

OFFICE OF DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE

"..promoting the transition to and consolidation of democratic regimes throughout the world."

HANDBOOK ON QUALITATIVE INDICATORS



March 2005

Technical Publication Series

Office of Democracy and Governance
Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance
U.S. Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-3100

PREFACE

Handbook on Qualitative Indicators (HQI) complements the first publication on indicators, *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (August 1998)*. *HQI* emerges from the Office of Democracy and Governance's (DG Office) second generation of work on indicators, which refines those in the first handbook and develops new qualitative alternatives. The *HQI* reflects the changing nature of guidance from an earlier preference for more quantitative indicators to acceptance and support for the use of qualitative ones. The Agency recognizes the ability of good qualitative indicators to better capture certain fundamental elements or aspects of democratic development. This change reflects the Agency and DG Office's more sophisticated approach to democratic development, concomitant programming and the need for clearer articulation of results.

HQI's genesis is in response to strong mission demand for technical assistance on qualitative indicators based on a 1999 DG Office-sponsored survey. In response, the DG Office developed an agenda for future indicator work. Missions view qualitative indicators both as a necessary complement or alternative to quantitative indicators and as a means of asking questions about institutions, processes, behaviors, degree and nature of democratic changes. Qualitative indicators permit missions to pose questions and capture data on the degree and nature of these changes and multi-faceted concepts like effectiveness, participation, impunity or responsiveness. *HQI* is designed and structured to provide detailed guidance to DG officers looking to capture and measure these concepts. As a practical and functional handbook, six illustrative qualitative indicators are presented along with their application and appropriate use.

The *HQI* represents the work of many people over several years. It has been difficult to keep up with a rapidly changing field, and even more rapid changes in priorities within our own agency. Much of the credit for this handbook goes to Robin Silver, the primary author. During her two years as a Democracy Fellow, she conducted extensive field interviews and wrote the entire first draft while serving on the Strategies Team in the DG Office. Karen Farrell, the first editor, significantly contributed to the structure of this report and supplied guidance for its completion. Michelle Schimpp deserves credit for offering the vision for the second draft, which included valuable suggestions for making the handbook a more hands-on, reference manual for quick use in the field. Kristin Lantz, a Presidential Management Fellow on loan from the Department of Labor, is responsible for reincarnating the first draft and synthesizing these visions into a single product. KC Choe, on the Strategies Team, made the final edits and re-formatted the structure to make it more user-friendly.

The *HQI*, like the *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* that preceded it, cannot provide complete details these indicators deserve either in full discussion on their use in general or the burgeoning literature that is related to qualitative analysis. Interested readers are urged to peruse additional references and material noted throughout the *HQI*, which provide valuable insights and comparative research that may ignite the imagination of readers looking for further ways to measure their progress in supporting improvements in democratic governance.



HANDBOOK ON QUALITATIVE INDICATORS

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PART 1 QUALITATIVE INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Why are Indicators Important?	1
B. How are Indicators Applied?.....	2
C. What is the Process for Developing Indicators?.....	2
II. STEP 2: DEVELOPING AND SELECTING INDICATORS.....	3
A. Step A: Select Type of Indicator.....	3
B. Step B: Deciding on the Qualitative Indicator.....	5
C. Step C: Selecting the Assessment Tool.....	5
D. Step D: Measurement Tools: How to Measure Change?	7

PART 2: ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS

I. INTRODUCTION TO QUALITATIVE INDICATORS.....	15
Section A: Civil Society.....	17
More Sustainable Coalitions	20
Increased Policy Dialogue	24
CSO/NGO capacity.....	28
Section B: Local Government	33
Increased Participation in Local Government.....	37
Responsive Local Government.....	39
Private/Public Collaboration on Service Delivery.....	41
Additional Indicators (Milestones).....	43
Section C: Anti-Corruption	43
Degree to which Oversight Mechanism Executes Mandate or Assumes Functions.....	
Hybrid Indicator: Degree to Which Oversight Mechanism Executes Mandates or Performs Tasks.....	
Quantitative Indicator: Number of Internal Affairs/Auditing Offices that Perform X or More of the Functions Listed Below.....	
Section D: Political Party Assistance.....	53
More Competitive Political Processes.....	57
Section E: Rule of Law.....	61
Rule of Law Chart.....	63

PART 3 APPENDIX.....	71
Appendix A: Civil society Organization Advocacy Index.....	72
Appendix B: Example of an Index for Assessing the Quality of Legislative Processes.....	74
Appendix C: Example of a Milestone Scale for Measuring Progress in Achieving a Legal Reform.....	75
Appendix D: Scorecards.....	76
Appendix E: Scorecard for “Local Government Autonomy Enhanced”.....	77
Appendix F: Addressing Auditing Concerns: Practical Tips from the Inspector General’s Office.....	79
Appendix G: Secondary Data Sources.....	81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Handbook on Qualitative Indicators (HQI)* complements and should be used in conjunction with the *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Indicators* (August 1998). Most of *HQI* is dedicated to introducing illustrative indicators in several program areas. Specific criteria were used to determine which indicators to develop and include in this handbook. These illustrative indicators serve as examples only and are not necessarily representative of current programming in the dynamic conditions of the field. However, the illustrative indicators included in the *HQI* are products of strong field demand and interest, new program areas, subjects not addressed in the *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Indicators*, and subjects (or changes) not captured by quantitative indicators. *HQI* addresses the following:

- What are qualitative indicators? How do they differ from other indicators, particularly quantitative indicators?
- Why and when would a mission use qualitative indicators?
- What models or structures can prove useful for performance measurement and program management?
- Are there specific illustrative indicator models missions can use?
- What guidance do PPC and IG offer on qualitative indicators?

HQI describes different indicator types - quantitative, qualitative, and hybrid (which quantify qualitative data). It offers direction on how to choose among these types and design indicators that meet Agency standards. *HQI* contains several qualitative indicator models, which are presented in detail in *Part 1* of this handbook, followed by illustrative indicators in *Part 2*. Some indicators take the form of questionnaires or structured outlines for assessments. A few indicators are formatted like indexes, while other indicators are constructed as stages or continua. All qualitative indicators serve as the basis for measuring change over time through short narrative assessments.



PART I

QUALITATIVE INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT



I. INTRODUCTION

Qualitative indicators, by definition, measure change over time against specific, predetermined criteria. Unlike their quantitative counterparts, they do not strictly involve enumeration, which allows them to surpass other measurements of analysis as well as provide specific and nuanced information. Qualitative measurements are best suited for measuring progress that are complex, multi-faceted or multi-dimensional, and are suited for the various dimensions of democratization. They address the broad picture, the detailed nature of the change or process, or the evolution of relationships among institutions, groups, individuals, or phenomena. In addition to qualitative indicators, use of hybrid indicators that quantify qualitative data will be discussed in this handbook.

To ensure missions develop the type of indicators, including qualitative indicators, best suited for their programming needs, indicators should be clearly defined, measures what is supposed to be measured, and control for data. Key questions, further presented in *Part 2: Illustrative Qualitative Indicators*, can help program managers ensure they are using indicator measurements effectively.

A. Why are Indicators Important?

Project development has changed over time to meet the demands and needs of the many stakeholders involved. Good indicators are important tools of design, implementation and monitoring, and evaluation of current development projects. The following are some of the reasons why indicators are needed in the Office of Democracy and Governance:

1. Better Understanding of Democracy

Over the past 15 years, democracy and governance (DG) has risen to the fore as a foreign policy priority. DG programming fulfills diverse needs in the global community from the prevention to management of failed and failing states to the building of ethics codes. Since the initiation of wide-scale DG programming, there has been growth and refinement in the literature on democratic reforms and on democratization. Better understanding of transitions - of how reforms do or do not coalesce into political change - creates a wealth of knowledge vital for current and future DG programs.

2. Increasing Demand for Accountability and Clearer Articulation of Results

With the expansion in DG programming, there has been an increasing demand for accountability outside USAID as well as from USAID leadership in making resource allocations. This demand has translated into greater program emphasis in monitoring and evaluation of projects, and developing practical ways to make project impacts more attributable to USAID-funded interventions. More recently, the DG Office is capturing results from impending shifts in strategy direction, changes in programming and activities to respond to sudden democracy momentums.

3. Learning from our Experiences: What Works and What Does Not?

In addition to the increased demand for accountability, our experiences are being examined more generally and comparatively to learn best practices to apply towards future programs. The DG Office is analyzing the impact of democracy and governance programs over the past decade, to determine what has and has not to then disseminate and share the results of the analyses, and incorporate findings into program activities.

B. How are Indicators Applied?

1. Changes in Mission Needs

Missions find themselves at a critical juncture when DG program emphases are shifting from fluid political and economic environments to critically emerging problems (i.e., failing states, drastic increases in crime, corruption) that are especially destructive to reform. With the expansion of DG programming, there is an increasing demand for accountability and need for USAID to apply successful program strategies. Missions are challenged to devise new ways of measuring the performance of their DG programs for better program management, streamlined reporting, communication, and outreach.

DG indicators supply critical information for program management. At the field level, a good indicator provides information whether or not a program is making progress towards anticipated results. It acts as a trigger, and can serve as the first sign that activities may or may not be accomplishing their goals. Good performance measures are useful for contributing to an on-going dialogue with partners about activity management, implementation, and effectiveness; assists DG teams to present both the general thrust and substance of programming; useful as part of portfolio and strategy reviews; and good for conducting external outreach to USAID through discussions with host-country counterparts, local NGOs, and citizens' groups, about medium and long-term DG goals.

C. What is the Process for Developing Indicators?

The full strategic planning and performance monitoring process is explained in the *Handbook on Democracy and Governance Indicators* from Step 1: Strategic Planning, Step 2: Developing and Selecting Indicators, and Step 3: Using Indicators. This handbook will elaborate on the Step 2:

Developing and Selecting Indicators process. Before embarking on the indicators exercise, readers should have gone through Step 1 of the strategic planning process explained in *Handbook on Democracy and Governance Indicators*, briefly explained below.

Step 1: Strategic Planning

Indicators are part of the larger performance monitoring system. Upon completing a strategy, achievable and measurable performance *objectives* must be established. Afterwards, development and selection of appropriate performance *measures* for the set objectives are determined through the use of indicators. The strategic planning process is covered in the *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Indicators* (pages 5-6), and therefore, will not be covered in this section.

II. STEP 2: DEVELOPING & SELECTING INDICATORS

Once each objective has been clearly articulated and defined, DG officers and their partners should ask, "Are targeted results being achieved?" Determining what information is necessary to answer this question *and* how to provide the necessary information is the process of developing performance measurement indicators.

An indicator is one of a variety of mechanisms that can answer the question of how much (or whether) progress is being made toward a certain objective. It measures the performance of a specific program by comparing actual results with expected results. It does not answer the question of why progress is or is not being made.

A. **Step A:** Select Type of Indicator

Although this is a handbook on qualitative indicators, it is important to review the

difference between quantitative and hybrid indicators and qualitative indicators.

1. Quantitative indicators

Quantitative indicators employ some type of count to indicate change. They are usually measured numerically or by percentages. Measuring change through counting allows you to define the precise amount of increase or decrease in impact. Percentage change also suggests a fixed measure of impact. These types of indicators are not well suited for defining trends over multiple activities or a greater length of time in programming. They do not provide you with information about the context or scale of change. These measures are appropriate for showing change in discreet activities or measuring the overall size and type of the population or target group. Depending on the type of project, numerical representations of change might better suit program management needs or immediate reporting expectations.

Some examples of quantitative indicators at the IR level include:

Counts/Absolute Numbers

1. Plural array of independent sources of information encouraged
 - a. # of non-government news sources or private sector news sources that exist
 - b. # of target CSOs publishing bulletins

Percentages

1. Increased use of new information technologies
 - a. % of target CSOs using Internet, with Internet homepage, or using e-mail.
2. Political parties are supportive of the participation of women and disadvantaged groups in political processes
 - a. % of political illustratives who are women
 - b. % of women in party leadership positions

2. Hybrid indicators

Hybrid (or mixed) indicators quantify qualitative data. They best capture data on multifaceted concepts like efficiency, participation, and the constituent elements of advocacy and legislative reforms and satisfy requirements to report numerical description. These hybrid indicators meet requirements for measuring and collecting quantitative data while satisfying the need for multi-dimensional indicators. Hybrid indicators are particularly effective in developing cross-national comparisons by making the changes in projects more comparable. There are three main types of tools to measure hybrid indicators: indexes, milestone scales and scorecards. For more information on these tools, please see "Measuring Multi-Faceted Concepts" section.

3. Qualitative indicators

A qualitative indicator is a narrative assessment that measures change over time against specific, predetermined criteria. Because it does not necessarily involve quantification, these indicators surpass indices and other related forms of measurement in depth of analysis, and in specificity and nuance of information they provide. As a result, they are particularly useful when trying to ascertain the nature, character, and scope of these changes. While a milestone scale on legislative reform could provide critical information about whether or not a bill has been drafted, only a qualitative indicator could relate information about the process involved, its transparency, the extent of reliance on committees, whether or not public input was absorbed, and about the quality of the product. They respond to the same demands for indicators that capture the critical, but hard to quantify, changes in processes, practices, institutions, and behaviors that are at the heart of DG initiatives.

In choosing among the indicator types quantitative, hybrid, or qualitative, it is

important to consider the following dimensions:

- **Level of complexity.** If the subject is relatively straightforward, perhaps uni-dimensional, a quantitative indicator may be appropriate. However, if the subject is more complex, perhaps multi-faceted or multi-dimensional, a qualitative indicator may be more appropriate and necessary than a quantitative indicator, which could possibly ignore, hide, or neglect critical aspects.
- **Scope.** Quantitative indicators necessarily maintain a narrower focus. Qualitative indicators address questions about the larger picture.
- **Units of measure.** When the number of units being measured is very high (large numbers of municipalities, NGOs or CBOs), it may be preferable and more feasible to use quantitative or hybrid indicators.
- **Questions of degree or extent.** Quantitative indicators pose “how much” or “how many” questions. They do not usually allow you to pose questions about the degree or extent of change. They cannot answer questions about the nature of change in detail. Qualitative indicators describe the nature of the changes more thoroughly.
- **Questions of process.** Qualitative indicators can provide good data on processes that are the target of so much democracy programming. They ask questions about the broader outlines and substance of a process, as well as movement through the process, even highly complex subjects such as institutions or policy reforms.
- **Relationships.** Qualitative indicators can measure and provide data on

evolving relationships among institutions, groups, individual or phenomena. Examples include the involvement of citizens in the policy process or reducing the power of the executive vis-à-vis the parliament.

