



Evaluation Design Report:

AIR's Performance Evaluation of MCA- Zambia's Innovation Grant Program Facility

Hannah Ring

David Seidenfeld

Evaluation Design Report: AIR's Performance Evaluation of MCA-Zambia's Innovation Grant Program Facility

Revised April 2018

Hannah Ring

David Seidenfeld



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
202.403.5000

www.air.org

Copyright © 2015 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

Contents

	Page
1.0. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background.....	1
2.0. Overview of the compact and the evaluation.....	3
2.1. Performance evaluation overview and implementation plan.....	3
2.2. Program logic.....	4
3.0. Literature review.....	7
3.1. Innovation grant programs.....	7
3.2. Performance evaluations.....	8
4.0. Evaluation design.....	10
4.1. Policy relevance of the evaluation.....	10
4.3. Evaluation questions.....	10
4.5. Methodology.....	13
4.6. Study sample.....	13
4.7. Analysis plan.....	15
4.8. Time frame.....	16
4.9. Limitations and challenges.....	16
5.0. Data sources.....	17
5.1. Data collection plans.....	17
5.2. Measuring implementation fidelity.....	22
5.3. Data needs.....	22
6.0. Administration.....	245
6.1. Summary of institutional review board requirements and clearances.....	25
6.2. Preparing data files for access, privacy, and documentation.....	25
6.3. Dissemination Plan.....	25
6.4. Evaluation team roles and responsibilities.....	26
6.5. Evaluation timeline.....	26
6.6. Reporting schedule.....	27
7. 0. References.....	28

List of Acronyms

AFO- Administration & Finance Officer

AIR- American Institutes for Research

GRZ- The Government of the Republic of Zambia

IGP- Zambia's Innovative Grant Program

IGPM- Innovative Grant Program Manager (COWI)

LCC- Lusaka City Council

LWSC- Lusaka Water and Sewage Company

LWSSD- Lusaka Water Supply Sanitation and Drainage Project

MCC- Millennium Challenge Corporation

MCA- Millennium Challenge Account

PIT- Performance Improvement Team

TEP- Technical Evaluation Panel

1.0. Introduction

American Institutes for Research (AIR) has been contracted by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) to conduct a performance evaluation of the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), Zambia's Innovation Grants Program (IGP) focusing on the grant facility's implementation, stakeholder perceptions of the program, and relation to other components of the MCA Zambia Compact. AIR's work with MCC and MCA related to the IGP includes two other components: evaluability assessments of grant proposals and evaluations of individual awarded grants. However, those activities are separate from the performance evaluation of the IGP and thus are not addressed in this design report.

1.1. Background

The MCA supports the implementation of water supply, water quality, sanitation, and hygiene interventions under the Lusaka Water Supply Sanitation and Drainage Project (LWSSD). The objective is to expand access to, and improve the reliability of, water supply and sanitation, and to improve drainage services in select urban and peri-urban areas of the city of Lusaka. The program logic suggests that these improvements will in turn decrease the incidence of waterborne and water-related diseases (such as diarrhea), generate time savings for households and businesses, and reduce nonrevenue water in the water supply network. The project focuses specifically on investments in (1) infrastructure development and rehabilitation, and (2) the provision of technical assistance to the Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC; the provincial utility responsible for the management of Lusaka's WASH assets and the provision of WASH services) and the Lusaka City Council (LCC; the government entity that manages the city's drainage infrastructure and services). The technical assistance component includes the IGP, of which AIR is conducting a performance evaluation.

1.1.1. Country context

Lusaka faces many challenges with regard to water supply, sanitation, and waste management. This is especially true for residents of peri-urban areas, where many of the city's poorest and most vulnerable people reside.¹ The city's water supply, sanitation, and drainage system was constructed in the 1960s and 1970s and is outdated, dilapidated, and unable to meet current or future demand, because Lusaka is home to 1.8 million people and is projected to have close to 5 million residents by 2035.²

In Lusaka, water and sanitation services have been decentralized to local authorities and various community-based service providers. In the peri-urban areas, water trusts, which are separate legal entities, provide water supply services under the LWSC.³ Currently, only approximately

¹ Millennium Challenge Account Zambia. (2014). *Millennium Challenge Account-Zambia Innovation Grant Program for Pro-Poor Service Delivery: Grant Manual*.

² Millennium Challenge Corporation. (2012, May 12). *Millennium Challenge Compact Between the United States of America Acting Through the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Republic of Zambia*. Retrieved from <https://assets.mcc.gov/agreements/compact-zambia.pdf>

³ Banerjee, S. G., & Morella, S. (2011). *Africa's water and sanitation infrastructure: Access, affordability, and alternatives*. Retrieved from <http://elibrary.worldbank.org/proxygw.wrlc.org/doi/pdf/10.1596/978-0-8213-8457-2>

70% of Lusaka residents have access to treated water, and only approximately 65% have access to waterborne sanitation (either through a connection to the network or with septic tanks) (see Footnote 2). The situation in Lusaka's peri-urban areas is significantly worse, where more than half of the population does not have access to an adequate water supply and up to 90% lack access to adequate sanitation facilities.⁴ These conditions contribute to a high incidence of water-related diseases such as malaria, diarrhea, and cholera, which are exacerbated during the rainy season when flooding is common. In addition to poor health, the degraded and inadequate condition of the system's core infrastructure also forces Lusaka's residents and businesses to waste substantial time and resources resolving water supply shortages and delays as well as flood losses, resulting in further lost productivity (see Footnote 2).

1.1.2. Objectives of this report

The purpose of this report is to provide MCC and MCA with AIR's proposed design for the performance evaluation of the IGP facility and plans for implementing the performance evaluation. This document's intent is to give both MCC and MCA-Zambia a comprehensive understanding of the performance evaluation design and an opportunity to provide feedback. Although it is essential that AIR remain a truly independent evaluator of the IGP (beginning from the design phase), it is important to ensure that all parties involved understand and accept the terms of the performance evaluation and believe in its utility. In addition, given the internal midterm evaluation of the IGP that is taking place concurrently with AIR's performance evaluation, this evaluation design report is intended to facilitate transparency and coordination among all parties involved with the IGP. AIR's performance evaluation of the IGP should validate and complement any internal evaluations rather than duplicate or impede them.

The performance evaluation of the IGP will generate evidence to help MCA learn what aspects of the IGP are working well and identify areas that could be improved. We will establish the fidelity of grant program implementation along various dimensions, including the grant announcement and associated communication efforts (and the initial call for concept notes), the extent to which grants were awarded according to program priorities, and the extent to which grants were managed and grantees were supported effectively. The performance evaluation will rely on a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data will come from interviews and focus groups with selected respondents (see Table 2 for a full list of evaluation respondents) and quantitative data will include a brief survey for concept note and proposal workshop participants⁵ as well as data collected by Innovation Grant Program Manager for monitoring and budgeting purposes (see Table 3 for a full list of qualitative and quantitative data sources). We will collect information on the perceptions of the program using formative and summative in-depth interviews with stakeholders, focusing on participation in the program and health and economic benefits.

