

International Religious Freedom

Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

October 2021
U.S. Department of State
J/IRF

How to Use this Guide

This list includes indicators that are in line with standard IRF programs. Each indicator includes a Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS), which provides definitions and other information that partners can use in project M&E Plans.

IRF has developed these indicators to allow for aggregation across IRF-supported projects. During the award negotiation stage, partners can select indicators, which they can use to measure progress during implementation. Each year, IRF will aggregate these indicators to measure program progress and illustrate how partners are contributing to the broader IRF portfolio.

Please note that these indicators have been included to simplify monitoring. While indicators can provide a snapshot of IRF performance, IRF does not expect partners to select an overwhelming number of indicators. Further, standard indicators have some inherent limitations in that they seek to generalize measurement in order to aggregate indicator reporting. Where relevant, partners should clarify in their monitoring and evaluation plans how their interpretation of a standard indicator fits within their program. Partners are encouraged to identify custom indicators where relevant to assist in tracking the results of a project.

Additionally, many of these indicators are outcome indicators in order to track the contribution of IRF-supported programs to outcome results. Given that IRF operates in complex and adaptive environments, where other interventions and dynamics may also contribute to any given outcome, oftentimes programs can only describe an intervention's contribution to that change rather than directly attribute the change to their project. However, monitoring those processes are still encouraged.

IRF also encourages partners to use various methods, both quantitative and qualitative, to monitor and evaluate their work. Oftentimes alternative methods can be more effective in documenting change and capturing results of a project. Monitoring methods such as most significant change, outcome harvesting and participatory video evaluation are some among others that can be explored. Partners are also encouraged to explore evaluative methods that can help better tell the story of their program.

- For additional information on DRL M&E processes and expectations, please refer to the DRL monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guide, which can be found here: <https://www.state.gov/resources-for-programs-and-grants/>

Selecting and reporting on indicators

Organization. The indicators are organized under the following program themes: (1) Social Inclusion, (2) Government and Policy Advancements, (3) Objective, fact-based and inclusive media international religious freedom and (4) cross cutting. The cross-cutting indicators and may fit any of the projects. Start by reviewing the cross-cutting indicators first, then if applicable, select other indicators under democracy, human rights, religious freedom or labor rights that are relevant for your project.

“Required-as-applicable”: Implementing partners should only select indicators that apply to their projects and can be used to measure their activities. For example, if an implementing partner is training journalists, then it should select any indicator that is relevant for measuring the output and outcomes of this activity.

Tips:

- Please do not select more indicators than are necessary. Partners should select three indicators that will be helpful in tracking activities and utilized for learning and making decisions about programming. These may be IRF, DRL or F-standard indicators.
- Several indicators in this list are Standard Foreign Assistance (F) indicators. In the list of indicators, below, the F-indicator is referenced in the second column (e.g., DR.4.2-1, GNDR-10). This is also referenced in each PIRS using an F-indicator number in parentheses (e.g., DR.6.1-2). IRF has included this subset of F-indicators as these are the measures most often used by partners to track progress. If interested in using other F-indicators, please refer to the broader list of Democracy and Governance F-indicators: <https://www.state.gov/foreign-assistance-resource-library/>.
- When reporting on these performance measures to IRF, these indicators should only be used to report activities funded by IRF. We understand that many partners have projects that are funded by several donors; however, for reports submitted to IRF, reporting should only include activities funded by IRF.
- Please read the full definition of the indicator before selecting it and placing it in your project M&E Plan.
- Supplement these indicators with your own custom indicators. These indicators only measure concepts that IRF can aggregate across projects. This is why most indicators focus on outputs, as outputs are easier to standardize and aggregate.
- Indicators only provide a snapshot of progress. Partners should supplement indicator reporting with qualitative / narrative analysis and information within quarterly reports. Please refer to the DRL monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guide for a list of various methods that can be used to gather and analyze project data. IRF encourages grantees to be innovative with their data collection management. IRF encourages implementing partners to collaborate with IRF on these options should some come to mind. For example, while quantitative measures are helpful for measuring change, so can qualitative methods. These can be helpful to both IRF and partners to better understand the Strategic Framework and how programming contributes to results identified through those pathways.
- Related to advocacy and the social inclusion theme in IRF's strategic framework, for further guidance, methods and tools in advocacy monitoring and evaluation, consider New Tactic in Human Rights' Human Rights Advocacy Evaluation Toolkit in the footnote below. This resource is useful in proving tools for evaluating human rights advocacy work while being aware of the low resource constraints facing many practitioners in this space. Should you seek further guidance on how to use this toolkit, please contact IRF's M&E specialist.¹
- Assessing implementing partner contribution to outcomes will require a methodology be determined by your organization's MEL approaches to establish the casual relationship between project outputs and outcomes.
- IRF adopts a Do No Harm approach to monitoring and evaluation. Make sure to assess if any of these indicators pose a risk to the security or ethical rights of beneficiaries and monitor risks throughout implementation. If those risks cannot be mitigated, we encourage you to not include or remove these indicators from your indicator list (please see the below "*Privacy, security, and barriers to participation*" for further detail).
- If you do not find an indicator that is appropriate for your grant, please make a note within the M&E narrative: "IRF Indicators are not applicable to the grant". In addition to this note, include a justification on why the IRF indicators are not applicable.

¹ New Tactics in Human Rights. Advocacy Evaluation Toolkit. 2019: <https://www.newtactics.org/human-rights-advocacy-evaluation>

- Please feel free to request support from DRL’s Applied Learning & Evaluation (ALE) Unit (DRL-GP-ME@state.gov). We are available to review M&E-related documents and can collaborate by email, phone, or video conference.

As always, we welcome and appreciate feedback from implementing partners. For M&E-related questions, please send your comments and questions to your DRL program officer and the DRL ALE Unit.

Disaggregates

Disaggregates are required-as-applicable—i.e. if the data is not applicable or useful for a certain project, it does not need to be collected. Examples:

- Data on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) is requested if relevant for a project. For instance, if an implementing partner is working with LGBTI persons, and would like to understand equity and inclusion in their programming, collecting SOGI data may be appropriate.
- Data on religious or ethnic identity may be relevant for those working with religious or ethnic groups, or on several programming areas (e.g. religious freedom, conflict prevention, land rights).

Privacy, security, and barriers to participation

The privacy and security of beneficiaries and partners must be considered before any sensitive demographic data is collected. Please follow standard protection protocols for personally identifiable information (PII), such as consent forms and secure data collection protocols. For example, partners should not gather sensitive demographic data through activity sign-in sheets or other methods that are widely accessible or visible to others. Further, partners should consider the degree to which collecting sensitive demographic data may discourage or present a barrier to project participants or beneficiaries. Partners should determine if such data can be collected, stored, and transmitted, given local context, without creating undue security risks; without invasion of privacy; and without presenting a barrier to participation. Data security protocols should be appropriate for the local context.

Alternative measurements

As noted above, IRF encourages grantees to be innovative with their data collection management. IRF encourages implementing partners to collaborate with IRF on these options should some come to mind. For example, while quantitative measures are helpful for measuring change, so can qualitative methods. These can be helpful to both IRF and partners to better understand the Strategic Framework and how programming contributes to results identified through those pathways.

One option to consider may include Most Significant Change as detailed in [Alternative Measurements](#) later in this document. .

DRL/GP Cross-cutting Indicators²

The indicators in this section correspond to measures that may fit for various international religious freedom projects. They have been included here because of their cross-cutting nature. Please refer to the cross-cutting indicators first, and then select indicators relevant to more specific themes (e.g., Social Inclusion, Government and Policy Advancements)

Indicator Tag	F-indicator Number	
DRL.1	DR.6.1-2	<u>Number of human rights defenders trained and supported</u>
DRL.2	DR.4.2-1	<u>Number of human rights organizations trained and supported</u>
DRL.3	-	<u>Number of human rights materials supported by DRL</u>
DRL.4	DR.4.2-2	<u>Number of CSOs receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions</u>
DRL.5	DR.4.3-1	<u>Number of USG-assisted CSOs that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees</u>
DRL.6	-	<u>Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) that engage in advocacy with regional or local governments, commissions, or regulatory bodies</u>
DRL.7	DR.3.2-5	<u>Number of individuals receiving civic education through USG-assisted programs</u>
DRL.8	GNDR-10	<u>Number of local women participating in a substantive role or position in a peacebuilding process supported with USG assistance</u>
DRL.9	DR.6.3-1	<u>Number of individuals from low income or marginalized communities who received legal aid or victim's assistance with USG support</u>

² For more access to the DRL Reference Sheets, please see them housed here: <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/DRL-Indicator-Reference-Sheets.pdf>

DRL.10	DR.5.2-2	Number of journalists trained and supported
DRL.11	DR.1.3-1	Number of judicial personnel trained with USG assistance
DRL.12	DR.3.1-1	Number of USG-Assisted consensus-building processes resulting in an agreement
DRL.13	DR.3.1-2	Number of groups trained in conflict mediation/resolution skills or consensus-building techniques with USG assistance
DRL.14	-	Number of cases supported
DRL.15	-	Number of laws, policies or procedures adopted, revised, stalled or changed to protect human rights

