reports sometimes discussed failures as well as successes. However, the tone of many reports tended to be quite positive so that we need to consider the incentive structure when assessing these past evaluations.³

RECOMMENDATIONS

Two extreme positions on the usefulness of these past evaluations for planning future USAID activities are possible. One is that these evaluations can provide specific guidance on the necessary ingredients for a successful future USAID activity in any given country at any given time period. That is, these past efforts provide enough information to match up the context of the country, the properties of the planned activity, and the rigorous assessment of success or failure to make precise, relevant recommendations. The other extreme is that these previous evaluations have little use and no value in planning future activities.

³ As an example, consider *The Democratic Pluralism Initiative: Evaluation of Programs for Afghan Women*. In this evaluation, the author is quite specific that the evaluation was revised on the basis of feedback from representatives of the organizations being evaluated (pp.5-6). This is a common practice among evaluators.

Neither of these extremes is justified. Instead, we recommend the evaluations be used in a manner that falls between the two extremes. Overall, we see the evaluations as providing useful background information for alerting readers to possible pitfalls in the implementation of new activities. Furthermore, many of these evaluation reports can provide invaluable information on prior activities in a country or set of countries. They represent information that is not available in the scholarly literature, or that would not be available without a significant time lag. Indeed, it would be unwise for future implementers of USAID activities to ignore the reports on similar activities or on the same target countries as those considered in the past. Our recommendations are based on this overall view.

We divide our specific recommendations on the use of the evaluations into those that specifically relate to the SORA task and additional recommendations:

Recommendations regarding the SORA task:

1. **Do not undertake a summary review/coding of the 300+ evaluations identified by the DG Information Unit.** Given the time investment required to read, evaluate, and record each evaluation, we conclude that there would be insufficient gain to justify the effort.
2. **Hold the evaluations in reserve as background information for desk studies or other qualitative analyses as part of the possible future research design.** We see the evaluations as potentially serving two purposes for SORA: (1) providing essential background information that is not available from other sources, (2) aiding idea generation for researchers focusing on specific countries or sets of countries.

Additional Recommendations:

1. **All new mission officers should be encouraged to do two separate, but related, searches of evaluations on the DEC website during activity planning stages: (1) a search for all evaluations performed in that country, (2) a search for all similar activities across all countries.** For example, if the Bolivian mission officer was planning a new judge training activity, we would recommend that the mission officer check the DEC for (1) all Bolivia studies and (2) all judge training studies. This would provide some essential background information to the officer and help reduce institutional memory loss.⁴
2. **All mission officers receive training in the use of DEC web searches and other technical resources available in Washington.** This might be included as part of the mission officers regular training activities.
3. **Future evaluations should be standardized through the creation of a core, common template.** That is, information considered essential to DG programming should be required of all evaluators. Having a core, common template for future evaluations would ensure that (1) mission officers and the DG central office were receiving appropriate information about the successes and failures of various activities, and (2) the evaluations could be used for more systematic and comprehensive assessments of DG programming in the future. In making this recommendation, we recognize that there are specific issues related to each country and activity, and that these idiosyncrasies must certainly be captured in an evaluation. Therefore, it is

⁴ Some modifications to this recommendation might be appropriate depending on the circumstances. For example, mission officers might be encouraged to download information on common activity programming *in their region*, rather than in all countries. It might also be useful to give the mission officers a copy of the coding template created for this document, to provide them with a means to quickly assess the evaluations relevant to their activity.

important that the common template we suggest represent only the “core” of the evaluation, and that space be available to evaluators for other impressions and issues. Indeed, the core template could make up as much or as little of an evaluation as deemed necessary by the DG office. For example, the common template could be included only as a required appendix, thereby making the evaluator’s impressions the central focus of the report. Or, the common template could make up the bulk of the evaluation, with a section entitled “the big picture/overall impressions/things not captured elsewhere,” thereby making the template the focus of the report. Regardless, there are certain issues that are common across evaluations and USAID should make sure that these issues are addressed in each and every evaluation performed as part of the scope of work. While the creation and wide dissemination of such a standardized evaluation core may be difficult, we strongly recommend an attempt, as the benefits would far outstrip any up-front costs.

REFERENCES

Carothers, Thomas. 1999. *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Valadez, Joseph and Michael Bamberger. 1994. *Monitoring and Evaluating Social Programs in Developing Countries: A Handbook for Policymakers, Managers, and Researchers*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Development Institute of The World Bank.

Clapp-Wincek, Cynthia and Richard Blue. 2001. *Evaluation of Recent USAID Evaluation Experience*. Submitted to U.S. Agency for International Development PPC/CDIE.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: We gratefully acknowledge the help of Bruce Kay, Shamila Chaudhary, and Beata Czajkowska in reading and coding a set of these evaluations for this report. Margaret Sarles was also quite helpful in clarifying goals during our SORA meetings.

APPENDIX

A. Evaluation Sampling	
A-1 Sample Selection of Evaluation Reports	22
A-2 Sector/Region of Evaluations	27
A-3 Country/Year in Study of Evaluations	28
A-4 Institutional Author of Evaluations	30
A-5 Sample of Evaluations for Review	33
B. Evaluation Template	
B-1 Template ver.1	34
B-2 Template Revision	36
B-3 Template ver.2	37
C. Evaluation Coding	40

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A-1: SAMPLE SELECTION OF EVALUATION REPORTS

“Activity 2” of our work task was to review “selected, critical past evaluations, assessments and reviews of projects and programs USAID has undertaken, using materials provided by USAID.” In consultation with the DG staff in May and early June 2003, we decided to review approximately two dozen evaluation reports that were broadly representative of all DG evaluations. The purpose of this appendix is to provide more detail on the selection of reports than was provided in the main text.

The sample selection procedures were carefully designed to reconcile feasibility, efficiency, and methodological rigor and to ensure validity of our evaluation review. The final sample was developed based on (1) a clearly defined population of evaluations studies; (2) a sampling frame based on a substantively meaningful criterion; and (3) case selection according to a set of key criteria, i.e., time, regions, sub-sectors, institutional authors, and so forth.

Obtaining the Population of Evaluations

The population of evaluation studies in the democracy and governance area was defined by applying the following procedure to The Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC; www.dec.org), the online database for USAID funded international development documentation. First, documents were selected by running a DEC search on the following criteria: (1) in “Search by category” selection, “Democracy/Governance” as major subject and “Evaluation” as document type; (2) in the bottom of the search page, “all formats” for document type (this was to ensure that both paper and electronic documents are included) and “summary” for display results

(this was to display a brief summary of each document and see if the actual contents of the selected evaluations fall under the category of USAID democracy and governance). This search resulted in 310 documents, including GAO reports, mid-term evaluations, project completion assistance reports, special evaluations, and final evaluations. Evaluations were then taken out of this set if they were either only marginally related to democracy and governance or could hardly be characterized as evaluations (e.g., simply end of project remarks, a literature review, and so forth).⁵ The resulting evaluations were imported into a spreadsheet, containing evaluation titles, publication date, sub-sector (e.g., governance, rule of law), region, country, and whether it was available electronically or on paper.⁶

Choosing a Sample of Evaluations

We created a sampling frame by taking the twenty-five different combinations of DG sub-sectors and region categories (see Appendix A-2). Our goal was to choose one evaluation within each sub-sector/region cell. This frame served to reduce the sample to a manageable size while ensuring sub-sector and regional variation.

In addition to region and sub-sector, we observed a four additional important characteristics of the evaluations: (1) the large majority of the evaluation reports were published in the 1990s (forty-six evaluations in the year 2000 or later, 183 evaluations in the 1990s, 147 evaluations between 1990 and 1996, ten evaluations in the 1980s, and one evaluation in the 1970s); (2) sixty-nine evaluations were conducted by USAID/mission authors, whereas several major non-mission authors (including both single- and co-authorship) undertook a considerable

⁵ Note that because paper copies and/or brief descriptions of the entire set of evaluations were not available for all reports when the population was being defined, we could not completely remove all irrelevant reports. As it turned out, this mix of DG evaluations and other non-pertinent reports resulting from the DEC database search would later cause difficulties in classifying DG evaluations as discussed below.

number of evaluation research (seventeen evaluations by GAO, twenty-nine by MSI, fifteen by Development Associates Inc., forty by CDIE, sixteen by Checchi, and two by ARD); (3) Some countries had been evaluated many more times than others. For example, El Salvador had been evaluated 27 times, where Nigeria had only been evaluated once. Appendix A-3 presents information on the evaluations by country and year; (4) some evaluations viewed more positively by the DG central office, and were therefore used in training, or had been a part of the original SORA effort.

In drawing our sample, we chose one evaluation each cell in Appendix A-2. Within in cell, we attempted to maximize variability among the additional four characteristics. We first incorporated into our sample three evaluations authored by MIS and two by CDIE, which the evaluation team had been provided as five of the most typical or most frequently requested DG reports. These were *Linking USAID Democracy Program Impact to Political Change: A synthesis of Findings from Six Case Studies*” for General sector/General region, *The Transition to Sustainable Democracy in South Africa and the Strategic Role of USAID* for General sector/AFR, *USAID/Croatia Democracy and Governance activities Impact on Political Change: 1995-2000* for General sector/E&E, *Constituencies for Reform: Strategic Approaches for Donor-Supported Civic Advocacy Programs* for Civil Society/General region, and *Weighing in on Scales of Justice: Strategic Approaches for Donor-Supported Rule of Law Programs* for Rule of Law/General region. Also, two evaluations in the Election/ANE and Rule of Law/AFR categories—*Cambodia: Limited Progress on free Elections, Human Rights, and Mine Cleaning* and *Rwanda Evaluation: Promoting Human Rights and Building a Fair Judicial System*—were automatically entered in the sample because there was only one evaluation report in each of these two categories.

Another consideration in drawing our sample was to achieve temporal variability by including reports from the 1980s or earlier. We had limited degrees of freedom for this criterion, however, because there were only ten evaluations from the 80s and one evaluation from the 70s, half of the 80s evaluations were for LAC Gov and LAC ROL, one of the rest five shared the same cell with the one from the 70s, and two of the rest four were already filled in with the MSI evaluations selected above. For Governance/ANE, we selected the only 1970s report, *Development Decentralization Project under the Organization for Reconstruction and Development of the Egyptian Village*. One of the three Rule of Law/LAC evaluation studies conducted in the 1980s by USAID/LAC, *General Evaluation Report: VI Interdisciplinary Course, InterAmerican Institute of Human Rights* was also chosen. Further, another evaluation of the 1980s, *Final Evaluation Report on the First Dominican Legislative Training Program*, satisfied the Governance/LAC category. Finally, we chose the 1980s report for the Governance/AFR category, *Report on Tax Reform in Somalia: Evaluation of the Recommendations and Suggestions for Implementation*.

Finally, we attempted to include some variation in mission/non-mission institutional authors. Appendix A-4 presents the institutional authors for all evaluations. For the AFR/Civil Society sector, we selected *Evaluation of the Zimbabwe American Development Foundation (ZADF) Project*, and for the AFR/Election sub-sector, *Project Assistance Completion Report for the Senegal Elections Assistance Project*.

Whenever possible, we considered country variation as well, choosing evaluations of countries not already represented in our sample. In addition, whenever multiple evaluations fulfilled a set of conditions, we chose based on electronic availability. The list of our final sample of twenty-five evaluations appear as Appendix A-5.

We should finally note that despite a series of efforts at screening, research papers not directly or only tangentially relevant to evaluations of DG programs still entered our sample. We found two such evaluations in the review processes. First, *Aftermath: Women and Gender Issues in Postconflict Guatemala* cannot be characterized as an impact evaluation. It is rather a literature review of women's status in Guatemala incorporating a set of suggestions for future USAID programs. As such, this report does not provide any discussion of specific activities, inputs information, or any outcomes. The other example was *Rwanda Evaluation: Promoting Human Rights and Building a Fair Judicial System*. This report is primarily an evaluation study of a program implemented by the United Nations, not USAID. The inclusion of irrelevant reports in our sample suggests that the applicability of each evaluation in the DEC database to a rigorous analytic review cannot be seen until a careful reading is conducted.