- **Qualitative aspects or dimensions of democratization.** Examples are presented below.
 - The ramifications of judicial dependence for institutional reforms
 - Emergence of new organizational forms (i.e., coalitions, networks, anti-corruption agencies)
 - Participation in local governance, involvement in specific decisions about service delivery, budgets, and resource allocation and the nature of that involvement.
 - The increased sophistication of public debate

Crafting and selecting indicators is always an iterative process. As missions modify strategies and build new results frameworks, they need to begin thinking about which indicator types and formats are most appropriate. Using guidance from both handbooks is a critical step. Both handbooks are also good sources of potential indicators. Similarly, the indicator database on the CDIE website offers missions the opportunity to look at indicators in use missions.¹ (There are, however, no analyses

¹ Additional information on indicator development is available in the *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*. The following USAID documents provide further assistance with indicator development:

- ADS Chapter 203
- CDIE TIPS Series
 - Tips 6: Selecting Performance Indicators
 - Tips 12: Guidelines for Indicator and Data Quality

of which indicators were particularly useful for program management.)

Once potential indicators are proposed, missions must consider resources and potential data sources. All indicators must also meet criteria of good indicators. This often means narrowing the list of possible indicators.

B. **Step B:** Deciding on the Qualitative Indicator

It is important to differentiate between well-structured and defined qualitative indicators, which establish strict criteria for measuring change over time, and *devices that provide a portrait or description of democracy and governance programs and activities*. The following are NOT qualitative indicators:

- Anecdotes about the program, activities, clients, beneficiaries, etc.
- Success stories which highlight achievements of activities
- Context setting discussion used to complement quantitative data.
- Other narratives, stories, reports, or activities

If there is uncertainty about distinguishing a descriptive device from performance measures, ask the following questions:

- Is it specifically structured to permit annual assessments against pre-determined and well-defined criteria?
- Does it measure change- whether positive or negative- over time? Was it intended to measure this type of change?
- Does the approach meet standards for indicator validity and reliability?
- Is the format systematized? Is it generalizable? Is possible to adapt this

-
- PPC : The Performance Management Toolkit, "Key Questions to Ask..." at www.usaid.gov/oig

format to different program or country contexts?

- Is there a system for data collection? Are there controls to maintain data quality?

C. **Step C:** Selecting the Assessment Tool

The form a qualitative indicator will take determined by the narrative assessment tool. The approach selected for a qualitative indicator will depend on fit and comfort. For example, some formats are more appropriate for process-oriented indicators, some for indicators that emphasize the development of certain functions. Other formats are good tools for assessing particular dimensions or attributes of democracy- such as inclusiveness, transparency, and institutional stability. The approach is also determined by comfort with a certain tool. For example, two or more of the approaches described here may be appropriate for measuring the progress of the project. Ultimately, it is important to pick the one you find helpful and accessible. It is critical to choose the approaches that provide the best kind of information you need for program management. The following brief descriptions refer directly to specific illustrative indicators in this handbook:

1. *Assessment of Attributes*

This approach examines the development in specific outcomes, components or elements of a project. It takes a set of attributes and asks questions about those attributes to gain a better understanding of the progress of the project.

Indicator criteria or elements are key qualities or aspects of the subject at hand. The indicator on the nature of public debate (Part 2, Section A) highlights both its quality, as well as its accessibility. It considers four attributes of public debate:

inclusiveness; access to information; availability and quality of policy analysis; and diversity of arenas for discourse. The constituent elements of each attribute are specified for the assessment. There are several other indicators of this type in the handbook. The indicator on infrastructure assesses the development of new administrative/managerial tools, the knowledge base, new support structures, a sustainable resource base, and mechanisms for governmental/ non-governmental communications and dialogue.

2. *Functional Capacity Assessment*

The *Functional Capacity Assessment* approach looks at specific functions or purposes assumed by a particular organization or institution. It asks whether or not, or to what extent, the organization has developed these functions, and specifically describes the activities or actions assessed each year. While similar to an index, this approach allows the mission to address and discuss in greater detail and with more nuance each part of the project.

This type of indicator looks at specific functions to be assumed by a particular organization or institution. It asks whether or not, or to what extent, the organization has begun developing these functions. This permits the most relevant elements, giving a better sense of the locus of change, something not always possible in a hybrid indicator.

The NGO functional capacity indicator looks at four broad functional areas: advocacy, external relations, management capacity, and activity execution. Under the advocacy function, six elements to be assessed are stipulated in knowledge of advocacy techniques; advocacy strategy development, advocacy campaign budget, information collection for a campaign, and identification of other NGOs for joint activities.

A similar indicator looks at the degree to which an anti-corruption agency carries out specific functions. It assesses where the agency has made progress in developing certain competencies and where progress has been impeded. The indicator looks at the correspondence between an agency's original mission, scope and activity levels.

3. *Program Emphases Framework*

This approach requires preliminary analysis of all program activities, grouping them into specific program emphases. The Program Emphases Framework is an integrative approach to thinking about activities, their commonalities, and possibly shared objectives. This approach breaks down larger programs into specific framework for analysis, which can be composed of parts of a project or part of the project.

An example of the Program Emphases Framework is in the private-public collaboration for local service delivery, which is organized around three large program emphases: development and dissemination of methods; establishment of mechanisms for collaboration; and establishing preconditions or initial support for effective service delivery. The qualitative indicator based on this framework assesses the extent to which specific efforts outlined in all three program categories were underway and with what effect.

4. *Stage Approach*

The Stage Approach assesses changes over time by examining a project's progress through predefined criteria apportioned into discrete stages. This approach can provide data on changes within or from one stage to another.

The indicator for participation in local governance outlines stages in participation. Each provides an assessment of the degree and character of citizen involvement in local

governance and decision-making, the relationship between local government officials and civil society, and the varying functions of participatory mechanisms. The four stages of participation are information sharing, consultation, negotiation/collaboration, and delegation. Each is assessed on the basis of stage-specific criteria for local government actions, citizen participation, outcomes of participation, if any, and mechanisms.

Another stage indicator assesses the process of ethics code development and dissemination. It may be especially relevant for governments establishing anti-corruption agencies and the like, or authorizing the drafting of new ethics codes. The four stages are establishment of a committee to oversee development; adoption of a plan outlining the drafting and dissemination process; drafting; and finally dissemination.

5. *Continuum Approach*

This approach relies on predefined criteria as the basis for assessing a project's progress in a sequence of events. Continuum increments are not apportioned into discrete stages. A continuum may be a useful way or device for conceptualizing and then structuring an assessment. Decisions about placement or location on each continuum are made by specific, well-defined criteria.

The section on local governance indicator uses the Continuum Approach method to assess the predominantly institutional factors that support local governance. These factors include the method for selecting local officials and staff; the professional expertise of staff; the procedures and practices that facilitate input; and the procedures and practices that enforce or impose transparency.

D. **Step D:** Measurement Tools: How to Measure Change?

1. *Measurement Tools Process*

Once an indicator (qualitative, quantitative or hybrid) has been designed, it is necessary to develop a plan for the following:

- Identify potential or available sources of data
- Generate a list of data collection options
- Decide on appropriate data collection option
- Select and develop a data collection tool
- Develop and implement a system for collecting data on a continuing basis

The data process should be well detailed to ensure its timelessness. The exact information on data sources, methods, procedures, and responsibilities should be well articulated. Missions should monitor their data systems for gross aberrations, tampering, or adaptation to changing conditions. Depending on scope, resources, or mission preferences, this analysis could be conducted by mission personnel, contractors, or consultants.

Both the *Handbook on Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* and the *PPC Performance Management Toolkit* include details on data collection approaches and the fit between possible sources of data and the indicator itself. Both also include helpful information on data collection, as does the CDIE TIPS Series.²

2. *What are possible tools for collecting data?*

a. **Indexes**

Various indexes are perhaps the most prevalent type of hybrid indicator and are increasingly used by missions. Indices have

² Refer to PPC's Performance Management Toolkit: A Guide to Developing and Implementing Performance Management Plan, January 2003, Contract No: AEP-C-00-99-00034-00

proven effective ways to quantify qualitative data (multiple bits of information) about legal reform processes, institutional capacity, advocacy, and effective reforms of electoral administration. There is no set rule about the size or scope of any index. Some are broader in scope, rely on a sizable number of elements, and require significant data collection efforts. Others are much smaller in scope, look at fewer elements and demand significantly less data collection. It is important to remember that, in general, indexes can be very labor intensive and complex. Their design and implementation may necessitate the assistance of a skilled and experienced methodologist.

The first handbook provides guidance on use of hybrid indicators. It offers well-developed examples of indexes for civil society organizations (CSO) advocacy and the quality of legislative processes as well as other suggestions for possible indexes.³

b. Milestone Scales

Many missions rely on milestone scales as one method of outlining sequential stages in a process. The indicator measures movement along this scale. Missions report on the highest stage reached or number of stages passed in the previous year. A good example of this is the milestone scale on “progress in achieving legal reform” in the first handbook.

These scales work best when each stage is clearly defined and well articulated. The key to creating a useful milestone scale is to choose stages that realistically represent the processes involved and the local context. It is important to first conduct an analysis to predict how the process might unfold and to avoid outright adaptation of any “generic” milestone scale and set of stages. For example, the milestone scale in Appendix C contains eight stages that range from proposition of legislation by interest groups

to implementation and possible need for subsequent amendments. However, this range is inappropriate for the passage of anti-corruption legislation, in which the proposal and drafting will comprise of differentiated stages over a five-year strategy and reporting period.

Although milestone scales is a useful method, there is the tendency to establish stages too broadly, limited in number or lacking in definition. The most common ones involve legislative reforms, which usually has three or four stages. For example, the stages are limited to drafting, passage, and implementation of legislation. This simplistic approach can create a reliance on three or four milestones, which can actually hinder rather than facilitate reporting on the progress of any piece of legislation. When a milestone is that legislation “stalled” at some point in the process, the indicator provides very little information for program management. There is often little way of expressing and reporting on what has happened along the way. In other cases, missions can report progress from one stage to another but are often without adequate information on the implementation of the project. Implementation is often left undefined and, as a result, there are rarely criteria to determine whether or not implementation has occurred. This has been the source of problems for program management and results measurement and is often the scourge of auditors. Suggestions for milestone scales, which are adaptations of qualitative indicators, appear throughout *HQI*.

c. Scorecards

In certain cases, scorecards are useful measures—particularly when assessing progress along “several fronts” of a larger initiative. They can provide a general picture of what has been accomplished (or not) across the board in several areas. *Appendix D* provides examples of two scorecards; the first one is a method for discerning the

³ Refer to Appendixes A & B.

extent to which the statutory and regulatory framework for local governance has been established. The other scorecard is from the first handbook and measures whether or not an NGO has established the systems or procedures necessary for improved financial management.

d. Questionnaire

The indicator poses specific questions about key aspects of a particular process, phenomenon, function, or organization. The example on sustainable coalitions asks five questions about building coalitions that includes coalition formation, institutional sustainability, resource sustainability, program sustainability, and legitimacy. Each question is followed by a well-detailed list of criteria: specific actions, functions, or capacities that the assessment should address. Similarly, the rule of law indicator on elite exemption from the law asks questions about the efficiency of case processing, the thoroughness of the investigation, the thoroughness of the prosecution, and the fairness of the verdict or sentence.

Another type of questionnaire is organized around key aspects of a particular subject. Criteria for answering these questions are also provided. The indicator on party systems and democratic competition consists of question sets about the expansion and retraction of public space for competition, system legitimacy, and the maintenance of viable party organizations, system stability and predictability, and the formalization of inter-party relations. In another example, the indicator on human rights commissions asks questions about the timeliness of the processes initiated, the thoroughness of investigations, coordination with other initiatives, and the decisions or actions taken.

e. Charts

A chart functions as an instrument for developing indicators that can assess change with respect to several dimensions or aspects of democratic reform. It can be appropriate for measuring higher-level results, for a strategic objective (SO) with a diverse set of program activities that have common dimensions or goals. The chart presents sets of key questions for assessing change.

The chart for initiatives in governance and participation looks at program goals with respect to eight dimensions of the SO. The chart covers sustainability; beneficiaries; functional diversity; support structures; the integration, adaptation and use of new tools; knowledge base; mechanisms for disseminating best practices; and participation in governance.

f. Expert Panel and Peer Review Evaluations

These evaluations rely on the expertise of people informed or knowledgeable about a particular subject or topic. These experts, chosen for their lack of bias, are called in to review and analyze information, and make judgments about qualitative aspects of democratization. Expert panels may consider, for example, the professionalism of local government staff or extent of implementation of a new policy or piece of legislation in a specific sector. This kind of assessment involves the stipulation of criteria for the rating and evaluation process.

g. Key Informant Interviews

It is often necessary to gather data from individuals with hands-on experience or involvement with a specific issue, a particular government agency or CSO, for example, or with relevant expertise in subject. For example, party leaders would be well positioned to offer their thoughts on internal party dynamics and structures or participation in negotiations with other parties. Attention should be paid to the criteria for selecting interviewees, how the

interview is to be structured, and how the data is to be integrated into the assessment.

h. Focus Groups

As with key informant interviews, focus group discussions allow participants (from a particular sample or sub-set of the population) to answer questions and offer opinions or insights on a topic, event or perceived change, for example. Formulating and facilitating focus groups can be a bit of an art, and need careful consideration. The Agency provides useful guidance on this process. Focus groups can be critical when trying to elicit information on government responsiveness to requests for citizen involvement in legislative or policy processes, or on improved service delivery.

i. Direct Observations

Consistent and organized site visits by observers are a good way to collect data about what goes on in practice, rather than what goes on in theory. They provide information on the extent or nature of CSO participation in parliamentary committee meetings or hearings, for example, or whether or not candidates actually run political campaigns focused on issues, rather than personalities.

j. Case Study

The case study method is an important tool for gathering, integrating and assessing information across a manageable set of well-selected cases. Case studies generally draw on data from a number of the sources listed here, as a means of answering questions, about process, institutions, and practices, such as those framed in qualitative indicators. For example, case studies can examine the nature of negotiations on revenue allocation across a set of target localities. They may be used to examine the quality of public debate across a set of issues, or perhaps in various locales. Case studies are complex enterprises; relying on

someone experienced in their development and execution is the key to producing robust, higher quality data.

Making the data more attributable to USAID-funded intervention can be difficult, even when controlling for influences external to the project. Having reliable **baseline data** is a good start. In absence of baseline data, alternative measures from outside data sources, like Freedom House, may provide some gauge of the project's impact. Selecting external data sources may also allow the democracy officer to engage in a **cross-national comparison**, even if at a higher level of results. Ideally, current program data should build or "scaffold" from the base of past USAID data. Finally, **randomly selecting** the participants or targeted geographic area that will receive the intervention out of a target population will increase the credibility of the data.

