

The Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development
Promoting Higher Education Partnerships for Global Development



2004 Special Request for Applications

**Cross-National Research on USAID's
Democracy and Governance Programs**



Date Issued: September 7, 2004

Closing Date: October 12, 2004

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) awarded a Cooperative Agreement in September 1997 to the American Council on Education (ACE), with the American Association of Community Colleges (AACCC), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC).

The Agreement (HNE-A-00-97-00059-00) seeks to mobilize the resources of American higher education in support of international development cooperation. One portion of the agreement supports higher education policy, technical and advisory assistance for Missions and other USAID operating units. The activities under the cooperative agreement are administered by the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO).

Background to the Special Request for Applications

Although democracy and governance programs have a twenty-year history as a foreign assistance priority, there have been to date no systematic and rigorous analyses to support what kind of programs under what circumstances best promote different aspects of democratic development. To remedy this, several years ago, USAID's Democracy and Governance Office in the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA/DG) began a long-term, rigorous evaluation of the impact of its democracy-building programs, named the Strategic and Operational Research Agenda (SORA). This initiative is intended to facilitate research that helps USAID revise its activities by ending or revising ineffective programs, adding new programs, integrating better design and evaluation into programs, and engaging in dissemination and learning activities with a wider policy community. This is also a critical step toward firmly establishing the relatively new field of applied democratic development, which melds insights from the academic, policy, and practitioner worlds to improve foreign assistance policy. At the end it should substantially improve USAID's ability to support countries' efforts to improve democratic governance, as well as USAID's capacity to measure and evaluate its own efforts.

The Office of Democracy and Governance plans to support quantitative cross-national research related to USAID's democracy and governance programs as part of SORA. Overall, the goal of SORA is to provide analytical support to USAID by generating data and findings that will improve democracy and governance programs and strategies. SORA will build a rigorous analytical base on which to make decisions regarding the type, mix, and sequencing of USAID's democracy and governance programs, maintain and expand a database of relevant democracy and governance data and information, analyze the impact of democracy assistance programs, disseminate and share the results of the analyses, and begin to incorporate analytical findings into program activities. It is anticipated that SORA will help build consensus, both within and outside of USAID, on a comprehensive vision of the field of democratization and governance interventions. This is also a critical step toward firmly establishing the relatively new field of applied democratic development, which melds insights from the academic, policy, and practitioner worlds to improve foreign assistance policy.

SORA was designed to ensure both quality and relevance to USAID DG programming. For example, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), an unbiased and highly qualified research institution, was hired to develop appropriate methodologies, the research will be conducted by individuals and groups with relevant research expertise

and unbiased approaches to a study of USAID DG assistance, and notable democracy professionals in academia and development institutions will serve as peer reviewers at critical points in the research. To ensure relevance to USAID DG program improvement, DCHA/DG has developed an internal core team that will closely collaborate with the awardee(s), facilitate internal DCHA/DG research, and act as DCHA/DG reviewers as the research proceeds. In addition, USAID missions and the Democracy and Governance Office have been involved in the selection of critical questions and approaches. Because of the unique linkages between outside and inside experts considered essential for the success of this project, the work of the awardee(s) will be presented to the expert group and USAID/DCHA at different points during the period of the award.

One discrete component of SORA, to be implemented under an award to a U.S. university or consortium is to conduct quantitative cross-national research using USAID and other donor data, important macro-political data bases, indices of democratic development, and other metrics of contextual or exogenous factors, and develop statistical, cross-national reports on USAID democracy and governance programs.

Special Request for Applications (RFA)

ALO, in cooperation with USAID, is issuing this RFA for a special project to conduct quantitative research and analysis related to USAID's democracy and governance programs.

Project Goals and Objectives

The aim of the project is to greatly enhance the state of the art of democracy and governance assistance and provide new data and insights to academics, democracy implementers, and donors. It is anticipated that this research and analysis will help USAID determine whether, how and under what circumstances there is a relationship between democracy programs and various aspects of political change in targeted countries, and provide data useful for subsequent in-depth country and activity-level comparisons that will follow. The research should provide the foundation for a sustainable data set on USAID and other donor DG programming and quantitative country measures related to development.

The analysis, based on a cross-national database, will focus on how much change in democratic development at the country and sub-sector level to attribute to USAID programs by examining the relationships between democratic development indicators, USAID expenditures, USAID Mission Officer assessments, other donor expenditures, and exogenous factors. These findings are expected to stimulate discussions among academics, USAID, non-U.S. development agencies and policy professionals about the relative effectiveness of USAID programs as a first step toward revising policy. The analysis will be published on the project web site and in hard copy.

Because of the linkages between outside and inside experts considered essential for the success of this project, it is anticipated that an expert group will review and comment on the research, methodology and analysis at regular intervals. The expert group would likely consist of at least two peer experts recognized for their expertise in the field of researching and/or analyzing democratic development. It is expected that the members of the expert group, to be selected in consultation with USAID, would be from outside both USAID and the lead awardee institution. For the expert group to properly fulfill its intended function, the awardee(s) would need to arrange for technical review of the codebook, implementation plan, and final reports by the expert group; timely delivery of the draft products to the experts; and costs and logistical arrangements. Successful implementation of this project will also require close and regular collaboration with DCHA/DG.

Project Methodology

The methodology for conducting the SORA research under this award is based in large part on the SSRC *Evaluation Plan for USAID Democracy and Governance Activities* (Appendix A). The plan recommends an approach consisting of **quantitative cross-national** research and analysis using data on sectoral and subsectoral information, indices of

democratic development, and other metrics of contextual or exogenous factors.¹ This **cross-national quantitative** research track will cover all developing countries (including all countries where USAID has funded democracy programs, as well as developing countries which have never had any USAID programs).² For countries in which USAID has had programming, the research period shall cover, to the extent possible, the entire period of USAID democracy and governance programming presence. In countries without USAID DG programming, or in which DG programming has ended, the research period shall cover, to the extent possible, the same period as the longest running USAID DG programming in countries in the same region. Generally it is expected that the research data will cover at least the past 12 years globally. This broad-gauge, cross-national analysis will provide insights into the relationship of USAID DG programs and democratic development at global and regional levels, and account for other donor activities and exogenous factors.

Project Activities

Applicants should address the following activities.