⁴ <http://www.wsup.com/programme/where-we-work/zambia/>

⁵ We will develop the brief survey for the second cycle of the IGP because the concept note and proposal workshops for the first cycle have already taken place.

2.0. Overview of the compact and the evaluation

The Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) and the Government of the United States of America, acting through the MCC, signed a Millennium Challenge Compact in 2012. The purpose of the compact is to reduce poverty in Zambia through economic growth, specifically via infrastructure investments in water supply, sanitation, and drainage. The LWSSD is the primary investment under the compact and is intended to increase access to clean and safe water, ensure adequate sanitation, and improve drainage. Under the LWSSD are two primary activities: an infrastructure activity and an institutional strengthening activity. The latter includes three sub activities, of which the Innovation Grants Program (IGP) is one.

The IGP funds innovative opportunities and partnerships in the WASH sector while encouraging active participation from the private sector, following a grant-making process that enhances its transparency and credibility. The MCA-Zambia and the MCC solicit concept notes and proposals, evaluate the submissions, and award grants according to clearly defined criteria. The grants fund innovations in water supply, sanitation, hygiene, and solid waste management. These projects are intended to be novel, able to improve outcomes for the urban poor, sustainable, and potentially scalable. A key evaluation criterion for the grants is that they benefit poor or otherwise vulnerable populations. The grants also target private sector participation and are expected to create synergies with the MCA's other investments in water supply, sanitation, hygiene, and solid waste management.

2.1. Performance evaluation overview and implementation plan

The performance evaluation of the IGP is structured according to four phases of IGP implementation that we have identified for each grant cycle: start-up, selection, implementing the award, and completing the award. These four phases differ slightly from the six main steps identified in the IGP grant manual; however, all of the activities reflected in the grant cycle implementation figure (p. 19 of the grants manual) are included in the four phases below. The evaluation activities included under these phases are further elaborated in Table 1.

Table 1. Phases and activities & subjects in each IGP grant cycle

Phase	Activities & Subjects to evaluate
Start-up	Stakeholder information meetings; identification of potential interested parties; partnership forum; development of application packages; call for concept notes; dissemination and outreach efforts (to include the targeting of women and other vulnerable groups); partnership facilitation; concept note workshop; invitation to submit proposals; the process of notification to unsuccessful concept note submitters; proposal workshop
Selection	Screening of concept notes; evaluation of concept notes; screening of proposals; evaluation of proposals (including the Technical Evaluation Panel [TEP] and investment committee meetings); IGPM fiduciary risk assessment; IGPM environmental compliance assessment; pre award negotiations
Implementing the award	Grant agreements signing; media events for grantees; fund disbursements; ongoing monitoring and reporting; quarterly and annual reporting; grant cycle review; ongoing communications (e.g., project and success stories)
Completing the award	Grant closeout (administrative and financial); communities within grant catchment areas; sustainability efforts; perceptions of grant catchment communities

Sections 4 and 5 of this report provide further detail regarding how each of these activities will be evaluated, including the data sources for each activity.

2.1.1. Program participants

The targeted program participants for the IGP are Zambian and non-Zambian private sector firms, nongovernment organizations, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, universities, research institutions, and foundations. Governmental organizations, political parties and affiliates, and public international organizations such as United Nations agencies are not eligible to receive IGP grants. Both small and large organizations are encouraged to apply for IGP grants, and partnerships are encouraged—especially between smaller and larger organizations.

2.1.2. Geographic coverage

Grants awarded under the IGP will be implemented in urban and peri-urban areas of Lusaka. The GRZ identified water, sanitation, and drainage as key issues in the capital city of Lusaka, which is why the compact and the IGP target these areas.


2.2. Program logic

According to the compact, the IGP “will support a competitive grant and partnership program designed to identify, and provide assistance to, innovative partnership opportunities, particularly through private sector engagement. [The IGP] is intended to increase and sustain the poor’s access to quality water and sanitation, improve water use, sanitation and hygiene practices among the poor, strengthen tenure security and capacity for community-based planning, provide significant access to women and vulnerable groups to LWSSD Project benefits and expand

opportunities for entrepreneurship and income generation activities related to water, sanitation, and drainage. Activities will thus enhance the functioning of the systems, complementing and supplementing the Compact's other investments. Grants issued under [the IGP] will be awarded, implemented and managed pursuant to open, fair and competitive procedures administered in a transparent manner in accordance with all relevant MCC policies and guidelines (including the Program Guidelines, the MCC Gender Integration Guidelines and Operational Procedures and the IFC Performance Standards).”

Figure 1 depicts the framework for the performance evaluation of the IGP, including the phases of implementation that we will examine (and the key components of each phase). The performance evaluation will also assess the different monitoring mechanisms and MCA-Zambia's management of IGPM and IGPM's performance during the implementation of the IGP. Finally, the performance evaluation will assess the fidelity of IGP implementation by comparing the reality of program execution with what is reflected in the IGP grants manual.

Figure 1. Program's Operational Processes



3.0. Literature review

3.1. Innovation grant programs

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) defines innovation as a new and interesting or unexpected business model, operational process, product, or service that leads to substantial improvements in addressing a pressing challenge (2015). Most IGPs strive to promote creativity and innovation in problem solving by supporting novel, often small-scale, efforts from civil society organizations through small, competitive grants programs in a specific arena (e.g., WASH) (AusAID, 2012; MCA-Zambia, 2014; Microsoft, 2014; Stone Family Foundation, 2015; United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], n.d.). This strategy enables organizations and partnerships to pilot their programs and assess their feasibility before scaling activities up to a higher level. In other words, IGPs offer a “financial incentive that induces change through competition” and “aims to stimulate or induce innovation” (Tremolet, 2015, p. 9).

While IGPs are increasing in popularity among the donor community, there is a dearth of literature on such programs—especially programs that emphasize supporting pro-poor services and local community-driven approaches to development. IGPs are relatively new to the developing country context, being favored in developed countries since their inception, and have a limited history of being used to fund non-research-related activities (AusAID, 2012; Ton et al., 2013; Tremolet, 2015). Even so, they are beginning to flourish in their new environment as development donors and practitioners are searching for new ways to fund projects and encourage new entrants into the field (Department for International Development [DFID], 2005).