Program Theme 1: Social Inclusion	
Goal 1: Community Resilience: Communities embrace principles of mutual respect, inclusion and peaceful co-existence among all religions, beliefs, and non-believers to ensure freedom from discriminatory practices.	
Objective 1: Communities are more aware, respectful and inclusive of members all religions, beliefs, or non-believers	
Objective 2: Processes and mechanisms are established to provide an opportunity for members of all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds to participate	
Objective 3: Communities take action on the concerns and interests of community members of all religions, beliefs, and non-believers	
IRF 1	Number of events that promote awareness, respect and inclusion
IRF 2	Number of actions, taken by community actors, that promote or protect freedom of religion or belief
IRF 3	Number of advocacy interventions that promote awareness, respect and inclusion for persons of all religions, belief and non-belief (cross-cutting)

IRF 4	<u>Number of community members who participate in initiatives in support of awareness, respect and inclusion</u>
IRF 5	<u>Number of individuals receiving rights education through IRF-assisted programs</u>
IRF 6	<u>Number of networks, alliances and coalitions that take actions that protect freedom of religion or belief</u>
IRF 7	<u>Number of processes and mechanisms established or improved that provide participation opportunities for members of all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds</u>

Program Theme 2: Government and Policy Advance	
Goal 1: Upholding, creating and enforcing legal and regulatory frameworks that protect human rights	
Objective 1: Processes services, benefits and institutions are accessible to members of all religions, beliefs and non-belief without discrimination or persecution	
Objective 2: Government, security, legal or judicial actors leverage existing domestic and international legal frameworks to advance human rights related to religious freedom	
IRF 3	<u>Number of advocacy interventions that promote awareness, respect and inclusion for persons of all religions, belief and non-belief (cross-cutting)</u>
IRF 8	<u>Number of civic or legal groups monitoring or reporting on implementation of reforms</u>
IRF 9	<u>Number of government officials, security and law enforcement and legal actors reached</u>
IRF 10	<u>Number of cases resolved in favor of protecting FORB</u>
IRF 11	<u>Number of actions taken by government institutions to inform community members of their rights and fundamental freedoms (cross-cutting)</u>

Program Theme 3: Objective, fact-based and inclusive media	
Goal: The public has greater access to balanced, quality information that advances awareness, respect and understanding regarding members of religions, beliefs, or non-believers	
Objective 1: Media actors, including traditional and new media, outlets, journalists and citizen journalists build resilience and better inform the public of FORB issues	
Objective 2: Media consumers are more resilient and literate against messages of disinformation, hate speech and incitement to violence	
IRF 12	<u>Number of online and offline media products that are relevant to FORB practices or policies</u>
IRF 13	<u>Number of persons reached by media products by IRF supported outlets, platforms and journalists</u>
IRF 14	<u>Number of engagements or amplification actions (shares and comments) with social media messages from IRF-supported outlets, platforms and journalists</u>
IRF 15	<u>Number of official responses made to stories that expose religious intolerance or protect FORB practices</u>
IRF 16	<u>Number of actions taken by media outlets, platforms and other information providers in order to prevent incitement to violence</u>

DRL/GP Cross-cutting Indicators

The indicators in this section correspond to measures that may fit for democracy, human rights, international religious freedom, or labor rights projects. They have been included here because of their cross-cutting nature.

Indicator	DRL.1 Number of human rights defenders trained and supported (DR.6.1-2)
Definition	<p>To be a human rights defender, a person can act to address any human right (or rights) on behalf of individuals or groups. Human rights defenders seek the promotion and protection of civil and political rights as well as the promotion, protection and realization of economic, social and cultural rights, including rights related to the protection of the environment.</p> <p>A human rights defender can be an individual working alone or as part of a recognized group or movement who investigates, documents, educates, advocates, organizes, communicates, pressures, and/or works to hold accountable those who violate the liberties of others. He or she can be a lawyer, journalist, teacher, activist, student, religious leader, or any other citizen who chooses to defend human rights of others.</p> <p>Support includes training, grants or other support designed to improve the human rights services, reporting, and advocacy for the citizens. The types of trainings measured are provided assistance as a result of DRL-supported programs, whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data should be sex-disaggregated; and where possible, training should meet national or international standards.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Human rights defenders are on the frontlines of human rights protection. They are a key aspect to government accountability and contribute to transparency in terms of violations of human rights standards. To the extent human rights defenders are trained and supported to improve their abilities to report and advocate on behalf of human rights, rights will be more easily respected and ensured.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of human rights defenders
Data Source	Training attendance sheets. Implementing partners should determine whether training registration sheets or attendance sheets can be used. This will depend on country context and the need to protect human rights defenders in-country. Direct observation can also be used to note the number trained.
Known Data Limitations	If using training attendance sheets, participants are sometimes uncomfortable providing detailed demographic information. If using direct observation, disaggregates on demographic characteristics cannot be applied.
Disaggregate(s)	Number of female, male, or other; participants self-identifying as LGBTI (if possible, further disaggregate by L-G-B-T-I); youth (age: 10-29); persons with disabilities; ethnic minorities; indigenous persons; and religious minorities.

Indicator	DRL.2 Number of human rights organizations trained and supported (DR.4.2-1)
Definition	<p>To be counted, the human rights organization / civil society organization (CSO) should focus a primary or significant portion of their work on strengthening human rights (e.g., in providing services, reporting, monitoring, advocacy, outreach, education or protection of citizens). In order to make this indicator a meaningful measure, implementing partners should qualify this indicator in their narrative, if possible, (i.e., by noting what types of human rights work, etc.) based on the country, or operating context. To be counted, local groups do not need to be registered in their countries.</p> <p>Training support or sub-grants to CSOs can be short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. Narrative reports should indicate the type of activity or training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; and that, where possible, training meets national or international standards.</p> <p>If multiple forms of assistance are provided in one year—multiple trainings are provided to a CSO on different subjects, or multiple sub-grants are provided for different purposes—then the organization can be counted more than once in that fiscal year. Similarly, if multiple types of support are provided to an organization in a fiscal year (i.e. a grant and training) then the organization can be counted each time that it receives DRL support.</p> <p>If the partner plans to conduct an advocacy intervention with DRL support, please report under 3.1-5 (DR.4.2.-2).</p> <p>This output indicator measures the number of organizations trained and supported (unit of measure: organizations). If training or supporting individual human rights defenders, the partner should use Indicator *** (unit of measure: human rights defenders).</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Indicator measures the output of DRL assistance aimed at strengthening human rights organization / CSOs working on human rights issues. Supporting local organizations engaged in monitoring or advocacy work will increase the level of transparency and accountability and contribute to the protection of human rights.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of human rights organizations / CSOs working on human rights
Data Source	Training attendance sheets. Implementing partners should determine whether training registration sheets or attendance sheets can be used. This will depend on country context and the need to protect human rights defenders in-country. Direct observation can also be used to note the number trained.
Known Data Limitations	If using training attendance sheets, participants are sometimes uncomfortable providing detailed demographic information. If using direct observation, disaggregates on demographic characteristics cannot be applied.
Disaggregate(s)	Type of CSO: groups working on LGBTI issues; women's rights groups; indigenous people's groups; disability rights groups; or groups working on religious freedom.

