

# innovATE

Innovation for Agricultural Training and Education



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



## Agricultural Education and Training Indicators: Background Study

Jessica Childers, Nikki Kernaghan

December 2016

USAID/BFS/ARP-Funded Project

Award Number: AID-OAA-L-12-00002



## Acknowledgments

Innovation for Agricultural Training and Education (InnovATE) is a USAID-funded project supporting the capacity development of agricultural training and education systems from primary school through secondary institutions as well as vocational and technical schools and universities. The InnovATE project, implemented by a consortium of U.S. universities led by Virginia Tech and including Pennsylvania State University, Tuskegee University, and the University of Florida, aims to strengthen the range of institutions that train and educate agricultural professionals.

This document was written as part of a series of InnovATE thematic studies. These research papers examine a particular agricultural education and training (AET) system, cross-cutting theme, model, or technique and offer an analysis of the subject in question. These studies often highlight AET innovations in good practices or examine how agricultural education and training intersects with other development issues that are important to AET capacity building.

This project was made possible by the United States Agency for International Development and the generous support of the American people through USAID Cooperative Agreement No. AID-OAA-L-12-00002. For more information about the InnovATE project and other publications visit our website at <http://www.oired.vt.edu/innovate>, or follow us on Twitter, @InnovATE, or Facebook, [www.facebook.com/InnovATEAgEd](http://www.facebook.com/InnovATEAgEd). Contact us at [innovateprogram@vt.edu](mailto:innovateprogram@vt.edu) or call 540-231-6338

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Evaluation and Indicators.....	2
<i>Types of Indicators</i> .....	3
Indicators Currently In Use.....	4
Developing Custom Indicators .....	4
Discussion of Existing AET Indicators .....	6
Recommendations.....	7
Appendix A: Agricultural Indicators.....	9
Appendix B: Extension Indicators.....	17
Appendix C: Education Indicators .....	20
Appendix D: Other Related Indicators (Including Project-Level) .....	26
References.....	29
Additional Resources.....	30

## Introduction

The InnovATE project, in discussion with USAID, identified as a special topic study a review of existing indicators related to AET. Through this review, it was hoped to understand better the indicators used for AET projects and facilitate ongoing conversations around AET evaluation. This report provides a situational analysis of indicators currently in use and the development of custom indicators. The first section of the report introduces indicators through an overview of how they fit into the project design and evaluation processes. The second section introduces indicators currently used to evaluate AET at agency- and project-levels. The third section provides guidance on the development of custom indicators. The fourth section of this review discusses existing AET indicators, while the final section provides recommendations for developing and institutionalizing AET indicators at USAID.

This background study is a compilation of literature and other resources on AET evaluation indicators. Resources incorporated in this study come from funding agency reporting requirements, individual projects that have developed and/or used indicators for AET evaluation, published reports, and professional organization resources.

## Evaluation and Indicators

USAID's Evaluation Policy defines evaluation as "the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of programs and projects as a basis for judgments, to improve effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about current and future programming" (2011, p. 2). USAID encourages the evaluation of all projects as appropriate (USAID Bureau For Policy, Planning And Learning: Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research, 2011). An evaluation plan provides guidance and structure for gathering evidence related to the status of the program, whether it is meeting its intended goals and audiences' needs, how well it is accomplishing its objectives, if it is having an impact on the targeted audiences, and a timeline of the program's implementation and major activities (Better Evaluation, 2014).

Evaluations are typically guided by the established program logic, theory of change, and/or a question or set of questions; the program logic or theory of change provides an underlying structure for evaluation, detailing the components (inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes) of the program. Each of these project components can have, and the World Bank (Kusek & Rist, 2004) recommends that they have, associated indicators which allow for the regular monitoring of progress and achievement of program goals. Guided by the program logic, indicators developed for the program's components provide empirical evidence for what the program is achieving (particularly related to objectives), who it is interacting with (including targeted audiences and unintended beneficiaries), and the outcomes of the program for its targeted audiences (Kusek & Rist, 2004).

Developing a strong evaluation system should be a collaborative effort for a project or funding agency. Setting up an M&E plan requires customization to the project's unique goals and setting, as well as incorporating the needs of the funding agency and decision makers. Conducting evaluations may require special considerations for the project, including bringing in additional staff and experts, costs of time and effort, and delays to the start of the project or interruptions in project delivery to beneficiaries. Establishing a good M&E plan during the design phase of a project, while not always practical given the time constraints, can be beneficial in the long run.

As a best practice, indicators should be selected and developed during project planning (Parsons, Gokey, & Thornton, 2013). This ensures that the project is measuring relevant information from the beginning that will allow the project managers to track and monitor progress over the life of the project and produce useful information attributable to the program. Multiple indicators can be used or combined to answer an evaluation question or represent a larger concept or goal for the program.

## *Types of Indicators*

Each component of a program can be monitored and evaluated using indicators. The components, definitions, and examples of indicators associated with each are detailed in this section.

**Input indicators** represent the resources, including human, fiscal, and physical, that are allocated to a project or program and necessary for its implementation. Examples of these indicators include the number of staff members, amount of operating budget, availability of vehicles used to travel to field sites, access to office space, etc.