APPENDIX A-2: Sector/Region of Evaluations

Evaluation Spreadsheet Count Matrix

<i>Sub-sector</i>	<i>Region</i>							Total
	General	LAC	AFR	ANE	E&E	ANE; LAC	(blank)	
General	5	16	11	9	9		2	52
Civil Society	8	12	6	6	8	1		41
Elections	4	6	3	1	4		2	20
Governance	3	31	10	19	14		3	80
Rule of Law	6	38	1	4	6		2	57
Governance; Civil Society				1				1
Governance; Political Processes		1						1
Rule of Law; Civil Society				2				2
(blank)		6	1	2			2	11
Total	26	110	32	44	41	1	11	265

APPENDIX A-3: Country/Year of Evaluations

Country	79	80	81	82	83	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00	01	02	03	Total
Afghanistan												1		1										2
Albania																					1			1
Albania; Bulgaria; Lithuania; Ukraine																1								1
Angola																			1					1
Argentina															1									1
Argentina; Uruguay														2										2
Bangladesh														1	1									2
Benin																1						1		2
Bolivia														1	1	1	1						1	5
Bosnia and Herzegovina																				2				2
Bosnia and Herzegovina; Croatia																			1					1
Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia															1									1
Bulgaria; Lithuania; Poland													1											1
Bulgaria; Poland														1										1
Cambodia														2		1				2		1		6
Chile												1	1	1										3
Colombia												1									1			2
Costa Rica							1				1	2												4
Cote d'Ivoire													1											1
Cuba																				1				1
Czech Republic													1											1
Dominican Republic						1										1	1					1		4
Ecuador													2											2
Egypt	1										1	3	1							1	1			8
El Salvador										3	2	1	4	7	2	3		1	1	1	1	2		27
Ethiopia													1											1
Former Soviet Union																						1		1
Georgia																						1		1
Guatemala										1		1	2	1						1				6
Guyana																	1							1
Haiti											1			1	2									4
Honduras									2	2		2	6					1						13
Hungary													1						2					3
Indonesia													1									2		3
Jamaica									1						1									2
Jordan												1												1
Kenya													1											1
Kosovo																						1		1
Kyrgyzstan																						1		1
Lebanon; Honduras																				1				1

Country	79	80	81	82	83	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00	01	02	03	Total	
Macedonia																			1			2		3	
Malawi																			1					1	
Mali																	1	1						2	
Mongolia																1								1	
Mozambique														1	1			2						4	
Nepal														1		1								2	
Nicaragua										1					2		1	1						5	
Nigeria																					1			1	
Panama												1		1	1									3	
Paraguay										1														1	
Peru										1				2				1	1		1	1		7	
Philippines									1			1			1		1	1			1			6	
Poland																1					1			2	
Poland; Czech; Slovakia; Hungary												1												1	
Russia																1								1	
Rwanda															1						1			2	
Senegal														1										1	
Slovakia																	1				1			2	
Somalia									1															1	
South Africa									1						1	1		1	1					5	
Sri Lanka															1									1	
Sudan																						1		1	
Tanzania																		1						1	
Thailand; Nepal; Sri Lanka; Philippines													1											1	
Tunisia																1								1	
Tunisia; Senegal												1												1	
Ukraine																	1					1		2	
West Bank/Gaza																1								1	
Yemen														1										1	
Zambia															1			1						2	
Zimbabwe																							1	1	
(blank)		1	1	1	3	1	1	1		3	4	7	7	18	3	6	3	1	5	2		6	3	2	79
Total	1	1	1	1	4	1	2	1	3	13	11	20	22	53	21	24	15	9	15	16	16	12	3	265	

APPENDIX A-4: Institutional Author of Evaluations

Institutional Author	Civ	Elect	Gen	Gov	ROL	Total
? (Institutional Author Unclear)				1		1
Abt Associates, Inc.				1		1
AED/CDIE			2			2
Africare, Inc.	1					1
Agricultural Development Consultants	1					1
Allan Rosenbaum; Cristina Rodriguez-Acosta; Karen Shaw				1		1
Amideast			1			1
ARD, Inc.			1			1
ARD; MSI			1			1
Aurora Associates; Creative Associates International			1			1
Biddle Associates; Foundation for a Civil Society; USAID/Slovakia	1					1
CAII			1		1	2
CDIE	16	1	3	11	3	34
CDIE/Price Waterhouse Coopers				1		1
Centre for Population Activities	1					1
Checchi	1	1	1	5	8	16
Chemonics				3		3
CIPE					1	1
City University of New York, Baruch College				1		1
Conwal; CDIE			1	1		2
Coopers and Lybrand			1		1	2
Datex; USAID/Haiti				1		1
Deborah Schein		1				1
Development Alternatives, Inc.					1	1
Development Associates			2	1		3
Development Associates, Inc.	1	2	4	2	3	12
Dr. Javier Diaz-Albertini			1			1
Environmental Health Project				1		1
Evsa Corporation/USAID Philippines				1		1
GAO		3	4	5	5	17
Georgetown University; USAID/Indonesia; Indonesian Institute of Economics			1			1
Hobart and William Smith Colleges	1					1
ICMA				3		3
Interamerican Management Consulting Corp.				1		1
Interamericas Group, Inc.					1	1
International Science and Technology Institute, Inc.				1		1
IRC/DevTech/ CDIE	1					1
J.E. Stepanek				1		1
Macro International, Inc.				1		1
Mercy Corps	1					1
Michigan State University; USAID/Zambia			1			1
MSI	6	4	6	5	5	26
MSI/AED	1					1
MSI/IRIS				1		1

Institutional Author	Civ	Elect	Gen	Gov	ROL	Total
National Center for State Courts					1	1
NDI		1				1
OTI			2			2
Partners for International Education and Training				1		1
PPC					2	2
Price Waterhouse Coopers			1			1
Professional Resources Group Intl.	1		1			2
Research Triangle Institute				1		1
Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.				1		1
RTI				1	1	2
Salvadoran Federation of Bar Associations					1	1
Sean R. Roberts		1				1
Social Planning, Analysis, and Administration Consultants; USAID Egypt	1					1
SUNY			2			2
TAF	1			1	1	3
TAF; USAID/Mongolia; USAID/ANE			1			1
Technical Support Services				1		1
Technical Support Services, Inc; USAID/E&E				1		1
Technical Support Services; USAID/Global; USAID/E&E				1		1
Thunder and Associates, Inc.		1				1
TvT Associates				1	1	2
University of Iowa Dept. of Political Science; USAID/REDSO			1			1
University of Pittsburgh Center for Latin American Studies; USAID/El Salvador				1		1
Urban Institute				2		2
USAID/ Bangladesh					1	1
USAID/ Dominican Republic			1			1
USAID/ Mozambique	1			1		2
USAID/ Nicaragua			1			1
USAID/ Zimbabwe	1					1
USAID/ANE; USAID/TUNISIA				1		1
USAID/Bolivia					1	1
USAID/Cambodia			1			1
USAID/Cambodia; Georgetown University			1			1
USAID/Chile				2		2
USAID/Costa Rica					1	1
USAID/Dominican Republic	1					1
USAID/E&E				1		1
USAID/Ecuador				1		1
USAID/Egypt				1		1
USAID/El Salvador			1	2	3	6
USAID/Ethiopia			1			1
USAID/Guatemala				1	2	3
USAID/Haiti			1			1
USAID/Honduras	1	1	1	1	1	5
USAID/Jamaica					1	1

Institutional Author	Civ	Elect	Gen	Gov	ROL	Total
USAID/LAC					6	6
USAID/LAC; Inter-American Institute of Human Rights					1	1
USAID/LAC; USAID/Global	1					1
USAID/Nicaragua				1		1
USAID/Panama			1			1
USAID/Peru				1		1
USAID/Peru; LAC Bureau					1	1
USAID/Philippines				1		1
USAID/PPC				1	1	2
USAID/Senegal		1				1
USAID/South Africa		1	1			2
Wilbur Smith and Associates, Inc.				1		1

APPENDIX A-5: Sample of Evaluations for Review

Sample Selection

Title	Year	Sector	region	Author
Linking USAID democracy program impact to political change: a synthesis of findings from six case studies	2003	Gen	Gen	MSI
Constituencies for reform	1996	Civil Soc	Gen	CDIE
Final report : the IFES [International Foundation for Electoral Systems] interim evaluation	1993	Elect	Gen	Thunder and Associates, Inc.
Spreading Power to the Periphery	1998	Gov	Gen	CDIE
Weighing in on scales of justice	1994	ROL	Gen	CDIE
The transition to sustainable democracy in South Africa and the strategic role of USAID	2001	Gen	AFR	MSI
Evaluation of the Zimbabwe American Development Foundation (ZADF) Project	2001	Civil Soc	AFR	USAID/Zimbabwe
Project assistance completion report for the Senegal elections assistance project	1994	Elect	AFR	USAID/Senegal
Report on tax reform in Somalia: evaluation of the recommendations and suggestions for implementation	1989	Gov	AFR	International Science and Technology Institute, Inc.
Rwanda evaluation: promoting human rights and building a fair judicial system	1995	ROL	AFR	PPC
Final Evaluation: Office of Transition Initiatives Program in East Timor	2003	Gen	ANE	Development Associates, Inc.
Democratic Pluralism Initiative - evaluation of programs for Afghan women	1992	Civil Soc	ANE	TAF
Cambodia: limited progress on free elections, human rights, and mine clearing	1995	Elect	ANE	GAO
Development decentralization project under the organization for reconstruction and development of the Egyptian village	1979	Gov	ANE	J.E. Stepanek
USAID/Bangladesh: project assistance completion report--human rights support project	1995	ROL	ANE	USAID/Bangladesh
USAID/Croatia democracy and governance activities impact on political change: 1995-2000	2002	Gen	E&E	MSI
Mid-Term Evaluation of the Democracy Network Project in Slovakia	1997	Civil Soc	E&E	Biddle Associates; Foundation for a Civil Society; USAID/Slovakia
Evaluation of the activities of the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute in Albania, Bulgaria, Ukraine, and Lithuania	1996	Elect	E&E	MSI
Final report : evaluation of local government activities in USAID programs in Central/Eastern Europe	1995	Gov	E&E	Tech Support Services, Inc; USAID/E&E
Interim evaluation project on legal and regulatory reform in Hungary	1994	ROL	E&E	CIPE
Evaluation of PIREd, the Umbrella Management Unit of the democracy enhancement project	1995	Gen	LAC	USAID/Haiti
Aftermath: women and gender issues in postconflict Guatemala	2000	Civil Soc	LAC	CDIE
Final Report: evaluation of the improved electoral administration project	1994	Elect	LAC	Checchi
Final evaluation report on the first Dominican legislative training program	1983	Gov	LAC	City University of New York, Baruch College
General evaluation report: VI interdisciplinary course, InterAmerican Institute of Human Rights	1988	ROL	LAC	USAID/LAC

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B-1: Template ver.1

1 Basic Information	
a	Document Number
b	Title
c	Countries in Study
d	Year of Evaluation
e	Author of Evaluation
2 Activity Characteristics	
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?
c	Main <i>target</i> groups
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)
e	Match with DG definition of sector
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?
g	Input to sector activities:
1)	What was spent?
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)
3)	What was done?
4)	When?
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?
i	What outcomes were considered?
1)	Individual
2)	Group
3)	Institutional
4)	Country
5)	Long-term
6)	Short-term
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a	Values of outcome
b	Deviant case
c	Importance of case
d	To have heterogeneous cases
e	Data availability
f	Probability sampling
g	Familiarity
h	Other (name)
4 Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal
b	Research method
1)	Interviews

	How many?	
2)	Documents	
	types?	
3)	Fieldwork?	
	Time in country	
	Places in country	
4)	Quantitative	
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	
2)	Case selection	
3)	Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	
2)	Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	
b	Measures explicitly defined	
c	Alternative measures considered	
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	
f	Reliability discussed	
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	
b	Integrated?	
c	Background factors considered in report	

APPENDIX B-2: Template Revision

We revised the original template (Appendix B-1) based on a meeting with USAID on 7/11/2003. The discussion raised two major points for further improvement of the coding template: (1) removal, retention, or collapsing of some of the original items for coding efficiency; and (2) clarification of the conceptual definitions and/or re-wording/elaboration of the items in order to achieve common, consistent, and valid interpretations of the coding questions across multiple coders.

