ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN

Fiscal Year 2023

U.S. DEPARTMENT *of* STATE

★ ★ ★

TABLE OF CONENTS

I.   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 Annual Evaluation Plan (AEP) that the Department of State developed in response to the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 (Evidence Act, Public Law No. 115-435) and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance. The Department conducts many evaluations to assess the effectiveness of its programming; this Annual Evaluation Plan outlines only those that the Department considers significant according to the requirements of the Evidence Act.

The Evidence Act requires agencies to develop an Annual Evaluation Plan, which describes the significant evaluation activities that the agency plans to conduct in the FY following the year in which it is submitted. The Department will submit to OMB and publish this AEP in FY 2022; therefore, this AEP includes evaluation activities conducted in the following year, FY 2023 (October 1, 2022, to September 30, 2023). A handful of evaluations outside of the FY 2023 timeframe are also included in a second section as their findings and recommendations will be actively used for learning in FY2023 or their planning will address key questions that the Department is contending in FY 2023. Although there are no evaluations listed for Questions 5 and 6 for FY 2023, there are evaluations for these questions in years immediately surrounding FY 2023, which are included in the aforementioned second section.

The AEP contains evaluations prioritized by the Department of State, criteria used for selecting significant evaluations, and their alignment to the Department's Learning Agenda priority questions (also a key deliverable of the Evidence Act, published here: Department of State Fiscal Years 2022-2026 Learning Agenda. Learning Agenda priority questions are those that, when answered, will address critical evidence gaps in institutional knowledge to help improve the agency's operations and performance. Evaluations presented in this AEP help answer those questions.

Each evaluation in this document includes questions that the study tries to answer, a description of the activity being evaluated, information on the data to be used, methods of how an evaluation may be conducted, and project challenges and mitigation strategies. The evaluations addressed in this AEP are as follows:

- There is one evaluation planned for FY 2023 that will examine the effectiveness of the Department's diplomatic interventions. This evaluation relates to expanding and strengthening the ability of the United States to advance its foreign policy and national security goals both bilaterally and within multilateral forums.
- There are five evaluations planned for FY 2023, addressing the effectiveness and sustainability of the Department's foreign assistance efforts. These can be classified into five categories: human rights, health, youth protection, peace and security, and counterterrorism.
- There are two evaluations planned for FY 2023 that assess refugee assistance.

- There is one ongoing evaluation that will examine the current processes, activities, and programs in the Office of Information Security, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, to assess the safety and security of the working environment for U.S. Government staff and partners.
- There are four evaluations from the FY 2022 AEP that the Department is tracking to completion, with reports on their status in Table 1.
- There are 15 evaluations that are planned or ongoing in FY 2022 and FY 2024. While these evaluations are outside the timeline parameters of the FY 2023 AEP, per OMB guidance, they support the agency's learning activities in FY 2023 either through planning or implementation and are important to include in this publication.

The Department has undertaken a range of evaluations across diplomatic engagement and foreign assistance programming. Many evaluations cut across fiscal years and focus on areas of significant foreign policy importance to the Administration.

The Department is leveraging multiple processes to enhance and expand its learning culture. This includes using the Learning Agenda implementation and senior-level review processes to improve the evidence -building functions at the Department to evaluate diplomatic and assistance programs. The Bureau of Budget and Planning and the Office of Foreign Assistance are partnering with other bureaus and offices to enhance the evidence-building culture at the Department of State, including the Office of Management Strategy Solutions' Center for Analytics and the Secretary's Office of Policy Planning. Any new significant evaluations will be added to subsequent AEPs. Completed evaluations from the FY 2022 AEP are included in Table 1 in Section III. The Department will continue to provide status updates on evaluations' progress in each AEP to ensure transparency of information and visibility to Department of State stakeholders.

II. PROCESS AND DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Department considers the following factors in determining that an evaluation is significant for the purposes of the AEP: 1) the subject matter of the program being evaluated and its relevance to the Department's priority goals and, most importantly, 2) whether and to what degree the evaluation would fill a critical learning need, as evidenced by its potential to support a Learning Agenda question.

III. SIGNIFICANT EVALUATIONS

The AEP catalogues the evidence-building and evaluation activities prioritized by the Department of State and presents their alignment to the Learning Agenda priority questions in Table 1.

Table 1 List of Evaluations and their Alignment to the Department's Learning Agenda Priority Questions

Learning Agenda Question	Evaluation	Timing
Question 1: How can the State Department improve the effectiveness of its diplomatic interventions to better advance foreign policy objectives?	* * Evaluation of Brazil's Youth Ambassadors and English Immersion Camp	Completed in FY 2021. Results and findings of the evaluation will inform the public diplomacy team in Brasília with their strategic planning and program design efforts and assist in the follow -up research projects.
	* Expo 2020 Dubai Evaluation	October 2021-June 2022
	Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative (YSEALI) Regional Workshop Participation Evaluation	November 2021-January 2023
Question 2: How can the Department improve the effectiveness and sustainability of its foreign assistance efforts?	Global Drug Demand Reduction Evaluation	January 2021-December 2025
	* Program Evaluation in the Central African Republic	June 2021-December 2021
	* Performance Evaluation of the U.S. -Jamaica Child Protection Compact Partnership Evaluation	September 2018-June 2022
	* U.S.-Peru Child Protection Compact Partnership Evaluation	September 2017-June 2022
	Practical Evaluations and Exercises (PE2)	October 2020-September 2024

Learning Agenda Question	Evaluation	Timing
	Evaluation of Counterterrorism Programs	September 2020-September 2023
	Prisons-Related Program Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Support to the Bureau of Counterterrorism (CT)	October 2020-September 2023
	* Fundamental Freedoms Fund Research, Evaluation and Learning Initiative	October 2018-April 2022
	* Midterm Evaluation of the South Asia Small Grants Program	October 2021-March 2022
	Multiyear Evaluation of the Tomorrow's Leaders (TL) Scholarship Program	March 2022-April 2024
	* * Effective Community Organizing and Mobilization	Ongoing. September 2020-September 2022
	* * Outcome Evaluation on Implementation of Child Drug Use Protocols in India	Ongoing. August 2018-September 2023
	* Bosnia Democracy Commission Small Grants Program (DemCom) Evaluation	November 2021-May 2022
Question 3: How can the Department's tools best address the climate crisis?	* Private Investment for Enhanced Resilience (PIER) Evaluation	January-May 2022
Question 4: How can the Department better respond to unpredictable international events and emergencies, such as global pandemics?	* Evaluation of Population, Refugees, and Migration-Funded Mental Health and Psychosocial Support Services (MHPSS) for Refugees	September 2021-July 2022
	Evaluation of Livelihoods Support to Syrian Refugees	September 2022-July 2023
	Evaluation of Population, Refugees and Migration-Supported Initiatives in Accountability to Affected Populations	September 2022-July 2023
	* * Evaluation of Protection of Refugee Youth in Urban Areas in Africa	Ongoing. September 2021-July 2022

Learning Agenda Question	Evaluation	Timing
Question 5: How should the Department confront the rise of global disinformation and its negative effects on the security and prosperity of the United States?	* Media Literacy Program (Eastern Europe and Eurasia) Evaluation	September 2020-February 2022
	* Media Literacy Training Evaluation	March 2021-December 2022 (TBD, pending COVID-19)
Question 6: How can the Department balance customer service expectations with national security and cost-effectiveness to provide a better customer service experience to U.S. citizens, and to foreign nationals seeking visas?	* Global Support Strategy (GSS) Evaluation	March 2024-July 2024
Question 7: How can the Department more effectively analyze and manage risks to promote a safe and secure working environment for its staff and partners?	Office of Information Security Process Evaluation	January 2021-October 2022
Question 8: How can the Department utilize performance management and evaluation data and data systems to improve decision-making?		

* Evaluations outside of FY 2023 timeframe that are significant and support Agency learning.

