

**Improving Think Tank Management:
Practical Guidance for Think Tanks, Research Advocacy NGOs,
and Their Funders**

ANNEXES

Document types:

- *Cases from real think tanks – these are narratives from one or more real think tanks that demonstrate practices that think tanks have used to address key management issues. They demonstrate take aways or other information from the book chapters.*
- *Additional information and guidelines – these are developed by the author to provide additional guidance for how a think tank could apply practices and procedures to address key management issues.*
- *Policies, procedures and forms – examples and templates – these are actual documents from real think tanks that can be adapted and adopted by other think tanks to address key management issues. These have been included with the permission of the think tanks that developed them.*

ANNEXES:

Overall Management (1)

- Cases from real think tanks
 - 1.1 Example of a Local Program for Management Improvement: The Think Tank Capacity Building Program in Baku
- Additional Information and guidelines
 - 1.2 Additional Information on Survey Data Employed

Staffing and Human Resources (2-5)

- Cases from real think tanks
 - 4.1 Sharing of Information Gained at Skills Acquisition Workshops
 - 5.1 Position Description for Team Leaders
- Policies, Procedures, and Forms – Examples and Templates
 - 2.1 Documents for Annual Staff Appraisal*
 - 2.2 Salary Administration Policy*
 - 2.3 Job Position Descriptions and Promotion Criteria for Research Staff*
 - 2.4 Job Position Descriptions for Communications Staff*
 - 2.5 Performance Standards for Administrative Positions*
 - 3.1 Establishing a Position

Core Operations (6-8)

- Additional Information and guidelines
 - 7.2 More Information on Recruiting New Board Members
- Policies, Procedures, and Forms – Examples and Templates
 - 6.1 Reviewers' Check List for Assessing Analytic Reports

- 6.2 Communications Guidelines*
- 6.3 Example of a Research and Publications Policy Statement that Includes Quality Control Provisions*
- 7.1 Example of a Think Tank's Board Bylaws*
- 8.1 White Book – Table of Contents

Agenda Setting (9-10)

- Cases from real think tanks
 - 9.1 Seven Innovations Undertaken by Eastern European and Russian Think Tanks
- Additional Information and guidelines
 - 10.1 Tasks Involved in Government Outsourcing for Policy Research
 - 10.2 Being Competitive in Pursuing Government Support

Financial and Performance Accountability (11-12)

- Additional Information and guidelines
 - 11.1 Additional Information on Indirect Rates
- Policies, Procedures, and Forms – Examples and Templates
 - 11.2 Model Cost Policy Statement
 - 12.1 Example Tables for Performance Reports to Management
 - 12.2 Policy Community Survey*

Annex 1.1 Example of a Local Program for Management Improvement: The Think Tank Capacity Building Program in Baku

Context

The Economic Research Centre (ERC) is a policy research oriented think tank established through the initiative of three young economists in 1999. ERC's mission is to contribute to formulation of economic and social policies of the government through research and exchange of ideas. At that time, involvement of citizens in state governance, control over spending of public assets, transparency, and accountability of state agencies were alarming issues. There was a scarcity of in-depth research in all sectors of economy; the budget package was only 20 pages, and the requirements for use of budget funds were not formulated. In the last 14 years, ERC has evolved to be a prominent and well-known think tank not only in Azerbaijan, but in the region and CIS countries as well.

Azerbaijan is living its post peak oil period and the period of rapid economic growth achieved by oil production will soon be left behind. In the post-oil period, Azerbaijan will face tremendous challenges ensuring continuous and sustainable economic growth. Consequently, the Azerbaijani government will face difficulties in continuing its current policies on poverty reduction and addressing issues of employment and access to social welfare. Therefore, independent non-governmental organizations like ERC need to keep its management practices updated and at international standards by involving diverse experts, taking internal steps to build capacity, and diversifying their financial sources.

To address the need for policy analysis and recommendations, a number of government-based research institutions were established in recent years – the Strategic Research Center under the President of Azerbaijan Republic, the Analytical Information Centre of Parliament, the Economic Research Institute of State Economic University, and the Research & Development Center of Central Bank. However, these institutions – restrained in their research by existing political dogma – are incapable of examining a full spectrum of alternative policy options. This gap is filled by non-state think tanks such as ERC. Particularly in the current situation, where pressure and restrictions are imposed by the Azeri government against independent think tanks, implementation of such projects has become challenging.

Therefore, ERC leadership believes it imperative for private think tanks to produce and excellent analytic work and communicate it effectively to succeed in the policy market place. Strong management is a critical element in realizing this objective. During 2007-2008, ERC was able to make major upgrades in its administrative practices—ranging from public relations and HR to financial management—with resources provided by a Think Tank Fund grant.

Initiative to strengthen think tank operations

The Center has a tradition of seeking to support other think tanks in Azerbaijan and contributing to improvement of these organizations. Therefore, ERC led establishment of the Azerbaijan Think Tank Alliance (ATTA) (www.thinktank.az) in May 2013. ATTA was established through the initiative, “Enhancing the effectiveness of government by strengthening the role of think tanks in decision-making arena,” which was funded by the European Union (EU) in partnership with Policy Association for an Open Society (PASOS) and “Intelligent Citizen” Enlightenment Center (ICEC). Its aim is to increase

the institutional and research capacities of think tanks and to expand their impact, including fostering their participation in decision making process through mobilizing funds from diverse, particularly domestic, sources.

Problems of Azeri think tanks. The main challenges faced by think tanks include: (i) lack of institutional capacity in strategic management, quality control, and financial sustainability; (ii) lack of policy-analysis research skills, particularly in modern research methods and technologies, and (iii) poor policy dialogue between government structures and non-state think tanks.

The initiative. To address these problems, ERC decided to design and implement the “Enhancing the effectiveness of government by strengthening the role of think tanks in decision-making arena” project, which aimed at de-monopolizing public policy decisions in Azerbaijan by (i) building the institutional and research capacity of 18 non-state think tanks, and (ii) empowering informed and responsible participation of these think tanks in inclusive policy making in the country.

In terms of institutional development, ERC implemented a series of trainings to support strengthening the institutional capacities of partner think tanks. These trainings included “Strategic management of think tanks,” “Strategic planning in think tanks,” “Fundraising and accounting policy in think tanks,” “Evidence-based advocacy strategy training,” “Think tanks-media: perspectives on mutual synergies,” “Making Contact: Tools for building effective communication,” and “Introduction to SPSS.” These course were supplemented with mentoring sessions given primarily by ERC staff.

Additionally, ERC developed the Journal of Policy, which publishes papers written by partner think tanks’ staff and published in a journal format. Besides this, ERC organized meetings of partner think tanks with governmental agencies in a roundtable format and similar meeting for Azerbaijan’s business community.

Less important activities including stimulation of more rigorous research through the “ Best Policy Paper” contest among ATTA members, which generated a robust response. Another way of bringing together partner think tanks under ATTA is by members presenting their ideas at the Board and Assembly of ATTA. Lastly, the first National Exhibition of Azerbaijan think tanks was organized. During this exhibition, think tanks had numerous opportunities to demonstrate their products, research, and projects before state agencies, business community members, international organizations and the public as well.

Outcomes realized

The formal project terminated in December, 2013 and by that time ERC had reached the following outcomes:

- 75 percent of think tanks had raised 25 percent of their budgets from local sources;
- The www.thinktank.az online payment (e-commerce) system was created, which allows think tanks to sell their policy products via an online platform;
- A bilingual (English/Azerbaijani) journal containing policy papers produced by local think tanks was produced in two editions and widely distributed;
- Over 10 evidence-based policy documents were produced and based on robust data analyses rather than mere data description;
- 95 percent of members now have quality control systems in place;

- The majority of beneficiary think tanks have (i) a strategic plan, (ii) a Public Relations (PR) policy in place and operating, (iii) an advocacy strategy,; and (iv) accounting and financial management policy and procedures in place.
- A formal think tank network with a realistic structure was created that will continue to operate.

Remaining challenges

Through realization of the “Enhancing the effectiveness...” project and establishment of Azerbaijan Think Tank Alliance, ERC management changed the way think tanks in Azerbaijan operate. However, there are still some gaps in this field:

- While funding diversification has improved, more is to be done.
- Relationships and involvement in dialogues with state agencies and business communities remain limited.
- A base of strong policy papers in Azerbaijan has not been created yet, so the penetration of think tanks’ analysis has been limited in the international market.

The future

By mobilizing the resources of both ATTA and ERC, the plan is to implement more joint advocacy activities. ERC with the support of members of ATTA is planning to advocate for hotly debated issues concerning Azerbaijan’s civil society and will try to resolve key existing problems. Additionally, the publication of the semi-annual journal of policy papers will be continued. Also, additional issues of a newsletter about the activities of partner think tanks in ATTA are planned.

Galib Bayramov, Chairman¹
Economic Research Center
Baku Azerbaijan

¹ Mr. Bayramov has since become Chairman of ATTA’s Board. www.erc.az; gibadoglu@erc.az

Annex 1.2 Additional Information on Survey Data Employed

The GDN-15. The “Strengthening Institutions to Improve Public Expenditure Accountability” project aimed to strengthen the capacity of the 15 participating policy research organizations to monitor and analyze public expenditure choices, processes, and impacts and to engage constructively with policy officials to recommend improvements. The four and a half-year project, launched in 2008, had as its ultimate goal more capable, accountable, and responsive governments in the countries where the project operated. Populations in the countries where participating organizations were located were anticipated to benefit tangibly in the mid-term from improved government performance. The project management team consisted of representatives from the Global Development Network (GDN), the lead organization; the Results for Development Institute (R4D), the technical partner; and NORC at the University of Chicago, the monitoring and evaluation contractor.²

The evaluation program collected data on management practices at baseline (2009 survey), in monitoring surveys in 2010 and 2011, and during a final survey for evaluation purposes in 2013.³ Overall, the surveys give us a picture of staffing composition and levels and a window on turnover and training, communications planning and practices, quality control, funding sources and composition, among other practices. The data I present in later chapters are generally from the 2011 survey; for some important questions that were not repeated in 2011, I show data from the 2009/2010 surveys.

The TTI-48. The Think Tank Initiative is a large-scale support-and-technical assistance project for an impressive number of think tanks (48 in 2013) administered by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and funded by a group of foundations and national aid agencies. Participating think tanks were selected, beginning in 2008, in regional cohorts from West Africa, East Africa, Latin America, and South Asia. The project has funding to continue through 2017.

TTI has three objectives whose summary statements indicate the program’s approach:

1. Select a group of promising independent policy research organizations and assist them in assessing critical areas of strength and weakness and identifying opportunities for improved organizational performance.
2. Provide a combination of general support funding and access to training and technical assistance to permit organizations to achieve improvements in research quality, organizational performance, and policy linkages.
3. Capture and share project learning about strategies for supporting and managing policy research organizations, in order to influence the future activities of the funding partners, participating think tanks, and other development actors. (Young, Huack, and Engel, 2013).

TTI conducted baseline surveys in 2008 and 2009 (think tanks were admitted to the program in two waves) and an annual monitoring survey from 2010 through 2013. Most data used here are from the 2011 survey to maximize comparability with the GDN data. Certain important questions – about quality control practices and comprehensive staffing information, for example – were only asked at baseline and therefore are shown for the earlier years. Generally, the survey year for data items is indicated in the

² Mid-Term evaluation results are in Struyk and Haddaway (2012).

³ Additional surveys were done of policy communities in each country to measure policy impacts, and research reports were reviewed by external experienced social scientists to rate research quality changes.

tables. Where only one dataset is presented (GDN or TTI) there is only one year in parentheses. When data from both GDN and TTI are presented, the year for GDN is noted first, followed by the year for TTI.

The TTI data are for the 48 think tanks still participating in 2013 (listed at the end of this Annex), a few initial participants having left the program in earlier years. In some instances not all 48 responded to all questions. Because four think tanks participated in both the GDN and TTI programs, the maximum sample size in any table is 59 think tanks (15 + 48 – 4). When data are presented for the GDN and TTI programs separately, the four think tanks common to both programs are included in both tabulations. In tabulations for all think tanks combined, they are included only once (among the GDN think tanks).

Many of the questions used by TTI were the same as those in the parallel GDN-15 survey, although some additional areas are covered, e.g., strategy development in the TTI survey. Where possible, responses from the two surveys are combined to provide a larger sample size. When questions differ between the GDN and TTI surveys or are missing in one of them, data from only one or the other are used.

In all tabulations, “Stage 1” think tanks are defined as those with fewer than 10 full-time researchers. Where there are significant differences between Stage 1 and later-stage think tanks in staffing patterns and other areas, data for the Stage 1 group are presented separately from data for the larger organizations (a grouping that combines Stage 2 and Stage 3 institutions).

Neither the GDN-15 nor the TTI-48 is in any way a representative sample of think tanks, as they were selected from among think tanks that applied to participate in the program in response to widely disseminated proposal calls. Important characteristics of the two samples are shown in Table A.1.1.2, size (as indicated by the number of full-time staff), work mix of research and advocacy, and age in 2009.

The size distribution of think tanks in the two groups differs considerably, with half of the GDN-15 think tanks having fewer than 15 staff, compared with only 10 percent of the TTI-48 group. At the other end of the spectrum, 20 percent of the GDN-15 think tanks has over 50 staff members, compared with fully one-third of the TTI-48 group. Hence, the combined sample affords a higher share of observations among larger organizations, usefully augmenting the representation of small organizations.

The research-advocacy work mix distribution indicates that 41 percent of the combined sample reports doing 75 percent research and 25 percent advocacy, which is the most common split. The second most common split (containing 34 percent of the sample) is 60 percent research to 40 percent advocacy. While the two think tank groups are broadly similar, there is one startling difference: TTI-48 has 31 percent with a 90-10 percent research-advocacy split in contrast to only 13 percent for GDN 15. This may seem a startling difference, but it should be interpreted in combination with the fact that 53 percent of the GDN are in the next most research-concentrated category (75-25 percent research-advocacy split), vs. only 33 percent for TTI-48.

Lastly, the age distribution of the combined sample is quite broad, with 44 percent relatively new (10 years old or less) and 34 percent very well established (17 years or older)—offering a good range of maturity. It often takes a think tank a decade to really establish itself as an important player in the policy arena, particularly in well-developed markets. If the think tank focuses on an area not well covered by existing think tanks that is also of significant policy attention, less time may be needed. The TTI-48 is slightly more concentrated in the oldest group (33 percent vs. 27 percent for the GDN-15).

The CEE-6. I supplement the information from the previous two surveys in a few places where useful information is not available for them with data from this third data set, representing six think tanks in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) (Struyk 2006). The general criteria for inclusion of a think tank in the sample used here were that it had a minimum of 10 full-time researchers and had to be operating at about

this level for the past five years (i.e., sufficient time to adequately address the personnel questions faced by an organization of this size).⁴ The six think tanks included in the sample come from two groups. Three are organizations with which I had long-standing working relations and I understood to have a particular interest in management questions. The other three were among those interviewed in 1997 for a prior study of think tanks in the region (Struyk 1999). They were invited to participate based on information obtained in 1997 and on recommendations from the first three think tanks selected. The data on these six think tanks are for about the year 2000, when these organizations were mostly 5-10 years old and led by their first president (generally a person who had previously worked as a researcher in a soviet-style research institute). They were all Stage 2 think tanks. Information gathered includes staff practices and related data on turnover and the ways in which they developed their agendas, as discussed further in Chapter 2 where the information is first used. Again the sample is non-representative.

⁴ Interviews on personnel practices were conducted with two smaller think tanks in the region, and the results confirmed that these practices were quite unstructured at that time.

Table A.1.2.1 Selected Characteristics at Baseline of Think Tanks Participating in the GDN and TTI Programs

Percent distributions

	GDN-15	TTI-48	Combined^b
Size by Full-Time Employees (2008-2009)			
1-15	53	10	20
16-30	13	33	29
31-50	13	23	19
51-100	20	25	25
101 and up	0	8	7
Work Mix (2011)			
25% research - 75% advocacy	0	2	2
40% research – 60% advocacy	0	0	0
60% research - 40% advocacy	33	33	34
75% research - 25% advocacy	53	33	41
90% research - 10% advocacy	13	31	24
Organization age (2008-2009)^a			
1-10 Years	33	46	44
11-16 Years	40	21	22
17 Years and Older	27	33	34

- a. Age in 2009
- b. Some values in this column may appear not to be the mean of the values in the previous two columns. Recall that the four organizations that participated in both projects are included for both programs but only once in the combined column.

Table A.1.2.2 GDN-15 Think Tanks

Organization Name	Abbreviation	Country
Advanced Social Technologies	AST	Armenia
Center for Economics and Development Studies, Faculty of Economics, Padjadjaran University	CEDS	Indonesia
Center for Research and Communication	CRC	Philippines
Research Center of the University of the Pacific	CIUP	Peru
Center for the Implementation of Public Policies Promoting Equity and Growth	CIPPEC	Argentina
Graduate School of Public Administration and Public Policy, Tecnológico de Monterrey	EGAP	Mexico
Fundación para el Desarrollo de Guatemala	FUNDESA*	Guatemala
Centre for Budget and Policy Studies	CBPS	India
Policy Research and Development	PRAD	Nepal
Unnayan Shamannay	US	Bangladesh
Integrated Social Development Centre	ISODEC	Ghana
Institute of Economic Affairs	IEA*	Kenya
Economic Policy Research Centre	EPRC*	Uganda
Economic and Social Research Foundation	ESRF*	Tanzania
Center for the Study of the Economies of Africa	CSEA	Nigeria

*Also in the TTI program.

Table A.1.2.3 List of TTI-48 Think Tanks

Name	Abbreviation	Country
Latin America		
Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales	ASIES	Guatemala
Centro de Análisis y Difusión de la Economía Paraguaya	CADEP	Paraguay
Centro Ecuatoriano de Derecho Ambiental	CEDA	Ecuador
Foro Social de Deuda Externa y Desarrollo de Honduras	FOSDEH	Honduras
Fundación ARU	ARU	Bolivia
Fundación Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo	FUNDAUNGA	El Salvador
Fundación para el Avance de las Reformas y las Oportunidades	Grupo FARO	Ecuador
Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Económico y Social / Departamento de Estudios Económicos y Sociales	FUSADES	El Salvador
Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo	GRADE	Peru
Instituto de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo	INESAD	Bolivia
Instituto de Estudios Peruanos	IRP	Peru
Instituto Desarrollo	ID	Paraguay
Sub-Saharan Africa		
Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment	ACODE	Uganda
African Heritage Institution	AfriHeritage	Nigeria
Center for the Study of the Economies of Africa	CESA	Nigeria
Centre d'études, de documentation et de recherches économiques et sociales	CEDRES	Burkina Faso
Centre for Population and Environmental Development	CREP	Nigeria
Consortium pour la recherche économique et sociale	CRES	Senegal
Economic and Social Research Foundation	ESRF	Tanzania
Economic Policy Research Centre	EPRC	Uganda
Ethiopian Development Research Institute	EDRI	Ethiopia
Ethiopian Economic Association / Ethiopian Economic Policy Research Institute	EEA	Ethiopia
Initiative prospective agricole et rurale	IPAR	Senegal
Institut de recherche empirique en économie politique	IERPE	Benin
Institute of Economic Affairs	IEA-Kenya	Kenya
Institute of Economic Affairs – Ghana	IEA-Ghana	Ghana
Institute of Policy Analysis and Research – Rwanda	IPAR-Rwanda	Rwanda
Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research	ISSER	Ghana
Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis	KIPPRA	Kenya
Makerere Institute of Social Research	MISR	Uganda
Research on Poverty Alleviation	REPOA	Tanzania
Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Research Organization	STIPRO	Tanzania
South Asia		
Center for Study of Science, Technology and Policy	CSTEP	India
Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability	CBGA	India
Centre for Policy Dialogue	CBD	Bangladesh
Centre for Policy Research	CPR	India
Centre for Poverty Analysis	CEPA	Sri Lanka
Centre for the Study of Developing Societies	CSDS	India
Indian Institute of Dalit Studies	IIDS	India
Institute for Social and Environmental Transition – Nepal	ISET-N	Nepal
Institute of Economic Growth	IEG	India
Institute of Governance Studies	IGS	Bangladesh
Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka	IPS	Sri Lanka
Institute of Rural Management Anand	IRMA	India
National Council of Applied Economic Research	NCAER	India

Annex 2.1 Documents for Annual Staff Appraisal*

THIS ANNEX PRESENTS THREE DOCUMENTS THAT ARE THE CORE OF THE URBAN INSTITUTE'S (WASHINGTON, DC) ANNUAL STAFF APPRAISAL:

1. A MEMO OUTLINING THE PROCESS TO ALL STAFF
2. THE EVALUATION FORM COMPLETED BY THE PERSON BEING ASSESSED AND HIS/HER SUPERVISOR, PARTS OF WHICH ARE COMPLETED ONLY BY AND FOR STAFF WITH PARTICULAR RESPONSIBILITIES
3. A MEMO ADDRESSED TO THE INSTITUTE'S MOST SENIOR RESEARCHERS, WHO USE A DIFFERENT PROCEDURE TO REPORT THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS FROM THE SECTION IN THE EVALUATION FORM FOR SELF-REPORTING. ESSENTIALLY, THESE STAFF MEMBERS COMPOSE AN ESSAY ABOUT THEIR WORK OVER THE YEAR.

THE URBAN INSTITUTE

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Staff

FROM: *Director of Human Resources*

DATE: September 7, 2012

SUBJECT: 2012 Performance Appraisal Review

This memo, the forms and policies described below, and the schedule for the appraisal process, are available on the human resource office's intranet page. A handy performance appraisal schedule is at the end of this memo.

The annual performance appraisal process is composed of two parts: the employee's self-assessment and the supervisor's evaluation of the employee's performance. A short description of each of these evaluations follows.

Generally, all regular full- and part-time employees participate in the annual appraisal process. However, your supervisor may postpone your appraisal if you were hired too recently to adequately evaluate your performance or if a three- or six-month appraisal has recently been completed. **It should be noted, however, that a completed performance appraisal is a prerequisite for the salary review process.**

Self-Assessment - The self-assessment is an opportunity to review your accomplishments and the quality of work you performed during the past twelve months; to set goals and objectives for the coming year; and to think about what skills or training may be required to develop and stay competitive in your current position or help qualify you for a new one. It also provides a basis for an important discussion with your supervisor. You should complete and sign the self-assessment by **September 28** and give it to your official supervisor.

Attention Researchers: The appraisal process for Senior Fellows differs from that for other research grades (RA thru SRA). Researchers who are not Senior Fellows use the two-part assessment/evaluation form on the HR intranet. See the appraisal section on the HR intranet for more information and all forms you will need.

Supervisor's Evaluation - Your supervisor will review the self-assessment; collect additional information from others for whom you have worked or provided services during the year; provide written comments about your statement of accomplishments; identify areas of especially strong performance; indicate ways to strengthen or enhance your job performance; and discuss goals and objectives for the coming year. You will also be rated on a set of performance factors according the scale below. Supervisors are encouraged to make comments on all ratings, but must explain all ratings other than "Fully Successful."

Performance Ratings:

E Exemplary level of performance: The employee accomplishes every requirement of the position in a truly exceptional manner, adding to its depth and breadth by

consistently working well beyond its defined scope and expectations. (Even the very highest-performing employees cannot perform at an exemplary level all of the time.)

- S Superior** level of performance: The employee meets all performance criteria and far exceeds several, but not all, other criteria.
- F Fully Successful** performance: The employee has accomplished all normal requirements and consistently meets all of the Institute's usual high expectations of performance. (Most employees will receive this rating.)
- I Improvement Required:** The employee falls short of achieving one or more job requirements or goals. Improvement in the form of corrective action on the part of the employee, further training, or closer supervision is required for the employee to satisfy job requirements and become fully proficient.
- D Serious Deficiency:** The employee consistently or frequently fails to achieve key job factors. Approach to or accomplishment of job responsibilities in one or more areas requires substantial improvement. The employee's performance is significantly below the level required to successfully perform the job. Immediate corrective action is required.