Thus, in our revision, we removed or collapsed coding questions that were either unnecessary in light of the purpose of the current project or simply redundant. For example, there were a few similar questions under the item 2 “Activity Characteristics,” such as 2b “Activities” and 2g3 “What was done?” Another example is the elimination, upon USAID’s advice, of the item 2b, “Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?” due to the absence of the concept “overarching strategies” in the USAID system.

We also elaborated those questions that seemed to pose a threat of generating multiple interpretations. For example, the sub-items under 2i “What outcomes were considered?” were clarified by adding specific examples. Likewise, considering diverse backgrounds of future coders, we replaced technical terms (e.g., 3f “probability sampling”) with more widely familiar ones (e.g., “random sampling”).

Finally, we provided space for (1) page numbers and (2) coders’ notes and comments to enhance coding validity. The revised template is included in Appendix B-3.

APPENDIX B-3: Template ver.2

Coding Date _____ Mo= _____ Da= _____ Yr= _____
 Coder Name _____

A. BASIC INFORMATION				
1	Document Number			
2	Document Title			
3	Institutional Author(s) of Evaluation (List all)			
4	Individual Author(s) of Evaluation (List all)			
5	Year of Document Publication	Yr=		
6	Year of Program Evaluation			
a.	Program Evaluation Start Date	Mo=	Yr=	No info Page #s:
b.	Program Evaluation End Date	Mo=	Yr=	No info Page #s:
7	Unit of study			
a.	Country/Countries in study (List all)			Page #s:
b.	Sub-national unit(s) in study (List all)			Page #s:

Comment:

B. SECTOR CHARACTERISTICS				
1	DG sub-sectors (Circle an applicable one)	1. General 4. Rule of Law	2. Civil Society 5. Governance	3. Election 6. No info Page #s:

Comment:

2	Activities (List all, e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)			Page #s: Page #s: Page #s: Page #s: Page #s: Page #s: Page #s: Page #s:
---	--	--	--	--

Comments:

3	Main target groups (List all)			Page #s:
---	-------------------------------	--	--	----------

Comments:

4	Input to sector activities:			Page #s:
a.	Funding provided			Page #s:
b.	Personnel involved (person hours)			Page #s:
c.	Time of activity implementation	Mo=	Yr=	Page #s:
d.	NGOs undertook the sector activities (List them all)			Page #s:

Comments:

5	What outcomes were considered?			Page #s:
a.	Individual (e.g., judges, leaders, voters)	1. Yes (a. Success; b. Failure)	2. No	Page #s:
b.	Group (e.g., political party, NGOs, etc)	1. Yes (a. Success; b. Failure)	2. No	Page #s:

c.	Institutional (e.g., offices in government, ministries, rules and laws)	1. Yes (a. Success; b. Failure)	2. No	Page #s:
d.	National level (i.e., democracy)	1. Yes (a. Success; b. Failure)	2. No	Page #s:

Comments:

e.	Long-term (longer than 1 yr)	1. Yes (a. Success; b. Failure)	2. No	Page #s:
f.	Short-term (shorter than 1 yr)	1. Yes (a. Success; b. Failure)	2. No	Page #s:

Comments:

C. SAMPLE SELECTION				
1	Why were country or area in the evaluation selected? (Circle applicable ones)	1. Values of outcome		Page #s:
		2. Unusual case		Page #s:
		3. Importance of case		Page #s:
		4. Variety in cases		Page #s:
		5. Data availability		Page #s:
		6. Random Sampling		Page #s:
		7. Familiarity (e.g., country expert evaluators, AID's history in the country, etc)		Page #s:
		8. Other (name)		Page #s:
		9. No info		Page #s:

Comments:

D. RESEARCH DESIGN				
1	Are any baseline characteristics/values assessed	1. Yes	2. No	Page #s:
2	Is over-time change in the targeted objectives considered?	1. Yes	2. No	Page #s:
3	Research method (Circle an applicable one(s)).	1. Interviews (How many?:)		Page #s:
		2. Documents (Types?:)		Page #s:
		3. Field Work (Time in country: Mo= Da= Yr= ; Place in country:)		Page #s:
		4. Quantitative		Page #s:
		5. Other		Page #s:
		6. No info		Page #s:

Comment

4	Method of Control (Circle an applicable one(s))	1. Case selection	2. Other methods	3. No controls	Page #s:
		4. No info			

Comment

5	Country context considered?	1. Yes	2. No info	Page #s:
----------	-----------------------------	--------	------------	----------

Comments:

6	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	1. Yes	2. No info	Page #'s:
----------	--	--------	------------	-----------

Comments:

7	Alternative explanations ruled out?			Page #'s:
a.	Within country	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:
b.	Foreign	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:

Comments:

8	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	1. Yes	2. No info	Page #'s:
----------	---	--------	------------	-----------

Comments:

E.	MEASUREMENT			
1	Concepts explicitly defined	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:
2	Measures explicitly defined	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:
3	Alternative measures considered	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:
4	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:
5	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:
6	Reliability discussed	1. Yes	2. No	Page #'s:

Comments:

Coder's overall comments:

APPENDIX C: Evaluation Coding

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a	Document Number
b	Title
c	Countries in Study
d	Year of Evaluation
e	Author of Evaluation
2 Activity Characteristics	
a	Name of Sector
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?
c	Main target groups
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)
e	Match with DG definition of sector
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?
g	Input to sector activities:
1)	What was spent?
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)
3)	What was done?
4)	When?
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?
i	What outcomes were considered?
1)	Individual
2)	Group
3)	Institutional
4)	Country
5)	Long-term
6)	Short-term
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a	Values of outcome
b	Deviant case
c	Importance of case
d	To have heterogeneous cases
e	Data availability

f	Probability sampling	Not explicit criterion.
g	Familiarity	Organizational familiarity or experience with
h	Other (name)	Region / length of USAID program in country, Development, Phase-out near in time vs. not
4	Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal, 5 countries and description brings in change over time in CAOs and their impact.
b	Research method	(see p.A2 Appendix A)
1)	Interviews	YES
	How many?	60 in each country
2)	Documents	YES
	types?	(of USAID and other donor materials as well as CAO-generated documents and much unrelated matter such as academic analyses and local newspapers)
3)	Fieldwork?	YES
	Time in country	three to five weeks in country
	Places in country	attempt to capture rural areas as well as major cities
4)	Quantitative	NO
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	No controls in analysis are mentioned. Largely a narrative, giving impressions of impact of CAOs with occasional comment on USAID's contribution toward CAO
2)	Case selection	
3)	Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	They note their programs worked better when NGOs had a history of democracy to work with, and that programs worked better under some types of regimes
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	They note their programs worked better when NGOs had a history of democracy to work with, and that programs worked better under some types of regimes
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	Systematic attempts to consider and rule out alternative domestic or international factors as facilitating or preventing the CAOs' efforts were not made. However, often mention was made of the activities of other international agencies in the sector. Also, the report makes note of the limits set by the domestic conditions in a country.
2)	Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	not considered
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	Yes. p.2 "...civil society can be referred to as the multitude of nonstate associations around which society organizes itself and which move in and out of the public realm of politics in accordance with their specific needs and agenda of interests." p. viii "...civic advocacy organizations [CAOs]-nonstate groups that engage in or have the potential for championing adoption and consolidation of democratic governance reforms."
b	Measures explicitly defined	not systematically
c	Alternative measures considered	No.
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	NO, this was a major problem. Causes were considered but only some of the countries were used to discuss individual variables. This was especially problematic when only the successful or unsuccessful countries were discussed
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	not explicitly
f	Reliability discussed	not explicitly
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	selectively
b	Integrated?	yes
c	Background factors considered in report	Prior regime; Prior democratization; Presence of other donors

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	
b	Title	The Democratic pluralism initiative. Evaluation of programs for Afghan women, February 1992
c	Countries in Study	Afghanistan, some refugee communities inside Pakistan
d	Year of Evaluation	1991 to 1992
e	Author of Evaluation	Nagat El-Sanabary, WID consultant, O/AID/Rep and Asia Foundation
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of Sector	Democratic pluralism initiative (increase participation of Afghan women in society)
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	female literacy; skills training and income generation
c	Main target groups	Afghan women
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	very detailed information given, see examples on sheet 2
e	Match with DG definition of sector	?
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	
g	Input to sector activities:	note: very nice NGO summaries at the back of the evaluation
1)	What was spent?	detailed information is provided, see examples on sheet 2
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	detailed information is provided, see examples on sheet 2
3)	What was done?	detailed information is provided, see examples on sheet 2
4)	When?	detailed information is provided, see examples on sheet 2
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	the Asia foundation is USAID's primary intermediary (p.4) and it made sub-grants to the organizations listed on sheet 2.
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	yes, and it is sometimes recorded exactly how much
i	What outcomes were considered?	overall, the outcomes section has a very "rah-rah" feel to it, see sheet 2
1)	Individual	how many women taught is recorded, as well as job opportunities and such
2)	Group	some discussion of staffing and instructional material is discussed
3)	Institutional	little is recorded at this level
4)	Country	little is recorded at this level
5)	Long-term	
6)	Short-term	necessarily short term since the programs were in place only a few years.
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	yes
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	not discussed, although there is some discussion of the constraints in translating individual outcomes into help for the reconstruction of Afghanistan
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	
b	Deviant case	
c	Importance of case	
d	To have heterogeneous cases	
e	Data availability	It appears that all NGOs receiving USAID funding were contacted
f	Probability sampling	
g	Familiarity	
h	Other (name)	
4 Research Design		note: the evaluation was revised on the basis of feedback from representatives of the organizations being evaluated (pp.5-6)
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	YES
	How many?	not listed

2)	Documents types?	YES teaching materials, program proposals, quarterly reports
3)	Fieldwork?	YES
	Time in country	appears to have been about a total of four weeks
	Places in country	Peshawar and Islamabad refugee programs
4)	Quantitative	"five-page questionnaire, completed by program directors. Information provided included numbers of students in various classes, student admission criteria, number and qualification of instructors and hiring methods, types of evaluation used to assess students progress, and evaluation of students, faculty and staff." (p.5)
5)	Other	"the evaluator interviewed key members of each implementing organization, visited classes in progress, observed teaching methods, examined teaching materials (textbooks or written notes), questioned the students about their reasons for attending classes, and their assessment of the impact of their education or training on their lives." p.5
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	no controls
2)	Case selection	
3)	Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	yes, issues such as resistance to female education discussed
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	yes, difficulties in overcoming country context are discussed
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	a bit, in the sense that the author notes that the more privileged women may be taking advantage of the programs, and, although she doesn't directly say this, this could skew the success rate
2)	Foreign	other donors are mentioned but the author thinks USAID should continue funding anyway
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	n/a
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	not really necessary in this evaluation (female education is pretty straightforward)
b	Measures explicitly defined	while not defined, per se, the same measures (# of students, # of graduates, attrition, demand) are used consistently throughout the report
c	Alternative measures considered	no
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	n/a
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	no
f	Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	not a lot
b	Integrated?	yes, in terms of constraints on the NGO programming
c	Background factors considered in report	culture, shortage of qualified females, declining employment of women