ACTIVITY ONE: Definition of concepts to be used in the analysis and development of acceptable operational measures for these concepts.³ This should be done in the form of a codebook, which will describe the constructs and their operational definition, and identify their source(s) of data. The codebook is expected to consist of *two basic types* of data:

- **USAID Data:** The first data type measure “inputs to and outputs of” USAID democracy programs over the life of the programs, (or at least a minimum of 12 years, depending on the availability of data). The awardee(s) will be given access to data from USAID sources for adaptation and analysis. The data is expected to be aggregated at country year level, disaggregated by DG subsector, and, when possible, by USAID activity codes, and will include variables such as budget, time, prevalence, number of mission DG staff, and information on implementing partners and donors.
- **External Data:** The second data type is expected to include data collected outside USAID on political, social and economic development issues in USAID recipient and non-recipient countries, including information compiled from other donors. These annually reported country data include (1) data used to measure political change within countries, (2) data that could be used to capture other factors theorized to effect political change, such as macro-economic development indicators (GDP, PPP, unemployment, etc) and socio-economic indicators (literacy, infant mortality, poverty, etc.), (3) exogenous factors in the form of discrete key events that are believed to have significant impact on democracy development (coups d’etat, wars, famine, etc), and (4) other donor inputs and outputs, such as funding levels, and types of DG assistance.

As needed, from the external data, the awardee(s) will be expected to develop measures and indices of aspects of democratic and political development that are specifically germane to USAID programming, and reflect the latest scholarly developments on political change and democratization. Illustratively, this would include concepts of legitimacy and consensus, rule of law, political inclusion, governance, and political competition which are fundamental to USAID’s work, as well as other measures needed for analyzing relationships between USAID data and country-level political development. Operational definitions will be agreed upon by USAID.

¹ For the purposes of this RFA, “sector” refers to the Democracy and Governance section; “Subsector” refers to DG program areas including Rule of Law, Civil Society, Political Processes, and Governance; “Activity-level” refers to discrete assistance activities, such as judicial training, institutional grants to advocacy groups, assistance in administration of an election, or legal defense programs for independent media.

² The SSRC Evaluation Plan actually recommends a two track approach consisting of (1) quantitative cross-national research and analysis and (2) in-depth qualitative country level research and analysis to be conducted in 20-25 countries. This RFA is based on SSRC’s recommended first track of research and analysis. The second track, i.e. the qualitative research in 20-25 countries, is NOT covered by this RFA. However, it should be noted that the quantitative research and analysis described in this RFA and to be conducted by the awardee will subsequently contribute to and be used in the second track of qualitative research and analysis.

³ This may include the creation of new, or adaptation of existing, indices and data.

This activity is expected to be carried out simultaneously with Activity 2 and in consultation with USAID. The Codebook will be submitted to USAID and the expert group for possible revision and then to USAID for approval. (See Appendix B for an illustrative, non-comprehensive listing of datasets and factors.)

ACTIVITY TWO: Plan of Analysis. The awardee(s) will be expected to develop a plan of analysis describing in layperson's language the variable relationships, data sources, and statistical techniques to be used to analyze the potential associations between USAID DG programs and observed changes in a DG subsector or in the political development of recipient countries. This plan shall reflect consideration of various techniques, including the use of innovative or emerging techniques.

Inquiries on the relationship between programs and other variables are expected to be comprehensive. Inquiries should be explored at different program levels of analysis (sector, subsector) and geographic levels of analysis (global, regional), and account for contextual and background factors that may serve as enabling or constraining factors in program success. Inquiries will primarily look for relationships among various aspects of USAID programs to the macro-political data sets, to determine as much as possible what difference programs may have had on democracy and governance. The awardee(s) will be expected to examine changes in the political development relative to USAID factors that should include the *presence* of USAID (its existence or not, the *investment* by USAID (program length, financial and human resources, sub-sectoral investment), the *characteristics* of USAID programming (funding sources and mechanisms, partners, for example), and similar factors.

An illustrative, non-comprehensive listing of inquiry examples can be found in Appendix C.

The Analysis Plan shall be submitted to USAID and the expert group for possible revision and then to USAID for approval.

ACTIVITY THREE: Data Collection and Management. In tandem with Activities 1 and 2, the awardee(s) will be expected to collect the data identified in the approved codebook, and to maintain these data in standard format for analysis and subsequent delivery to USAID.

The resulting database should be submitted to USAID in a useable and conventionally acceptable electronic data format that can be subsequently updated by USAID on a regular basis and also made available (excluding any data that are copyright protected) on a publicly available website.

ACTIVITY FOUR: Analysis. Upon completion of the first three activities the awardee(s) will be expected to **conduct the analysis** according to the approved analysis plan. The general goal of this activity is to determine statistical relationships between USAID DG programs and political change net of other potentially significant factors for each of the relevant democracy and governance sub-sectors, addressing each of the inquiry natures in the previous activities.

ACTIVITY FIVE: Dissemination and Information Sharing. To ensure that the research results and methodology are shared within the broader community of people studying and implementing democracy assistance, it is anticipated that the awardee(s) will undertake activities to disseminate and share information. It is anticipated that the awardee will hold at least two workshops or video conference with USAID and the expert group, the first of which would be held on or about the mid-point of the award (i.e., by the end of month five), to discuss and share status of data collection, initial findings, descriptive characteristics, and any problems encountered. A final workshop/roundtable in Washington, DC would allow for discussion of the draft final report(s). Participants would include representatives from USAID and the awardee(s) institution(s), expert group, and key members of academia, think tanks, and other donor organizations. The award amount will cover costs and logistical arrangements related to this activity. The participant lists would be developed in consultation with USAID. Other means of dissemination and information sharing will likely include posting research and findings on a publicly accessible web site, and publication of final reports.

The final analytical report(s), based on the research, data collection and analysis described above should answer the types of questions and queries outlined in the implementation plan. For example, the report(s) will:

- address how much change in democratic development may be attributable to DCHA/DG democracy programs by examining the relationships between democratic development indicators, DGHA/DG expenditures, other donor expenditures, exogenous factors, and other variables;
- include a quantitative descriptive analysis of USAID democracy and governance programs since their inception, to the degree data are available;
- provide analysis at the DG sector and subsector-levels;
- provide global as well as, where appropriate, regional (Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and Eurasia, Africa, Asia and the Near East) analyses;
- suggest what hypotheses and topics should be further addressed in subsequent country level research; and
- include recommendations for USAID programming, if possible, based on the quantitative research and analysis.

In the end, this quantitative cross-national research and analysis should produce:

- the best and most complete historical and contemporary data set on USAID financing of democracy and governance programs, used not only in this research, but useable for future USAID analysis;
- a compilation of existing or newly derived state of the art indicators of democratic development based on both academic literature and USAID experience in applied democratic development, relevant both to USAID analysis and the wider academic community; and
- analysis of the data indicating relationships between USAID programming and indicators of democratic development, as well as with broader socio-economic data. This will assist in looking at causality—the effects of USAID programs on democratic development under what circumstances—and in developing hypotheses and topics for greater analysis during a subsequent stage of country level research and analysis.