Appraisal Discussion - Supervisors are asked to give employees at least 24 hours to review the supervisor's evaluation prior to the performance appraisal discussion. The supervisor will schedule a private discussion to review the written appraisal and to set future work objectives. You may also discuss ways in which your supervisor can help strengthen or enhance your performance. Performance appraisal discussions must take place before the appraisal is submitted to HR.

Signatures - The employee must sign the self-assessment before giving it to the supervisor. Both the employee and the supervisor must sign the supervisor's evaluation to acknowledge its receipt and to acknowledge that the appraisal discussion has taken place. A signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the supervisor's evaluation. An employee may, if he or she wishes, add a statement to the appraisal if it is properly submitted through the supervisor to the personnel office. **Completed performance appraisal forms are due in the Human Resources office no later than October 26.**

Requests for Reclassification (Admin & IT Staff) - Supervisors and/or Administrative or Information Technology staff may request to have the human resources office review and "reclassify" a position. This process may (or may not) result in the position's grade level being changed when significant, measurable changes in the level of responsibility, authority, or scope of the job have been demonstrated consistently over time. Changes in the amount of work alone will not result in reclassification. The reclassification process is not part of the performance appraisal, but the appraisal will help assess the employee's current level of skills.

Employees are reminded that the Institute's grade levels allow for a wide range of salary and performance growth within each grade and that there is considerable overlap between grades. Please notify the human resources office as soon as possible of your intent to request a reclassification to allow sufficient time for the evaluation process.

Research staff promotions - Members of the research staff may be nominated by their Center Directors for promotion. Promotions are not part of the performance appraisal process, although the appraisal will be considered part of the Center Director's nomination for promotion, along with writing samples and an updated resume. All promotions must be approved by the Salary Review Committee. Standards for

promotion to RAI, RAI, SRA and senior Fellow are located on the HR intranet in the “salary review” section.

Important note: All requests for reclassification/promotion are due in the Human Resources office no later than close of business **October 26**.

New to UI or Want More Information?

Attend the upcoming brown bag lunch meeting at noon:

September 12

- Performance Appraisal for New Employees, Conference Room 4A

This session will review the self-assessment process and will address the following topics: how to evaluate your performance constructively; goals setting; career development; what to do if I disagree with my supervisor?

2012

Performance Appraisal Schedule

September 7	All-staff memo on performance appraisal process distributed. All forms available on-line and on human resource’s intranet page.
September 12	Brown Bag lunch discussion: <i>Performance Appraisal for New Employees</i> on self-assessment and goal setting, noon, Conference Room 4A.
September 28	Self-assessments are due to supervisors.
October 26	Supervisors and employees must have held performance appraisal discussions. Completed performance appraisals are due in Human Resources. Requests for reclassification ¹ (admin and information tech staff) and promotion ² (research staff) are due in Human Resources.

¹ Reclassification requests consist of a cover memo, copy of performance appraisal, and job description questionnaire (Admin & IT staff).

² Research Promotion requests consist of a Request for Promotion form for promotions to RA2 or RA1 or simply a cover memo for promotion to SRA or Senior Fellow, a copy of the performance appraisal, resume, and writing samples (Research staff).

THE URBAN INSTITUTE
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL (PART ONE)
EMPLOYEE SELF-ASSESSMENT

Employee's Name:

Job Title:

Center:

Period Covered:
(from/to)

1. List your major accomplishments during the appraisal period: **Research Staff examples** include: data collection and analysis, literature reviews, research reports/publications, research proposals and other fundraising activities, special external activities (speeches, testimony, briefings); special internal activities (committees, presentations, staff development). **Administrative and Information Technology Staff examples** include: ways you have contributed to the efficiency and performance of your center/office, include special activities such as committee participation, presentations, etc.

2. Did you achieve the objectives set by you and your supervisor during the last year? (Please explain.)

3. During this period did you take on new major responsibilities or expanded supervisory responsibilities? If so, how? If research staff, has the level of your research increased? If so, how?

4. Have you recently acquired new job-related skills or attended courses that will prepare you for additional responsibilities in the future or enhance your skills in your current position? If so, please specify.

5. If you have had budgetary/project management responsibilities during the past year, have you operated within budget and on schedule? Please explain.

6. What steps have you taken to address the career development of those who report to you? (For employees with supervisory responsibility only - others mark N/A)

7. Indicate areas in which you hope to improve your performance and goals you wish to achieve during the coming year.

8. Are there ways in which your supervisor(s) can assist you in improving your performance or achieving your goals? If so, please indicate:

- make expectations clearer
- provide more frequent feedback
- set more realistic work deadlines
- provide additional resources such as:
- other (specify):

9. Are there other aspects of your job that you would like to discuss during the performance review? If so, please specify.

10. Are there other people who have directed your work during the rating period? If so, please list their names and give a brief description of the work done.

Note: Research Staff should attach a current resume to this assessment.

Employee's Signature:

Date:

THE URBAN INSTITUTE
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL (PART TWO)
SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEE

Employee's Name:

Job Title:

Center:

Period Covered (from/to):

(If more space is needed, attach additional sheets.)

A. Comment on the employee's self-assessment of job performance for the appraisal period and note any significant omissions. If your view of employee's performance differs from that of employee, please explain.

B. Comment on the employee's goals for the coming year as stated in the self-assessment and any additional objectives you have set for the employee. If you do not concur with the objectives stated by employee, please explain.

C. Identify the employee's strengths. Give examples of exemplary or outstanding performance.

D. Note any areas of performance that need improvement and describe your plan for correcting them.

The following question is for future planning and career development purposes and is not part of the assessment of the prior year's job performance. It should be used as a basis for discussion of the employee's long-term career development.

E. Make at least one suggestion that, if followed, could enhance the employee's performance, strengthen skills, or improve the employee's opportunity for advancement or career growth.

F. General Performance Factor Ratings: Using the definitions provided below, rate each of the following general performance factors according to the typical level of competency demonstrated by the employee.

E EXCEPTIONAL level of performance: Employee accomplishes requirements of the position in an exemplary manner, adding to its depth and breadth by consistently working beyond its defined scope and expectations. NOTE: even the very highest-performing employees cannot perform in an exemplary manner all the time. ***Cite specific examples.**

S SUPERIOR level of performance: Employee's performance meets all performance criteria and far exceeds several, but not all, other criteria. ***Cite specific examples.**

F FULLY SATISFACTORY performance: Employee has accomplished all normal requirements and consistently meets all of the Institute's usual high expectations of performance.

I IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: The employee falls short of achieving one or more job requirements or goals. Improvement is required in order to fully meet the requirements of the job. It is expected that some new employees who are still learning aspects of their positions will receive this rating for some factors. ***Cite specific examples where performance needs improvement and provide a plan for achieving improvement.**

D SERIOUS DEFICIENCY in approach to or accomplishment of the job: Substantial improvement is required to meet the requirements of the job. ***This rating must be explained fully by the supervisor and unless extraordinary circumstances exist, must have been the subject of a previous face-to-face counseling session with the employee. Such rating constitutes a written warning of a serious performance problem as required in UI Policy 112, Addressing Performance Concerns.**

CA = CANNOT ASSESS

NA = NOT APPLICABLE

FOR ALL EMPLOYEES:

GENERAL PERFORMANCE FACTORS

1. Quality of Work/content, accuracy, follow-through, thoroughness, creativity:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

2. Productivity/quantity of high-quality work:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

3. Organizational Skills & Timeliness/plans and organizes work efficiently; produces results on a timely basis:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

4. Technical Skills/competence in performing technical work (please specify*):

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

5. Initiative/self-starter; works well without detailed instructions:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

6. Problem Solving/anticipates or recognizes relevant problems and recommends or applies solutions:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

7. Writing Skills/produces concise, readable written work:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

8. Oral Communication Skills/transmits or presents information articulately, accurately, and in a timely and professional manner:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

9. Flexibility/adapts well to changing priorities and work situations; adjusts easily to new colleagues, ideas, and procedures:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

10. Interpersonal Skills/positive work attitude and ability to work with others to facilitate group performance:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

11. Work Habits/attendance and punctuality:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

FOR RESEARCH STAFF ONLY:

12. Policy Understanding/knowledge of policy issues and the ability to relate them to research and vice versa:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

13. Conceptual Ability/the ability to formulate and design research plans:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

14. Professional Involvement/presentations at professional meetings, articles in refereed professional journals, briefings, testimony, etc.:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

15. Raising Funds to Support Research:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS:

16. Supervisory Skills/makes timely and effective decisions, provides constructive feedback, develops staff, resolves performance issues appropriately, uses staff efficiently, and keeps staff apprised of Institute policies, practices, and objectives:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

17. Financial Management/uses financial resources efficiently and stays within budget:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

18. Compliance with Organizational Policies and Procedures/integrates office objectives with those of the Institute:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

19. Compliance with the Institute's Affirmative Action Program/meets, and ensures that subordinates meet program objectives; ensures good faith efforts to include underrepresented groups in recruitment and promotion decisions:

E* S* F I* D* CA NA

G. Based on all parts of the above evaluation, what is your overall assessment of this employee's performance?

Additional Comments:

SIGNATURES:

Rating Supervisor:

(if different from center/office director)

Date:

Center/Office Director:

Date:

Employee's Signature:*

(*signature acknowledges that employee
has read the appraisal)

Date of Appraisal Discussion:

Executive/Human Resources Office Review:

Signature:

Date:

■ THE URBAN INSTITUTE

2100 M STREET, N.W. / WASHINGTON D.C. 20037

Director of Human Resources

Phone

Fax

E-mail

TO: All Senior Fellows
CC: Center Directors
FROM: Director of Human Resources
SUBJECT: 2009 Performance Assessments
DATE: September 15, 2009

Over the years, a number of Center Directors and many Senior Fellows (formerly PRAs) have expressed the opinion that the forms we use for your annual performance appraisals are cumbersome, time consuming, and don't prompt constructive conversations between Senior Fellows and Center Directors about strengths, weaknesses, and objectives for the coming year.

Therefore, this year we will shift to an appraisal format similar to the annual memos that ___ requests from Center and Office Directors. This approach will also incorporate some independent indicators (generated by UI management systems) that reflect a *subset* of the dimensions of performance that we value.

The new process will work as follows:

You will write a self-assessment memorandum to your Center Director that addresses each of several areas of leadership, discussing accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses, and explicitly referencing the independent indicators referenced below. The areas addressed in this memo should include:

- **Research** -- summarize your substantive accomplishments and work underway, highlighting quality and rigor; creativity and innovation; relevance and importance.
- **Communication** -- describe effectiveness in outreach, including testimony, op-eds and media interviews, speeches, publications, reports and issue briefs.
- **Business** -- discuss successes and failures, including fundraising, project and PD financial management, on-time deliverables, and client relationships.
- **People** -- assess strengths and weaknesses, including intellectual leadership, supervision and mentorship, turnover, recruitment, and staff development.
- **Institution** -- describe contributions to UI, including cross-center collaboration, interaction with support offices, and service on committees.
- **Future Vision** -- look ahead 3 to 5 years and comment on likely developments in your areas of expertise, how you are positioned to shape them or respond to them, and what kinds of support your center and UI could provide to help.

Some time later today or tomorrow, I provide each Senior Fellow a centrally-generated report containing key financial performance indicators. Note that this report won't fully reflect proposals and projects for which you are a co-PI or cross-center collaborative work. Your memo should explain and discuss accomplishments that aren't fully reflected in these financial indicators. But note that you should not feel that you need to recompute them all with additional data.

Your center administrator will also generate a preliminary list of your publications, speeches, and testimony (based on what you've been providing for your center's bi-monthly reports) and a list of your active projects (drawn from JAMIS). Again, your memo can expand or correct this information, and discuss collaborative and cross-center projects in your discussion.

Finally, your Center Director will provide a short narrative to your memo, after which you and your Center Director meet to discuss accomplishments, challenges, and forward-looking objectives.

We hope this new approach will more closely meet all of our needs. If you have any questions or concerns about this process, feel free to contact me or your Center Director.

Annex 2.2 Salary Administration Policy*

SALARY ADMINISTRATION

POLICY

The goal of the Institute's salary administration program is to enable the Center to attract, retain and motivate the number and caliber of employees necessary to achieve its objectives. In pursuing this goal, the Institute has developed a logical structure of job categories and associated pay ranges to compensate employees appropriately for the nature and level of work performed and to provide opportunities for growth.

The pay ranges assigned to each job were designed and are maintained to be consistent with the financial position of the Institute, internally equitable, and competitive with those of other employers for comparable work. The salary review process provides an effective method for evaluating and rewarding individual job performance.

The salary administration policy seeks to comply with relevant federal and District of Columbia laws and to keep employees informed of compensation matters affecting them while protecting the confidentiality of salary information pertaining to other Center employees.

The Institute considers only job-related factors in making decisions on pay and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, age, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, disability, matriculation, veteran status, marital status, personal appearance, family responsibilities or political affiliation.

DEFINITIONS

Position: Work consisting of responsibilities and duties assignable to one employee. There are at least as many positions within the Institute as there are employees.

Job: A grouping of positions which are essentially the same in terms of the nature and level of work being performed by the position incumbents. Each job has a title, classification and an associated grade level.

Job Description: There is a formal description of the **major** responsibilities, duties, and level of work performed for each job. Such job descriptions are not exhaustive lists of responsibilities.

Job Description Questionnaire: A questionnaire completed by an employee and reviewed by the supervisor which describes the employee's work assignment and lists the skills and abilities normally required to perform it satisfactorily. The questionnaire provides the basis for the Human Resources (HR) Office evaluation and classification of a position and for preparing or updating a job description.

Job Evaluation: The process used to determine the level and appropriate classification and salary grade for each job relative to all other Institute jobs.

Salary Grade: The classification level assigned to a group of similar jobs which, although different with respect to skill and knowledge requirements and kinds of work performed, are similar enough in level of difficulty and responsibility to warrant similar pay.

Salary Range: The minimum to maximum dollar amount payable to incumbents in each job. Each range is developed from relevant labor market surveys that reflect salaries being paid by other organizations for similar jobs. The ranges are reviewed each year and are approved by the president.

Salary Structure: A hierarchy of salary grades and ranges which allows for the appropriate classification of each job.

JOB CLASSIFICATION AND SALARY STRUCTURE

There is a job classification and salary structure for each category of Institute employees:

Research Staff	(Grades R01 - R05)
Administrative Staff	(Grades S01 - S05)
Information Technology	(Grades C01 - C05)

The Institute assigns each job to a grade on the appropriate salary structure based on an evaluation of the job's relative worth to the Institute and what other organizations pay for comparable work. The HR office uses a compensable-factor system to evaluate the jobs at each level.

Along with a salary grade, the HR office will assign each job an appropriate title and will prepare a standard job description.

Each job is also designated as either exempt or nonexempt from the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF SALARY RANGES

Once a year, normally in September, the HR office will review the salary ranges for each job in comparison to rates of pay by other employers in the various labor markets in which the Institute competes. The director of HR will review surveys and other information on conditions in the relevant outside labor market and will recommend to the president any changes necessary to remain competitive. The president will authorize such changes, when they are feasible, on the basis of labor market conditions and not directly on changes in the cost of living. This process is separate from the adjustment made to individual salaries.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL SALARIES

Salary Review Committee: The salary review committee consists of the president and vice presidents; all Center directors, a senior fellow, the director of administration, the director of IT, and the director of HR. The function of the salary review committee is to ensure consistency and fairness of the salary review process and in the salary adjustments approved for staff members. The committee reviews the salary increase and promotion recommendations for all staff below the Center/office director level.

Salary Increase Budget: Each fall, the HR office will distribute to center and office directors historical and comparable salary data for their staffs. Prior to the fall meeting of the Institute's board of trustees, the salary review committee will meet to develop a recommended salary increase budget for the annual review based on the Institute's overall financial position, the general economic outlook, the CPI, and increases being proposed by comparable organizations. The president, in consultation with the board of trustees, will authorize a salary increase budget.

Salary Review Committee Decisions: Center and office directors will send salary increase recommendations to the salary review committee through the director of HR. The director of HR will review the recommendations for consistency with the most recent performance appraisals and with the goals of the Institute's Affirmative Action Program, and will verify that they are within the established salary ranges. The HR office will provide the salary review committee with the information it needs to make fair and equitable decisions. The recommendations of the salary review committee shall be reviewed and approved by the president.

Notification to Employees: The HR office will transmit a notification, through the appropriate center or office director, to each employee who receives a salary increase. The center or office director will notify each employee of his or her salary increase. Salary increases are effective January 1.

Salary Adjustment Appeals: An employee who wishes to appeal a salary increase decision should forward the appeal through the appropriate center or office director and the director of HR to the salary review committee. The appeal must be in writing and must explain why the employee feels the salary review committee's decision should be modified. The committee will consider the information presented in the written appeal and will make a recommendation to the president for final decision. Modifications resulting from an appeal will be made retroactive to January 1.

STARTING SALARIES FOR NEW EMPLOYEES

Center and office directors may make recommendations to the director of HR in connection with the hiring of a new employee, but only the director of HR has the authority to extend an official offer of employment or to authorize any other Center employee to extend a verbal offer of employment. Generally, starting salaries will not be set below the minimum nor above the maximum of the salary range for the job. The director of HR will recommend all starting salaries, basing them on internal equity and outside labor market considerations and may authorize starting salaries for all nonexempt employees and all exempt employees. Those cases where the center or office director and the director of HR do not concur require the authorization of the president.

TIMING OF FIRST SALARY REVIEW FOR NEW EMPLOYEES

Salaries for regular employees are reviewed as set forth in the offer letter that established their employment with the Institute.

Salaries for regular employees on term assignments are set for the duration of the assignment. If the term is extended or renewed, the term employee's salary will be considered at that time for adjustment for the duration of the new term. If the employee continues on regular employment status but is no longer subject to a specified term, the salary may be adjusted at that time or deferred until the next annual review cycle. Thereafter, the employee will receive salary consideration during the annual review cycle.

OUT-OF-CYCLE INCREASE IN SALARY

There may be circumstances that justify a salary increase at times of the year other than during the annual review period; such as promotion into a vacant position, or the necessity of counteracting an outside offer to an Institute employee. In such cases, associated salary increases will be effective on the date of approval.

DECREASE IN SALARY

Occasionally, because of work schedule requirements, the assumption of fewer or lower levels of responsibility, organizational changes which result in the elimination of an employee's former position, changes in career path, or other reasons, an employee will apply for a vacancy in a position at a lower level. The salary in such circumstances will be set within the new position's range at a point comparable to salaries paid to incumbents in that grade who have similar job responsibilities and job performance

levels. The director of HR in consultation with the appropriate center/office director will decide an appropriate salary rate.

PROMOTION

A salary increase associated with a promotion will be based on the individual's performance and relative position in the new salary range. Generally, promotion recommendations are considered by the salary review committee during their fall review cycle and, if approved, become effective on the first day of the calendar year. Out-of-cycle promotions to fill a vacant position, that are made outside of the regular salary review process, become effective on the date they are approved and any associated salary increase is effective on that date as well.

RECLASSIFICATION

A reclassification will occur when an employee's existing position is reevaluated by the HR office and reclassified into a higher or lower salary grade as a result of discernible and measurable changes in the level of responsibilities and skills required to perform the work. Those reclassifications which result in a position being moved to a higher salary grade will be considered promotions. A job reevaluation may also result in the position's title being changed (with no change to salary grade) or in no change to the position's classification. Requests for reclassification will generally be considered during the annual salary review cycle and any salary adjustment resulting from the reclassification will be effective January 1.

A request for reclassification may be initiated by the supervisor or by the employee through the supervisor and must be supported by substantial evidence that there has been a **significant** and **sustained** change in the degree of independence with which an individual works, the level of judgment the individual must exercise, the degree of difficulty of the tasks performed, or the individual's supervisory responsibilities. A change in the number of tasks associated with a job or the number of individuals supervised does not alone provide sufficient justification for reclassifying a position.

Reclassification Procedures for Administrative and IT Staff: The employee will complete a Job Description Questionnaire form, which may be obtained from the HR office. The supervisor will review the employee's responses and complete the supervisory section before forwarding the completed questionnaire, a copy of the employee's most recent performance appraisal, and any other substantiating data, along with a written request for reclassification, to the director of HR.

The HR office will compare the questionnaire to existing job descriptions and other job classification data to determine the appropriate classification for the position. If appropriate, the director of HR will recommend a new job title, classification, and salary grade to the salary review committee or president as may be appropriate. The employee will be notified of the decision through the supervisor.

Promotion Procedures for Research Staff: When, in the opinion of the center director, a researcher meets the established standards for promotion to the next higher grade, the center director may recommend a promotion. The center director must submit a Request for Promotion form (available from the HR office) or a written memorandum noting specific examples of performance that demonstrate a higher level of work than expected for the current grade level. A current resume, writing samples, and a copy of the most recent performance appraisal should accompany the memo.

Requests for promotion are considered during the annual salary review cycle. The director of HR will review the recommendation for completeness and consistency with the most recent performance appraisal and forward it to the salary review committee for a decision. The employee will be notified of the decision through the supervisor.

Annex 2.3 Job Position Descriptions and Promotion Criteria for Research Staff*

Presented below are job descriptions for researcher positions at the Urban Institute, Washington, DC. There are five researcher levels in this scheme. A few specialty positions, e.g., methodologist, fit within these five levels.

In addition to the descriptions, promotion criteria for one level to another appear together after the descriptions. Job descriptions and promotion criteria are organized from the lowest position, Research Assistant, to the highest position, Senior Fellow.

**THE URBAN INSTITUTE
JOB DESCRIPTION**

Job Title: Research Assistant

Salary Grade: R01

Reports To: More experienced researcher

GENERAL SUMMARY

Under close supervision by more experienced researchers, assists in the performance of social science research by gathering information and helping to prepare material for inclusion in reports. May administer surveys and/or questionnaires and compile results. May collect, tabulate, and process data using basic statistical methods and statistical analysis software.

TYPICAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

- 1 Performs library research on specified topics and synthesizes material in the form of bibliographies, abstracts, memoranda and reports, according to instructions.
- 2 Tabulates and/or maintains collected data by means of coding or organizing data into tables or graphs.
- 3 Processes data from tapes or other sources of large data sets using statistical analysis software such as SAS or SPSS.
- 4 Analyzes primary and secondary data using basic statistical methods.
- 5 Administers structured surveys (telephone, written, computer-assisted, and in-person interviews) for projects requiring primary data collection.
- 6 May assign work to junior level administrative staff or temporary staff.

QUALIFICATIONS:

The academic knowledge of a discipline that is generally associated with the completion of a bachelor's degree or an equivalent combination of education and experience or demonstrated ability to perform beginning level research in a social science field.

Only those major job duties necessary for proper job evaluation and/or labor market analysis have been included. Other duties may be assigned by the supervisor.

The Urban Institute

Job Description

Job Title: Research Associate II (R02)
Department: Research Center
Reports To: Center Director
FLSA Status: Exempt
Prepared By:
Prepared Date: 01/20/2011
Approved By:
Approved Date:

SUMMARY

Responsible for conducting assigned parts of social science research projects under the general direction of more senior staff members. Assists in the development of research approach and data collection instruments and in the selection of statistical techniques. Collects data and applies standard methods of statistical analysis. Reports research findings in writing.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES include the following. Other duties may be assigned.