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a	Document Number
b	Title
c	Countries in Study
d	Year of Evaluation
e	Author of Evaluation
2 Activity Characteristics	
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?
c	Main <i>target</i> groups
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)
e	Match with DG definition of sector
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?
g	Input to sector activities:
1)	What was spent?
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)
3)	What was done?
4)	When?
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?
i	What outcomes were considered?
1)	Individual
2)	Group
3)	Institutional
4)	Country
5)	Long-term
6)	Short-term
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a	Values of outcome
b	Deviant case
c	Importance of case
d	To have heterogeneous cases
e	Data availability
f	Probability sampling
g	Familiarity
h	Other (name)
4 Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal

b Research method	
1) Interviews	YES
How many?	over 100
2) Documents	YES
types?	"USAID and grantee reports, survey data, analyses of political change" (p.2)
3) Fieldwork?	YES
Time in country	3 weeks
Places in country	Zagreb, Rijeka, Split, Porec, Osijek, and Vukovar
4) Quantitative	NO
5) Other	desk study to get baseline, process-tracing (causal chain from outputs to outcomes to higher level impacts) (p.1)
c Method of Control	
1) No controls	
2) Case selection	used the four variables listed above
3) Other methods	
d Country context considered?	
e Does country-context influence USAID activity?	
f Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1) Within country	worsening economy led support to the opposition (p.2); general drift away from HDZ (p.3); growing dissatisfaction with HDZ (p.7)
2) Foreign	Croatia's growing isolation from Europe (p.7)
g Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
some scattered evidence for this: e.g., IRI does polls about opposition coalitions after coalition has been formed (p. 11)	
5 Measurement	
a Concepts explicitly defined	NO, the format of the report changed from sector to sector, only the three levels of impact really remained the same (individual, institutional, systemic)
b Measures explicitly defined	NO
c Alternative measures considered	NO
d Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	N/A
e Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	
f Reliability discussed	No, the word of interviewees (and indeed the direction taken by the report based on what information is presented) seemed to be taken for granted.
6 Background Information	
a Provided?	yes, although it wasn't exactly "background." It went over changes throughout 90s
b Integrated?	somewhat, although not really as "competing explanations"
c Background factors considered in report	war, corruption, worsening economy, need for state building, political parties and electoral system, lack of associationalism (lower levels than Slovenia and Serbia (p.3), rule of law (judges fired, lots of corruption)

frustrations: (1) the format of the report changed between sections so that the same information wasn't always provided in each section, or provided in the same way, (2) impacts were sometimes noted for activities that had not been mentioned as activities in the first place.

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	
b	Title	spreading power to the periphery: an assessment of democratic local governance
c	Countries in Study	Bolivia, Honduras, Mali, Philippines, Ukraine, Indian state of Karnataka
d	Year of Evaluation	1996-97
e	Author of Evaluation	CDIE
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	governance
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	decentralization
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	local governments, with special attention to women and minority ethnic groups
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	varied, see sheet 2
e	Match with DG definition of sector	seems good
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	no information
g	Input to sector activities:	no information given on specific activities
1)	What was spent?	
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	
3)	What was done?	
4)	When?	
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	
i	What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual	participation of women and ethnic minorities, empowerment of women and ethnic minorities, local elites stealing benefits
2)	Group	active civil society, media
3)	Institutional	local revenue generation, local control over local civil servants, strong local party system
4)	Country	regional disparities, at least one free and fair local election
5)	Long-term	
6)	Short-term	programs have only been in effect since 1991 (in the longest instance) so most conclusions are preliminary
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	unknown, no information about activities
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	wasn't considered
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	yes, looked for cases where decentralization worked
b	Deviant case	
c	Importance of case	
d	To have heterogeneous cases	regionally heterogeneous, experience with decentralization (p.4)
e	Data availability	
f	Probability sampling	
g	Familiarity	USAID presence in all but India
h	Other (name)	
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	little discussion of over-time events
b	Research method	began with a "concept paper"
1)	Interviews	mostly interviews of key government personnel, NGO people, USAID mission personnel, other donors
	How many?	?
2)	Documents	YES

	types?	documents from above interviewees
3)	Fieldwork?	YES
	Time in country	three weeks
	Places in country	capital, visiting local governments
4)	Quantitative	opinion surveys in two countries
5)	Other	focus groups in a few cases; note: India did not have fieldwork, instead Indian social scientists were commissioned to analyze issues
c	Method of Control	no real discussion of controls
	1) No controls	
	2) Case selection	
	3) Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	many contextual factors were considered, see sheet 2
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	no information on USAID activity
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
	1) Within country	
	2) Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	?
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	YES, very nice distinction between deconcentration, delegation, devolution; also, democracy defined
b	Measures explicitly defined	there were no measures
c	Alternative measures considered	no
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	this study is exemplary in this respect. For the most part, every country was discussed with respect to every variable or outcome
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	no
f	Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	yes, see sheet 2
b	Integrated?	somewhat
c	Background factors considered in report	see sheet 2

Part of the evaluation is a review of previous literature on decentralization. Conclusions are reached but these have little or nothing to do with specific USAID programming. I have therefore not reported these findings.

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PD-ABI-959-89135
b	Title	project assistance completion report for the Senegal elections assistance project (685-0303)
c	Countries in Study	Senegal
d	Year of Evaluation	1993
e	Author of Evaluation	RLA:D. Annette Adams
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	elections and political parties
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	voter education and provision of electoral materials
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	1) the production and distribution of written, audio, and audiovisual materials (in six local languages) for voter education, 2) the procurement of electoral materials such as ballot boxes, voting booths, and indelible ink
e	Match with DG definition of sector	very good
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	not mentioned
g Input to sector activities:		
1)	What was spent?	\$500,000 for all activities
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	unclear
3)	What was done?	posters, how-to-vote brochures, radio spots, etc. created and disseminated; ballot boxes, voting booths, indelible ink procured and disseminated.
4)	When?	September 1992-93
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	SUDCOM, some direct USAID purchasing
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	not mentioned
i	What outcomes were considered?	NOTE: Although specific goals were mentioned (p.6), these were not followed up in the assessment. For example, goal (a) was that "voter education campaign would inform at least 2 million Senegalese of the new electoral code requirements and revised voting procedures promulgated by the new electoral code." no attempt was made to assess whether the population became informed as a result of USAID activities. Similarly, goal (b) states "a 25% increase in the number of voters participating in the elections." Again, this goal is not specifically evaluated.
1)	Individual	although a goal focused on voter education, the assessment of the outcomes focused solely on the number of radio spots produced, the number of brochures printed, and how often they were actually aired or passed out.
2)	Group	
3)	Institutional	although a goal was institutionalizing a democratic electoral process, assessment of the outcomes focused on the number of ballot boxes, voting booths, etc. bought by USAID and whether they were used.
4)	Country	
5)	Long-term	no
6)	Short-term	yes
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	only partially, although radio and TV spots were produced, they were aired many fewer times than anticipated. Also, although ballot boxes and voting booths were provided, they were not used in the February 1993 elections (they were used in the May 1993 elections). similarly, although indelible ink was provided by USAID, there is evidence that it was not used properly and that individuals may have voted more than once.
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	not discussed
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	n/a
b	Deviant case	n/a
c	Importance of case	n/a

d	To have heterogeneous cases	n/a
e	Data availability	n/a
f	Probability sampling	n/a
g	Familiarity	n/a
h	Other (name)	
4	Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	slightly longitudinal, in that it discusses the history of electoral reform in Senegal
b	Research method	no research design is mentioned
1)	Interviews	no research design is mentioned
	How many?	
2)	Documents	no research design is mentioned
	types?	
3)	Fieldwork?	no research design is mentioned
	Time in country	
	Places in country	
4)	Quantitative	
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	none mentioned
2)	Case selection	no
3)	Other methods	no
d	Country context considered?	no
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	no, in fact, some of the problems might have been avoided if country context had been better understood.
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	n/a the evaluation is so proximate (e.g., 2000 ballot boxes procured) that there is no issue of alternative explanation
1)	Within country	
2)	Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	yes, a new electoral code in 1991 led to the need for both voter education, and voting materials
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	no
b	Measures explicitly defined	not defined, although they were so straightforward (e.g., # ballot boxes, # brochures) as to render definition really unnecessary
c	Alternative measures considered	no, importantly, voter information or turnout was not explicitly measured although it likely should have been considering the goals of the project
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	n/a
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	no
f	Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	some
b	Integrated?	no
c	Background factors considered in report	the electoral code

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	180-0021 and 110-0007
b	Title	Evaluation of the activities of the International Republican Institute and the National democratic Institute in Albania, Bulgaria, Ukraine, and Lithuania
c	Countries in Study	Albania, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Lithuania
d	Year of Evaluation	Oct-95
e	Author of Evaluation	Heilman, Voien, Independent consultants
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	Political process and elections
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	Political party strengthening, election monitoring, legislative 'outreach'
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	parties, voters, MPs, Local governments, civic education
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	
e	Match with DG definition of sector	Yes but for legislative component
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	
g	Input to sector activities:	
	1) What was spent?	\$703,679 (Lith) Bulgaria \$1,478,699 \$3,299,101 (Ukraine) Albania \$1,415,109
	2) Personnel involved (person hours)	
	3) What was done?	training seminars, briefing books and other materials
	4) When?	1991-1995
	5) Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	multiple in multiple countries
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Yes-EU
i	What outcomes were considered?	
	1) Individual	Yes
	2) Group	Yes
	3) Institutional	Yes (Parliament) "No objective criteria" p.45
	4) Country	Yes (In an indirect, vague way)
	5) Long-term	Yes (sort of)
	6) Short-term	Yes
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	Yes in Bulgaria; yes in Albania, Ukraine Lithuania: NO
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	Unclear
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	No
b	Deviant case	No
c	Importance of case	No
d	To have heterogeneous cases	Yes but not intentionally
e	Data availability	No
f	Probability sampling	No
g	Familiarity	No
h	Other (name)	sample was selected according to contractual need
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	longitudinal
b	Research method	
	1) Interviews	Yes
	How many?	unknown
	2) Documents	IRI and NDI materials, USAID documents, govt. of host country documents

	types?	reports
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes (21 days)
	Time in country	6 days in all countries except Lithuania-3 days
	Places in country	Multiple cities in each
4)	Quantitative	No except budget
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	None
2)	Case selection	None
3)	Other methods	None
d	Country context considered?	Somewhat (only to the extent that it influenced USAID strategy)
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	No
1)	Within country	No
2)	Foreign	No
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	No
b	Measures explicitly defined	No
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	No
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	No
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Not really
b	Integrated?	No
c	Background factors considered in report	No

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PN AAG 592
b	Title	Development Decentralization Project under the organization for reconstruction and development of the Egyptian village
c	Countries in Study	1 Egypt
d	Year of Evaluation	1978
e	Author of Evaluation	unclear
2 Activity Characteristics		Goal is rural development
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	Governance--Decentralization ROL
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	socio economic development projects at village level
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	Egyptian village councils, villagers, ministry of local government
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	Funding through grants to small development projects
e	Match with DG definition of sector	
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	No They pre-date DG and decentralization is peripheral
g Input to sector activities:		
1)	What was spent?	\$3,000,000
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	unclear
3)	What was done?	
4)	When?	1972-1978
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	None
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	No
i What outcomes were considered?		
1)	Individual	Yes
2)	Group	Yes, industry groups
3)	Institutional	Yes
4)	Country	Yes
5)	Long-term	Yes in a vague, abstract way
6)	Short-term	Main focus is on projects completed, roads and schools, etc.
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	Yes
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	unclear
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	None
b	Deviant case	None
c	Importance of case	None
d	To have heterogeneous cases	No information
e	Data availability	No information
f	Probability sampling	No information
g	Familiarity	No information
h	Other (name)	
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	cross sectional 19 governm (sub nat'l) Longitudinal --Egypt
b Research method		
1)	Interviews	Yes
	How many?	Unclear
2)	Documents	Order records, USAID
	types?	Reports
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes

	Time in country	Unclear
	Places in country	Rural areas beneficiaries of rural development fund
4)	Quantitative	Yes
5)	Other	questionnaire for enterprise owners
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	No
2)	Case selection	No
3)	Other methods	No
d	Country context considered?	No
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Unknown
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	No
2)	Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	Yes
b	Measures explicitly defined	Yes production statistics
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	same variables in each sub-national unit (gover
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	Yes
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	
b	Integrated?	
c	Background factors considered in report	

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PD-ABN-967
b	Title	Rwanda evaluation: promoting human rights and building a fair judicial system
c	Countries in Study	Rwanda
d	Year of Evaluation	May-95
e	Author of Evaluation	Peter Manikas, consultant
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of Sector	ROL
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	investigations (prosecutions of violators of human rights)
c	Main target groups	investigators, victims of human rights abuses
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	
e	Match with DG definition of sector	good
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	No: this is NOT an evaluation of an USAID project
g	Input to sector activities:	
1)	What was spent?	N/A
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	N/A
3)	What was done?	N/A
4)	When?	N/A
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	N/A
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	N/A
i	What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual	N/A
2)	Group	N/A
3)	Institutional	N/A
4)	Country	N/A
5)	Long-term	N/A
6)	Short-term	N/A
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	N/A
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	N/A
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	N/A
b	Deviant case	N/A
c	Importance of case	N/A
d	To have heterogeneous cases	N/A
e	Data availability	N/A
f	Probability sampling	N/A
g	Familiarity	N/A
h	Other (name)	N/A
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	N/A
b	Research method	N/A
1)	Interviews	N/A
	How many?	N/A
2)	Documents	N/A
	types?	N/A
3)	Fieldwork?	N/A
	Time in country	N/A
	Places in country	N/A

	4) Quantitative	N/A
	5) Other	N/A
c	Method of Control	
	1) No controls	N/A
	2) Case selection	N/A
	3) Other methods	N/A
d	Country context considered?	N/A
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	N/A
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	N/A
	1) Within country	N/A
	2) Foreign	N/A
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	N/A
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	N/A
b	Measures explicitly defined	N/A
c	Alternative measures considered	N/A
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	N/A
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	N/A
f	Reliability discussed	N/A
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	N/A
b	Integrated?	N/A
c	Background factors considered in report	N/A

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a Document Number	
b Title	Linking USAID Democracy Program Impact to Political Change: A Synthesis of Findings from Six Case Studies
c Countries in Study	Bolivia, South Africa, Bulgaria (2001 synthesis); Guatemala, Ghana, Croatia (2002 synthesis)
d Year of Evaluation	2001 & 2002
e Author of Evaluation	Management Systems International
2 Activity Characteristics	
a Name of Sector	Elections/Pol.Parties & Processes, Civil Society, human rights, legislature, local gov't, media, Rule of Law
b Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	Unclear
c Main target groups	Varied by country and by sector.
d Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	p.6 voter education, get out to vote campaigns, election monitoring, political party development, polling, legal framework, new institutions, coalitions & networks, human rights & mediation, court administration, judicial reform, legislative strengthening
e Match with DG definition of sector	Yes
f Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Seemed so. Not central focus, but very diverse examples prevent knowing this in all cases.
g Input to sector activities:	
1) What was spent?	Exact dollar figures not given.
2) Personnel involved (person hours)	Not given
3) What was done?	Varied by sector and activity
4) When?	Varied by sector and activity, but most take place in last half 1990s
5) Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	Political parties, electoral organizations are discussed. NGOs also funded (e.g., p.6, 7, 9)
h Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Not systematically listed, but mentioned in some cases.
i What outcomes were considered?	
1) Individual	Yes, see p.3 for table listing (attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and knowledge)
2) Group	Yes, see p.3 for table listing (create new organizations; policy & legal reform, change in norms, rules, mandates by which organizations operate)
3) Institutional	Yes, see p.3 for table listing
4) Country	Yes(?), see p.3 for table listing (change in pol. Competition, inequality, inclusion)
5) Long-term	Unclear
6) Short-term	some discussion
j Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	p.4 Claims greatest effectiveness in elections & pol. Processes in work with political parties & elections administration. P.5 lists individual, institutional impacts in Ghana & Croatia.
k Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	p.5 Ghana moved from 5 to 2 on Freedom House scale through 1990s. Croatia mostly 4 but 2 in 2000. /// Elections more free & fair. Calming of political environment.
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a Values of outcome	Selected on (1) political competition using Freedom House & (2) constraints on chief executive (see p.1)
b Deviant case	No
c Importance of case	No
d To have heterogeneous cases	No
e Data availability	No
f Probability sampling	No
g Familiarity	Possibly
h Other (name)	According to bottom of p.1, the following were used: (1) SES, (2) Average program size. P.2 says Year 1 countries: high competition, medium SES, big USAID program (>\$5.5 million annual) & high constraints on executive. Year 2 countries: medium competition, medium-high SES; medium-large USAID program (>\$1.5 million) low constraints on executive.
4 Research Design	

a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal ("process tracing")
b	Research method	
	1) Interviews	Yes (?)
	How many?	?
	2) Documents	Yes (desk study)
	types?	Unclear
	3) Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	Couple of weeks in each
	Places in country	Unclear
	4) Quantitative	Mostly qualitative, except occasional mention of dollar amounts & # receiving training.
	5) Other	Desk studies of political change (in the initial stage of research) & country visits typical.
c	Method of Control	
	1) No controls	yes
	2) Case selection	yes, but use as control unclear
	3) Other methods	no
d	Country context considered?	yes, for each country discussed it was common to talk about the country situation in that sector.
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes, suggests that USAID devised strategy that addresses perceived needs in country.
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	See p.30 where discussion of how "political environment" affect chances of success Table 3.
	1) Within country	yes, e.g., see political will on p.32
	2) Foreign	yes, e.g., see p.31 prospect of EU membership influenced ?Bulgaria & Croatia in ways favorable to democratization.
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Yes in some cases (e.g., Ghana 1992 election had procedural & logistic problems led to charges of fraud by opposition. USAID & others provide support for next election to avoid this.
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	Yes, e.g., p.51
b	Measures explicitly defined	Not always. Examples or illustrations are given.
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	No
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	Mostly no.
f	Reliability discussed	Mostly no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Yes (mostly)
b	Integrated?	Yes (mostly)
c	Background factors considered in report	Yes (mostly)

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a Document Number	
b Title	Cambodia: Limited Progress on Free Elections, Human Rights, and Mine Clearing
c Countries in Study	Cambodia
d Year of Evaluation	p.1 "...information about Cambodia's progress since 1993." (report 1996)
e Author of Evaluation	GAO
2 Activity Characteristics	
a Name of Sector	(1) Elections & political processes, (2) civil society ("human rights"), (3) Rule of Law, (4) Clear land mines
b Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	Unclear
c Main target groups	Unclear, appear to be gov't officials, political parties, masses
d Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	Oct 1995 seminar on types of electoral systems (p.10); Set-up national election timetable (p.11); plans to strengthen all pol parties to compete in election
e Match with DG definition of sector	Good except land mines
f Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Partially. Not always clear what is being done with money.
g Input to sector activities:	
1) What was spent?	Planned expenditures: 1994 \$29 million; 1995 \$42 million; 1996 \$40 million; U.S. provided some money for land mine clearing but unclear as to what has been done.
2) Personnel involved (person hours)	Unclear
3) What was done?	See Activities above.
4) When?	Dates not always given, but appears between 1994 to 1996.
5) Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	Unclear
h Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Yes, some are mentioned, but no detailed breakdown.
i What outcomes were considered?	
1) Individual	
2) Group	
3) Institutional	freedom of media; human rights; rule of law; running of elections; clear land mines
4) Country	see preceding
5) Long-term	Unclear
6) Short-term	see outcomes
j Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	Success described as limited (see p.2)
k Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	Success described as limited (see p.2)
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a Values of outcome	No
b Deviant case	No
c Importance of case	Yes
d To have heterogeneous cases	No
e Data availability	No
f Probability sampling	No
g Familiarity	No
h Other (name)	Strategic interests.
4 Research Design	
a Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal- one country
b Research method	
1) Interviews	Yes
How many?	Not stated: "...Key U.S., Cambodian, other foreign gov't and U.N. representatives & with representatives of a variety of NGOs." p.5
2) Documents	Yes

	types?	reports & documents on Cambodia; international treaties
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes, in Cambodia and Thailand
	Time in country	May to December 1995 (p.5)
	Places in country	Unclear
4)	Quantitative	Little
5)	Other	Little
c	Method of Control	
	1) No controls	no controls
	2) Case selection	no
	3) Other methods	none
d	Country context considered?	Yes, see espec. pp.1 to 2
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes, appears to.
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	No
	1) Within country	No
	2) Foreign	No
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Yes, successful election in 1993.
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	No
b	Measures explicitly defined	No
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	NA
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	No
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Yes
b	Integrated?	Somewhat
c	Background factors considered in report	Yes

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PD-ABM-975-90675
b	Title	evaluation of local government activities in USAID programs in central/Eastern Europe
c	Countries in Study	Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia
d	Year of Evaluation	1995 (September)
e	Author of Evaluation	Technical support services, Inc. (three-member consulting team)
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of Sector	local government (governance)
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	no (but categorize activities into four groups. See below). Page 5 says local governments was not original focus of work, this label came after the activities were in operation. But in annex 6, pp. 87-90 it discusses strategies for each country.
c	Main target groups	local government groups
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	technical assistance in (1) financial management, (2) human resource management, (3) intergovernmental relations, (4) service delivery improvement
e	Match with DG definition of sector	closest to government sector
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	page 5 suggests that activities were not part of a strategy to build local government, but were organized under the label later. But see annex 6, pp.87-90.
g	Input to sector activities:	
1)	What was spent?	see pp. 50 to 52, annex 2; specific amounts for specific countries are not given.
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	unclear
3)	What was done?	see annex 2, pp. 50-52, over 25 specific activities listed.
4)	When?	1990-1995
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	contract to variety of organizations, see annex 2
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	other government agencies (e.g. DOE) mentioned, but all donors not clearly identified.
i	What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual	not primary interest
2)	Group	municipalities and government workers
3)	Institutional	
4)	Country	straightening of local governments
5)	Long-term	partially
6)	Short-term	primary focus
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	pages 11-16 give brief descriptions of outcomes for a list of many activities in the four countries. In most but not all examples, USAID funding was seen as having a positive effect though the significance of the activity was not always clear. Pages 83-90 give a concise description of each activity in each country and seems to be a more candid assessment of the relation of activities to strategies.
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	unclear. Mention national government's opposition to strengthening municipal governments (e.g. p.6)
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	no (except all former Communist)
b	Deviant case	no
c	Importance of case	no
d	To have heterogeneous cases	no
e	Data availability	no
f	Probability sampling	no
g	Familiarity	no
h	Other (name)	
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	longitudinal
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	yes
	How many?	150+ (see pp. 53-57 for list)
2)	Documents	yes

	types?	reviewed documentation on activities
3)	Fieldwork?	yes
	Time in country	two weeks to Poland, one week each to the other three countries
	Places in country	pp. 83-86 for maps with cities visited (3-5 cities per country)
4)	Quantitative	no (generally)
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	no
2)	Case selection	no
3)	Other methods	no
d	Country context considered?	yes
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	yes
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	no
	1) Within country	
	2) Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	unclear
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	partially
b	Measures explicitly defined	no
c	Alternative measures considered	no
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	mostly
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	no
f	Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	yes
b	Integrated?	some
c	Background factors considered in report	