As mentioned, IGPs first got their start as research funding mechanisms, and they targeted a variety of key sectors including education, the environment, agriculture, and health. More recently, IGPs with an emphasis on innovations in WASH programming and service delivery, in particular, have blossomed. Although not always solely intended for local community-based organizations, innovation grants have been used to fund new initiatives aimed at increasing access to proper forms of water and sanitation across the developing world. Examples of such programs include the WASH Advocacy Challenge, which provides small grants to support programs that improve water and sanitation by generating new efforts to hold local service providers accountable in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; the Stone Family Foundation, which offers seed capital via a competitive grants mechanism to market-based projects that target WASH initiatives in both rural and urban areas; AusAID’s Civil Society WASH Fund, which provides multiple competitive grants specifically targeted at civil society organizations to deliver WASH programming to increase access to safe water and sanitation; and UNDP’s Community Water Initiative, which provides grants to support activities related to local watershed management, community water supply, household sanitation, and innovative financing and management structures (AusAID, 2012; Stone Family Foundation, 2015; UNDP, n.d; WASH Advocates, n.d.).

Another important feature of many of these programs is the requirement of incorporating specific subpopulations in the innovations, particularly women, the poor, and other vulnerable individuals. A few examples of this MCC managed and otherwise is the Zambia Civil Society and Environment Fund mandates that all grant applicants must address cross-cutting themes such

as gender, HIV/AIDS, and people living with disabilities in their work; the Honduras Agriculture Public Goods Grant requires applicants to assess the social and gender effects of their programs; and the Namibia Conservancy Development Support Fund stresses gender equality in all funded projects (MCA Zambia, 2014). Therefore, MCA Zambia's current IGP is following suit by emphasizing the inclusion of women and the poor in all grantee activities.

This is only one reason that IGPs are ideal for furthering improvements in the WASH sector. Another, perhaps more salient, issue is that of limited funding in this sector caused by low demand and lack of institutional support, which lead to the inability of current WASH initiatives to be scaled up (Tremolet, 2015). Ideally, the funding gap left will be filled by IGPs. Moreover, by targeting grants toward local civil society and grassroots organizations, funders can take advantage of the local community's inherent knowledge advantage; local communities have the most knowledge about their individual needs and what will work in the local context, which gives innovations stemming from this group a potential advantage in terms of sustainability and feasibility (UNDP, n.d.). Involving the community also produces greater levels of social cohesion, buy-in, and support for development projects, which are essential for long-term improvements in and the success of WASH initiatives.

However, few evaluations of such funding mechanisms exist, and those that do lack rigor (Ton et al., 2013). Almost all of the evaluations of IGPs that have been done were conducted by the donors or implementers themselves, potentially inducing bias into the results or how the results are presented because these entities are likely more inclined to highlight the positives at the expense of any potential drawbacks. For instance, the Local Innovation Support Funds program (LISF) implemented by Prolinnova in Cambodia, Ethiopia, South Africa, and Uganda to promote and improve innovative activities in agriculture and natural resource management was found to be successful in an impact evaluation conducted by Prolinnova (Prolinnova, 2012). Specifically, this program was reported to have improved practices and systems in these sectors, which led to increased livelihood improvements for farmers and land-users. The LISF was shown to enable farmers to increase access to and use of information about new practices and then use this knowledge to create innovations. Moreover, this evaluation concluded that such innovation funds can feasibly be managed locally at the grassroots level, and that decentralization with respect to these programs is practical. In addition, an evaluation of another agricultural innovative support program in Uganda found positive impacts (Benin et al., 2007). However, although this report touts vast improvements in agricultural innovation, it subtly notes that rates of adoption of such innovations remained low among households, yet it attributes the overarching effects to "dramatic" increases in many treatment areas. Despite these claims of success, the authors concede that they produced no significant difference in actual yield growth. Therefore, although these programs may appear viable on paper, the only way to understand whether, how, and why they have any actual value added is to conduct rigorous evaluations of their impact and processes, ideally by neutral third parties.

3.2. Performance evaluations

Researchers and policy makers use a number of different types of evaluation to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of IGPs and various other programs or interventions, each with a distinct purpose. Performance evaluations are focused on understanding and identifying how a program achieved or failed to achieve the intended outcomes as well as how the program

operates on the ground and whether this aligns with the original implementation plan and logic model (Bowie & Bronte-Tinkew, 2008; Gomby & Larson, 1992; Linnell, n.d.; Linnen & Steckler, 2002; Paul, 2009; Saunders, Evans & Joshi, 2005; World Health Organization [WHO], 2000). MCC defines performance evaluations as “A study that seeks to answer descriptive questions, such as: what were the objectives of a particular project or program, what the project or program has achieved; how it has been implemented; how it is perceived and valued; whether expected results are occurring and are sustainable; and other questions that are pertinent to program design, management and operational decision making. MCC’s performance evaluations also address questions of program impact and cost-effectiveness.”⁶

More specifically, performance evaluations address questions related to overall program operations, such as whether program activities were accomplished, how well the activities were implemented, whether the target beneficiaries were reached, how external factors influenced program delivery, how efficiently resources were used, and the effectiveness of program management (Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab [J-PAL], n.d.; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2009). In addition, they can be used to identify current or potential issues in program implementation that need immediate attention and rectification for improved service delivery, and they can be used to inform program replicability and scaling up (Bowie & Bronte-Tinkew, 2008; Linnell, n.d.; WHO, 2000). Perhaps most importantly, performance evaluations can be used to disentangle program components and mechanisms to determine which factors are most influential to produce (or impede) anticipated program effects (Bowie & Bronte-Tinkew, 2008; Butterfoss, 2006; Harachi et al., 1999; Linnell, n.d.; Linnen & Steckler, 2002; Saunders et al., 2005; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], n.d.; World Bank, n.d.). Often researchers invest time and resources only to conduct a program impact evaluation to determine whether results have been realized. However, this does not give researchers or policy makers a clear picture of why a program was successful or unsuccessful. Performance evaluations can be used to support findings from such impact evaluations to assess which aspects of program implementation were most conducive to achieving results or which were most limiting. This further informs program replication by apprising program implementers of the components most relevant for realizing program effects.

AIR will conduct the performance evaluation of the IGP by utilizing best practices through a mixed methodology approach. While AIR is committed to conducting a rigorous performance evaluation of the IGP it is important to note that there remains the potential for measurement errors (especially with regards to instances where considerable time has elapsed between IGP phases and data collection.)