1. Reviews and writes critical summaries of research literature and/or public policy.
2. Administers surveys (telephone, written, computer-assisted, and in-person interviews). Makes site visits and conducts surveys and interviews with local public officials and/or private citizens.
3. Analyzes data using such standard statistical techniques as multiple regression and factor analysis; draws conclusions from analyzed data; prepares statistical reports and data presentations.
4. Writes up research results; assists in writing proposals and preparing papers for publication. May be called upon to present results to clients.
5. Supervises and assigns work to research assistants and more junior administrative staff.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES

This job has no supervisory responsibilities.

QUALIFICATIONS To perform this job successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill, and/or ability required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

The academic knowledge of a discipline that is generally associated with the attainment of a master's degree (usually with a bachelor's degree in a related field) or an equivalent combination of education and progressively more responsible relevant work experience.

LANGUAGE SKILLS

Ability to read, analyze, and interpret general business periodicals, reports, business correspondence, and government regulations. Ability to write reports and business correspondence. Ability to effectively present information and respond to questions from senior researchers, managers, and funders.

MATHEMATICAL SKILLS

Ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide in all units of measure, using whole numbers, common fractions, and decimals. Ability to apply concepts such as fractions, percentages, ratios, and proportions to practical situations.

REASONING ABILITY

Ability to define problems, collect data, establish facts, and draw valid conclusions. Ability to interpret an extensive variety of instructions in written, oral, or diagram form. Ability to deal with several abstract and concrete variables.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

None are necessary for this job.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to sit; use hands to finger, handle, or feel; reach with hands and arms; and talk or hear. The employee frequently is required to stand and walk. The employee must occasionally lift and/or move up to 10 pounds. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision, distance vision, and ability to adjust focus.

WORK ENVIRONMENT The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

The noise level in the work environment is usually quiet.

**THE URBAN INSTITUTE
JOB DESCRIPTION**

Job Title: Research Associate I

Salary Grade: R03

Reports To: Senior researcher

GENERAL SUMMARY

Responsible for planning and independently executing a major segment of a social science research project in consultation with and under the general supervision of a Center Director, Senior Research Associate, or Principal Research Associate. Designs the research approach and selects the appropriate quantitative or other tools of analysis, with consultation from more senior staff. Performs analysis; draws policy inferences; writes and presents reports. May develop and write proposals. May function as principal investigator and project manager for small projects.

TYPICAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

1. Develops or participates in developing research topics, proposals, and research design.
2. Selects appropriate statistical techniques to analyze collected data.
3. Supervises and/or participates in data collection, and analysis by less senior research staff; participates in interpreting data from a policy perspective.
4. Makes site visits, conducts interviews with public officials, and supervises field research.
5. Maintains budget and manages resources for segments of research project under his/her responsibility; may supervise less senior researchers.
6. Participates in writing final reports and presenting results to clients.

QUALIFICATIONS

A combination of the quantitative, analytical, and writing skills, relevant substantive knowledge, and social policy research experience needed to perform the duties described above, or the academic knowledge of and research experience in a discipline that is generally associated with the attainment of the Ph.D.

Only those major job duties necessary for proper job evaluation and/or labor market analysis have been included. Other duties may be assigned by the supervisor.

Job Description

Job Title: Senior Research Associate (R04)
Department: Research Center
Reports To: Center Director

SUMMARY

Working collaboratively with other senior and junior researchers develops and directs policy analyses, program evaluations, and research studies.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES include the following. Other duties may be assigned.

Directs multiple research projects serving at times as principal investigator and at other times as project associate.

Develops plans for project or studies guidelines for project.

Plans schedule according to variety of methods to be used, availability and quantity of resources, and number of subordinate personnel assigned to participate in project.

Conducts research, utilizing institution library, archives, and collections, and other sources of information, to collect, record, analyze, and evaluate facts.

Discusses findings with other personnel to evaluate validity of findings.

Prepares reports of completed projects for publication in technical journals, for presentation to agency requesting project, or for use in further applied or theoretical research activities.

Conceptualizes research topics and strategies for addressing the inquiry, develops appropriate data, estimate and evaluate statistical relationships and models and present the findings in coherent, thoughtful and interesting manner.

Directs and participates in fundraising efforts to support research.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES

Manages 1-3 subordinate employees in the junior research staff. Is responsible for the overall direction, coordination, and evaluation of one or more research projects. Carries out supervisory responsibilities in accordance with the organization's policies and applicable laws. Responsibilities include interviewing, hiring, and training employees; planning, assigning, and directing work; appraising performance; rewarding and disciplining employees; addressing complaints and resolving problems.

QUALIFICATIONS To perform this job successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill, and/or ability required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

Doctoral degree (Ph. D.) or equivalent; and six to ten years related experience and/or training; or equivalent combination of education and experience.

LANGUAGE SKILLS

Ability to read, analyze, and interpret the most complex documents. Ability to respond effectively to the most sensitive inquiries or complaints. Ability to write speeches and articles using original or innovative techniques or style. Ability to make effective and persuasive speeches and presentations on controversial or complex topics to top management, public groups, and/or boards of directors.

MATHEMATICAL SKILLS

Ability to comprehend and apply principles of advanced calculus, modern algebra, and advanced statistical theory. Ability to work with concepts such as limits, rings, quadratic and differential equations, and proofs of theorems.

REASONING ABILITY

Ability to apply principles of logical or scientific thinking to a wide range of intellectual and practical problems. Ability to deal with nonverbal symbolism (formulas, scientific equations, graphs, musical notes, etc.,) in its most difficult phases. Ability to deal with a variety of abstract and concrete variables.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

None.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to sit. The employee frequently is required to talk or hear. The employee must occasionally lift and/or move up to 10 pounds.

WORK ENVIRONMENT The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

The noise level in the work environment is usually quiet.

Job Description

Job Title: Senior Fellow (R05)
Department: Research
Reports To: Center Director

SUMMARY

The fundamental qualification for the Senior Fellow designation is a national reputation for policy-related research/analysis. In addition to this qualification, all of the responsibilities and qualities of the Senior Research Associate are expected of these employees.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES include the following. Other duties may be assigned.

An extensive publications record including a significant number of articles in top-rated journals and a body of other published work such as policy briefs, contributions to books, and influential project reports;

Research leadership demonstrated through the initiation and completion of a number of successful, highly-complex research projects, and the proven ability to mentor junior staff;

A substantial fund-raising track record that contributes significantly to their research center's base of financial support.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES

Manages 2-3 subordinate supervisors who supervise 3-5 employees in the junior research staff. Is responsible for the overall direction, coordination, and evaluation of a research program. May also directly supervise one or more non-supervisory employees. Carries out supervisory responsibilities in accordance with the organization's policies and applicable laws. Responsibilities include interviewing, hiring, and training employees; planning, assigning, and directing work; appraising performance; rewarding and disciplining employees; addressing complaints and resolving problems.

QUALIFICATIONS To perform this job successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill, and/or ability required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

Doctoral degree (Ph. D.) or equivalent; and more than 10 years related experience and/or training; or equivalent combination of education and experience.

LANGUAGE SKILLS

Ability to read, analyze, and interpret the most complex documents. Ability to respond effectively to the most sensitive inquiries or complaints. Ability to write speeches and articles using original or innovative

techniques or style. Ability to make effective and persuasive speeches and presentations on controversial or complex topics to top management, public groups, and/or boards of directors.

MATHEMATICAL SKILLS

Ability to comprehend and apply principles of advanced calculus, modern algebra, and advanced statistical theory. Ability to work with concepts such as limits, rings, quadratic and differential equations, and proofs of theorems.

REASONING ABILITY

Ability to apply principles of logical or scientific thinking to a wide range of intellectual and practical problems. Ability to deal with nonverbal symbolism (formulas, scientific equations, graphs, musical notes, etc.,) in its most difficult phases. Ability to deal with a variety of abstract and concrete variables.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

None.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to sit. The employee frequently is required to talk or hear. The employee must occasionally lift and/or move up to 10 pounds.

WORK ENVIRONMENT The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

The noise level in the work environment is usually quiet.

STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION FROM RESEARCH ASSISTANT TO RESEARCH ASSOCIATE II

Those promoted to RAI must demonstrate the ability to conduct research that is equivalent in quality and thoroughness to work done at the master's degree level. They should be performing at a level that exceeds the level expected of a research assistant. Most importantly, they must consistently demonstrate a high level of *independence* and *initiative* in their work. This requirement applies whether the research assistant's work is largely quantitative or qualitative. In general, it takes a minimum of two to two and a half years of experience as a research assistant to achieve the level of RAI; however, given truly exceptional performance, this standard could be met in a shorter period of time.

The research assistant should be making substantive contributions to research projects by helping to do the following: 1) frame analytic questions; 2) identify relevant measures and data sources; 3) organize the process of data collection and analysis; and 4) interpret the results.

To be promoted, a research assistant must consistently demonstrate at least three of the following:

- Expertise in manipulating and analyzing complex data using statistical programming software, such as SAS or STATA.
- A detailed and thorough understanding of one or more databases (e.g., CPS, SIPP, or NSAF) or programming software. As an expert in these areas, the research assistant serves as a resource to other researchers.
- Strong writing skills, demonstrated through high-quality contributions to reports and articles.
- Substantive knowledge of his or her field(s), including an understanding of key policy issues and an ability to apply that knowledge to research.
- Effective data collection through surveys or site visits. For example, the research assistant will have successfully led site interviews and synthesized information collected in a site visit, identifying key issues raised and questions for follow-up.
- Excellent communication skills and good judgment when working with internal or external collaborators.
- Effective mentoring of new research assistants, including helping to train them.

STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION FROM Research Associate II to Research Associate I

A researcher promoted to RAI must demonstrate a combination of analytic and writing skills, relevant substantive knowledge, and social policy research experience that is generally associated with the equivalent of having a Ph.D. This means that, in addition to the specific minimum requirements listed below, the candidate must have demonstrated the independent ability to conceptualize a research question, relate the research question to appropriate theories and prior research, develop research designs,

manage significant components of research projects without close supervision, and interpret and communicate the findings. These skills can be demonstrated while working under the supervision of a more senior researcher. In general, a minimum of four years of research experience at the RAI level is required to achieve the level of an RAI, although not all of this experience must occur at the Urban Institute. To be *considered* for promotion, an RAI ***must meet at least four of the following five performance standards:***

1. Plays a significant role in the development and design of research projects.

- Designs the approach and methodology for at least one substantial proposal, research project, or for a significant component of a large project.
- Research designs and/or proposal contributions should demonstrate independent expertise in the concepts and methods of social science research (although they may involve the application of pre-existing methodologies and a more senior researcher may participate as an advisor and/or contributor).

2. Independently collects, analyzes or manages qualitative information and/or quantitative data.

- Primary responsibility for implementing statistical techniques and/or other methods for collecting, analyzing or managing data in at least one significant research project, *and*
- Demonstrated ability to synthesize results and draw conclusions from data.
- These accomplishments should be reflected in one or more proposals, design documents, or research reports.

3. Authors or co-authors research reports.

- Sole or co-author of at least three project reports, journal articles, or book chapters (see UI policy on authorship).
- These publications should involve different analytic efforts (not three versions of the same analysis) and demonstrate substantive knowledge of the field and relevant policy issues.
- For publications where the candidate is a co-author, he/she should have lead responsibility for one or more significant components of the analysis and writing.

4. Manages major components of research projects.

- Takes initiative and works collaboratively with his/her supervisor in the conduct of research projects and their management;
- Plans and manages research activities, such as data collection, data base development, or statistical analysis; *and*
- Manages schedule, budgets, and project coordination for at least one funded research project.

5. Presents research methods and findings to clients and other outside audiences.

- At least two presentations to clients or at academic or policy conferences, *or*
- Assigned primary responsibility for communication with outside clients, or other users of Urban Institute research.

In certain instances researchers will have non-traditional career paths. When a researcher's position is clearly defined as technical or research development, exceptional performance in areas 1 or 2 may substitute for full achievement in areas 3, 4 or 5. For example, promotion may be appropriate for a

candidate who regularly develops research ideas and plays a significant role in securing support for projects (including meeting with representatives of funding organizations), or a candidate with highly specialized skills in data collection or data management who is responsible for designing major components of a survey or complex analytical model, even if that candidate does not fully satisfy the requirements in areas 3, 4 or 5. In all instances, however, a candidate must demonstrate independent conceptual ability to be promoted.

Standards for Promotion to Senior Research Associate

Those promoted to SRA must have demonstrated on more than one occasion their ability to conduct research that is equivalent in thoroughness and originality to the completion of a doctoral dissertation. Also, they generally must meet minimum requirements¹ in each of four performance categories:

- Publications -- achieve the qualitative equivalent of being the sole author of two articles published in selective refereed journals (e.g., *Journal of Human Resources*);
- Other Dissemination Activities -- accomplish the qualitative equivalent of (a) being the primary author of two project reports which achieve wide circulation and attention and (b) presenting six research papers at selective national conferences;
- Fundraising -- over a period of time not longer than two years, achieve the qualitative equivalent of raising the funding for three professional-person-years of research activity; and
- Management -- over a period not longer than two years, accomplish the qualitative equivalent of managing the budget, staff, schedule, substantive work and external relations for three professional-person-years of research activity.

Substantially exceeding the minimum requirements in one category can offset a shortfall relative to the minimum requirements in another category. For example, a combination of publications and other dissemination activities can be used to satisfy one of the two dissemination requirements. Special experience (e.g., service as a program administrator or as a practicing lawyer) will be considered if relevant.

In certain instances, researchers will have non-traditional career paths. For example, if a researcher's position is clearly defined as technical, then responsibility for a substantial data collection effort or a highly technical analytic activity may offset a shortfall in another area, such as academic publications. In addition, if a researcher's position is clearly defined to focus on research development (developing new research ideas and securing funding to carry them out), then substantially exceeding the minimum requirements in fundraising and management may be combined with non-academic dissemination activities to offset a shortfall in academic publications.

¹The examples provided are illustrations of achievements which would just meet the minimum standards for a category. They represent baselines against which other relevant accomplishments can be evaluated. For example, co-authorship of four or even three articles in *Evaluation Review* might be treated as equivalent to sole authorship of one article in the *Journal of Human Resources*. Books or book chapters, certainly if published after peer review by a selective press, would also be counted.

Standards for Promotion to Senior Fellow

The fundamental qualification for the Senior Fellow designation is a national reputation for policy-related research/analysis. This reputation should be demonstrated through a number of research accomplishments:

- Research leadership as demonstrated through the initiation and completion of a number of successful, highly-complex research projects, and the proven ability to mentor junior staff;
- A substantial fund-raising track record that contributes significantly to the research center's base of financial support;
- An extensive dissemination record including
 - (1) a significant number of articles in top-rated journals *and/or*
 - (2) a body of other significant work such as policy briefs, contributions to books, Congressional testimony, invited conference presentations, and influential project reports;

It is expected that a Senior Fellow will meet most, if not all, of these criteria. It is essential that the Senior Fellow meet the publication/dissemination criteria in at least one of the two ways mentioned above. A candidate that has a shortfall in one of other two criteria (leadership or fund raising) would be held to a higher standard of excellence in the other criteria. Senior Fellow status generally will require a minimum of 15 years of research experience beyond a PhD or equivalent; while this is the expectation of the Urban Institute, researchers that can demonstrate that these criteria have been met prior to the 15 year standard will be given full consideration. Designation of Senior Fellow status through promotion or the hiring process only results after consideration by an Urban Institute SRA/ Senior Fellow -review committee and approval by the president of the Institute.

Institute Fellow

Institute Fellows are designated by the president of the Institute and must have a broad-based national reputation for expertise on major issues on which their views, analysis, and commentary are sought out by the broad public policy world (including academics, political figures, journalists, and private sector individuals/ groups). They will often have held some prominent public/private-sector position. They will have evidenced an ability to interact competently with that broad public policy making world in a variety of forums and under public pressures. For example, they will frequently engage in the following activities:

- Interactions with the media (often quoted in print, on local and national radio and television);
- Speaking at high quality forums and gatherings focused on broad public policy — not just academic meetings;
- Writing substantive pieces for the serious popular press such as opinion editorials or articles for national news outlets (such as major newspapers, the Atlantic Monthly, Harpers, etc.)
- Serving (or having served) on government and private commissions, substantive panels, and/or advisory boards;
- Testifying before the Congress.

Annex 2.4 Job Position Descriptions for Communications Staff*

At the time of this writing, the Urban Institute was upgrading its communications program to a major activity that would be at the forefront of think tank programs. Because I obtained the descriptions at this time of transition, some of the new descriptions are copy for recruitment ads rather than formal position descriptions; they nevertheless provide a clear indication of the position's content.

Position Description

Director of Digital Marketing Urban Institute

Founded in 1968, the Urban Institute offers independent, rigorous analysis and evidence-based solutions to inform policymakers and the public about the challenges and opportunities confronting vulnerable populations. The Institute recently launched a comprehensive organizational initiative to increase its visibility and impact. To support this work, the Urban Institute is seeking a Director of Digital Marketing to develop and execute a public engagement strategy that will foster interactive communication with the Institute's key audiences and advance the organization's reputation for fair, robust policy analysis.

Position Overview

The **Director of Digital Marketing** will lead the Urban Institute's ambitious online communications efforts. He/she will be responsible for developing the voice for all aspects of the organization's online presence. We are looking for a dynamic, self-motivated communications professional who can oversee web design and content management, writing and editing for the web, graphic design and site management. This individual will work closely with the communications team and the policy research staff to maintain site standards with regard to new development as well as existing online properties.

The **Director of Digital Marketing** will develop, execute, and manage successful online strategies that are based upon goals and intended audience while mindfully positioning the Institute and supporting its branding strategy. He/she will provide vision, leadership and an integrated approach to all online communications products. This is a senior position requiring strong, proven communications skills and significant experience managing people, online projects and strategies.

Specific Responsibilities

The successful candidate will execute on the following priorities:

- Be responsible for the management, update and quality control of content for the organization's website and affiliated URLs.
- Help develop web-specific outreach strategies for new reports and major areas of research and produce required web copy and modules.
- Provide leadership, vision and management oversight for the digital team and its strategic priorities.
- Draft policies and develop work plans for maintaining and improving the Urban Institute website.
- Supervise the development of new online content to ensure it meets the Urban Institute's standards for excellence and quality.
- Work in close collaboration with researchers on the development of effective online strategies, including needs assessment, planning, design, implementation, audience engagement, and life-cycle management.
- Manage relationships with web development firms and vendors, including development of RFPs, policies, and requirements for new deliverables, and supervise the design and development of new online properties.
- Explore options and make recommendations for ways to leverage new online technologies.
- Create, develop and manage content for organization's web presence (requires working with content management software).
- Coordinate web projects that span multiple departments and/or projects.
- Maintain a consistent look and feel throughout all web properties.

- Keep current with emerging web technologies through relevant blogs, listservs, and events.
- Assure web-based information is archived for future needs and reference.
- Analyze and report on web traffic metrics and develop actionable responses to trends.

Qualifications

The Institute is seeking an experienced and energetic professional with the following attributes:

- Minimum 10 years' experience in digital marketing, online communications and management, with a portfolio that includes strategy development, content management, and supervision of ongoing operations.
- Exceptional communications, interpersonal, and organizational skills.
- Ability to manage multiple projects in a fast-paced, deadline-driven environment.
- Proven track record of successful online initiatives, such as new or upgraded websites, technology ports or major campaigns using technology such as CSS/HTML, CMS and Photoshop.
- Familiarity with Cold Fusion and SQL, E-mail lists, Javascript, XML, 508 compliance; knowledge of search engine optimization and web traffic analysis.
- A keen interest and curiosity in using online technologies and ideas to solve communications problems, including working with colleagues who lack deep technology experience
- Enthusiasm for great websites and online strategy along with the practical skills to address immediate needs and long-term priorities.
- The ability to act as a mentor to direct reports and colleagues.
- Strong written, verbal and visual communications skills, including presentation skills.
- An understanding of public policy trends, critical issues, and effective media responses to policy opportunities.

Position Description
Director of External Affairs
Urban Institute

Founded in 1968, the Urban Institute was created to bring to the study of domestic issues the same scientific evidence and analysis that others brought to defense and foreign affairs. The Urban Institute offers independent facts, rigorous analysis and evidence-based solutions to inform policymakers and the public about the challenges and opportunities confronting our nation. Today, the Urban Institute is seeking a **Director of External Affairs** (a new role within the organization) as we aspire to raise the influence of our research, improve the quality of public policy by ensuring that rigorous analysis is available to policymakers and policy-influencers when they need it and that our independence and reliability is well-recognized and respected.

Position Overview

The **Director of External Affairs** will be a member of the Urban Institute's communications office, reporting to the Vice President of Communication and carry out the daily programmatic requirements to further the Urban Institute's resource development and external affairs goals. The Director of External affairs must possess the ability to effectively implement a variety of resource development and develop strategic partnerships as well as act as a liaison with Capitol Hill to assist the Urban Institute in furthering its mission.

The **Director of External Affairs** will have duties including the following:

Resource Development

- Identify potential funding sources.
- Develop funding proposals to support the Urban Institute's mission and strategic activities.
- Work with appropriate staff to organize fundraising .
- Ensure continued positive relationships with the Urban Institute's funders and supporters.
- Complete grant reports and work closely with staff who are implementing grants and/or contracts.

Networking

- Create and develop strategic partnerships with organizations, companies and individuals with the objective of building the Urban Institute's visibility.
- Align with strategic partners that can help build awareness of the Urban Institute and support its mission and programs.
- Represent the Urban Institute to a variety of audiences, including grassroots and community-based organizations, foundations, trade associations, for-profit and non-profit entities, members of Congress, and other organizations in a professional manner.
- Use technology and innovative systems to expand the Urban Institute's brand and promote development opportunities.

Candidate Qualifications and Requirements:

The Institute is seeking an experienced and energetic development professional with the following attributes:

- Advanced degree in a relevant field, such as non-profit management and development, marketing, project management or communications is preferred. The minimal educational requirement for this position is a Bachelor's degree in a relevant field.
- Minimum of two years of successful experience in the field of resource development, grant management, project management, community affairs, marketing, communications, external affairs, or another related field.
- Superb organizational and fund raising skills as well as excellent judgment in developing and implementing priorities.
- Excellent public speaking and communications skills to develop and nurture relationships across a broad spectrum of groups, businesses and government agencies.
- Demonstrated ability in managing complex workloads including success in organizing special events or conferences and developing work plans, writing reports, executing contracts, staying on task and executing deliverables against a time table and work plan.
- Successful experience in developing and managing budgets and analyzing financial documents.
- Working knowledge and familiarity with Microsoft Office Suites and Outlook or equivalent software.
- Ability to work independently as well as be a team player in a multi-task work environment while producing the highest caliber work product in a timely manner

The Urban Institute Job Description

Job Title: Editorial/Production Supervisor (S04)
Department: Communications - Urban Institute Press
Reports To: Director of Publications

SUMMARY

Working under minimal supervision, manages UI book and report production from final edited manuscript to distribution of printed books. Supervises regular employees as well as on- and off-site freelance proofreaders, copy editors, and desktop publishers.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES include the following. Other duties may be assigned.