** Evaluations from FY 2022 AEP and their status.

IV.   FY 2023 SIGNIFICANT EVALUATIONS

Learning Agenda Question 1:
How can the State Department improve the effectiveness of its diplomatic interventions to better advance foreign policy objectives?

A public diplomacy evaluation, planned for FY 2023, will examine the efficacy of educational exchanges that support the Department's global diplomatic interventions. This evaluation will focus on expanding and strengthening relationships between the people of the United States and citizens of other countries and on engaging foreign publics in enhancing their understanding of and support for the values and policies of the United States.

Evaluation Summary – Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative Regional Workshop Participation Evaluation

Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs (R/PPR)

Timeline: November 2021-January 2023

Program Description: Launched in 2013, the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative (YSEALI) provides a variety of programs and engagements, including U.S. educational and cultural exchanges, regional exchanges, and seed funding. YSEALI seeks to build the leadership capabilities of youth in the region, strengthen ties between the United Statess and Southeast Asia, and nurture an Association of Southeast Asian Nations community. The YSEALI community consists of bright young leaders, generally 18-35 years old, from across the East Asian Pacific (EAP) region. YSEALI programs include professional fellowships to the United States, academic fellowships to the United States, regional workshops, and grant funding. This evaluation will examine the extent to which participation in regional workshops contributes to ongoing study or career development in the workshop topics, the extent to which participants have maintained contact with and access resources among fellow workshop participants, and whether workshop participation is associated with higher levels of political support for U.S. foreign policy goals.

Evaluation Question(s): The evaluation will examine if YSEALI workshop participation can be associated with a number of intended outcomes, including improved outcomes in key workshop topics, increased networking behavior, and more closely aligned attitudes toward U.S. foreign policy priorities. In addition, the evaluation will look at how the EAP region can frame messages around climate change and international economic ties in select YSEALI countries to more effectively promote U.S. foreign policy priorities.

Data and Information Needed: Information needed for this evaluation includes post-workshop knowledge and skill application, network behavior and participation, policy positions, demographic information, and the experiences and outcomes of the workshops among participants of the same workshop and theme.

Methods: R/PPR's Research and Evaluation Unit (REU) will design and administer an optional survey to all YSEALI regional workshop participants from 35 workshops that took place between 2013 and April 2021, YSEALI regional workshop applicants, and the broader YSEALI network to assess the effects of the workshops on the network. REU administered a survey in November 2021 and will administer another survey in November 2022. The evaluation will also incorporate focus group discussions and interviews to understand if and how information is shared or received between the program participants and their social networks. Finally, the research team will conduct a series of message-testing studies in select EAP countries to inform the nature and construction of public diplomacy messages.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: There is no centralized mechanism to track participants. Depending on the availability of that information for each post, the team will 1) compare the two groups of applicants and participants for workshops where that information is available; and 2) only

look at workshop participants and compare them to the broader network. Conducting surveys and focus groups in English is standard for other networking evaluations, so this evaluation will conduct focus groups and surveys in local languages as previous studies have systematically overestimated the English language capabilities of the respondents and inclusion is important to evaluating outcomes.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The primary audiences for this evaluation are program and policy staff in the Public Diplomacy Office of the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs (EAP/PD) and regional embassies that administer YSEALI. The evaluation results will be used in two ways: 1) the assessment of program outcomes will assist in understanding the efficacy of its current and historical suite of YSEALI workshops to determine the extent to which they contribute to the achievement of regional foreign policy objectives, and 2) the additional data collected in the survey will help the Department perform more precise audience segmentation and analysis to understand the extent to which current participants align with ideal target audiences in order to improve programming.

Learning Agenda Question #2
How can the Department improve the effectiveness and sustainability of its foreign assistance efforts?

There are six evaluations addressing the effectiveness and sustainability of the Department's foreign assistance efforts.

Evaluation Summary – Global Drug Demand Reduction Program Evaluation

Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL)

Timeline: January 2021-December 2025

Program Description: The Drug Demand Reduction Program (DDRP) will support the implementation of drug use prevention, treatment, and recovery interventions within Pereira, Colombia. Specific interventions that INL anticipates will be implemented as part of this study include: 1) training drug use prevention, treatment, and recovery professionals in the INL-developed Universal Prevention Curricula and Universal Treatment Curricula to increase the number of qualified professionals in the field, 2) establishing community coalitions to address prevention at the community level, 3) developing quality assurance systems at the municipal level to ensure that treatment centers are meeting international quality standards, 4) promoting systems-level approaches to alternatives to incarceration to advance drug treatment options within the criminal justice system to prevent recidivism, and 5) using media prevention training and mentoring programs to address youth substance use.

Evaluation Question(s): As a central part of INL's global DDRP strategic approach, INL intends to support implementing drug use prevention, treatment, and recovery interventions within a target population and evaluate their collective effect on drug use and related crime trends at the population level. This study builds upon numerous previous INL-supported outcome evaluations of individual INL-funded projects by evaluating the holistic effect of comprehensive and interconnecting

programming within a community at large. What is the collective effect of INL's drug use prevention, treatment, and recovery programming on drug consumption, attitudes toward drug consumption, and drug-related crime?

Data and Information Needed: A panel design will be used to examine change over time in the communities participating in the study. While the evaluation will review the efficacy of globally -implemented interventions, the evaluation will be conducted in a midsized Colombian city to demonstrate population changes as a result of DDRP programming.

Prior to and immediately following program implementation, INL will support a baseline survey that represents the population of Pereira, Colombia, on drug consumption, attitudes toward drug consumption, and drug-related crime. In addition, throughout the course of programming, INL's implementing partners will collect project data on drug consumption, treatment outcomes, and recidivism rates. These new data sources will inform evaluation analysis.

Methods: A panel design will be used to examine change over time in the communities participating in the study.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The unpredictable course of the COVID-19 pandemic continues to pose a challenge to the implementation of programming and related data collection efforts. INL is working with project partners to develop online program options until it is feasible to resume in-person engagements.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: As the first study of its kind at this scale, the evaluation will provide INL with peer-reviewed, statistical evidence to reference in support of evidence-based prevention, treatment, and recovery programs that also seek to reduce drug-related crime and violence. INL will highlight this research in bilateral engagements and multilateral forums to promote balanced, evidence-based approaches to drug policy.

Evaluation Summary – Outcome Evaluation on Implementation of Child Drug Use Treatment Protocols in India

Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL)

Timeline: August 2018-September 2023

Program Description: The Department is supporting a five-year outcome evaluation study to evaluate the efficacy of the Child Intervention for Living Drug Free (CHILD) curriculum to treat substance use disorder in children under 12 years old in India. The evaluation has been implemented since 2017 in collaboration with the University of North Carolina and the Social Promotion for Youth and Masses—a local non-governmental organization (NGO) in India.

Evaluation Question(s): The Department expects to evaluate 1) how to alter intervention techniques to accommodate the child's level of cognitive and emotional development, 2) how to effectively translate theoretical constructs into hands-on practices for use in the field, and 3) how to

focus on pharmacology as a part of a holistic and systems approach to managing substance use disorders in children.

Data and Information Needed: Data is being collected on child health, including emotional and physical issues. Information collection forms and a database were developed specifically for the baseline and follow-up assessments, given the sensitivity of the data. Follow-up assessments are done through in-person visits and by phone.

Methods: This is a five-year outcome evaluation study to evaluate the efficacy of the CHILD curriculum.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Possible challenges to the evaluation may include low subject recruitment or the lack of reliable drug tests. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the study will be extended for an additional year to fully evaluate the efficacy of the CHILD curriculum.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The evaluation, once completed, will be used to strengthen the CHILD curriculum, which will then be peer-reviewed and disseminated on a global scale as a part of the universal treatment curriculum.

Evaluation Summary – Practical Evaluations and Exercises

Bureau of Counterterrorism (CT)

Timeline: October 2020-September 2024

Program Description: The Practical Evaluations and Exercises (PE2) blends a targeted evaluation of a Partner Nation capability with a Counter-Terrorism exercise carried out in a simulated but realistic environment. It produces quick turn, actionable, data that is used to validate CT-funded Partner Nation capabilities, identify gaps and areas for improvement, and communicate returns on investment.