⁶ Millennium Challenge Corporation. (2012 May 1). *Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation of Compacts and Threshold Programs*. Retrieved from <https://assets.mcc.gov/guidance/policy-050112-monitoring-and-evaluation.pdf>

4.0. Evaluation design

The performance evaluation of the IGP facility will be a mixed-methods study, relying on both qualitative and quantitative data over the course of IGP implementation (2015–2018). As detailed in Section 2, the performance evaluation will collect data during the four phases of each IGP grant cycle: start-up, selection, implementing the award, and completing the award.

4.1. Policy relevance of the evaluation

Through the performance evaluation, we will identify potential gaps or inefficiencies in IGP implementation, areas in which coordination can be improved, and positive aspects of the IGP that could potentially be expanded or replicated in other contexts. This performance evaluation will enable us to examine whether the IGP’s design principles (*simplicity, efficiency, flexibility, and adaptability*) are being realized during implementation. The performance evaluation of IGP has the ability to have far reaching policy implications and it works to inform innovative approaches to improving water quality and sanitation. Furthermore, the performance evaluation will gauge if the IGP meets its core objectives:

- To increase and sustain the access of the poor to quality water and sanitation and improved drainage maintenance through solid waste management
- To enhance the functioning of the water supply, sewerage, and drainage systems
- To demonstrate an innovative approach or technology to improve water use, sanitation, and hygiene practices among the poor
- To identify and provide assistance to innovative partnership arrangements, particularly through private sector engagement
- To provide significant access by women and vulnerable groups to the IGP and its benefits
- To expand opportunities for entrepreneurship and income-generating activities related to water supply, sanitation, and drainage maintenance through solid waste management

As part of the efforts to understand the impact of the IGP the performance evaluation will also examine the perception of relevant stakeholders. The evaluation findings will shed light on a number of areas relevant to the MCC compact including the role that infrastructure investments play in increasing access to water supply, sanitation, and drainage to vulnerable populations.

4.3. Evaluation questions

AIR’s performance evaluation of the IGP is structured around the four phases of IGP implementation established in Section 2. AIR will use the following overarching questions as a framework to the evaluation question design:

- Did the program achieve its objectives following the implementation model envisioned in program documentation?
- Did the program achieve the outcomes envisioned in key peri-urban areas of Lusaka?
- Did the grant selection process prioritize interventions based on its key objectives, and was the process an efficient and effective way to identify the “best” projects?

- Is grant oversight sufficient? Is it cost-effective?
- How can the Innovation Grant Program better mobilize private-sector resources?
- Based on the degree of success of the IGP, what are the key lessons learned related to program design and the implementation model?

In each phase, the performance evaluation will investigate program implementation (including fidelity of implementation, which is explained in further detail later in this report), stakeholder response to the program, and costs of the program. Grant-level evaluations will be utilized to look at specific outcomes.

The performance evaluation will also examine the costs associated with grant oversight through two main metrics. First, we will examine the ratio of oversight costs to grant funding. In calculating this metric, we will include costs associated with the IGP grants team at MCA-Zambia as well as the IGP fraction of MCC costs. We include MCC costs to account for the significant costs associated with ensuring that a grant facility meets the core MCC requirements such as environmental and social performance, and monitoring and evaluation obligations. To calculate grant funding, we will include both grant disbursements and any associated co-financing. It is important to include co-financing because some of the oversight costs are directly attributable to monitoring and tracking co-finance obligations.

The second metric will examine the proportion of disbursed funds to planned disbursements on cancelled projects. This performance metric reflects a more direct measure of oversight capabilities and aims to assess whether there is sufficient oversight to cancel projects early on rather than after significant disbursements have been made.

AIR, as the independent evaluator, will rely on MCA and IGPM to provide cost information required for analysis. We will analyze the information that is provided to us but will not attempt to generate cost information of any kind. As appropriate and feasible, and in consultation with MCC, we will benchmark performance on these metrics against performance on similar MCC compacts or other large scale grant making mechanisms.

In addition to cost and fidelity of implementation, the evaluation questions below are driven by the other key components of performance evaluation identified in the literature by Linnen & Steckler (2002) and Shenderovich (2015): context, reach, dosage, and recruitment. Finally, the IGP's design principles and core values motivate the evaluation questions under each implementation phase.

Overview of IGP Grant Process:

- To what extent do the applications cover a broad range of technical intervention areas (e.g. solid waste management)?
- How many grants are awarded?
- What is the average grant size?
- What is the proportion of awarded grantees from each technical intervention area (e.g. solid waste management, water supply, etc.)?
- What proportion of available funds is committed to accepted grants?

Start-up: During start-up, we will investigate the effectiveness of the IGP solicitation process to potential grantees. Another key area of interest will be gathering the demographic information of the grantees. The evaluation of the IGP's start-up phase will be based on the questions below:

- How is information about the program disseminated?
 - Were there specific outreach and dissemination activities targeting potential grantees that are best qualified to provide high quality services to poor and vulnerable populations, including poor women, girls, and youth?
 - How well informed are potential grantees of the application and selection process and of the resources and support available to help them participate in the IGP?
- To what extent do the number and nature of applications meet MCA-Z and MCC expectations?
- Are proposals received highly relevant to the proposal call area and well distributed across the different calls areas? What are the factors that shape applicant distribution?
- Do the problem statements and proposal calls address areas that key IGP stakeholders perceive to be high impact? Why or why not?

Selection: During selection, we will investigate the selection process of the IGP with particular focus on the scoring procedures of the grants. Additionally, AIR will also examine the ways in which selection decisions are communicated to the grantees. Selection questions include:

- Are the reviewers adequately trained and supported? Why or why not?
- Does the IGPM follow its rules for reviewing, rating, and ranking grant applications? Why or why not?
- Is the grant selection process an efficient and effective way to identify the “best” projects based on how well the projects align with IGP concept note and proposal evaluation criteria (i.e., grantees clearly demonstrate benefits to poor and vulnerable populations)?
- Is the review process fair, efficient, and responsive to the needs of potential grantees? If not, why not?

Implementing the award: During the implementation phase, we will investigate the process of implementing the award. AIR will closely examine the negotiations of grantees' contracts, the process in which funds are disbursed, and the ability of grantees to successfully meet their quarterly goals. Illustrative research questions include:

- Are grantees adequately supported with necessary technical and managerial assistance?
- How well is the grant program integrated into other Compact activities?
- What proportion of awarded grant funds is spent on time?
- What proportion of grantees achieve their performance objectives at key milestones throughout the grant period?
- Is the oversight of grants on the part of MCA-Z and the IGPM sufficient and cost-effective in terms of spending and M&E targets?