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PD-ABK-081 92011
b	Title	EVALUATION OF THE IMPROVED ELECTORAL ADMINISTRATION PROJECT (Project No. 525-0317)
c	Countries in Study	Panama
d	Year of Evaluation	1994 (Oct visit)
d	Author of Evaluation	Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc. (H. Johnson, Mila Brooks, Marta Villaveces)
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of Sector	Elections and political process
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	Yes, certain groups targeted for improvement.
c	Main target groups	1) Electoral Tribunal 2) Voters
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	1) technical and commodity assistance to Electoral Tribunal, 2) Civic education campaign, 3) Education of political parties.
e	Match with DG definition of sector	Yes
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Yes.
g	Input to sector activities:	
1)	What was spent?	See Table 2 p.11 \$4,086,827 disbursed (breakdown provided), \$1,755,050 to CAPEL for tech support to Electoral Tribunal (p.7)+ others see p.7.
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	Unknown
3)	What was done?	See Activities
4)	When?	Sept. 1994 to December 1994.
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	USAID & Panamian organizations most central. CAPEL also (see p.6)
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Related USAID funding & other donors mentioned on p.12
i	What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual	
2)	Group	
3)	Institutional	page i: institutional strengthening of Electoral Tribunal; support free, fair, and open general elections in May 1994; 73% voter participation.
4)	Country	
5)	Long-term	Implied improvement for future elections.
6)	Short-term	Yes: Electoral tribunal had improved information technology, stronger planning/training, improved registries.
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	Yes
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	strengthened Electoral Tribunal; voter motivation & participation program; elections free & fair
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	No
b	Deviant case	No
c	Importance of case	Yes (importance of Panama to U.S.)
d	To have heterogeneous cases	No
e	Data availability	No
f	Probability sampling	No
g	Familiarity	Some role.
h	Other (name)	Desire to correct problems in prior election.
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	One country over time.
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	Yes

	How many?	40 people Annex B US Embassy Panama; USAID/Panama; Panama Electoral Tribunal; Modennoble-Mega Advertising Agency; Commission de Paz y Justicia; Centro Pro-Democracia; USAID/W/IRM; Electoral Tribunal of Costa Rica.
2)	Documents types?	Yes see Annex C
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	21/2 weeks in Panama Oct '94 reviewing documents & interviewing key informants from Electoral Tribunal, implementing organizations, USAID/Panama, & US Embassy. 2 members of evaluation team went to Costa Rica to talk to additional participants. Visit to Provincial Electoral Tribunal offices.
	Places in country	Outside the capital cities
4)	Quantitative	Mostly, No
5)	Other	.
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	No controls
2)	Case selection	
3)	Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	Yes
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes (receptive environment for activities)
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	No, though suggest that "supportive atmosphere" contributed to success.
1)	Within country	
2)	Foreign	mentioned
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Yes, bad prior election
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	sometimes
b	Measures explicitly defined	some
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	NA
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	No
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Yes
b	Integrated?	somewhat
c	Background factors considered in report	Yes, p.ii high commitment to hold free, fair, & open elections in 1994 shared by President Endara, the Electoral Tribunal Magistrates, the political parties, & citizens. Project took advantage of favorable climate.

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a	Document Number
b	Title
c	Countries in Study
d	Year of Evaluation
e	Author of Evaluation
2 Activity Characteristics	
a	Name of Sector
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?
c	Main target groups
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)
e	Match with DG definition of sector
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?
g	Input to sector activities:
1)	What was spent?
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)
3)	What was done?
4)	When?
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?
i	What outcomes were considered?
1)	Individual
2)	Group
3)	Institutional
4)	Country
5)	Long-term
6)	Short-term
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a	Values of outcome
b	Deviant case
c	Importance of case
d	To have heterogeneous cases
e	Data availability
f	Probability sampling
g	Familiarity
h	Other (name)
4 Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal
b	Research method
1)	Interviews
	How many?
2)	Documents
	types?

3)	Fieldwork?	Yes (through interviews)
	Time in country	Oct 18 to Nov 15, 2001
	Places in country	Unclear
4)	Quantitative	Mostly qualitative, except advocacy index & number in programs
5)	Other	Desk studies of political change (in the initial stage of research).
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	yes
2)	Case selection	no
3)	Other methods	no
d	Country context considered?	yes
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	No, though local conditions mentioned
1)	Within country	
2)	Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Local conditions influenced USAID's perception of what was needed.
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	Partially
b	Measures explicitly defined	Some
c	Alternative measures considered	Yes
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	NA
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	Partially
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Yes
b	Integrated?	Yes
c	Background factors considered in report	Changing economic and political conditions

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a Document Number	PD-ABC-689
b Title	Project completion report: Human Rights support project
c Countries in Study	Bangladesh
d Year of Evaluation	1995
e Author of Evaluation	USAID/Bangladesh
2 Activity Characteristics	
a Name of Sector	Rule of Law
b Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	
c Main target groups	NGOs
d Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	training on human rights; investigations of human rights abuses
e Match with DG definition of sector	yes
f Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	?
g Input to sector activities:	
1) What was spent?	\$42,961
2) Personnel involved (person hours)	N/A
3) What was done?	training (100 volunteers); 25 h.r. abuses investigations
4) When?	1990-1991
5) Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	Bangladesh Society for the Enforcement of Human Rights
h Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	
i What outcomes were considered?	
1) Individual	
2) Group	train base of volunteers for h.r. abuses
3) Institutional	
4) Country	
5) Long-term	improve capacity of investigating h.r. abuses
6) Short-term	
j Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	N/A
k Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	no information
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
this is not an evaluation/none of the following questions can be answered due to lack of information	
a Values of outcome	
b Deviant case	
c Importance of case	
d To have heterogeneous cases	
e Data availability	
f Probability sampling	
g Familiarity	
h Other (name)	
4 Research Design	
a Cross-sectional or longitudinal	

b	Research method	
	1) Interviews	
	How many?	
	2) Documents	
	types?	
	3) Fieldwork?	
	Time in country	
	Places in country	
	4) Quantitative	
	5) Other	
c	Method of Control	
	1) No controls	
	2) Case selection	
	3) Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
	1) Within country	
	2) Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	
b	Measures explicitly defined	
c	Alternative measures considered	
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	
f	Reliability discussed	
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	
b	Integrated?	
c	Background factors considered in report	

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a	Document Number PD-ABG-772
b	Title General Evaluation Report of Interdisciplinary Course
c	Countries in Study LAC
d	Year of Evaluation 1988
e	Author of Evaluation Joseph Thompson, Interamerican Institute of Human Rights
2 Activity Characteristics	
a	Name of <i>Sector</i> Rule of Law
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities? Promoting respect for human rights through intro to human rights; exchange of experience; creating a network of local support groups;
c	Main <i>target</i> groups primarily NGOs but not totally clear
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll) training course
e	Match with DG definition of sector no info
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG? no info
g	Input to sector activities:
1)	What was spent? no info
2)	Personnel involved (person hours) no info
3)	What was done? training for over 100 participants
4)	When? not clear: this course was 1 of ??? in a series
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities? Interamerican Institute of Human Rights
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well? no info
i	What outcomes were considered? not clear
1)	Individual
2)	Group
3)	Institutional
4)	Country
5)	Long-term
6)	Short-term
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do? not clear
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level? not clear
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
this is an evaluation of 1 course	
a	Values of outcome
b	Deviant case
c	Importance of case
d	To have heterogeneous cases
e	Data availability questionnaires handed to the participants and direct observation of the course by the evaluator who was also course director
f	Probability sampling none
g	Familiarity
h	Other (name)
4 Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal
b	Research method
1)	Interviews
	How many?
2)	Documents
	types?
	questionnaires handed to the participants
3)	Fieldwork?

	Time in country	
	Places in country	
4)	Quantitative	
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	X
2)	Case selection	
3)	Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	no
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	no information about the country in which the course took place
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	
2)	Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	no
b	Measures explicitly defined	no
c	Alternative measures considered	no
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	no
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	no
f	Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	no
b	Integrated?	no
c	Background factors considered in report	no

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a Document Number	
b Title	The transition to sustainable democracy in South Africa and the strategic role of USAID: Case studies in program impact
c Countries in Study	South Africa
d Year of Evaluation	2000
e Author of Evaluation	MSI
2 Activity Characteristics	
a Name of Sector	General
b Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	Not clear, but if we define "overarching strategies" as something in column D of Sheet2, then they were used.
c Main target groups	Various (See Seet2)
d Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	(1) Justice and human rights: building court houses in Transkei, support of the Human Right Commission in drafting equality legislation, human rights education, establishing mediation and arbitration programs, training of historically disadvantaged legal professionals, and creation of a network of legal advice centers in rural South Africa.
e Match with DG definition of sector	Yes
f Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Seemed so.
g Input to sector activities:	See Sheet2. They noted they did not present all the activities they had undertaken. The presentation is inconsistent in terms of a set of key information it should have included.
1) What was spent?	No info if at all.
2) Personnel involved (person hours)	
3) What was done?	
4) When?	
5) Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	
h Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	See Sheet2
i What outcomes were considered?	See Sheet2
1) Individual	
2) Group	
3) Institutional	
4) Country	
5) Long-term	
6) Short-term	
j Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	Mixed, and even when the evaluation seems to suggest it went well, it is not necessarily clear.
k Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	Seemed so, although they do not isolate the contribution of the AID program.
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a Values of outcome	Not clear
b Deviant case	No
c Importance of case	Yes
d To have heterogeneous cases	No (But South African study is one of the cases in their pilot three-country study, where three countries has a good regional spread).
e Data availability	Yes (South African study is one of the cases in their pilot three-county study; and AID's democracy program was in place for the 95-00 period).
f Probability sampling	No
g Familiarity	Yes (South African study is one of the cases in their pilot three-county study; and AID's democracy program was in place for the 95-00 period).
h Other (name)	Similar cases in terms of high political competition, medium SES and large program size.
4 Research Design	
a Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal

b	Research method	
	1) Interviews	Yes
	How many?	Not clear
	2) Documents	Yes
	types?	Not clear
	3) Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	Not clear
	Places in country	Outside the capital cities
	4) Quantitative	No
	5) Other	Desk studies of political change (in the initial stage of research).
c	Method of Control	
	1) No controls	No Controls
	2) Case selection	No
	3) Other methods	No
d	Country context considered?	Yes
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes (provided in the background info p.6)
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	No (although the presence of assistance by other local/international contractors is mentioned in some part).
	1) Within country	No
	2) Foreign	No
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Yes (provided in the background info p.4-)
5	Measurement	
	a Concepts explicitly defined	No
	b Measures explicitly defined	No
	c Alternative measures considered	No
	d Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	N/A
	e Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	No
	f Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
	a Provided?	Yes
	b Integrated?	Yes, to some degree
	c Background factors considered in report	Yes