Evaluation Question(s): The Practical Evaluations and Exercises (PE2) effort develops specific, custom evaluation questions for each individual exercise target.

Data and Information Needed: The PE2 effort uses tailored exercises to demonstrate capabilities and capacities associated with CT-funded assistance. A combination of desktop study, interviews, focus groups, exercise observations, and exercise results are used as data to support the evaluation. It is a combination of existing data and new or generated data.

Methods: The PE2 effort uses a combination of methods for both the exercise and evaluation components of each event.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Limitations associated with COVID-19 are the primary challenge. To mitigate this challenge, the PE2 effort will explore potential remote exercise and evaluation events.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The evaluation and learning component—for both partner units, who will better understand their actual capabilities, and for CT, who will better understand the

efficacy of Department of Stat assistance—is essential to this exercise. Depending on the subject matter and associated sensitivities, evaluation reports and other related products will be disseminated to implementing partners, partner nation officials, embassy personnel, and other relevant parties on a case-by-case basis.

Evaluation Summary – Evaluation of Counterterrorism Programs

Bureau of Counterterrorism (CT)

Timeline: September 2020-September 2023

Program Description: This evaluation effort broadly considers the strategic effects and political implications of our assistance activities, as well as the program-level and project-level effects on foreign partners' capabilities.   It is intended to improve the effectiveness of identified programs and projects. Findings will influence future program design and implementation for the subject programs.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation will answer the following questions: To what extent are the selected country projects meeting their stated goals and objectives? How can project design and implementation be improved? How can program design and implementation be improved?

Data and Information Needed: A combination of desktop studies, interviews, focus groups, and surveys is used as data in support of this evaluation. It is a combination of existing data and new or generated data.

Methods: This evaluation employs a mixed-method approach, using both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, and draws from primary sources (informational and key informant interviews and surveys) and secondary sources (document analysis).

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The primary challenge is limitations associated with COVID-19. To mitigate this challenge, the evaluation team will conduct remote data collection wherever possible.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Depending on the subject matter and associated sensitivities, evaluation reports and other related products will be disseminated to implementing partners, partner nation officials, embassy personnel, and other relevant parties on a case-by-case basis. The evaluation reports will be used primarily to refine ongoing programming and inform future assistance.

Evaluation Summary – Prisons-Related Program Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Support to the CT Bureau

Bureau of Counterterrorism (CT)

Timeline: October 2020-September 2023

Program Description: The purpose of this evaluation is to support CT in evaluating and designing projects in the areas of law enforcement, corrections, and criminal justice to respond to the threat

posed by terrorists, including returning foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs). This contributes to the CT's strategic goals to coordinate efforts with other partner governments to increase their capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute, incarcerate, rehabilitate, and where applicable repatriate their domestic terrorists and FTFs.

Evaluation Question(s): Throughout the lifespan of this effort, evaluation targets vary from the overall prison-related programming portfolio itself to individual country projects. Each evaluation target has unique context, design components, and expected results. As such, the evaluation team, in close consultation with the CT Office of Programs, develops tailored evaluation questions for each individual evaluation effort, such as: Has CT's prisons programming enhanced the ability of partner nations to manage terrorist inmates? Should CT continue funding prison programming? How might CT's prison programming be improved if funding is to continue?

Data and Information Needed: A combination of desktop studies, interviews, focus groups, and surveys is used as data in support of the evaluation. It will use a combination of existing data and new or generated data.

Methods: This evaluation employs a mixed-method approach, using both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, and draws from primary sources (informational and key informant interviews and surveys) and secondary sources (document analysis).

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The primary challenge is limitations associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Depending on the subject matter and associated sensitivities, evaluation reports and other related products will be disseminated to implementing partners, partner nation officials, embassy personnel, and other relevant parties on a case-by-case basis. The evaluation reports will be used primarily to refine ongoing programming and inform future assistance.

Evaluation Summary – Multiyear Evaluation of the Tomorrow's Leaders Scholarship Program

Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs (NEA)

Timeline: March 2022-April 2024

Program Description: The Tomorrow's Leaders (TL) Program aims to build a cadre of professional leaders who are civically engaged, intellectually able, and professionally prepared to become the community, business, and national leaders of the future. To achieve this goal, the TL program is comprised of 1) the TL Undergraduate Program, 2) the TL Graduate Program, 3) Study Abroad, 4) TL Gender Scholars (TLS), and 5) the TL Alumni Association.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation has the following objectives: 1) understand, broadly, TL's past achievements and lessons learned to incorporate into future program design and strategic

planning efforts; 2) review, analyze, and evaluate the outcomes and any impact of the TL program; and 3) create a TL baseline to measure success against in future TL programming efforts.

The TL program offers leadership training opportunities to capable and highly motivated college (undergraduate and graduate) students in the Middle East and North Africa who are from underserved backgrounds and have high potential to become leaders. Eligible students for TL and TLS include men and women who represent the region's cultural, religious, and geographic diversity, who could otherwise gain admission to but would be unable to afford college at an American -accredited university in the region.

Data and Information Needed: This evaluation is expected to utilize the data collected for this evaluation (new) and quarterly performance reports (existing).

Methods: This evaluation will use an evaluation strategy and methodology that include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis approaches.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: With the global COVID-19 pandemic and unforeseen country concerns, individuals might not be on location or have access to their university systems. All evaluation methods will be accessible and adaptable to the best of possibilities.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: This evaluation will establish a baseline, a formative midterm assessment, and an outcome evaluation of whether TL achieved its objectives and program effectiveness. Findings from this multi-phase, multiyear evaluation will be published on the Department of State's website and distributed to key stakeholders via a one-page brief with key takeaways.

<div align="center">

Learning Agenda Question #3

How can the Department's tools best address the climate crisis?

</div>

There are no planned or ongoing evaluations for FY 2023. See Section V, which describes the evaluation planned for FY 2022.

<div align="center">

Learning Agenda Question #4

How can the Department better respond to unpredictable international events and emergencies, such as global pandemics?

</div>

There are two planned evaluations in FY 2023 under Question 4. These evaluations assess refugee services, including livelihood support and the Department of State's accountability to affected population components of refugee programs.

Evaluation Summary – Evaluation of Livelihoods Support to Syrian Refugees

Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM)

Timeline: September 2022-July 2023

Program Description: This evaluation will examine the effectiveness of PRM-supported livelihoods programs, which are implemented by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), other international organizations (IOs), and NGOs in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and Iraq for refugees from Syria. This programming is designed to increase refugees' income, self-reliance, and dignity through improved access to and participation in income-generating opportunities (such as formal or informal employment). Examples of such programming include 1) support for formalized and home-based businesses; 2) provision of and support for agricultural livelihoods activities; 3) provision of vocational, interview and soft-skills, and language training; 4) outreach to private sector companies to increase refugee employment and awareness of refugee work rights; and 5) support to obtain legal work permits and access to formal work opportunities.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation looks at the effectiveness and outcomes of livelihoods support on the economic well-being of Syrian refugees in some combination of Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and Iraq. This evaluation will compare what has worked and what has not in terms of the livelihoods programs that PRM has funded. In addition, the evaluation will look more generally at outcomes with particular attention to outcomes when refugees are able to work legally compared to when they are not and the job skills held by refugees upon arrival in the host country.

Data and Information Needed: Data on the background and best practices on livelihoods programming in the humanitarian assistance context; information on the type, duration, activities, and outputs and outcomes of PRM-supported IO and NGO livelihoods activities for Syrian refugees; and information on the perceptions of both implementers and Syrian refugee beneficiaries on the effectiveness of that programming are needed.

