

---

**MEMORANDUM****TO:** Sophia Sahaf, MCC**FROM:** Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer**DATE:** 10/21/2010**SUBJECT:** Rwanda Research Design Report

---

The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is sponsoring a Threshold Program in Rwanda to help improve Rwanda's scores on the MCC Political Rights, Civil Liberties and Voice and Accountability governance indicators. The Rwanda Threshold Program (RTP) consists of five initiatives designed to help deliver training and technical assistance to the Rwandan National Police (RNP) to enhance transparency and professionalism; improve the country's judicial and legislative capacity; train Rwanda's journalists and members of the media to enhance their professionalism and skills; and provide training, technical support, and grants to civil society organizations (CSOs) at both the local and national levels to expand civic engagement. Mathematica Policy Research is designing a rigorous evaluation of these components to determine their ultimate impact on intermediate and long-term outcomes. The core team from Mathematica, Mr. Matt Sloan, Mr. Ira Nichols-Barrer, and Dr. Scott Straus, visited Rwanda in April 2010 to learn more about implementing specific RTP activities and to explore possible data sources and research designs for an evaluation of those activities. In this memorandum, we briefly review the status of program implementation and present proposed research designs to evaluate each of the main RTP activities.

The memorandum is divided into two sections. In Section A, we provide an overview of the five RTP programs and briefly discuss our recommended approach to evaluating each program. In Section B, we summarize the design plan for a nationwide data collection effort and Mathematica-led evaluations of three programs (Strengthening RNP Inspectorate Services, Media Strengthening, and Strengthening Civic Participation). Our recommended evaluation designs for this effort are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1. Evaluation Designs for Targeted RTP Program Activities**

RTP Program	Targeted Activity	Evaluation Design
Strengthening RNP Inspectorate Services	Collecting citizen complaints	Comparison group design
Media Strengthening	Supporting community radio	Pre-post design
Strengthening Civic Participation	Training district and sector government officials and CSOs	Pair-wise random assignment

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 2

Conducting one data collection effort for all three programs will help us to maximize efficiency. However, each program entails unique design issues and sampling plans that will need to be addressed separately, as discussed in Section B.

## A. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC RESEARCH DESIGNS

In the following section, we briefly review implementation activities for each RTP program and then present our recommended research designs for assessing whether component activities are achieving intended objectives.

### 1. Strengthening RNP Inspectorate Services

The RNP-strengthening program, known as “Every Voice Counts,” is a two-year initiative implemented by the U.S. Department of Justice’s International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program (ICITAP). The program focuses primarily on establishing a public system, through the Office of Inspectorate Services, for collecting and resolving citizen complaints about police conduct. The program also provides training to RNP staff on internal investigation and internal audit methods and supports several public outreach activities of the RNP.

“Every Voice Counts” began in August 2009. Currently, there are about 230 drop boxes for complaints posted in 25 districts. The program will eventually distribute a total of about 250 boxes across all 30 districts in Rwanda. Each complaint box is posted in a public space (for example, local government administrative buildings, universities, or medical facilities). A complaint box is typically introduced to local residents by a community leader, either during the installation of the box (if an audience is present) or during a local administrative meeting. Each box is prominently labeled with filing instructions and includes forms that solicit complaints or compliments about the police.

To evaluate this program, Mathematica recommends using a comparison group design. The treatment group would be citizens living in villages near posted complaint boxes. The comparison group would be either (1) citizens living in sectors (political subdivisions within a district) that do not have complaint boxes or (2) citizens who have complaint boxes in their sectors but live further away from them, compared to the treatment group. We would conduct a



*An RNP complaint drop box mounted in Kigali.*

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 3

large-scale, nationwide survey of citizens to collect data on their knowledge of disciplinary procedures and confidence in police handling of complaints (for more details on the survey design, see Section B). In addition, Mathematica and ICITAP are also exploring the feasibility of accessing RNP administrative data on complaint filings and disciplinary actions. If these data become available, it may be possible to supplement the findings from our survey with a descriptive analysis of trends in the number and types of citizen complaint filings, the RNP's actions in response to filings, and the resolution of complaints.