Indicator	DRL.3 Number of human rights materials supported by DRL
Definition	<p>DRL-supported materials are defined as those developed by implementing partners, which are designed to help individuals and organizations—including civil society organizations, human rights defenders, and the public—prevent or respond to human rights violations. Tools can include, but are not limited to, printed guides, hotlines, mobile applications, online platforms, and other written products directed at individuals and organizations engaged in the defense of human rights, as well as those advocating for the rights of victims of human rights abuses and violations. Includes both print and digital mediums distributed through in-person or online channels. <i>Partners should describe the type of tool/material and nature of distribution in their quarterly narrative reports.</i></p> <p>This indicator does not track revisions, development, new releases, bug fixes (for online tools). It simply tracks the current number of DRL-supported materials or tools produced by an implementer. Each material or tool will only be counted once per fiscal year. Different versions of the same tool should not be counted as discrete tools. If more than one award or agreement has been made in support of the same product, the material / tool / technology should only be counted once. If the material covers multiple languages or geographies, it should only be counted once--i.e. count number of materials / tools, not instances of localization.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator directly measures an output related to improving and increasing resources to prevent and respond to human rights violations.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of tools or materials
Data Source	The indicator should not be reported on a cumulative basis. Implementing partners should only count the number of tools made accessible during the quarterly reporting period. Tools or materials from previous quarters should not be included in the current quarterly reporting period. DRL will review and aggregate partner indicator reporting on an annual basis.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator measures the provision of materials, it does not measure a qualitative improvement in those materials, their ability to prevent and/or respond to human rights abuses, nor their distribution/reach.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	DRL.4 Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions (DR.4.2-2)
Definition	<p>Civil society organizations (CSOs), individuals working in an individual capacity, or civil society networks that receive DRL assistance to initiate or participate in advocacy interventions. Advocacy should be understood as a means for individuals, constituencies, or organizations to shape public agendas, change public policies, and influence other processes that impact their lives. Advocacy does not involve one march, meeting or poster, but a series of strategic, interconnected, integrated activities designed to achieve a goal. It may include a wide range of activities, such as, lobbying, public interest litigation, letter writing campaigns, civil disobedience, etc.</p> <p>Advocacy interventions tend to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be strategic (a deliberate, planned action, not random); • Involve a set of actions that are sustained in order to build and direct pressure; • Be designed to persuade; • Be targeted; • Involve alliance building. <p>Implementing partners should specify the type of advocacy interventions in their M&E plan and use narrative reporting to describe the scale/scope of the advocacy interventions, target audience, and intended outcomes. This type of information can be disaggregated during quarterly reporting, if implementing partners would like to categorize advocacy targets (e.g. public, influencers (media, lobbyists, non-profits), decision-makers) and scope (e.g. awareness-raising, strategic communications, policy change).</p> <p>If an advocacy intervention includes a component where advocates are participating in legislative proceedings or engaging in advocacy with sub-national governments, commissions or regulatory bodies, please account for this component by reporting under DRL.5 (DR4.3-1). Other components within an advocacy intervention (e.g. public awareness-raising, publications) can be reported within this indicator.</p> <p>If the CSO is receiving advocacy training, please report the outcome under DRL.4 (DR.4.2-2).</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Supporting local civil society to conduct advocacy improves the likelihood that non-governmental stakeholders have a voice in public decision-making and other political processes.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of CSOs

Data Source	Data may include, but is not limited to: local partners' advocacy plans or strategies, implementation plans; recording of press conferences; copy of testimony or press releases; advocacy campaign materials; direct observation of advocacy initiative.
Known Data Limitations	Indicator only measures the number of interventions supported. It does not measure the relevance or appropriateness of the advocacy approach or whether the correct target was identified. Please include this type of information within narrative reports (see Definition).
Disaggregate(s)	Type of CSO: groups working on LGBTI issues; women's rights groups; indigenous people's groups; disability rights groups; or groups working on religious freedom.

Indicator	DRL.5 Number of USG-assisted CSOs that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees (DR.4.3-1)
Definition	<p>Measures CSOs' active participation in, or engagement with, legislative proceedings. Participation and advocacy includes, for example, attending and contributing to public hearings or committee meetings, submitting policy briefs or position papers, providing comments on proposed legislation, meeting with MPs or staff, etc. Measures both civil society advocacy efforts with legislatures and legislative outreach and openness to civil society engagement.</p> <p>Within the narrative reports, describe the participation or advocacy in terms of the scale/scope.</p> <p>CSOs can include both formal and informal institutions and do not need to be registered with their national government. CSOs can include non-governmental organizations providing services, community-based organizations, village associations, environmental groups, women's rights groups, farmers' associations, land rights groups, faith-based organizations, labor unions, professional associations, chambers of commerce, independent research institutes, non-profit media outlets, and other groups or networks organizing for a common purpose.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This measure captures more than one democracy and governance outcome. It implies CSOs have or will have the capacity to substantively participate in democratic policymaking and that legislators are open to public participation and actively engage in it. Taken together, civil society participation in democratic policymaking improves the transparency and accountability of the legislative process.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of CSOs
Data Source	Reports of committee proceedings augmented by implementing partner audits
Known Data Limitations	None
Disaggregate(s)	Type of CSO: groups working on LGBTI issues; women's rights groups; indigenous people's groups; disability rights groups; or groups working on religious freedom.

Indicator	DRL.6 Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) that engage in advocacy with regional or local governments, commissions, or regulatory bodies
Definition	<p>Measures whether civil society organizations (CSOs) are actively participating in, or engaging with, government bodies. Participation and advocacy includes, for example, attending and contributing to public hearings or committee meetings, submitting policy briefs or position papers, providing comments on proposed legislation, meeting with MPs or staff, etc. Measures both civil society advocacy efforts with government bodies, and openness to civil society engagement. Implementing partners should define participation or advocacy in terms of the scale/scope in their M&E plan and within quarterly narrative reporting.</p> <p>This indicator can be reported as either an output or outcome. In extremely restrictive environments, local CSOs must often conduct extensive outreach with their government in order to be invited to attend a hearing or be able to contribute to proposed legislation--in these cases, participation could be seen as an outcome of effective outreach (output). If the implementing partner chooses to report the indicator as an outcome, there should be an associated output indicator (in many cases, this will be DRL.4 Number of CSOs receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions (DR.4.2-2)).</p> <p>Civil society organizations (CSOs) can include both formal and informal institutions and do not need to be registered with their national government. Civil society organizations (CSOs) can include non-governmental organizations providing services, community-based organizations, village associations, environmental groups, women's rights groups, farmers' associations, land rights groups, faith-based organizations, labor unions, professional associations, chambers of commerce, independent research institutes, non-profit media outlets, and other groups or networks organizing for a common purpose.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Assumes that CSOs have or will have the capacity to participate in democratic policymaking and that legislators are open to public participation and actively engage. In the longer-term, civil society participation in democratic policymaking improves the transparency and accountability of legislative processes.
Indicator Type	Output or Outcome (must have associated output)
Unit of Measure	Number of local civil society organizations (CSOs)
Data Source	Data may include, but is not limited to: recording of press conferences; copy of testimony or press releases; advocacy campaign materials; committee proceedings; direct observation of advocacy initiative.
Known Data Limitations	Official data sources--copies of testimony, committee proceedings--may not be readily available as forms of documentation. Advocacy materials, third-party or media (e.g. news articles) may be used in place of official data.

Disaggregate(s)

Type of CSO: groups working on LGBTI issues; women's rights groups; indigenous people's groups; disability rights groups; or groups working on religious freedom.

Indicator	DRL.7 Number of individuals receiving civic education through USG-assisted programs (DR.3.2-5)
Definition	<p>Any individuals that receive civic education through print, broadcast, or new media, as well as via in-person contact can be counted. Civic education also includes curriculum-based trainings, community-based trainings in underserved areas, public service announcements on electronic media, written materials, internet-based information and messages using new media or technology (in this usage primarily, but not exclusively social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter).</p> <p>Implementing partners should list the different types of media or other contacts used in their programs, along with the objectives of the civic education programming in their country context.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The provision of civic education in developing democracies will help ensure that individuals have the information they need to be effective participants in the democratic process, contributing to the development or maintenance of electoral democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals reached
Data Source	Review of project/program documents from implementers; Attendance sheets and independently collected audience estimates can also be used to demonstrate coverage. Given the data limitations, implementing partners should detail in their M&Plan the data collection/calculation methodology for each method used, along with efforts being taken to avoid multiple counting.
Known Data Limitations	Consistency issues related to receiving reliable data on voter outreach from implementing partners. Indicator is limited in its ability to measure multiplier effects. There is a high potential for double counting.
Disaggregate(s)	Number of female, male, or other; participants self-identifying as LGBTI (if possible, further disaggregate by L-G-B-T-I); youth (age: 10-29); persons with disabilities; ethnic minorities; indigenous persons; and religious minorities.

Indicator	DRL.8 Number of local women participating in a substantive role or position in a peacebuilding process supported with USG assistance (GNDR-10)
Definition	<p>For this indicator, a peacebuilding process refers to formal (diplomatic or official) or informal (grassroots, civil society) activities aimed at preventing or managing violent conflict, resolving conflict or the drivers of conflict, and to sustaining peace following an end to violent conflict.</p> <p>This indicator is intended to capture the participation of local women in peacebuilding processes; to be counted in this indicator, women should be from the relevant conflict country, area, or region. This indicator does not count the participation of women in U.S. or other third-party delegations to peace processes.</p> <p>To be counted in this indicator, participants should have a substantive role in the peacebuilding process or initiative, meaning a participant has realistic opportunities to share information and represent her own perspectives or those of a group she represents; to help define issues, problems, and solutions; and to influence decisions and outcomes associated with the process or initiative. To the extent practicable, individuals should be counted only once per fiscal year under this indicator.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • persons serving on a local peace committee • persons representing a group or organization with official consultative status to a peace negotiation • person serving as an official delegate to a peace process
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Women's participation in peacebuilding activities is posited as an important mechanism for increasing the gender-sensitivity of processes and outcomes, and for improving the overall strength and sustainability of such processes by ensuring focus on a broader set of issues relevant to preventing, managing, and resolving conflict and by bringing the skills and capacities of women to bear in these processes.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of women
Data Source	Relevant project/program documents (e.g. quarterly and final reports, project monitoring records); however, analysis of secondary data (e.g. newspapers, records of proceedings) or direct observation of processes by post also may also be useful.
Known Data Limitations	Availability/timeliness of program documentation.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	DRL.9 Number of individuals from low income or marginalized communities who received legal aid or victim's assistance with USG support (DR.6.3-1)
Definition	<p>Areas of low income are defined as those where 60% of the population has an income in the lowest quintile of the country as a whole. Marginalized communities are those who have traditionally been excluded from power and access to resources, and may include indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, LGBTI persons, women and girls, youth, individuals with disabilities, or other groups.</p> <p>Legal aid should be considered as free or inexpensive assistance to individuals that may not have had representation or access to the justice system.</p> <p>Victim's assistance includes the provision of information or aid to individuals who have suffered a crime (physical, psychological, financial harm). This includes support before, during, or after court proceedings.</p>
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Local availability of legal aid or victim's assistance for low income or marginalized communities indicates some degree of effectiveness in providing access to justice, a key component of rule of law and human rights. When low income and marginalized groups can access justice it helps improve the legitimacy of the justice system as a whole because individuals can depend on the justice system to seek relief.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals
Data Source	Review of project documents (attendance sheets, registration forms, direct observation notes). The implementer should determine whether attendance sheets or registration forms, and the type of information listed, are necessary or safe to collect or store. If data sources are not secure, certain information can often be gathered through direct observation.
Disaggregate(s)	Number of female, male, or other; participants self-identifying as LGBTI (if possible, further disaggregate by L-G-B-T-I); youth (age: 10-29); persons with disabilities; ethnic minorities; indigenous persons; and religious minorities.