Methods: PRM evaluations are normally mixed-method evaluations, combining both qualitative and quantitative methods. The Department of State anticipates that the evaluation will begin with a desk review of academic literature; PRM reporting, policy, and program documents; data and reports from UNHCR and other IO partners; and project documents from PRM-funded NGOs. The desk review would be followed by field travel to countries with PRM-supported livelihoods programing for Syrian refugees. Methods used may include online and /or in-person surveys; interviews with UNHCR and other IOs, NGO implementers and others; and group discussions and/or interviews with refugee beneficiaries of programming.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Security conditions and COVID-19 may impact the ability of evaluators to undertake field travel and conduct in-person interviews and group discussions with implementers and beneficiaries. If necessary to mitigate challenges, evaluators will use online or phone surveys, phone or video interviews; and conversations with refugee advocacy groups (as surrogates for conversations with individual refugees).

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The primary audience for the evaluation is PRM and its partner organizations. This evaluation will inform PRM's design of livelihoods programming in other regions and further inform future interventions that PRM decides to fund for Syrian refugees or other vulnerable populations in the region or elsewhere. Unless doing so creates security or sensitivity concerns, the final evaluation report will be posted on public websites.

Evaluation Summary – Evaluation of PRM -Supported Initiatives in Accountability to Affected Populations

Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM)

Timeline: September 2022-July 2023

Program Description: PRM funding guidelines for NGO partners require those partners to submit their organization-level frameworks for collecting and using feedback from the individuals and communities served. Those frameworks require partners to collect information about how the target population is involved in program design and implementation and to implement procedures for collecting, analyzing, and responding to beneficiary feedback throughout the life of the program. This evaluation will judge the efficacy of those guidelines in prompting PRM-funded NGOs to assess and respond to the views of a diverse target population and examine how the guidelines compare with current Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) best practices in the humanitarian space.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation looks to address the following questions: Do components of PRM-funded programs generate credible and useful information about how beneficiaries perceive the delivery and responsiveness of those programs? If yes, to what extent is that information being used to inform PRM or partners' programming decisions?

Data and Information Needed: Some of the information needed includes background and best practices on AAP in the humanitarian assistance context; information on how PRM-supported IO and NGO partners collect, report, and use information collected through AAP frameworks in their programming; and qualitative and quantitative data on the perceptions of both implementers and beneficiaries of PRM -supported programming regarding the extent to which beneficiary feedback impacts programming decisions.

Methods: PRM evaluations are normally mixed-method evaluations, combining both qualitative and quantitative methods. The Department of State anticipates that the evaluation will begin with a desk review of academic literature to determine a baseline of current best practices; PRM reporting, policy, and program documents; data and reports from UNHCR and other IO partners; and project documents from PRM-funded NGOs. The desk review would be followed by field travel to countries with PRM-supported IO and NGO programing. Methods used may include online or -in person surveys; key informant interviews with UNHCR and other IOs, NGO implementers and others; and group discussions or interviews with refugee beneficiaries of programming.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: This evaluation will be different from a normal performance evaluation in that it will address the way in which PRM-supported programs in general are delivered and how beneficiaries and target communities participate in decisions about that programming rather than focusing on specific programs and projects. Accordingly, discussions with beneficiaries of PRM-supported programming will be central to this evaluation. PRM's support for IO programming for its beneficiaries is not linked to specific projects. Additionally, some refugees may be reluctant to talk to evaluators. Ensuring that evaluators engage with a fully representative

sample of the diversity of a program's target population will be critical. COVID-19 may impact the ability of evaluators to do in-person interviews and group discussions with implementers and beneficiaries. To mitigate challenges, evaluators may use surveys (online or by phone if in-person is not possible), phone or video interviews, and conversations with refugee advocacy groups (as surrogates for conversation is with individual refugees).

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Findings from the evaluation will be used to inform future program design and policy decisions and potential changes to funding guidelines, including to determine how the Department of State can improve partners' AAP capacities and measurable effects. The primary audience for the evaluation is PRM and its partner organizations. Unless doing so creates security or sensitivity concerns, the final evaluation report will be posted on public websites.

Learning Agenda Question #5

How should the Department confront the rise of global disinformation and its negative effects on the security and prosperity of the United States?

There are no planned or ongoing evaluations for FY 2023. See Section V, which describes two evaluations that are ongoing in FY 2021-2022. While these evaluations do not fall in the timeframe for planned or ongoing in FY 2023, their findings and recommendations will be actively used for learning in FY 2023 and their planning will address key questions that the Department is contending in FY 2023.

Learning Agenda Question #6

How can the Department balance customer service expectations with national security and cost-effectiveness to provide a better customer service experience to U.S. citizens and to foreign nationals seeking visas?

There are no planned or ongoing evaluations for FY 2023. See Section V, which describes an evaluation planned for FY 2024. While these evaluations do not fall in the timeframe for planned or ongoing in FY 2023, their findings and recommendations will be actively used for learning in FY 2023 and their planning will address key questions that the Department is contending in FY 2023.

Learning Agenda Question #7

How can the Department more effectively analyze and manage risks to promote a safe and secure working environment for its staff and partners?

Evaluation Summary – Office of Information Security Process Evaluation

Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS)

Timeline: January 2021-October 2022

Program Description: The Information Security (IS) process evaluation examines how DS/SI/IS can better ensure the protection of, and trusted access to both National Security (NSI) and

Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information in domestic and overseas environments. This includes examining policy initiatives that facilitate secure, appropriate, and effective information sharing.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation responds to the following questions: How can the organization streamline its processes? To what extent is the staff positioned for success and has the right tools to succeed? To what extent is the structure of the organization conducive to be most successful?

Data and Information Needed: Data needed includes documentation outlining the process in its current state, (i.e., process maps), current standard operating procedures, customer feedback, stakeholder (i.e., office director, division or branch chief, staff) feedback, and organizational structure charts.

Methods: For this evaluation, the Department plans to conduct staff interviews, analyze existing documentation, facilitate improvement sessions, document and analyze processes to identify inefficiencies and root causes of challenges, prioritize improvements, and identify pilot projects.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Nondigital security processes, legacy systems, and outmoded classification management practices have contributed to bottlenecks that diminish the effectiveness to deliver and share information that is essential to the national security and critical infrastructure protection of the United States. The office plans to implement iterative process improvements through reporting, partner and stakeholder coordination, engagement, and automation to identify and communicate priorities with staff and customers.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: DS/SI/IS process evaluation activities focus on specific program-level outcomes relative to programmatic, organizational, and technology-based improvements. The results of the evaluation will be used to improve processes to securely share digitized information, examine staffing and customer needs and operational priorities, leverage technology, and inform future changes to the program. With improved business processes, DS/SI/IS will be able to provide faster and more robust support to DS and the Department. This support encompasses a full spectrum of global risk-managed information security services, including safeguarding and sharing classified and sensitive information, overseeing Department contractors' access to classified and sensitive but unclassified information, and managing intelligence information.

Learning Agenda Question #8
How can the Department utilize performance management and evaluation data and data systems to improve decision-making?

There are no planned evaluations under Question 8. However, other evidence-building activities are being considered. Please see the Department's Learning Agenda for details on the Department's Enterprise Data Strategy to equip the workforce to use data for strategic assessments.

V. OTHER EVALUATIONS THAT SUPPORT AGENCY LEARNING

While these evaluations do not fall in the timeframe for planned or ongoing in FY 2023, their findings and recommendations will be actively used for learning in FY 2023 or their planning will address key questions that the Department is contending with in FY 2023. Having these evaluations included in the AEP FY 2023 will provide additional transparency and insight into Department's learning culture.

Learning Agenda Question #1
How can the State Department improve the effectiveness of its diplomatic interventions to better advance foreign policy objectives?

Evaluation Summary – Expo 2020 Dubai Evaluation

Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs (R/PPR)

Timeline: October 2021-June 2022

Program Description: One hundred and ninety-two countries participated in Expo 2020 (rescheduled to October 1, 2021, through March 31, 2022) in Dubai. A projected 15 million visitors from around the world were expected to make 25 million visits to the Expo, according to United Arab Emirates (UAE) projections (actual visitors will likely be lower due to COVID-19 and its variants). The Gulf region and India were expected to provide the largest share of visitors. The U.S. presence at the Expo will primarily involve a standing pavilion housing static exhibits, spaces for networking, and event spaces, which will host ticketed events.