Crafting indicators is an iterative process. Combining the right approach with the most effective and efficient tool requires creativity. Selecting which impact to measure (approach) and how to measure it and the proper tools is. As indicators are developed, special attention needs to be paid to the following:

- **Definitions:** Is the indicator well defined? Has this definition helped me to get a better understanding on a particular dimension of DG programming, such as sustainability or coalition building? Will it provide insight into the extent or degree of competition, participation, "sustainability or coalition building, for example?" Are the indicators well specified, so that there is no confusion about the meaning of all elements, criteria, or questions elaborated in the indicator? Are the "units of measurement" clearly stated?
- **Validity:** Does the indicator measure what we want it to measure? This question is paramount with respect to

qualitative indicators, because they are meant to convey change in different attributes or dimensions of democratization. Does the indicator list specific criterion against which to measure change? Can it provide information key to program management?

- **Reliability:** If the indicator data were collected again by another person would they yield the same answers? Will two analysts, using the same framework, be able to reach similar conclusions?

- **Operational:** Can data collection systems be put in place so that those responsible for data collection will know what is required of them? Will they know where to find data or how to generate data? Does the mission have access to relevant data? Can it construct a reasonable data collection system?

- **Soundness over Time:** In addition to reliability, the indicator should stand the test of time. If another analyst, using the same or a similar framework, collects data several years from now, will they reach similar conclusions? Will another analyst confirm the trend lines currently perceived by the mission?

Democracy officers and those collecting data should be conscious of the impact their opinions, biases, or perceptions will have on the data set. Indicators strive to provide objective views of the progress of the project. Whether the result is favorable or unfavorable, it furnishes valuable perspectives on the problem it measures.

Crafting and selecting indicators is both a technique and art. The selection process must be iterative, playing off good "theoretical" illustrative aspects for indicators against the realistic capacity to actually measure them, find them, afford them, and replicate them. Finally, even "final indicators" may not be final. Constant monitoring of their usefulness is critical.

For example, the government data serving as the basis for the indicator may stop being collected, or become politicized and the methods originally used may be, for some reason, no longer possible to employ. In past experience, interested parties may become aware of how their success is measured and may modify their program or report to invalidate it as a measure. Indicators are truly dynamic in nature.



PART 2

ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS

Introduction to Illustrative Indicators

Each of the illustrative indicators in the handbook asks a series of key questions to guide you through the discussion:

- **What are USAID's *objectives*?**
- **What are the main types of *activities*?**
- **What *results* must be measured?**
- **What measures were identified in the Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators?**
- **What would the qualitative indicator(s) include?**
- **How would a mission use this indicator in practice?**

Each section includes:

- brief descriptions of program areas, with an emphasis on new trends
- a review of results statements, particularly intermediate results, chosen by missions
- a discussion of existing indicators that includes definitions, units of measurement, structure, and data collection
- suggestions for when qualitative indicators might replace or complement quantitative ones

The illustrative indicators were selected based on field demand and expressed mission interest. Subjects not covered in *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* as well as difficult subjects that were too difficult to measure or not captured by quantitative indicators are also included. To reflect varying programs, activities and results, each of the illustrative indicators is formulated as comprehensively as possible. As part of the indicator development and adaptation process, missions would be responsible for customizing the indicator and narrowing the scope.

Each illustrative indicator provides an example of valid, well defined, and reliable indicators. This handbook is intended to spark creativity in the reader. The reader should develop new qualitative indicators as well as new approaches to measuring these indicators. The guidance on construction, use, and data quality of indicators provided by the handbook should be seen as facilitating, rather than prohibiting, the use of qualitative indicators.

SECTION A:
**CIVIL SOCIETY ILLUSTRATIVE
INDICATORS**

CIVIL SOCIETY

What are USAID's objectives?

USAID believes that supporting the growth of civil society is a staple of democracy programming. It is a central feature of programming in all sub-sectors, rule of law, governance, elections and political processes, where CSOs or certain constituencies advocate for particular policy reforms or focus on broader system change. The focus on civil society has increased in response to the difficulties of reforming institutions or pressing the cause of reform when political will for change is absent. Civil society is viewed as both a means and an end.

As articulated in USAID/CDIE's *Constituencies for Reform*, USAID seeks to promote civic advocacy organizations that “engage in or have the potential for championing the adoption and consolidation of democratic governance reforms.” USAID believes CSOs play a critical role throughout the transition process and seeks to support to CSOs to:

- contribute to policy dialog
- act as watchdog during policy implementation processes
- maintain the capacity and sustainability to further democratic change
- carve out a public space separate from the state, often in environments where there is no public space
- provide structure to the public space

What are the main types of activities?

A major objective of USAID democracy programs is to strengthening civil society organizations (CSOs) as advocates for political reform and good governance. This effort involves support for a wide range of activist organizations including, pro-democracy groups, human rights organizations, professional and faith-based associations, think tanks, business associations, labor unions, women's organizations, environmental groups, and media outlets. Program activities focus on enhancing CSO and media performance in strategic planning, policy dialogue, constituency mobilization, civic education, watchdog roles, coalition building, fund-raising, and support for creating legal enabling environment that protects and promotes a vibrant civil society.

What results must be measured?

Establish and strengthen CSOs is one set of results commonly established by USAID programs. For example, programs often state as their anticipated results:

- “issue-based formal and informal associations organized and active”
- “improved CSO impact”
- “increased CSO participation in public decision-making”
- “increased organized societal participation to advance community interests”
- “improved effectiveness of participating local/national CSOs in influencing policy”
- “NGO participation in civil society strengthened”
- “organization and outreach capacity of civil society organizations expanded”
- “targeted CSO capacity to more effectively represent public interests strengthened”
- “to increase CSO capacity to influence the policy process”

Measuring these IRs presents several problems. First, these IRs combine capacity for advocacy or impact with sustainability, which can make it difficult to define an appropriate indicator. Different missions use the same indicator to measure different results. Second, it has been difficult to define (much less measure) impact, influence, or effective participation, as articulated in these IRs. (Please see excerpts of The Advocacy Index in Appendix A, which as outlined in *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*, links assessments of capacity with function to understand impact.)

Missions tend to favor particular quantitative indicators, such as number of NGOs created, number of meetings with decision-makers, or number of consultative mechanisms established, to measure impact or influence. These quantitative indicators provide critical information, which may be more readily available. However, the data is unable to tell us more specific information about the process of structuring civil society or what it means to strengthen civil society organizations.

What measures were identified in the Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators?

Qualitative indicators enable the program manager to address “impact” or “effectiveness” in terms of specific structures or processes or functions. The following qualitative indicators for policy dialog/public debate, sustainable coalitions, and functional capacity are intended to facilitate the collection of more nuanced data about civil society participation in the policy process and about the evolution of civil society structures and institutions. These indicators are presented together because sustainable coalitions can act as an arena for discussion or as a catalyst for dialog and debate.

Civil Society: What would a qualitative indicator for “more sustainable coalitions” include?

USAID DG programs stress the need for coalitions, which are often crucial for strengthening constituencies for reform early in the transition. Issue-based coalitions occasionally cohere as interested actors press for changes in specific legislation or policies. Additionally, CSO coalitions (e.g., women’s organizations, NGOs, professional association, trade unions) have cooperated in get-out-the-vote efforts or in organizing and executing plans for elections monitoring or increasing women’s participation in local government. This is true not only in the DG sector, but also in the health, population, and economic growth sectors.

Having dedicated resources to the formation of these coalitions, both issue-based and event-related, USAID Missions and coalitions members realize the potential they represent for shaping and/or strengthening civil society in the longer term. (Sustainable coalitions can generate increased capacity for oversight, for providing governments with assistance in policy development, for monitoring and implementing policy, for forging inter-sectoral relations.) Building sustainable coalitions, whether reconfiguring existing coalitions or organizing new ones, is a different intervention involving: administrative, decision-making structures, long-term planning, mechanisms for communication and coordination, establishing rules of the game and division of labor, etc.

Sustainable coalitions are generally defined as one form of collaboration. The members recognize that they can achieve desired ends over time by working together (e.g., sharing skills and technical expertise, pooling resources, and solving common problems) rather than working individually.

To understand the development of sustainable coalitions, this indicator poses questions about: initial formation and organizing principles, institutional sustainability, resource sustainability, program sustainability, and legitimacy. The assessment required for this indicator should answer the questions stipulated below for each element. These are not presented sequentially or according to significance. Although this is intended as a comprehensive indicator, missions need to modify this indicator according to relevance as noted below and through this handbook.

Qualitative Indicator:	The extent to which sustainable coalitions emerge, and develop new structures and/or organizational capacities.
Approach:	Functional Capacity Assessment
Tool(s):	Questionnaire
Illustrative Results:	Strengthened civil society organizations
Indicator:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extent to which actors are involved in the initial stage of coalition formation: identifying shared interested and potential members or relying on a “convener” to foster participation? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Interest and Membership Identification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the actors identified (or redefined) their common interests or concerns? • Have the actors identified possible coalition members or extended their membership beyond their core group(s)? • Have small groups with common interests that are more limited in scope or a larger group with broader issues of sectoral reform formed? • Have actors initiated some joint activity (discussions, workshops, and seminars) to facilitate both identification of potential coalition members and various approaches to particular issues or problems? b. Role of “convener,” when applicable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the convener fostered participation? • Has the convener used legitimacy (formal or informal, due to expertise, credibility or position) to begin the process of coalition-building? • Has the convener identified possible participants? • Has the convener framed issues or formed an orientation to problem? 2. Extent to which the coalition developed elements of institutional sustainability <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Coordination and decision-making body <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the body facilitate communication, information sharing, organize participation in advocacy activities? • Does the body take responsibility for decisions about fundraising and resource use? • Does the body make decisions about staffing, paid professional or volunteers? • Does the body make decisions about recruitment and acceptance of new coalition members? • Does the body work to establish central and/or regional offices? b. Division of labor/responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the initial assessment of the coalition show that it has the mechanisms for communication, inter-organizational skills,

	<p>resources, and the capacity to carry out functions such as advocacy, analysis, and planning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the initial assessment of the individual coalition members show the resources, technical expertise, structure and capacity to carry out functions? • Are decisions about the allocation of responsibilities within the coalition made through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participation in decision-making mechanism; ○ Participation in communication mechanisms; ○ Provision of technical expertise; ○ Provision of skills/advocacy training for coalition members; ○ Coordination of relations with other CSOs, private sector, and with government actors; ○ Planning and executing advocacy campaigns or producing policy analysis, for example. • Are there job descriptions? <p>c. Rules of the game/organizing principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a determination about flexibility: tolerance for members' decision-making autonomy within the coalition—support for particular activities or acceptance of particular decision? • Is there an established constitution/by-laws that defines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Membership, including requirements, fees? ○ democratic internal structures? ○ determination of decision-making committee members • Are there established mechanisms for conflict resolution, which include procedures for resolving conflicts over allocation of resources or for accommodating diverse interests/organizational norms? <p>3. To what extent has the coalition acted to secure resource sustainability?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the coalition created a strategic plan to determine resource needs and requirements? • Has the coalition formulated plans and mechanisms for fundraising, both in the national and international donor community? • Has the coalition developed and implemented financial management and budgeting systems? <p>4. To what extent has the coalition adopted procedures to secure program sustainability?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have they engaged in periodic re-evaluation of mission and identification of short-term, medium term or long-term goals? • Is the coalition monitoring the political environment to identify both changes in approach to issues and opportunities for advocacy or intermediation? • Has the coalition developed members' skill set and technical
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>expertise?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the coalition engaging in public relations and media? <p>5. To what extent is the coalition viewed as legitimate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By base constituency of member CSOs/NGOs? • By other CSOs and private sector actors? • By government- based on recognition by donors, participation in international fora, provision of useful information and technical expertise, ability to articulate and present interests of concerned actors?
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

Consultations between SO teams, local country experts and CSO representatives will determine criteria for selecting coalitions. The political context will determine the number of coalitions for assessment. It may be that two or three coalitions have recently emerged; in other cases, one large coalition may predominate.

This indicator would require a baseline assessment of each coalition. It should also identify any critical issues or aspects of coalition-building particular to each case and those potentially sensitive to change during the strategy period. It should make suggestions for any modifications to the indicator, including addition or substitution of questions and related actions, functions or capacities.

In some instances, targets could be set on a yearly basis, given the possibility of registering change. For example, in a year, a coalition could begin the process of creating a set of by-laws: putting together an early draft, receiving commentary, revising, and submitting a draft for confirmation. However, where it is anticipated by the baseline assessment that some changes or movement will be more gradual, targets might be set at the middle and last year of the strategy. It is also possible that in the first year or two of the strategy, these coalitions work toward identifying mission and recruiting members; other elements of institution building may be postponed till after this initial stage. Trend lines would have to be identified accordingly.

Civil Society: What would a qualitative indicator for “increased policy dialog” include?

USAID views increased policy dialog as key to reform. The Office of Democracy and Governance emphasizes the need to focus on both increasing the capacity of civil society to influence policy-making by precipitating and extending discussion as well as developing partnership between civil society and governments during the determination, elaboration and implementation of policy.

The *Constituencies for Reform* presents policy dialog as a critical CAO function, (along with strategic planning, negotiation, education, public relations, networking) requiring particular resources and the development of skills. A second approach employed by Implementing Policy Change project (IPC), seeks to increase policy dialog by developing practices, processes and institution-building objectives in cooperation with governmental organizations to better manage the implementation of new policy, as it worked with NGOs so that they could strategically integrate themselves into policy change and implementation processes.

Even though there is clearly overlap here, these differences can be significant when choosing the appropriate indicator for a particular IR. A number of missions use IRs like “more effective civil society organizations” while others are more explicit in phrasing the result as “strengthened NGO participation in public policy processes” or “citizen input into political decision making.” In both cases, it is necessary to assess, based on programs and program objectives, first, whether or not these relate to policy dialog, rather than more narrowly defined questions about increased CSO sustainability or institution-building. If the intent is policy dialog, it is important to distinguish between an emphasis on catalyzing or expanding dialogue, either cross-sectorally or across a broad spectrum of civil society organizations, or if the emphasis is on working with government (and NGOs) towards the development and management of policy reform and implementation processes.

Policy dialog has not been an easy thing to measure, in part because of difficulties of defining the thing and in part because of the early guidance that quantitative indicators and data alone were acceptable performance measures. The first handbook suggests several quantitative indicators; often these do have some qualitative aspect.

Some indicators in the first handbook address policy dialog as expanded public discussion of policy issues. For example, one looks at the number of targeted issues that “receive heightened public attention” either in parliamentary hearings, ministerial studies, government commissions, or perhaps in the press or statements by individual policy makers. This indicator also requires some qualitative judgments about the meaning of the “heightened public attention.”