The USAID Cognizant Technical Officer for this project is Martin Hewitt, who may be contacted at mhewitt@usaid.gov. The DCHA/DG contact person is David Black at dblack@usaid.gov.

Terms of the RFA

ALO will conduct a peer reviewed competition to award a grant of up to \$300,000 over a ten-month period to a U.S. institution or consortia under this RFA for cross-national research on USAID's Democracy and Governance programs. Awards are expected to commence by November 30, 2004 and be completed by September 30, 2005.

Applications must include: (1) a clear statement of the approach to be adopted to carry out the research; (2) a clear indication that the activities are in alignment with DCHA/DG and SORA and are responsive to the needs of USAID; (3) a description of the qualifications, expertise of the researchers proposed for this series of activities; and (4) an implementation plan and description of the activities to be accomplished and the outcomes to be achieved. The appendices must contain: (5) the schedule of activities according to the illustrative timeframe presented; (6) the budget summary, and budget narrative that includes cost sharing and other contributions from the lead institution and other partners; (7) curriculum vitae of key personnel; (8) signed letters of commitment from the lead researcher, the applicant institutions and other partners; and (9) a signed letter from an official at the applicant U.S. institution verifying conformity with institutional policies and practices. Applications must also include a separate abstract (1 page maximum) summarizing items (1) through (6).

Applications must indicate a total cost sharing of at least 25 percent from the U.S. institution(s). Additional cooperating institutions are also encouraged to contribute resources.

Applicants should itemize all cost sharing on the budget form, including faculty release time, stipends, professional travel, supplies, equipment, other direct costs, indirect costs, etc.

Both cash and in-kind contributions will be accepted as part of the applicant's cost sharing when such contributions are: (a) verifiable from the applicant's records; (b) not included as contributions for any other federally-assisted program;

(c) reasonable for the accomplishment of partnership objectives; and (d) not paid by the federal government under another grant.

Applications must be received at ALO by 5:00PM, Eastern Daylight Time (EDT), Oct. 12, 2004. Faxed or electronically transmitted applications will not be accepted. Peer review of applications and notification about awards is expected in November 2004.

The award will be executed as a sub-agreement between the lead U.S. institution and the American Council on Education (ACE), through the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO), under USAID Cooperative Agreement HNE-A-0097-00059-00. The lead U.S. institution recommended for the award will receive a draft subagreement from ALO for review.

Work is expected to begin immediately following full approval of the subagreement. **No ALO award or cost share funds designated in the application may be expended prior to a fully executed (i.e., signed by both parties) sub-agreement between ACE/ALO and the lead U.S. institution.**

Award funds will be disbursed to the lead institution in the United States, based on the applicant's implementation of the work plan, stated budget, and submission to ALO and USAID of financial reports and narrative progress reports.

The following additional reports are required:

Quarterly Activity Reports, delivered by email to ALO and the USAID cognizant technical officer (CTO) for this project, on the status of the analysis and pertinent findings, any problems encountered or anticipated, or other information that should be brought to the attention of USAID;

Final Analysis Report(s), to be delivered to ALO and USAID six weeks prior to the end of this grant agreement, that addresses all of the questions and components described above. The total page length of the final report or reports (not including appendices and supplementary materials) should not exceed 30 pages without the prior approval of USAID.

All reports should be written in English and submitted both in hard-form (paper) and electronically (on a CD or diskette saved as a Microsoft Word file). The awardee(s) shall submit ten (10) hard copies of the final report (or bound versions of final reports), and four electronic copies (CDs or diskettes).

It is the lead U.S. institution's responsibility to provide disbursements (reimbursements) for any collaborating partners in accordance with the agreed-upon activity schedule and budget. Applicants must budget funds (travel and per diem) to cover the required meetings with USAID and to convene meetings with the expert group.

Eligibility and Review of Applications

ALO welcomes applications from the member institutions of ACE, AACC, AASCU, AAU, NAICU, and NASULGC, and from other regionally accredited, degree-granting, U.S. higher education institutions. ALO also welcomes applications from higher education consortia.

Applications will be reviewed by panels comprised of higher education experts in democracy development and a representative of USAID/DCHA. The award will be made on the basis of the reviewers' recommendations of merit and final concurrence of USAID/DCHA.

Application Review Guidelines

Peer reviewers will use the following criteria to evaluate applications:

I. Alignment with DCHA/DG's goals (10 points)

The application makes a sound case of addressing the goals and objectives of the research as described in the RFA and appendices.

II. Research Design, Collaborative and Institutional Potential (30 points)

Applicants should demonstrate a substantive understanding of the expected research and exhibit a sound approach to addressing the issues and objectives identified in the RFA. The proposed approach must address key DCHA/DG research inquiries and concerns; draw on a wide variety of global, regional, and topical datasets; and demonstrate strong familiarity with current scholarly literature on political change.

It is expected that the social scientist(s)/analyst(s) will have previous recent experience in collaborative research involving use of research assistants. If more than one social scientist/analyst is proposed, the division of effort between the social scientists should reasonably reflect their individual experience and specific expertise. The design should demonstrate potential to utilize research assistants with relevant experience in data collection, management, and quantitative analysis function as much as possible.

The social scientist(s)/analyst(s) should demonstrate an affiliation with a relevant research center at the lead institution (and/or cooperating institution, in the case of multiple social scientists) or at a relevant multi-institutional organization to which the lead (and/or cooperating) institution belongs.

III. Quality of Key Personnel (30 points)

It is anticipated that the tasks under this program will require the time and expertise of at least one lead social scientist/analyst as well as collaborators and research assistants. The lead social scientist/analyst is expected to be a leading scholar in the study of democratization affiliated with an academic or research institute; with experience conducting cross-national empirical research on democratization, political reform and other related issues. Applicants should be familiar with a wide variety of global and regional datasets, and ability to actively consider their utility with respect to the requirements of this award and current scholarly literature on political change. Applicants should have demonstrably excellent writing and presentation skills, preferably through a publishing record in refereed academic or policy journals.

The social scientist(s)/analyst(s) must be able to communicate conclusions generated by those methods to laypersons, and to suggest to policymakers the practical and programmatic implications stemming from those conclusions. Previous experience working with a U.S. Government agency as a researcher/analyst or consultant is desirable.

IV. Monitoring and Evaluation (20 points)

Quality of plans to provide feedback to USAID, regular dialogue with USAID team to remain focused on research and goals of activity, and to ensure orderly and regular communications, delivery, follow-up and evaluation.

V. Overall Application (10 points)

Completeness, clarity, and organization of the overall application.