Evaluation Question(s): Questions for this evaluation include: Is visiting the U.S. World Expo Pavilion associated with improved attitudes toward the United States and other U.S. public diplomacy priorities and, if so, to what extent? How do attendees of U.S. pavilion cultural and networking events assess the quality and utility of these events? What is the volume and nature of media coverage of U.S. Expo participation across English, Arabic, and Russian language media markets?

Data and Information Needed: The evaluation will use a mixed-method approach to understanding the effects of U.S. participation at the Expo on pavilion visitors, event attendees, and media coverage.

Methods: This project will use a large-scale quantitative intercept survey of pavilion visitors entering and exiting the pavilion, a follow-up survey of these individuals, a series of qualitative in-depth interviews with event attendees, and a longitudinal media content assessment.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Establishing sampling quotas prior to survey deployment is difficult for two reasons: 1) There is an undefined sampling frame, meaning that the research team will not know the size and characteristics of event visitors prior to data collection, and 2) there is a

high probability of inaccurate onsite sampling as survey takers will not have the ability to consistently and accurately identify visitors prior to survey completion.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The intended audiences for the evaluation results are internal program and partner staff who are interested in the impact of Expo participation, partners at other Expo participating countries, and program and partner staff who are interested in understanding which characteristics contribute to the largest program impact. The evaluation results will be used in two ways: 1) to assist Department of State leadership in understanding the extent to which the 2020 World Expo achieved its desired outcomes and meaningfully contributes to foreign policy priorities and 2) to help provide a more thorough understanding of who attends the Expo and how they experience the event and U.S. participation.

<div align="center">

Learning Agenda Question #2

How can the Department improve the effectiveness and sustainability of its foreign assistance efforts?

</div>

Evaluation Summary – Bosnia Democracy Commission Small Grants Program Evaluation

Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs (R/PPR)

Timeline: November 2021-May 2022

Program Description: The Democracy Commission Small Grants Program (DemCom) enables embassies to support initiatives in Europe, Eurasia, and Central Asia that aim to strengthen countries' political and economic systems and advance human rights. Each Embassy that receives DemCom funding selects a particular area to focus on from a broad, prescribed list. This evaluation will investigate the outcomes of the over 2,500 participants in Bosnia's 28 DemCom programs from 2015 to 2020. These programs also aim to increase youth employment in order to encourage young Bosnians to build their futures in the country. The evaluation will examine the extent to which the programs have improved participants' employment and economic outcomes by surveying and comparing participants to a demographically similar sample of Bosnians. Additionally, the evaluation will examine if there is a difference in the likelihood of leaving Bosnia, level of self--efficacy, and attitudes toward democracy between participants and non-participants.

Evaluation Question(s): The evaluation will examine the Bosnia DemCom's contribution to the following employment-based and U.S. foreign policy outcomes: higher employment rates, lower intention to leave Bosnia to seek employment, higher levels of self-sufficiency, higher favorability toward democratic political systems, and greater preference for the United States as an international partner.

Data and Information Needed: The following information is needed for all respondents: employment status, interest in entrepreneurship and self-employment, attitudes toward state of democracy in Bosnia, attitudes toward democracy in general, optimism or pessimism about the future, and other data.

Methods: This evaluation will utilize two parallel surveys. The first sample will include program participants (2015-2020) and the second will be a targeted sample of Bosnians similar in age and location to program participants. The surveys will collect information from all respondents on employment-based outcomes, levels of self-efficacy, intent to stay in Bosnia, and attitudes toward democratic political systems.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The length of time that has passed since the completion of some of the programs and the lack of an available baseline for each participant create a challenge for measuring program efficacy. By surveying a demographically similar sample of Bosnians, it is possible to measure whether there is little or no difference between the two groups in any of the relevant areas. In the absence of such a difference, the results could suggest that the programs do not produce the intended outcomes.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The primary audiences for this evaluation are program staff and policy makers across the Department of State. They will use the results to understand whether or not past DemCom programs achieved the desired results and to understand the policy orientation and relevance of program alumni.

Evaluation Summary – INL Program Evaluation in the Central African Republic

Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL)

Timeline: June 2021-December 2021

Program Description: This program is focused on building the next generation of professional law enforcement in the Central African Republic (CAR) and training the CAR Gendarmerie and Police, increasing their capacity to provide law enforcement, security, public order, and rule of law. The program is also focused on professionalizing the judicial sector in the CAR by addressing the immediate needs of victims and vulnerable populations through the provision of legal aid while strengthening the ability of CAR's judicial actors to effectively administer justice. This professionalization reinforces the ability of civil society organizations and communities to enhance access to justice for vulnerable populations. The program is also building court and legal capacities to prevent atrocities in the CAR by improving justice administration for serious criminal offenses, expanding access to legal services, and building confidence in the judicial system to prevent and combat atrocities. Reestablishing and building the capacity of security, governance, and justice in the CAR is a major goal of the program.

Furthermore, the program aims to provide prison support (i.e., in Sibut and at Ngaragba Central Prison, uniforms), support provincial deployment of CAR law enforcement (i.e., in Bouar, Sibut, Bambari, Berberati, and Bangassou), expand the law enforcement radio communications network for CAR cities (i.e., Bouar, Berberati, Sibut, Bambari, and Bangassou), support law enforcement and internal security forces, support criminal justice and the justice sector in CAR, and strengthen the rule of law and human rights to sustain peace and foster development by increasing the effectiveness of the justice sector through increasing operational and human resource capacity.

Evaluation Question(s): INL's CAR program is one of the newer country-level programs to be established by INL over the past few years. As such, the purpose is to evaluate this relatively new program to ensure that appropriate project design standards and monitoring and evaluation practices are not only used to design future CAR programming but also to better manage the current project. The objectives are to evaluate the overall success of CAR programming since 2017 and to provide useful lessons learned and recommendations for future programming in CAR and INL at large.

Data and Information Needed: A combination of desk reviews, onsite field visits, interviews, and surveys will be used as data in support of the evaluation.

Methods: This evaluation involves a desk review, primary data collection and analysis, and secondary data analysis. These various evaluation approaches and findings will be analyzed and triangulated into an integrated analysis, according to the questions proposed by INL.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The current security situation on the ground in CAR poses a serious challenge to conducting the evaluation, but the contractor has committed itself to using local partners in different localities in which the evaluation will take place and to making use of communication technology.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: This evaluation, when completed, will paint a picture of the effectiveness of INL programs in CAR and areas where these programs can be improved. Results of this evaluation will be shared with the host government, as permitted, and relevant Department of State offices.

Evaluation Summary – Performance Evaluation of the U.S.-Jamaica Child Protection Compact Partnership

Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (TIP Office)

Timeline: September 2018-June 2022

Program Description: The U.S.-Jamaica Child Protection Compact (CPC) Partnership is a four-year plan aimed at bolstering efforts of the Government of Jamaica (GoJ) and civil society to 1) increase the number of victim-centered investigations, prosecutions, and convictions of child trafficking cases; 2) strengthen government and civil society capacity to identify and provide comprehensive services to child trafficking victims, such as identification, protective care, community reintegration, and long-term follow-up; and 3) increase the prevention of child trafficking and develop and strengthen community-based mechanisms.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation will respond to the following questions: How has the U.S.-Jamaica CPC Partnership affected the ability of key stakeholders to appropriately identify and refer child trafficking victims for investigation and protection services? How has the CPC Partnership affected the quality, availability, and use of victim protection, care, and reintegration services to support child trafficking victims? How has the CPC Partnership affected the capacity of the Office of the National Rapporteur in Trafficking in Persons to report data related to trafficking, including monitoring the adequacy of victim-centered approaches to child trafficking

cases? How has the CPC Partnership affected the number of cases identified, investigated, prosecuted, convicted, and sentenced as child trafficking cases?