In addition to developing the complaint system, ICITAP has conducted small-scale training activities consisting of one two-week workshop on internal investigation techniques (approximately 40 RNP officers participated) and a one-week training-of-trainers workshop (all master trainers also attended the initial internal investigation workshop), which focused on disseminating internal investigation techniques. ICITAP has also delivered an internal audit workshop from April 19–26, 2010. To support monitoring of these activities, Mathematica will continue to advise ICITAP on the design and implementation of its internal performance monitoring and evaluation plan, in coordination with USAID.

## **2. Strengthening the Rule of Law for Policy Reform**

This program, a two-year initiative implemented by Chemonics, has been in operation for approximately 14 months. Program activities focus on two main areas: strengthening the judicial system and supporting legal reform.

The first area, strengthening the judicial system, includes a variety of training activities designed to improve the quality and professionalism of the legal system. Using a training-of-trainers approach, the program seeks to train all 250 professional judges in Rwanda in judicial decision-writing methods. In addition, Chemonics is supporting Rwanda's Institute for Legal Practice and Development (ILPD) by redesigning the ILPD curriculum and training ILPD faculty on adult education, internal management, and curriculum-development methods.

The program's legal reform activities mostly involve training a pool of approximately 26 legal development unit staff posted in the Ministry of Justice and the Parliament. These trainings focus on developing participants' skills in research; French, English, and Kinyarwanda translation; and law drafting. If Rwanda's Law Reform Commission is formed (relevant legislation is still pending), the program will also assist in the development of a policy-and-procedures manual, provide technical advice regarding a legal-reform agenda, and provide the commission's staff with training on research and law drafting. Finally, the program is facilitating legislative planning focused on passing new laws, or reforming existing laws, in ways that would improve Rwanda's scores on MCC's Rule of Law, Voice and Accountability, and Civil Liberties indicators.

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 4

To help monitor these activities, Mathematica plans to provide oversight and ongoing consultation to Chemonics staff as they implement the program's internal program monitoring and evaluation plan. For example, Chemonics plans to rate the quality of a sample of judicial decisions for a sample of judges before and after the training. Mathematica will coordinate with implementers to increase the sample size of rated decisions and improve the rigor of decision-rating criteria used by the program. Similarly, Chemonics plans to administer knowledge tests before and after all program training sessions. Mathematica will provide guidance on the design and administration of these tests.

### 3. Media Strengthening

The Media-Strengthening Program, a two-year initiative implemented by International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), focuses primarily on building professional journalism skills. The program began in the third quarter of 2009 and has completed one year of operations. We learned that curriculum and instructional support activities have focused on two educational institutions: the National University of Rwanda and the Great Lakes Media Center. In addition, the program provides direct support to journalists through "Pitch Lab" training activities; during each Pitch Lab, IREX provides substantive education about a selected local issue and supports the development of news stories addressing the given issue. The program also includes a number of secondary activities, such as providing IT instruction and equipment to educational centers, conducting business and marketing workshops for media organizations, establishing two new community radio stations, promoting youth media activities, and supporting organizational capacity building for Rwanda's four media associations.

To evaluate the program's journalism-strengthening activities, Mathematica recommends consulting with IREX to oversee the program's existing data collection activities as specified in the IREX program monitoring and evaluation plan. These activities include a descriptive analysis of article quality; IREX will independently rate a sample of print articles written by journalists before and after they received training. Mathematica would also work with IREX to encourage greater use of knowledge tests before and after each training session.



*USAID, MCC, and Mathematica staff meet with community radio board members in Gicumbi.*

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 5

Mathematica recommends using a separate, more rigorous research design to assess whether the program's two new community radio stations improve citizens' access to reliable, objective local news. Surveying citizens before and after the stations become operational (initial broadcasts are scheduled for September/October 2010) would permit a descriptive assessment of citizens' knowledge of the stations, use of radio programming, and perceptions of the radio stations' reliability as a news source. We will explore the feasibility of developing a comparison group of people who do not receive radio broadcasts. See Section B for details on our recommended baseline and follow-up designs for this survey.