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: 100 points

Application Format

Please provide the contents of the application in the following order:

1. **Title page** (Complete ALO form in full and obtain signatures of authorized officials)
2. **Abstract** (not to exceed 1 typed, single-spaced, one-sided page, 12-point font)
3. **Table of Contents**
4. **Narrative** (not to exceed 10 typed, double-spaced, one-sided pages, 12-point font) addressing all of the elements listed in Application Review Guidelines I through V.
5. **Appendices** (*Attachments beyond the stated appendices will not be read or taken into consideration*):
 - **Schedule of Planned Activities** over the funding period, with completion dates by year, of all proposed activities.
 - **Summary Budget** indicating costs of personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, other direct costs, and indirect costs requested for award and contributed as cost sharing (1 form only).
 - A **Budget Narrative** to explain the basis for the calculations of the figures presented in the summary budget. **No more than 3 pages of text are required.** N.B. Additional tables and charts will not be reviewed. See page 12 for budget instructions and form.
 - **Statement of Contributions** other than “cost share,” from other partners.
 - **CVs** of each proposed social scientist/analyst, not to exceed 4 pages per person, one-sided, single-spaced, 12-point font.
 - **Signed Original Letters of Commitment** from the president(s), chancellor(s), or other chief executive officer(s) of the cooperating institution(s) in the United States, in addition to a signed letter of commitment from the proposed lead social scientist/analyst.
 - **Signed Original Letter from Appropriate Official at Applicant Institution** verifying that all costs cited conform to established institutional policies and practices.

Application Summary

2004 Special Request for Applications Cross-National Research on USAID's Democracy and Governance Programs

Deadline: Applications must be received by **October 12, 2004, 5:00 PM (EDT)** from a U.S. college, university, or consortium. Faxed or electronically submitted applications will **not** be accepted. All elements of the application must be received by the deadline. Faxed copies of the application title page and letters that include all necessary signatures may be used as a placeholder in the application, provided signed originals are received at ALO within seven (7) calendar days of the deadline.

Eligible Applicants: All members of the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), and other regionally accredited, degree-granting, U.S. higher education institutions or consortia.

Award Period: Ten (10) months. Activities funded through this competition are expected to commence immediately after the final subagreement has been fully executed, and end September 30, 2005.

Award Amounts: Applications that request more than the stipulated amount of \$300,000 will not be reviewed. Awards are contingent upon expected obligation of funds by USAID.

Cost Sharing: The minimum 25 percent total cost sharing of the award amount must be met by the U.S. institution(s). Evidence of cash or in-kind support from public or private sources is required. This may include academic costs, faculty release time, stipends, travel, supplies, equipment, other direct costs, indirect costs, and other contributions.

Commitments: Successful applicants will collaborate with ALO, USAID and the expert group. Representatives from the U.S. institution(s) must organize and attend briefings and other meetings with USAID and the expert group throughout the project period.

Note: Once an application has been received, there is to be no contact with the ALO office until the completion of the peer review process in order to ensure fairness to all parties concerned. Letters of communication from members of the U.S. Congress in support of an application are discouraged as these may be thought to prejudice the peer-review process. Upon final announcement of the award, all applicants are invited to request copies of their peer reviewers' scores. Neither personal reviews nor comparative score tabulations will be shared.

Illustrative Schedule of Planned Activities

**2004 Special Request for Applications
 Cross-National Research on USAID's Democracy and Governance Programs**

Suggested durations are provided in italics. Please replace with target dates.

Time Frame /Completed by	Planned Activity
<i>Week 4</i>	Preparation of codebook; draft to USAID and expert group for consultation
<i>Week 7</i>	Consultation, revisions and final codebook
<i>Week 7</i>	Preparation of analysis plan; draft to USAID and expert group for consultation
<i>Week 20</i>	Data collection and management
<i>Week 22</i>	Mid-point roundtable/workshop with USAID and expert group
<i>Week 30</i>	Second roundtable/workshop with USAID and expert group
<i>Week 36</i>	Analysis
<i>Week 36</i>	Draft(s) of final report(s) to USAID and expert group
<i>Week 40</i>	Workshop with USAID, expert group and invited participants
<i>Week 42</i>	Consultation, revisions, and final report(s) completed

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development
Promoting Higher Education Partnerships for Global Development

Budget Instructions and Form

Applications must include a line-item summary budget together with a narrative explanation of the budget figures. Clearly indicate the method of cost computation and how the total charge for each budget item was determined for the ALO award, the cost sharing by the applicant institution, and contributions from other partners in the narrative. The items on the five-column budget form are: (1) Personnel (wages and salaries); (2) Fringe Benefits; (3) Travel; (4) Equipment (if applicable; typically a cost shared item); (5) Supplies; (6) Other Direct Costs; (7) Total Direct Costs; (8) Indirect Costs; and (9) Totals.

All of the items listed in the five column budget, whether supported by ALO award monies or cost sharing contributions, must be reasonable, necessary to accomplish objectives, allowable in terms of the applicable federal cost principles, auditable, and incurred during the award period. U.S. institutional cost sharing must meet the minimum 25 percent requirement.

1. Personnel (Line I). Personnel include all individuals involved who are employed by the applicant institution. Stipends for any individuals not employed by the applicant institution are usually listed and documented under Other Direct Costs. The budget narrative must provide the position, title, and the method of cost computation of the actual wages/salary, including summer salary, for each individual. Calculations should be shown as a percentage of academic year or annual salary and must conform to established institutional policies and practices.

Example 1.

ALO Award	Applicant Institution Cost Share
--------------	-------------------------------------

Senior Social Scientist: 33% time x \$/yr.
 Mid-level Analyst : 60% time x \$/yr.
 Research Assistants: 60% time x 3 x \$/yr.
 Administrative Assistant:
 % time x wks x hrs./wk x \$/hr. =

Example 2.

ALO Award	Applicant Institution Cost Share
--------------	-------------------------------------

The Senior Social Scientist will spend x % time during the academic year and x time month in summer 2005.
 based on a 9-month salary of \$/yr.
 Calculation: \$

2. Fringe Benefits (Line II). Fringe benefits may include established institutional contributions for social security, employee insurance, pension plans, etc. Only those benefits that are not included in the institution’s indirect cost pool may be considered direct costs. Fringe benefits are calculated on the basis of a certain percentage of annual salary. Where more than one fringe benefit rate is used, include each as appropriate.