The first handbook also contains indicators that are in line with IPC’s approach to policy dialog, although these indicators do not capture all critical aspects. A couple look at the openness policy meetings or policy commissions to CSO involvement or representatives from the private and not-for profit sectors. Another looks at the number or percentage of firms and NGOs who say they have experienced a “valid engagement with the executive branch” during policy making and implementation.” Here “valid engagement” is defined as NGOs that have received proper notice of meetings or necessary information and also sense that government representatives have taken their views into account. The latter requires a qualitative analysis.

This indicator assesses quality and access with four criteria as outlined below. The assessment required for this indicator should answer the questions stipulated below for each element. These are not presented sequentially or according to significance. Although this indicator tracks debate on one issue, it could easily be modified to compare debate on two or more issues. Missions need to modify this indicator according to relevance as noted below and through this handbook.

Qualitative Indicator:	Quality of and accessibility to public debate.
Approach:	Assessment of Attributes
Tool(s):	
Illustrative Results:	Increased policy dialog Increased citizen participation in public policy processes Increased citizen input in policy debate
Indicator:	<p>A. Inclusiveness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent did the number of NGOs conducting advocacy on this issue expand? 2. To what extent did issue specific coalitions or networks form (or broaden)? 3. How diverse are the actors engaged in the debate? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are women's organizations, minority organizations, labor unions, and professional associations (also as part of coalition or network) represented? b. Are government actors, especially from relevant ministries/agencies, represented? c. Are political parties, including opposition parties, represented? d. Are private sector actors, including firms and foundations, represented? e. Is the academic community represented? f. Are religious groups represented? <p><i>Questions for consideration include: Which are new entrants? In what capacity are they active? Have there been changes in major or minor actors?</i></p> <p>B. Access to information: are there a diverse number of channels for dissemination of information?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent does the internet serve as an arena for discussion and a source of information? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dedicated web-sites or web-pages are in use? • With whom is website affiliated (government, NGO, private sector)? Is its sponsorship clearly identified? • To what extent are the websites accessible? Are there restrictions or fees associated with access? • How frequently are they used? 2. To what extent have national and/or local government information centers or libraries (executive, parliamentary, legislative) been established or expanded? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How reliable is the available material and data? • To what extent is it accessible to the public (NGOs, citizens,

	<p>private sector)? Are there required fees or permissions for access?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there prohibitions on the use of material? <p>3. To what extent has an Office of Statistics or archives been established or expanded?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the available material and data reliable? • Does the public (NGOs, citizens, private sector) have free access? • Are there any prohibitions on use of material? <p>4. To what extent is media available?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the number/type of non-governmental sources of news/information/opinion available? • What is the number/type of government-controlled media outlets available? • What kind of/are there any restrictions on public access to non-governmental media outlets (press, radio, TV)? <p>C. Quality and Availability of Policy Analysis</p> <p>1. To what extent are the key non-governmental public policy institutes/ think tanks working on this issue reliable and productive?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affiliation, if any. Connections to university, professional association, labor union, CSO, or private sector actor/institution? • How open is think tank about funding sources? Sponsorship? • What are the qualifications of analysts contributing issue briefs? • Is there a diversity of products: working papers, issue briefs, training materials newsletters with recent actions/activities? • Distribution? Primary audience? What channels does the think tank use to disseminate information? <p>2. Are key government and government-sponsored policy think tanks working on this issue reliable and productive?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is there funding source? Directorship? • What are the qualifications of analysts contributing issue briefs? • Is there a diversity of products: working papers, issue briefs, training materials newsletters with recent actions/activities? • What is there distribution? Who is their primary audience? What channels does the think tank use to disseminate information? <p>D. Arenas for Discourse</p> <p>1. To what extent is there increased diversity in arenas for discourse?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training workshops (sponsored by government, by international NGOs, by local NGOs or by donors, think tanks or universities) • Legislative hearings • Seminars/roundtables (sponsored by government, by international NGOs, by local NGOs, by donors, by think tanks
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>or universities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International or national conferences (sponsored by government, by international NGO, by local NGO, by donors or universities) • Joint commissions • Coalitions/formal networks • Peak federations • Web-pages and web-sites devoted to issue • Media fora, “call in shows,” for example <p>2. How is the debate expanded?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographic • Institutional <p>3. How is knowledge diffused?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the establishment of (follow-on) working groups? • What/Are there mechanisms for outreach to citizens?

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

This indicator tracks debate on one issue, but it could easily be modified to facilitate a comparison of debates on two or more issues. It requires a baseline assessment of the debate against the four criteria. This assessment should identify any criteria or elements critical or salient with respect to debate on a particular issue, and those elements potentially sensitive to change during the strategy period. It could also make suggestions for any modifications in the indicator. Targets could be set on a yearly basis with the possibility of registering change against certain criteria; examples include measuring the increased productivity of think tanks or less restrictive access to government data. For other criteria, change may be more gradual and targets might be set at the middle and last year of the strategy.

Civil Society: What would qualitative indicators for increased CSO/NGO capacity include?

Missions often choose intermediate results that generally address CSO or NGO strengthening. Quantitative indicators may not be helpful in capturing the various aspects of organizational development. The following qualitative and hybrid indicators examine whether or not CSOs or NGOs have developed a specific set of functions. NGOs are assessed on: advocacy, external relations, management and activity execution. One benefit of this indicator is the range of information, about all of these functions, it provides for program management.

The framework below serves two purposes. First, it allows for a qualitative assessment of a smaller number of targeted NGOs or CSOs. Second, it provides the basis for an index or series of indexes (quantifying qualitative data) to assess a larger set. Both applications are discussed below. Missions should modify these indicators to meet their needs according to relevance as noted below and through this handbook.

First Indicator (Qualitative)

The indicator allows for an annual assessment of NGO or CSO capacity in four broad functional areas. Prior to undertaking a baseline assessment, the mission should determine if it wants the indicator to cover all or a subset of these functional areas. The elements in each area are stated as a list of actions to be undertaken.

Qualitative Indicator:	NGO/CSO functional capacity
Approach:	Functional Capacity Assessment
Tool (s):	
Illustrative Results:	Organizational capacity of CSOs and NGOs expanded CSO capacity strengthened CSOs/NGOs better represent public interests
Indicator:	<p>A. Advocacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO board/directorate recognizes and understands key advocacy techniques. • NGO can articulate goals of an advocacy campaign. (For example, provide general information on issue, influence policy debate, educate the public or a particular constituency, and provide technical expertise to policymakers/decision-makers.) • NGO develops (preliminary) advocacy strategy. (For example, incorporates techniques learned from seminars and selects and crafts strategy to address audience—decision-makers/public/constituency) • NGO develops advocacy campaign budget and identifies potential sources of funding. (Are resources adequate for budget?) • NGO collects information necessary for campaign. (Collects and analyzes data as input for campaign, requests public input on issue, seeks information on issue, conducts policy analyses, develops materials for dissemination or as appropriate) • NGO identifies other NGOs for joint advocacy or joint activities during the campaign <p>B. External Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO establishes longer-term relationships with other NGOs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO joins or participates in an existing NGO network. • NGO participates in/joins a formal coalition or NGO is a member of an umbrella organization. • NGO and coalition partners involved in joint activities. (For example, organizing working groups, conferences, advocacy initiatives) • NGO engages decision-makers: in legislature, legislative committees, government offices. (For example, provides technical expertise, disseminates research, designates liaison) • NGO continues to identify and engage new constituencies. (For example, it initiates and pursues contacts with organized interests—business or labor—and with more geographically dispersed communities) <p>C. Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO develops a human resource management plan. (For example, to include staffing and hiring plans, job descriptions, personnel policies/manuals, training programs) • NGO develops plan to recruit and train volunteers. (For example, coordination and management of volunteers, job descriptions, staffing plans, training programs) • NGO initiates formal strategic planning process. (For example assesses organizational capacity and development needs, articulates long-term goals for organization, establishes processes for feedback from members, etc.) • NGO improves financial management systems. (For example, accounting, budgeting, internal/external auditing, strategic financial planning, fundraising, submits grant proposals, preparation of financial statements, etc.) <p>D. Activity Execution (in support of any activity- civic education, domestic monitoring, legal literacy, advocacy, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGO establishes procedures or encourages broad participation in its efforts. (For example, includes women, minorities, indigenous populations, and communities outside the capital.) • NGO works with media or develops media relations campaign to assist in its efforts. • NGO establishes outreach or public education programs. • NGO establishes mechanisms or procedures for monitoring issues, policy implementation, and political environment • NGO develops information collection and dissemination systems. (For example, reports regularly on activities, creates an information office, creates resource center or library, sets of computer databases, as appropriate etc.)
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

The baseline assessment should identify any critical elements to each functional area as well as any elements potentially sensitive to change during the strategy period. It could also suggest necessary modifications to the indicator. (Are there additional actions that need to be included? Should some be abandoned?) The final version should incorporate any revisions made prior to or directly after the baseline assessment. Targets could be set on a yearly basis, given the possibility of registering change against certain criteria or elements. For other criteria or elements, change may be more gradual and targets might be set at the middle and last year of the strategy.

Second Indicator (Hybrid)

Hybrid Indicator:	Extent to which NGOs developed or improved functions
Approach:	Hybrid
Tool(s):	Index
Illustrative Results:	Organizational capacity of CSOs and NGOs expanded CSO capacity strengthened CSOs/NGOs better represent public interests
Indicator:	<p>Each of the four functional areas should be approached, first, as separate index. NGOs efforts on each action are scored individually. The scale, as presented below, can be adapted to measure frequency of efforts or quality of efforts.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 Never, not at all, poorly Always, extensively or skillfully</p> <p><u>Scoring procedure:</u> <i>(This is just one approach)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First score each statement in each functional area using the scale, 1 to 5. 2. Next, average these scores for each of the four indexes. Each index could have an average score from 1-5. 3. You can use the use the data in different ways, depending on programming needs and reporting preferences. These are only some examples: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If you use all four indexes, you could total up the averages for each, with a range of 4 to a 20. (If you used only three of the indexes, you could total up the averages, with a range of 3 to 15.) 2. Another possibility, of course, is averaging the four individual index averages and creating one functional capacity index score, with a range of 1-5. 4. There are several options for reporting this data. For example, working again with averages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You could report the number of NGOs that show a particular point increase in total average score per year. • You report the number of NGOs each year that have an average score of 3, for example, on the functional capacity index.

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

NGOs are scored by USAID and/or by outside experts, and also by the NGOs themselves. While scores determined by the NGOs are not reported and not included in the final calculation, they can be a useful check on scoring by the mission or outside experts and make the process somewhat more participatory.

SECTION B: LOCAL GOVERNMENT ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

What are USAID's objectives?

As part of DG and other initiatives, decentralization yields opportunities for more democratic local governance. The *Decentralization and Democratic Local Governance Programming Handbook* observes that the transfer of power to local governments can provide officials with a chance to develop more democratically structured forms of decision-making. The anticipated result is that, to some degree, local governance is more responsive and participatory.

USAID programs emphasize the need to create an enabling environment for newly established or reconfigured local governments and to improve their capacity to operate in light of their newly gained responsibilities. Improved delivery of services, better skilled local officials, and more experience with financial management continue to be the focus of much programming.

What are the main types of activities?

While building local government capacity continues to be critical, a growing number of missions devote resources to bolstering citizen participation in local government. This has meant designing activities ranging from improving the technical skills of local CSOs or promoting the use of town meetings or public hearings as mechanisms for giving citizens some voice in budget formation and decisions about service provision. Missions fund stand-alone activities or integrate them into other local government programming.

What results must be measured?

DG local government SOs and IRs reflect the salience of citizen participation. Local government SOs results often address **“more effective, responsive and accountable local government”** through:

- capacity-building
- improved legal environments
- greater autonomy
- the availability of intermediate support organizations
- increased participation

Programs often state as their anticipated results:

- “public policy decisions reflect of civic input”
- “broader participation in the formulation and implementation of public policies and budgeting”
- “more effective partnerships or cooperation between local government and citizens or local CSOs”

What measures were identified in the Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators?

The indicators in *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* suggest quantitative measurements, such as the numbers of meetings or attendees, which are often significant particularly where there is little tradition of participation. However, these

measurements are unable to recognize more nuanced information about the character and evolution of participatory processes and they can present problems for interpretation of the data as well as for setting targets for these kinds of indicators.

The two qualitative indicators offered here supplement quantitative indicators for information sharing or participatory mechanisms. They are not intended, however, to capture every aspect of participatory local governance. Instead, they reflect current approaches to and thought on participatory processes and the obstacles to participation. They encourage you to consider the course of participation and the various ways in which local decision-makers interact with citizens. The other illustrative indicator addresses the responsiveness of local government.

Local Government: What would a qualitative indicator for measuring increased participation in local government include?

The indicator assesses participation in stages. It is designed to provide a better understanding of the degree and character of citizen involvement in local governance and decision-making processes, the relationship between local government officials and civil society, and the varying functions of participatory mechanisms. The four stages included in this qualitative indicator are: information sharing, consultation, negotiation and collaboration, and delegation. This indicator assesses the trajectory from one stage to the next or the changes between elements within the same stage. Missions should modify these indicators to meet their needs according to relevance as noted below and through this handbook.

Qualitative Indicator:	Stage of citizen participation in local governance.
Approach:	Stage
Tool(s):	
Illustrative Results:	More participatory local government Increased public participation in local government decision-making
Indicator:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stage One: Information Sharing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government action: provides information (about budgets, service design/delivery, fees) but is not required to do so by law or by procedural arrangements. • Citizen participation: citizens function as recipients. • Outcome: Local government may provide some feedback, but makes no commitment to do so. • Mechanisms for information sharing: town meeting, public hearings, newsletter, website, and local/municipal information center. 2. Stage Two: Consultation Stage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government actions: invites relevant stakeholders, such as local CSOs, citizens groups, and community organization, to exchange information; requests input on issues or policy. • Citizen participation: citizens function as clients, are expected to express needs and comment on subject under discussion (budget, utility pricing) • Outcomes: Local government begins developing capacity to process input and offer response to commentary. Local governments are not required to address concerns. Final decisions rest with local government • Mechanisms for consultation: workshops, deliberative councils and local boards 3. Three: Negotiation/Collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government action: Encourages both mutual evaluation of issues or proposals and joint problem solving • Citizen participation: citizens function as partners in processes of negotiation and collaboration • Outcome: Some citizen influence on decision-making as local

	<p>governments and citizens attempt to build consensus and reach agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanisms for negotiation: joint working groups and task forces, steering groups or committees, local development trusts, co-management plans <p>4. Stage Four: Delegation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government actions: Shares or transfers, partially or in full, decision-making or managerial authority in certain sectors to citizens (community organizations, other CSOs, etc.) • Citizen participation: citizens function as managers and decision-makers. • Outcome: new power sharing arrangements (local government may retain power to veto or rescind decisions) • Mechanisms for delegation: municipal development boards, water boards, community councils, cooperatives
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

This indicator tracks the course and nature of participation between local government and civil society actors. However, it gauges this participation with respect to specific issues or processes in a targeted locality or in selected localities over the strategy period. For example, this indicator could assess ongoing participation in budgetary processes or in the design and implementation of a community development project. Depending on the context, it may be possible to assess participation between local government and citizens in more than one area. Clearly, the indicator needs to be adapted to various environments.