1. Plans, schedules, assigns and reviews the work of editorial and production staff, and on-site freelance proofreaders, copy editors, and desktop publishers.
2. Creates and monitors production schedule from manuscript to printed publication.
3. Plans and supervises execution of schedules with the designer, typesetter, printer, and/or desktop publishers, and distributor.
4. Selects vendors for typesetting and printing of manuscripts not copublished and maintains relationship through production process.
5. Works with authors during the production process. Keeps them on schedule for returning proofs, approving cover designs, and so on.
6. Oversees publication manufacturing.
7. Prepares required documentation for the Library of Congress and the U.S. Copyright Office.
8. Prepares and monitors production budgets and selects vendors for research center publications.
9. Oversees budgets and prepares cost analyses of individual UI Press titles produced.
10. Prepares royalty statements to authors and monitors royalties due from distributors.
11. Prepares monthly analysis of distributor sales reports. Analyzes budget and sales figures and recommends corrective action as appropriate.
12. Takes responsibility for special Institute-wide system-related projects (e.g., design and implementation of central mailing list system) and Press' presence on the UI Internet home page.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES

Is responsible for the overall direction, coordination, and evaluation of several data entry operators as well as editorial/production assistants. Carries out supervisory responsibilities in accordance with the organization's policies and applicable laws. Responsibilities include interviewing, hiring, and training employees; planning, assigning, and directing work; appraising performance; rewarding and disciplining employees; addressing complaints and resolving problems.

QUALIFICATIONS To perform this job successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill, and/or ability required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

Bachelor's degree (B.A.) from four-year college or university and five to seven years related experience and/or training; or equivalent combination of education and experience.

LANGUAGE SKILLS

Ability to read, edit, analyze, and interpret documents such as correspondence, articles, and technical reports. Ability to write technical and business reports, business correspondence, as well as edit and proofread books, manuscripts and papers. Ability to effectively present information and respond to questions from groups of managers, clients, customers, and the general public.

MATHEMATICAL SKILLS

Ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide in all units of measure, using whole numbers, common fractions, and decimals. Ability to compute rate, ratio, and percent and to draw and interpret bar graphs.

REASONING ABILITY

Ability to define problems, collect data, establish facts, and draw valid conclusions. Ability to interpret an extensive variety of technical instructions in mathematical or diagram form and deal with several abstract and concrete variables.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

None are required for this job.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to sit; use hands to finger, handle, or feel; reach with hands and arms; and talk or hear. The employee frequently is required to stand and walk. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision, distance vision, and ability to adjust focus.

WORK ENVIRONMENT The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

Position Description
Senior Writer/Editor
Urban Institute

Founded in 1968, the Urban Institute was created to bring to the study of domestic issues the same scientific evidence and analysis that others brought to defense and foreign affairs. The Urban Institute offers independent facts, rigorous analysis and evidence-based solutions to inform policymakers and the public about the challenges and opportunities confronting our nation. Today, the Urban Institute is seeking a **Senior Writer/Editor** as we aspire to raise the influence of our research, improve the quality of public policy by ensuring that rigorous analysis is available to policymakers and policy-influencers when they need it and that our independence and reliability is well-recognized and respected.

Position Overview

The **Senior Writer/Editor** will be a member of the Urban Institute's communications office, reporting to the Vice President of Communication and will perform complex editing, writing and interviewing assignments on social science research topics. This individual will work closely with web, public affairs, and publishing teams within the Communications Group

The **Senior Writer/Editor** will:

- Perform complex editing and writing assignments on social science research topics and special projects for UI staff members and UI Press and Office of Publications.
- Perform major substantive editing of manuscripts submitted to the UI Press for publication as books or UI reports.
- Edit working papers and final research project reports.
- Assist in recasting research project reports or other materials according to agency specifications for transmittal to Congress.
- Ghostwrite articles for staff members based on research reports or papers that they have authored. Edits testimony or speeches for staff members..

Candidate Qualifications and Requirements:

The Institute is seeking an experienced and energetic development professional with the following attributes:

- Ability to write technical reports as well as lay translations.
- Ability to effectively present information and respond to questions from researchers and research audiences.
- Understanding of and enthusiasm for the Urban Institute's role and potential as well as a strategic vision for raising our visibility and impact.
- MA in journalism, communication, public policy or related social science field. Newsroom experience also valued.
- Ability to read, analyze, and interpret sophisticated research.
- Knowledge and experience in the world of economic and social policymaking, especially -- but not exclusively -- federal policy.
- Excellent written communications, presentation, organizational, and interpersonal skills.
- Ability to initiate, prioritize, and follow through on plans.
- Collaborative style, diplomacy and tact.
- Comfort with social scientific methods and data.

Metro Policy Editor

Position Description

Founded in 1968, the Urban Institute offers independent, rigorous analysis and evidence-based solutions in social and economic policy to inform decision makers and the public. The Institute recently launched a comprehensive organizational initiative to increase its visibility and engagement. To support this work, the Urban Institute is seeking a **Metropolitan Policy Editor**, a savvy, flexible, fast-thinking expert who works within the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center team to shape debate and discussions among influencers at the state and national level.

Essential functions

The Metropolitan Policy Editor will be embedded in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center, which concentrates on the communities—housing developments, neighborhoods, cities, and suburbs—that make up America's urban regions. The Metropolitan Policy editor will work alongside its researchers and director while also serving as a member of the Urban Institute's Strategic Communications and Outreach team. S/he should have subject matter expertise in issues that relate to center, including cities and neighborhoods and the federal, state, and local policies that affect them. S/he is expected to build a communications program that advances the center's and the organization's goals, including developing content, conducting outreach, and building relationships with current and new audiences. S/he will leverage the knowledge, data, and relationships of the center and its scholars, and s/he will shape conversations and decisions among thought leaders who should know about the center's work.

This is a unique opportunity to build a new program for visibility and engagement that is rooted in the Institute's strong reputation for providing nonpartisan, evidence-based policy solutions. The center's research investigates factors that shape the quality of life in American communities, the opportunities they offer residents, and the effectiveness of federal, state, and local public policies that govern urban housing and neighborhoods. The Metropolitan Policy Editor reports to the Director of Strategic Communications with a dotted line to one of the center's senior leaders.

Responsibilities:

- Act as policy communications advisor and strategist within Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center
- Translate complex research reports for a broader, sophisticated audience of thought leaders, influencers, media, and interested individuals
- Develop compelling content including (but not limited to) policy briefs, newsletters, blog posts, op-eds, fact sheets, and press releases
- Develop communications plans and editorial calendars for new publications and promotion of existing research
- Conduct outreach with Hill staff, thought leaders, traditional media, bloggers, and others to leverage research and influence policy conversations on the state and national level
- Be familiar with all research that has been developed to date; be poised to seize opportunities within the news cycle to bring all our pre-existing research to bear in policy conversations and the news media
- Develop strong relationships with reporters and bloggers in the field of urban policy

- Liaise with the central comms team to be able to reflect the refined Urban Institute brand in center communications; elevate center issues so that they are part of the broader organizational strategy to boost the impact and visibility of the institute
- Manage events, roundtables, briefings, and other opportunities in coordination with the Dir. of External Affairs
- Work with other members of the communications team to train spokespeople and equip them with the requisite media, digital, presentation, and other skills to effectively represent metropolitan and housing policy

Qualifications

- Bachelor's degree in political science, communications, marketing, journalism or in the field of urban policy issues
- 5-10 years of policy communications experience, including in the field of urban policy issues; Capitol Hill experience strongly preferred
- Experience leading strategy development of organization, including managing timelines and producing deliverables
- Experience managing outside vendors and freelancers
- Strong writing and analytical skills, with strong experience in journalism, external affairs or digital/traditional media strategy
- Strong project management and organizational skills
- Ability to form relationships with a range of staff, including data-driven researchers
- Ability to understand and interpret data and translate it for mainstream audiences
- Proven track record on management and team building, including the ability to set objectives, measure success, and meet or exceed goals
- Demonstrated experience in MS Office, Word, and Excel. May require database management, such as for social media monitoring, constituent relationship management, and/or media relations

Urban Institute Job Description

Job Title: Production Editor (S03)
Department: Communication
Reports To: Production Supervisor

SUMMARY

Under general supervision, coordinates activities of editorial, production, and other staff engaged in preparing written material for print or electronic publication by performing the following duties.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES include the following. Other duties may be assigned.

Oversees workflow of projects throughout production process, within specified budgets and deadlines.

Coordinates activities of copy editors, editorial assistants, technical editors, proofreaders, indexers, graphic designers, illustrators, and production and marketing department staff.

Maintains smooth traffic flow between design, editorial, and production departments.

Confers with authors and editors regarding budget, background information, objectives, audience level, and style.

Maintains author relationships.

Prioritizes, tracks, handles, and maintains records of the elements, costs, and time schedules of multiple projects.

Selects, supervises, and obtains cost estimates from outside vendors such as freelance editors, packagers, proofreaders, and indexers.

Initiates or replies to correspondence regarding material being published.

Copy edits manuscripts or supervises copy editors.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES

None.

QUALIFICATIONS To perform this job successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill, and/or ability required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

Bachelor's degree (B. A.) from four-year college or university; and one to two years related experience and/or training; or equivalent combination of education and experience. Advanced degree or public policy training helpful.

LANGUAGE SKILLS

Ability to read, analyze, and interpret common scientific and technical journals, financial reports, and legal documents. Ability to respond to common inquiries or complaints from customers, regulatory agencies, or members of the business community. Ability to write speeches and articles for publication that conform to prescribed style and format. Ability to effectively present information to top management, public groups, and/or boards of directors.

MATHEMATICAL SKILLS

Ability to calculate figures and amounts such as discounts, interest, commissions, proportions, percentages, area, circumference, and volume. Ability to apply concepts of basic algebra and geometry.

REASONING ABILITY

Ability to define problems, collect data, establish facts, and draw valid conclusions. Ability to interpret an extensive variety of technical instructions in mathematical or diagram form and deal with several abstract and concrete variables.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

None.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to sit. The employee is occasionally required to use hands to finger, handle, or feel and reach with hands and arms. The employee must occasionally lift and/or move up to 25 pounds. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision, color vision, and ability to adjust focus.

WORK ENVIRONMENT The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

Job Description

Job Title: Web Specialist (S03)
Department: Communications
Reports To: Sr. Public Affairs Associate

SUMMARY

Develops, organizes, and manages Web sites by performing the following duties.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES include the following. Other duties may be assigned.

Consults with design, technical, and marketing staff to plan Web site development.

Develops technical architecture of Web sites including scripting, database design, and user interface design.

Refreshes Web site content to ensure accuracy and timeliness of information and images.

Stays abreast of industry trends and all applicable technologies, including scripting, security issues, authoring tools, graphic design tools, and new languages.

Integrates new technologies into Web site.

Answers or forwards to management any Web site-related e-mail questions from users.

Communicates with other personnel regarding technical requirements of Web site and upcoming projects or events related to Web site.

Analyzes traffic to Web site and recommends any necessary programming changes.

Manages transfer of files and memory allocation for Web site on the server.

Creates automatic systems of data and content storage on Web site.

Provides technical support and participates in employee Web site training.

Collaborates with external vendors on special Web site events, promotions, marketing campaigns, or specific design projects.

Works with information services and other internal divisions to create internal Web sites running on proprietary intranets.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES None

QUALIFICATIONS To perform this job successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill, and/or ability required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

MA/BA and two or more years related experience and/or training; or equivalent combination of education and experience.

LANGUAGE SKILLS

Ability to read, analyze, and interpret general business periodicals, professional journals, technical procedures, or governmental regulations. Ability to write reports and business correspondence. Ability to effectively present information and respond to questions from groups of managers, clients, customers, and the general public.

MATHEMATICAL SKILLS

Ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide in all units of measure, using whole numbers, common fractions, and decimals. Ability to compute rate, ratio, and percent and to draw and interpret bar graphs.

REASONING ABILITY

Ability to solve practical problems and deal with a variety of concrete variables in situations where only limited standardization exists. Ability to interpret a variety of instructions furnished in written, oral, diagram, or schedule form.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

PHYSICAL DEMANDS The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

WORK ENVIRONMENT The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

Infographics (or Data Visualization) Specialist

Position Description

The Urban Institute is seeking an infographic (data visualization) specialist who can create clear compelling graphics from economic and social science research reports for UI's website and publications.

The infographics specialist will work with researchers and the publishing and website teams to create new graphics that display key findings in striking ways and also find ways to combine data from more than one report to show a big picture. She/he will be given assignments and eventually will also propose graphics projects that encompass broad, novel, or re-framed topics.

Candidates should have a strong artistic sense, ease with complex data, advanced computer skills, proven design skills, ability to work with others and alone, and a commitment to the Urban Institute's mission. Fluency in Photoshop and Illustrator is essential along with experience in Flash, AfterEffects, or other interactive design tools. The ideal candidate will also be able to pinch-hit as a text editor to make documents web-ready. A BA in communications, information design, related arts, or social science is required. An MA in one of these or allied fields is desirable.

Content and Social Media Strategist

Position Description

Overview:

Founded in 1968, the Urban Institute offers independent, rigorous analysis and evidence-based solutions to inform policymakers and the public about the challenges and opportunities confronting vulnerable populations. The Institute recently launched a comprehensive organizational initiative to increase its visibility and impact. To support this work, the Urban Institute is seeking a Content and Social Media Strategist to join a communications program that advances organizational goals; leverages the knowledge, data, and relationships of the Urban Institute and its researchers; and strengthens relationships with current and new audiences. This is a unique opportunity to help build a new program for visibility and impact that is rooted in the Institute's strong reputation for providing nonpartisan, evidence-based policy solutions.

The Content and Social Media Strategist will report to the Director of Digital Marketing and work across the Communications team as well as researchers within the Urban Institute's ten policy centers.

Responsibilities

The Content and Social Media Strategist will ...

- Work with the Director of Digital Marketing to create and implement an editorial strategy for the organization's digital properties.
- Write original content (blog posts and articles) for the Urban Institute website and other platforms based on our research.
- Partner with graphic designers and videographers to create multimedia content.
- Work with Urban Institute researchers and center directors to create content for the Urban Institute website and other platforms based on our research.
- Post content to the website and blogs through our content management system.
- Work with the Director of Digital Marketing to conceive and implement an organization-wide social media strategy.
- Work across the organization to run the day-to-day operation of the Urban Institute's social media accounts through a social media CRM.
- Help implement individual social media strategies for Urban Institute experts and researchers.
- Devise strategies for expanding our social media presence across new platforms.
- Work with the public affairs team to create a blogger outreach program and pitch Urban Institute content to top-tier blogs and digital-only outlets.

Qualifications:

- Bachelor's degree in political science, communications, marketing, journalism or related field and minimum 5-7 years related work experience or equivalent combination
- Strong written and verbal communication skills
- Demonstrated ability to execute successful content and social media strategies
- Demonstrated experience creating web features, blog posts and multimedia content
- Previous exposure to content management systems and customer relationship management systems

- Working knowledge of HTML and Adobe Creative Suite, especially Photoshop
- Production and/or development experience with dynamic websites
- Comfort executing assigned projects independently when necessary
- Ability to multi-task under tight deadlines while maintaining attention to detail
- Willingness to adapt to change
- Ability to form relationships with a range of staff, including data-driven researchers
- Ability to understand and interpret data and translate it for mainstream audiences
- Proficiency with PC and/or Mac platforms and Microsoft office

COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR

Overview:

Founded in 1968, the Urban Institute offers independent, rigorous analysis and evidence-based solutions to inform policymakers and the public about the challenges and opportunities confronting vulnerable populations. The Institute recently launched a comprehensive organizational initiative to increase its visibility and impact. To support this work, the Urban Institute is seeking a junior-level Analytics and Administrative Assistant to support the entire Strategic Communications and Outreach team. This is a new position designed to enhance the Institute's ability to measure its impact and track its progress against goals. The right candidate will be a highly organized, detail-oriented self-starter. S/he should be entrepreneurial, flexible, adept at handling multiple assignments, and eager to grow and learn.

This position reports to the Public Affairs and Publications managers. S/he will work closely with the Public Affairs, Publications, and Web teams.

Responsibilities:

- Gathering and organizing communication data, and measuring and reporting on the reach and impact of the Institute's varied communications activities and initiatives, encompassing traditional, web, and social media and events;
- Compiling, distributing, and tracking daily press coverage using the Vocus media management tool;
- Assisting in the selection of a database to measure social media impact and managing the implementation of that system;
- Creating, maintaining, and expanding targeted distribution lists for traditional and social media;
- Developing and maintaining an editorial calendar;
- Maintaining the Institute's databases of academic journals and subscriptions and updating the library's intranet page;
- Distributing news releases and similar communications;
- Distributing invitations for events, managing RSVPs, and handling event logistics;
- Coordinating event webcasts, including directing the broadcast cameras;
- Managing Urban Institute Press mailings and marketing activities.

Qualifications:

- B.A. or B.S. in communications, journalism, media studies, English, or a related field is required, and an interest in public policy is preferred.
- 1-2 years of experience in communications or public affairs, preferably at a policy-related organization, academic institution, a nonprofit, or news entity.
- Experience organizing data and working in databases.
- Strong attention to detail and track record in task management.
- Strong writing skills.
- Proficiency with all Microsoft Office applications.

Only those major job duties necessary for proper job evaluation and/or labor market analysis have been included. Other duties may be assigned by the supervisor.

Annex 2.5 Performance Standards for Administrative Positions^{1*}

Successful program and administrative staff at R4D excel along a number of key performance dimensions. While the dimensions of performance remain the same for staff at all levels, performance standards along each dimension change depending on the seniority of the individual. This document provides a summary of the key performance dimensions and standards along each dimension for staff at different levels of seniority.

Seven Dimensions of R4D Performance

1. **Task and team management**, including proactive planning and prioritization, reliable and timely delivery, efficiency, flexibility and adaptability, and resourcefulness in problem solving.
2. **Communication**, including structure, clarity, fluency, and creativity of written documents and presentations, effective facilitation of groups, and clarity and enthusiasm in oral communications.
3. **Analysis**, including logical structuring of information and analytical questions, effective issue-identification, critical reasoning, quantitative analysis, and ability to synthesize information.
4. **Thought-leadership**, including development of new ideas and approaches, creation of new knowledge, and reputation as an expert on key topics both internally and externally.
5. **Entrepreneurship**, including initiative in identifying and pursuing opportunities for existing projects as well as for new areas of work, development of relationships that lead to new opportunities, and engagement in new business development.
6. **Teamwork and leadership**, including positive attitude, responsiveness, active listening, inspiring and motivating others, effective coaching, judgment and integrity, and contribution to overall R4D efforts (e.g., recruiting, fundraising, community service, social).
7. **Partner engagement**, including responsiveness to external stakeholders (funders, clients, partners, governments, vendors,) ability to negotiate difficult situations and work with challenging partners, and long-term relationship development.

¹ Created and used by the Results for Development Institute. Last update as of January 2014.

Annex 3.1 Establishing a Position

Policy and Procedure No. 101

Page 1 of 3 Pages

THE URBAN INSTITUTE *Personnel Policies and Procedures*

Date: 2/28/03

Subject: ESTABLISHING A POSITION

POLICY

Prior to hiring an employee, a position must first be established and a salary range and grade assigned based on the specifications of the job to be performed. In addition, a determination must be made about the expected duration of the position, the work schedule, and the status of the position with respect to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).

Eligibility for participation in the Institute's employee benefits programs is determined in part by employment status. Attachment A summarizes benefits eligibility by employment status. For complete benefits information and eligibility requirements, refer to the appropriate summary plan description or the Urban Institute policy and procedure for each benefit.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS DESCRIPTIONS

Positions may be classified as regular, intermittent, temporary, intermittent fellow, or expatriate according to the definitions listed below:

"Regular" means a position of indefinite duration or one with a set term of employment of more than 1000 hours and having a regular, predictable, full- or part-time work schedule as described below. Most Institute positions are regular status. Regular positions bear full fringe, overhead and G&A burdens for pricing and billing purposes.

"Temporary" means a position authorized for fewer than 1000 hours during any twelve-month period. Temporary employees may not work for the Institute in any other employment status for a period of eight months from the date last worked as a temporary employee (creating, in effect, an eight-month cooling off period after a temporary assignment). Similarly, a regular employee may not be rehired or converted to temporary status unless eight months has elapsed since the last day of employment as a regular employee. A temporary position may have a full-time, part-time, or casual work schedule. Temporary positions bear statutory fringe and full G&A, but no overhead for pricing and billing purposes.

"Intermittent" means a position (like a temporary position) that is of indefinite duration and has a casual work schedule and is a position authorized for fewer than 1000 hours in a calendar year. It is, however, used only when a regular employee is rehired or converts to a casual work schedule before the eight-month cooling off period has elapsed or as an alternative to temporary status when the employing center or office wishes to consider the employee for regular employment following the assignment. Intermittent positions bear full fringe, overhead and G&A burdens for pricing and billing purposes.

"Intermittent Fellow" means a position that is of indefinite duration and is authorized for greater than 1000 hours in a calendar year. It is used only at the discretion of the president. Intermittent fellow positions bear statutory fringe, plus full overhead and G&A burdens for pricing and billing purposes.

"Expatriate" means a position whose duty post is outside the U.S., whose assignment outside the U.S. is anticipated to last 6 months or longer, and whose direct labor costs are covered primarily by a contract/grant to UI by an outside funding source. Expatriate positions bear full fringe, overhead, and G&A for pricing and billing purposes.

WORK SCHEDULE DESCRIPTIONS

"Full-time" means a regular, predictable work schedule of 40 hours per week.

"Part-time" means a regular, predictable work schedule of at least 20 but fewer than 40 hours per week.

"Casual" means a work schedule on average of fewer than 20 hours per week or one that averages fewer than 20 hours per week over the duration of the assignment.

PROCEDURES

Obtaining Authorization for a Position

To establish a new position, replace a terminating employee in an existing position, or hire a temporary employee, the hiring supervisor completes a **Request for Position/Job Specifications Form** (Attachment B) available from the human resources office. The form requires the hiring supervisor to specify the budgeted salary range, on-site or off-site status, employment status, supervisor, desired starting date, and whether the position has supervisory responsibilities. The hiring supervisor also describes the position's major responsibilities and duties and the qualifications and skills required to perform the job successfully, and makes recruitment suggestions for attracting qualified applicants. The center or office director must sign and approve the request.

The completed form is forwarded to the director of human resources, who reviews the job specifications and classifies the position according to the Institute's job evaluation procedures (see Urban Institute Policy and Procedure No. 108 - Salary Administration). Once classified, requests for new positions are sent to the senior vice president for approval. The director of human resources approves requests for replacement positions, notifies the supervisor when new and replacement positions are approved, and maintains a log of approved positions.

Temporary assignments allow researchers to fill short-term hiring needs quickly and cost-effectively. As is the policy for all job offers, offers of employment regardless of employment status may be extended only through the human resources office.

Publicizing Vacant Positions

All vacant regular positions, with the exception of senior fellow, will be posted internally in common areas and sent to appropriate external sources, except in cases where employees are promoted or transferred within the same center or office, or where a written request for a waiver of the job posting requirement has been approved by the senior vice president. Senior fellows serve at the invitation of the Institute's president and are selected based on their nationally recognized expertise in a specific field of study.

Exempt positions will be posted for a minimum of two weeks, non-exempt positions for a minimum of one week. Temporary and intermittent positions are not required to be posted.

Canceling a Vacant Position

A posted exempt position that remains vacant for longer than six months will be canceled unless the hiring supervisor makes a written request to the director of human resources that the position remain open for an additional three months.

A posted non-exempt position that remains vacant for longer than three months will be canceled unless the hiring supervisor makes a written request to the director of human resources that the position remain open for an additional three months.

Annex 4.1 Sharing of Information Gained at Skills Acquisition Workshops¹

The GDN Project strived to increase participating organizations' competence in policy research and communicating the results of their analysis in part through transferring knowledge gained a workshops to other members of each think tank's staff. During the period under observation, two workshops were held in the course of the project: the launch workshops, one in Asia and one in Africa, in summer 2009, and another held in March 2010 aimed primarily at peer-reviewing work accomplished since the launch workshop. The topics of the presentations made are summarized in Table A4.1.1.