Completing the award: During the completion phase of the award, we will investigate the sustainability and impact of the grantees' programs. In particular, how effective IGP efforts were in increasing access to clean water and sanitation to vulnerable communities. AIR will pay

particular attention to grantees' ability to successfully sustain its programs efforts and the impacts of these programs on their catchment communities. As part of these efforts, AIR will examine the perceptions of relevant stakeholders regarding grantees' programs. However, it is important to note that a full assessment of IGP may not be possible due to the short timeframe. Illustrative questions include:

- How have grantees demonstrated that their interventions are sustainable post-Compact?
- For civil society organizations and policymakers, what are the perceived benefits of the IGP interventions in Lusaka?
- Has the grant program led to new public-private partnership models or other ways targeting and improving water supply, sanitation, and/or solid waste management services in Lusaka?
- For poor and vulnerable populations in Lusaka, what are the perceived benefits of IGP interventions in their respective communities?

4.5. Methodology

The performance evaluation of the IGP will rely primarily on qualitative data collected through in-depth interviews and small focus groups. These two methods are indispensable tools for performance evaluations, because they provide more detailed information than is typically available through other data collection methods, such as surveys.⁷ In addition, interviews and focus groups are ideal instruments to use for planning and evaluating programs because they are open ended and discovery oriented, which allows an interviewer or facilitator to deeply explore a respondent's feelings and perspectives on a subject. The product of this method results in rich background information that can shape further questions relevant to the topic.⁸ The qualitative data collected through interviews and focus groups will be complemented by an analysis of quantitative and secondary source data, including most importantly the IGPM's own internal records. Quantitative data will include M&E data collected by IGPM, cost information collected by AIR, and survey data collected following the second cycle concept note and proposal workshops. In addition, AIR would also like to be provided with the findings of MCC's internal review of the IGP to include in the performance evaluation.

4.6. Study sample

During the performance evaluation of the IGP, we will collect qualitative data through key-informant interviews and focus groups with the respondents reflected in Table 2. The majority of the respondents listed in Table 2 will be interviewed multiple times during the performance evaluation (i.e., during multiple phases of IGP implementation) to capture their perspectives on various aspects of the grant facility. AIR will utilize key-informant interviews in order to gain the greatest insight into the performance of the IGP while minimizing the burden to grantees and staff of MCA and IGPM.

⁷ Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006, May 1). Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input.

⁸ Guion, L., Diehl, D., & McDonald, D. (2001, October 1). *Conducting an in-depth interview*.

Table 2. Performance evaluation respondents

IGP phase(s)	Respondents
Start-up	Representatives who attended concept note workshop ⁹
Start-up	Representatives from organizations that submitted concept note but did <u>not</u> submit a full proposal despite being invited to do so
Start-up	Representatives from organizations that submitted a concept note and <u>did</u> submit a full proposal
Start-up, selection	Representatives who attended proposal workshop (for large grants)
Start-up, selection	Representatives who attended proposal workshop (for small grants)
Start-up, selection	Unsuccessful grant applicants; those rejected at concept note and full proposal stage
Selection	TEP
Selection	Investment Committee members
Implementation; completing the award	Community members located in grant catchment areas
Start-up, selection, implementation, completing the award	Successful grant applicants (small and large grants)
Start-up, selection, implementation, completing the award	MCA-Zambia staff (including Grants Director)
Start-up, selection, implementation, completing the award	LWSC staff
Start-up, selection, implementation, completing the award	LCC staff
Start-up, selection, implementation, completing the award	MCC staff

Phase-specific protocols for interviews and focus groups with the aforementioned respondents will be developed and refined throughout the course of the performance evaluation. AIR will share all additional protocols with MCC and MCA as they are completed. Because the findings from each implementation phase inform the design of protocols for subsequent phases, it is not possible to include all protocols in this initial design report. Instead we lay out in this performance evaluation design report the general topics and activities to evaluate along with the key evaluation questions for each phase of IGP implementation.

It bears mentioning that the timing of certain data collection activities (for example, interviews with grant applicants) is quite sensitive: Certain questions must be asked of applicants prior to award notification to avoid potential bias on the part of unsuccessful applicants. Similarly, other interviews will be conducted with both successful and unsuccessful IGP applicants *after* award

⁹ For the first IGP grant cycle, it may be impossible to collect information from certain respondents from the concept note stage because of the time that has passed since the call for concept notes, the concept note and proposal workshops, and so on; however, we will certainly collect these data during the second IGP grant cycle.

notifications have been distributed. Conducting interviews after the award notifications have been distributed enables us to ask questions about the notification process itself, the perceived fairness of the selection process, and successful grantees' understanding of next steps.

Respondents for interviews and focus group discussions will be purposively selected on the basis of which phase of IGP implementation the interview or focus group is designed to inform. For interviews with potential grantees during the start-up phase, we will conduct individual interviews with 16 applicants before award notification. We will purposively select the 16 applicants to ensure that our sample includes a mix of small and large grant applications (ideally 8 of each type). The selection of interviewees and focus group participants from MCA-Zambia, IGPM, LWSC, and LCC will also be done deliberately, to ensure that our respondents are actively involved in the IGP. AIR will work under the guidance of MCA-Zambia and IGPM to select the most appropriate individuals from each group.

AIR will also develop a brief survey to be completed by those attending the concept note and proposal workshops (during the second grant cycle only, because the workshops during the first cycle occurred some time ago). The survey will be administered upon completion of the second grant cycle workshops to ensure that respondents' impressions are fresh in their minds. Results from the concept note and proposal workshop surveys will be analyzed in the context of the start-up phase of IGP implementation and will shed light on applicants' perceptions of the presentation and content of the concept note and proposal workshops.

4.7. Analysis plan

For this performance evaluation, secondary information sources (primarily IGPM records) will be reviewed and qualitative and quantitative primary data (interviews and focus groups; workshop surveys) will be analyzed.

Interviews and focus groups will be documented using a digital recorder and manual notes, which will later be transcribed by the respective data collectors. Transcriptions will then be coded and analyzed using qualitative data analysis techniques and the NVivo qualitative software package. Qualitative data analysis begins with entering all interview notes and transcribed interviews into NVivo software, a platform for analyzing unstructured data. The team creates a preliminary coding outline and analysis structure based on the research questions, interview protocols, and memos of ideas that emerged during data collection. This coding outline serves as a tool to organize and subsequently analyze the information gathered in the interviews. The outline is a living document that may be modified as new themes and findings emerge during data analysis. In addition, a list of definitions for the codes accompanies the outline so that coders categorize data using the same standards. After entering the raw data into NVivo, coders select a sample of interviews to double-code to ensure inter-rater reliability. The team subsequently codes the data into the structure.

Using these coded data, the qualitative team uses grounded theory to identify themes, categories, and theories that emerge from the data that confirm or refute researchers' initial impressions. That is, rather than basing the analysis on a hypothesis, the researchers create concepts and categories based on the data, refining the concepts as they go to eventually inform overall findings. During this process of data reduction, researchers characterize the prevalence of

responses, examine differences among groups, and identify key findings and themes related to the research questions.