**Process indicators** are related to the implementation of a program and its activities. Process or activity indicators “provide an important project management tool” that describes the implementation of a program and reveals gaps between planned versus actual implementation (Parsons, Gokey, & Thornton, 2013, p. 12). These indicators are related to the internal processes (which staff member is responsible, actions taken by that person, etc.) necessary to implement a project. These indicators “are most valuable when you are able to connect a given set of activities to a particular output or outcome” (Parsons, Gokey, & Thornton, 2013, p. 12)

**Output indicators** represent what was actually done by the project and include the products and activities delivered by a program. Often, output indicators are quantitative measures, such as numbers of trainings or workshops held, number of papers and publications produced, number of hits on a website or social media as a representation of outreach, number of people trained to use a new technology in the field, etc. Output indicators should be monitored “at regular intervals over the life course of an initiative, as a way of assessing progress towards project goals and detecting delays” (Parsons, Gokey, & Thornton, 2013, p. 13).

**Outcome indicators** are related to outputs via a cause-and-effect relationship; ideally, the outputs should cause the outcome. Outcome indicators represent the immediate or short-term change the project wishes to effect and provide parameters for a successfully implemented program (Parsons, Gokey, & Thornton, 2013; Kusek & Rist, 2004). Examples of outcome indicators include number of people implementing a new strategy learned at a training and the development of new policies or changes in existing policies based on papers and publications produced.

**Impact indicators** “describe progress made towards higher-level goals” and can be quantitative or qualitative (Parsons, Gokey, & Thornton, 2013, p. 15). These types of indicators provide evidence of a longer-term change and can be “shared with other development partners and national government agencies” working towards the same goal (Parsons, Gokey, & Thornton, 2013, p. 15). An example of an impact indicator used by USAID’s Feed the Future (FTF) is the percent change in agricultural gross domestic product (measured in local currency, using the first measurement as a baseline and held constant at the baseline local currency rate over subsequent measurements); another example from USAID’s Africa Lead project is the percentage change in private sector investment in agriculture.

## Indicators Currently In Use

The [appendices](#) include tables of current and past indicators used to monitor and evaluate agriculture, education, extension, and AET initiatives at the agency and project-levels within USAID. Individual projects are required to report on agency-level indicators, but also have project-specific indicators to aid in the improvement of program delivery and tracking of the project's goal achievement. In searching for indicators, it became evident that agency-level indicators focus on broad sectors such as agriculture or education; AET projects pull from these broad sectors to select indicators to use in their monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans and create custom indicators for the specific aspect of AET their project was working on.

To avoid duplication of indicators in the tables, indicators are included only once. Additionally, for individual projects which report on agency-level indicators, only unique indicators are included; agency-level indicators relevant to either Agriculture or AET are reported only once.

The indicator type is included in the tables as it is denoted by USAID or the project. In reviewing the tables, note the abundance of output and outcome indicators and the lack of impact and process indicators. It is important to note that the type of indicator can change (i.e., an output can become an outcome, or vice versa) depending on the goals of the project and how the indicator is used.

## Developing Custom Indicators

Custom indicators allow for the monitoring and evaluation of specific areas of interest to the project that facilitates improved implementation of activities and services. The development of custom indicators should involve measurement and content-area specialists, project staff, and project managers and funding agency representatives who are responsible for making decisions regarding the project (Horsch, 1997).

Based on a USAID TIPS document from 2010, the two major considerations for selecting an indicator are: (1) how well the indicator measures what it is supposed to measure and (2) whether the indicator can consistently measure what it is supposed to measure across time, which allows comparisons to be made across time (Performance Monitoring & Evaluation TIPS: Selecting Performance Indicators). The TIPS document also includes an "Indicator Selection Criteria Checklist" which provides the following

attributes as necessary for indicators: “Direct, Objective, Useful for Management, Attributable, Practical, Adequate, and Disaggregated (as necessary)” (p. 11).

Furthermore, there are two useful acronyms to keep in mind: SMART and CREAM. SMART stands for: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound. A SMART indicator should specifically state what it claims to measure, should be able to be measured (either quantitatively or qualitatively), and should be practical and appropriate to the project with a given period of time. The second acronym, CREAM, stands for: Clear, Relevant, Economic, Adequate, and Monitorable. Much like SMART, the indicator should clearly state the information it examines, be appropriate for the project and representative of the concept of interest, be not overly expensive or burdensome to collect, and be able to be measured.

Related to SMART and CREAM indicators, a 1997 brief written for the Harvard Family Research Project outlined several questions for choosing indicators, which are also relevant to developing indicators. The questions include:

- “Does this indicator enable one to know about the expected result or condition?”
- Is the indicator defined in the same way over time? Are data for the indicator collected in the same way over time?
- Will data be available for an indicator?
- Are data currently being collected? If not, can cost effective instruments for data collection be developed?
- Is this indicator important to most people? Will this indicator provide sufficient information about a condition or result to convince both supporters and skeptics?
- Is the indicator quantitative?” (Horsch, 1997)

The last question in the quote above is exemplary of the bias towards quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation. Indeed, the tables included in this report show the prevalence of quantitative indicators for agriculture, education, extension, and AET at the organization and project-levels, including the custom indicators.

The Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI) developed custom indicators to help monitor progress towards its goal of “strengthen[ing] training and collaborative research capacities of Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) and the Tanzanian Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives (MAFC) with the goal of improving food security and agricultural productivity in Tanzania” (Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI), n.d.) Based on this goal, iAGRI developed objectives and sub-objectives for the program, as well as custom indicators to measure progress towards each objective. For example, the custom indicators below contribute to tracking progress towards the



objective of “Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities” through the sub-component of “Increased capacity of women to participate in agriculture and nutrition” (Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI), 2016):

1. Number of high school girls provided with career guidance and counselling program (Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI), 2016)
2. Number of actions supportive of gender mainstreaming at Sokoine University of Agriculture (Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI), 2016)

Data for each indicator is collected during each quarter of the project; it is included in a quarterly report to the funding agency (USAID) along with the target for the current year, the target for the life of the project, and a cumulative total for previous years.