Indicator	DRL.10 Number of journalists trained and supported (DR.5.2-2)
Definition	<p>Count journalists, editors, and related production staff for news and public information media. Implementing partners should qualify this indicator in their narrative, if possible (i.e., by noting the operating context, the type of human rights work focused on by journalists).</p> <p>Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. It includes pre-service and in-service training for journalists, editors, and related production staff for news and public information media. The level of training includes basic, technical, university, mid-career, and certification training.</p> <p>If implementing partners are working with other human rights defenders—who investigate, document, educate, advocate, organize, communicate, pressure, and/or work to hold accountable those who violate the liberties of others—use DRL.1 (DR.6.1-2).</p> <p>Support includes training, grants or other support designed to improve human rights information services and reporting for citizens. People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects, can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that training follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data should be sex-disaggregated; and where possible, training should meet national or international standards.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Like human rights defenders, journalists are on the frontlines of human rights protection. They are a key aspect to government accountability and contribute to transparency by reporting violations of human rights standards. To the extent journalists are trained and supported to improve their abilities to investigate and report on human rights violations, rights could be more easily respected and ensured.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of journalists
Data Source	Training attendance sheets. Implementing partners should determine whether training registration sheets or attendance sheets can be used. This will depend on country context and the need to protect human rights defenders in-country. Direct observation can also be used to note the number trained.
Known Data Limitations	If using training attendance sheets, participants are sometimes uncomfortable providing detailed demographic information. If using direct observation, disaggregates on demographic characteristics cannot be applied, as participants must self-identify with regard to gender or ethnicity.
Disaggregate(s)	Number of female, male, or other; participants self-identifying as LGBTI (if possible, further disaggregate by L-G-B-T-I); youth (age: 10-29); persons with disabilities; ethnic minorities; indigenous persons; and religious minorities.

Indicator	DRL.11 Number of judicial personnel trained with USG Assistance (DR.1.3-1)
Definition	<p>Judicial personnel include judges, magistrates, prosecutors, advocates, inspectors and court staff. Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad.</p> <p>People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data should be sex-disaggregated; and where possible, training should meet national or international standards.</p> <p><i>Training of legal personnel—including defense attorneys or paralegals—should be documented in DRL.1 Number of human rights defenders trained and supported (DR.6.1-2).</i></p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Training of judicial personnel improves their ability to more effectively carry out their duties, which improves the capacity of the judiciary to act as a check on government power. Training may also instill a sense of the value of and necessity for judicial independence, transparency and accountability in a democratic society.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of judicial personnel
Data Source	<p>Review of project documents (attendance sheets, registration forms, direct observation notes).</p> <p>The implementer should determine whether attendance sheets or registration forms, and the type of information listed, are necessary or safe to collect or store. If data sources are not secure, certain information can often be gathered through direct observation.</p>
Known Data Limitations	If using training attendance sheets, participants are sometimes uncomfortable providing detailed demographic information. If using direct observation, disaggregates on demographic characteristics cannot be applied.
Disaggregate(s)	Type of judicial personnel: judges, prosecutors, court staff; number of female, male, or other; participants self-identifying as LGBTI (if possible, further disaggregate by L-G-B-T-I); youth (age: 10-29); persons with disabilities; ethnic minorities; indigenous persons; and religious minorities.

Indicator	DRL.12 Number of USG-Assisted consensus-building processes resulting in an agreement (DR.3.1-1)
Definition	<p>Consensus-building processes include: national, sub-national, and local dialogues, as well as referenda, and peace. Consensus-building processes include: national, sub-national, and local dialogues, as well as referenda, and peace processes. Agreements can take the form of interim or final plans of action, constitutions, constitutional amendments, draft legislation, legislation on electoral frameworks issues, statutes, regulations, or peace agreements.</p> <p>Each part of the consensus-building process that results in an agreement may be counted separately, each as one unit. For example, if an operating unit works on an interim and final action plan, which then result in an agreement, these can be counted as two processes.</p> <p>This may involve informal agreements.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Consensus-building processes increase the likelihood that parties will reach agreement. Such processes are a critical part of fostering an environment that is tolerant or inclusive of people of all faiths or non-belief. Over the long-term, consensus-building will result in an increase in mutual understanding and a decrease in societal conflict and instability, contributing to the development of a consensual, deliberative and participatory culture of democracy.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of processes
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	None
Disaggregate(s)	Types of processes: number of processes related to LGBTI issues; number of processes related to women's rights issues; and number of processes related to religious freedom.

Indicator	DRL.13 Number of groups trained in conflict mediation/resolution skills or consensus-building techniques with USG assistance (DR.3.1-2)
Definition	<p>“Groups” are entities (e.g. NGOs, government, women's groups, political parties, civil society organizations, unions, employers, factions, media, or ethnic or marginalized groups) involved in, or planning to be involved in, conflict mediation or consensus-building processes.</p> <p>Training can be for any amount of time at a USG sponsored event, workshop or seminar. People attending the same type of training but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training (pre-service, in-service), who the training is for (community health worker, to upgrade a medical assistant to a nurse), level of training (basic, elementary, technical, university/certification), duration of training, what constitutes completion (for a short course, full attendance may be mandatory; for a longer course, there might be testing to ensure competencies are achieved; for certification, there may be a graduation). It is required that training follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data be sex-disaggregated; and that where possible, training meets national or international standards.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Consensus-building processes increase the likelihood that parties will reach agreement. Such processes are a critical part of fostering an environment that is tolerant or inclusive of people of all faiths or non-belief. Over the long-term, consensus-building will result in an increase in mutual understanding and a decrease in societal conflict and instability, contributing to the development of a consensual, deliberative and participatory culture of democracy.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of groups that have received training
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	None
Disaggregate(s)	Type of groups: number of groups working on LGBTI issues; number of women's rights groups; number of indigenous people's groups; and number of groups working on religious freedom.

Indicator	DRL.14 Number of cases supported
Definition	<p>Legal cases identified, developed and managed by implementing partners to protect any category of human rights should be counted. Given the highly contextual nature of rule of law and access to justice project interventions, the type of legal action taken (such as strategic public interest litigation or filings to dismiss a case against a human rights defender) will vary depending on the legal system and context of the legal strategies that apply. Given these contextual factors, the implementing partner should explain in the narrative reporting the how cases are developed, how cases progress through the legal system(s) based on case decisions and determinations made by relevant authorities, and describe the type of legal support provided.</p> <p>See the disaggregation below for guidance on counting cases within broad categories of legal developments.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracking cases supported by implementing partners will provide insight into progress made to advance human rights and access justice through existing legal frameworks.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of cases
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	Availability/timeliness of case updates or information.
Disaggregate(s)	Legal developments: number of cases identified or developed; number of cases registered, filed or brought to court (or to accountability mechanism); and number of cases favorably resolved.