Example:

ALO Award	Applicant Institution Cost Share
--------------	-------------------------------------

Senior Social Scientist: x \$/yr.
 Mid-level Analyst : x \$/yr
 Research Assistants: x \$/yr

3. Travel (Line III). In compliance with the “Fly America Act” (<http://www.tvlon.com/resources/FlyAct.html>), all international air travel rates must be based on the use of U.S.-registered carriers and/or international carriers “code-shared”

with U.S. carriers when available. In the latter instance, travelers must have tickets issued by a registered U.S. carrier. Provide the actual calculations for each trip (domestic and international) by specifying the trip origin, trip destination(s), the number of individuals traveling, the length of the trip in days, and the per diem for each of the destination(s). For international travel per diems, refer to: <http://www.state.gov/m/a/als/prdm>. For domestic travel per diems, refer to: <http://policyworks.gov/org/main/mt/homepage/mtt/perdiem/travel.shtml>.

Example:

ALO
Award

Calculated using U.S. carriers and per diem according to the most recent U.S. Department of State rates for foreign travel.

Travel from City of Origin to Final Destination:

Transportation: 2 travelers x \$1000 (round-trip on Airline Name) = \$2,000

Lodging, Meals and Incidental Expenses (M&IE): 2 travelers x 10 days x \$100/day
(no more than the maximum per diem for Destination City) = \$2,000

Ground transportation: From (place of origin) to airport (city of origin),
2 travelers x 30 mile roundtrip @ .375/mile = \$22.50

From airport (destination city) to hotel, 2 travelers by taxi = \$100

Total = \$

N.B. Applicants must budget for meetings with USAID and for convening meetings with the expert group.

4. Equipment (Line IV). Permanent equipment is defined as non-expendable personal property with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. ALO discourages the use of award monies for equipment-related costs. In-kind equipment contributions, however, are appropriate and encouraged.

5. Supplies (Line V). Supplies include consumable supplies, materials to be used by the researchers and items of expendable equipment; i.e., items costing less than \$5,000 and with an estimated useful life of less than one year. The detailed budget narrative must list the types of supplies with accompanying approximate total costs and indicate the approximate cost per unit, where applicable.

Example:

Total: \$

6. Other Direct Costs (Line VI).

Stipends or honoraria for any individuals not employed by the applicant institution should be listed in this section.

Example 1:

Dr. X will be a member of the expert group. He will spend (number of) days on the project. His established fee is \$/day x (number of) days.

ALO Award: \$

The cost of photocopying and printing, long-distance phone calls, equipment rental, postage, and other services related to research activities, which are not included under other budget categories or under indirect costs should be included in this category.

Example 2:

Telephone: long-distance \$45/month x 10 months

ALO Award: \$450

7. Total Direct Costs (Line VII). Provide accurate calculation of total for Direct Costs. Total Direct Costs are calculated by adding lines I through IV (Personnel + Fringe Benefits + Travel + Equipment + Supplies + Other Direct Costs = Total Direct Costs)

8. Indirect Costs (Line VIII). Indirect costs are calculated by applying a negotiated indirect cost rate (NICRA) to a distribution base (usually some or all of the direct costs of the partnership; e.g., salaries plus fringe benefits). The budget narrative must state the applicant institution's NICRA and that of other collaborating U.S. institutions.

Example:

Applicant Institution
Cost Share

The Applicant Institution's current federally negotiated indirect cost rate is 26 % of salaries and fringe benefits.
Calculation: 26% of \$ = \$

9. Totals (Line IX). Provide accurate calculation of Totals. Totals are calculated by adding Direct and Indirect Costs (Lines VII and VIII).

N.B. Cost sharing by the applicant institution should be clearly stated in the budget as the applicant's contribution. Preference is given to applicants proposing to waive or substantially cost share indirect costs in order to utilize the highest possible proportion of award monies for direct partnership costs.

Upon completing the budget, applicants should double-check to ensure that the figures in the budget and narrative are consistent, are correct, and that all costs included in the application conform to established institutional policies and practices before the application is submitted to ALO.

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development
Promoting Higher Education Partnerships for Global Development

Summary Budget

Please refer to the electronic version of this form (in Excel) on the ALO Web site www.aascu.org/alo.

(Mo/Yr to Mo/Yr)	ALO (Award)	Applicant Institution (Cost Share)	Other (Cost Share)	Total
I. Personnel	_____	_____	_____	_____
II. Fringe Benefits	_____	_____	_____	_____
III. Travel	_____	_____	_____	_____
IV. Equipment*	_____	_____	_____	_____
V. Supplies	_____	_____	_____	_____
VI. Other Direct Costs	_____	_____	_____	_____
VII. Total Direct Costs (=I+...+VI)	_____	_____	_____	_____
VIII. Indirect Costs**	_____	_____	_____	_____
IX. Totals (= VII+VIII)	_____	_____	_____	_____

* Institutions are discouraged from requesting award monies for equipment.

** Institutions are encouraged to contribute indirect costs as part of their cost sharing.

Application Checklist

2004 Special Request for Applications Cross-National Research on USAID's Democracy and Governance Programs

Please use this checklist to ensure completeness of the application:

- ___ **Title Page** (ALO form with all required signatures)
- ___ **Abstract** (1 page maximum, typed single-spaced and one-sided, 12-point font)
- ___ **Table of Contents**
- ___ **Narrative** (10 pages typed—excluding appendices—double-spaced, one-sided, 12-point font)
- ___ **Appendices** (*Attachments beyond the appendices below will not be read or taken into consideration.*)
 - ___ **Schedule of Planned Activities**
 - ___ **Summary Budget**
 - ___ **Budget Narrative with explanation of costs** (3 pages maximum)
 - ___ **Statement of Contributions**, other than “cost share,” from cooperating and other partners
 - ___ **CVs** (not to exceed 4 pages per person, single-sided, single-spaced, 12-point font)
 - ___ **Signed Original Letters of Commitment** from lead institution, lead researcher, other cooperating institutions
 - ___ **Signed Original Letter from Official at Applicant Institution** verifying costs

Send the original application plus seven (7) hard copies of the complete application package containing title page, abstract, table of contents, narrative, and appendices (all on loose-leaf paper, clipped together — no three-ring binders, staples, or plastic bindings), and a diskette or CD (with files saved as Microsoft Word/Excel for PCs) containing the abstract and entire application, including all budget forms, budget narrative, and other appendices to:

DCHA-SORA

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development
1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20005-4701

Deadline: Receipt at ALO by 5:00PM (EDT), October 12, 2004.

Faxed and electronic applications will not be accepted. All elements of the application must be received by the deadline. Faxed copies of the application title page and letters that include all necessary signatures may be used as a placeholder in the application, provided signed originals are received at ALO within seven (7) calendar days of the deadline.