## Discussion of Existing AET Indicators

In terms of publicly accessible information on AET indicators, resources such as the Development Experience Clearinghouse, AidData, and other clearinghouse-type sites (included in the [Additional Resources](#) section at the end of this paper) provide information on some aspects of development projects, but generally do not post specific indicators used to monitor and evaluate a project or detail how they were developed. Particularly for AET, most project-level indicators are outputs and outcomes and tend to be quantitative, with very few impact indicators. Impact indicators are important because they show the long-term effect of a project on its target population, which can take years beyond the end of a project to reveal themselves. This makes measuring the impact of a project a difficult, or impossible, task. Funding agencies do not tend to allocate funds for a project to conduct impact evaluation studies years after it has ended.

There is also an abundance of quantitative indicators and a lack of qualitative indicators (especially for FTF and including custom indicators developed for specific projects). The lack of qualitative indicators limits the ability of the project and funding agency to determine and share the full story of the project’s impact on the target population (and unintentional beneficiaries).

An additional issue for AET, that was mentioned previously, is that agency-level indicators tend to not focus on AET, but rather on components such as agriculture and education. Importantly, the development of custom indicators tends to be limited to information related to an individual project, as opposed to broad AET indicators that could be used across multiple AET projects. The next section of this report makes recommendations for AET indicators to be added to USAID’s indicator bank.

## Recommendations

The first recommendation is to adapt existing custom indicators developed by USAID-funded projects and add them to USAID's standard indicators list (see Table 1). There are a number of project-specific indicators that are appropriate for USAID to institutionalize for the monitoring and evaluation of AET. For example, many projects have individual indicators for program evaluations and assessments they have conducted. The ERA project looks at the organizational level (Number of AETR institutions conducting self-assessments to improve institutional performance, 1.3.4); while INGENAES tracks the "Number of assessments conducted in country to identify extension and advisory service needs and opportunities." MEAS collects counts for "Evaluations of extension programs/practices completed" and "Country extension systems assessed." The HED project looked at the "Number of evaluations/impact assessments carried out whose findings have been published or widely distributed." InnovATE uses counts for "Number of institutions/organizations undergoing capacity/competency assessments as a result of USG assistance" (C1) and "Number of institutions/organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance" (C2). The InnovATE project does go one step further with its custom Design indicators, collecting counts of evaluations conducted, plans developed and implemented, and institutions strengthened (AET system program evaluation, D2; AET reform and investment plans designed, D3; AET reform and investment plans implemented, D5; AET institutions strengthened, D6).

A common output indicator is the number of trainings or workshops conducted and the number of attendees. However, the Africa Lead II project goes one step further looking for the desired outcome of training participation: the application of knowledge or skills gained from the training. Their indicator is the "Percentage of individuals trained in leadership/management techniques who apply new knowledge and skills acquired". While more difficult to collect data on, it is none-the-less important to understand if and how attendees use the information from trainings and workshops.

An additional outcome of education is employment, which exists as USAID indicator (Percentage of graduates from USG-supported tertiary education programs reporting themselves as employed, 3.2.2-37). However, this indicator is interested in USG-supported individuals. If employment within AET as a system is of interest, then institutions need to have a system for tracking alumni. The ERA project has an indicator that provides this information (Number of AETR institutions tracking the employment of graduates, 1.3.3).

<b>Table 1. Recommended changes for existing custom indicators</b>		
Project	Custom Indicator Used	Recommendations for adapting for AET broadly
iAGRI	IR 3/Sub IR 3.2/OSU 1.3.2.4 Percentage change in the female secondary school students with intention to applying for admission to agriculture and science degree programs at Sokoine university	Actual number or percentage of women who 1) apply to, 2) are admitted, and 3) graduate from agriculture and science degree programs at universities in a given country
ERA	Number of AETR professors trained in syllabus development/curriculum design	Number of AETR instructors trained in syllabus development/curriculum design
ERA	Number of AETR institutions tracking the employment of graduates	Number of AETR institutions tracking the employment of graduates
Africa Lead II	Percentage of individuals trained in leadership/management techniques who apply new knowledge and skills acquired	Percentage of individuals trained in AET who apply new knowledge and skills acquired

One of the simplest ways to adapt many of the existing indicators to account for gender is to disaggregate, where appropriate, by sex. Focusing on gender in AET, iAGRI has a number of exemplary indicators (Number of research projects conducted which specifically focus on gender, IR 1/Sub IR 1.1/OSU 1.1.1.5; Number of young female students provided with women-to- women mentorship program, IR 3/Sub IR 3.2/OSU 1.3.2.1). One indicator in particular seems particularly useful when discussing gender and AET; that is the “Percentage change in the female secondary school students with intention to applying for admission to agriculture and science degree programs at Sokoine University” (IR 3/Sub IR 3.2/OSU 1.3.2.4 ). This indicator can be altered to track the actual number or percentage of women who apply to, are admitted, and graduate from agriculture and science degree programs at universities in a given country.

The hope is that the information compiled in this document acts as a resource for conversations related to AET evaluation, including the development and institutionalization of AET indicators (including quantitative, qualitative, impact, and systems) at USAID. One final recommendation is to convene an expert group of project leaders, USAID representatives, AET and evaluation specialists to recommend or develop indicators for AET that could be incorporated into USAID’s indicator bank.