Indicator	DRL.15 Number of laws, policies or procedures adopted, revised, stalled or changed to protect human rights
Definition	<p>Number of laws, policies or procedures (draft or final) affecting human rights, which encompass fundamental freedoms (assembly, association, expression and religion) and political rights (such as voting, political participation), that were revised, stalled, adopted or enacted (i.e. positively impacted as a result of advocacy initiatives). The indicator includes the number of laws, policies or procedures that were stalled, revised or changed to account for defensive victories. Adoption, enactment or implementation note proactive developments. To be counted, such proactive developments should focus on the promotion and protection of human rights locally or nationally. Local level policies, decrees, statements, procedures that are not formalized at the national level count towards this indicator.</p> <p>Within narrative reporting, the implementing partner should note the law, policy or procedure, and the outcome (revised, stalled, adopted, etc.) in order to identify the type of policy outcome. When writing about policy outcomes, the implementing partner should also relate the outcome to the type of advocacy initiative conducted, as well as document other partners or stakeholders that may have contributed to the outcome, and other contributing factors (e.g. well-organized coalition, favorable political conditions or policy window).</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Assumes that civil society has or will have the opportunity to participate in democratic policymaking or decision-making and that legislators and authorities are open to public participation and actively engage. In the longer-term, civil society participation in democratic policymaking improves the transparency and accountability of legislative processes.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of laws, policies or procedures
Data Source	Data may include, but is not limited to: recording of press conferences; copy of testimony or press releases; committee proceedings; record of law, policy or procedure.
Known Data Limitations	Official data sources--copies of testimony, committee proceedings, record of laws, policies or procedures--may not be readily available as forms of documentation. Advocacy materials, third-party reports or media (e.g. news articles) may be used in place of official data.
Disaggregation(s)	None

IRF Cross-cutting Indicators

The indicators in this section correspond to measures that may fit for international religious freedom, projects across their objectives. They have been included here because of their cross-cutting nature.

Indicator	IRF 3 Number of advocacy interventions that promote awareness, respect and inclusion for persons of all religions, belief and non-belief (FORB)
Definition	<p>Advocacy interventions should be counted if they are designed to shape public agendas, public opinion/perception, change public policies, and influence other processes that impact their lives as it is related to protecting freedom of religion and belief.</p> <p>Advocacy interventions does not involve one march, meeting or poster, but a series of strategic, interconnected, integrated activities designed to achieve a goal. It may include a wide range of activities, such as, public awareness campaigns, community messaging, lobbying, public interest litigation, letter writing campaigns, civil disobedience, etc.</p> <p>Advocacy interventions tend to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be strategic (a deliberate, planned action, not random); • Involve a set of actions that are sustained in order to build and direct pressure; • Be designed to persuade; • Be targeted; • Involve alliance building. <p>This indicator is distinct from DRL.4 Number of CSOs receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions (DR.4.2-2) because it counts advocacy interventions (not the number of CSOs engaged in advocacy) and the type of advocacy must be oriented towards promote awareness, respect and inclusion for persons of all religions, belief and non-belief FORB and it tracks interventions rather than the CSOs involved.</p> <p>For further guidance, methods and tools in advocacy monitoring and evaluation, consider New Tactic in Human Rights' Human Rights Advocacy Evaluation Toolkit. This resource is useful in proving tools for evaluating human rights advocacy work while being aware of the low resource constraints facing many practitioners in this space. Should you seek further guidance on how to use this toolkit, please contact IRF's M&E specialist.³</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks the breadth of programming that integrates advocacy into project interventions. The process of civil society participating in advocacy exercises democratic practices that promote transparency and accountability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of advocacy interventions
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	None
Disaggregate(s)	None

³ New Tactics in Human Rights. Advocacy Evaluation Toolkit. 2019: <https://www.newtactics.org/human-rights-advocacy-evaluation>

Indicator	IRF 11 Number of actions taken by government institutions to inform community members of their rights and fundamental freedoms
Definition	<p>“Actions” should be determined of efforts made by government officials, units or offices to provide rights education. Rights education could be considered messaging through print, broadcast, or new media, as well as via in-person contact, notices posted in offices, curriculum-based trainings, community-based trainings in underserved areas, public service announcements on electronic media, written materials, internet-based information and messages using new media or technology (in this usage primarily, but not exclusively social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter).</p> <p>Implementing partners should clarify how their intervention contributed to this result. In doing so, they should provide evidence that this action represents a change in behavior, procedure or action in government behavior to informing community members. To this end, actions tracked should be limited to the officials, units or offices with which the partner has reached.</p> <p>As this action is of a government stakeholder, it would stand as an action that is the result of partner or beneficiary engagement and intervention. In that sense it is a behavior change from a government institution, which should qualify as an outcome. Given that this is an outcome, the partner should track the intervention’s contribution to this change as many factors may influence its achievement.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks actions by government institutions to communicate rights and fundamental freedoms to traditionally marginalized and underserved populations, specifically those of religious, faith or non-belief minorities.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of actions
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	Oftentimes it can be difficult to assess contribution to this result and tracking all actions from government institutions can be difficult. Additionally, results may happen after the grant or outside of the purview of implementing partner access. Where these actions are observed they should be tracked.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Program Theme Social Inclusion

Goal 2: Promote international religious freedom, increase protection of religious minorities, and combat intolerance and violent extremism

Objectives

Objective 1: Communities are more aware, respectful and inclusive of all religions, beliefs, or non-beliefs

Objective 2: Processes and mechanisms are established to provide an opportunity for members of all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds to participate

Objective 3: Communities take action on the concerns and interests of community members of all religions, beliefs, and non-believers

Indicator	IRF 1 Number of events that promote awareness, respect and inclusion
Definition	Events include forums, seminars, meetings, and conferences that convene groups to encourage conversations about tolerance and inclusion. For purposes of this indicator, a series of regularly-recurring events that are part of the same process are counted as one event. For example, a series of community meetings designed to bring together citizens in solidarity as a response to a violent act in their community should be counted as one event. This may include interfaith events, which would be included as a disaggregate. Interfaith events should be counted if they include individuals from more than one faith.
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Interactions within a community to encourage awareness, respect and inclusion help guide discussion and debate. Those between diverse actors of different faiths can increase interactions and pluralism.. Such processes are a critical part of fostering an environment that is tolerant or inclusive of people of all faiths or non-belief.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of events
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	Activity documentation may not be readily available. Third-party documents or media (e.g. news articles) may be used.
Disaggregate(s)	Interfaith

Indicator	IRF 2 Number of actions taken by community actors that promote or protect freedom of religion or belief
Definition	<p>"Actions" should be broadly defined as letters to the editor, civic or community education efforts, community projects, public statements, etc. taken by community actors that seek to promote or protect the freedom of religion or belief undertaken by community actors (including citizens, CSOs, government stakeholders, etc.) supported through USG-funded projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the action taken is organizing an event, then it should be reported under 2.1-1 Number of events that promote awareness, respect and inclusion. <u>Actions</u> should be considered efforts supported through IRF-funded projects that are intentionally meant to promote tolerance or inclusion as a direct outcome, not as a secondary outcome to further program goals. • If the action is an advocacy intervention, this should be reported as an output under IRF 3: Number of advocacy interventions that promote awareness, respect and inclusion for persons of all religions, belief and non-belief (cross-cutting). <p>Partners should provide evidence that this action represents a change in behavior, procedure or action.</p> <p>These actions may be conducted at the local, national or international geographic level.</p> <p>Multiple actors may take part in one action, but the action should only be counted once. The same actors may undertake multiple "actions" and if so, each action should be counted.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracking the actions undertaken by community actors to promote and protect freedom of religion and belief shows the types and level of responsiveness to the needs for all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of actions
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	Activity documentation may not be readily available. Third-party documents or media (e.g. news articles) may be used.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	IRF 4. Number of community members who participate in initiatives in support of awareness, respect and inclusion
Definition	<p>Community members should be counted if they are participants in initiatives or events held in order to support awareness, respect and inclusion. This would include participation in IRF-supported initiatives occurring under SI Objective 2: Processes and mechanisms are established to provide an opportunity for members of all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds to participate. Locally implemented initiatives should include, but may not be limited to awareness campaigns, protests, community building projects, etc. They should be counted if they are designed to promote awareness, respect and inclusion for persons from all religions, faith and non-belief. These should be viewed as an event and double counting across events is acceptable given the challenges in tracking participation.</p> <p>Community members should be counted through a simple count of participants, where feasible.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks the reach and scope of project initiatives, particularly tracking support and participation in a given community for initiatives. The process of community members participating in such efforts emphasizes their effect in the community and potential for a multiplier effect.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of community members
Data Source	Simple Count; Participation Lists
Known Data Limitations	May be subject to double counting and difficulty tracking participation in broader events.
Disaggregate(s)	Gender

Indicator	IRF 5. Number of individuals receiving rights education through IRF-assisted programs
Definition	<p>Any individuals that receive rights education through print, broadcast, or new media, as well as via in-person contact can be counted. Rights education also includes curriculum-based trainings, community-based trainings in underserved areas, public service announcements on electronic media, written materials, internet-based information and messages using new media or technology (in this usage primarily, but not exclusively social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter). This should be tracked when the messaging is targeted towards informing individuals of their and others' human rights and fundamental freedoms, regardless of the laws in place in their specific jurisdiction. In this sense, it is related but distinct from civic education, which primarily focuses on providing citizens with information about democratic institutions, roles, and responsibilities.</p> <p>Implementing partners should list the different types of media or other contacts used in their programs, along with the objectives of the rights education programming in their country context.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks the reach and scope of project initiatives, particularly tracking the reach of rights education programs. The provision of rights education will help ensure that individuals have the information they need to protect their and others' rights and fundamental freedoms, access services and enjoy benefits.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals reached
Data Source	Review of project/program documents from implementers; Attendance sheets and independently collected audience estimates can also be used to demonstrate coverage. Given the data limitations, implementing partners should detail in their M&E Plan the data collection/calculation methodology for each method used, along with efforts being taken to avoid multiple counting.
Known Data Limitations	Consistency issues related to receiving reliable data on voter outreach from implementing partners. Indicator is limited in its ability to measure multiplier effects. There is a high potential for double counting.
Disaggregate(s)	Number of female, male, or other; participants self-identifying as LGBTI (if possible, further disaggregate by L-G-B-T-I); youth (age: 10-29); persons with disabilities; ethnic minorities; indigenous persons; and religious minorities.