Quantitative survey data will be analyzed in either Excel or Stata, depending on the type and volume of data collected in the survey instrument. Secondary sources such as the grants manual and IGPM records will be reviewed and analyzed qualitatively according to the evaluation questions.

4.8. Time frame

The timeline for the performance evaluation of the IGP is 2015–2018, with data collection tied to the four phases of IGP implementation for each grant cycle: start-up; selection, implementing the award; and completing the award. Data collection efforts will be streamlined in order to ensure cost effectiveness and minimize the burden on grantees, MCA-Z, and IGPM. While data collection for the IGP performance evaluation will occur over the life of both grant cycles, findings will be shared in a first report and final report. A more detailed timeline regarding data collection is illustrated in (Figure 2) of this report.

4.9. Limitations and challenges

The biggest challenge for the performance evaluation of the IGP will be timing, although it is not an unsurmountable challenge and we have designed our performance evaluation in stages that accommodate the IGP's implementation schedule. Nevertheless, coordinating data collection efforts with IGP activities could potentially pose a challenge. In the first IGP cycle, for example, we have already missed the opportunity to collect some of the data pertaining to the start-up phase because of the amount of time that has elapsed since certain activities (such as stakeholder meetings, the partnership forum, etc.) occurred. That said, for the current and second IGP cycles, the evaluation team will strive to be responsive to MCA-Zambia's interests and needs while also collecting and analyzing data in a timely manner. Additionally, AIR has worked to streamline the data collection process in order to minimize the burden placed on the grantees and the staff of MCA-Zambia. Data collection tools have been designed to capture multiple subject areas during each round of data collection.

5.0. Data sources

The performance evaluation of the IGP will rely on several different primary and secondary data sources, both quantitative and qualitative. These sources are detailed in Section 5.3. In addition, this performance evaluation would benefit from access to data already collected from the internal midterm evaluation of the IGP. Therefore, AIR will work with MCC and MCA to determine how our performance evaluation can further explain or validate the findings of self-evaluation, use self-evaluation findings to refine the design of the performance evaluation, and complement the self-evaluation by expanding or further exploring areas of interest.

5.1. Data collection plans

AIR will work closely with our Lusaka-based partner, Palm Associates, to collect all data for this performance evaluation. AIR's Washington, DC-based staff will train, supervise, and advise local researchers from Palm regarding how to conduct, record, and transcribe interviews and focus groups during each round of data collection for this performance evaluation.

The timing of the various performance evaluation data collections is presented in the work plan (Figure 2). Please bear in mind that the exact timing of each data collection will depend on a number of factors, including the IGP's adherence to its implementation schedule and the period of performance for the individual grant awards. For example, interviews with Cycle 1 grantees upon completion of their awards will take place at different times based on the period of performance of each grant project.

Figure 4. Work Plan

First Cycle

	2015						2016						2017						2018										
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov
Phase 1: Start-up																													
Preaward interviews with applicants who submitted full proposals (both successful and unsuccessful applicants)																													
Interviews with LWSC and LCC about IGP design and targeting																													
Document review: IGPM records including meeting notes; application package; outreach materials, etc.																													
Interviews with MCA-Z and IGPM staff about solicitation process																													
Start-up data analysis																													
Phase 2: Selection																													
MCA: first cycle grant awards																													
MCA: contract negotiations and signing of grant agreements																													
MCA: Initial disbursement to grantees																													
Interviews with MCA-Zambia, IGPM, TEP, investment committee about selection process																													
Interviews with both successful and unsuccessful IGP applicants																													
Document review: records from concept note and proposal evaluation; IGPM fiduciary risk assessment and environmental compliance assessment																													
Selection Data analysis																													
Phase 3: Implementing the award																													
Interviews with grantees 6–8 months after award (or later depending on the grant period of performance) and catchment communities																													
Interviews with MCA, IGPM, LWSC, and LCC staff 6–8 months after award																													
Data analysis																													

	2015						2016						2017						2018											
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Interviews with MCA, IGPM, LWSC, and LCC staff 6–8 months after award																														
Data analysis																														
Report 2 to MCC (Cycle 2, Phase 1-3)																														
Phase 4: Completing the award																														
MCA: closeout of Grant Cycle 2 ¹²																														
Interviews/focus groups with grantees, MCA, IGPM after award closeout																														
Interviews/focus groups with civil society organizations, grant catchment communities, and policy makers about perceptions of the IGP																														
Data analysis																														
Final Report to MCC to include: (Cycle 1, Phase 4&5; Cycle 2, Phase 4&5).																														

¹² Grantees will be completing activities between February and October 2018. ASD = February 2018; WASAZA = April 2018; Keepers Zambia = May 2018; Afya = June 2018; L&N = June 2018; GP&J = July 2018; Newtech = July 2018; MECB = August 2018; and PPHPZ = October 2018.

5.2. Measuring implementation fidelity

To evaluate program fidelity, we will use a combination of secondary data sources collected from IGPM and qualitative data collected during interviews and focus groups to determine whether the processes detailed in the IGP grant manual are being adhered to fully. When measuring implementation fidelity, it is important to examine four critical components of adherence to a program or intervention: content, coverage, frequency, and duration.¹³

5.3. Data needs

We will use a mix of qualitative and quantitative data (from both primary and secondary sources) to conduct the performance evaluation of the IGP facility. The data sources for each activity are reflected in Table 3.

Table 3. Data sources by phase and activity

Phase	Activity	Data source(s)
Start-up	Stakeholder information meetings	IGPM records; interviews/focus groups with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, LWSC, LCC
	Identification of potential interested parties	Interviews/focus groups with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, LWSC, LCC
	Partnership forum	Interviews/focus groups with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, LWSC, LCC
	Development of application package	Interviews with IGPM, MCA-Zambia
	Call for concept notes	IGP website; interviews with submitters of concept notes, IGPM, MCA-Zambia
	Dissemination and outreach efforts	IGP website; interviews with grantees, IGPM, MCA-Zambia, LWSC, LCC
	Partnership facilitation	Interviews with grantees, IGPM, MCA-Zambia, LWSC, LCC
	Concept note workshop	Postworkshop survey; interviews with attendees
	Invitation to submit proposals	Interviews with grantees; IGPM records
	Notification to unsuccessful concept note submitters	Interviews with grantees; IGPM records
	Proposal workshop	Postworkshop survey; interviews with attendees
Selection	Screening of concept notes	Concept note registration log
	Evaluation of concept notes	Concept note evaluation report; interviews/focus groups with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, TEP
	Screening of proposals	Proposal registration log
	Evaluation of proposals (including TEP and investment committee meetings)	Interviews with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, TEP, investment committee
	IGPM fiduciary risk assessment	IGPM records; interviews with IGPM

¹³ Carroll, Patterson, et al. (2007). A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity. *Implementation Science*.