This indicator requires a baseline assessment to establish the different stages and particular configuration of elements within each stage. The assessment should identify any critical issues and elements potentially sensitive to change during the strategy period. It should suggest modification to the indicator.

Targets could be set annually or for the middle and last year of the strategy to reflect more gradual change. When the trend line is not obvious, this indicator may reveal patterns with which to track change (for example, the slower movement from Stage II to Stage III than from Stage I to Stage II, or frequency of movement).

Local Government: What would a qualitative indicator for responsive local government include?

Local governments consistently resist the adoption of more democratic decision-making practices. There are several reasons why even vigorous decisions at the national level to devolve responsibility and develop local level capacity can have little effect on the “democratic” disposition of local government. First, civil society may lack the capacity and know-how to make demands on local government. This may be a result of shortages in resources, weak organizational structures or a population’s unfamiliarity with local government processes. The first handbook provides numerous quantitative indicators that address: these problems, data on the institutionalization and sustainability of CSOs, and the availability of civic education.

Secondly, local governments may have few incentives to respond to any demands for inclusion in the decision-making process or for greater accountability. They often do not have established procedures or practices that make greater inclusion or accountability possible.

The following qualitative indicator considers factors that can affect the degree of responsiveness. This indicator is based on the assumption that local government responsiveness depends on a certain degree of professionalism, specific institutional arrangements, and incentives deriving from both. This indicator considers the following factors:

- Selection of local officials
- Selection of staff
- Professional expertise of staff
- Procedures and practices that facilitate input
- Procedures and practices that enforce or impose transparency

In order to better capture and gauge change, each factor is presented as a continuum; specific criteria determine location on the continuum, with respect to the degree of responsiveness.

Qualitative Indicator:	The degree to which specific (institutional) factors support or check responsiveness
Approach:	Continuum
Tool(s):	
Illustrative Results:	More responsive local government
Indicator:	<p>1. Selection of local officials Custom, tradition, or Appointment Reduced reliance on customary practices. Non-competitive elections or electoral systems. Competitive elections. Electoral management provides reliably free and fair elections Not responsive Middle range Responsive</p> <p>2. Selection of staff Local staff are designated by Mostly non-competitive hiring Mostly competitive hiring parties or are political appointees • few formal job descriptions • formal job descriptions • minority of staff hired either • majority of new hires based Patronage through merit or in on merit accordance with job • procedures for recruitment descriptions adopted and followed Not all positions distributed through patronage. Not responsive Middle range Responsive</p> <p>3. Professional expertise of staff</p>

	<p>Staff lacks experience and training Some staff has received training Mostly professional staff with in technical field or has some related experience. relevant degree. Training is a condition of employment.</p> <p>Not responsive Middle Range Responsive</p> <p>5. Procedures and practices that facilitate input</p> <p>6. Few or narrow points of entry or Access on an ad-hoc basis Multiple <i>and regular</i> channels of access to the decision-making • invitation to hearing access. process. • invitation to budget session diverse participatory Budget or planning meetings Staff hold irregular office hours mechanisms.losed.</p> <p>Staff/officials hold regular office hours.</p> <p>Participatory planning and budgeting.</p> <p>Not responsive Middle Range Responsive</p> <p>5. Procedures and processes that enforce or impose transparency</p> <p>Not responsive Middle range Responsive</p> <p>No independent oversight of municipal finance.</p> <p>No regular auditing.</p> <p>No requirement to publish budgets.</p> <p>Some independent oversight of municipal finance.</p> <p>Ad hoc auditing.</p> <p>Audit reports not generally available</p> <p>No requirement to publish budgets, only done so on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>Oversight of municipal finance and budgeting.</p> <p>Regular auditing and reporting.</p> <p>Budget process transparent; all budgets published.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

This indicator tracks factors that can affect the degree of responsiveness. The continuum is a good instrument for gauging the nature and direction of change. It can be used to assess change in one locality or to compare change in targeted localities. The continuum helps focus the analysis on gradations of change. Given the nature of institutional change, it may be appropriate to set targets for the middle or the end of the strategy period. Comparisons across factors may reveal some common trend lines.

Clearly, the relevance of any factor and the selection of specific placement criteria depend upon the country or local government context. Missions will have to adapt the indicator to reflect other factors that effect responsiveness. Once the selection of factors and criteria has been fixed, a baseline assessment would examine the extent to which each factor either supports or checks responsiveness. The assessment will suggest which factors are potentially sensitive to change during the strategy period and make suggestions for any modifications to the indicator.

Local Government: What would qualitative indicators for “private/public collaboration on service delivery” include?

Missions typically design activities that combine participation in local governance with service delivery. The objective is to improve the quality of service delivery, have it better meet and respond to local needs, while strengthening both the local government bodies and citizen organizations involved in the process. These objectives are usually expressed in broad intermediate results. To develop indicators for this type of multi-faceted indicators, officers need to address the critical elements of community level service delivery, as well as the forms of participation in decisions about service delivery.

The following indicators are based on three distinct program emphases: the development and dissemination of best practices, mechanisms for collaboration, and pre-conditions and initial support for service delivery. Missions should modify these indicators to meet their needs according to relevance as noted below and through this handbook.

First Indicator (Qualitative)

This indicator reveals, for each program emphasis, where efforts were underway, to what extent, and perhaps with what effect. This information is beneficial for program management.

Qualitative Indicator:	The extent to which best methods have been developed in several key areas; mechanisms for collaboration are created and used; and preconditions for service delivery are established.
Approach:	Program Emphases Framework
Tool(s):	
Illustrative Results:	Increased public/private sector collaboration on service delivery Citizen participation in service delivery
Indicator:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and Disseminate Methods/Best Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods for local resource mobilization, possible efficiency, improvement of service delivery • Methods by which local deliberative bodies and communities can work together • Best practices for improved community service delivery • Mechanisms, such as coordinating committee or website, for sharing methods/practices. • Model of collaboration to improve community level services (for the purpose of replication) 2. Establishing Mechanisms For Collaboration Between Stakeholders And Deliberative Bodies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and define mechanisms • Implement mechanisms • Use mechanisms to initiate/facilitate collaboration 3. Establishing Preconditions/ Initial Support for Service Delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills/knowledge training for local deliberative bodies • Mechanisms for private sector providers to access capital • Commodity support • Facilitating communication/coordination with oversight body: local,

	regional or national. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Small grants program (e.g., related and discrete CBO activities)
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

How would a mission use the indicator in practice?

The mission needs to adapt this type of illustrative indicator, perhaps changing program emphases, perhaps changing elements listed in each. In some cases, the mission should establish even more specific criteria for assessing the elements in each category. A baseline assessment would enable further refinement of the indicator framework, particularly if the assessment reveals certain elements to be more sensitive to change. It may be that during the strategy period, as the program evolves, certain activities receive more time or resources, or are deemed priorities. In light of this, it may be necessary to modify individual elements. These same factors should inform target setting. In some cases, targets could be set on an annual basis. In others, perhaps mid-point targets make more sense, for example, establishing mechanisms to help private sector providers access capital.

Local Government: Additional Indicators (Milestones)

It is possible to measure, either quantitatively or qualitatively, movement along a specified trajectory. Putting together a set of milestones would require looking at the elements within each program emphasis category and specifying an order in which you think each will be begun and executed during the project or strategy period.

Milestone Indicator:	The extent to which best methods have been developed in several key areas; mechanisms for collaboration are created and used; and preconditions for service delivery are established.
Approach:	Program emphases framework
Tool(s):	Milestone
Illustrative Results:	Increased public/private sector collaboration on service delivery Citizen participation in service delivery
Indicator:	<p>For example:</p> <p>Program emphasis 1: You could select milestones such that, first you establish best methods, then you derive best practices or lessons learned, and finally you create a model for future replication.</p> <p>Program emphasis 2: You may find that the development of a mechanism for collaboration, its implementation and then actual use already constitute a trajectory. However, it may be more useful to break each milestone into phases.</p> <p>Program emphasis 3: You need to examine the project strategy. Do you anticipate focusing on skills first, then private sector access to capital, and then commodity support? Do you try to establish means of communications early on?</p> <p>You need to answer these questions prior to setting the appropriate milestones. Once you've set up the milestones in each category, it is possible to design actual indicators.</p>

How would a mission use the indicator in practice?

Use a qualitative assessment of movement along the trajectory specified for each program emphasis. This assessment would determine both how far you've gone and any impediments to moving from one milestone to the next. As with stage indicators, it may be possible to establish or anticipate certain trend lines.

It is best to use quantitative measurement through the milestone scales. It is possible to score each program emphasis category according to the number of milestones reached. You can use these scores to measure performance in different ways. For example, you might report individually on all three program emphasis categories, average the three scores, or present a combined total. The choice depends on your preferences, on whether you want to emphasize, demonstrate or explain differences among the categories, or just like one collective measure.

SECTION C: ANTI-CORRUPTION ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS

ANTI-CORRUPTION

What are USAID's objectives?

USAID recognizes the serious obstacles corruption poses for both democratic and economic development. It undermines chances for improved representation, accountability in governance, an impartial and independent judiciary, and greater equity. Combating corruption requires the implementation of reforms designed to address the several, often mutually reinforcing, sources or incentives for corruption. As identified in the *Handbook on Fighting Corruption*, USAID's anticorruption programming seeks to initiate institutional reforms that:

- attempt to limit monopolies on authority and resources
- improve accountability
- realign incentives

Anti-corruption programs create an awareness of the consequences of corruption and the role that advocacy, which can play a role in dismantling corrupt systems, institutions, and procedures.

What are main types of activities?

Missions fund the establishment of local TI chapters, other civil society organizations and anti-corruption NGO networks which foster transparency and accountability of governments and encourage greater citizen participation. Missions also encourage access to information laws and train journalists in effective investigative reporting techniques for corruption cases. They support institutional strengthening efforts for governmental oversight bodies such as supreme audit institutions, legislative committees and anti-corruption commissions and implement programs to strengthen the capacity of financial management and internal control systems of governments at national and sub-national levels. Missions seek to reduce corruption in the judiciary through training in judicial ethics, training prosecutors in investigating corruption cases and administrative improvements such as case tracing systems.

What results must be measured?

USAID programs that address corruption indirectly through their anticipated results frequently seek:

- "a more efficient and independent judiciary"
- "more competitive political processes"
- "a more effective or more accountable legislature"

Missions include a diverse set of activities with anti-corruption payoffs including:

- more transparent criminal justice
- enhanced prosecutorial capacity for corruption cases
- stronger parliamentary committees for oversight of budget development and execution with audit capabilities

More recently, missions are creating more inclusive anti-corruption IRs. These intend to capture new government anti-corruption initiatives, particularly those assisted by USAID, and build on current anti-corruption indicators. A sample of these more comprehensive IRs includes:

- Tangible steps toward reducing corruption taken
- Increased civil society oversight and participation

- Visible decrease in corrupt practices in the public sector
- Increased public awareness of corruption
- Government efforts to reduce corruption increased
- Strengthened approaches to improve public sector legitimacy

What measures were identified in the Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators?

Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators contains several indicators that address apparent reductions in corruption or the presence of mechanisms established to prevent, monitor, or curtail corruption. One set of indicators, under IR 2.4.3, “ethical practices in government strengthened,” examines public perceptions of corruption in the delivery of services. It examines the perceptions of corruption by private sector actors engaging in business with the state and the time and cost of attempting to get a license from government regulatory or licensing agencies. These perception indicators gauge whether or not there is a decline in corrupt practices in transactions between citizens and government.

A second set, under IR 2.4.3.2, “oversight mechanisms to maintain ethical standards strengthened,” focus primarily on the existence of these mechanisms. These ask whether or not the government maintains an auditor general’s office, inspector general’s office, office of ethics in government, or anticorruption agency. Other indicators address the availability of resources and the general administrative capacity of these agencies. These indicators may provide insights into government commitment to these efforts and their willingness to allocate resources.

These indicators have significant limitations. These quantitative indicators cannot explicitly assess:

- the correspondence between the mandate and actual functions of oversight mechanisms; the nature and scope of their authority (and their independence)
- the relationship between a specific anti-corruption activity and broader reform initiatives; or the pace and process of reform
- what factors may account for changes in perception of corruption, such as improved management or an effective public relations campaign
- whether or not the changes in the perception of corruption actually track with or reflect institutional changes
- the project conditions to predict the effects of anti-corruption efforts

Key factors to consider when reviewing the qualitative indicator in HQI include:

1. The purpose and function of oversight mechanisms

In addition to asking if an oversight mechanism exists, it is necessary to consider its mandate and functions. What is the stated purpose? What does it actually do? Auditing offices, anti-corruption commissions, or ethics offices, despite the nomenclature, may or may not perform the same or similar functions. Their activities may include: formulating a code of ethics, drafting anti-corruption legislation, educating the public and raising awareness, providing some form of auditing, formulating sanctions, or investigating infractions. The agency or office may coordinate a broader anticorruption effort. Is there a balance among responsibilities or specific priorities? Is there follow up to the implementation that includes enforcement and prosecutorial abilities?

2. Authority and independence of oversight mechanisms

Does the office or agency have the authority, legal or otherwise, to execute its mandates, to do its job? For example, can it craft a code of conduct for government employees, disseminate it, and set up the appropriate enforcement mechanisms? Or is its authority limited—in terms of activities or jurisdiction, for example? Is its authority compromised in any way? How independent is this office or agency in setting its own mandate, in managing its internal affairs? Do resources, including funding sources and staffing, compromise this in any way? If the body is an extension of the Prime Minister's office or legislature can it work without undue interference? Is there civil society participation and oversight to demand transparency and accountability?

3. Relation of anti-corruption actions to broader reform initiatives

Is this a single activity? Limited to one particular ministry or office? If it is part of a larger initiative, to overhaul the public sector, reform the civil service, or resuscitate parliament, for example, what function does this activity serve in relation to the whole? One would anticipate different results from an anti-corruption activity intended to accompany civil service reforms, and one intended to make parliament more accountable.

4. Process

Is it possible to determine just how an anticorruption initiative is to move forward? Will it be done in stages? If an anti-corruption legislation or a code of ethics is to be created, what does the drafting process look like? Is there an agenda or time line? Has this been honored? Any of these factors can be the basis for a qualitative indicator, as elaborated in the following indicators.

Anti-Corruption: What would indicators for oversight mechanisms include?