## Appendix A: Agricultural Indicators

Agency/Project	USAID		
Objective Title	Agriculture		
Reference #	Indicator Title	Indicator Type	Notes
4.5.1-21	Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance	Output	
4.5.1-22	Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated	Outcome	
4.5.1-26	Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time)	Outcome	
4.5.2-14	Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance	Output	
4.5.2-23	Value of incremental sales (collected at farm- level) attributed to FTF implementation	Outcome	
4.5.2-25	Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	
4.5.2-32	Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	
4.5.2-35	Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities	Outcome	
4.5.2-36	Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	
4.5.2-40	Number of hectares of agricultural land (fields, rangeland, agro-forests) showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance	Output	
4.5.2-41	Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken	Output	
4.5-11	Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities	Outcome	
4.5-15	Agricultural gross domestic product		
4.5.1-21	Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance	Output	
4.5.1-22	Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated	Outcome	

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Africa Lead</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Better prioritized, designed, managed and measured agriculture policies, programs, and enterprises in Africa</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
G1.3	Percentage change in private sector investment in agriculture	Impact	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved institutional effectiveness for increased sustainable agriculture productivity and food security</b>		
SO1.1	Number of countries implementing prioritized and coordinated action plans based on their NAIPs	Outcome	
SO1.2	Percentage of countries with improved year over year “Ease of Doing Business in Agriculture Index” ranking (BBA)	Outcome	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Intermediate Result 1: Improved capacity among key institutions to achieve their mandates in developing and managing national agricultural and food security programs</b>		
1.1	Percentage of individuals trained in leadership/management techniques who apply new knowledge and skills acquired	Outcome	
1.3	Percentage of institutions/organizations that show overall improvements in organizational capacity assessments and performance index	Outcome	
1.4	Number of organizational/institutional capacity assessments completed with support from AL II	Output	
1.6	Number of food security-related events supported by AL II	Output	
1.7	Number of participants attending food security related events supported by Africa Lead II	Output	% Women also reported
1.8	Number of organizations at the national and regional level receiving technical assistance under AL II	Output	
1.9	Number of organizations/institutions supported by AL II	Output	

<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Intermediate Result 2: Enhanced capacity to manage policy change and reform across Africa</b>		
2.2	Number of agriculture policies in countries' G-8 Cooperation Framework policy matrices that have been advanced along the policy development continuum	Outcome	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Intermediate Result 3: More inclusive development and implementation of agriculture and food security policies and programs, through greater engagement of NSAs</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
3.4	Percentage of countries that have NSAs actively participating in JSR Steering Committee	Outcome	
3.5	Percentage of countries that have women's organizations actively participating in JSR Steering Committee	Outcome	
3.6	Percentage of NSAs that report satisfaction with their JSR participation	Outcome	
3.7	Percentage of policy commitments adopted by AU and national governments that are informed by CAADP NSA's policy agenda	Outcome	
3.8	Percentage of constituents represented by agriculture-focused NSAs participating in the JSR process	Outcome	

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Feed the Future</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased agricultural sector productivity</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
4.5.2-11	Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance	Output	
4.5.2-27	Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance	Output	
4.5.2-34	Number of people implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	

4.5.2-42	Number of private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	
4.5.2-5	Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	
4.5.2-6	Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	Output	Disaggregated by sex
4.5.2-7	Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	Output	Disaggregated by sex
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation</b>		
4.5.1-28	Hectares under new or improved/rehabilitated irrigation or drainage services as a result of USG assistance	Output	
4.5.2-13	Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions	Output	
4.5.2-2	Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	
4.5.2-39	Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance in Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance in Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance	Output	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services</b>		
4.5.2-29	Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans	Output	Implementing Partners
4.5.2-30	Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans	Output	Implementing Partners
4.5.2-37	Number of micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources	Output	Implementing Partners

<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved Agricultural Policy Environment (increase productivity)</b>		
4.5.1-24	Number of agricultural and nutritional enabling environment policies completing the following processes/steps of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analysis Stage 2: Stakeholder consultation/public debate Stage 3: Drafting or revision Stage 4: Approval (legislative or regulatory) Stage 5: Full and effective implementation	Steps 1,2, & 3: Output Steps 4 & 5: Outcome	Implementing Partners
4.5.1-TBD9	Number of national policies supporting regionally agreed-upon policies for which a national-level implementation action has been taken as a result of USG assistance (Regional missions only)	Outcome	Regional USAID Missions w/ bilateral Missions
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved Agricultural Productivity</b>		
4.5-16	Farmer's gross margin per unit of land	Outcome	1. Hectares planted (for crops); Number of animals (for milk, eggs); or Area (ha) of ponds or Number of crates (for fish); 2. Total Production (same unit of measure as Quantity of Sales); 3. Value of Sales (USD); 4. Quantity of Sales (same unit of measure as Total Production); 5. Purchased recurrent input costs (USD); Enter the five data points into FTFMS for baseline and actual reporting. Data should be entered <u>disaggregated to the lowest level – i.e. by commodity then by sex under each commodity.</u>
4.5-17	Farmer's gross margin per unit of animal (animals selected varies by country)	Outcome	1. Number of animals (for milk, eggs); or Area (ha) of ponds or Number of crates (for fish); 2. Total Production (same unit of measure as Quantity of Sales); 3. Value of Sales (USD); 4. Quantity of Sales (same unit of measure as Total Production); 5. Purchased recurrent input costs (USD); Enter the five data points into FTFMS for baseline and actual reporting. Data should be entered <u>disaggregated to the lowest level – i.e. by commodity then by sex under each commodity.</u>