Phase	Activity	Data source(s)
	IGPM environmental compliance assessment	IGPM records; interviews with IGPM
	Communication of selection results to grantees	Interviews with successful and unsuccessful grantees
	Preaward negotiations	Interviews with IGPM, grantees
Implementing the award	Grant agreements signing	Interviews with IGPM, grantees
	Media events for grantees	Interviews with IGPM, grantees
	Fund disbursements	IGPM records; interviews with grantees, IGPM AFO
	Ongoing monitoring and reporting	IGPM M&E files (including data collected during IGPM field visits); interviews/focus groups with grantees and IGPM staff
	Annual reporting	Annual reports; interviews with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, MCC
	Grant cycle review	Interviews with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, MCC
	Ongoing communications (e.g., project and success stories)	IGPM records (including relevant publications); interviews with IGPM, MCA-Zambia, grantees
Completing the award	Grant closeout	Interviews with grantees, IGPM AFO
Community perceptions	Communications with grant catchment communities; perceptions of these communities	Interviews with LWSC, LCC, community members

AIR will analyze quantitative information (to be provided to AIR by MCA-Zambia or IGPM/COWI and also to be collected as part of the performance evaluation) to determine whether the IGP is functioning as intended. Incorporation of these data into the performance evaluation assumes that the requested information is shared freely with AIR for each grant cycle. Some examples of the types of information to be shared with the evaluation team are listed below¹⁴:

- Number of concept note and proposal workshop attendees; content of concept note and proposal workshops
- Screening and scoring data from concept notes and proposals
- IGP implementation costs (time and material)
- IGPM M&E data (including the number of field visits by IGPM)
- Funding value of IGP grant portfolio

¹⁴ Some of this information has already been shared with AIR for the first IGP grant cycle.

- AIR will be happy to work with IGPM and MCA-Zambia to discuss the ideal approach to information sharing for the purposes of this performance evaluation to minimize the burden on IGPM and MCA-Zambia.

6.0. Administration

6.1. Summary of institutional review board requirements and clearances

AIR conducts rigorous ethical reviews through our institutional review board (IRB) for all our internal research activities and provides this service for a variety of subcontractors and collaborators. AIR's IRB has conducted expedited and full-board reviews of research involving human subjects for more than 16 years. AIR is registered with the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) as a research institution and conducts research under its own Federalwide Assurance. The IRB completed its review of the proposed performance evaluation of the IGP and determined it to be exempt from further IRB review, because the purpose of the activity, evaluating the MCA grant facility, is not a systematic inquiry designed for the development of generalizable knowledge. Therefore, the activity is not research involving human participants, and IRB oversight does not apply.

6.2. Preparing data files for access, privacy, and documentation

AIR handles all data in accordance with the procedures and protocols approved by our IRB. Standard practices include digital recording, transcription and translation where necessary, complete anonymization of data, and protection of confidentiality.

6.3. Dissemination Plan

The performance evaluation of the IGP targets three audiences to communicate and engage in the research: the GRZ, including all of the ministries actively involved in the program; the donor community focused on water access, sanitation, and hygiene; and researchers engaged in program evaluation to inform policy. Additionally, the study may also be of interest to the implementing entities that sit on the IGP Investment Committee. The research team will work to implement different activities that are best suited to reach each targeted audience.

MCA-Zambia is ultimately responsible for implementing the IGP while MCC provides high-level policy and guidance for the program. They are the policy makers and practitioners who will decide the fate of the program and lead the initial public dissemination efforts, which involve making the evaluation results available on the MCA website and disseminating results to appropriate stakeholders in a timely fashion. As requested by MCC and MCA, AIR will present learnings at workshops and facilitate dialogue at relevant conferences and workshops. AIR will collaborate with MCA and MCC to ensure that the results of the performance evaluation help inform stakeholders and improve future decision making on similar program investment, design, and implementation should the program be scaled to larger populations or reproduced in other contexts.

We will also produce several policy briefs designed to highlight parts of the study that may be of interest to the GRZ and that could help donors discuss the findings with their peers. After each report is presented, we will work with MCA and the GRZ to determine which topics should be developed into a brief. These one-page briefs will use language accessible to all stakeholders

relevant to issues of water, sanitation, and hygiene and include figures and pictures to help tell the story of our evaluation findings.

The donor community focused on water, sanitation, and hygiene is the second audience that the research team will target for communication and engagement. Donors are influential in the creation and sustained operations of vital programs that address the needs of developing countries. Upon acceptance of each deliverable, we will engage MCA, MCC, and other donors focused on innovations in water and sanitation through presentations and by sharing reports because they are the primary supporters of water, sanitation, and hygiene programs in Africa and particularly in Zambia.

Researchers focused on evaluating development programs for WASH represent a third important community that we will target for communicating the results of the study. We hope to advance knowledge about the effects of comprehensive water access and sanitation programs and move the field forward via innovative research methods and by filling gaps in the knowledge base. The research team will publish journal articles based on study findings and present these articles at conferences regularly attended by academics and researchers focused on applied research and the evaluation of development programs.

6.4. Evaluation team roles and responsibilities

David Seidenfeld: Dr. Seidenfeld serves as principal investigator (PI), ultimately responsible for the technical direction and oversight of all components of this study, including technical oversight of the performance evaluation and quality control of data collection instruments and reports. Dr. Seidenfeld is AIR's primary liaison with MCC and will direct all evaluability assessments and the design of individual IGP grant evaluations.

Gelson Tembo: As co-PI, Dr. Tembo has primary responsibility for evaluation design and in-country coordination of local data collection efforts. He will oversee all data collection activities undertaken by researchers from Palm Associates and serve as the in-country evaluation coordinator, ensuring cooperation and coordination among all parties involved in the performance evaluation, including AIR, Palm Associates, MCC, MCA-Zambia, IGPM, LWSC, and LCC.

Hannah Reeves: Ms. Reeves serves as project director for the performance evaluation of the IGP facility. Together with Dr. Seidenfeld and Dr. Tembo, Ms. Reeves will lead the development of data collection instruments; plan individual rounds of data collection; train and supervise the local researchers conducting interviews and focus groups; analyze performance evaluation data, and write the resultant reports.