These indicators consider the functions of oversight mechanisms. What is the organization's mandate or express duties? What does it actually do, in comparison to this mandate? (Again, it seems reasonable to expect differences in functions for auditing agencies, as opposed to anti-corruption commissions, but there may be similarities in any given environment.)

First Indicator (Qualitative)

Rather than pinpointing one particular process, this indicator asks if, and to what extent, the agency or office has moved forward on a series of tasks and developed certain competencies. If it has not, where has this been impeded? This assessment permits a better understanding of correspondence or discrepancy between original missions and tasks undertaken. It would also reveal changes in tasks (or priorities or emphases, on prevention rather than sanctions, for example) during the reporting period.

Qualitative Indicator:	Degree to which oversight mechanism executes mandate or assumes functions
Approach:	Functional capacity assessment
Tool(s):	
Illustrative Results:	Government efforts to reduce corruption increased Anti-corruption efforts or oversight mechanisms strengthened
Indicator:	<p>To determine the scope and level of activities under each task</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For each office or agency, stipulate original mandate 2. Determine individual tasks in mandate 3. Specify and define individual activities undertaken by agency or office. Then assess the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Extent to which activities are underway or being implemented. ii. Extent to which activities are nearing conclusion. iii. Extent to which activities have been routinized or standardized (for example, auditing and reporting). iv. Specify results expected for each activity, if information is available, and progress towards these. The tasks outlined below are illustrative. Each mission would need to adjust these as appropriate to anti-corruption initiatives. <p>A. Anti-corruption Agency or Office of Government Ethics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Elaborates standards for behavior of public officials <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. stipulates sanctions ii. establishes means of enforcement iii. formulates regulations, policies, or code b. Provides guidance to other institutions of government for the establishment of internal affairs/ disciplinary offices. c. Investigates and initiates prosecution of high-level public offices (coordinates with law enforcement agency, police, and prosecutors, as appropriate, as part of this process.) d. Creates or coordinates anti-corruption campaigns or efforts at the national and/or sub-national levels (regions, states, provinces, for example) e. Designs and implements an anti-corruption education/awareness program (for the general public, for civil servants) <p>B. Audit Agency</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Audits on a regular basis b. Submits reports c. Monitors individuals or units d. Reviews cases e. Refers to authorized prosecutorial agency, if necessary
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

With respect to auditing functions, this indicator is designed for a national agency or perhaps a pilot in one ministry. It could also be adapted for a small sample of cases. If there is an extensive network of internal affairs offices, for example, quantitative indicator #2 below may be more appropriate.

Second Indicator (Hybrid)

It is possible to create hybrid indicators (which quantify qualitative data) and quantitative indicators that focus on the functions of oversight mechanisms. However, they provide less information about the extent and nature of change or about correspondence with the original mandate. The following indicator assesses the extent to which an agency has executed its mandate or made headway on several tasks.

Qualitative Indicator:	Degree to which oversight mechanism executes mandates or performs tasks
Approach:	Functional Capacity Assessment
Tool(s):	Index
Illustrative Results:	Government efforts to reduce corruption increased Anti-corruption efforts or oversight mechanisms strengthened
Indicator:	<p>The Anti-corruption agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elaborates standards for behavior of public officials. 2. Provides guidance to other institutions of government for the establishment of internal affairs/disciplinary offices. 3. Investigates and initiates prosecution of high-level public offices (coordinates with law enforcement agency, police, and prosecutors, as appropriate, as part of this process) 4. Creates or coordinates anti-corruption campaigns at the national and/or sub-national levels (regions, states, provinces, for example) 5. Designs and implements an anti-corruption education/awareness program (for the general public, for civil servants)

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

The mission would use this indicator for program management. Score this indicator by:

- 1. Performance of tasks is scored on a scale ranging from one to five. One represents only an initial or minimal level of activity. Five represents a high level of activity.
- 2. Although not necessary, it may be useful to stipulate particular criteria (describing each task and selected activities) for scoring each element.
- 3. These points would be totaled for a score, with a possible range of 5 to 25, and tracked on a yearly basis.

Third Indicator (Quantitative)

This indicator is most appropriate for ascertaining the performance of a larger target group or potential sample, such as numerous internal affairs offices throughout the executive or at different levels of government.

Quantitative Indicator:	Number of internal affairs/auditing offices that perform X or more of the (possible) functions below
Approach:	
Tool(s):	
Illustrative Results:	Government efforts to reduce corruption increased Anti-corruption efforts or oversight mechanisms strengthened
Indicator:	Auditing office: illustrative functions 1. Undertakes auditing on a regular basis 2. Submits reports on a regular basis 3. Monitors individuals or units 4. Reviews cases 5. Takes disciplinary actions 6. Refers cases to authorized prosecutorial agency, if necessary

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

The key concern here is defining the appropriate unit of measure. If these offices are relatively new, counting the offices that perform two or more functions may be reasonable and a sensitive measure of change. At the other end of the spectrum, where offices are well established, counting the number that performs four tasks may be more telling and significant. Similar considerations should also inform target setting.

**SECTION D: POLITICAL PARTY ASSISTANCE
ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS**

POLITICAL PARTY ASSISTANCE

What are USAID's objectives?

USAID's political party programs have three long-term objectives:

- peaceful political competition through the creation of organizationally viable political parties;
- improvement of party performance during the electoral process; and
- improvement of party skills managing legislative processes, whether in the majority or minority.

What are the main types of activities?

The absence of viable political parties to serve as a principal channel of organizing and communicating interests, on a sustained basis, constitutes a potential fault line for new democracies. As a consequence, USAID party programs often emphasize institution building with a focus on representation and participation, both internal to the party and externally as well. So, USAID encourages membership involvement in party governance, better linkages between national and regional party offices, and making special efforts to recruit women, youth and minority populations. It also assists parties to strengthen outreach to constituencies, better represent and serve their constituents and aggregate interests by surveying preferences, for example.

What results must be measured?

Institution building and representation are one set of results commonly sought by USAID programs. For example, programs often state as their anticipated results:

- "political parties are more transparent"
- "participatory political parties are more accountable" and
- "political party platforms reflect public interests"

Competitive political systems are the results sought by another set of USAID political party assistance programs. Results are often stated in terms of:

- Coalition building
- Cooperation among parties
- Multi party dialogues
- Creating mechanisms to regulate the political system
- Institutional relations among parties
- Determining the rules of the political game.

What measures were identified in the Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators?

The indicators offered in the *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* focus primarily on the organizational development of political parties. Indicators are offered for three main results:

For the result “*Political parties have institutional structures that reflect internal democratic structures and procedures that are judged to be transparent, inclusive and accountable, and that are accepted by party leaders*”, proposed indicators measure:

- the extent to which by-laws are crafted to promote democracy,
- the extent of membership participation in platform development, and
- the existence of internal communication structures promotes communication between party offices.

For the result “*Political parties have established functioning political party administrative structures that advance institutional stability in the long term,*” proposed indicators measure:

- the dispersion of party offices;
- the availability of staff and formal job description;
- the development of leadership and/or other training programs; and,
- the extent of long-term planning.

For the result “*Increased institutional capacity of each political party to identify, represent and expand its defined constituency in the electorate,*” proposed indicators measure:

- The extent to which parties conduct democracy and other research on districts;
- The extent to which parties assess constituent concerns (as part of agenda or policy development);
- Whether parties maintain membership lists;
- Whether they conduct membership drives or maintain auxiliaries for corporate groups or minorities.

For the result “*Representative and competitive multi-party system*” proposed indicators emphasize:

- The institutionalization of opposition parties;
- Party strength in fielding illustratives;
- Party capacity to formulate clearly recognizable, fully articulated agendas and programs.

Of particular note is that these indicators are essentially qualitative, involving some form of assessment.⁴ For the most part, though to different extents, the suggested indicators have not been fully elaborated, illustrating the need to find measures that can adequately answer the complex and multifaceted questions that we have about party systems.

Political Party Assistance: What would a qualitative indicator of “more competitive political processes” include?

The qualitative indicator presented below is intended to complement, and certainly extend, the aforementioned indicators that focus on the institutionalization and establishment of ruling and opposition political parties. However, “competitiveness” as a concept goes beyond the formation of viable individual parties. We need an indicator that tracks whether or not the party system has allowed for the emergence of more democratic and long-lived competition, not only the formation of parties.

⁴ One indicator in the Indicator Handbook examines the percent of votes received by illustratives running for office under political party labels, and the other looks at the percent of illustratives in elections running for office under political party labels.

The assessment required for this indicator should answer the questions stipulated below for each element. These are not presented sequentially or according to significance. (It is important to note that this indicator does not equate any particular electoral system with greater democratic competition.) As with the other indicators, this is intended as a comprehensive indicator. Missions need to modify the indicator according to relevance as noted below and through this handbook.

Illustrative Indicator for *More Competitive Political Processes*

Qualitative Indicator:	
Illustrative Results:	More competitive political processes
Approach:	Qualitative
Tool(s):	Questionnaire
Indicator:	<p>Extent to which the <u>party system</u> allows for democratic competition by posing questions about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expansion or retraction of public space for competition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do parties receive government funding to finance campaigns and parties? Is this distributed equitably? • Are parties guaranteed time on television or radio, or editorial space in newspapers during the campaign? • Is there sufficient freedom for political debate? Does the government tolerate expression of opposing viewpoints or ideological agendas? 2. Extent of system legitimacy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do people accept the current party system? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Is voter turnout increasing? ➢ Do citizens voice interests via political parties? ➢ Are parties, rather than social protest movements, gaining support? • Do parties reach out to constituents, elicit their opinions or concerns, and act upon those interests? Do individual illustratives who reject existing parties fare poorly in elections? Nationally? Regionally? Locally? To what extent do illustratives support the idea of a multi-party system? • Has there been a decline in the number or percentage of non-party illustratives elected? Or in the percentage of votes received by these illustratives? 3. Existence of viable party organizations⁵ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have parties adopted rules and structures for internal democracy? • Are parties well administered and organized?

⁵ Any of the political party indicators in the first handbook may be relevant and appropriate here, as long as they speak to the issue of viability.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do parties attempt to increase and/or diversify membership? • Have parties diversified funding sources (aside from contributions from individual illustratives)? • Has a second or third generation of leaders succeeded the original leadership? • To what extent do the parties enforce discipline? • Have parties articulated a specific electoral platform or issues agenda? <p>4. System stability and predictability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are there predictable party contestants in elections? • Are party coalitions or blocs stable? • Do individual politicians remain loyal to the party that they were elected to represent? • To what extent do parties articulate and adhere to a particular ideological outlook? Do they practice what they preach? <p>5. Formalization of inter-party relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do parties express a general acceptance of the roles that parties play in a democratic system? • Are there formal mechanisms for governing party participation, establishing and enforcing the rules of the game? • To what extent do parties accept and abide by rules of competition – during election periods? • Are there rules of codes of conduct in the legislature or parliament? • Do parties join in legislative or parliamentary coalitions or caucuses?
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

How would a mission use this indicator in practice?

After an initial revision and adaptation of this indicator, the mission should conduct a baseline assessment. This assessment should identify any questions or elements critical or salient with regard to the party system and those elements potentially sensitive to change during the strategy period. It might make further modifications in the indicator at this point.

Targets could be set on a yearly basis, given the possibility of registering change against certain criteria or elements. For other criteria or elements, change may be more gradual and targets might be set at the middle and last year of the strategy. Clearly, setting targets and the ability to answer certain questions may depend on the election cycle. The target would have to be modified accordingly.

**SECTION E: RULE OF LAW
ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS**

RULE OF LAW

What are USAID's objectives?

The rule of law and the development of an effective and equitable justice system are essential underpinnings of a democratic society. The objective of the USAID Rule of Law program is to support the role of legal systems in consolidating democracy. These programs strengthen foreign legal systems and reinforce country-based efforts in the areas of:

- Promoting respect for human rights
- Improving the institutional administration of justice
- Increasing access to justice
- Building local constituencies for justice sector reform and improvement

RESOURCES: Several DG Office publications provide extensive information on programming and experiences to date. They offer guidance on activities and detail the conceptual framework that informs USAID efforts. These include:

- *The ROL Strategy Framework (Guide to ROL Country Analysis)*
- *Guide to Administrative Law for DG Officers*
- *Alternative Dispute Resolution Practitioners Guide*
- *Case Tracking and Management*
- *Guide Guidance for Promoting Judicial Independence and Impartiality*
- *Achievements in Building and Maintaining the Rule of Law: MSI's Studies in LAC, E&E, AFR, and ANE*

What are the main types of activities?

Rule of Law programming focuses on creating four essential elements: legitimacy, fairness, checks and balances, and effectiveness. Over forty missions currently provide assistance towards a rule of law objective. Activities address fundamental challenges to democratic governance, such as disruption of public order and security; undemocratic and unchecked concentrations of power; systematic abuses of official authority with impunity; inequality before the law; and the poor performance of courts as a government service.

What results can be measured?

The Rule of Law program recently adopted a new strategic framework that designates five categories of programming addressing the: order and security, legitimacy, checks and balances; fairness, and effective application of legal systems. These categories describe the means in which USAID supports the role of foreign legal systems in consolidating democracy. Each of these elements must be present for rule of law to prevail. The following chart was presented in the ROL Guide to Country Analysis to further describe rule of law issues under each element.