Indicator	IRF 6. Number of networks, alliances and coalitions that take actions that protect freedom of religion or belief
Definition	<p>A network, alliance or coalition is defined as a set of like-minded actors, stakeholders or groups who form a formal or informal group to protect freedom of religion or belief. Formal networks have documentation of established guidelines for official membership for the network itself, or expected norms, if appropriate for the context of the network. Networks may also be informal and loosely formed, but should include more than one person from different groups, that may not have a formal commitment to the network, but at a minimum, participate in the networks' activities.</p> <p>This indicator is considered distinct from belief "in that the unit counted. While IRF 2 tracks the "actions taken by community actors" as the unit IRF 6 tracks the "networks, alliances and coalitions that take actions" as the counting unit. There may be overlap in the action taken, but the distinction is in the unit measured.</p> <p>"Taking action" is defined as an act or a series of actions that fit within a strategic approach. It may include a wide range of activities, such as lobbying, public interest litigation, public advocacy, civil disobedience, or other civil expressions. "Taking action" may also be in response to an action-forcing event. The intent is to capture network's actions that are strategic, coordinated, targeted sustained and designed to protect freedom of religion or belief.</p> <p>If a single group or organization takes action report under IRF 8: Number of civic or legal groups monitoring or reporting on reform implementation if the criteria remains relevant.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracking the presence of networks that promote and protect freedom of religion and belief shows the types and levels of responsiveness to the needs for all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of networks
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	Activity documentation may not be readily available. Third-party documents or media (e.g. news articles) may be used.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	IRF 7. Number of processes and mechanisms established or improved that provide participation opportunities for members of all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds
Definition	<p>Processes and mechanisms should be defined as community-based systems established to encourage dialogue, engagement, coordination and collective action to address the concerns and interests of members from all religions, beliefs, and non-believers. Participation opportunities may include sustained opportunities for multi-faith engagement, dialogue and advocacy.</p> <p>In general, these processes or mechanisms should be considered established when there is either a formal document or agreement to form the mechanism. However, as many will be informal structures, there may be alternative ways in which these processes and mechanisms form.</p> <p>While partner intervention should contribute to the establishment or furtherance of such processes and mechanisms, processes facilitated by implementing partners that receive direct funding should not be counted unless they can stand independent of those partners. Rather these should be community-led processes and mechanisms. As such, this outcome indicator may serve, but may not be limited to being associated to outcomes tracked in IRF 4: Number of community members who participate in initiatives in support of awareness, respect and inclusion.</p> <p>As these processes and mechanisms are likely subject to high local variation, as a result that should be documented by implementing partners. Additionally, these processes and mechanisms may previously exist or rely on traditional structures and as such establishing a baseline of operations to determine how these are improved in relation to providing greater participation opportunities for members of all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds will be important.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks achievement to IRF's social inclusion Objective 2 Processes and mechanisms are established to provide an opportunity for members of all religious, belief and non-belief backgrounds to participate.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of processes and mechanisms
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation; Direct observation
Known Data Limitations	Determining when these processes and mechanisms are established or improved may be subject to subjectivity.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Program Theme: Government and Policy Advancements

Goal 1: Legal and policy reform implementation: Upholding, creating and enforcing legal and regulatory frameworks that protect human rights

Objectives

Objective 1: Processes, services, benefits and institutions are accessible to members of all religions, beliefs and non-belief without discrimination or persecution

Objective 2: Government, security, legal or judicial actors leverage existing domestic and international legal and regulatory frameworks to advance human rights related to religious freedom

Indicator	IRF 8. Number of civic or legal groups monitoring or reporting on reform implementation
Definition	<p>Civic or legal groups should be considered formal or informal associations that take action to monitor, track, or report on the implementation of reforms made by public, political and government stakeholders. If the civic or legal groups form a network or coalition to monitor FORB related reform, report under 2.1-3 Number of networks, alliances and coalitions that take actions that protect freedom of religion or belief.</p> <p>In the narrative reporting, the implementing partner should explain how the monitoring, tracking, reporting activities of such groups takes place and how that information is disseminated.</p> <p>This indicator should be considered distinct from DRL.2 Number of human rights organizations trained and supported (DR.4.2-1), as IRF 8 will track the action of the groups taking action to monitor or report on reform, while the DRL2 tracks if they were trained and supported.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator assumes that civic and legal groups have or will have the capacity to participate in democratic policymaking and that legislators are open to public participation and actively engage. In the longer-term, civil society participation in democratic policymaking improves the transparency and accountability of legislative processes.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of groups
Data Source	Program reports and activity documentation
Known Data Limitations	Activity documentation may not be readily available. Third-party documents or media (e.g. news articles) may be used.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	IRF 9. Number of government officials, security and law enforcement and legal actors reached
Definition	Any government officials (elected or unelected), security and law enforcement and legal actors (e.g., judges, prosecutors) that are contacted by civil society, religious rights organizations or other community organizations advocating for legal and policy reforms related to the rights of persons of all religions, beliefs and non-belief, as well as freedom from discrimination. Reaching these individuals may be through meetings, roundtables or other forms of direct advocacy. This may include efforts to educate and raise awareness on issues of awareness, respect and inclusion for persons of all religions, belief and non-belief.
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator seeks to track the recipients of advocacy and awareness raising with the goal of moving them towards action to reduce discriminatory barriers and revise policies, frameworks and practices that might be detrimental to the inclusions of all persons.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of officials and actors
Data Source	Attendance sheets, participant lists
Known Data Limitations	Activity documentation may not be readily available. Third-party documents or media (e.g. news articles) may be used.
Disaggregate(s)	Gender

Indicator	IRF 10. Number of cases resolved in favor of protecting FORB
Definition	<p>Cases resolved is subject to significant community variation, however, should be assessed as cases related to those supported under DRL.14-Number of cases supported. As such, with the following definition, this should be counted if the case is won in favor of the efforts to protect the rights of persons of all religions, beliefs and non-belief.</p> <p>Legal cases identified, developed and managed by implementing partners to protect any category of human rights should be counted. Given the highly contextual nature of rule of law and access to justice project interventions, the type of legal action taken (such as public interest litigation or filings to dismiss a case against a human rights defender) will vary depending on the legal system and context of the legal strategies that apply. Given these contextual factors, the implementing partner should explain in their narrative reporting how cases are developed, how cases progress through the legal system(s) based on case decisions and determinations made by relevant authorities and describe the type of legal support provided. This may include tracking the following steps before the resolution of the count is counted: number of cases identified or developed; number of cases registered, filed or brought to court (or to accountability mechanism); and number of cases favorably resolved.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	<p>Tracking the result of cases supported by implementing partners will provide insight into progress made to advance human rights and access justice through existing legal frameworks.</p>
Indicator Type	<p>Outcome</p>
Unit of Measure	<p>Number of cases</p>
Data Source	<p>Program reports and activity documentation</p>
Known Data Limitations	<p>Availability/timeliness of case updates or information.</p>
Disaggregate(s)	<p>None.</p> <p>N/A.</p>

Program Theme: Objective, fact-based and inclusive media

Goal: Media addresses FORB issues: Media actors, including outlets, journalists and citizen journalists, and other information stakeholders build resilience and better inform the public of FORB issues

Objectives

Objective 1: Media and other information stakeholders coverage advances awareness, respect and understanding regarding members of religions, beliefs, or non-believers

Objective 2: Media and other information stakeholders advance information that counter hate speech, violence and misinformation