Table A4.1.1 Topics of Presentations at Project Workshops

Area	Workshop	
	Summer 2009	March 2010
<i>Analysis</i>	PETS ^a and absenteeism study methods and examples of such studies	Cost effectiveness analysis
	"Technical support" in sampling, survey design, and data analysis	
<i>Communications</i>	Advocacy: case studies from past grantees	Constructive engagement & communications to achieve results
	Advocacy: best practices	

a. Public Expenditure Tracking System

The discussion presents information on how the knowledge gained through participation in the workshops was shared with other staff at the participating organizations and the effectiveness of the workshops in improving Participating Organizations' (POs) communications practices.

Dissemination of Knowledge Gained at Project Workshops

To know whether the training of one or two staff from a project workshop is transformed into organizational capacity, one must determine the degree to which workshop attendees share information obtained in the workshop with others at the organization. If there is little sharing, the institution-level effects will be small, even though the individuals may have learned a lot and are using the new knowledge effectively. With workshop participants being researchers, it is especially important for communications staff to be informed about the content of presentations in this sphere.

Table A4.1.2 summarizes the information on within-institution sharing reported by POs. The questionnaire included the list of possible actions that could have been taken shown in the table and included space for other action types to be included.

¹ Source: Struyk, Damon and Haddaway (2010).

Table A4.1.2 Actions Undertaken After Project Workshops

	Percent			
	Yes, we did this	No, because staff know about this already	No, for other reasons	N
May-09 – Launch workshop				
Analytic presentations				
· Distributed the materials obtained or a list of them to other researchers	86.7	6.7	6.7	15
· Led an informal discussion about program budgeting analyses	78.6	14.3	7.1	14
· Gave a formal presentation on program budgeting analyses	41.7	33.3	25.0	12
· Led an informal discussion on benefit incidence analyses	78.6	14.3	7.1	14
· Gave a formal presentation on benefit incidence analyses	53.8	30.8	15.4	13
Communications presentations				
· Gave materials on communications and impact strategies to your communications team	57.1	7.1	35.7	14
· Met with the communications team to explain what the sessions on communications strategies were about	53.3	0.0	46.7	15
· Other	100	0	0	2
Jan-10 – Review workshop				
Analytic presentations				
· Distributed the materials obtained or a list of them to other researchers	92.3	0.0	7.7	13
· Led an informal discussion about cost effectiveness studies	91.7	8.3	0.0	12
· Gave a formal presentation on cost effectiveness studies	50.0	16.7	33.3	12
Communications				
· Gave materials on communications best practices to your communications team	58.3	0.0	41.7	12
· Met with the communications team to explain what the sessions on communications techniques were about	58.3	0.0	41.7	12
· Other (specify)	100	0	0	1

The table shows a high degree of sharing the materials. Forty percent of POs reported having 3-5 sharing activities after the launch workshop and 60 percent after the review workshop. One-third reported 6 or more activities after the launch workshop.² (Respondents were asked to indicate all activities they had undertaken; so there are multiple responses.)

Substantial activity at nearly all POs is evident for the knowledge gained on research techniques at both workshops, ranging from sending around a list of the materials obtained to making formal presentations. The incidence of sharing materials and leading informal discussions is in the 78-87 percent range. The pattern indicates that organization-level benefits on the research side should accrue from participation in the Project. There was a substantial increase in sharing of research technique material between the first and second workshops.

² Figures are not in the table.

The pattern for the content of communications events at the workshops is quite different. For both workshops attendees from about half of the participating organizations passed on to the communications staff the materials from the “best practices in communications” session to the communications staff and met with them to review the material. Staff participating in the workshop who did not share the information from the analytic session fairly often said this was because other staff already was familiar with it. This is not the case for the communications information, where it appears that half of attendees just did not bother to share it.

We can explore this point further by examining how PO senior managers perceived the change in their staffs’ advocacy communications knowledge resulting from the GDN presentations. As shown below, there is essentially a normal distribution of responses, with 73 percent of managers reporting modest to large increases. Table A4.1.3 illustrates a clear relationship between a modest or greater capacity increase and the number of transfer activities undertaken, i.e., managers perceive real improvement where greater effort was made by those attending the workshops to inform their colleagues charged with communications responsibilities. For the two workshops, those reporting negligible increases in capacity had a total 10 transfer actions, while those with modest increases and large increases had 44 and 37 actions, respectively.

Table A4.1.3 Management Rating of Increased Communications Capacity from TAP Events

How would you rate the increase in your organization’s knowledge of advocacy and communications abilities as a result of GDN presentations on these topics?	
Negligible increase	13.3
Modest increase	40.0
Large increase	33.3
Fundamental improvement	13.3

Further to the issue of effectiveness of the communications sessions, 60 percent of respondents named a change in communications practice in response to the following question: “Can you name a major change you organization made to your communications practices due to what you learned at the GDN events?” The questionnaire asked for a short summary of these changes. Examples include: “Address issues systematically, convince with reasons,” and “We learned about the pitfalls to avoid when granting interviews to media networks.”

Annex 5.1 Position Description for Team Leaders at the Data Policy Institute

Responsibilities and Expectations for Institute Center Directors¹

Institutional leadership: Center directors are members of the Data Policy Institute's senior leadership team, contributing to planning and management that advances a shared vision and strategy for the success of the organization as a whole – today and in the future.

- Participate regularly in monthly meetings of center directors and the larger strategic management group.
- Actively engage in DPI-wide thinking, planning, and problem-solving.
- Help implement new DPI-wide policies and procedures within their centers, working constructively with administrative offices.
- Connect relevant center staff to cross-center teams working on new initiatives (e.g., big data, subcontract process improvements, IT modernization) and provide the support they need to represent the center effectively.
- Encourage and facilitate collaborative, cross-center research endeavors.

Intellectual and substantive leadership: Center directors are responsible for sustaining and advancing the quality and relevance of Institute research.

- Maintain and enhance the center's reputation for technical sophistication, rigor, and independence.
- Lead the center in framing a forward-looking agenda of research – building on current areas of expertise, but expanding to address issues of emerging importance.
- Produce timely analysis (including policy briefs, fact sheets, and other products) that responds to current events in the news cycle.
- Find opportunities for innovation in data, methods, and scope.
- Manage quality control, particularly for high-profile/high-risk projects.
- Encourage center researchers to work collaboratively with colleagues in other centers to capitalize on DPI's strengths.
- Actively participate in the center's research, as principle investigator, collaborator, and/or senior adviser.

External engagement: Center directors ensure that the center has successful efforts to engage with the full range of audiences for its research and actively participates in new institutional strategies for raising visibility and impact.

- Systematically reach out and build relationships with diverse audiences (including academics, media, policymakers, practitioners, business, and advocates).
- Empower and encourage appropriate center staff to publicly represent the center's work to a variety of audiences, helping to make them available for interviews and other relationship cultivation activities.

¹ This description is used by a stage 3 think tank which permit use of the description in this book but asked that the organization not be identified.

- Work with communications and outreach staff to identify and engage new audiences (including early identification of products and events).
- Expand the policy and communications capacities within the center (through training, practice, and possibly recruitment) to communicate key findings and engage with external audiences to gain insight on key questions for further exploration.

Fundraising: Center directors are responsible for planning and coordinating their centers' fundraising activities so as to maintain a diverse and healthy portfolio of funding sources.

- Manage and sustain good relationships with funders, guide bidding strategies, and develop and promote new funding proposals.
- Partner with development staff to cultivate new funding sources, including individuals and corporations.
- Pursue opportunities for more flexible, programmatic funding that supports outreach and communications as well as self-defined research.
- Encourage and support collaboration with other centers on cross-cutting idea development and fundraising strategies.

Staff mentoring and recruitment: Center directors are responsible for building a well-qualified and effective team of researchers and other professionals so that together the center has the research, policy, communication, and support skills necessary to sustain the center's success into the future.

- Attract new, high caliber researchers, policy experts, and communicators to the team.
- Work with executive office staff to overcome hiring disincentives perceived by senior researchers.
- Work with human resources staff to recruit the right mix of staff and set salaries that effectively attract and retain talent.
- Support the professional development and morale of existing staff at all levels, including through mentoring and by providing training and skill-building opportunities.
- Communicate effectively with center staff at all levels about all relevant goals, strategies, new initiatives, research learning, and procedures.
- Foster a sense of community and belonging to both the center and the Institute as a whole.

Internal management: Center directors oversee and are accountable for the day-to-day management of project budgets and schedules, internal controls and reporting, and use of institutional resources.

- Ensure that the center meets contract and grant obligations on time and within budget.
- Ensure that center staff complies with institutional procedures and reporting requirements.
- Deploy institutional resources strategically and responsibly.
- Oversee staffing plans, work assignments, mentoring, and quality control processes.
- Establish and monitor work schedules and flexible work arrangements.
- Keep staff at all levels informed and involve them in planning for the center's future.

Annex 6.1 Reviewer's Check List to Use in Assessing Analytic Reports

Document Name	
Author	
Name of Reviewer	
Date:	

	Question
A	General
A.1	Is the issue well-defined and the case for its policy importance effectively made?
A.2	Is the issue defined or structured in such a way that a clear hypothesis or researchable question is stated?
A.3	Are all the relevant aspects of the issue included for analysis?
A.4	Are relevant previous studies on the issue in the country cited and built on?
A.5	Do the authors show knowledge of the relevant international studies on this topic?
A.6	Has the right type of information and data been assembled to address the issue? If not, what was omitted that should have been included? Where sample data are employed, is the sample correctly drawn to be representative? Is it sufficiently large for the necessary tests?
A.7	Are the methods employed appropriate? Are statistical tests used where needed?
A.8	Is the report well-organized and clearly and succinctly written?
B	Conclusions and recommendations
B.1	Are the conclusions based squarely on the paper's findings? (or do the authors go beyond the findings in effect expressing personal views or political opinions?)
B.2	If the conclusions call for action through government programs, is the cost realistically estimated? Is the administrative feasibility and complexity of the program considered?
B.3	Do the authors consider various options for addressing the issue and the merits of each, or focus exclusively on a single approach?
B.4	In general, do the authors draw out the full policy implications of the findings and make realistic suggestions for their use in changing current policies?
B.5	Where appropriate, do the authors suggest what additional data could be collected and/or analysis undertaken to better answer the question posed or to answer additional questions the study raised?
C	Reviewer's summary comments (use as much space as needed)

Guidelines for Rating Policy Research Reports

	Question	Very Weak	Very Strong
A	General		
A.1	Is the issue well-defined and the case for its policy importance effectively made?	Hard to identify the issue under discussion, possibly because it is confused with others; or issue is stated but there is no attempt to explain why it merits public policy attention.	Issue crisply and clearly defined and a cogent case for its policy importance and timeliness is made.
A.2	Is the issue defined or structured in such a way that a clear hypothesis or researchable question is stated?	Difficult-to-impossible to understand the specific question or hypothesis that is the research subject.	The basic policy issue is expressed in a way that makes addressing it empirically straightforward and accessible to the reader.
A.3	Are all the relevant aspects of the issue included for analysis?	Author leaves out key point, e.g., the distribution of benefits or subsidies or the efficiency with which they are employed, while focusing only on the total amount	All relevant elements are noted. (It is not necessary that they all be covered in the paper, but enough information should be provided to fully understand the situation.)
A.4	Are relevant previous studies on the issue in the country cited and built on? ^b	No prior studies are cited.	There is a good review of the prior studies and the advances that the current research makes over the prior is clearly articulated.
A.5	Do the authors show knowledge of the relevant international studies on this topic? ^b	Such studies are not mentioned.	This study exhibits knowledge of the relevant literature and states or implies its influence on the current study.
A.6	Has the right type of information and data been assembled to address the issue? If not, what was omitted that should have been included? Where sample data are employed, is the sample correctly drawn to be representative? Is it sufficiently large for the necessary tests?	The selection of data seems arbitrary and not well-suited to the study. Where survey data are used, insufficient information is provided to judge its quality, or the information provided makes problems with the sample clear.	The data employed are ideal for the study. Where survey data are used, the sample is well-described and clearly appropriate for the task at hand.
A.7	Are the methods employed appropriate? Are statistical tests used where needed?	The authors do not employ the relevant statistical tests but rather just describe qualitatively the patterns in the data.	Relevant statistical tests are used throughout. The author interprets the results of the tests effectively.
A.8	Is the report well-organized and clearly and succinctly written?	The report is very poorly structured, with little logic to the sequencing of the presentation. The writing style is very wordy or otherwise makes it hard for the reader to	The report is well-organized and tightly written. The flow of language makes it easy to read. There are few extra words. The author exercises good judgment in allocating material to

Reviewer's Check List to Use in Assessing Policy Briefs or Other Documents Aimed Explicitly at Advancing a Policy Position

Document Name	
Author	
Name of Reviewer	
Date:	

	Question
A.1	<p>What is the purpose of the paper? (record number in next column)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Call attention to a pressing policy issue 2. Define an issue and propose a way to address it 3. Other (name) -- <p>Reviewers will use sections A and D for all documents; and will choose one of either section B or C depending on the type of document. B is for documents identified above as type #2; and C for those identified as #1. For those identified as #3 select either B or C as appropriate.</p>
A.2	Purpose of the Brief is clear and the issue well-defined
B	For Briefs that define an issue and ways to address it (item 2) in A.1
B.1	Is the problem definition supported properly with facts?
B.2	Are options for addressing the issue articulated well? (A stronger presentation is one that does advance only a single solution.)
B.3	Are the criteria for judging the alternative solutions well-articulated?
B.4	Are the reasons for the superiority of the recommended solution clearly stated?
B.5	Is the analysis underlying the recommendation sufficiently explained that the reader can judge it?
B.6	Is the presentation of the recommended action comprehensive, i.e., addresses costs, administrative issues, as well as the program or other action to be taken?
C	For briefs that define a pressing policy issue
C.1	Are the public policy dimensions of the problem well developed and presented, i.e., why is this an issue deserving policy attention?
C.2	Is the dimension of the problem, e.g., the share of children not attending classes, well-developed and based on credible sources and analysis?
C.3	Are “next steps” defined, i.e., now that the problem is defined, who should take responsibility for addressing it in some way?
C.4	Is the recommendation (C.3) sensible and well-justified?
D	All Briefs
D.1	Is the presentation engaging, i.e., is the reader motivated to continue to read?
D.2	Is the level of presentation suitable for the policymaker or “intelligent layman”?
D.3	Is the presentation succinct, closely reasoned, and of the appropriate length?

Explanation of Ratings for Policy Briefs

	Question	Very Weak	Very Strong
B	For Briefs that define an issue and ways to address it in A.1 of the scoring sheet		
B.1	Is the problem definition supported properly with facts?	Essentially no facts are presented. There seems to be an assumption that everyone agrees that this is a problem and no further explanation is needed.	Facts are succinctly and effectively marshaled to document the problem.
B.2	Are options for addressing the issue articulated well? (A stronger presentation is one that does not advance only a single solution.)	No options other than the one favored by the authors is even described, not to mention being assessed.	The relevant options are fairly stated and described.
B.3	Are the criteria for judging the alternative solutions well-articulated?	No criteria are explicitly or even implicitly stated. Everything seems to hinge on the authors' judgment.	The criteria are stated clearly and the set is complete, i.e., the criteria are not biased through omission.
B.4	Are the reasons for the superiority of the recommended solution clearly stated?	No. The reader is in effect asked to accept the recommendation simply on the basis of the authors' judgment.	A full discussion of the reasons for the selection of the favored options is presented.
B.5	Is the analysis underlying the recommendation sufficiently explained that the reader can judge it?	The analysis is simply missing or so obscure that the reader really cannot understand it. The author does not reference other documents where a full explanation can be found.	The analysis is carefully explained and presented, given the space limitations of the policy brief. Other supporting studies are cited.
B.6	Is the presentation of the recommended action comprehensive, i.e., addresses costs, administrative issues, as well as the program or other action to be taken?	Little-to-nothing is said about the short-term to long-term costs or administrative issues. The brief does not raise transition issues (from the current to the new policy) that are involved.	The author provides careful and comprehensive cost estimates over a reasonable time period (5-years) and accurately describes the administrative issues that will be involved in the new action.
C	For briefs that define a pressing policy issue		
C.1	Are the public policy dimensions of the problem well developed and presented,	It is unclear why the issue raised in the brief is a matter to	A compelling case is made for the public's interest in the issue. Both the most obvious

Annex 6.2 Communications Guidelines of the Results for Development Institute*

Table of Contents

External Communications

- I. BRANDING**
- II. MEDIA RELATIONS**
- III. PUBLICATIONS**
- IV. MARKETING MATERIALS**
- V. POSTING CONTENT TO THE R4D WEBSITE**
- VI. E-COMMUNICATIONS (MAIL CHIMP)**
- VII. EVENT PLANNING**
- VIII. REQUESTS FOR R4D TRADEMARK/LOGO**
- IX. R4D E-MAIL SIGNATURES**

Internal Communications

- X. Staff Meetings
- XI. Using R4D E-Mail Addressess
- XII. R4D E-mail "Info Accounts"

R4D Communications Guidelines

These guidelines have been developed to help streamline, coordinate and support communications across the organization. The guidelines address key internal and external communications activities in areas including branding, media relations, website and e-communications.

External Communications

I. BRANDING

To ensure that branding is consistent across the organization and developed to maximum effect, communications will approve and coordinate R4D brand development activities. Branding activities requiring coordination and consultation with Communications include the below:

1. Coordination of branding related to new program initiatives and partner collaborations
2. Printing and design of R4D materials -- brochures, fact sheets, annual reports, publications
3. Development of new websites
4. Logo design and development
5. Launch of social networking platforms (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, YouTube etc)

For the above activities, Communications will provide recommendations of marketing firms and designers to assist with projects.

II. Media Relations

Effective media relations planning and coordination can have a significant impact on how R4D is perceived externally. Coordinating media relations activities through Communications will ensure that 1) R4D media coverage is tracked and recorded; 2) staff are well prepared for interviews and; 3) media vendors are offering competitive bids.

- The R4D Chief Communications Officer (CCO) will serve as the point of contact for all external media and help assist with vetting journalists and preparing staff for interviews.
- If a reporter or press officer calls R4D's main phone line/e-mails asking for a statement on an issue or initiative, or is requesting an interview, the call should be transferred to the CCO.
- All requests for support from Burness Communications and/or other media relations vendors should be coordinated through Communications.
- If a reporter contacts a staff member directly, the staff member should coordinate with Communications before providing a public statement or response.

III. Publications

Coordinating R4D publication development and design through Communications will help ensure that new publications are branded consistently and effectively across the organization.

- Program leads should inform Communications when a new publication is being planned for a program or is in the pipeline.

- The pipeline of new R4D publications will be discussed and tracked via the weekly R4D Editorial Committee Meetings. Please have your Editorial Committee designee come prepared to discuss the publications.
- Communications will work with the programs to find the best and most cost effective vendors and designers.

IV. Marketing Materials

Creating a consistent look and feel and brand across all R4D marketing materials is an important priority. This will be achieved by effective coordination across the organization through the below means:

- Staff should consult Communications when initiating printing and design of new marketing materials, e.g. stands, banners, printed materials, brochures etc.
- Communications will work with the programs to ensure they are receiving the most cost effective bids and that the best vendors are aligned to projects.
- Communications will also work with the programs to ensure that overall program budgets for communications related activities are being maximized and strategically leveraged.
- Note: Communications has built a library of program Road Show PowerPoint presentations for the benefit of staff. Please visit the R4D Communications Dropbox folder to access these materials and alert Communications if you plan to make amendments/and or share the presentations widely.

V. Posting Content to the R4D Website

Each program has a designated staff member (see Figure 1, next page) who updates and maintains their 1) program website and 2) individual project pages on the R4D website.

- Website content intended for publication on the R4D homepage (e.g. homepage news stories, slideshow banners, publication news) must be approved by Communications prior to posting.
- News stories and substantive content updates intended for individual project pages on the R4D website should also be shared and approved by Communications.
 - Note: Periodic content updates and one-off-changes do not require approval.

The below staff members are responsible for oversight of the R4D and program web pages.

[FORMATTER_Annex 6.2 Chart 1.PDF]

VI. External Communications (Mail Chimp)

To improve messaging at R4D, it is important that external e-communications have a consistent style, and tone, and are tracked proactively and approved by Communications.

- Any e-mail communication planned for the “FULL R4D LIST” on mailchimp must be approved by Communications prior to distribution.

- Program communications, planned for “SEGMENTED PROGRAM LISTS” in mailchimp, should be shared with Communications, prior to distribution, for both approval and tracking purposes.
- Program e-communications will be logged on the “R4D Editorial Calendar Website E-Comms” saved in dropbox.

VII. Event Planning

- Upcoming dates and plans for internal and external R4D events should be shared with Communications.
- Events will be included on the “R4D Events & Comms Calendar” (located in the R4D Communications Dropbox folder).
- Event details will also be discussed and updated weekly at the R4D Editorial Committee meetings.

VIII. Requests for R4D Trademark/Logo

All requests for the use of the R4D trademarked logos must be cleared and approved by Communications. For example:

- Requests for use of our marks on T-shirts; other promotional materials
- Requests for logo placement on partner and other external websites;
- Co-branding and use of logos on new publications

IX. R4D E-MAIL SIGNATURES

R4D staff should adopt the below *standard email signature* when sending and replying to messages. These signatures should include staff member title, location, and phone contact information. See template below.

NAME
TITLE
PROGRAM (if applicable)
Results for Development Institute
1875 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 1210
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 1-202-xxx-xxxx
Fax: 1-202-470-5712
E-mail: xxxxxx@resultsfordevelopment.org
Website: www.resultsfordevelopment.org
Skype: Optional, not required
Twitter: Optional, not required

Internal Communications

Please see the below information regarding internal communications/activities and key contact persons below:

X. Staff Meetings:

- Staff meetings at R4D occur monthly. Each meeting will have an appointed Chair and agenda items will be coordinated through the Office Manager.
- Staff meetings will include a spotlight on a program or initiative followed by general organizational updates/agenda items as outlined by the chair.
- Staff who are in town are expected to attend. Those traveling are encouraged to dial-in.
- If you have questions or suggestions for agenda items, contact the Office Manager directly.

XI. Using R4D E-mail Addresses:

- @R4D and @1875: Please use your discretion when sending e-mail communications to both the R4D@resultsfordevelopment.org and 1875@resultsfordevelopment.org e-mail lists.
- @R4D includes all individuals who are “onsite at R4D” e.g. they physically use office space in the building.
- @1875 includes consultants and individuals who are not R4D employees or onsite in our offices.

XII. R4D E-mail “Info” Accounts:

The following “info” mailboxes are currently maintained by R4D. We recently went through an exercise to delete all inactive e-mail accounts. Specific staff or program related questions received in

these R4D mailboxes will be shared with the appropriate individuals directly. If you have questions about the below e-mail accounts, please contact the Office Manager directly.

If you have questions regarding the above document, please contact the Chief Communications Officer directly.

Annex 6.3 Example of a Research and Publications Policy Statement that Includes Quality Control Provisions*

ECONOMIC POLICY RESEARCH CENTRE



Research and Publication Policy, Regulations and Guidelines

Abbreviations/Acronyms

ARF	Assistant Research Fellow
BoM	Board of Management
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ED	Executive Director
EPRC	Economic Policy Research Centre
FAC	Finance and Appointment Committee
GoU	Government of Uganda
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IMDM	Information Management and Dissemination Manager
MISR	Makerere Institute of Social Research
PRF	Principal Research Fellow
RAP	Research Advisory Panel
SRF	Senior Research Fellow
UMA	Uganda Manufacturer's Association

Table of Contents

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
- 2. RESEARCH POLICY**
- 3. PUBLICATION POLICY**
- 4. GUIDELINES FOR THE AUTHORS**
- 5. RELEVANT PROCEDURES/POLICIES, ACTS**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

The Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) was established in 1994. It is an autonomous not-for-profit organisation limited by guarantee. It is governed by a Board of Management comprising of eminent persons from the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Bank of Uganda, Parliament of Uganda, National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Private Sector (through the Uganda Manufacturers' Association (UMA)), Makerere University and Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR). Its legal status renders it eligible to receive direct funding from Government of Uganda (GoU), bilateral and multi-lateral donors, and other educational and research oriented institutions.