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a	Document Number
b	Title Final Evaluation: The Office of Transition Initiatives Program in East Timor
c	Countries in Study East Timor
d	Year of Evaluation 10/02 to 11/02
e	Author of Evaluation Development Associates, Inc. (p. 10 "The OTI representatives in East Timor...and the day staff members assigned to East Timor forged a united team that presented a seamless front to external actors. There was no distinction between OTI and DAI in their 'coherent relationship.'"); International Organization for Migration (as a procurement mechanism, through a cooperative agreement; p.14)
2 Activity Characteristics	
a	Name of <i>Sector</i> General
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities? Yes (p.8)
c	Main <i>target</i> groups Various (Individuals, East Timorese NGOs, community organizations, media, government institutions, other entities)
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll) Small grants for equipment procurement for institutional reconstruction; Economic recovery projects; Democratic development projects; Interaction with other actors
e	Match with DG definition of sector Yes, except for the program for promoting the economic recovery
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG? Yes (e.g., p.33 bottom)
g	Input to sector activities:
1)	What was spent? \$17M (514 grants and related activities); \$3.9M for TEP (through 469 small projects); \$644,000 for TEPS II (through 61 small projects); \$2,051,398 for BELE (88 projects). Support NGO: 23 \$8,000 to \$25,000 grants. Support Media \$3M (investment in the print consortium \$169,566); (\$74,333, \$100,123, and \$114,963 from 2000-2002 for ex-guerrilla reintegration).
2)	Personnel involved (person hours) No info
3)	What was done? (1) Economic recovery: TEP (in 2000, grants to repair/rehabilitate schools, markets, water facilities, public buildings in all districts of the country, putting 63,000 people in the work force); TEPSII and BELE programs, grants for the in-kind provision of construction materials and commodities needed for the rehabilitation of community-identified facilities for economic recovery; OTI interventions (the technical assistance for the Gov of East Timor, e.g., capacity in diplomatic negotiations, in the public administration structures of the new government, training for statisticians). (2) Democracy: to promote access to information and citizen participation (media program, civic education, work with NGOs and other activities. P.26-28.); to assist building government capacity and provide technical assistance/consultations; to provide training of judicial staff, human right training of police, support of legal services organizations, etc. ((3) Ex-guerrilla reintegration).
4)	When? 11/99 (grant approval)-2/00 (OTI opened in East Timor)-10/02; TEP in 2000; TEPS II and BELE till early 2002. NGO support, 2000.
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities? Development Alternatives, Inc. (the primary implementing contractor); Some projects implemented through the UNTAET district administrators. UNDP, WB, OIM, etc.
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well? Yes (and other relief/humanitarian organizations from other countries, other country gov't's donors, UN, UNDP, UNESCO, WB)
i	What outcomes were considered?
1)	Individual Yes
2)	Group Yes
3)	Institutional Yes
4)	Country Yes (and also as a demonstrable foreign policy achievement; e.g., p.4, p.24)
5)	Long-term Yes
6)	Short-term Yes
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do? (1) Economic Recovery: TEP: Yes; TEPS II and BELE: No; (2) Democratic Development: Public access to info and participation in government: Yes (with some caveat, e.g., p.41); Political institution strengthening: Yes; Rule of law: Yes (with some caveat, p.50-);
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level? Yes
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a	Values of outcome No

b	Deviant case	No
c	Importance of case	Yes (a country in political transition processes; p.4; p.19).
d	To have heterogeneous cases	No
e	Data availability	No
f	Probability sampling	No
g	Familiarity	No
h	Other (name)	No
4	Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	Yes
	How many?	more than 100 conducted with key informants in and beyond East Timor (in the latter case, it is done via email and telephone).
2)	Documents	Yes
	types?	Internal USAID and OTI documents concerning the program in East Timor; relevant internal and external studies and evaluations.
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	No info
	Places in country	Seven districts beyond the capital city of Dili.
4)	Quantitative	No
5)	Other	Database analysis (random sampling to see the range and the breadth of activities supported by OTI. P.48.
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	Yes
2)	Case selection	No
3)	Other methods	No
d	Country context considered?	Yes
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes (p.1-3)
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	Yes (e.g., p.11, saying things worked due more to personalities than to coherent management structures)
2)	Foreign	No (although the presence of other donors is mentioned).
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Yes (p.1-3)
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	Not explicitly
b	Measures explicitly defined	Not explicitly
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	N/A
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	Yes (p.7)
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Yes
b	Integrated?	Yes
c	Background factors considered in report	Yes

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	
b	Title	A Mid Term Evaluation of the Democracy Network Project in Slovakia
c	Countries in Study	Slovakia
d	Year of Evaluation	1997
e	Author of Evaluation	Biddle Associates
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of Sector	Civil Society
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities?	Yes (p.2; p.5)
c	Main target groups	Public-policy oriented organizations that worked in AID's priority areas of democracy, environment, economic growth and social welfare.
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	Grants to indigenous NGOs in the four sectoral areas above; the provision of training and technical assistance (p.3-4).
e	Match with DG definition of sector	Yes
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Yes
g	Input to sector activities:	
	1) What was spent?	\$3,000,000 (pursuant to a Cooperative Agreement with FCS); 48 sub-grants (averaging \$24,800, \$1.2 mil in total thus fare) through a competitive selection process
	2) Personnel involved (person hours)	The number not provided.
	3) What was done?	Grants with which grantees to "provide expertise and skills to indigenous NGOs in the area of public policy advocacy and manage two sets of activities, i.e., the making of sub-grants including the development of criteria, the design of a transparent selection process, advisory assistance to sub-grantees, monitoring and evaluation and assurance of geographic, ethnic, and gender balance (more details in p.12-13); the provision of general institution building support in such areas as strategic marketing, membership development and financial planning, and the development of alliances and networks." Training and technical assistance through workshops and consultations, from the short term technical assistance program which provides funds for consultants and advisors, and from a "voucher" program which makes small awards to cover the costs of participation in workshops and seminars and through staff consultations.(p.3)
	4) When?	3/1995, three years (set forth in 8/94)
	5) Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	the Foundation for a Civil Society (FCS)
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Not mentioned.
i	What outcomes were considered?	
	1) Individual	Not explicitly discussed
	2) Group	Mostly
	3) Institutional	Mostly (the NGO sector), but for one point the impact and the initial assessment seem to be conflated.
	4) Country	Yes (as the philosophical goal of the whole project)
	5) Long-term	Yes (as the philosophical goal of the whole project)
	6) Short-term	Yes
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	They claim it was to some degree. However, (1) the text in the findings part is mostly narrative without any comparison group, and thus readers will find it difficult to understand the actual, specific magnitude of impacts/effectiveness; (2) as it is a mid-term evaluation, many of the specific goals do not seem to be achieved yet (e.g., building up organizational capacities, etc).
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	Not significantly seemed so.
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	No
b	Deviant case	Not explicitly claimed, but implied by mentioning attitudinal changes and citizen participation
c	Importance of case	Not explicitly claimed
d	To have heterogeneous cases	No
e	Data availability	Not explicitly claimed
f	Probability sampling	No

g	Familiarity	Not explicitly claimed
h	Other (name)	One of the individual country projects of the Democracy Network Program.
4	Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	Yes
	How many?	Not clear, but they interviewed with a variety of people involved in the Project (p.1; p.12; p.13 and there is supposed to be an appendix for this info.)
2)	Documents	Yes
	types?	A selective reading of proposals and sub-grant synopses
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	2/17/1997 to 3/7/1997
	Places in country	Various places (including the NY headquarters of the fCS, AID/Washington, AID/Slovakia), rural areas of Slovakia are also implied.
4)	Quantitative	No
5)	Other	No
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	No control
2)	Case selection	No
3)	Other methods	No
d	Country context considered?	Yes (e.g., the sociocultural legacy of the communist rule)
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Probably
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	No
2)	Foreign	No (but the presence of foreign donors is mentioned)
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Seemed so.
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	Yes (they provide an extensive discussion about the concept "public policy" and "sustainability").
b	Measures explicitly defined	No
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	N/A
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	No
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Yes
b	Integrated?	Yes
c	Background factors considered in report	Yes

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	
b	Title	Weighing in on the scales of justice: strategic approaches for donor-supported rule of law programs
c	Countries in Study	Argentina, Columbia, Honduras, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Uruguay
d	Year of Evaluation	1992 (18 months)
e	Author of Evaluation	CDIE
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of Sector	ROL
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	Yes (Four major strategies, but it seems that the strategic framework presented is rather a post-hoc categorization constructed by the evaluator, than the one outlined prior to the implementation of the programs. Also, it looks they are using the word "strategy" at different levels, e.g., p.36 Table.7. These "strategies" are called "program elements" or "activities" in Chapter 4 and Table.2). Further, they use the words "strategy" and "tactics" in an interexchangeable manner in p.36.
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	Various
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	Various across the countries (e.g., public polls, media investigative reporting, mobilizing/advocacy for marginal groups and elites, recruitment of/training for public defenders/mediators/investigators/prosecutors/judges, judicial/law school/library aid, ARD, etc)
e	Match with DG definition of sector	Mostly, although some overlap with Civil Society
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Not clear, but probably
g Input to sector activities:		
1)	What was spent?	\$2.0M for Argentina; \$2.7M in 86-91 and \$36M in 92-96 for Columbia; \$15.8M for Honduras; \$2.3M for Philippines; \$1.5M for Sri Lanka; \$0.85 for Uruguay.
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	Not clear
3)	What was done?	Various, see 2d above and p.17.
4)	When?	FY1989-93 for Argentina, FY 1986-96 for Colombia, FY 1987-94 for Honduras, FY 1988-93 for Philippines, FY 1980-93 for Sri Lanka, FY 1990-93 for Uruguay.
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	Host country NGOs in Argentina and Columbia, UNDP in Uruguay
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Yes (Asia Foundation; Ford Foundation, other bilateral donors). The evaluation presents the results regardless of the sources of assistance/reform (whether it was from AID, other donors, or even the host country government), thus it does not establish a rigorous scheme of comparison in terms of the possible impact of AID's program.
i What outcomes were considered?		
1)	Individual	Yes
2)	Group	Yes
3)	Institutional	Yes
4)	Country	Yes
5)	Long-term	Yes
6)	Short-term	Yes
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	Mixed and various across the countries. The presentation of the findings is basically according to the four overarching strategies, but not necessarily in line with the "objectives" or activities (the success/failure of each activities is used as an example for presenting "lessons learned."
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	Not clear
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	Not explicitly
b	Deviant case	No
c	Importance of case	No
d	To have heterogeneous cases	Yes (the level of development)
e	Data availability	Yes
f	Probability sampling	No

	g	Familiarity	Yes
	h	Other (name)	None
4	Research Design		
	a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal
	b	Research method	
	1)	Interviews	Yes
		How many?	Not clear
	2)	Documents	Not explicitly mentioned
		types?	Not explicitly mentioned
	3)	Fieldwork?	Yes
		Time in country	9/93 to 10/93 in Argentina, 6/92 to 7/92 in Columbia, 8/92 to 9/92 in Honduras, 3/93 to 4/93 in Philippines, 7/93 to 8/93 in Sri Lanka, 9/93 to 10/93 in Uruguay.
		Places in country	Not clear
	4)	Quantitative	No
	5)	Other	None
	c	Method of Control	
	1)	No controls	Yes
	2)	Case selection	No
	3)	Other methods	No
	d	Country context considered?	Yes
	e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes (during the process the program unfolded)
	f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
	1)	Within country	No
	2)	Foreign	No
	g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Seemed so (Chapter 2).
5	Measurement		
	a	Concepts explicitly defined	No
	b	Measures explicitly defined	No
	c	Alternative measures considered	No
	d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	No
	e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	No
	f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information		
	a	Provided?	Yes
	b	Integrated?	Yes
	c	Background factors considered in report	Yes

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information	
a	Document Number PN-ABT-487
b	Title Final Evaluation Report on the First Dominican Legislative Training Program
c	Countries in Study Dominican Republic
d	Year of Evaluation 1983
e	Author of Evaluation City University of NY, Baruch College (Harry P. Pachon)
2 Activity Characteristics	
a	Name of Sector Governance
b	Were overarching strategies used to organize activities? Not explicitly
c	Main target groups Freshman Deputies and Senators of the Dominican national legislature
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll) Provide the first legislative orientation seminar
e	Match with DG definition of sector Yes
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG? Yes (according to the activity table Bruce sent us)
g Input to sector activities:	
1)	What was spent? No info (However, the current evaluations says this is the last one of the four-report series they have done. Thus, such information may be provided in the previous two reports).
2)	Personnel involved (person hours) No info (However, the current evaluations says this is the last one of the four-report series they have done. Thus, such information may be provided in the previous two reports).
3)	What was done? Holding a seminar to inform legislators of the role of the congress and individual legislator's role.
4)	When? July, 1982
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities? Not clear (However, the current evaluations says this is the last one of the four-report series they have done. Thus, such information may be provided in the previous two reports).
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well? Not clear (However, the current evaluations says this is the last one of the four-report series they have done. Thus, such information may be provided in the previous two reports).
i What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual Yes
2)	Group Yes
3)	Institutional Yes
4)	Country Not explicitly
5)	Long-term No (at least not explicitly)
6)	Short-term Yes
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do? Seemed so, although the evaluation is based on perceptions of the respondents.
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level? Not mentioned.
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)	
a	Values of outcome No
b	Deviant case No
c	Importance of case No
d	To have heterogeneous cases No
e	Data availability No
f	Probability sampling No
g	Familiarity Probably yes
h	Other (name) The primary unit of analysis of this study is analysis-wise individual. Although possible implications for the upper levels (institutional or systemic) is mentioned, the basic focus is on individual legislative members.
4 Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal Longitudinal (they evaluated at the immediate end of the session and then six months later to discuss a longitudinal impact).
b	Research method