4.5-18	Farmer's gross margin per crate (crops selected varies by country)	Outcome	1. Hectares planted (for crops); 2. Total Production (same unit of measure as Quantity of Sales); 3. Value of Sales (USD); 4. Quantity of Sales (same unit of measure as Total Production); 5. Purchased recurrent input costs (USD); Enter the five data points into FTFMS for baseline and actual reporting. Data should be entered <u>disaggregated to the lowest level – i.e. by commodity then by sex under each commodity.</u>
4.5-16	Farmer's gross margin per unit of land	Outcome	1. Hectares planted (for crops); Number of animals (for milk, eggs); or Area (ha) of ponds or Number of crates (for fish); 2. Total Production (same unit of measure as Quantity of Sales); 3. Value of Sales (USD); 4. Quantity of Sales (same unit of measure as Total Production); 5. Purchased recurrent input costs (USD); Enter the five data points into FTFMS for baseline and actual reporting. Data should be entered <u>disaggregated to the lowest level – i.e. by commodity then by sex under each commodity.</u>
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved Market Efficiency</b>		
4.5.1-17	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed	Output	
4.5-10	Total increase in installed storage capacity (m3)	Output	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth</b>		
4.5-19	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index	Impact	M&E contractor 1. Score for 5DE sub-index; 2. Score for GPI sub-index 3. Total population in the ZOI
4.5-3	Percent change in agricultural gross domestic product (GDP)	Impact	Mission or M&E contractor 1. Baseline Ag GDP in 2010 (local currency) (entered only once) 2. Reporting year Ag GDP (constant 2010 local currency) (entered annually)

4.5-9	Daily per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas	Outcome	M&E contractor 1. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) of sample; 2. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) of FNM households from sample; 3. Total population of people in FNM households in the ZOI; 4. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) MNF households from sample; 5. Total population of people in MNF households in the ZOI; 6. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) in M&F households from sample; 7. Total population of people in M&F households in the ZOI; 8. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) in CNA households from sample; 9. Total population of people in CNA households in the ZOI
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Increased employment opportunities in Project-level, targeted value chains</b>		
4.5-2	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	Outcome	Implementing Partners
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Increased Investment in Agriculture and Nutrition-related Activities</b>		
4.5.2-12	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance	Output	Implementing Partners Disaggregated by 1)Agricultural production, 2) Agricultural post harvest transformation, 3)Nutrition, 4) Other, 5)Multi-focus
4.5.2-38	Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation	Outcome	Implementing Partners
4.5.2-43	Number of firms (excluding farms) or CSOs engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance	Outcome	Implementing Partners

<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Increased Public Sector Investment</b>		
4.5-12	Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture	Outcome	Mission or M&E Contractor 1. Numerator: amount of national budget in USD allocated to Ministry of Agriculture 2. Denominator: total national budget amount in USD
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened</b>		
4.5.1-25	Number of households with formalized land	Outcome	Implementing Partners

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI)</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved Enabling Policy Environment for both Agriculture and Nutrition</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
IR 8/Sub IR 8.1/OSU 1.4.1	Number of policy issues in agriculture, natural resources and environment, climate change and nutrition researched and analysed as a result of FtF assistance		
IR 8/Sub IR 8.2/OSU 1.4.2.1	Number of USG- supported policy dialogue events held that are related to improving the enabling environment for agriculture and nutrition		

## Appendix B: Extension Indicators

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Higher Education</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
3.2.2-40	Number of academic research initiatives whose findings have been replicated, applied, or taken to market		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Capacity building</b>		
CBLD-4	Percent of mission awards with organizational capacity development objectives or activities that require reporting on capacity development metrics on a regular basis	Output	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>		
STIR-1	Score on the Innovation Capacity Index among countries receiving USG assistance for science, technology and innovation programs.	Outcome	
STIR-6	Number of scientific studies published or conference presentations given as a result of USG assistance for research programs.	Outcome	
STIR-7	Number of new, USG-funded awards to institutions in support of research.	Output	
STIR-8	Person hours of training completed in formal science or science-related training courses supported by the USG	Output	
STIR-9	Number of new research collaborations established between USG-supported beneficiaries and other institutions	Output	

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Education and Research in Agriculture Senegal (ERA) (mid-term evaluation)</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
2.2.1	Number of farmers who have applied new technologies or management practices developed by institutions supported by USAID/ERA as a result of USG assistance (16)		
2.2.2	Number of partnerships developed to deliver training services to local farmers and the private sector (22)		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Feed The Future</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Increased Public Sector Investment</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
3.1.9.3 (1)	Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition	Outcome	Mission or M&E Contractor 1. Numerator: amount of national budget in USD allocated to nutrition 2. Denominator: total national budget amount in USD

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Integrating Gender and Nutrition within Agricultural Extension Services (INGENAES)</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved Enabling Policy Environment for both Agriculture and Nutrition</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	Number of <b>mentor-mentee</b> extension-related relationships initiated		
	Number of individual extension service organizations applying integrated gender strategies and/or components.		
	Number of extension service providers applying integrated nutrition strategies and/or components.		
	Number of <b>assessments conducted</b> in country to identify extension and advisory service needs and opportunities		
	Number of <b>technologies assessed</b> in terms of how suited they are to meet women's needs as well as what the barriers to adoption may be		
	Number of <b>training workshops</b> for agriculture and nutrition extension advisory services conducted		
	Number of <b>country level or regional fora</b> on gender and nutrition in extension and advisory services held		
	Number of <b>global symposia</b> on gender and nutrition in extension and advisory services held		
	Number of <b>field level activities</b> carried out with at least one subawardee per country		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Modernizing Extension and Advisory Services (MEAS)</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Disseminate Modern Approaches to Extension</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1.4	Extension staff trained	Output	
1.7	Programs/institutions using MEAS training modules and materials	Output	
1.8	Extension specialists registered in global network	Outcome	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Document Lessons Learned &amp; Good Practice</b>		
2.4	Evaluations of extension programs / practices completed	Output	
2.7	New extension strategies/ approaches/ methods defined	Output	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Design Modern Extension &amp; Advisory Service Systems</b>		
3.1	Country extension systems assessed	Output	
3.2	Private enterprises and client organizations receiving project assistance	Output	
3.3	Good practice reforms incorporated into private sector extension services	Outcome	
3.4	Good practice reforms incorporated into public extension programs	Outcome	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Extension</b>		
4.2	Rural clients receiving improved services from extension systems		