Indicator	IRF 12. Number of online and offline media products that are relevant to FORB practices or policies
Definition	<p>Count media reports, articles, stories and products that convey information about the advancement or corrective action of FORB practices (both societal and governmental) or policies applicable to the local community, subnational, or national level. Include reports that are online and offline. Products may include articles, manuals, videos, podcasts or other media products that convey information. The actions that are covered by online and offline media can be any type (i.e. raising awareness campaigns, educational events, etc.) as long as the media stories counted relate to FORB practices or policies.</p> <p>The products counted must be produced by IRF-supported media actors, outlets and journalists and should provide evidence that these products represent responsible journalistic practice. To be counted, journalists should produce articles that apply principles of responsible media practice including the following characteristics: language should be balanced, content should not be politically motivated, and writing should demonstrate awareness of religious freedom issues.</p> <p>To collect products, implementing partners can take two approaches: (i) partners can request that trained journalists, outlets and influencers provide a copy of articles, as a requirement of training; or, (ii) partners can set up a web feed (e.g., RSS, Atom, other XML-formatted data, Google News, Flipboard or other) to automatically aggregate the products posted online by media actors. See known data limitations, below.</p> <p>Implementing partners would need to analyze the content of articles, as a way to assess if trained individuals were following responsible journalistic practice in their writing. To make this data more meaningful, implementing partners should qualify this indicator in their narrative, if possible, by noting the types of articles written based on the country or operating context.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The coverage of FORB practices and policies in news media both online and offline is needed to promote changes to restrictive laws and policies. For the purposes of FORB programming, the increased exposure to information that advances (a) social tolerance would signal improved attitudes resulting in decreasing hostility that can lead to discrimination and violence and/or (b) governmental action would safeguard FORB in a rule of law context and address governmental constraints. The FORB team will track the extent to which the presence of such information is one of the catalysts for the desired changes.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Media products
Data Source	Program reports and documentation of media report
Known Data Limitations	Possible lag time in data availability, particularly for copies of offline reports. Asking media actors to forward products to implementing partner staff may reduce the burden on implementing partners; however, journalists may not forward all articles on a timely or systematic basis, due to time constraints. Web feeds may not capture all instances, especially if keywords are misspelled or translated in different languages. This indicator does not request the percentage of articles following good journalistic

	practice, as this would require partners to compile all articles produced by trained journalists. Rather, the intent of the indicator is to understand whether media projects are producing more news that follows improved protocols.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	IRF 13. Number of persons reached by media products by IRF-supported outlets, platforms and journalists
Definition	<p>Any individuals that access or receive media products by IRF-supported outlets, platforms and journalists through print, broadcast, or using social media (in this usage primarily, but not exclusively social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter). Media products may involve articles, blogs, radio or video reports or other new reports that are presented to the public. The media products produced by IRF-supported journalists should provide evidence to correlate the outlets, platforms and journalists to partner interventions.</p> <p>Given the challenges of tracking print and broadcast this indicator will mostly relate to new media through social networks and platforms. If the implementing partner has a reliable method of tracking reach of other media sources that can be included.</p> <p>To collect products, such as articles in particular, implementing partners can take two approaches: (i) partners can request that trained journalists provide a copy of articles, as a requirement of training; or, (ii) partners can set up a web feed (e.g., RSS, Atom, other XML-formatted data, Google News, Flipboard) to automatically aggregate the articles posted online by trained journalists. See known data limitations, below.</p> <p>In both cases, implementing partners would need to analyze the content of products, as a way to assess if supported outlets, platforms and journalists were following responsible journalistic practice according to international journalist standards in their writing. To make this data more meaningful, implementing partners should qualify this indicator in their narrative, if possible, by noting the product content.</p> <p>Note: This indicator should not track organized press releases.</p> <p>Implementing partners should list the different types of media or other contacts used in their programs, along with the objectives of the civic education programming in their country context. If relying on sub-partners, it might require them reporting data to the implementing partner.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The coverage of FORB practices and policies in news media both online and offline is needed to promote changes to restrictive laws and policies. For the purposes of FORB programming, the increased exposure to information that advances (a) social tolerance would signal improved attitudes resulting in decreasing hostility that can lead to discrimination and violence and/or (b) governmental action would safeguard FORB in a rule of law context and address governmental constraints. The implementing partner team will track the extent to which the presence of such information is one of the catalysts for the desired changes.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Persons
Data Source	Social media analytics, partner reporting.

Known Data Limitations	<p>Tracking print and broadcast, or traditional, media can be extremely difficult to track reliably. The total population of those reached will be difficult to bound, given this and multiplier effects.</p> <p>Asking journalists to forward articles to implementing partner staff may reduce the burden on implementing partners; however, journalists may not forward all articles on a timely or systematic basis, due to time constraints. Web feeds may not capture all instances, especially if keywords are misspelled or translated in different languages. This indicator does not request the percentage of journalists reporting on elections, politics and governance, as this would require partners to compile all articles produced by trained journalists. Rather, the intent of the indicator is to understand whether trained journalists are producing media projects on these issues.</p>
Disaggregate(s)	Media type

Indicator	IRF 14. Number of engagements or amplification actions (shares and comments) with social media messages from IRF-supported outlets, platforms and journalists
Definition	Count only the actions that increases the public reach of a FORB-related story that protects or promotes the practice of belief, religion or non-belief by an online action (e.g. retweet, share, re-post, etc.) or an offline action (e.g. re-printed story in another news platform beyond the original publication). Individual shares or email forwarding counts only if there are more than one recipients of the content. The count also includes actions that cross-over from print to online media (see disaggregation below). Implementing partners should only track actions from efforts, outlets, platforms and journalists supported by the given project as this is an intervention-based indicator.
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Amplification in news media is needed to strategically the spread information. For the purposes of FORB programming, the increased exposure to information that advances (a) social tolerance would a step towards changing attitudes and observable behaviors expected to contribute to decreasing hostility at the local level and/or (b) governmental action and the decision-making processes that influence larger systems level changes. The FORB team will track the extent to which amplification is one of the catalysts for the desired changes.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Unique actions (either online retweet, shares, etc.)
Data Source	Program reports and documentation of media report
Known Data Limitations	Analytics for print media may not be parallel to online measures because online actions are immediate reactions that are easily initiated with a few clicks, whereas amplification actions for print media involve more steps and may be more meaningful in terms of level of effort.
Disaggregate(s)	Type of media (online, offline, or cross over).

Indicator	IRF 15. Number of official responses made to stories that expose religious intolerance or protect FORB practices
Definition	<p>Count any type of official reaction or statement (examples may include, though not limited to: a speech, public statement letter, published opinion article, blog post, etc.) by a representative of a local, national, or regional authority, local community leader, employer, or entity that has a constituency. The official reaction action must be public and include a remark that definitely conveys a message that protects or promotes FORB.</p> <p>Within the narrator, partners should identify the story that correlates to the response and, where feasible, evidence that the response is in reaction to the mentioned story.</p>
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	For the purposes of FORB programming, both societal and governmental protection and promotion are necessary for FORB to be truly achieved. Any public action taken to acknowledge and safeguard FORB is an important step to changing attitudes and observable behaviors that signal larger systems level changes and is a measurement of the quality and relevance of the media piece. The FORB team will track the extent to which official responses is one of the catalysts for creating momentum for the desired changes.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of official actions
Data Source	Program reports
Known Data Limitations	Possible lag in time between the occurrence and reporting. Establishing contribution of DRL-funded interventions to the actions taken is dependent on the MEL approaches used by implementing partners.
Disaggregate(s)	Response type

Indicator	IRF 16. Number of actions taken by media outlets, platforms and other information providers in order to prevent or mitigate incitement to violence
Definition	Count any actions taken by media outlets, platforms and other information providers in their practices, approaches and policies to prevent incitement to violence through their method of information distribution. This may include establishing a policy or taking action to reduce the flow of misinformation or disinformation that incite violence or actions to improve the ability of information consumers to understand and counter this information. In order to track this indicator, implementing partners should track those actions taken in response to advocacy or data-based awareness raising from IRF-assisted partners and or community groups.
Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	As media outlets, platforms and information providers can often be vectors for misinformation, disinformation and incitement to violence to be spread, actions taken to prevent or mitigate this helps to improve media literacy and media consumer resilience to malign influence.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of actions
Data Source	Program reports
Known Data Limitations	Possible lag in time between the occurrence and reporting. Establishing contribution of DRL-funded interventions to the actions taken is dependent on the MEL approaches used by implementing partners.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Alternative measurements

As noted above, IRF encourages grantees to be innovative with their data collection management. IRF encourages implementing partners to collaborate with IRF on these options should some come to mind. For example, while quantitative measures are helpful for measuring change, so can qualitative methods. These can be helpful to both IRF and partners to better understand the Strategic Framework and how programming contributes to results identified through those pathways.

One option to consider may include Most Significant Change as detailed below. While there are alternative methods, such as outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, stakeholder mapping, ripple-effect mapping and so on, if interested, IRF would encourage partners to consider if this method might serve as a useful approach to their storytelling. If so, partners should coordinate with IRF's M&E specialist for guidance and/or training on MSC application. A template for MSC is included following this reference sheet to provide a better idea of what this looks like. Make sure to consult with IRF's specialist and the below citations for further guidance on how to use this method.