#### **4. Strengthening Civic Participation**

The local civic participation program, implemented by the Urban Institute (UI), is a three-year initiative with two focus areas: (1) supporting the efforts of CSOs to advocate for local issues and (2) training local government officials to increase responsiveness to the concerns and priorities of citizens. The program will eventually reach all 30 districts in Rwanda, providing assistance at two points in time: 15 districts will receive the program in Year 1, and the remaining 15 districts will receive the program in Year 2. With Mathematica's oversight, UI implemented a pair-wise random selection process, assigning districts to Phase I and Phase II. This process divided each province's districts evenly between the two phases, stratifying the random selection process within each province to ensure the best possible match between the two phases on the following characteristics:

- Population change between 2002 and 2006
- Population density
- Common Development Fund (CDF) appropriation amounts for FY 2008 (as a proxy for poverty levels)
- Share of district spending obtained through local revenues in FY 2008
- District expenditure per capita on good governance and social affairs

Within each province, UI matched districts in pairs or groups of three, seeking the best possible matches across the five characteristics. UI then used a public lottery selection procedure to assign districts within each pairing to Phase I or Phase II. This nationwide selection process was completed in June 2010.

After receiving the list of district assignments from UI, Mathematica analyzed the data to determine whether the groups identified as Phase I and Phase II districts were statistically similar across the five characteristics. After analyzing the data, we did not find statistically significant differences between the Phase I and Phase II districts on any the characteristics used in the pair-

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 6

wise matching process.<sup>1</sup> This suggests that random assignment successfully established a “treatment” group and a “control” group of districts with baseline equivalence on each of the characteristics for which data is available.

The final district assignments reported by UI are as follows, in Table 2:

**Table 2. District Assignments for the Civic Participation Program**

	Phase I	Phase II
Northern Province	Gicumbi	Rulindo
	Gakenke	Musanze
	Burera	
Western Province	Karongi	Rusizi
	Nyabihu	Rubavu
	Rutsiro	Nyamasheke
	Ngororero	
Southern Province	Nyaruguru	Nyamagabe
	Gisagara	Kamonyi
	Nyanza	Huye
	Ruhango	Muhanga
Eastern Province	Rwamagana	Ngoma
	Bugesera	Nyagatare
	Kirehe	Gatsibo
		Kayonza
Kigali City	Gasabo	Kicukiro
		Nyarugenge

Now that district selection has taken place, the program is providing assistance to local government officials and CSOs. The first program activity after district selection is a baseline diagnostic assessment of needs within each district, which is currently underway. This diagnostic will help program staff assess the capacity of the government and CSOs to participate in civic activities at the district level and also within a subset of 2 or 3 sectors within each district (on average, each district has 15 sectors). The results of the diagnostic will assist UI in developing district-specific work plans for training activities targeting civil society and local government

---

<sup>1</sup> We tested baseline equivalence using two-tailed t-tests for each characteristic. None of the differences in average Phase I and Phase II characteristics was statistically significant at the 5 percent or 10 percent level.

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 7

officials. It may also be possible to randomly select which sectors would receive the program; however, program activities taking place at the district level would likely create spillover effects on sectors that had not been specifically targeted for extra activities.

In addition to activities targeting the district and sector needs identified by the diagnostic, UI plans to provide every district with support related to participatory budgeting, citizen report cards, and community scorecards. The participatory budgeting activities will initially focus on simplifying national-level budget information provided by the Ministry of Planning and providing synthesized information, translated into Kinyarwanda, for local government staff and CSOs. Phase 1 districts will also receive input on the FY 2011–2012 district development plans, which will be used in the budget planning process slated to begin in January 2011.