Essential Elements	Legal Frameworks	Judicial Institutions
	<p>Constitutions, codes, regulations</p>	<p>– Judiciary, prosecutors, defense, police, bar, civil society. – Customary/religious and community institutions.</p>
<p>Order and Security</p>	<p>What is the legal basis for maintaining order? Is the constitution or other basic laws in effect? Is society under martial law or other exceptional law (e.g., laws of foreign occupation, UN Security Council Resolution? Is a cease-fire or peace accord working?</p>	<p>Is there an effective police force? Do police cooperate well with prosecutors and the courts in the gathering of evidence and prosecution of criminal cases?</p>
<p>Legitimacy</p>	<p>What is the source of law? What is its history? What groups in society wrote the laws?</p> <p>What is the place of customary or religious law? Is it recognized as part of the laws of the country or is its status unclear? Does it conflict with laws which are part of the formally adopted legal system? If it does conflict with the official framework of laws, do substantial portions of the population nevertheless regard it as having priority over the official legal codes?</p>	<p>How long have the key institutions been in place? How are they viewed by the public? By different social groups?</p> <p>What role do customary, religious, or community institutions play in practice in the justice sector? Are they regarded as more legitimate and credible than institutions of the state? Do judges, prosecutors, and lawyers understand and properly apply customary and religious law (where it has been officially adopted as part of the country's legal framework)?</p> <p>Do prosecutors use their authority to bring charges fairly and impartially based on credible evidence? or do they prosecute or not prosecute individuals or organizations for political, social, corrupt, or other illegitimate reasons (or are they perceived as acting in this way)? do they consistently fail to act to protect certain persons or groups from rights violations?</p> <p>Do police and other bodies performing law enforcement/public order functions consistently act within the law? Do police routinely violate human rights with relative impunity? Do courts</p>

		routinely accept and consider illegally obtained evidence (coerced confessions, items obtained as the result of illegal searches Are there armed groups who harm and intimidate citizens with seeming impunity?
Fairness		
Equal application		Are all parties treated the same in the courtroom? Do judges and other parties act with decorum and with respect for all parties? Are judges' rulings consistent regardless of the status of the parties before the court?
Protection of rights	Which human rights treaties has the state ratified? Does the framework of laws in the country recognize these rights and provide for means of enforcing them? If the country is not a signatory to international human rights treaties, does its constitution nevertheless recognize basic human rights generally recognized by international law? Have subordinate laws been passed providing for institutions and procedures to enforce those rights?	Are human and other rights established by law well understood and consistently respected and protected in practice by the courts, prosecutors and police? Do members of the public understand their basic human rights as guaranteed by their constitution and international law?
Procedural fairness	Are the laws prescribing the procedures to be followed in civil and criminal proceedings consistent with international fair trial standards?	Are civil and criminal procedures as set forth in the codes consistently followed in practice? Are judges' decisions well-reasoned, supported by the evidence presented and consistent with all applicable law? In cases in which judges have discretion in the enforcement of trial procedures, do they exercise that discretion reasonably and in a way which encourages the fair and expeditious resolution of cases?
Access	Does the constitution guarantee the right to legal counsel in legal proceedings, and legal counsel for indigents at government expense in	Do most segments of society understand their legal rights and the role of the legal system in protecting them? Do they understand how the courts work and

	<p>criminal proceedings? Have laws been passed which provide mechanisms for providing such counsel?</p>	<p>how to access them effectively?</p> <p>What mechanisms are in place for defense of indigents accused of crimes (public defenders service, court-appointed counsel)? Does the mechanism utilized provide, in practice, competent legal counsel for indigent criminally accused?</p> <p>Do women use the justice system, and what are the results?</p> <p>Where do poor people go to obtain justice? Other social groups and classes?</p> <p>Do lawyers have the knowledge and skills necessary to competently advise parties and advocate their interests in court?</p>
<p>Checks & Balances</p> <p>Independence, autonomy & accountability</p>	<p>Do the constitution and laws of the country provide that the judiciary is an independent branch of government? Do the laws relating to the structure and operations of the judiciary place the principal control over most judicial operations in the hands of the judiciary itself?</p>	<p>Is the independence of the judiciary respected in practice? Do high ranking government officials frequently and strongly criticize the courts, judges or their decisions? Are sudden audits/inspections of court operations (usually by the ministry of justice) used to intimidate judges? Are changes in pay, allowances and court budgets used to reward judges supporting the government's position or to punish judges making decisions which are politically unpopular or contrary to the interests of the government?</p>
<p>Effective Application</p>	<p>Do civil procedure codes and other laws relating to the enforcement of civil judgments prescribe clear responsibilities and well-defined and efficient procedures for enforcement of civil judgments? Is sufficient legal authority provided to judges and enforcement agents (e.g., marshals, bailiffs, sheriffs, debt collection agents, and police) to effectively enforce judgments? Do enforcement laws include provisions permitting a judge to issue interim orders freezing or otherwise protecting assets</p>	<p>Are civil cases tried effectively and in a timely manner? Are there significant delays in the trials of cases and substantial case backlogs? Are case disposition times in line with recognized standards for courts in the region? Are judges proactive in reducing trial delays (limiting continuances, sanctioning non-appearing parties, ensuring proper service of process)? Are judges fully knowledgeable about the applicable laws and trial procedures? Are decisions consistently well-reasoned and legally correct? Are a substantial number of</p>

	pending final judgment? Does the law permit parties to reopen and relitigate the case as part of enforcement proceedings?	cases reversed on appeal and returned for retrial? Is case document processing by court staffs inefficient and excessively time-consuming?
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Within the new framework, a great variety of IRs and indicators could be pursued. The following section suggests mission level IRs with complimentary indicators for more common Rule of Law programs. IRs are designated by the darkened bullet; their indicators are indicated by an unfilled bullet. It should be noted that some qualitative indicators could be an objective in one context and an indicator in another. For example, “security courts eliminated” might be an objective (an end in itself) in one country context, or it might be an indicator (a milestone in a complex process of criminal law reform, for example) in another country context.

Order and Security

- Security courts eliminated (Key Informant interviews, direct observations)
- Prosecutorial discretion reduced (Expert panel, peer review, key informant interviews, focus groups, case study)
- Revised criminal code (milestone scale, index, scorecard)
- Prosecutors trained (Questionnaire, focus group, direct observations, case study)

Legitimacy

- New constitution is drafted with extensive public input and ratified via referendum (Milestone scale, expert panel)
- New codes drafted with extensive public input in the form of hearings, consultations with stakeholders, etc. (Expert panel, key informant interviews, focus groups, direct observation, case studies)
- Customary or religious laws and legal institutions are sanctioned by constitutional or other formal legal instruments (Expert panel, case study)
- Customary or religious institutions adjudicate cases on a voluntary basis, in parallel with the formal legal system (Key informant interviews, focus groups, case studies)

Fairness

- Revised criminal procedure code adopted
 - Criminal procedure code places burden of proof on the state
 - Defendants charged with serious crimes have right to counsel
 - Criminal defendants have right to review evidence against them
 - Only judges may issue subpoenas
 - Prosecutorial discretion increased
 - Fewer criminal cases based on confessions
- Security courts eliminated
- Revised civil procedure code adopted
 - Judges have power to compel appearance in court
 - Administrative law requires comment period on new regulation
- Indigent clients receive public defense
 - System of public defense established

- All defendants accused of a serious crime are assigned a public defender if indigent
- Quality of defense bar improved
 - Defense lawyers required to take continuing legal education
 - Defense lawyers trained in and use practical skills such as how to cross-examine witnesses
- Quality of bar improved
 - Bar exam and licensing instituted and required to practice law
 - Continuing legal education requirements instituted
 - Law school curriculum features practical skills training as well as legal theory
 - Ethical rules governing the practice of law and mechanisms for enforcing them are established
 - Courts have power to hold lawyers in contempt for failure to appear or to file a pleading
- Judges have improved knowledge of legal developments are able to adjudicate cases based upon the law
 - Fewer judgments overturned in cases falling under new laws (i.e. bankruptcy)
 - Cases involving newer areas of law are handled more quickly
- New Constitution with human rights guarantees ratified
 - Constitution upholds universally accepted human rights such as right to free speech, right to a fair trial, etc.
- Human rights defenders trained
 - Public interest law firms established
 - Legal clinics established
- Human rights commission established
 - Human rights commission given adequate budget and fully staffed
 - Human rights commission given subpoena powers
- Justice houses established
 - Justice houses have trained legal or paralegal staff available
- More transparent judicial processes instituted
 - Judicial decisions available in writing and to public
 - Journalists permitted in courtrooms
 - Simplified case filing processes
 - Fees for filing a case reduced
 - Forms for filing a case simplified
 - Increased public information regarding judicial processes available at court or on-line
- Small claims courts established
- Administrative Law processes adopted
 - Proposed regulations published for comment before adoption
 - System of adjudication of regulations instituted (i.e. administrative law judges)
 - Administrative fees schedules posted in government offices
- Judicial salaries increased
 - Judicial salaries comparable to salaries of senior civil servants
- Court security enhanced
- Statute laws and secondary legislation/administrative norms are regularly published
- Copies of laws are distributed to courts outside the capital

- Court interpreters are available in those areas where large numbers of residents do not speak the national language

Checks and Balances

- Law on Judiciary Revised/Adopted
 - Law on judiciary provides for life tenure of judges
 - Judicial Inspectorate eliminated
 - Judicial Council Established
 - Judges cannot be transferred without their consent
 - Judges' compensation, including pension, fixed while they are in office
- Control of Judicial Budget Transferred from MOJ to Judiciary
 - Court administrators hired and trained for all courts
 - Judicial budget appropriated by legislative body and disbursed through Ministry of Finance or directly to judiciary
- Judicial disciplinary system established/reformed
 - Authority to investigate judicial misconduct vested in Judicial Council
 - Operating procedures for removing a judge, featuring due process, instituted
- Constitutional "budget quota" for judicial operations established
- Judicial selection procedures reformed
 - Judicial exams implemented
 - Judges appointed after nomination by independent body
- Constitutional court established/strengthened
 - Constitutional court empowered to determine constitutionality of all legislative and executive acts
- Parliamentarians' perceptions of courts' effectiveness in redressing executive abuses of power (split between govt. and non-government party members)
 - Citizens perception of courts ability to resolve disputes with government impartially
- Prosecutorial discretion reduced

Effectiveness

- Revised criminal code
 - "New" crimes, such as money laundering, defined
- Prosecutors trained
 - Prosecutors learn how to prosecute organized crime
- Police have access to forensics equipment and are trained
- Witness protection programs exist
- Court security measures implemented
- Civil service system for hiring prosecutors established
- Improved case management speeds judicial processes
 - Case filing available to attorneys and the public upon request
 - Judges have contempt of court powers effectiveness?
 - Judges have powers to compel witnesses to appear in court ditto
- ADR speeds judicial processes
 - Court-Appendixed ADR program handles civil cases and resolves substantial percentage of cases without trial
- Plea bargaining instituted

How would missions use these indicators in practice?

This section takes two of the proposed indicators and discusses how to use them in practice.

- 1. Revised criminal procedure code adopted
 - Criminal procedure code places burden of proof on the state
 - Defendants charged with serious crimes have right to counsel
 - Criminal defendants have right to review evidence against them
 - Only judges may issue subpoenas
 - Prosecutorial discretion increased
 - Fewer criminal cases based on confessions

Many USAID ROL programs aim to see a country adopt a revised criminal procedure code. The objective is to modernize criminal justice systems and decrease violations of human rights such as lengthy pre-trial detention, confessions extracted by torture, etc. Since the objective is usually not simply to have the country pass a law, but rather to reform the criminal justice system, the indicator used to measure the objective must be multidimensional and look at the law in practice. The objective could be measured using several of the tools discussed in this handbook.

Index

One approach to this objective might be to create an index from the indicators relating to this objective. A local NGO, for example, might receive a grant to conduct focus groups on these questions and to assign a rating to each indicator on a scale. The ratings would then be averaged or combined with a weighting to determine each year whether the reform was taking place and being consolidated.

Milestone Scale

The objective could be measured by a milestone scale, in which the indicators were arranged in a chronological order according to an analysis of how the process of criminal justice reform might unfold.

Scorecard

If the intention of the mission is to characterize the nature of a new code that was passed with USAID assistance, a scorecard could be used to judge which dimensions of reform are contained in the legislation on a de jure basis. A panel of experts would presumably be asked to examine the new legislation and score it for its impact on these various elements.

Questionnaire/Key Informant interview/Focus groups

These tools could be used with the indicators, which would be posed as questions in order to ascertain whether the criminal procedure reform had been institutionalized in practice in the criminal justice system. The questions would not be appropriate for a general public survey, but could be meaningfully answered by representatives of various actors in the justice system, such as judges, defense lawyers, prosecutors, human rights activists, etc. Responses could be solicited on

a scale to judge the extent to which informed interlocutors feel that certain conditions (i.e. defendants have adequate counsel) have come about.

2. Judicial selection procedures reformed

- o Judicial exams implemented
- o Judges appointed after nomination by independent body

At first glance, these seem like simple yes or no indicators, and they could be used this way if the aim is to measure steps that a country is taking to reform its judicial selection procedures.

Another approach would be to use direct observations and write up case studies. For example, each time that judicial exams are implemented, direct observation would be used to determine whether the process of administering judicial exams was secure and whether grading by unbiased third parties was used so that judges were ultimately selected only based on merit. Case studies could be commissioned each year to examine how that year's new judges came to be on the bench. An expert panel could be convened to study the nomination process before and after reforms and make judgments as to the ability of the process to result in independent judges.

PART 3: APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: Civil Society Organization Advocacy Index

Because measuring CSO advocacy is a concern for all four Agency democracy objective areas, we have used this as an example of a multi-component index. The index is intended to be scored concerning one or more advocacy issues for a CSO. For example, given this issue, to what extent and how intensively did the CSO perform each component? The elements following each component are given as examples of the types of evidence to think about when scoring that component. Not all elements are likely to be relevant to every situation. The total score needs to be accompanied by a narrative explaining progress or strengths and weaknesses.

Each of the index components should be rated on a scale such as the following:

CSO collects input about the issue: (Circle one number)

None, not at all 1 2 3 4 5 Extensively

The scores for each component are added to form the score on the overall CSO Advocacy Index, which will range from 7 to 35 (given 7 components, as at present).

Components of the CSO Advocacy Index (scored for one or more issues):

Score:

_____ 1) Issue is timely, with the following possible elements:

- Issue is of vital concern to the group's constituents
- Issue is critically important to the current or future well-being of the CSO and/or its clients, but its importance is not yet broadly understood
- New opportunities for effective action exist
- At least a few key decision makers are receptive to the issue

_____ 2) CSO collects information and input about the issue, with the following elements and examples:

- Relevant government agencies and their respective roles in the issue are identified at national and local levels; knowledge and positions investigated
- General public input is solicited (including from women and minorities) on the issue via public meetings, focus groups, etc.
- Representative input is collected on the issue via surveys (including from women and minorities, where appropriate)
- Existing information and data on the issue is collected, such as for summaries or positions papers
- Policy analyses, such as the legal, political, social justice, or health aspects of the issue, are conducted

_____ 3) Formulating a policy position on the issue, with the following elements and characteristics:

- Policy formulation done in participatory (and gender-sensitive) manner
- Policy being advocated exists in writing, with formats and levels of detail that are appropriate for various audiences and policy makers
- Policy position is clearly and convincingly articulated
- Rationale for policy is coherent, persuasive, and uses information collected in component 2
- Presentation of policy position uses attractive and effective formats, such as graphs

_____ 4) Obtaining and/or allocating resources (especially time and money) for advocacy on the issue, with the following elements and examples:

- Contributions collected from members, interested citizens, and/or from other organizations (businesses, foundations, religious groups, etc.)
- Financial or other resources assigned to the issue from within the CSO
- Volunteer time to help advocate for the issue obtained and well managed
- International agencies with interests in the issue area identified, and their procedures for applying for financial support determined
- (Other resources?)