The Board of Management has two sub-committees: the Research Advisory Panel (RAP) and the Finance and Appointments Committee (FAC). The role of RAP is to oversee the research function of the Centre.

The Centre's mandate is to provide research-based evidence to support the formulation of government policies and programmes, to undertake capacity building activities in the country and carry out policy engagement based on research findings;

The main objectives of this Research and Publication Policy, Regulations and Guidelines include:

- i) To ensure that the Centre's research and publications are of the highest quality;
- ii) To provide guidelines for authorship, editorship and publication ethics;
- iii) To protect the Centre's intellectual property;
- iv) To ensure that research outputs shall be disseminated to relevant stakeholders in a timely manner and in a way that ensures optimal use; and
- v) To motivate researchers in the pursuit of their scientific careers.

1.2. The policy is divided into research and publication:

- a) The research policy clearly sets out the framework within which research at the Centre shall be undertaken. This policy applies to all researchers employed by the Centre and all collaborative research projects it initiates. The regulations and guidelines to be followed are also highlighted.
- b) The publication policy clearly sets out the framework for dissemination of the Centre's knowledge products. It details authorship of publications, policy for submission and review of papers, and outlines the procedure to be followed.

1.3. Interpretations

a) Definitions

- i) "EPRC" means Economic Policy Research Centre.
- ii) "Board" means the Board of Management of EPRC.
- iii) "Centre" means EPRC.
- iv) "Executive Director" of EPRC means the Executive Director (ED) appointed by the EPRC Board

- v) “Research staff” means all research staff of the Centre including the Executive Director, Principal Research Fellow (PRF), Senior Research Fellow (SRF), Research Fellow (RF) and Assistant Research Fellow (ARF)
- vi) “Research Associate” means a person who is not on the EPRC’s permanent structure but is associated with the Centre through research.
- vii) “Month” means calendar month.
- viii) “Year” means a period of twelve months

Any questions arising out of the interpretation or application of this policy shall be referred to RAP through the ED.

- b) These provisions, except as otherwise are expressly provided in this policy:
 - i) Shall apply to all researchers of the EPRC and to all agreements entered into by the Centre in respect of research, including all collaborative research projects initiated by the Centre’s researchers;
 - ii) Shall take precedence over all previous notices, regulations, rules and standing instruction in conflict with these provisions;
 - iii) Shall be the responsibility of every researcher to know and understand; ignorance of any particular provision herein cannot in itself be accepted as an excuse for non-compliance; and
 - iv) Shall, if they fail to cater for a particular EPRC circumstance, demand that it be referred to the Board for consideration and resolution.

1.4 The Centre’s research and publication shall be guided by the RAP in collaboration with the Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee and Publication Committee. The following responsibilities are assigned as follows:

- a) The RAP’s duties are to:
 - i) Help the Centre draw up its research agenda;
 - ii) Guide the implementation of the research agenda;
 - iii) Review and approve research proposals and concept notes; and
 - iv) Guarantee the quality of the Centre’s research outputs.
- b) A Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee shall be made up of the PRF (as Chair), and the Heads of Research Units. This Committee shall ensure:
 - i) Research agendas as proposed by individual Research Units are in line with the Centre’s thematic research areas;
 - ii) Regular monitoring of the progress of the proposed research as per EPRC annual work plan;
 - iii) That the content of the research outputs meets the Centre’s set standards. The standards include application of rigorous methodologies and writing in a user-friendly form for dissemination to a broad spectrum of stakeholders and the wider public;
 - iv) Proper procedures are followed in the selection and management of the Centre’s Research Associates and that research associates comply with this policy;
 - v) Adherence to procedures in the selection and management of peer reviewers of the Centre’s research outputs; necessary recommendations are made to the Publications Committee.

- c) The Publications Committee shall be made up of the Executive Director, Principal Research Fellow, and the Information Management and Dissemination Manager. The Committee shall ensure:
 - i) Timely production of research publications;
 - ii) Receipt and consideration of recommendations on completed research outputs from the Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee;
 - iii) That the Centre's research outputs meet the minimum EPRC publication format standards; and
 - iv) Wide dissemination of the Centre's research publications.
- d) The Information Management and Dissemination Manager (IMDM) shall be responsible for the Centre's website content management system;
- e) Each Head of a Research Unit shall provide intellectual leadership and be responsible for the coordination, accuracy, consistency and timeliness of content in publications under his/her Unit as well as for approval of content for publication.

1.4. Framework for research collaboration with Makerere University

- a) The Centre shall, on a case-by-case basis, undertake research jointly with relevant faculties of Makerere University. This arrangement shall be guided by a Memorandum of Understanding. This collaboration shall enhance research quality and improve knowledge sharing between the Centre's researchers and faculties. The faculties, where necessary, shall be contacted to peer review the Centre's research outputs while the Centre's researchers shall offer supervisory and limited part-time teaching roles to postgraduate students upon receiving clearance from the EPRC Management.
- b) To build capacity and strengthen research skills in economics and related academic programmes of the University, the Centre shall encourage postgraduate students to join its research team to work on particular projects of their interest on a competitive basis.
- c) In addition, the Centre under its internship policy shall admit undergraduates in economics and related areas for attachment/internship for a period of not more than three months during the University's long vacation, with the goal of capacity building and strengthening in economic research.

1.5. Framework for research collaboration with other institutions

- a) The Centre shall strategically collaborate with other institutions in and outside Uganda for the purposes of research in areas of common interest, knowledge sharing, and enhancing the quality of its research;
- b) All such collaborations shall be undertaken after signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the collaborating institution;
- c) In addition, the Centre under its internship policy, shall admit undergraduates in economics and related areas for attachment/internship from other universities for a period of not more than three months during the University's long vacation with the goal of achieving capacity building and strengthening in economic research;
- d) The internship policy shall be extended to international students with whom the Centre has forged a strategic partnership; and
- e) The Centre will undertake collaborative organization of seminars and workshops with other institutions in Uganda to review and critique its work and that produced elsewhere.

1.6. The visiting research fellowship programme targets non-EPRC researchers (local and international) who wish to conduct research on Uganda (also in Uganda?). The research shall be cleared by the relevant authorities, where necessary.

2. RESEARCH POLICY

2.1. Strategic Research Programme

- a) The Centre shall develop a four-year medium-term strategic research agenda to reflect the development challenges facing Uganda and the region at large;
- b) The Centre's four-year strategic research plan shall be operationalised through the development of its annual research agenda;
- c) The Centre shall, on a regular basis, review its strategic research programme in line with the development priorities of its stakeholders. The research programme shall demonstrate relevance and increase its national and regional visibility and policy influence;
- d) The proposed research programme shall be informed by a review of the Centre's past, present and prospective work. The programme shall also be shared with the Centre's stakeholders in a consultative manner to sharpen and ensure its research relevance. The ideas from the consultative process shall be an input into the Centre's strategic research programme;
- e) The research programme shall be flexible to accommodate "hot" emerging development issues that were not envisaged in the programme and these shall include requests for commissioned studies from the Centre's stakeholders; and
- f) Like the four-year strategic research plan, the annual research plan shall be submitted to the EPRC Board for approval.

2.2. Types of research: The Centre shall carry out three types of research:

- a) Core research, which shall be initiated by the Centre's in-house researchers or in collaboration with partners in local institutions. Areas of core research shall be guided by the Centre's strategic research agenda (refer to 2.1), which agenda shall be reviewed on an annual basis by the EPRC Board of Management;
- b) Commissioned research shall be funded and done for particular stakeholders. Areas for collaboration through commissioned studies shall be determined by the Centre's research agenda;
- c) In the case of collaborative research co-funded and jointly undertaken with particular stakeholders, areas for collaboration shall be guided by the Centre's strategic research agenda (refer 2.1).

All outputs from the three types of research mentioned in section 2.2 shall be of a quality that meets international standards. This shall be achieved through a combination of: (i) peer review of EPRC's work by external reviewers of international reputation; and (ii) rigorous scrutiny by the internal Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee.

2.3. *Procedures and Guidelines for Research Approval*

There shall be clear guidelines/regulations to ensure uniformity and ease in conducting research at the Centre. These guidelines shall be reviewed periodically as and when necessary. The researcher(s) within his/her respective Research Units shall initiate and agree on research topics guided by the Centre's Strategic Research Programme (refer 2.1).

- a) The RAP shall review the proposed annual research work plan and propose changes where necessary. It shall co-opt subject matter experts to review the proposed research where necessary. Thereafter, the EPRC Board of Management shall approve annual work plans on recommendations from RAP. The decision of the EPRC BoM shall be final;
- b) Each research undertaking shall have a designated lead researcher;
- c) Each research topic shall be developed into a concept note/proposal. The concept note shall not be more than four pages and shall spell out clear and realistic deliverables and timelines, expected dates of completion, data sources, research team composition and tasks assigned to each team members, among others. A budget shall be included in case the proposed research topic involves fieldwork;
- d) All concept notes/proposals shall be presented to the Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee within the Centre for comments and further guidance;
- e) The research proposals/concept note, research papers/reports shall be formatted according to the Centre's *Guidelines for authors* (refer section 4);
- f) Each Research Unit shall submit all its research proposals/concept notes to the PRF. The PRF shall convene a meeting of the Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee to critically review these research concept notes in terms of policy relevance, timeliness and composition of the research team. Any concerns about the concept notes shall be communicated in writing to the respective Head of a Research Unit within two weeks after their submission;
- g) The PRF shall thereafter organize an internal seminar where researchers shall come together to discuss and harmonise research submissions from various Research Units. The various research topics from the Research Units shall be consolidated into the Centre's research work plan for the year. This is to ensure ownership of the proposed annual research plan;
- h) Regular progress reporting shall be made at specific times as agreed with the PRF; and
- i) The researchers through their respective Heads of Research Units shall ensure that research reports are submitted in a timely manner to the Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee.

2.4. *Monitoring and evaluation*

The Centre shall have a mechanism to monitor and evaluate all its key activities including its annual research work plan as approved by the EPRC BoM as follows:

- a) Overall monitoring and evaluation of the Centre's research programme shall be done by the Executive Director. However, he/she may delegate the responsibility to the PRF;
- b) Monitoring and evaluation shall focus on time management, meeting targets, treatment of data, research integrity, among others; and

- c) Meeting targets according to the annual work plan shall play a central role in the evaluation of individual researchers. All researchers shall have to meet their expected output and this shall be reviewed on a regular basis (quarterly and annually)
- d) Researchers whose projects are spilling over their time limits by over one month shall have to provide strong justification to the Research Management Committee.
- e) All researchers, depending on their level, shall be required to publish the minimum number of working papers and peer-reviewed work per year. The minimum number of papers for each researcher shall be determined from time to time by the RAP in consultation with EPRC Management.
- f) All researchers, depending on their level, shall be required to present their work to various workshops within and outside EPRC. The researchers shall also be evaluated on the basis of the seminars/workshops they have organized and presented their outputs.

2.5. Quality Assurance

The Centre seeks excellence in research as reflected in its Vision and requires that all researchers adhere to the highest standards of responsible conduct and integrity in research. Should a violation of research integrity and/or research misconduct appear to occur, the Centre's *Staff Terms and Conditions of Service* shall be consulted for details of the procedures to follow. Research misconduct shall include but will not be limited to: plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, etc. The Centre's research shall meet the national standards governing research in Uganda.

2.6. In case of failure to comply with the Centre's research and publication policy (i) the Publication Committee shall have a right to withhold or withdraw the right to publish or to withdraw from circulation any material whatsoever until such time as it complies with the policy. This right may be exercised without prior notice if the nature of non-compliance is such as to place the Centre's corporate image at serious risk. The Centre reserves the right to institute disciplinary or legal action if it has reasonable grounds to believe that non-compliance with this policy exposes the Centre to risk of significant loss, disadvantage or detriment to its good standing.

2.7. Research conducted and data collected as part of research while employed by the Centre shall remain the intellectual property rights of EPRC.

3. PUBLICATION POLICY

3.1. Dissemination of knowledge is one of the core activities of the Centre. Publication can take a number of forms and can occur in a variety of media, both in print and electronic formats, including academic journals and conferences, dissemination through websites, and general public audiences. The Centre shall ensure that all information produced through its research activities is reliable, legally compliant, accurate and consistent across all media and production processes over time. This publication policy applies to all researchers and to all agreements entered into by the Centre in respect of research. It details the authorship of publications, review of papers, and outlines the procedure to be followed.

3.2. The publication policy is meant to institute procedures that ensure that it suits the purpose. It is not intended to compromise researchers' independent thinking or their freedom of expression. Where necessary, a disclaimer may be required, stating that no representation is being made or implied that the

content has official endorsement of EPRC. Publishing research material that does not meet the requirements of the guidelines outlined herein may constitute research misconduct.

EPRC's Audiences

3.3. The Centre recognises the following audiences for information dissemination through its publication: policymakers in government ministries, departments and agencies; development partners; international community; civil society organisations (CSOs); private sector; academia and the general public.

Classification of EPRC publications

3.4. In view of the wide differences in the information needs of its audience groups, the Centre produces a wide range of knowledge products in the following categories:

Articles in refereed journals

3.5. These serve to gauge the quality of the Centre's research and thus play a vital role in influencing the Centre's future funding prospects and raising the Centre's profile internationally.

Web-site based publications

3.6. Any publication under this category shall be approved by the PRF after consultation with the ED and uploaded by the Knowledge Management Specialist under the supervision of the Information and Dissemination Manager. Uploading of such publications shall be done within a day after receipt of approval from the PRF.

Working papers

3.7. These are research outputs from core and commissioned studies and are published by the EPRC as Research Series and Occasional Papers respectively. The policy messages from these publications shall be summarized and published as policy briefs once the paper has been peer reviewed. The researchers shall be encouraged to develop these working/discussion papers into articles in refereed journals.

General audience publications

3.8. The publications in this category are non-technical and are addressed to the general public and to Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in particular, to facilitate policy advocacy. These publications address a wide variety of issues related to public awareness about EPRC and its role in Uganda's development discourse and they include: brochures, newsletters, annual reports, press releases among others. Notable among these are the Centre's quarterly publication: "*The Ugandan Economy Today*" and periodic Policy Briefs.

3.9. Each publication shall indicate the month and year of printing. This shall be printed on the cover page of the printed material.

Publication Procedures

Refereed publications

3.10. Journal articles accepted for publication by external reviewers belong to this category.

- a) Review procedures: Before submission to external reviewers, all publications shall be reviewed internally to ensure compliance with internal procedures. The Research Management and Quality

Assurance Committee shall then evaluate their suitability for publication or may seek the advice and assistance of subject matter experts in the relevant research area;

- b) The author(s) shall revise the draft papers, incorporating the reviewer's comments/suggestions where necessary, and submit the revised paper to the Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee. A note from the authors indicating how the comments/suggestions were incorporated in the paper shall be attached; and
- c) The Research Management and Quality Assurance Committee shall forward the revised paper to the Publication Committee for further review. The ED shall have the author(s) make the necessary revisions, and then submit the revised paper to the appropriate journal.

Non-refereed publications

3.11. All publications reviewed in-house, but not by external reviewers belong to this category. These include the research reports, newsletter, workshop/conference papers and proceedings, discussion papers, annual reports and others of a similar nature.

- a) Review process: All non-refereed publications shall be reviewed internally. Non-refereed publications of a regular nature such as annual/quarterly progress reports shall be reviewed by Management. Non-refereed publications that are not of a regular nature, such as working papers, workshop/conference papers etc shall require approval of the Centre's Research Management Committee for them to be published. The processing of these publications shall differ according to their nature.
- b) Workshop/conference papers: The author(s) shall submit their paper(s) after they have been reviewed internally to ensure compliance with EPRC minimum standards. The author(s) may seek English language editing/editor assistance before the paper is forwarded to the conference editor. In case the paper is published, the author(s) shall advise the Information Management and Dissemination Unit accordingly and the Unit shall update the information in the Centre's database.
- c) Research/working papers: Any written-up research that has been approved for internal publication by the Centre's Research Management Committee shall be eligible for publication as a Research Series paper or an Occasional Paper by the EPRC.
- d) A report of research results of significance but which is not yet appropriate for refereed journals because of length, degree of detail, limitation of audience etc shall belong to this category.
- e) Also belonging to this category are general reviews, publications etc that are commissioned to the Centre by its clients.
- f) Proceedings of workshop/conferences: Where possible, publication of full conference/workshop proceedings shall be considered only in those cases where the papers presented make a substantial contribution to the furtherance of knowledge; for others, publication of abstracts only may be considered. The papers to be included shall be reviewed by the Centre's Editorial Board.
- g) EPRC Annual, quarterly and monthly reports belong to this category.

- h) General audience publications: Information brochures, folders, general audience newsletters, belong to this category. These publications shall be reviewed by EPRC Publications Committee or by an *ad hoc* committee as shall be determined by ED.

3.12. General procedures for external review:

- a) The Centre in consultation with the Board shall agree on the list of competent external reviewers to be consulted;
- b) The researchers shall inform both the ED and PRF of their intention to prepare a paper for publication. This shall be done well in advance, with at least two weeks' prior notice;
- c) Draft papers shall be submitted by the Centre to suitable internal and external reviewers depending on the area of research. The reviewers shall be expected to provide detailed comments/suggestions on the paper. The reviewers shall provide feedback to the author(s) within two weeks of receipt of the paper;
- d) If the comments/suggestions of the reviewers require significant changes, a new version of the paper shall be circulated again for comments/suggestions and changes. Otherwise, the author(s) have two weeks to respond to the reviewers' comments/suggestions; and
- e) The final version of the paper shall be submitted to the ED/Editorial Board for approval prior to publication.

3.13. Failure to comply with one or more of the clauses stipulated in this publication policy shall be considered unethical conduct and may be brought to the attention of the Board of Management for appropriate disciplinary action.

Authorship and Editorship

3.14. Where research involves more than one researcher, all researchers shall agree on authorship of a publication at an early stage in the research and may review their decisions periodically. Researchers must offer authorship to all research associates, who meet the criteria for authorship stated in this document. Furthermore, a researcher who qualifies as an author shall not be excluded as an author without his/her written consent.

3.15. An author is a person who has made a significant contribution to the research and the publication. The author is a person who has (a) made substantial contribution to conceptualization of the research or acquisition of data or analysis and interpretation of the data; (b) participated in drafting of the paper or revising it critically for important intellectual content. An author shall meet at least one of the two conditions (a) or (b) above. All those listed as authors must have participated sufficiently in the work to be accountable and to take responsibility for the content of the publication.

3.16. The right to authorship shall not be tied to position or profession. To be an author, it is not enough to provide data or routine technical support on which the publication is based. Substantial intellectual involvement is required. None of the following contributions, in and of themselves, justifies including a person as an author:

- a) Being the Head of Research Unit, holding higher position of authority, or personal friendship with the authors;

- b) Providing a technical contribution but not intellectual input to the research;
- c) Providing routine assistance in some aspects of the research, the acquisition of funding or general supervision of the research team;
- d) Providing data that had already been published or materials that were obtained from third parties e.g. Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Bank of Uganda, Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies among others; or
- e) Authorship shall also be done in a balanced manner where work is done in collaboration with consultants outside the Centre. Being a task leader to the project shall not constitute the right to authorship.

3.17. Any dispute concerning authorship shall be brought in writing to the attention of the ED and PRF in case the researchers are unable to resolve the dispute themselves.

3.18. The authorship of a publication shall be based on original research carried out by an individual(s). The following guidelines shall apply to research reports, books and annual reports:

- a) Books and research written/edited by individual researcher(s) shall bear the names of the authors or editors, as applicable, on the cover;
- b) Annual reports, research reports based on collective work or similar publications shall appear in the name of EPRC but appropriate credit may be given to contributions either in the preface or elsewhere in the book or annual reports; and
- c) Any researcher may request that his/her name be excluded from the author list of any particular publication. Such a request may or may not signify a lack of concurrence with the contents of the publication.

Publication Ethics

3.19. Authorship shall be decided by the researchers who were mostly involved in designing and executing the research, and the authors shall be able to take responsibility for the content of the publications and defend it if need arises. Contributions from persons who had little to do with the intellectual content of the publication, but who provided other kinds of assistance, need not be rewarded with authorship. Such assistance may be acknowledged in the appropriate section of the publication.

3.20. Authors have three main ethical responsibilities in presenting their work for publications.

- a) Honest and full reporting, which implies accurate and complete description of the observations and data used;
- b) Honest relation of their work to that of others allowing the reader to objectively evaluate the research paper; and
- c) Authorship shall follow the Centre's procedures for the approval of their paper to protect the institution's reputation.

3.21. The researcher(s) shall ensure that research is original and does not contain plagiarised content. If after publication, researcher(s) become aware of misleading or inaccurate statements they must correct the record as soon as possible. Researchers shall cite other relevant work appropriately and accurately.

Use of the work of other authors without acknowledgement shall be considered unethical and punishable by the RAP.

3.22. Unpublished data drawn from other sources shall be identified as such and be appropriately credited, with indication that such acknowledgement is with the consent of the person being credited.

3.23. Unless the data have been updated and the conclusions modified, the same paper shall not be published in more than one outlet.

3.24. The Centre's Publications Committee must treat papers as confidential communications and not divulge their content without the consent of the author(s). Reviewers are responsible not only for unbiased, objective critical analysis of paper but also for completing their task within the time allowed.

Branding

3.25. All the Centre's publications shall follow the Centre's brand identity guidelines.

- i) The Publications Committee shall provide a 'no-objection' before attachment of the EPRC logo or website posting;
- ii) The publications shall display the Centre's logo in its corporate colours;
- iii) Each EPRC working paper shall include a brief paragraph about EPRC, mission and vision statement;
- iv) The printed material shall be attractive (not necessarily over decorated) and well designed. The copy shall convey information accurately, concisely, clearly and in a style that invites readership;
- v) The publication shall include instructions about how readers can obtain additional information;
- vi) Each publication shall indicate the month and year of printing on the cover page. Generally this shall be on the cover, inside cover or back page of publication and printed materials;
- vii) The research publications shall include a listing of previous publications, including titles, authors and year of publication;
- viii) Where possible, the publication shall bear artwork on the cover page reflecting the content. The artwork shall not be published until it has been approved by the Publication Committee;
- ix) Neatness and quality of typography shall be emphasized;
- x) Printed materials shall be attractive and well designed. The copy shall convey information accurately, concisely, clearly and in a style that invites readership and avoids jargon;
- xi) All EPRC publications shall bear an ISBN number and shall be copyrighted.

4. GUIDELINES FOR THE AUTHORS

The EPRC regularly issues a series of publications on various topics for dissemination of knowledge to targeted audiences. These publications fall within the Centre's thematic areas of Trade, Regional Integration and Multilateral agreements; Institutional efficiency and Service Delivery; Socio-economic Governance and Accountability; Social Protection; Growth and Employment; Impact Evaluation of Policies and Programmes.

Emerging issues and changes in policy dialogue shall shape the Centre's strategic research agenda, and this shall require a variety of publications taking a multitude of forms and sizes. The Centre shall encourage submission of papers presenting research findings, fostering policy debate, and contributing to capacity building in policy analysis.

These guidelines are meant to direct Researchers (both staff and non-staff) intending to submit papers to the EPRC Publications Committee for onward publication.