## Appendix C: Education Indicators

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Higher Education</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
3.2.2-38	Number of USG-supported tertiary education programs that adopt policies and/or procedures to strengthen transparency of admissions and/or to increase access of underserved and disadvantaged groups		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
3.2.2-33	Percent of USG-funded tertiary education and workforce development programs that include experiential and/or applied learning opportunities.	Output	
3.2.2-36	Number of USG-supported tertiary programs with curricula revised with private and/or public sector employers' input or on the basis of market research	Output	
3.2.2-37	Percentage of graduates from USG-supported tertiary education programs reporting themselves as employed		
3.2.2-39	Number of US-supported tertiary educational programs that develop or implement industry-recognized skills certification		
3.2.2-41	Number of individuals from underserved and/or disadvantaged groups accessing tertiary education programs		
3.2.2-42	Number of tertiary institution faculty or teaching staff whose qualifications are strengthened through USG-supported tertiary education programs		

Agency/Project	<b>USAID/Education and Research in Agriculture Senegal (ERA)</b>		
Objective Title	<b>Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training</b>		
Reference #	Indicator Title	Indicator Type	Notes
1.1.1	Number of AETR professors trained in syllabus development/curriculum design		
1.1.2	Number of syllabi developed by AETR institutions		
1.1.3	Number of students in classrooms receiving course syllabi		
1.2.2	Number of faculty members and students trained in: Faculty members (distance and distributed learning, subject matter competencies, other); Students (distance and distributed learning, career management, other)		
1.2.4	Number of AETR faculty members and students registered on Innovate's online community of practice		
1.3.3	Number of AETR institutions tracking the employment of graduates		
1.3.4	Number of AETR institutions conducting self-assessments to improve institutional performance		
1.1.1	Number of graduates at the License, Masters, and Doctorate levels (USAID/ERA Outcome Indicator).	Outcome	Disaggregated by gender and level (License, Masters, Doctorate)
	Number of graduates at the Diploma and technical certificate levels (USAID/ERA Outcome Indicator).	Outcome	Disaggregated by gender and level (Diploma, Technical Certificate)
	Number of AETR supported to develop syllabus/curriculum		
	Number of curricula revisions completed with detailed course outlines		
	Number of graduates from AETRs obtaining employment in their field		
	Number of AETR members trained		This indicator is disaggregated by training to take into account all activities implemented in training area (Administration, Finance or M&E; International program exchange research, consulting networking; and Strategic documents implementation)
1.1.2	Number of AETRs provided with 1) improved ICT infrastructure and equipment (USAID/ERA Output Indicator); 2) Improved non- ICT infrastructure and equipment (USAID/ERA Output Indicator); 3) Laboratory equipment; or 4) special tools and equipment for advanced research	Output	



	Number of AETRs conducting distance and distributed learning programs through ICT infrastructure (USAID/ERA Output Indicator)	Output	
1.1.3	Number of higher education partnerships between international institutions and host country higher education institutions that address regional, national, and local development needs (USAID/State Standard Indicator)		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Management and Policy Support</b>		
3.1.2	Number of AETR institutions completing performance contracts with their respective ministries as a of FtF assistance		
3.2.1	Number of AETR stakeholder action plans for improving higher education policies for quality assurance		
3.3.1	Number of AETR institutions using databases tracking student academic records, performance and post- graduate occupations (29)		
	Number of AET institutions using accounting software to manage program finances and to generate reports (30)		
	Number of students participating in private sector internships (32)		
	Number of private sector participants in international study tours (33)		
	Number of private sector/AETR joint training programs (35)		
	Number Private sectors partners identified for partnership development with AETR institutions		
	Number of Private Sector partners note of interest for having partnership with AETR institutions		
	Number of Private Sector/university research collaborations		
	Number of GDA partners identified		
3.3.2	Number of GDA partners note of interest		
	Number of institutions with improved Management Information Systems, as a result of USG Assistance. (USAID/State Standard Indicator) (25)		
	Number of AET institutions using database (26)		
	Number of “bureaux d’insertion” using database to assist students as a student support service (28)		
	Number of cross component study tours		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Higher Education for Development</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	HED will work with higher education institutions and USAID Missions, bureaus, and technical sectors to design RFAs resulting in 10 or more collaborative partnerships (4-8 solicitations annually--Leader and Associate Awards).		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	Number of RFAs designed		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>HED will widely distribute RFAs and conduct fair and transparent application review, and nomination processes for partnership selection resulting in broad participation from the U.S. higher education community.</b>		
	Number of contacts through which RFA was advertised		
	Number of applications received		
	Number of peer reviews organized and completed		
	Number of peer reviewers		
	Number of applications recommended for funding		
	Number of collaborative partnerships funded		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Partnerships between U.S. and host country higher education institutions will result in improved institutional capacity to offer technical assistance for addressing development goals in host countries.</b>		
	Number of higher education institution engagement/outreach activities in community		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Partnerships between U.S. and host country higher education institutions will result in improved human capacity of higher education professionals' to address teaching, research, and public service resulting in measurable effects on regional and national development goals.</b>		
	Number of host-country individuals (EXCLUDING faculty) who completed USG-funded long-term programs resulting in academic degrees or professional or technical certificates (Long-term qualifications strengthening - EXCLUDING faculty/teaching staff)		
	Number of host country individuals who completed USG-funded short-term training or exchange programs involving higher education institutions (Short-term qualifications strengthening - ALL individuals)		