1)	Interviews	Yes
	How many?	Not clear
2)	Documents	No
	types?	N/A
3)	Fieldwork?	No
	Time in country	N/A
	Places in country	N/A
4)	Quantitative	Yes (descriptive)
5)	Other	Mail questionnaire (N=12; the author warns the return rate was so bad that no conclusive statement can be made from the questionnaire results)
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	No control
2)	Case selection	No
3)	Other methods	No
d	Country context considered?	No
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Not clear
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
1)	Within country	No
2)	Foreign	No
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Not clear
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	No
b	Measures explicitly defined	Somewhat. They talk about variables (e.g., p.13-), yet it is not really clear what these variables theoretically mean in terms of the whole context of the democracy project.
c	Alternative measures considered	No
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	N/A
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	Yes (mentions strengths of in-depth interviews compared to mail questionnaire and the "quality control procedures" i.e., set up a two-person team in order to insure the consistent and value-free format).
f	Reliability discussed	Yes (the "quality control procedures" i.e., set up a two-person team in order to insure the consistent and value-free format).
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	No info (However, the current evaluations says this is the last one of the four-report series they have done. Thus, such information may be provided in the previous two reports).
b	Integrated?	No
c	Background factors considered in report	No

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PN-ABN-236
b	Title	Interim Evaluation Project on Legal and Regulatory Reform in Hungary
c	Countries in Study	Hungary
d	Year of Evaluation	1994
e	Author of Evaluation	Center for International Private Enterprise
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	Governance
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	1. Press and media coverage; 2. Expressions of interest through requests for information; 3. Direct citing of project in political and legislative debates; 4. level and extent of participation in conference or other project activities; 5. Enacting of any recommendations of project
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	public policy research institutes, private business community/associations
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	development of research and advocacy programs in areas of legal and regulatory reform
e	Match with DG definition of sector	yes
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Public opinion poll conducted, conference held, and publications distributed as part of program activities
g	Input to sector activities:	
1)	What was spent?	1 million for entire project
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	Advisory board of 12 people; public policy groups and private sector groups; 1 director and 3 logistics and research support staff (Hungarian)
3)	What was done?	Conference organized; public opinion poll conducted; report published
4)	When?	1992-1994
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	public policy groups; private sector groups
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Not mentioned
i	What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual	
2)	Group	Yes
3)	Institutional	Yes
4)	Country	
5)	Long-term	Yes
6)	Short-term	
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	The public opinion poll was effective in determining people's attitudes
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	Yes - had a national conference and report presented at meeting of Hungarian Academy of Science (p. 8)
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	
b	Deviant case	
c	Importance of case	
d	To have heterogeneous cases	None
e	Data availability	
f	Probability sampling	
g	Familiarity	Not sure
h	Other (name)	
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	Longitudinal
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	Yes
	How many?	Indefinite

2)	Documents types?	Yes Related articles and news clippings attached
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	1 week
	Places in country	Budapest
4)	Quantitative	No
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	
2)	Case selection	
3)	Other methods	Based on evaluation forms filled out during conference
d	Country context considered?	Yes, pp. 4-6; public opinion poll considered
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	Yes, p. 4: HDF party called for elections which eventually led USAID to postpone some of its program activities
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	Somewhat - looked at how the introduction of new concepts, such as advocacy, also helped to break new ground in promoting reform
1)	Within country	Yes
2)	Foreign	No
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	Based on previous CIPE program in Hungary involving U.S. Chamber of Commerce
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	Could be better
b	Measures explicitly defined	Yes, pp. 7-8
c	Alternative measures considered	
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	
f	Reliability discussed	No
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	Yes
b	Integrated?	Yes
c	Background factors considered in report	Yes

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PN-ABJ-691
b	Title	Report of Tax Reform in Somalia: Evaluation of the Recommendations and Suggestions for Implementation
c	Countries in Study	Somalia
d	Year of Evaluation	1989
e	Author of Evaluation	International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI), Inc.
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	Governance
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	The report corresponds to the requirements enlisted in the scope of work - see pp. 3-4 for scope of work points.
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	Tax Reform Commission; legislators
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	review tax laws, advise on tax collection and laws and make recommendations for improvement, provide training for staff dealing with tax related issues
e	Match with DG definition of sector	Yes
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	Yes
g	Input to sector activities:	
1)	What was spent?	NA
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	Tax Reform Commission was main group involved - had 40 members
3)	What was done?	review tax laws, advise on tax collection and laws and make recommendations for improvement, provide training for staff dealing with tax related issues
4)	When?	1988-1989
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	Tax Reform Commission, ministers
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	Not mentioned
i	What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual	Yes
2)	Group	Yes
3)	Institutional	Yes
4)	Country	
5)	Long-term	Yes
6)	Short-term	
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	Yes and no
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	Yes
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	
b	Deviant case	
c	Importance of case	
d	To have heterogeneous cases	no
e	Data availability	have addendum reports in other languages
f	Probability sampling	
g	Familiarity	
h	Other (name)	
4 Research Design		
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	longitudinal
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	Yes

	How many?	Informal and indefinite number with USAID/Mogadishu officials, Ministry of Finance officials, Treasury officials, and Tax Reform Commission officials
2)	Documents types?	Yes based on two previously prepared reports authored by ISTI on the tax structure and administration
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	12 days
	Places in country	
4)	Quantitative	no - resources unavailable
5)	Other	
c	Method of Control	
	1) No controls	
	2) Case selection	
	3) Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	Yes - new taxes introduced while TRC work in progress
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	yes - new taxes influenced need for new programming activities
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	
	1) Within country	
	2) Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	yes
b	Measures explicitly defined	no
c	Alternative measures considered	no
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	no
f	Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	yes
b	Integrated?	yes
c	Background factors considered in report	yes

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PD-ABM-573
b	Title	Evaluation of PIREd the Umbrella Management Unit of the Democracy Enhancement Project
c	Countries in Study	Haiti
d	Year of Evaluation	1995
d	Author of Evaluation	Patrick Fn'Piere, Sherif Rushdy for USAID/Haiti
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	DG with emphasis on civil society and local governance
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	institutional strengthening
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	PIRED sub-grantees were supposed to work civil society, political parties, electoral commission, National Assembly, and local government institutions
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	management of PIREd sub-grantees
e	Match with DG definition of sector	N/A
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	N/A
g	Input to sector activities:	
1)	What was spent?	\$6.5 million
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	no info
3)	What was done?	PIRED selected sub-grantees and helped them to develop activities of strengthening institutions of democracy in Haiti
4)	When?	1991-1995
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	PIRED was comprised of American Development Foundation (ADF) and 2 sub-contractors DATEX, Inc. and World Learning
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	no
i	What outcomes were considered?	
1)	Individual	no
2)	Group	yes
3)	Institutional	yes
4)	Country	Haiti
5)	Long-term	yes
6)	Short-term	difficult to say
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	yes, especially considering a radical change of political conditions after the coup in 1991: PIREd was able to adapt its operations to a constantly changing environment
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	yes
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	no information
b	Deviant case	no
c	Importance of case	N/A
d	To have heterogenous cases	N/A
e	Data availability	PIRED program information and reports were accessible
f	Probability sampling	no
g	Familiarity	no

	h Other (name)	study designed to draw lessons learned
4	Research Design	
	a Cross-sectional or longitudinal	
	b Research method	
	1) Interviews	yes, in depth
	How many?	at least 74 people were contracted, but it is not clear how many were interviewed
	2) Documents	yes
	types?	PIRED program documents, PIREP reports to USAID/Haiti, sub-contractors documents
	3) Fieldwork?	yes
	Time in country	19 days
	Places in country	no information
	4) Quantitative	no
	5) Other	
	c Method of Control	
	1) No controls	no controls
	2) Case selection	single case study
	3) Other methods	no
	d Country context considered?	yes
	e Does country-context influence USAID activity?	yes, a profound impact on the programs due to coup d'etat in 1991; programs was temporarily suspended and then re-started with modifications
	f Alternative explanations ruled out?	
	1) Within country	N/A
	2) Foreign	N/A
	g Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	yes, democratic election in 1990
5	Measurement	
	a Concepts explicitly defined	not very
	b Measures explicitly defined	no
	c Alternative measures considered	no
	d Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	
	e Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	no
	f Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
	a Provided?	yes
	b Integrated?	yes
	c Background factors considered in report	yes

Please note that this is not an evaluation of a DG programs but an evaluation of a management abilities of PIREP. Although PIREP was contracted by USAID/Haiti to facilitate the performance of DG activities of its grantees, these activities are not a subject of the document coded here.

TEMPLATE QUESTIONS

1 Basic Information		
a	Document Number	PD-ABP-402
b	Title	Final Report: The IFES Interim Evaluation
c	Countries in Study	All regions
d	Year of Evaluation	1993
d	Author of Evaluation	Thunder & Associates
2 Activity Characteristics		
a	Name of <i>Sector</i>	Elections
b	Were overarching <i>strategies</i> used to organize activities?	yes
c	Main <i>target</i> groups	poll workers, citizens, electoral officials
d	Activities (e.g., training of judges, public opinion poll)	pre-electoral assessment, technical on-site electoral assistance, poll worker training, identification and provision of electoral commodities, civic education, election observation, symposiums, conferences and exchanges among electoral officials, development of electoral resource center and data base, and publications
e	Match with DG definition of sector	yes
f	Evidence missions are following strategies outlined by DG?	yes
g Input to sector activities:		
1)	What was spent?	unclear
2)	Personnel involved (person hours)	unclear
3)	What was done?	see activities answer above
4)	When?	began in 1991
5)	Which NGOs undertook the sector activities?	
h	Did other donors fund those NGOs as well?	
i What outcomes were considered?		
1)	Individual	yes
2)	Group	yes
3)	Institutional	yes
4)	Country	yes
5)	Long-term	yes
6)	Short-term	
j	Was a sector activity effective in what it was specifically designed to do?	yes but the evaluators identified problem areas
k	Did the sector activities have an impact at the national (democracy) level?	yes
3 Sample Selection (country or area selection)		
a	Values of outcome	n/a
b	Deviant case	n/a
c	Importance of case	
d	To have heterogeneous cases	looked at programming across countries

e	Data availability	yes - provided appendix of reports and individuals consulted
f	Probability sampling	
g	Familiarity	yes
h	Other (name)	
4	Research Design	
a	Cross-sectional or longitudinal	both cross-sectional and longitudinal
b	Research method	
1)	Interviews	Yes
	How many?	Phone and in-person interviews; appendix provides list of individuals interviewed
2)	Documents	Review of reports and manuals produced by IFES
	types?	Appendix provides list of documents reviewed - IFES publications
3)	Fieldwork?	Yes
	Time in country	
	Places in country	
4)	Quantitative	no
5)	Other	questionnaire distributed - 12 responses received
c	Method of Control	
1)	No controls	
2)	Case selection	
3)	Other methods	
d	Country context considered?	somewhat
e	Does country-context influence USAID activity?	
f	Alternative explanations ruled out?	looked at other programming by U.S. NGOs in elections
1)	Within country	
2)	Foreign	
g	Did prior change in sector bring in USAID activity?	
5	Measurement	
a	Concepts explicitly defined	yes
b	Measures explicitly defined	yes
c	Alternative measures considered	
d	Same variables in each country (if multiple countries)	yes
e	Validity of measures discussed (within or between countries)	
f	Reliability discussed	no
6	Background Information	
a	Provided?	very little
b	Integrated?	very little
c	Background factors considered in report	very little