Guidelines

1. **Language of publication:** Publications must be written in or translated into English (UK), therefore Researchers are encouraged to set their online dictionary (in the Word Processor of choice) to UK English;
2. **Revision of original draft:** Prior to sending the original draft electronically as an attachment to the editorial committee, the author is expected to carefully edit it, aiming to correct grammatical and contextual errors and ensure that editorial norms in the EPRC publishing policy have been followed.
3. **Submission of original draft:** Authors may submit the draft electronically as an attachment to the PRF's email address. The body of the email should contain the title of the publication, date of writing, as well as the names, professional affiliation (where necessary), and email addresses of all authors. All successful submissions will be acknowledged upon receipt. The EPRC does not guarantee the electronic submission process and authors are advised to check and ensure successful delivery of submissions.
4. **File Format:** All drafts sent for publication must be in the following format:
 - Document: *.doc or .docx*
 - Font type: *Calibri*
 - Font size: *12* (notes must be in 8-point font)
 - Line spacing: *1.5 spacing*
 - Pagination: *Arabic figures*, (page numbers centered on the bottom border of the page)
 - Margins: *Top (3cm); Bottom (2cm); Left (3cm) and Right (2.5cm)*
5. **Illustrations:** The graphics and tables (including artwork when indispensable) should be incorporated into the text, in an adequate position defined by the author. The photos or images should be copied in extension files – gif or jpeg. They should have titles and be numbered consecutively using Arabic numerals. The worksheets and graphic data that are included in the text should be edited in MS Excel. The graphics should be done in *Corel Draw* or *Adobe Photoshop*.

6. Notes: Bibliographic references, documents, and other information should be presented in full detail at the end of the document. The endnotes should be numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals, and aligned in *justified* format. They should be in *font size 10 point*.

7. Bibliographic references: The bibliographic references should follow a consistent format as illustrated below:

Books: Author(s) of book [last name, first name]. (Year). [*Title in Italics*], edition number other than the first, City, Publisher.

Example:

Lal, D. (2002). *The Poverty of 'Development Economics'*, 3rd Edition. London, The Institute of Economic Affairs.

Articles in Books: Author(s) or editor(s) of book [last name, first name]. (Year). '[Title of Article]' in: Editor(s) of Book [Last name, first name], [*Title of Book in Italics*], City, Publisher, Page numbers.

Example:

Bardhan, P. (2000). 'The Nature of Institutional Impediments to Economic Development' in M. Olson and S. Kahkonen (eds), *A Not So-Dismal Science*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 245 – 268.

Electronic Referencing: Author(s) or editor(s) (year). 'Title of Reference', Publisher, <web address> (date of access)

Example:

Garstang (2007). 'Slavery Today', Garstang Fair Trade Website, www.garstangfairtrade.org.uk/slavery_today.htm (accessed 9 August 2007).

Working Papers: Author(s) [Last name, first name] (Year), 'Title of Document', *Series of the paper*, Working Paper number, City, Institution.

Example:

Harriss-White, B. (1997) 'Informal Economic Order: Shadow States, Private Status States, States of Last Resort and Spinning States: A Speculative Discussion Based on S. Asian Case Material', *QEH Working Paper Series*, No. 6. Oxford, Queen Elizabeth House.

8. House Style

- Dates: Present as day month year with no punctuation
- Quotation marks: use double quotation marks with singles for quotes within quotes
- Foreign words: these should be in italics unless they have become common English usage
- Numbers: one to nine expressed in words. For 10 upwards, use numerals, unless the number starts the sentence
- Percentages: use 'percent' in longer prose. The % sign should be used in tables and figures
- Spellings: Usages and punctuation should be consistently English from UK. American spellings should be avoided. Use 's' spellings rather than 'z' spellings; useful spellings: labour, programme, centre, etc.
- 'below'/'above': Do not use the terms 'below' and 'above' to refer to figures and tables on in the text. Do refer directly to the number or the name of the figure or table.

- Subheadings, table headings and figures: Should consist of capital initial letters with no periods (full stops).

9. Copyright: All EPRC published articles will remain the copyright of EPRC. Clearance is required for further publication in journals or book collections.

10. Responsibility: The views expressed in all EPRC publications are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) or its Management.

Any matter which might arise regarding research and publication between EPRC and its employees, but not provided for in this document will be decided upon by the Board of Management.

5. RELEVANT PROCEDURES/POLICIES, ACTS

These include, but are not limited, to the following:

- i) EPRC Statutory Instrument
- ii) EPRC Staff terms and Conditions of Service
- iii) EPRC Finance Operations Manual
- iv) EPRC ICT Policy
- v) The Access to Information Act 2006
- vi) Other Government of Uganda Acts related to Research and Data Policy

Annex 7.1 Example of a Think Tank's Board's Bylaws*

AMENDED AND RESTATED BYLAWS OF RESULTS FOR DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, INC.

ARTICLE I Activities and Membership

Section 1.01. **Non Profit Activities.** The Corporation is organized exclusively for charitable, educational, scientific and literary purposes, within the meaning of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (or corresponding provisions of any subsequent federal tax laws), and, within such limits, to reduce global poverty, promote sustainable economic and human development and improve human welfare through the building of capacity for policy analysis and implementation in lower and middle income countries around the world. This goal will be accomplished by hosting and contributing to topical conference and meetings, writing reports and briefs, sharing expert technical assistance with policymakers, and providing financial support in the form of grants to build the technical capacity of non-governmental organizations in lower and middle income countries engaged in development work. Consistent with the foregoing, the Corporation shall exercise all powers available to corporations organized pursuant to the District of Columbia Non-Profit Corporation Act.

Section 1.02. **Members.** The Corporation shall not have members.

ARTICLE II Board of Directors

Section 2.01. **Functions of Board of Directors.** All corporate powers shall be exercised by, or under the authority of, and the activities and affairs of the Corporation shall be managed by or under the direction, and subject to the oversight, of the Board of Directors. The Board may adopt such rules and regulations for the conduct of its business as it shall deem advisable, and may, in the execution of the powers granted, delegate authority and responsibility as permitted under law. The Board may hold meetings in executive session under such rules and regulations as the Board may adopt.

Section 2.02. **Qualifications of Directors.** Each director shall be an individual. A director need not be a resident of the District of Columbia.

Section 2.03. **Number of Directors.** The number of directors constituting the entire Board of Directors shall be at least three (3) and not more than thirty (30). The maximum number of directors may be changed by an amendment to these Bylaws, but any such amendment shall not affect the tenure of office of any director, except as provided in Section 2.05.

Section 2.04. **Election and Term of Directors.** The initial Board of Directors shall consist of the directors named in the Articles of Incorporation and shall hold office until the first annual meeting of the Board of Directors and until their successors are elected and qualified. Thereafter, directors shall be elected by the Board at the annual meeting or other meeting of the Board.

Directors shall be elected to three (3) year terms of office based on qualifications established by the Board. Directors shall immediately assume the duties of their office upon election and shall continue in office until the election of directors at the annual meeting of the Board in the year in which their terms expire, unless otherwise determined by the Board. Directors may be reelected to additional terms of office. The President of the Corporation shall be an ex-officio member of the Board.

Section 2.05. **Removal of Directors.** Except as otherwise required by law or restricted by the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, any one or more of the directors may be removed with or without cause at any time by action of the Board, provided there is a quorum of not less than a majority of the entire Board present at the meeting of the Board and only if the meeting notice states that the purpose, or one of the purposes, of the meeting is the removal of the director.

Section 2.06. **Resignation.** Any director may resign at any time by delivering a signed written notice to the Chair, the President or the Secretary. Such resignation shall take effect when such notice is delivered unless the notice specifies a later effective date.

Section 2.07. **Vacancy on the Board.** A majority of the remaining directors, whether or not sufficient to constitute a quorum, may at any time fill a vacancy on the Board of Directors which results from any cause. A director elected to fill a vacancy shall serve for the unexpired term of such director's predecessor.

Section 2.08. **Quorum of Directors and Voting.** Unless a greater proportion is required by law or by the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, a third (1/3) of the number of directors in office before the meeting begins, and not fewer than two directors, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business and, except as otherwise provided by law or by the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, the vote of a majority of the directors present at the meeting at the time of such vote shall be the act of the Board. Each member of the Board shall have one vote.

Section 2.09. **Meetings of the Board.** An annual meeting of the Board of Directors shall be held each year at such time and place as shall be fixed by the Board, or the Chair acting for the Board, for the election of officers and directors and for the transaction of such other business as may properly come before the meeting. Other meetings of the Board may be held at any time whenever called by the Chair or upon request of any two directors of the Corporation. Meetings of the Board may be held in or out of the District of Columbia.

Section 2.10. **Notice of Meetings.** At least seven (7) days prior written notice of the time and place of an annual meeting of the Board shall be provided to each director. Notice of other meetings of the Board shall be given to each director in writing or orally at least twenty-four hours before said meeting.

Except as otherwise required by these Bylaws, a notice, or waiver of notice, need not describe the purpose of any meeting of the Board of Directors.

Notice of a meeting of the Board of Directors need not be given to any director entitled to such notice who submits a signed, written waiver of notice whether before or after the date and time stated in such notice. A director's attendance at a meeting constitutes waiver of notice of such meeting, except attendance for the purpose of objecting to the transaction of business because the meeting was not lawfully called or convened.

Section 2.11. **Written Consents of Directors.** Any action required or permitted to be taken at any meeting of the Board of Directors may be taken without a meeting if a consent in writing, setting forth

the action so taken, shall be signed by all of the directors then in office. Such written consents shall be included in the minutes or filed with the corporate records reflecting the action taken.

Section 2.12. **Compensation of Directors.** Directors shall serve without salary or compensation unless the Board determines otherwise. Directors may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses actually and necessarily incurred in the performance of their director duties under such policies as may be adopted by the Board. Nothing herein shall prohibit a director from providing services to the Corporation in another capacity and receiving reasonable compensation therefor under such rules and regulations and conflict of interest policies as may be adopted by the Board.

Section 2.13 **Standards of Conduct for Directors.** Each member of the Board of Directors, when discharging the duties of a director, shall act in good faith and in a manner the director reasonably believes to be in the best interests of the Corporation, with the level of care prescribed by law. No director shall take advantage, directly or indirectly, of a business opportunity of the Corporation without first presenting such opportunity to the Corporation in accordance with applicable law.

ARTICLE III **Officers, Agents and Employees**

Section 3.01 **Officers.** The Corporation shall have a Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer elected by and from the Board of Directors. The Corporation also shall have a President appointed by the Board and such other officers as the Board may deem necessary and desirable. The Board may prescribe the powers and duties of each office and may fill any vacancy which may occur. Two or more offices may be held by the same person, except for the offices of President and Secretary. The President may appoint assistant officers to assist in the operation of the day-to-day affairs of the Corporation.

Section 3.02. **Tenure and Removal.** Each officer, except the President, shall hold office for the term of one (1) year or until his successor has been elected and qualified. The President shall serve for a term as determined by the Board. All officers may be reelected to additional terms to the same or different office. Any officer may be removed by the Board of Directors at any time with or without cause, and any assistant officer appointed by the President may be removed by the President.

Section 3.03. **Resignation.** Any officer may resign at any time by delivering written notice to the Corporation. Unless the written notice specifies a later effective date, the resignation shall be effective when the notice is delivered to the Corporation.

Section 3.04. **Vacancies.** Vacancies in any office arising from any cause may be filled by the Board of Directors at any regular or special meeting of the Board or by unanimous written consent of the Board. An officer appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the unexpired term of the officer's predecessor.

Section 3.05. **Powers and Duties of Officers.** Subject to the control of the Board of Directors, all officers as between themselves and the Corporation shall have such authority and perform such duties in the management of the Corporation as may be provided by the Board of Directors and, to the extent not so provided, as generally to pertain to their respective offices.

A. **Chair.** The Chair shall perform all duties customary to that office and shall be responsible for facilitating the work of the Board which shall include the following:

1. Preside over all meetings of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee;
2. Provide leadership to enable the Board to accomplish its objectives;
3. Provide leadership to enable the Corporation to secure and maintain the resources necessary to achieve its objectives and to achieve sound management of those resources;
4. Communicate with the Board of Directors and Executive Committee on matters affecting the welfare of the Corporation;
5. Investigate complaints, irregularities and conditions detrimental to the Corporation and report thereon to the Board or Executive Committee as circumstances warrant;

6. Appoint all chairpersons and members of committees, except as provided in these Bylaws;
7. Along with the President, be the official spokesperson and representative of the Corporation in all matters; and
8. Perform such other duties usually incident to the offices of the Chair and as may be assigned by the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee.

B. **Vice Chair.** The Vice Chair shall, in the absence of the Chair or in the event of his or her inability or refusal to act, perform the duties of the Chair, and, when so acting, shall have all the powers of and be subject to all the restrictions upon the Chair.

C. **Secretary.** The Secretary shall be responsible for preparing and maintaining custody of minutes of all meetings of the Board of Directors, and for authenticating the records of the Corporation, and shall give or cause to be given all notices in accordance with these Bylaws or as required by law, and, in general, shall perform all duties customary to the office of Secretary.

D. **Treasurer.** The Treasurer shall oversee and be responsible for the financial affairs of the Corporation, shall report on the financial condition of the Corporation to the Board of Directors, and shall perform such other tasks as may be directed by the Board or Executive Committee.

E. **President.** The President shall be the chief executive officer responsible for directing the day-to-day operations and management of the Corporation. The President shall report to the Board of Directors and Executive Committee and shall be employed under such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Board or the Executive Committee. The duties and responsibilities of the President shall include:

1. Carrying out the policies established by the Board of Directors;
2. Hiring, firing, and supervising the staff necessary to carry out the work of the Corporation and fixing their compensation within the budget approved by the Board of Directors;
3. Working with professional staff and consultants to ensure that the Corporation's accounts, books and records are properly maintained;
4. Assisting the Corporation's officers and committees in preparing budgets, financial and other reports, tax and other legal filings, and other matters within delegation of authority or committee charter under these Bylaws or as may be established by the Board;
5. Preparing business plans, annual reports, and other reports as requested by the Board of Directors or Executive Committee; and
6. Performing such other tasks as may be directed by the Board of Directors or Executive Committee.

Section 3.06. **Agents and Employees.** The Board of Directors and the President may appoint agents and the President may hire employees who shall have such authority and perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Board or the President. The Board or President, as applicable, may remove any agent or employee at any time with or without cause. Removal without cause shall be without prejudice to such person's contract rights, if any, and the appointment of such person shall not itself create contract rights. The President may delegate authority to such employees and agents as he shall deem advisable and which he may properly delegate. The delegation of authority by the Board or the President shall not operate to relieve the Board or President, as applicable, from any responsibility imposed upon it or him under these Bylaws or by law.

Section 3.07. **Compensation of Officers, Agents and Employees.** The Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer shall serve without compensation, unless the Board determines otherwise, but may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses actually and necessarily incurred in connection with the performance of their service for the Corporation under such policies as may be determined by the Board. The President shall, and assistant officers may, receive reasonable compensation for services rendered to the Corporation as determined by the Board or the Executive Committee. The Corporation may pay reasonable compensation to agents and employees for reasonable and necessary services rendered.

Section 3.08. **Disciplinary Action; Suspension.** The Board shall have the power by majority vote to discipline or suspend any officer of the Corporation, provided there is a quorum of not less than a

majority of the entire Board present at the meeting of the Board and only if the meeting notice states that the purpose, or one of the purposes, of the meeting is the discipline or suspension of the officer.

Section 3.09. **Standards of Conduct for Officers.** Each officer of the Corporation, when discharging the duties of such office, shall act in good faith and in a manner the officer reasonably believes to be in the best interests of the Corporation, with the level of care prescribed by law. No officer shall take advantage, directly or indirectly, of a business opportunity of the Corporation without first presenting such opportunity to the Corporation in accordance with applicable law.

ARTICLE IV **Executive Committee**

Section 4.01. **Composition.** There shall be an Executive Committee of the Board of Directors consisting of up to seven (7) members, including the Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer. The President of the Corporation shall be an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee. The remaining members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed by and from the Board. Appointed members shall serve a one (1) term of office and may be reappointed to additional terms.

Section 4.02. **Powers and Responsibilities.** The Executive Committee shall exercise all of the powers of the Board in the management and direction of the business and affairs of the Corporation between Board meetings, to the fullest extent permitted under law, in accordance with the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and policies established by the Board; provided that the Executive Committee shall not have the power to elect or remove directors, adopt a plan of merger or consolidation with another organization, voluntarily dissolve the Corporation, liquidate or dispose of all or substantially all of the Corporation's property and assets, or amend the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. The Board may adopt and impose additional limitations on the Executive Committee's powers. The Executive Committee shall serve as the compensation committee of the Corporation, unless the Board determines otherwise. The Executive Committee may appoint persons to fill vacancies in any office occurring between Board meetings and such appointments shall be effective until the next meeting of the Board.

Section 4.03. **Meetings and Quorum.** A majority of the members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum at any duly called meeting. The Chair shall call such meetings of the Executive Committee as the business of the Corporation may require. Meetings also may be called at any time at the request of the President or two (2) members of the Committee. The Executive Committee may hold meetings in executive session under such rules and regulations as the Board may adopt.

ARTICLE V **Other Committees**

Section 5.01. **Board Committees.** The Board may establish and appoint committees that consist of one or more directors and determine their authority and responsibilities, to the extent permitted under law, and may dissolve such committees at its discretion. The Chair shall have authority to appoint all members of any such committee and shall designate the committee chair; provided that all such committees and their members, including the chair, shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. Committees shall exercise the authority delegated to them by the Board, but the delegation of authority to and appointment of any committee shall not relieve the Board of any of responsibility imposed on it under these Bylaws or by law. The provisions of this section shall not apply to the Executive Committee.

Section 5.02. **Advisory Committees.** The Board may establish and appoint "Advisory Committees" that consist of at least two directors and other members who are not directors, and determine their authority and responsibilities, to the extent permitted under law, and may dissolve such committees at its discretion. The Chair shall have authority to appoint all members of the Advisory Committee and shall

designate the committee chair (who shall be a director); provided that all Advisory Committees and their members, including the chair, shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. Advisory Committees shall not be a committee of the Board and they shall not be authorized to exercise the authority of the Board or any of its committees.

Section 5.03. **Term.** Unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws, members of committees shall serve a one (1) year term and may be reappointed to additional terms.

Section 5.04. **Compensation.** Members of committees shall serve without compensation except that they may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses actually and necessarily incurred in the performance of their service under rules and policies adopted by the Board of Directors. Nothing herein shall prohibit a member of a committee from providing goods or services to the Corporation in another capacity and receiving reasonable compensation therefor under such rules and procedures as may be adopted by the Board of Directors.

Section 5.05. **Disciplinary Action; Suspension.** The Board (excluding any member who is the subject of the vote) shall have the power by majority vote to discipline or suspend any committee member, provided there is a quorum of not less than a majority of the entire Board present at the meeting of the Board and only if the meeting notice states that the purpose, or one of the purposes, of the meeting is the discipline or suspension of the committee member.

ARTICLE VI **Miscellaneous**

Section 6.01. **Fiscal Year.** The fiscal year of the Corporation shall end on the last day of December.

Section 6.02. **Bank accounts.** All monies received shall be deposited promptly to the credit of the Corporation in such bank or other depositories as may be approved by the Board of Directors, or officer designated by the Board, and all disbursements shall be made in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board or the President.

Section 6.03. **Checks, Notes and Contracts.** The Board of Directors and the President, unless the Board determines otherwise, shall determine who shall be authorized from time to time on the Corporation's behalf to sign checks, drafts, or other orders for payment of money; to sign acceptances, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness; to enter into contracts; or to execute and deliver other documents and instruments. A person who holds more than one office in the Corporation may not act in more than one capacity to execute, acknowledge, or verify an instrument required by law to be executed, acknowledged, or verified by more than one officer.

Section 6.04. **Books and Records.** The Corporation shall keep at its registered office or principal office in the District of Columbia correct and complete books and records of the account; the activities and transactions of the Corporation; the minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Directors, any committee of the Board of Directors, and any other committee of the Corporation; and a current list of the directors and officers of the Corporation and their residence addresses. Any of the books, minutes and records of the Corporation may be in written form or in any other form capable of being converted into written form within a reasonable time. The original or a certified copy of the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and committee charters, if any, shall be kept at the principal office of the Corporation. All books and records of the Corporation may be inspected for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

Section 6.05. **Telephonic Meetings.** Any one or more members of the Board of Directors, Executive Committee or other committees may participate in a meeting by means of conference telephone

or any other means of communication by which all persons participating in the meeting are able to hear one another, and such participation shall constitute presence in person at the meeting.

Section 6.06. **Mail, Fax or Electronic Voting.** Voting on all matters by the Board, Executive Committee and other committees at a duly constituted meeting may be conducted by mail, fax or electronic means, as may be authorized by the Board or applicable committee, except as may be otherwise provided by law. In the event of a vote by mail, fax or electronic means at a duly constituted meeting, the entire Board of Directors or committee, as applicable, shall be considered present.

Section 6.07. **Majority Vote.** Except as may be provided in the Articles of Incorporation, these Bylaws or under law, all matters voted on shall be decided by majority vote of a duly constituted quorum.

Section 6.08. **Proxy Voting.** There shall be no proxy voting.

Section 6.09. **Legal, Accounting and Annual Audit.** The Corporation may employ or retain such persons including accountants, auditors and attorneys as deemed necessary to carry on the functions of the Corporation. The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited annually by a Certified Public Accountant.

Section 6.10. **Office Location.** The principal office of the Corporation shall be located within or without the District of Columbia, at such place as the Board of Directors shall from time to time designate. The Corporation may maintain additional offices at such other places as the Board of Directors may designate. The Corporation shall continuously maintain within the District of Columbia a registered office at such place as may be designated by the Board of Directors.

Section 6.11. **Bond.** The Treasurer, President and any other person responsible for handling funds of the Corporation, shall, if required by the Board of Directors and at the Corporation's expense, furnish a surety bond in such amount as the Board may direct.

Section 6.12. **Voting Upon Shares in Other Corporations.** Stock of other corporations or associations, registered in the name of the Corporation, may be voted by the Chair, the Vice Chair or the President or a proxy appointed by any of them. The Board of Directors, however, may by resolution appoint some other person to vote such shares, in which case such person shall be entitled to vote such shares upon the production of a certified copy of such resolution.

ARTICLE VII **Indemnification and Insurance**

Section 7.01. **Indemnification of Directors and Officers.** The Corporation shall indemnify, advance expenses and hold harmless, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law as it presently exists or may hereafter be amended, any person (a "Covered Person") who was or is made or is threatened to be made a party or is otherwise involved in any action, suit or proceeding, whether civil, criminal, administrative or investigative (a "Proceeding"), by reason of the fact that he or she, or a person for whom he or she is the legal representative, is or was a director or officer of the Corporation or, while a director or officer of the Corporation, is or was serving at the request of the Corporation as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee or agent of another domestic or foreign corporation, partnership, joint venture, trust, employee benefit plan or other entity, against all liability and loss suffered and expenses (including attorneys' fees) reasonably incurred by the Covered Person in that capacity or arising from the Covered Person's status as a director or officer (including such other service at the request of the Corporation). Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, except for claims for indemnification (following the final disposition of such Proceeding) or advancement of expenses not paid in full, the Corporation shall be

required to indemnify, advance expenses and hold harmless a Covered Person in connection with a Proceeding (or part thereof) commenced by such Covered Person only if the commencement of such Proceeding (or part thereof) by the Covered Person and such indemnification, advancement of expenses and hold harmless obligation was authorized in the specific case by the Board. Any amendment, repeal or modification of this Section shall not adversely affect any right or protection hereunder of any person in respect of any act or omission occurring prior to the time of such repeal or modification.