To assess the effectiveness of these activities, Mathematica recommends using the completed pair-wise process to generate experimental impact estimates for the program. Random assignment represents the “gold standard” in international evaluation studies, providing a valuable opportunity to generate unbiased estimates of a program’s direct impacts. This design would require two rounds of nationwide data collection. During the first round, in fall 2010, we would use a large-scale survey to assess the baseline ability of citizens to analyze, monitor, and provide input on local policymaking decisions in all 30 districts nationwide. The second round would take place after Year 1 of the program, immediately before the implementation of activities in Phase II districts (around fall 2011). By comparing changes in citizens’ perceptions in Phase I districts (the treatment group) to the changes in perceptions in Phase II districts (the control group) over the same period (prior to Phase II), this design would provide a highly rigorous assessment of the extent to which program activities had a causal impact on perceptions of local government and citizen participation. In addition, Mathematica recommends that MCC consider undertaking a third round of the survey in fall 2012 to assess longer-term impacts and the persistence of program effects over time. See Section B for details on our recommended survey design, methods, and scale.



*Gathering civic participation project details at the Urban Institute’s Butare field office.*



MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 8

## **5. Strengthening Civil Society**

The Strengthening Civil Society Project, a two-year initiative implemented by IREX, seeks to improve the operational, outreach, and advocacy capacities of national-level CSOs. The program began planning activities and recruiting Kigali-based CSOs in March 2010. The first activity for CSOs will be to complete a self-assessment, identifying capacity gaps and future development goals. IREX has developed a standard CSO self-assessment form to accomplish this task. All employees of participating CSOs will complete the form separately to allow IREX to cross-check responses as much as possible. The CSOs will also complete an interim assessment after the program's first year as well as a final assessment after the program ends (IREX has agreed to share these assessment tools with Mathematica and coordinate with us to identify opportunities for descriptive data collection). The program's first set of training activities will focus on operational capacity (that is, human resources, financial controls, and management). Later, IREX plans to support CSO advocacy and outreach to CSO constituents, including awarding small advocacy and outreach grants to trained organizations through a second competitive process.

To evaluate the civil society-strengthening program, Mathematica recommends supporting IREX's existing plans to descriptively monitor national CSO capacity through assessment activities laid out in the program's monitoring and evaluation plan. Mathematica will continue to consult with IREX on the development and implementation of the program's CSO self-assessment tool, which participating organizations will complete before receiving training and at six-month intervals throughout the program. After the program ends, Mathematica will also advise IREX on how best to analyze and interpret the descriptive data obtained through the self-assessment questionnaires.

## **B. NATIONWIDE DATA COLLECTION DESIGN**

As discussed above, a data collection plan that will accommodate each of Mathematica's recommended research designs would require a nationwide citizen survey, first conducted in fall 2010 and again in fall 2011. We would use this survey to gather data on citizens' perceptions, knowledge, and behavior in order to assess the effectiveness of three of the five RTP programs. Specifically, the survey would include the following sampling frames and major outcomes of interest for each program:

1. *Strengthening RNP Inspectorate Services:* Using a comparison group design, we would develop a survey to evaluate the effects of the complaint system on citizens' knowledge of RNP disciplinary procedures and confidence in how the police handle complaints. Using a sector-level sampling frame, Mathematica would identify sectors that contain collection boxes and compare them to sectors that do not. In addition, Mathematica could also use cell- (subdivisions of sectors) or village-level



MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 9

sampling frames within selected sectors to contrast a sample of citizens located close to collection boxes with a sample of citizens located further away. Since the complaint system has already been partially implemented, it is not possible to collect true baseline data for the program. However, conducting this survey in two phases—once while the ICITAP assistance program is still in place and again after the program ends—may provide useful descriptive evidence of changes in outcomes over time.