Researchers—performance evaluation: AIR's International Development, Evaluation, and Research (IDER) program has a number of experienced qualitative researchers and performance evaluation specialists who may be called on to support this performance evaluation. The overall responsibilities of the research team will include: assisting in the development of a rigorous evaluation design given rules of implementation and feasibility of options, supporting MCC and MCA to build buy-in and ownership of evaluation, developing evaluation materials that are held to international standards, ensuring appropriate review of evaluation materials and research

protocols, managing the data collection firms, supervising data collection, leading data cleaning, analysis, interpreting results for evaluation reports and ushering public dissemination efforts.

6.5. Evaluation timeline

The timeline for the performance evaluation for the first two grant cycles is presented in Figure 2.

It is important to note that the timing of data collections for the performance evaluation of the IGP depends entirely on the timing of IGP implementation, so it follows that any changes to the IGP implementation calendar will affect the time frame for data collection, analysis, and reporting.

6.6. Reporting schedule

As presented in the performance evaluation work plan (Figure 2), AIR proposes to submit two individual reports on findings of the IGP. The first report will showcase the findings from the start-up, selection, implementation of the award, completion of the award, and revision phases of the first cycle. The final report will highlight the findings from the start-up, selection, implementation of the award, and completion of the award phases of the second cycle. Each report will provide an in-depth look into the activities evaluated during each of the report specific phases and the data collected and analyzed pertaining to that phase. The submission of the first report will occur at the end of cycle one, which is expected to occur in October of 2017. The final report will be completed following the end of cycle 2 and is expected to occur in November 2018. The reports will form a comprehensive evaluation on the performance of the entire IGP facility. Additionally, AIR will be prepared to present the report findings to the EMC at MCC headquarters as well as MCA headquarters.

7. 0. References

- AusAID. (2012). *Civil society WASH fund design document*. Canberra, Australia: Author.
- Benin, S., Nkonya, E., Okecho, G., Pender, J., Nahdy, S., Mugarura, S., . . . Kayoby, G. (2007). *Assessing the impact of the national agricultural advisory services (NAADS) in the Uganda rural livelihoods*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Bowie, L., & Bronte-Tinkew, J. (2008). Process evaluations: A guide for out-of-school time practitioners. *Child Trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/01/Process-Evaluation.pdf>
- Butterfoss, F. D. (2006). Process evaluation for community participation. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 27, 323–340.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009, February). Developing process evaluation questions. *Evaluation Brief* (). Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/evaluation/pdf/brief4.pdf>
- Department for International Development. (2005). *Competitive grant schemes (CGSs)*. London, England: Author.
- Gomby, D. S., & Larson, C. S. (1992). Evaluation of school-linked services. In R. Behrman (Ed.), *The future of children: School linked services*, 2(1), 68–84. Los Altos, CA: Center for the Future of Children and David and Lucile Packard Foundation.
- Harachi, T. W., Abbott, R. D., Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P. & Fleming, C. B. (1999). Opening the black box: Using process evaluation measures to assess implementation and theory building. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 27(5), 711–731.
- Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab. (n.d.). *Process evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.povertyactionlab.org/methodology/what-evaluation/process-evaluation>
- Linnell, D. (n.d.). *Process evaluation vs. outcome evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://tsne.org/process-evaluation-vs-outcome-evaluation>
- Linnen, L. & Steckler, A. (2002). *Process evaluation for public health interventions and research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- MCA-Zambia. (2014). *Innovation grant program for pro-poor service delivery*. (Grant Manual). Lusaka, Zambia: Author.
- Microsoft. (2014). *Microsoft announces an innovation grant program to fast-track African startups*. Retrieved from <http://news.microsoft.com/2014/02/03/microsoft-announces-an-innovation-grant-program-to-fast-track-african-startups/>
- Paul, D. (2009). *Evaluation types: Formative/developmental, process and impact/outcome*. A topic article in the Outcomes Theory Knowledge Base [Internet].

- Prolinnova. (2012). *Farmer access to innovation resources: Findings and lessons learnt on facilitating local innovation support funds*. Leusden, the Netherlands: Prolinnova International Secretariat, ETC Foundation.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (n.d.). *Using process evaluation to monitor program implementation*. Retrieved from <https://captus.samhsa.gov/access-resources/using-process-evaluation-monitor-program-implementation>
- Saunders, R. P., Evans, M. H. & Joshi, P. (2005). Developing a process-evaluation plan for assessing health promotion program implementation: A how-to guide. *Health Promotion Practic*, 6(2), 134–147.
- Shenderovich, Y. (2015). *What is a process evaluation and how to design one?* (3ie-LIDC Seminar Series).
- Stone Family Foundation. (2015). *Funding guidelines*. Retrieved from <http://www.thesff.com/wash/funding-guidelines/>
- Ton, G., de Grip, K., Klerkx, L., Rau, M.L., Douma, M., Friis-Hansen, E., . . . Wongtschowski, M. (2013). *Effectiveness of innovation grants to smallholder agricultural producers: An explorative systematic review*. EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Tremolet, S. (2015). *Can innovation prizes help address water and sanitation challenges?* London, England: Ideas to Impact.
- United Nations Development Programme. (n.d.). UNDP's Community Water Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/environmentandenergy/focus_areas/water_and_ocean_governance/water-supply-and-sanitation/community-water-initiative.html
- USAID. (2013). *Frequently asked questions—Development innovation ventures*. Retrieved from <http://www.usaid.gov/div/FAQs#lingo2>
- WASH Advocates. (n.d.). *WASH Advocacy Challenge*. Retrieved from <http://www.washadvocates.org/connect/wac/>
- World Bank. (n.d.). *Results of the expert roundtables on innovative performance measurement tools: Note #4 process evaluations*. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLACREGTOPPOVANA/Resources/840442-1235414009766/TechnicalNoteProcessEvaluation.pdf>
- World Health Organization. (2000). *Process evaluations. Workbook 4*. Retrieved from http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2000/WHO_MSD_MSB_00.2e.pdf

ABOUT AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Established in 1946, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., American Institutes for Research (AIR) is an independent, nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research and delivers technical assistance both domestically and internationally. As one of the largest behavioral and social science research organizations in the world, AIR is committed to empowering communities and institutions with innovative solutions to the most critical challenges in education, health, workforce, and international development.



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
202.403.5000

www.air.org

Making Research Relevant

LOCATIONS

Domestic

Washington, D.C.
Atlanta, GA
Austin, TX
Baltimore, MD
Cayce, SC
Chapel Hill, NC
Chicago, IL
Columbus, OH
Frederick, MD
Honolulu, HI
Indianapolis, IN
Metairie, LA
Naperville, IL
New York, NY
Rockville, MD
Sacramento, CA
San Mateo, CA
Waltham, MA

International

Egypt
Honduras
Ivory Coast
Kyrgyzstan
Liberia
Tajikistan
Zambia