Data and Information Needed: The TIP Office is providing implementer reports. Evaluators will seek data and reporting templates from the Jamaican Constabulary Force, Victim Services Division, Child Protection and Family Services Agency, National Taskforce Against Trafficking in Persons, and available statistical data for secondary analysis.

Methods: The performance evaluation component of this program includes key informant interviews, focus group discussions, surveys, and document reviews of statistical information. Evaluation activities will respond to four evaluation sub-questions and their respective baseline surveys using propensity score matching techniques to identify appropriate comparison groups.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: COVID-19 continues to present a challenge in Jamaica for in-person data collection. The Department of State has developed precautions and guidelines to ensure in-person data collection can be conducted safely for enumerators and respondents. If in-person data collection is not possible, the evaluation team will use remote data collection on video platforms.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: This evaluation will help to determine whether projects funded by the U.S.-Jamaica CPC Partnership were properly focused to support improvements in the GoJ's response to child trafficking. Using information from the baseline, this evaluation will measure the effectiveness of the CPC Partnership, allowing the TIP Office to determine the impact of these types of partnerships and shape future partnerships to be more effective in improving governments' responses to child trafficking. Dissemination will be through a final report and dissemination presentation.

Evaluation Summary – U.S.-Peru Child Protection Compact Partnership Evaluation

Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (TIP Office)

Timeline: September 2017-June 2022

Program Description: The governments of the United States and Peru signed the U.S.-Peru Child Protection Compact (CPC Partnership in June 2017, a jointly developed and implemented plan between the two governments to build on the Government of Peru's (GoP) existing efforts to investigate, prosecute, and convict those engaging in child trafficking; identify and provide comprehensive, trauma-informed services to child trafficking victims; and prevent child trafficking in all of its forms. The TIP Office contracted evaluators to conduct a baseline assessment of this CPC Partnership in 2017 and an endline evaluation in 2021.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation covers the following questions: What was the original vision for CPC programming and how has it evolved since its inception? To what extent have CPC implementing partners implemented activities as originally designed? What adjustments were made during implementation and why? In what way has the capacity of Peruvian stakeholders (i.e., government officials, NGOs, frontline service providers, and community-level actors) to effectively

identify and address all forms of child trafficking in Peru changed since the baseline? Have the CPC Partnership goals been achieved, and how has the Partnership contributed to changes in government capacity? What other outcomes has the Partnership contributed to? What are some elements of the Partnership that enabled its success or lack thereof? What external or environmental factors contributed to or hindered achieving Partnership objectives, and how have those factors changed since the start of the CPC?

Data and Information Needed: The evaluation team will perform a desk review and conduct key informant interviews with respondents, including federal and local GoP officials, implementing partners, and other NGOs and community leaders. The evaluation team may perform three to five structured observations of implementing partners' training events, in-person or remote, and visits to the workplaces of trained beneficiaries, such as prosecutors and police officers. Evaluators may review training curricula, guides, and evaluation forms.

Methods: Methods for assessing the GoP's response to all forms of child trafficking under the implementation of the CPC Partnership will include desk reviews, key informant interviews, and training and site-structured observations.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: In-person fieldwork may not be possible, should circumstances surrounding international and domestic travel remain difficult due to COVID-19. The evaluation team is equipped to undertake fully remote data collection and will endeavor to simulate face-to-face interactions as much as possible, even during virtual data collection.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Key findings from the baseline assessment informed changes to the Partnership's activities, in addition to providing a basis for an endline. The endline will also help determine whether CPC activities were implemented as originally planned and, if not, what changes most influenced the outcomes of the CPC Partnership.

Evaluation Summary – Fundamental Freedoms Fund Research, Evaluation and Learning Initiative

Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL)

Timeline: October 2018-April 2022

Program Description: The Fundamental Freedoms Fund is a grant mechanism that responds to evolving opportunities and threats to the protection and advancement of the fundamental freedoms of association, assembly, expression, and religion. Activities are implemented to respond to action--forcing events (e.g., snap elections, new legislation that curtails fundamental freedoms, rapid deterioration of the media environment), which trigger the need for an intervention to counter or prevent the closing of democratic space or where progress in erecting democratic institutions and establishing the rule of law is in jeopardy.

Evaluation Question(s): In what ways does the experience of actively participating in -decision-making processes (e.g., in politics, project implementation) affect an individual's or organization's interest in civic engagement and future democratic participation? Under what conditions is increased

access to information most and least effective in protecting or promoting fundamental freedoms, such as the integrity of political processes? How and to what degree do local civil society organizations' horizontal ties (e.g., with others in civil society), vertical ties (e.g., with government entities), and transnational ties (e.g., with inter-governmental or multilateral institutions, foreign governments) strengthen their ability to advance or protect civil society freedoms?

Data and Information Needed: This evaluation uses a combination of new and existing data. Existing data include indices, such as the Varieties of Democracies index and Democratic Erosion dataset, which have been used to understand the types of environments where activities are implemented.

Methods: Strategic impact evaluations would attempt to answer key impact questions within the Research, Evaluation and Learning Initiative that may be beyond the ability or scope of a single consortium partner to answer. The Fundamental Freedoms Fund Consortium would commission academic researchers to design and implement a strategic impact evaluation independent of consortium members or in partnership with consortium members, leading to publication in peer-reviewed journals and other outlets. As the number of potential observations are limited, mixed-method approaches will be utilized, with qualitative methods (e.g., process tracing) complimenting quantitative methods to improve opportunities for causal explanation within each case.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Conducting evaluations in closing democratic spaces presents security challenges; thus, partners are required to assess potential risks and threats to participants and outline mitigation strategies, such as the use of secure communications and data protocols. The COVID-19 pandemic has required partners to assess whether international travel is feasible and safe for them and participants. In this case, partners have been asked to find alternatives to in-person data collection by utilizing virtual methods and by engaging local consultants or staff, when safe.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Activities include a series of deliverables explicitly designed to promote dissemination and use, including a conference, publicly disseminated learning briefs, and a knowledge repository and toolkit for implementing partners.

Evaluation Summary – Effective Community Organizing and Mobilization

Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL)

Timeline: September 2020-September 2022

Program Description: The objectives of this evaluation include 1) understanding the factors that contribute to effective community organizing and mobilization in democracy and rights-based programming in freedom of assembly and association, labor rights, and offshore programs in closed and closing environments; 2) determining the results and objectives realized by activists and mobilized groups; and 3) exploring whether programmatic approaches led to sustainable effects.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation will seek to understand the effectiveness of community organizing and mobilization in varying contexts through three targeted iterative case studies of

projects. It will seek to answer one overarching question: What makes for effective organizing and mobilization in democracy and rights-based programming, particularly for freedom of assembly and association, labor rights, and offshore programs in closed and closing environments?

Data and Information Needed: Existing data will be utilized (partner quarterly reports, performance indicator tables, evaluations, etc.) in addition to new data collected through interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys.

Methods: Methods for this evaluation include ex post evaluation. Content, thematic, and constant comparative analyses may be used.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: There may be challenges reaching project participants and implementing partner staff for the projects that have ended. Travel to certain countries may be limited due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Findings will be disseminated to other Department bureaus, implementing partners, and peer organizations and through a web platform for the broader democracy and rights community.

Evaluation Summary – Midterm Evaluation of the South Asia Small Grants Program

Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs (SCA)

Timeline: October 2021-March 2022

Program Description: The Department of State's SCA seeks to conduct a midterm evaluation of the project design and management of the South Asia Grants Program Fund (SAGP). SCA initiated SAGP in September 2019, and the program is expected to end in March 2023. SAGP is intended to be responsive to local governance needs in concert with defined U.S. foreign policy goals and priorities. SCA selected The Asia Foundation (TAF) as the Fund Manager through a competitive process. SCA has a cooperative agreement with TAF, meaning that SCA has substantial involvement in the implementation of the project. Beneficiary countries include Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal, and Sri Lanka. The purpose of this midterm evaluation is to assess the performance of SAGP against stated objectives and expected outcomes, examine the implementation challenges or successes of the sub-grantees and award mechanism of the implementor, and draw lessons learned for future programming.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation will answer the following questions: To what extent has the performance met stated objectives and expected outcomes? What have been the implementation challenges and successes? What are the lessons learned for future programming and implementation?