Title	Improved protection and promotion of religious freedom (Most Significant Change stories)
Definition	<p>This 'indicator' acts as a reference page, which comprises the use of the Most Significant Change (MSC) approach. MSC is a storytelling approach to monitoring. As it is not possible to anticipate all outcomes, or measure them quantitatively, MSC offers an alternative approach to documenting change. In order to capture the stories related to advancing religious freedom, implementing partners will collect MSC stories on a bi-annual basis. The MSC approach is not meant to generate success stories. It is meant to capture both positive and negative outcomes. This information can then be used to learn about intended and unintended outcomes, and to adjust programming if needed.</p> <p>For purposes of this indicator, human rights include those rights enumerated in the core UN international rights treaties, with an emphasis on the rights of the most vulnerable and marginalized individuals. MSC stories will detail how GEF-supported activities have contributed to the ability to experience these rights.</p> <p>For additional information on MSC, please contact IRF's M&E specialist, though the footnoted resources may also prove helpful.⁴⁵ Make sure to</p>

⁴ Better Evaluation, Most Significant Change:

https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/most_significant_change

⁵ Davies, R. and Dart, J. (2005) The 'Most Significant Change' Technique - A Guide to Its Use, Funded by CARE International, United KingdomOxfam Community Aid Abroad, Australia | Learning to Learn, Government of South AustraliaOxfam New Zealand | Christian Aid, United Kingdom | Exchange, United Kingdom Ibis, Denmark | Mellempfolkeligt Samvirke (MS), Denmark Lutheran World Relief, United States of America. Retrieved from <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf>

Link to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	IRF-supported projects seek to contribute to the protection and promotion of religious freedom, social inclusion, government and policy advancements and objective, fact-based and inclusive media to meet the outcomes, objectives, goals and vision IRF's strategic framework in order to meet the goal. MSC efforts should seek to report towards these results to help foster better understanding of the results within this space.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Use of Indicator	MSC is an appropriate indicator for the intermediate outcome level because it can capture higher-level results that are attributable to program interventions, but which may be unpredictable or diverse across IRF partners.
Data Source	Implementing partners will collect MSC stories on a bi-annual basis.
Disaggregation	MSC domains: (a) change at the individual level; (b) change at the community level; (c) change at the organizational level; (d) policy and institutional change.
Known Data Limitations	The MSC approach may be limited in its ability to quantify results across the portfolio. However, analysis of the change stories has the potential to produce quantifiable results, if necessary. Its principal advantage over quantitative indicator-based M&E systems is its ability to explore unanticipated outcomes and impacts.

Most Significant Change Story

What was the most significant change that took place from your involvement in the program over the last six months?

Project name:

Grantee name:

Date:

Who is telling the story (e.g. individual beneficiary, sub-grantee organization)?:

Instructions

All MSC stories should provide information on who collected the story and when the events occurred, a description of the story itself (e.g. what happened), and why the event(s) described in the story are significant (to the storyteller). You can write your story in any format you choose, but, at a minimum, please include the aforementioned details in your story.

If you prefer more structure, please use the following template to guide your storytelling.

- **Who collected the story and when did the events occur?**

- **Please provide a description of the story, including who was affected by the change, where, and what events or efforts led to the change.**

- Why are the changes in this story significant to the storyteller? What relationship do the changes have to your project objectives?

- *(Optional questions)* Did other individuals or organizations conduct similar activities (e.g. advocacy initiatives) that contributed to the change you mentioned? If so, how did they contribute?

MSC Process Note

****This is one method to apply MSC but there are other approaches. Check with IRF's M&E specialist to discuss ways to apply this method.****

Before panel

1. Panel preparation

1. **[Program Officer]** sends stories and instruction sheet to panelists, and provides submission deadline
2. **[Program Officer & M&E Specialist]** collect MSC scoresheets.
 - a. **[M&E Specialist]** compiles data in Excel.
3. **[M&E Specialist]** categorizes by domain.
 - a. Use domain list to select programs during panel process (see Day of panel, Step 4: [Panel process steps](#))
 - b. Bring Excel data table to panel.

Day of panel

1. Introductions

2. Background information on MSC process [M&E Specialist]

In 2015-2106, this portfolio went through an evaluation and developed a framework that our grantees could report to, in order to more easily aggregate program results. Due to DRL/GP's structure as a grant-making organization, we manage an array of activities implemented by various implementing partners. While these organizations contribute to common outcomes and results mentioned in the framework, the activities themselves produce diverse outcomes which are difficult to capture in standard indicators. For this purpose, we also initiated a Most Significant Change process, which is an alternative monitoring approach.

Most Significant Change (MSC) is a participatory monitoring technique that is focused on documenting the qualitative impact of social change initiatives. MSC bridges monitoring and evaluation (M&E) as it provides ongoing feedback to program managers throughout the implementation period (monitoring), and provides outcome data that can be used to assess the impact of the project (evaluation).

During the MSC process, DRL/GP seeks to understand what beneficiaries and implementing partners consider as the most significant effect that a project may have had in the last six months. The focus of this MSC approach is to learn about events that have produced significant positive or negative results, so we can then replicate what went well and learn about areas for improvement.

Since 2017, we've hosted two MSC panels per year. The first two panels included DRL/GP staff. In later rounds, we opened the panels to policy and program counterparts in other offices. We'd also welcome your feedback on the process, as we're always interested in improving how this is conducted.

3. Information on the selection panel [M&E Specialist]

Before today's panel, we sent out the stories and a story scoresheet for your review. We've compiled all of the data you sent back to us, so we could more easily categorize the stories into five domains of change (we can think of these like units of analysis):

- Individual [story focuses on change for an individual]
- Community [focuses on change for an entire community]

- Organizational [focuses on change for local CSO(s)]
- Policy / institutions [focuses on policy change or institutions, usually at national or international level]
- Other area [focuses on internal changes for an implementing partner, not a change story, etc.]

We were also interested in understanding if you felt there was enough information in the story (level of detail) and your understanding of the level of change (from none to significant).

During today's panel, we'll select what we consider the most significant stories. [Program Officer] will provide some background information on each program, before we introduce the story, and then we'll all discuss our opinion of this story.

After we review the stories in each category, we'll vote on the most significant. We'll then take these and vote for the most significant change story overall.

4. Panel process steps

1. **[M&E Specialist]** picks a domain and then selects a program to start
2. **[Program Officer]** introduces program concept and background information
3. Ask participants about their opinion of each story (*note: they shouldn't select the most significant yet*)
 - **[M&E Specialist or Program Specialist]** takes notes on participants' comments. This will be used during analysis.
 - What is your opinion of this story?
4. After all panelists provide their thoughts for all stories in a domain, facilitator asks participants to choose the most significant for that domain.
 - If there are differences, ask the participant(s) why they voted for this particular story
 - Why did you choose this story over the others?
 - (If disagreement on the most significant): Can you explain why you didn't choose this story?
 - What do you think of the stories in general?
 - Ask if any participants would like to change their vote, based on explanations
5. Move to the next domain. Repeat steps 3 and 4 until all stories are reviewed for each domain.
6. Re-introduce most significant by domain and vote for most significant overall. Use questions from Q4.
7. Once most significant stories are chosen, explain the after-panel process to participants.
 - After the panel, we'll be providing feedback to grantees on the quality of the stories and how they ranked in terms of significance. This is usually done to improve the stories we receive.
 - We'll also be taking all of the comments and feedback from today's panel and synthesizing that data to better understand the types of impact or change that we're interested in seeing (meta-analysis).

After the panel

1. Share information

1. Prepare feedback for grantees (storytellers)
 - a. [Program Officer] sends constructive feedback on story quality to grantees
 - i. This is done to improve stories for the next reporting period
 - ii. During implementer workshop, announce most significant?
2. [Program Officer] shares information with DRL/GP management.
 - a. Data will have been compiled from panel process (below, done by M&E Specialist) to facilitate data sharing process with management.

2. Data preparation

3. Upload data (from panel) into qualitative data analysis platform (e.g. Dedoose)
4. Group stories by domain, program theme, and type of change
 - a. Domains determined at panel; Themes determined by program descriptions (in DRL-PAT database); Type of change needs to be determined through analysis
 - b. Descriptors: DoS office
5. Analyze by domain, program theme, and type of change
 - a. Note any emerging trends

3. Analyze story feedback from panel

1. Note the type of feedback provided by panel participants
 - a. Did any participants change scoresheet rankings on the day of the panel?
 - b. Are there any themes present in the data?
 - i. What types of stories do DoS staff value? [Level of detail]
 - ii. What types of changes do DoS staff value? [Level of significance]
 - iii. Are there poorly written stories that ranked low, but seemed significant? Are there well-written stories that ranked high, but were less significant?

4. Analyze stories against project logic model (LM) and portfolio results framework (RF)

1. Attach each story to project-level LM and DRL RF
 - a. Note intended and unintended changes.
 - i. Were there any unintended changes? Are we interested in tracking these only during MSC process; or should we incorporate this into the DRL RF? Do we value these types of changes?

5. Data interpretation session and after-action review (one or two meetings?)

1. [M&E Specialist] schedules meeting with Program Officer.
 - a. Discuss data trends.
 - b. Discuss how process could be improved for the next round.