_____ 5) Coalition and network building, to obtain cooperative efforts for joint action on the issue, with the following elements and examples:

- Other groups and individuals with interests concerning the issue identified or persuaded to take an interest (may include govt. organizations which share concerns)
- Coalition formed (defined as any type of joint working group)
- An existing or new coalition or network activated, such as by having informal contacts, joint meetings, identifying common interests, sharing resources, etc.
- Joint or coordinated actions planned (see #6 and #7 below, for carrying out the actions)

_____ 6) Taking actions to influence policy or other aspects of the issue, with the following elements and examples:

- News releases generated or public meetings held
- Members/citizens encouraged to take appropriate actions, such as writing letters to legislators
- Active lobbying conducted for the policy position, such as by testifying in hearings, personal visits to legislators, etc.- Model legislation drafted and circulated to legislators
- Policy relevant position papers and recommendations disseminated, based on the input collected and coalition's joint interests

_____ 7) Follow up actions, after a policy decision is made, to foster implementation and/or to maintain public interest, with the following elements and examples:

- Monitoring the implementation of a newly passed law or policy, such as by making sure that authorized government funds are disbursed, implementing regulations are written and disseminated, checking implementation in field sites, asking members for feedback on how well it is working, etc.
- Some staff or volunteer time and resources are allocated to the issue or policy for monitoring
- [If desired policy was not passed] At least a minimal level of advocacy methods maintained to take advantage of next opportunity for pressing the issue, perhaps with a reformulated approach or different specifics
- [If desired policy was not passed] Public awareness and interest in issue monitored, to look for examples, incidents, opportunities to create or renew a sense of urgency on the issue

Data could be collected for this index by one or more of the methods laid out earlier in this section.

SOURCE: *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*. USAID/Center for Democracy and Governance, August 1998.

APPENDIX B: Example of an Index for Assessing the Quality of Legislative Processes

This index suggested could be more fully developed and used as an indicator to capture progress in strengthening legislative processes. It can also be used to monitor the legislative process with respect to one particular issue, such as reforming the criminal code or the laws on decentralization.

As shown in the draft below, a legislature would score between 8 and 40 points. Criteria for each of the eight components would need to be more fully fleshed out. The components could be changed or adapted to fit local circumstances. An expert panel could be convened once each year toward the end or immediately after the legislative session, with each panel member independently rating that session. Then the panel would convene to discuss their ratings, perhaps with an opportunity for panel members to adjust their original ratings. Scores of individual members would be added and divided by the total number of panel members in order to obtain an average. Both the total scores and the extent of variability among the raters would be of interest. Too much variability might suggest that the scale is insufficiently detailed or that raters need more training in its application. Over time, however, a panel of raters is likely to become more consistent, as they share understandings about the components, and become more observant of processes throughout the year. Data could be drawn for making the assessment from the legislative record, documents produced by the research service, panel members' contacts with MPs and staff, etc. Score each component on the following scale:

Never or Poorly 1 2 3 4 5 Excellently, at every opportunity

During the period from xxx to xxxx (or when working on the target legislation), how well did the legislature, in general, perform on each of the following quality characteristics?

Score:

- ___ 1) Use of facts and figures, of data drawn from reference service, Internet, or other sources
- ___ 2) Thoughtful use of legislative models and experience from other countries
- ___ 3) Use of analysis from reference service or other sources (think tanks, NGOs, etc.), including projections of impact on the country from various provisions
- ___ 4) Focus on constituent interests in considering legislation; MPs in frequent touch with constituents; information flows in both directions
- ___ 5) Inclusion of NGO and expert testimony; openness to hearing outside testimony; reference to testimony in considering legislation
- ___ 6) Wide involvement in committees and debate of deputies from different factions and parties
- ___ 7) Relevant government agencies and ministries work with legislature on drafting key items of legislation
- ___ 8) Drafting competence, clarity of language, internal consistency, and consistency with other laws

SOURCE: *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*. USAID/Center for Democracy and Governance, August 1998.

APPENDIX C: Example of a Milestone Scale for Measuring Progress in Achieving a Legal Reform

Making progress in reforming the law is fundamental to several results in the democracy and governance framework. The process of obtaining a reform is not, however, such a simple one. It involves a number of steps or stages and missions aiding the beginning of a difficult reform process may want to measure progress short of the actual achievement of the legal reform. For a given piece of legislation, mission staff could simply score this indicator or an expert observer, with the score being the highest stage (Milestone) passed during that year. If the processes are not sequential, then the score could be the number of stages completed.

Stage 1) Interested groups propose that legislation is needed on issue.

(Stakeholders, public interest groups, think tanks, key donors, and others are active in pressing for new legislation, such as by sharing relevant legislation and models from other countries, soliciting press coverage, sponsoring public fora or hearings, scheduling meetings with government officials and elected officials, publishing papers, etc. Stakeholders may form networks or coalitions to advocate.)

Stage 2) Issue is introduced in the relevant legislative committee/executive ministry.

(The issue is raised, discussions are being held, studies/research are being conducted, hearings are being conducted by committee)

Stage 3) Legislation is drafted by relevant committee or executive ministry. (If drafted by the executive, it is submitted to the legislature.)

Stage 4) Legislation is debated by the legislature. (Might include additional committee hearings, and/or consideration of alternative model laws, projecting likely impact of various provisions, and broad participation from delegates and stakeholders representing different factions and parties. This stage might extend over a considerable time, if revised versions are needed before passage is scored.)

Stage 5) Legislation is passed by full approval process needed in legislature.

Stage 6) Legislation is approved by the executive branch (where necessary).

Stage 7) Implementing actions are taken. (Such as executive agencies passing operating regulations, information disseminated to citizens about the new law, administering agencies informed and provided with technical assistance to fill any new role required by the law, etc.)

Stage 8) No immediate need identified for amendments to the law. (Shows law was well crafted) and lawmakers believe that given time it will have its intended effect.

Stages 2 and 3 above may need some adjustment depending on whether the executive branch is the primary drafter of legislation, which the legislature then reviews.

SOURCE: *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*. USAID/Center for Democracy and Governance, August 1998.

APPENDIX D: Scorecards

Another type of index is a scorecard that more simply examines a law, a process, or an organization to determine whether or not it has each of a set of desirable characteristics. As defined here, a scorecard is an index that uses a simple “yes” or “no” scoring, with a “yes” scored as 1 and “no” as 0 (binary scoring) for each of a number of characteristics or components. A scorecard is usually most appropriate when the judgments to be made are straightforward (e.g., a court has a judge with a recognized law degree or it does not). An index with rating scales for individual components may be better when more complex qualitative judgments are needed. A weighting system can also be used to assign a greater or lesser value to each characteristic. However, weights should be based on careful analysis, preferably empirical evidence, that those items weighted more heavily are truly more influential in achieving the overall result being addressed.

The following is an example of the *format* of a scorecard system for assessing improvement in NGO’s financial management:

Score Weight Weighted Score

1. Has a double entry bookkeeping system ____ X 2 = _____
2. Has an annual audit X 2 = _____
3. Produces accurate and timely quarterly financial statements ____ X 1 = _____
4. Controller is a chartered accountant X 1 = _____

TOTAL

Yes = 1 point; No = 0 points

Note: The above is intended only to show the *format* for this type of scorecard. It does not include all the components that might be needed to assess “financial management.” This very simple yes/no scorecard requires minimal training and inter-rater reliability testing, but it still requires some. The scorecard can be adjusted to adapt to NGOs at relatively early or late stages of development.

SOURCE: *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*. USAID/Center for Democracy and Governance, August 1998.

APPENDIX E: Scorecard for “Local Government Autonomy Enhanced”

This scorecard was originally developed for the Ukraine mission as a way of tracking and assessing the development, drafting, passage, and implementation of those pieces of legislation that make up the statutory framework for autonomy. By conceiving this as a progression through ten specific stages, this scorecard is sophisticated measure that provides detailed information on a wide range of laws. The stages are

1. Relevant NGOs are involved and are ready to provide support
2. Drafts of amendments or new laws are ready and submitted for review by relevant agencies/organizations
3. Drafts endorsed by agencies/organizations and submitted to the Parliament
4. Passed by Parliament
5. Enabling regulations adopted
6. Implementation mechanism established
7. General public informed
8. Implementation commenced
9. Implementation advanced (applied in 30 percent to 40 percent of municipalities)
10. Implementation comprehensive (applied in over 70 percent of municipalities)

Stages in legislation

Laws/regulations

1 3 7 8 9 10

Law on Local Self-governance

Law on Local State Administrations

Law on Communal Property

Law on Local Taxes and Fees Budget Code

Law on Property Tax

Law on Potable Water

Law on Taxes on Profit of Enterprises

Law on Value Added Tax

Law on Program of State Support for the Development of Local Self-governance

Law on Delineation of Expenditures between the Budgets of Different Levels Law on Territorial Community

Cabinet of Ministers Resolution “Rules for Provision of Water, Wastewater and Heating Services in Ukraine”

Ministry of Economy’s “Rules for Calculating Prices for Municipal Water Services”

2 6 5 4

Scoring

1. Each year, the mission scores each piece of legislation by the number of stages it has reached, from one to ten.
2. The mission could use an aggregate as the measure of progress. For example, if there are five laws and ten stages you would have a possible maximum of 50.
3. Another possibility is to count the number, or calculate the percentage, of laws that have progressed through a particular number of stages. An example would be the number of laws that have reached stage 5 and above.

4. In all cases, it is important to make sure that the total number of laws being tracked is stated at the beginning.

APPENDIX F: Addressing Auditing Concerns: Practical Tips from the Inspector General's Office

Each year USAID's IG office audits mission use of indicators in all sectors—health, economic growth, environment and democracy and governance—and issues reports available on the IG's website. The auditors consider whether or not indicators meet standards set in the ADS. They also review the systems in place for data collection, the quality of data, and mission procedures for analyzing data quality.

Reviewing these reports is a useful exercise. It is a good way of recognizing, understanding, and then avoiding common problems. This section highlights some problems common to all indicators, especially earlier attempts at quantifying qualitative indicator. It raises points to flag when putting together any new indicators. Following the guidance and criteria in this handbook should assist you in avoiding these fundamental problems.

I. Common performance measurement problems

A. Indicator Definition.

In all sectors, even in those that rely more heavily on “hard” scientific data, auditors often found that indicator definitions were either absent or, more predominantly, lacking in clarity. The issue was not that the indicator itself was somehow “wrong,” but rather that the mission had not communicated its meaning as clearly as possible. Not doing so hampered efforts to measure change or to collect necessary data.

Some illustrative examples include the following:

1. “Scientific research designed, disseminated, and utilized”

While this was an appropriate indicator, there was no elaboration on the meaning of dissemination or utilization—no discussion of methodologies, of scope of effort or activities involved. There was no discussion of the research itself.

2. “Implementation of legal and regulatory framework”

In this case, a mission was more specific about some of the issues involved in this sector generally, but did not further define the “legal and regulatory framework,” nor did it elaborate on the meaning of implementation.

3. “Enabling legislation for DG reforms passed and implemented”

In this case, there was no determination of the specific “enabling legislation” necessary for implementation.

4. “Community participation in management of selected projects.”

The exact meaning of this “participation” was left unstated. The mission did not talk about management of projects but rather described efforts necessary to promote participation. There was such a discrepancy between the indicator defined as “community participation in the management of selected projects” and the unit of measure.

B. Units of Measurement

Once you've defined the indicator, missions must pick an appropriate and well-defined unit of measurement and be able to explain that choice. In many instances, the auditors found that units of measurement were vague, unclear, or illogical.

Some examples are illustrative:

As a measure of "free flow of information," missions chose to look at an "increase in the number of private media outlets." But missions did not always define just what the unit of measurement is. Does "a private media outlet" refer to all non-governmental TV and radio channels? Does it refer to newspapers? Does it include outlets controlled by opposition parties? As a measure of "improved court administration," missions chose to look at an "average amount of time for case processing." Missions have been faulted for not making the unit of measurement (time for case processing) clear— whether you are counting the time from arrest to sentencing or, from arraignment to resolution, for example.

Establishing units of measurement for "implementation" or other phased processes like legislative reform has proven a stumbling block for missions and a particular cause of concern for auditors.

a. In some cases, missions relied on percentages, reporting that implementation was 20 percent done, for example. Auditors found several problems with this. First, it is very difficult to measure something presented as a milestone with a percentage. Second, there was often no criterion stipulated by the mission for making such a determination, assuming you can. Third, implementation is often a multi-dimensional process—something again, that is difficult to capture in one percentage.

b. In other cases, missions chose to report either "yes or no" on implementation. Here again, there were often no criteria stipulated for making this determination. Again, auditors were curious as to why the missions were not more explicit in detailing the process.

APPENDIX G: Secondary Data Sources

1. Documents

Indicators can draw qualitative data from a variety of secondary sources. The type of documents reviewed and data culled depend, of course, on the individual indicator. When dealing with documents, missions should first and foremost assess the quality (and original function) of the data.

- If the documents are to be a source of facts—whether on web-site use, attendance at committee meetings, lists of NGOs participating in coalition, number of human rights complaints registered— it is critical to ascertain the accuracy and quality of that data. How was it collected? Was it checked or verified in some way? How complete is this data set? Are there corroborating sets of data, if need be?⁶
- No document is free from individual or institutional bias. It is important to be aware of these biases when reviewing documents.
- In some cases, discerning that bias or perspective may be the point of the exercise. Gleaning data on quality of public debate on a particular issue requires careful reading of papers from advocacy groups, as well as the informational material disseminated by the relevant government agency. Information provided by an advocacy group, while offering insight into the tenor or nature of the debate may prove factually incorrect or skewed in interpretation.
- Agency documents, whether internal to USAID, or between USAID and implementers (such as quarterly reports) may provide useful data, though it may have been analyzed or presented as necessary for reporting or activity management. It may be necessary to go back to the data originally collected by the implementers.
- Naturally, these same cautions and considerations should be taken into account when reviewing documents from international agencies or host countries. Clearly, there will be differences in reliability, accuracy, and perspective. Possible document or narrative sources:
 - Reports from contractors and grantees— quarterly reporting or project and program assessments
 - Reports from NGOs, CSOs, think tanks, research centers
 - Reports from government agencies- whether statistical data, annual reports (on the budget, for example) or issue briefs
 - Reports or minutes from hearings- from Parliamentary committees, local town meetings, commissions (on human rights, for example)
 - Legislation—pending or adopted
 - Laws
 - Reports or briefs from workshops, roundtables or seminars
 - Reports by international organizations or other donors.
 - Court documents, briefs
 - Media reporting—TV, radio, print

All of the indicators in this handbook- qualitative assessments, indices, and milestones—will require some review of data from documents such as these.

⁶ *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*. USAID/Center for Democracy and Governance, August 1998

2. Content Analysis

Content analysis is one approach to working with documents. It is an established method of generating data about qualitative issues, especially when this requires reviewing a large number of documents. It has been used, as often noted, to analyze the content of political speeches to determine priorities, for example, or media reporting to determine accuracy of coverage of a particular issue or event. It involves coding document content according to predetermined criteria and definitions.