Data and Information Needed: Qualitative and quantitative data needs include collection from project documents, performance reports, annual meeting minutes, focus group discussions, survey responses, and grant documents.

Methods: This evaluation is a midterm performance evaluation conducted by TAF through cooperative agreement with the Department of State. This evaluation will assess implementation, inputs, outputs, and expected outcomes. The methodology may include, but is not limited to, document review; individual or group interviews and focus groups in Washington, D.C., and beneficiary countries with relevant Department of State and other U.S. government agencies, implementing partner, sub-grantees, and external organizations (interviews may need to be conducted by phone, video teleconference, or email); an electronic survey; key informant interviews with local partners, community members, and current and former beneficiaries when and where this can be accomplished safely; and content analysis of existing data.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: SCA designed the evaluation as a desktop study in anticipation of COVID-19 travel restrictions challenging the evaluation. Some organizations have limited English language capacity. As such, SCA stipulated the need for translation capabilities when competing out the contract.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Recommendations and findings from this evaluation should identify corrective measures for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of SAGP. The evaluation should provide information on how to improve management and compliance with the assistance award. Additionally, the evaluation should articulate actions for follow-up, reinforce initial benefits of previous activities, and identify mid-point course corrections, if any.

<div align="center">

Learning Agenda Question #3

How can the Department's tools best address the climate crisis?

</div>

There is one planned evaluation under Question 3 to assess private sector investment in resilience and climate adaptation.

Evaluation Summary – Private Investment for Enhanced Resilience Evaluation

Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs

Timeline: January-May 2022

Program Description: The goal of the Private Investment for Enhanced Resilience (PIER) Project is to increase private sector investment in resilience to climate change in developing countries. Stage One will assess the public environment for private investment in resilience, identify opportunities for private investment in resilience, and build public and private capacity for climate risk assessment. PIER will improve the capacity of regulators, funders, and private investors to plan for resilience, using a suite of tools. The awardees will provide their climate finance tools as well. In Stage Two, PIER and its public and private sector partners will develop four climate risk-reduction investment models, one in each of four of the eight target countries, and will support their applications for finance, including blended public-private financial partnerships, in collaboration with Climate Finance Advisers. Stage Three will publicize the investment models and lessons learned from investment partnerships through country-, regional-, and global-level outreach, including presentations at climate events and private sector conferences.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation is intended to evaluate the performance of the PIER project, which is focused on mobilizing private sector investment in resilience and climate adaptation. The evaluation may include questions related to the success of the project in meeting its intended objectives, how the project addressed challenges, and other questions that are pertinent to the project's design, management, and operational decision-making.

Data and Information Needed: The evaluation will likely involve both existing information in the form of project documentation managed by the grantee and the Department of State and information that needs to be collected, analyzed, and summarized in the form of interviews and other forms of research.

Methods: The evaluation will likely involve several different methods to ascertain the project's results and performance. These methods may include interviews with staff members of the grantee organization, sub awardee organizations, Department of State, and other partners and beneficiaries of the program; document review; web-based research about the results of the program; and others.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is expected to limit the evaluator's ability to travel and meet with individuals face-to-face. The evaluator is expected to use virtual meetings, phone calls, online document sharing, and other methods to access the necessary information.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The Office of Global Change intends to use this evaluation to learn about and record the impact this project has had toward climate goals and the efficacy of the project's approach. The office will also use the evaluation to help inform future funding decisions and program planning.

Learning Agenda Question #4
How can the Department better respond to unpredictable international events and emergencies, such as global pandemics?

Evaluation Summary – Evaluation of the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM)-Funded Mental Health and Psychosocial Support Services for Refugees

Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration

Timeline: September 2021-July 2022

Program Description: This evaluation will examine the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM/PRP)-supported Migration-Funded mental health and psychosocial support services (MHPSS) programming for refugees. The evaluation will look at IO and NGO programs designed to improve the mental health and well-being of refugees through psychosocial support services.

Evaluation Question(s): This evaluation responds to the following questions: To what extent have programs supported by PRM, as implemented by both IOs and NGOs, contributed to meeting the MHPSS needs of refugees and internally displaced persons? How have PRM partners integrated the

needs and perceptions of beneficiaries of PRM -funded programs into the planning, development, and evaluation of their MHPSS programming? How has the COVID-19 pandemic affected the efficacy of MHPSS programming from PRM partners (both standalone and integrated)? What changes or updates to PRM's MHPSS strategy would help strengthen the ability of PRM to meet and address the MHPSS needs of its Populations of Concern?

Data and Information Needed: Information needed includes background and best practices on MHPSS in the humanitarian assistance context; information on the type, duration, activities, and outputs or outcomes of PRM-supported IO and NGO activities in MHPSS; and the perceptions of both implementers and beneficiaries on the effectiveness of that programming.

Methods: This evaluation will take a mixed-method approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative methods. It will begin with a desk review of academic literature; PRM reporting, policy, and program documents; data and reports from UNHCR and other partners; and project documents from PRM-funded NGOs. The desk review will be followed by field travel to the Geneva-based headquarters of PRM's IO partners and to countries with PRM-supported MHPSS programming. Methods used may include online and in-person surveys; key informant interviews with UNHCR, NGO implementers, and others; and group discussions or interviews with refugee beneficiaries of programming.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: PRM-supported MHPSS programming is often integrated into health, education, and protection programming rather than separately programmed. Refugees may be reluctant to talk to evaluators about MHPSS issues. COVID-19 may impact the ability of evaluators to do in-person interviews and group discussions with implementers and beneficiaries. If necessary to mitigate challenges, evaluators will use online surveys, phone or video interviews, and conversations with refugee advocacy groups.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Findings from the evaluation will be used to inform program design and funding and policy decisions. The primary audience for the evaluation is PRM and its partner organizations. Unless doing so creates security or sensitivity concerns, the final evaluation report will be posted on public websites.

Evaluation Summary – Evaluation of Protection of Refugee Youth in Urban Areas in Africa

Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM)

Timeline: September 2021-July 2022

Program Description: This evaluation will look at IO and NGO programs and Department of State, IO, and NGO advocacy efforts for protection of refugee children.

Evaluation Question(s): Evaluation questions may include: Is Department-funded assistance for child protection reaching those most in need of assistance in African urban areas, particularly adolescents and young adults? Which Department-funded interventions aimed at refugee children and youth, implemented through both NGOs and IOs, have been most and least successful and why? What are lessons learned and best practices for the Department to follow? How well do

funded activities support the goals and objectives outlined in the implementing or managing bureau's Functional Bureau Strategy?

Data and Information Needed and Methods: The evaluation will use a mixed method design involving both quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze programming covering the period from 2018 to the present. Methods include a combination of desk research/analysis, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and collection of case studies to produce findings, draw conclusions, and present recommendations. Refugees receiving PRM-supported assistance will provide input.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Anticipated challenges include locating and interviewing beneficiaries without putting them at risk and assessing the effects of Department-funded humanitarian assistance implemented through IOs that have multiple funders.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Unless doing so creates security or sensitivity concerns, the final evaluation report will be posted on public websites and findings from the evaluation will be used to inform program design and funding and policy decisions.

Learning Agenda Question #5
How should the Department confront the rise of global disinformation and its negative effects on the security and prosperity of the United States?