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO)
1307 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 478-4700; Fax: (202) 478-4715
E-mail: alo@aascu.org Web site: www.aascu.org/alo

APPENDIX A

Please note: Attachment A is included for background, although it describes the overall methodology of SORA rather than exclusively the methodology of the quantitative cross-national research and analysis included in the RFA.

SSRC Evaluation Plan for USAID Democracy & Governance Activities (Excerpts):

Evaluation Plan for USAID Democracy & Governance Activities

Social Science Research Council

8 January 2004

This memo responds to the DG office's request for more guidance on how to implement an evaluation of democratization programs, utilizing the research design created by Kenneth Bollen et al in late 2003. In the following pages, we outline a plan to implement an evaluation using cross-national longitudinal sectoral analysis, combined with country expert reports. Because the suggested budget for an evaluation is extremely restricted (<0.1% of the programs being evaluated, more than an order of magnitude less than a typical expenditure for evaluations of nonprofit organizations) and must be done retrospectively, choices of methods, operations, and scope must be made that will leave out many desired elements. An example is country contextual factors: developing a data set for contextual factors in each country studied in addition to what is suggested is simply impossible given budget constraints. Such considerations lead us to a heavy dependence on country experts (top-level academics with extensive, multi-disciplinary knowledge of countries) who can draw readily on prior research, personal and professional contacts within the countries, worldwide academic networks, etc.—in other words, indispensable assets that already exist at no cost to USAID. This is a win-win situation, but the tradeoff is to allow the contractor, advisory council, and the country experts themselves some flexibility and adaptability in implementing the evaluation: *i.e.*, any plan to operationalize the evaluation has to avoid rigidity and excessive pre-determination.

What we provide, then, is a version of the Bollen et al research design with more specific recommendations, a narrowing of methods to lower costs and increase manageability, more cost data, and a sequence for products and policy guidance. We have factored in the issues of affordability, burdens of data collection, the desire to move quickly once a decision is made to proceed, flexibility with respect to choice of specific research methods, and highly usable products.

We avoid some of the difficulties of defining the object of evaluation by beginning with subsectoral-level analysis, and refining that object to include "activities"---still undefined but used herein as the level designated in the census of activities in "rule of law" (Bollen, Appendix B, by upper-case letter headings). Activities become a central focus of evaluation once the country experts begin their work in the countries we have specified. The theoretical aspects of democratic development are addressed as a problem of evaluation and indicators of progress, via work led by the advisory council, and we urge USAID to include field building funds directed by the advisory council to refine and improve such indicators, and, in that process, to integrate them with the agency's work.

In sum, these recommendations are built upon the Bollen, Paxton, and Morishima document, "Research Design to Evaluate the Impact of USAID Democracy and Governance Programs" (RD). This memo provides a guide for implementing the RD, particularly the alternative method (p 46), with some modifications. Also in this memo are guidance on administration, a timetable, an inventory of likely products, and a comprehensive budget (Appendix A).

An Evaluation Plan

It is our recommendation that USAID conduct a retrospective evaluation of past efforts (1993-2002) to improve democratic governance by adopting a two-track approach that has been designed to achieve the evaluation's goals in a

cost-effective way and to provide in-depth assessments and policy guidance to USAID. The goal of such an evaluation is to provide independent assessments of whether USAID programs have had a significant impact in promoting democratization and good governance, and to provide USG decision makers with the analytical tools and knowledge to set policies that optimize such efforts in the future.

We believe the evaluation plan detailed below is the best option for addressing concerns raised, *e.g.*, that the evaluation design:

- provide useful comparisons without sacrificing attention to activities within subsectors;
- maximize constrained financial and human resources;
- provide empirical bases for policy guidance, and
- inform theoretical understanding of democracy promotion.

Our implementation calls for interlocking research and analytical efforts. One research track compiles data on subsectoral information, indices of democratic development, and other metrics of contextual or exogenous factors. A second, simultaneous research track utilizes country experts to describe the general context and assess subsectoral impact. The analytical effort, which will operate within a comparative framework for quantitative and qualitative data inputs, will produce a **preliminary analysis** (at 10 months into the project) based on a cross-national database; an **intermediate analysis** (18 months) based on the cross-national database integrated with detailed subsector and activity data from the first phase of country-expert overviews; and a **final report** (42 months) providing policy guidance for decision makers, based on a second phase of country expert assessments of specific activities. Although the cross-national research track will cover all countries where USAID has been active, the country-specific research track will focus on 20-25 countries around the world over a ten-year period beginning in the early 1990s (Appendix B).

By gathering and examining data on a cross-national level *and* on a country-specific level, meaningful, comparative conclusions about country-, subsector-, and activity-level programs across regions can be drawn and will be conveyed in the final report.

The following discussion, through page 7, is organized to describe the two tracks, and then to describe in more detail the analytical process and products.

Track One: Cross-National Level

The initial task of the cross-national research track is analyzing the impact of USAID program expenditures at the country- and subsector-level globally. This task involves the following steps:

- The research director (contractor) would compile data on existing indicators of democratic development as a whole and in part, socio-economic development, and institutional features, as elaborated in the RD.
- USAID would continue its census of activities for all subsectors and by compiling data on subsector-level expenditures from such sources as Results Review and Resource Request (R4) reports, Performance Measurement Plans (PMPs), W253 reports, and Budget Office reports; and
- Compiling information on other donors, by making high-level requests to several major development agencies for data on country- and subsector-level expenditures by year. (The specific agencies would be determined after further consultation within DG and a survey of likely correspondents.) This would be supplemented by information from relevant mission staff as to the involvement of other agencies in relation to USAID activities in a country.
- Finally, a web-based survey sent to all mission officers will gather subjective assessments of USAID DG subsector activities for postings during the 1993-2002 period, based in part on the draft survey in the RD, Appendix F.

This data compilation would be used in the preliminary analysis that examines the relationships between democratic development at the country- and subsector-level on the one hand, and USAID expenditures, similar expenditures by other actors, and exogenous factors on the other. The results of the web-based survey will be used not only as another indicator of USAID effort, but also as a means to identify supplemental countries for the first phase of country-expert overviews and provide further information for the experts.

The cross-national database would later be augmented by evaluations of subsectoral- and activity-level impact from the first phase of country-expert overviews, and then used for an intermediate analysis at the country-, subsector-, and activity-levels across regions.

Track Two: Country Level

This research track is designed to provide in-depth information at the country level and information at the subsector-level that will be used in the intermediate (and final) analysis. We envision two phases of country-level overviews. Experts sent to the 20-25 selected countries⁴ would describe the general context and assess the overall impact of activities within each subsector according to criteria established by the research director and others, and this work—completed by about the sixteenth month of the project—would provide the major new data for the intermediate analysis. Following that analysis, experts would return to the countries to examine specific, common activities to better understand factors leading to the “success” or “failure” of that activity.