	Number of host-country institution faculty and/or teaching staff who enrolled in long-term training programs for qualifications strengthening [Training - Long Term (Enrolled)]		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>HED will secure advisory assistance/expertise from the higher education community to support USAID Bureaus, Missions and technical sectors' strategic objectives.</b>		
	Number of technical assistance field visits to USAID missions (by team members/composition)		
	Number of technical assistance requests from USAID missions and or Bureaus received		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>HED will sponsor/promote a series of research studies, roundtables, conferences related to global development issues.</b>		
	Number of technical presentations given by HED staff at higher education and international development conferences and/or institutions/organizations		
	Number of roundtables and/or conferences organized by HED		
	Number of new technical resources or other related documents and materials that HED creates for the higher education community		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>HED will design and implement performance management processes, evaluations, and impact assessments that support USAID's education strategy and policy</b>		
	Number of evaluations/impact assessments carried out whose findings have been published or widely distributed		
	Number of monitoring visits across HED portfolio		
	Number of updated and/or new HED performance management processes		
	Number of research activities conducted by HED		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Integrating Gender and Nutrition within Agricultural Extension Services (INGENAES)</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	Number of <b>faculty, staff, students, and consultants</b> engaged in project		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI)</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Improved Agricultural Productivity</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
IR 1/Sub IR 1.1/OSU1.1.1.1	Number of students assessed for Graduate level English competency		Disaggregated by sex
IR 1/Sub IR 1.1/OSU1.1.1.5	Number of research projects conducted which specifically focus on gender		
IR 1/Sub IR 1.1/OSU1.1.1.6	Number of students making use of improved ICT in classroom instruction		Disaggregated by sex
IR 1/Sub IR 1.1/OSU1.1.1.9	Number of researchers trained on Randomized Control Trials (RCTs)		Disaggregated by sex
IR 1/Sub IR 1.2/OSU 1.2.1.1	Number of research projects that address issues of climate change		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities</b>		
IR 3/Sub IR 3.2/OSU 1.3.2.1	Number of young female students provided with women-to-women mentorship program		
IR 3/Sub IR 3.2/OSU 1.3.2.2	Number of high school girls provided with career guidance and counselling program		
IR 3/Sub IR 3.2/OSU 1.3.2.4	Percentage change in the female secondary school students with intention to applying for admission to agriculture and science degree programs at Sokoine university		
IR 3/Sub IR 3.2/OSU 1.3.2.5	Number of actions supportive of gender mainstreaming at Sokoine University of Agriculture		
IR 3/Sub IR 3.3/OSU 1.3.3.1	Number of people participating in study tours as a result of FtF assistance		Disaggregated by sex

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Innovation for Agricultural Training and Education (InnovATE)</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Train</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
T2	Short term training supported for curriculum development		
T4	Number of training module users		

## Appendix D: Other Related Indicators (Including Project-Level)

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Science, Technology and Innovation/Research</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
STIR-2	Number of tools, technologies, or practices introduced to the commercial sector.	Outcome	
STIR-3	Number of new businesses established based on a new technology or innovation .	Outcome	
STIR-4	Person hours of training completed in science and technology workforce supported by the USG.	Output	
STIR-5	Gross domestic expenditure on research and development (GERD) as percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) for beneficiary countries, as measured by UNESCO Institute for Statistics	Outcome	

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Africa Lead</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Intermediate Result 1: Improved capacity among key institutions to achieve their mandates in developing and managing national agricultural and food security programs</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1.1	Percentage of individuals trained in leadership/management techniques who apply new knowledge and skills acquired	Outcome	
1.3	Percentage of institutions/organizations that show overall improvements in organizational capacity assessments and performance index	Outcome	
1.4	Number of organizational/institutional capacity assessments completed with support from AL II	Output	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Intermediate Result 2: Enhanced capacity to manage policy change and reform across Africa</b>		
2.1	Number of countries with a strengthened JSR process as measured by milestones of a "Strong JSR"	Outcome	
2.4	Number of countries receiving Africa Lead II assistance	Output	

2.5	Number of countries with completed IAAs that are validated in stakeholder workshops	Output	
2.6	Number of JSR workshops conducted/facilitated	Output	

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Feed The Future</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
3.2.2-35	Number of U.S.-host country joint development research projects	Outcome	
3.2.2-40	Number of USG-supported research initiatives whose findings have been applied, replicated or taken to market		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Innovation for Agricultural Training and Education (InnovATE)</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
C1	Number of institutions/organizations undergoing capacity/competency assessments as a result of USG assistance		
C2	Number of institutions/organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Learn</b>		
L1	Number of users accessing project databases		
L2	Studies completed (background/thematic studies)		
L3	AET assessment tools developed		
L4	Technical notes and good practice papers disseminated		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Design</b>		
D1	Consultancies for AET development linkages and AET support services		
D2	AET system program evaluations		
D3	AET reform and investment plans designed		
D4	Institutional linkages established		
D5	AET reform and investment plans implemented		
D6	AET institutions strengthened		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Train</b>		
T6	Development practitioners trained in AET		
T7	Development professionals trained in AET		
T8	Regional/international symposia hosted		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Integrating Gender and Nutrition within Agricultural Extension Services (INGENAES)</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	Number of <b>seminars</b> (1-2 hours) presented		
	Number of <b>knowledge products</b> prepared		
	Number of individuals registered in INGENAES network		