Evaluation Summary - Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs (EUR/ACE) Media Literacy Program (Eastern Europe and Eurasia) Evaluation

Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs (EUR)

Timeline: September 2020-February 2022

Program Description: The evaluation covers nine different project approaches in nine countries by seven implementing partners in Europe and Eurasia. It covers the selection of trainers and their training in media literacy skills to counter disinformation in the media and a wide range of ages of targeted trainees ranging from elementary school children to senior citizens. The projects work with a wide range of target groups by age in formal institutional settings (i.e., schools, libraries, community centers) and informal casual settings for the training. The training evaluated ranged from formal courses over many months to a few minutes of gaming experience.

Evaluation Question(s): Media literacy projects funded by the Department's Office of the Coordinator of U.S. Assistance to Europe and Eurasia (EUR/ACE) and overseen by the Department's Global Engagement Center; DRL; several United States Agency for International Development Missions, and National Endowment for Democracy in Central Europe, Eurasia and the Baltics are compared in this evaluation.

The contractor will develop a typology of media literacy improvement techniques and answer the following evaluation questions for each specific target group (defined by age, language, and other relevant sociocultural factors) that is represented in the set of cases to be evaluated: To what extent

are the various approaches in the typology of techniques (if at all) effective in the short- and long-term- in making specific target groups into discerning consumers of media, able to recognize and disregard disinformation and misinformation? To what extent do different target groups (disaggregated by age, gender, other relevant sociocultural factors, and type of media) use the various media literacy techniques post-intervention? To what extent have participants in the projects altered their use of media (communication modes, specific channels and websites, etc.) due to influence from the media literacy training they received from the projects? Have the target groups improved their understanding of digital literacy—that is, an understanding of the role algorithms and micro-targeting play in the type of information they see? Has target groups' understanding of such practices had an impact on their use of social media platforms or apps, or in how they protector share their own data? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches used by implementing organizations, and which, if any, are the most cost-effective in terms of the number of media consumers who have changed their behavior? To what extent have changes in media literacy behavior been sustained by participants post-project? To what extent have the different approaches used by implementers demonstrated a multiplier effect in terms of affecting media literacy behavior in a broader group, rather than just the direct project participants? To what extent does the post-intervention evidence indicate that there is a specific volume (quantity or critical mass), depth (intensity), or duration of an intervention that is required to produce enduring improvements in media literacy in specific target groups and sociocultural contexts?

Data and Information Needed: Information needed includes new data obtained from remote surveys, virtual key informant interviews and focus groups with implementers, and surveys of direct and indirect beneficiaries of media literacy training.

Methods: Methods used include remote surveys, such as testing of media literacy skills; virtual key informant interviews and virtual focus groups with implementers and beneficiaries; and surveys of changes in media consumption behavior by direct and indirect beneficiaries of media literacy training.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The COVID-19 travel bans required use of wholly remote and virtual data collection methods. Given the subject matter of countering online disinformation and improving online media literacy and media consumption behavior, the evaluators' inability to travel to the field was not a major obstacle.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: The Media Literacy Project Design Best Practices Manual that will be produced by the evaluation team based on the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations will be published online and made available to guide future media literacy project design and monitoring and evaluation systems throughout the U.S. government worldwide, and among the NGO community. It will also be disseminated to other donors active in the European, Eurasian, Balkan, Baltic, and Central Asian countries. This is critical to EUR/ACE efforts to counter disinformation that may have negative impacts in the region.

Evaluation Summary – Media Literacy Training Program

Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs (R/PPR)

Timeline: March 2021-December 2022 (TBD, pending COVID-19)

Program Description: This evaluation will measure media consumption and media literacy awareness, attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors of participants from five media literacy trainings through surveys and focus groups focusing on their ability to discern between reliable information sources and sources of misinformation and disinformation. The evaluation will also conduct national surveys of individuals aged between 18-35 to compare with media literacy participants.

Evaluation Question(s): The evaluation will assess whether training participation causes changes in media literacy knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are aligned with program goals, including whether media literacy outcomes differ based on training content and delivery. The evaluation will also look at changes in media consumption habits, studying whether participants are more likely or less likely to consume media from verified sources, the steps participants take to verify content, and the formats of media participants consume (e.g., social media links versus news organization websites).

Data and Information Needed: For all respondents, data needed includes media literacy awareness, knowledge, and behaviors; media locus of control; and value for media literacy.

Methods: The evaluation will incorporate a quasi-experimental design to collect information from participants of the selected EUR Office of Press and Public Diplomacy (PPD) Media Literacy programs and a control group through baseline and endline surveys. Focus groups will be organized at the endline stage for participants to reflect on the application of media literacy skills and knowledge from the training program, skill sharing and potential spillover effect, satisfaction with logistics and instruction, expected and unexpected outcomes they attribute to the training, and suggestions for improvement for media literacy programs. A sample of treatment and control group respondents will also complete a survey measuring media consumption habits.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: Learner outcomes from media literacy programs vary. Several studies have shown that while participants may feel more confident in their skills after a media literacy course, they are not able to discern between reliable and less-credible sources, fact or opinion, or news and advertisements when faced with a critical thinking task. Other studies have shown moderate changes in deconstructing news stories, but the effects waned after one year. While data shows that Learn to Discern participants are better able to identify disinformation, are more knowledgeable about the news media industry, and have a better sense of agency around news consumption compared with a control group, there has not been a detailed analysis of which components of media literacy instruction and activities translate to those outcomes, for which types of individuals they are most effective, whether the length of the training affects learner outcomes, and whether the same effects can be replicated across different media literacy training models. While there are a number of media literacy online courses, more research is needed on whether they build the same media literacy outcomes in knowledge, skills, and attitudes that have been found in in -person trainings. This evaluation will compare outcomes between treatment and control groups

and assess to the extent possible changes in media literacy outcomes based on the training delivery method.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: This evaluation will be used to inform the EUR public diplomacy regional bureau officers, post program officers, and other stakeholders seeking to use media literacy programs as a mechanism to combat disinformation.

Learning Agenda Question #6
How can the Department balance customer service expectations with national security and cost-effectiveness to provide a better customer service experience to U.S. citizens and to foreign nationals seeking visas?

There is one planned evaluation under Question 6. The evaluation assesses the effectiveness of the Global Support Strategy (GSS) for visa application support.

Evaluation Summary – Global Support Strategy (GSS) Evaluation

Bureau of Consular Affairs (CA)

Timeline: March 2024-July 2024

Program Description: GSS is a worldwide program that was created in 2010 to provide visa applicants standardized, transparent, and accountable delivery of common administrative service support functions. Prior to 2010, individual posts overseas made their own contract arrangements to provide this support, which led to inefficient allocation of financial resources. Since March 2020, after a significant drop in consular fees caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the level of support to individual missions and posts was adjusted several times. The Department signed a new set of contracts in 2021.

Evaluation Question(s): Evaluation questions for this program include the following: Are the GSS 2.0 contracts providing administrative support for consular services overseas as efficiently and effectively as possible? What is the maximum and minimum price per applicant CA should be paying for the level of services GSS provides? What should be the minimum level of acceptable service? Is the GSS team staffed appropriately to support GSS contracts as efficiently and effectively as possible? Do staff have the skills needed to achieve success?

Data and Information Needed: The Department proposes using an evaluation to review the effectiveness of GSS in providing the services for the cost CA is paying. The evaluation will identify priority services and best practices, which will allow the Department to continue to provide the administrative support that overseas posts need at a cost that it can afford.

Methods: Methods used for this evaluation include document review on the founding of GSS 1.0, document review of GSS 2.0 contracts and budgets, in-person interviews of GSS and Executive Directorate staff and GSS contract personnel, and analysis of best practices across the federal government for providing contract support.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies: The COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting drop in consular revenue in the Consular and Border Security Programs plan resulted in changes to the level of services provided to posts. While the Department works to stabilize the Consular and Border Security Programs accounts that fund program evaluations, this evaluation could be postponed due to financial circumstances.

Dissemination Strategies and Use: Recommendations from the evaluation will inform CA and Department leadership on how to organize and fund GSS services more efficiently and effectively.

U.S. DEPARTMENT *of* STATE