2. *The Media-Strengthening Program:* Our evaluation design would involve sampling citizens living in the broadcast regions of the two RTP-supported radio stations (we will also explore the feasibility of developing a comparison group of people who do not receive radio broadcasts). Conducting data collection at two points in time would permit a pre-post comparison—we would conduct the baseline survey before the beginning of station operations, and we would complete the follow-up survey one year after programming begins. Our survey instruments would obtain data on citizens' awareness of community radio programming and local current affairs, and assess whether the programming improved citizens' access to reliable, objective local news.
3. *The Strengthening Civic Participation Program:* As discussed above, the program has randomly assigned 15 districts to Phase I program activities and the remaining 15 districts to Phase II activities, scheduled to begin in the program's second year. We would complete a baseline citizen survey before program activities begin in late 2010, followed by an outcome survey before Phase II activities begin a year later. This process would allow us to compare a treatment group of districts and a control group of districts to determine the program's impacts on how citizens analyze, monitor, and provide input on local policymaking decisions. Using a dual-frame sample at the district and sector level would also allow us to detect and differentiate between impacts created on a district-wide basis and more local impacts observed only in sectors that received program activities directly. In addition, the surveys would be stratified to ensure adequate representation of three groups: ordinary citizens, citizens targeted by the program, and other stakeholders (such as NGOs or local officials). This approach would permit us to answer questions about how the program affects each group.

## **1. Sampling Design and Power Calculations**

In designing a sampling strategy, we must take several considerations into account. For example, inadequate statistical power can cause a study to conclude that a program *did not* have a meaningful impact when, in fact, it did. This design flaw has undermined the value and credibility of numerous policy evaluations. Researchers can help control for this issue by adjusting their sample sizes: a larger sample size will result in higher statistical power, which in turn will lead to more accurate results regarding meaningful impacts.

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 10

In addition to statistical considerations, the sampling strategy is also affected by practical considerations, such as the partial overlap of the three targeted RTP programs, the implementation timeline, the number of study participants, clustering in the data (due to households in the same cluster having similar outcomes, as opposed to households from different clusters), and the budget. Balancing these practical considerations with the statistical considerations is important when designing a sampling strategy. Table 3 shows the sample sizes needed to detect minimum detectable impacts (MDIs) of 0.1 of a standard deviation, a low effect size, as well as MDIs for a 50 percent subgroup (such as males vs. females).

We propose to design a sampling strategy that will address the sampling needs of the two most rigorous designs available—pair-wise random assignment and comparison group design—which are being implemented for the Strengthening Civic Participation Program and the RNP Inspectorate Services Program, respectively. Depending on the sampling strategy chosen for the Strengthening Civic Participation Program, we could expect to detect an MDI of 0.21 based on a sample of approximately 9,000 respondents and assuming that the variables used to pair districts explain 40 percent of the variability in the outcomes between districts. Increasing the number of respondents by a factor of 6.7, while keeping the rest of the assumptions the same, would lead to insignificant gains in the MDI (MDI = 0.20). However, it is important that we collect good baseline data that explains the differences in outcomes between districts; for example, including variables that explain 75 percent of the differences in outcomes between districts leads to a significant improvement in the MDI (MDI = 0.15).

For the evaluation of the RNP Inspectorate Services Program, the sample sizes required to detect an MDI of .10 vary significantly with the proposed designs—(1) comparing the outcomes of households in sectors with and without the treatment or (2) comparing the outcomes of households living in sectors with the treatment, but who live close to or far away from the complaint boxes. If we select the first design, we would need to survey approximately 6,600 households in 300 sectors, while the second design would require only 3,300 households in 150 sectors to achieve similar MDIs. Also, since ICITAP is implementing the complaint collection program at the sector level, for the first design it is essential to spread the respondents across a larger number of sectors. For example, going from 300 sectors to 200 would require an increase of 242 percent in the total household sample size for the first design (from 6,600 to 16,000), whereas a similar reduction in the number of sectors included in the second design would not significantly change the sample size needed. In other words, the second design offers much higher precision but lower generalizability. We should consider these trade-offs when choosing the final evaluation design.