More specifically, the *first phase* involves the following tasks:

- *Countries and criteria:* A task force—appropriate personnel from USAID, the advisory council, and the contractor—would select the countries for expert review. (See Appendix B for a preliminary and representative list of selected countries.) The task force also would develop a template of evaluation criteria to be used by the country experts to achieve optimal objectivity and comparability of these country reports. These criteria would be based upon the DG Results Framework for determining how successful activities are in meeting intermediate results (RD, p 84) under each subsector, and the project's overall comparative framework.
- *Data gathering:* Country experts would spend a total of 90 days in each of the selected countries gathering information needed to provide a qualitative analysis of the general context and exogenous factors; analyze existing R4 reports, PMPs, and other contractor reports available at the mission in order to evaluate the “success” of a USAID activity according to the pre-established criteria; draw upon the expertise of relevant mission officers, past and present, through Web-based questionnaires and follow-up interviews; interview key local personnel involved in USAID-funded activities, local academics, and other actors; and write an overview of the context and USAID activities. Appropriate local researchers will assist the country experts.

The overview of general context and exogenous factors would be structured to provide more details on, and a “reality check” of, the indicators of democratic development and exogenous factors in the preliminary analysis. The expert would produce a single-country qualitative analysis of the same relationships examined in the cross-national research track. The country expert reports would be peer reviewed. This deeper and expanded information on context and subsectoral impact would be used for the cross-national research track’s intermediate analysis.

A *second phase* of country-level research stems from the results of the intermediate analysis and a midstream assessment, which would identify specific common activities across countries and regions for closer examination. Country experts would return to all or a subset of the original 20-25 countries to examine specific activities in terms of indicators and process, in order to better understand factors leading to the “success” or “failure” of that activity relative to the same activity in another country.

Analysis and Reporting

The evaluation process will produce three major analytical reports and a series of country overviews and activity analyses. The major reports include a preliminary cross-national subsectoral analysis; an intermediate analysis using augmented subsectoral data; and a final report that aggregates policy-relevant findings from the first two reports as well as the activity analyses.

A *preliminary analysis* would focus on how much change in democratic development at the country and subsector-level to attribute to the impact of USAID programs by examining the relationships between democratic

⁴ The hedge on the exact number of countries is twofold: first, selection criteria established by the task force may alter the number, as might supplementary data (e.g., questionnaire responses); second, cost considerations, since the difference between 25 and 20 overviews is about 7 percent of the entire project budget.

development indicators, USAID expenditures, USAID Mission Officer assessments, other donor expenditures, and exogenous factors.⁵

For the indicators of democratic development, several sources are possible. At the country level, either Freedom House, Polity IV, or Bollen's index would be appropriate measures (listed in RD, Appendix H). At the subsectoral level, different indicators of democratic development should be used for each subsector. For "rule of law" and "governance" (accountability and corruption) subsectors, we recommend the World Bank's "Governance Matters" series.⁶ For "elections and political parties," we recommend the Arthur Banks Handbook series. Appropriate indicators for "civil society" are in less abundance, although it could be possible to expand on DG's own "NGO Sustainability Index" for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia. Not incidentally, this evaluation is an opportunity to develop better indices for some of the sectors, particularly civil society, under the direction of the advisory council.

Data on other variables that might affect democratic development in countries are available from a variety of other sources such as the World Bank, the United Nations, or a variety of other international data sets.

This broad-gauge, preliminary analysis would be conducted in order to provide valuable guidance on the effectiveness of USAID programs at global and regional levels; provide insights into each of the four subsectors at global and regional levels; assess the impact of other donors and exogenous factors; and indicate how useful a more complete database incorporating detailed activity information for all countries would be.

The *intermediate analysis* would incorporate information from the expert overviews, and be synthesized with the data and inferences of the preliminary analysis. This richer body of data on a smaller set of countries would allow for analysis of activities that goes beyond expenditures in describing subsectoral impacts, thus making it possible to compare country-level programs across countries, and subsectors across countries, in addition to identifying a set of common activities across countries that would benefit from further assessments.

As this suggests, the intermediate analysis would essentially build on the preliminary analysis by adding an indicator of the "success" or "failure" of USAID activities, as measured by the extent to which those activities meet intermediate results for each subsector in accordance with the DG Results Framework.⁷

The intermediate analysis would provide much more specific guidance on the effectiveness of USAID programs at the subsector and activity level; consider more closely (and systematize) the extent and limitations of other donors and exogenous factors; and highlight "good" and "bad" practices for the most common activities, which would allow for follow-up comparative analysis.

⁵ In general and specific terms, the analysis will be:

Δ democracy indicator = f (USAID effort; other donor effort; Δ exogenous factors)

Δ Freedom House = f (USAID total expend; USAID MO assessments; other donor total expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

Δ World Bank indicator = f (USAID subsector expend; USAID MO assessments; of "rule of law" other donor subsector expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

⁶ D. Kaufmann, A. Kraay and M. Mastruzzi, *Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996–2002* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank Institute, May 2003). <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pdf/govmatters3.pdf>

⁷ Similar to the preliminary analysis, the intermediate analysis will be:

Δ democracy indicator = f (USAID effort; other donor effort; Δ exogenous factors)

Δ Freedom House = f (USAID total expend, USAID total "success"; other donor total expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

Δ World Bank indicator = f (USAID subsector expend, USAID sector "success"; of "rule of law" other donor subsector expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

The *activity analyses* that are driven by the intermediate analysis would examine the sequencing, outputs, outcomes, and impacts, in addition to tracing the process of the activity and accounting for exogenous factors. The individual analyses would then be used by experts at the project home for comparative analysis of “good” and “bad” practices across regions, countries, subsectors, and activities. (More neutral terms would be used.)

A *final analysis* synthesizes the findings from the preliminary analysis, the intermediate analysis, and the comparative activity analyses, with refinements to each and as a composite picture of the impact of USAID activities. The goal would be to provide strong, empirically based policy guidance—making specific recommendations for pursuing or eliminating lines of activity based on the success or failure that the evaluation revealed; flagging activities that bear close watching; and building a deeper understanding of the interaction between activities within subsectors and across subsectors. This final report will undergo extensive review by the task force and outside experts, both for methodological soundness and policy relevance and realism.

Administration

[...]

The advisory council plays a role of aiding the research director in final selection of countries; ensuring rigor and comprehensiveness in the cross-national analysis; establishing a template for country expert overviews; making the midstream assessment a pivotal period in maximizing short-term results (the intermediate analysis) and drawing lessons from the initial phases of the project to complete the work successfully; ensuring that products meet high standards; and building a field of democratization evaluation and theory that can be durable, multinational, and multi-institutional.