<b>Agency/Project</b>	<b>USAID/Modernizing Extension and Advisory Services (MEAS)</b>		
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Disseminate Modern Approaches to Extension</b>		
<b>Reference #</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1.1	Training Modules developed	Outcome	
1.2a	Training Workshops conducted (1-5 days long)	Output	
1.3	Technical Notes / Good Practice Papers prepared	Output	
1.5	Professionals (from USAID and development partners) trained	Output	
1.6	Policy makers (senior government officials) trained	Output	
<b>Objective Title</b>	<b>Document Lessons Learned &amp; Good Practice</b>		
2.1	Good Practice – Best Fit Synthesis Review completed	Outcome	
2.2	Good Practice – Best Fit Team Workshops (Symposia) completed	Output	
2.3	Case Studies completed	Outcome	
2.5	Pilot action research projects completed	Outcome	
2.6	Academic papers published		
<b>Objective Title</b>			
4.1	Specialists qualified and active in implementing project activities		
4.3	Linkages established between EAS providers and US institutions		

## References

- Better Evaluation. (2014, March). *Evaluation Framework*. Retrieved from Better Evaluation website: [http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/evaluation\\_framework\\_templates](http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/evaluation_framework_templates)
- Horsch, K. (1997). *Indicators: Definition and Use in a Results-Based Accountability System*. Retrieved from Harvard Family Research Project: <http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/indicators-definition-and-use-in-a-results-based-accountability-system>
- Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI). (2016). *Quarterly Report: 2nd Quarter FY 2016*. Quarterly report, Columbus, OH; Morogoro, Tanzania; . Retrieved from <http://iagri.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/iAGRI-Quarterly-Report-FY2016-Q2-revised.pdf>
- Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI). (n.d.). *About iAGRI*. Retrieved from Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative (iAGRI): <http://iagri.org/about/>
- Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2004, 01 01). *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: a handbook for development practitioners*. Retrieved from The World Bank: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2004/01/5068054/handbook-development-practitioners-ten-steps-results-based-monitoring-evaluation-system-ten-steps-results-based-monitoring-evaluation-system-handbook-development-practitioners>
- Parsons, J., Gokey, C., & Thornton, M. (2013, October 15). *Indicators of Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts in Security and Justice Programming*. Retrieved from Vera Institute of Justice: <http://www.vera.org/sites/default/files/developing-indicators-security-justice-programming.pdf>
- United States Agency for International Development. (2011). *USAID Evaluation Policy*. Washington, DC.
- USAID. (2010). Performance Monitoring & Evaluation TIPS: Selecting Performance Indicators. *Number 6*(2nd). Washington, DC. Retrieved from [http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/pnadw106.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadw106.pdf)
- USAID Bureau For Policy, Planning And Learning: Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research. (2011, March 25). USAID Evaluation Policy: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Issue 1. Washington, DC.



## Additional Resources

Africa Lead II (<http://www.africleadftf.org/>)

Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators (<http://www.asti.cgiar.org/>)

Agricultural Economics Research Institute (AERI)  
(<http://www.arc.sci.eg/institlabs/Default.aspx?OrgID=9&lang=en>)

AidData (<http://aiddata.org/>)

Building Agribusiness Capacity in East Timor (BACET) program ([http://www.landolakes.org/Where-We-Work/Asia/Timor-Leste/Building-Agribusiness-Capacity-in-East-Timor-\(BACE\)](http://www.landolakes.org/Where-We-Work/Asia/Timor-Leste/Building-Agribusiness-Capacity-in-East-Timor-(BACE)))

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (<http://www.cgiar.org/>)

Development Experience Clearinghouse (<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/home/Default.aspx>)

Education and Research in Agriculture (ERA) project 9 (<http://www.oired.vt.edu/Senegal/welcome-era-senegal/>)

Farmer-to-Farmer program (<https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/agriculture-and-food-security/supporting-agricultural-capacity-development/john-ogonowski>)

Feed the Future (<https://www.feedthefuture.gov/>)

Feed the Future Monitoring System (secured system) (<https://www.ftfms.net/de/de/login.xhtml>)

Food and Agriculture Organization Statistics (<http://www.fao.org/statistics/en/>)

Food and Agriculture Organization FAOSTAT website (<http://faostat3.fao.org/home/E>)

Food and Agriculture Organization's Improving agricultural extension: a reference manual  
(<http://www.fao.org/docrep/W5830E/w5830e00.htm#Contents>)

Innovative Agricultural Research Initiative ([www.iagri.org](http://www.iagri.org))

International Food Policy Research Institute ([www.ifpri.org](http://www.ifpri.org))

International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (<http://www.3ieimpact.org/en/>)

Land O'Lakes International Development Toolkits (<http://www.landolakes.org/Resources/Tools?page=2>)

Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) 100 Proposed Global Indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals (<http://indicators.report/>)

Tegemeo Institute (<http://www.tegemeo.org/>)

USAID ([www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov))

USAID Evaluation Toolkit (<http://usaidlearninglab.org/evaluation>) (USAID, 2010)

Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (<http://www.ifpri.org/topic/weai-resource-center>)

World Bank (<http://data.worldbank.org/>)