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
 FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
 DATE: 10/21/2010  
 PAGE: 11

**Table 3. Minimum Detectable Impacts**

Sample Size					Minimum Detectable Impacts	
Total Number of Households	Households per Sector	Sectors per District	Districts	R <sup>2</sup>	Full Sample	50 Percent Subgroup (household level)
<b>RNP Inspectorate Services Program (comparison group design; assignment at the sector level)</b>						
6,600	22	150 T/ 150 C			0.10	0.13
9,600	40	120 T/ 120 C			0.10	0.12
16,000	80	100 T/ 100 C			0.10	0.11
<b>RNP Inspectorate Services Program (comparison group design; assignment within sector)</b>						
3,300	11 T/ 11 C	150			0.10	0.15
3,200	16 T/ 16 C	100			0.10	0.15
<b>Media- Strengthening Program (pre- post design; eight districts assigned to the intervention)</b>						
1,520	19 pre/ 19 post	10	8 T		0.10	0.14
1,520	38 pre/ 38 post	5	8 T		0.10	0.14
<b>Strengthening Civic Participation Program (pair- wise random assignment of districts)</b>						
9,000	30	10	15 T/ 15 C	0.40	0.21	0.22
60,000	200	10	15 T/ 15 C	0.40	0.20	0.20
9,000	30	10	15 T/ 15 C	0.75	0.15	0.17

Notes: The calculations are based on the assumptions that (1) there is one treatment group and one control group for each intervention; (2) the interventions do not interact with each other (e.g., the presence of the Media-Strengthening Program in the same areas as the RNP Inspectorate Services Program is unlikely to affect the outcomes of either program; (3) the statistical significance level will be 0.05 for a two-tailed test with 80 percent statistical power; (4) the intra-class correlation will be 0.05 at the district level (if the district is the level of assignment) and 0.05 at the sector level; (5) for the Media-Strengthening Program, different households within the same sectors and districts will be surveyed for baseline and follow-up data collection to avoid priming (and possibly affecting through the administration of the survey) the outcomes for the baseline households; (6) for the Strengthening Civic Participation Program, R<sup>2</sup> (a measure of the percentage of inter-district variability predicted by observed characteristics) will be either 0.40 at the district level due to pair-wise random assignment of districts or will be 0.75 due to the addition of baseline covariates at the district level.

Finally, the community radio stations created by the Media-Strengthening Program will affect households in eight districts, and its evaluation is based on a pre-post design. To detect a difference of 0.10 standard deviation in the outcomes before and after data collection (MDI = 0.10), 1,520 surveys would need to be administered at baseline and again at followup.

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 12

As we select the specific sectors and households as well as the final number of individuals surveyed, we will need to consider (1) the final evaluation designs agreed upon with MCC, (2) the MDIs, and (3) the overlap between different interventions on the ground. Once we know this information, we can optimize our sampling strategy to address all three interventions while minimizing the burden on participants and the expenses of data collection.

## **2. Survey Instrumentation and Targeted Outcomes**

Mathematica will select a local firm, through a competitive bid, to collect data on knowledge, attitudes, and experiences. We will oversee all aspects of the data collection process, including design and pilot testing, survey management, and preparation of data sets and documentation.

- *Designing and piloting knowledge tests and survey tools.* After reviewing questionnaires that have been used previously in Rwanda and similar settings, we will design survey instruments to measure all key outcomes reliably. With assistance from representative members of the target populations, we will oversee pilot testing of the instruments in all relevant languages and dialects, checking for accuracy and appropriateness of translations, ensuring that all questions are unambiguous and easy to understand, and looking for problems with skip patterns or response categories. During this phase, we will also confirm procedures for administering the survey, obtaining consent, and screening for survey eligibility, and we will test the data entry system. In addition, we will analyze the pilot data for evidence of ceiling or floor effects and to ensure that ranges of values are reasonable, and we will revise the questionnaires, procedures, and data entry system accordingly.
- *Planning and managing the evaluation in the field.* We will develop training materials for the survey interviewers, including agendas, exercises, and tests, to certify the interviewers' competence. We will also create all necessary documentation for survey supervisors and managers, including job descriptions, quality assurance procedures, and training materials for these procedures. Once the survey has begun, we will hold weekly phone meetings with the local firm to check on progress, discuss any problems, and review any changes to protocols or schedules. We will also conduct periodic reviews of data entry files to check for problems with missing or out-of-range information.
- *Preparing clean data sets.* Following data collection, Mathematica will work with the local firm to ensure that the data are correctly entered, complete, and clean. This will include a review of all frequencies for out-of-range responses, missing data, or other problems. We will then provide data sets to MCC with documentation that describes the sample design, questionnaire design, data collection procedures, data editing