[...]

Products

The evaluation project would result in a substantial number of written products and related briefings intended for USAID, academic, and international development agency audiences.

- The *preliminary analysis* would focus on how much change in democratic development at the country and subsector-level to attribute to the impact of USAID programs by examining the relationships between democratic development indicators, USAID expenditures, USAID Mission Officer assessments, other donor expenditures, and exogenous factors. This analysis makes a valuable contribution toward gauging the impact of USAID subsectors across regions, individual subsectors across regions, taking into account the effect of other donor expenditures and exogenous factors. These findings would stimulate discussions about the relative effectiveness of USAID programs as a first step toward revising policy. This analysis would be the subject of an advisory council meeting and internal USAID review. It would be published on the project Web site and in hard copy, distributed to appropriate congressional staff, USAID administrators, State Department officials, and non-U.S. development agency personnel involved in the benchmarking exercises, and to non-governmental policy professionals.
- The *country-expert overviews* would analyze the general context, exogenous factors, and activity impact with respect to specific criteria established by the advisory council, and then analyze relationships between variables following the analytical model from the cross-national research track. The overviews would be stand-alone reports available on the project website, and could also be the basis for scholarly publications by the experts.
- The *intermediate analysis* assesses subsectoral impacts, thus making it possible to compare country-level programs across countries, subsectors across countries, as well as identify a set of common activities across countries that would benefit from further assessments. This analysis would provide much more specific policy guidance on the effectiveness of USAID programs at the subsector- and activity-level; consider more closely the extent and limitations of other donors and exogenous factors; and highlight “good” and “bad” practices for the most common activities, which would allow for follow-up comparative analysis. These findings would be reviewed by the advisory council meeting and USAID staff, and in official venues, but in addition would be the subject of forums at key policy research venues in Washington, DC, the U.N., and Brussels.

- The *activity analyses* would examine specific activities in terms of indicators and process, in order to better understand factors leading to the “success” or “failure” of that activity relative to the same activity in another country. The analyses would be stand-alone reports available on the USAID website, and would lead to a series of internal USAID briefings in Washington, DC, and at selected regional meetings of mission officers.
- The *final analysis* would aggregate the policy-relevant lessons learned from the preliminary analysis, the intermediate analysis, and the comparative analysis of the reports on “good” and “bad” activity practices. The goal would be to provide specific policy guidance on lines of activity; the analysis would also address findings related to exogenous factors that have demonstratively positive effects on democratic development, thus producing further guidance for revising or adopting new policy initiatives. This major document would be the focus of internal USAID and State Department briefings, congressional briefings, and forums at key policy research venues in Washington, DC, Europe, and elsewhere.

In addition, two lines of work that are not essential to the success of the evaluation effort, but are highly recommended, would also yield useful products.

The first is *field-building scholarship* on the democracy development indicators commissioned by the advisory council, yielding theoretical articles and perhaps new indices.

The second are the *benchmarking activities* with non-U.S. development agencies. At the low end, these activities would produce data for use in the USAID evaluation. More concerted efforts could yield much more in-depth cooperation on calculating impacts, reviewing norms and strategies, comparing approaches, and so on, carried out collectively in workshops, through papers, and the like; the other agencies should be able to cost-share for these activities, making this quite feasible with leadership from the U.S. project director.

The Web site, created and maintained by the contractor, is a product in itself, will host all written products and additional, related materials and interactions, and be intended as a permanent resource on the issues engaged in this evaluation project.

APPENDIX B

Illustrative, Non-comprehensive List of Datasets and Factors

Illustrative, Non-Comprehensive Listing of Relevant Datasets

Indicators: Polity, Freedom House, Polyarchy, World Bank Governance Indicators, World Development Indicators, the Human Development Index, PRS, Database of Political Institutions, Arthur Banks, International IDEA, NGO Sustainability Index, Evans & Rauch, Segura-Kaufman, Alvarez-Cheibub-Limongi-Przeworski.
Survey data: Global Barometers and other regional surveys, Transparency International's Corruption Perception and Bribe Payers' indices, World Value Surveys, European Social Surveys.

Illustrative, Non-Comprehensive Listing of Relevant Contextual Factors

Income distribution, general level of economic development, ethnic diversity, ethnic conflict, regime type, other donor agencies' investments, US foreign policy priorities, colonial heritage.

APPENDIX C

Illustrative, Non-comprehensive List of Inquiry Examples

Presence

What is the relationship between [DG, subsector] programs and broadly-defined democratic development?
Under what circumstances do [DG, subsector] programs have the most and the least effect?
To what extent do contextual factors (regime type, socio-econ, baseline, ethnic, HDI, ODA, etc) matter?
Have CSO activities had a positive influence on citizens' awareness of rights?
Have CSO activities had a positive influence on democratic values of citizens?
Have CSOs been able to enhance citizen participation?
Have media programs improved citizen awareness?
Are citizens better able to discern differences between competing parties?
Have EPP programs contributed to improving the political culture among officials and citizens?
Have EPP programs improved access by gender or ethnicity?
Have EPP programs improved citizen satisfaction with various democratic institutions?
Have EPP programs contributed to broadening the competitive range of parties?
Have EPP programs contributed to changing electoral laws?
Have EPP programs contributed to improving government duration?
Have EPP programs contributed to increasing the number of parliamentary parties?
Are citizens satisfied with local government services and value officials at the local level?
Has the view of the legislature as a legitimate democratic institution improved?
Have anti-corruption programs ameliorated the level of corruption?
Have anti-corruption programs improved the quality of civil service recruitment?
Have anti-corruption programs raised awareness among citizens?
Have RoL programs improved citizen perception of justice system?
Have RoL programs improved human rights observance?

Investment

Is there a threshold level of funding for effective [DG, subsector] programming?
To what extent do program staffing levels matter?
To what extent does DG's proportion of overall USAID funding matter?
Is concentration of funding in one subsector more or less effective than diverse programming?

Time

Does the duration of [DG, subsector] programming matter?
Does a sudden surge/withdrawal in [subsector] funding have a positive effect on [democratic development]?
How does lag time differ between subsectors?
Does the contribution made by [subsector] programs decline over time?
What is the lag time between [subsector] program implementation and effect?

Program Characteristics

Is there a most effective sequence of subsector programs?
Are multiple programs more effective than single-sector programs?
Is the effect of multiple programs additive or synergistic?

Implementation Structure

Does the type of contracting mechanism matter?
Does USAID's funding source matter?
Does the number of implementing partners matter?