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
DATE: 10/21/2010  
PAGE: 13

procedures, coding of verbatim and open-ended responses, and the response rate and weighting used in the survey. We will also provide a codebook that includes information about each variable. All data sets and documentation will be properly de-identified for use by interested members of the academic and development research community.

While the final set of evaluation outcomes will be selected based on further discussions with implementers and the results of survey pre-tests, we have identified the following potential outcomes of interest for each RTP program. To the extent possible given the logistical and political challenges of survey administration in Rwanda, data collection instruments would be designed to measure impacts on the outcomes listed in Table 4.

**Table 4. Evaluation Outcomes of Interest**

Program	Outcomes of Interest
Strengthening RNP Inspectorate Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A better understanding among citizens regarding disciplinary procedures</li><li>• Improved confidence in how the police handle complaints</li><li>• Perceptions of improved police conduct</li></ul>
Media Strengthening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Awareness of community radio station broadcasts and programming</li><li>• Knowledge of local current affairs</li><li>• Access to reliable and objective news sources</li></ul>
Strengthening Civic Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increased ability of citizens to analyze and monitor government performance</li><li>• Improved knowledge of mechanisms and opportunities for citizen participation</li><li>• Increased public input into local policymaking and governance</li></ul>

### **C. NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE**

Because all five RTP programs are already underway, we would have to quickly complete evaluation activities that involve “baseline” data collections to maintain the integrity of the study designs. If MCC chooses to authorize a baseline national survey, we should immediately begin to prepare an RFP for local data collectors and to design survey instruments, with the goal of beginning data collection in fall 2010 (see Table 5). As a next step, we recommend meeting with MCC to discuss the design, scale, and scope of the proposed baseline survey so that the RFP drafting and instrument design work can begin as soon as possible.

MEMO TO: Sophia Sahaf  
 FROM: Matt Sloan and Ira Nichols-Barrer  
 DATE: 10/21/2010  
 PAGE: 14

**Table 5. Possible Data Collection and Analysis Timeline**

Date	Program Implementation	Evaluation Activities
<b>2010</b>		
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RNP completes installation of complaint boxes</li> <li>• National election period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop data collection RFP</li> <li>• Begin designing survey instrument</li> </ul>
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civic participation program completes district needs assessments</li> <li>• Final preparations for initial community radio broadcasts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue RFP and select local data collection firm</li> <li>• Finalize instrument</li> </ul>
October–December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase I civic participation training begins</li> <li>• Community radio broadcasts begin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-test survey instruments</li> <li>• Revise survey based on pre-test findings</li> <li>• Conduct round 1 nationwide data collection</li> </ul>
<b>2011</b>		
January–August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase I civic participation activities continue</li> <li>• RTP Media-Strengthening Program ends, community radio stations may continue operations</li> <li>• RNP Strengthening Program ends, citizen complaint system may continue operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze round 1 data</li> <li>• Prepare summary report with round 1 findings</li> </ul>
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase I civic participation training activities continue, Phase II district needs assessments begin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-test survey instrument</li> </ul>
October–December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civic participation training activities begin in Phase II districts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct round 2 nationwide data collection</li> </ul>
<b>2012</b>		
January–TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase II civic participation training activities continue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze round 2 data</li> <li>• Issue final report presenting all evaluation findings</li> </ul>