Section 7.02. **Indemnification of Advisory Committee Members.** The Corporation may indemnify, advance expenses, and hold harmless, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law as it presently exists or may hereafter be amended, any person (a “Advisor”) who was or is made or is threatened to be made a party or is otherwise involved in any Proceeding by reason of the fact that he or she, or a person for whom he or she is the legal representative, is or was a member of an Advisory Committee against all liability and loss suffered and expenses (including attorneys’ fees) reasonably incurred by such Advisor; provided that, in all instances, the Advisor shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Covered Persons pursuant to these Bylaws and applicable law.

Section 7.03. **Indemnification of Employees and Agents.** The Corporation may indemnify, advance expenses and hold harmless, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, any employee or agent of the Corporation who was or is made or is threatened to be made a party or is otherwise involved in any Proceeding by reason of the fact that such person is or was an employee or agent of the Corporation against all liability and loss suffered and expenses (including attorneys’ fees) reasonably incurred by such agent, but only to the extent authorized in a resolution or a contract adopted by the Board, whether adopted by the Board before or after the act or omission giving rise to the applicable claim, and, in all instances the employee or agent shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Covered Persons pursuant to these Bylaws and applicable law.

Section 7.04. **Indemnification of Volunteers.** The Corporation may indemnify, advance expenses and hold harmless, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, any volunteer of the Corporation who was or is made or is threatened to be made a party or is otherwise involved in any Proceeding by reason of the fact that he or she is or was a volunteer of the Corporation against all liability and loss suffered and expenses (including attorneys’ fees) reasonably incurred by such volunteer, but only to the extent authorized in a resolution adopted by the Board, whether adopted by the Board before or after the act or omission giving rise to the applicable claim, and, in all instances the volunteer shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Covered Persons pursuant to these Bylaws and applicable law.

Section 7.05. **Insurance for Indemnification and Advancement of Expenses.** To the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, but only to the extent reasonably available for purchase, (a) the Corporation shall purchase and maintain insurance on behalf of all Covered Persons in respect of any Proceeding for which the Covered Persons may be entitled to indemnification or advancement of expenses under these Bylaws or applicable law and (b) the Corporation may, upon the specific authorization of the Board, purchase and maintain insurance on behalf of Advisors, employees, agents or volunteers of the Corporation in respect of any Proceeding for which Advisors, employees, agents or volunteers may be entitled to indemnification or advancement of expenses under these Bylaws or applicable law.

Section 7.06. **Non-exclusivity.** The indemnification provided by this Article VII shall not be deemed exclusive of any other rights to which any Covered Person, Advisor, employee, agent or volunteer may be entitled under any statute, agreement, vote of the Board of Directors, or otherwise and shall not restrict the power of the Corporation to make any indemnification permitted by law.

ARTICLE VIII

Amendments

The Bylaws of the Corporation may be amended by a majority vote of the Board of Directors at any duly called meeting of the Board if notice of the proposed change is provided prior to such meeting. If authorized by the Board at a meeting, a vote on Bylaws changes may be taken by mail, fax, or electronic ballot, sent not less than thirty (30) days before the date for receipt of the ballots.

Adopted by the R4D Board of Directors on September 18, 2013.

Board Secretary

Annex 7.2 More Information on Recruiting New Board Members

Recruiting: What Board Members Want

Most people who serve as members of a think tank's board do so for some combination of three reasons. First, they would like to enjoy the company of their fellow board members. This can be an especially powerful draw if the institution's board is populated with prestigious individuals. Second, members want to feel that they are doing good work, that they are giving something back to their community through serving without compensation.¹ Third, board members want to be associated with an organization doing high-quality work that may have significant positive effects on national living standards and governance. Highly regarded think tanks active in the public domain will have an easier job than others in attracting their most desired candidates.

Over time, boards can become more attractive to potential new members by helping the think tank achieve its primary objectives and by recruiting excellent new members for the board. Here, success breeds further success. Given the board's central place in a think tank's life and the intangible benefits board members seek from serving on the board, it is not surprising that boards typically devote substantial energy to recruiting new members.

Many candidate board members will want to be assured that the institute will purchase for them directors' and officers' liability insurance—in other words, insurance to cover the costs of defending themselves against allegations that they acted wrongfully in discharging their duties as a board member. (See article VII in the board bylaws presented in Annex 7.1 for specific language.) This insurance is payable to the directors and officers of an organization or to the organization itself, as indemnification (reimbursement) for losses or advancement of defense costs in the event an insured suffers such a loss as a result of a legal action brought for alleged wrongful acts in their capacity as directors and officers. Such coverage can extend to defense costs arising out of criminal and regulatory investigations/trials as well; in fact, often civil and criminal actions are brought against directors/officers simultaneously.

How to Recruit

Before approaching a candidate for board membership, the board needs to clearly define the minimum expectations for successful service on the board. How much time should it take? Does it just involve attending the board meetings, or is something also expected between meetings? The board member who knows the candidate best is usually asked to make the initial contact. Robinson (2001, 126–27) provides a good list of questions the board needs to answer before a member approaches a candidate.

What major issues is the board currently focused on?

What talents, expertise, qualities, or characteristics is the board seeking in new members?

How often does the board meet and for how long?

Is everyone asked to serve on a committee? How are committee assignments made?

What kind of fund-raising is required of board members?

¹ These two reasons are noted in Robinson (2001, 22).

What is the relationship between the board and the executive director and between the board and other staff?

Is an orientation program in place? Are other board education activities offered?

Does the board have an annual retreat of any kind?

Are there changes on the horizon that a new board member should know about?

Many recruitment conversations stress how little time will be required of the new board member. This is a mistake for two reasons. It may lead to unrealistic expectations on the part of the new member, possibly resulting in lower involvement than actually required. More important, it diminishes the real reason for which the person is being recruited: Their talent and experience would be valuable in helping to shape the institution's work and future agenda. In short, apologizing for the inconvenience of serving usually backfires.

The tradition among think tanks has been *not* to expect board members to personally contribute funds to the organization. This was contrary to the practice of many service-providing NGOs. Many in the business or communications may not understand this distinction, and it is certainly worth pointing it out when approaching a candidate. At times the president may gently ask the chairman or a board member with a specific connection to a possible donor to make introductions or even participate in an initial meeting.

While this tradition still holds in many countries, in the west the last decade has witnessed an evolution toward members being contributors. This is particularly true in the U.S., where annual contributions are often expected from members in a position to make them. The board-as-revenue source is one explanation for the steady increase in the size of U.S. boards.

New Member Orientation

Orientation programs, formal or informal, make it easier for new board members to make a contribution right away. While private firms in many countries offer formal training programs for the directors of nonprofit organizations, these programs are likely ill-suited for most think tanks, for two reasons. First, most such programs are oriented to a wide range of service delivery nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), with which think tanks have little in common. Think tanks often more closely resemble for-profit consulting firms or university research centers than the typical NGO that provides human services (e.g., counseling, training, and various social services). Second, the kind of people recruited to think tank boards are unlikely to have the inclination or time to attend such training events.

A simple program organized by the chairman of the board and the think tank's president can deliver the necessary information. For orientation at many think tanks, the new board member is invited to the think tank for an extended meeting with the president and introductions to key staff members. When the new member resides in another city, rules of common courtesy suggest that the president should visit the new member to provide the orientation, or at least offer to do so.

The orientation should include a summary of the organization's history, because the current activities and attitudes are often heavily conditioned by its roots and early development. Additional topics to cover include:

goals and objectives
the current program of work
recent successes in research and the policy process
the organization's communications and dissemination programs
recent financial history
fund-raising, especially if this has been a problem and year-to-year swings in financing have been significant, along with the strategy for dealing with funding problems
any other current or impending problems that have been discussed with the board
a quick review of the performance indicators being employed
the institution's key staff, highlighting each member's special contributions.

Each new member should be given a package of materials about the organization: its charter and other legal documents are a must, as are current financial statements and the strategic plan if one exists. Annual reports for the past two or three years and examples of the think tank's written products should also be included. It is doubtful that the new member will study these immediately. But he may turn to them if a particular issue arises, especially an urgent one. Lastly, provide him with a copy of this book or a similar guide that provides an in-depth discussion of not only boards' responsibilities but think tank management more generally.

It is often said that board members learn best by asking questions.² The one-on-one meeting with the president offers significant scope for such questions. But the president should also encourage any new member who wants to talk with senior staff members—both researchers and administrators—to go ahead.

No orientation is complete without a discussion of the new board member's duties and the kind of role the organization hopes the member will play. This conversation can be led by the president or the chairman of the board. In either case, it should be guided by a statement produced by the board, ideally at the same time the board discusses specific candidates to serve. Most duties will be common to all members, including attendance at board meetings, active participation in the meetings, and so forth. But there may be particular tasks for some members. For example, a member with a strong financial background could be asked to take the lead in monitoring the organization's financial condition and controls, presumably mostly by reviewing the annual external audit of the institution's finances.

² This paragraph draws on Robinson (2001, 76–77).

Annex 8.1 White Book – Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Goal

Chapter 2: CIPPEC's Strategic Vision

- 2.1 Institutional Description
- 2.2 Mission, Vision, Goals and Values
- 2.3 Types of Intervention
- 2.4 Areas, Programs and Projects
- 2.5 CIPPEC's flowchart

Chapter 3: Internal Bodies of Governance

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Administrative Board
- 3.3 Executive Committee
- 3.4 Project Approval Committee
- 3.5 Code of Ethics Committee

Chapter 4: Code of Ethics

- 4.1 General Principles
- 4.2 Origin, scope and amendments' proposals
- 4.3 Relationships in the workplace. Solution of internal conflicts
- 4.4 Use of facilities and tools 26
- 4.5 Financing, funds' management and accountability
- 4.6 Purchases of goods and hiring of services
- 4.7 Gifts
- 4.8 Conflict of Interests
- 4.9 Incompatibilities with public, political or partisan positions
- 4.10 Payments by third parties to the staff members
- 4.11 Information Management
- 4.12 Intellectual Property, Publications and Software
- 4.13 Code of Ethics Committee

Chapter 5: Process for Projects' Approval, Monitoring and Evaluation

- 5.1 Annual Projects' Approval Process Approval
- 5.2 Standard Projects' Approval Process
- 5.3 Management Commitment Process

Chapter 6: Sources of Funding and Institutional Linkage

- 6.1 Objective
- 6.2 Fundraising policy
 - A) Private sources and institutional development
- 6.3 Responsibilities
- 6.4 Donor Loyalty
- 6.5 CIPPEC' Annual Dinner

- 6.6 Accountability
- 6.7 Payments' management and monitoring
- 6.8 Billing meeting
- 6.9 Processes by source of funding
- B) Public sources and political linkages

Chapter 7: Administration and Finance

- 7.1 Billing and collection of non-allocated donations
 - 7.1.1 Origin of the process: Donation
 - 7.1.2 Register of donation
 - 7.1.3 Billing Process
 - 7.1.4 Collection Process
 - 7.1.5 Policies
 - 7.1.6 Monthly Reports' Process
- 7.2 Projects' Billing and Collection Process
- 7.3 Payments' Process
- 7.4 Petty cash's Process
- 7.5 Expenses' Accountability Process
- 7.6 Monthly Closure process
- 7.7 Auditing Process

Chapter 8: Human Resources

- 8.1 Linkage Modalities
- 8.2 Internal policies and benefits 98
- 8.3 Labour Unlinking
- 8.4 Selection of Directors Policy

Chapter 9: Communication

- 9.1 Information and Confidentiality
- 9.2 Publications Policy
- 9.3 Media Policy
- 9.4 Events
- 9.5 Individual participation in external events
- 9.6 Internal communication program
- 9.7 Communication of crisis
- 9.8 Institutional Cards
- 9.9 Web
- 9.10 Audiovisual Policy

Chapter 10: Technology

- 10.1 Quick Start
- 10.2 Telephony
- 10.3 Internet
- 10.4 Hardware
- 10.5 Software
- 10.6 Help-desk
- 10.7 New technologies for the organization

Annex 9.1 Seven Innovations Undertaken by Eastern European and Russian Think Tanks

Overview of Initiatives

How many and what types of initiatives did these think tanks undertake? Why did they do it? How important are such initiatives to the institutions? Table A9.1.1 and Box A.9.1.1 provide summary information; the box includes a short description of each initiative.¹

Of the four study firms, three were clearly in Stage 2, meaning that they had more than five full-time researchers, had stable funding, and were well established in their markets. All three were all large by regional standards. The fourth, the Center for Democracy and Free Enterprise (CDFE), was nearly there.

Each firm cited one or two initiatives that had progressed enough to be reported upon. Initiatives were wide-ranging and included setting up a market survey operation, a credit rating agency, customized corporate training programs, and an in-house consulting center for working in other transition countries.

Most initiatives had been undertaken after the think tank had been in operation for two or three years, but there are exceptions to this rule. One is the radio station established by the Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD); founding the station was one of the center's first activities, and was meant to break the government's monopoly on local news broadcasts by rebroadcasting Voice of America programs. Over the years the programming format has changed in line with evolving consumer preferences. Another example is the Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE), which began advising other transitional countries very early in its life, when a foundation invited one of CASE's senior staff to work with Russian reformers on macroeconomic policies.

The Institute for Urban Economics (IUE) was also a fast starter because it believed it could survive only if it aggressively diversified its activities and client base from the initial project—a large housing and real estate reform project supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Motivation for the initiatives varied. CDFE was facing very tough times financially and diversified out of necessity. CASE's "corporate sponsors" initiative was also a straightforward attempt to diversify funding sources. On the other hand, CSD set up its marketing research operation primarily because it offered the chance to become engaged in new topic areas. Similarly, CASE's technical assistance to transitional economies resulted from its desire to share its staff expertise. IUE was motivated by wanting both to reduce dependency on its primary sponsor and to enter new fields.

One key element in determining the nature of the initiative was the institution's initial activity base. CSD built its marketing survey operation on its existing survey capacity, and IUE created its credit rating agency for local government bonds around a team already doing related municipal-finance projects. Similarly, CDFE was able to exploit its established reputation for conducting training projects in preparing its custom training packages for corporate clients. CASE's international consulting operation built squarely on the group's work on similar topics in Poland.

¹ Note that not all actions cited as entrepreneurial by the respondents have been included. Some had begun too recently at the time of the interview to be of interest, and others were simply a somewhat different approach to marketing to prior clients.

In short, the firms generally built on the positive reputation they had established for related activities and exploited the capabilities of existing staff in selecting an initiative. Building on strength is a common business strategy. However, the modest capital available to underwrite the start-up costs of an initiative also prevented these institutions from launching any initiative further afield from their core activities.

Identifying and Launching Initiatives

The most common pattern for the launch of an initiative was for the basic idea to come from the president of the organization or from a staff member (table A.9.1.2). The idea was then discussed among the staff and a few people outside the organization and usually with the Board. If it was agreed upon as probably feasible, then the new line of work was marketed by word of mouth and participation in seminars, where this specific expertise could be demonstrated and promotional material distributed. In short, these were low-tech, often rather informal processes. Instinct played at least as large a role as analysis in making the decision to proceed.

Preparation of a formal business plan to test the feasibility of an initiative was relatively rare, with plans prepared for only two initiatives—CSD’s marketing survey initiative and IUE’s credit rating facility. IUE was the only group surveyed that contracted for assistance in analyzing its initiative. It hired an international management consulting firm to help prepare the business plan. IUE believes this was a good investment, because the strong business plan was instrumental in inducing Standard & Poor’s (S&P) to sign a strategic affiliation agreement with the credit rating agency less than a year after it began operations.

Similarly, formal promotional efforts beyond seminar participation to launch a new initiative were exceptional. IUE has been more aggressive than most think tanks in explicitly marketing an initiative. For its credit rating initiative, for example, it sponsored presentations by the key researcher at numerous seminars within Russia, gave the activity prominence on its home page, produced a slick three-fold marketing brochure and distributed it widely at conferences, and sponsored a session at a major international conference in London on credit ratings in the Commonwealth of Independent States. The affiliation with Standard & Poor’s was announced at a splashy press conference in a five-star Moscow hotel. CASE launched its “corporate patrons” program with a customized sophisticated mailing to 70 of the largest corporations and banks in Poland, with telephone follow-up to recruit patrons.

Common, if modest, promotional efforts included devoting space in the institute’s newsletter and on its web site to the initiative, where these vehicles were available. Since most projects resulted in reports, these, too, were available to show to new potential clients.²

Of those interviewed, only CASE cited an example of an initiative that had not worked. CASE attempted to obtain contracts from the Polish government for carrying out research and policy analysis; while government offices used the Center’s work, they resisted paying for it. This initiative was handled very informally. The practice of Polish ministries in contracting out has changed dramatically since 2000, so by 2005 ministries were major research clients. (See the next chapter for more on government procurement of policy research and evaluation services.)

Rewards and Challenges

How did the pluses and minuses of introducing innovations balance for these think tanks? Table A9.1.3 provides an overview using the same factors listed above.

² CDFE was not anxious to advertise its special corporate training activities, because some viewed the training as not fully consistent with its primary mission, so it used none of these tools.

Rewards

Financially, the revenues generated by the initiatives have generally been moderately important, representing 10 to 30 percent of total revenues (table A9.1.1). But CASE's assistance to transition economies was uniquely successful, with revenues from this activity accounting for 40 to 55 percent of total revenues in the two years before the interview.

The directors of the think tanks rated the initiatives as financially successful. This is, however, a fairly imprecise term. While each initiative is generating significant revenue, as seen above, the rating of financial success is *not* based on revenues net of start-up costs. For many initiatives these costs were quite modest, so the needed adjustment would be small. But in a few cases, such as IUE's substantial promotional efforts and paid assistance in business-plan development, the rating of financial success could be affected. Unfortunately, these think tanks do not keep records in a way that permits all relevant costs to be readily identified.

Some respondents emphasized that the form in which the funds were received made them especially valuable. Both CDFE and CSD reported that the use of profits from corporate training and the radio station, respectively, had no restrictions and could be used very flexibly. For example, they could serve as matching funds for foundation grants or be used for computer purchases or other institution-building tasks. On the other hand, if the activity increases total operations but leaves profits unchanged, then funds in the overhead accounts increase—but these are all dedicated to specific purposes.

All four think tanks believed their initiatives improved their reputation and/or visibility with certain local communities, especially the business community. IUE's credit ratings made the young institute visible to financial circles. CASE's corporate patrons program helped establish a firmer relationship with the business community. CDFE's customized training courses were more important in giving the Center access to other projects than for its reputation per se. Finally, CSD saw its market survey work for major multinational firms as a recognition of its capabilities—recognition that it could use to woo future clients.

Three of the sample think tanks also saw various aspects of their initiatives as broadening their experience base for policy development. Working in these new areas expanded the perspective of the researchers involved, and in some instances informed other policy analyses. IUE's ratings of municipal bonds gave analysts new insights into the actual financial condition of local governments and the structure of intergovernmental fiscal relations.

Interestingly, certain unanticipated benefits were cited important to the overall success of the new ventures. First, CSD thought its market survey operation helped the group retain staff, by giving analysts a change from the typical research and writing assignments. CASE also thought the change of pace provided by foreign travel and somewhat different assignments made the center a generally more attractive place to work for some staff members.

IUE and CASE cited a second unexpected benefit: the new activities generated important staff training. For IUE, the training in the credit rating initiative came from the classroom training provided by Standard & Poor's and by IUE staff working directly with the S&P staff on benchmarking and other tasks. The leadership at CASE stated that young staff members were challenged by working largely on their own in other countries of the region, helping them mature quickly as researchers and policy analysts. The training and adjustments to management (described below) can be counted as indicating improved operational efficiency.

None of the think tanks spoke about the benefits of expanded overhead revenues, although this may have been implied in the positive statements on financial success.

Challenges

Think tank leaders reported remarkably little in the way of problems accompanying the new, more commercially oriented initiatives. The interview included explicit questions about the half-dozen different types of problems the institution might have encountered (listed above), so the respondents were thoroughly prompted to recall any problems.

Neither IUE nor CDFE could identify any. The IUE director said she thought this was due in part to the orientation of the organization, which from the beginning had worked on multiple demonstration projects that involved close relationships with local government officials and banks. CDFE stated that the financial pressures were so severe that the staff understood the organization had to change direction if it was to survive.

CSD reported no philosophical problems with the staff, the Board, or foundation clients. Rather, the problem was in changing employees' task orientation; staff shied away from doing the necessary marketing. At CASE, the only problems encountered were managerial. There was a certain conflict between the demands of short-term consulting jobs in other transition countries and keeping the larger home-based projects on schedule: the major projects fell behind as staff dashed off on short-term assignments. This conflict was finally resolved by expanding the size of the permanent and associate staff. Both these difficulties can be classified as management challenges.

It is important to note that none of the four institutions reported problems with dilution of the focus of their work, perceived independence in the policy process, or cultural conflicts within the organization. This happy record may result from the fact that the new lines of work were all closely aligned with each institution's main activities and that these were young organizations whose identities were not yet carved in stone and hence were still able to be quite flexible in creating or responding to opportunities.

Status in 2013

An important question is whether the seven innovations described above proved to be successful. At a minimum, success is indicated by the program undertaken still being part of the think tank's program. I was able to determine the status as of December 2013 of five of the seven innovations reviewed.³ The results for the five are listed in Table A9.1.4. Four of the five were clear successes. Of these four, three are still operational within the think tank and one was sold profitably as an investment to an international firm.

The one unsuccessful innovation was establishment of a radio station in Sofia by the Center for the Study of Democracy. Over time, competition increased and its market share decreased. The station was sold. CSD's executive director draws the conclusion that major new undertakings should be closely related to a think tank's core competencies.⁴

³ It appears that the Center for Democracy and Free Enterprise in Prague no longer exists. An inquiry to CASE to clarify the status of the corporate sponsors program was not answered. A review of the CASE 2012 annual report shows that private giving is significant but it is unclear if this is associated with the program.

⁴ Private communication from Ognian Shentov, December 9, 2013.

Box A9.1.1 Summary of Initiatives

<i>Firm</i>	<i>Initiative title and summary</i>
CSD	<p><i>Radio station.</i> Began in April 1991, rebroadcasting Voice of America programs. Received early U.S. government and other support for equipment and otherwise establishing the station. Once the transition began, the station tried a strong news format but soon discovered that this was not appealing. In response to lost market share, in 1993 the station shifted to a music format with news briefs, and expanded to three stations. Under this format, the station is profitable.</p> <p><i>Marketing surveys.</i> Although CSD's first survey was conducted in 1990, Vitosha Research (VR), which conducts marketing surveys and analysis for commercial clients, was not created until 1994. VR has a number of international clients and specializes in more demanding survey research tasks.</p>
IUE	<p><i>Credit rating agency.</i> IUE created the first Russian credit agency in 1997; initially the activity focused on rating bonds issued by municipalities and subjects of the Federation. In summer 1998, it was spun off as a wholly owned subsidiary (E-A Ratings Service) and signed a strategic affiliation agreement with Standard & Poor's. In 2001, S&P purchased a 70 percent interest in E-A Ratings.</p> <p><i>Municipal economic development.</i> Established in fall 1997, a team within IUE provides consultancy services to mid-sized cities in the creation of their economic development plans.</p>
CDFE	<p><i>Corporate training.</i> The program provides development and management of customized education programs for senior staff of banks and enterprises.</p>
CASE	<p><i>Technical assistance to transitional countries.</i> In 1992, a foundation invited CASE staff to provide technical assistance to Russia on its evolving macroeconomic policy. Further requests from donor organizations followed and activity expanded. In 1994-95, CASE more actively sought support for such work.</p> <p><i>Corporate sponsors.</i> CASE recruited "corporate patrons" from among Poland's 70 largest and most respected corporations and banks. Patrons make a fixed contribution and receive CASE's publications, invitations to open seminars, and invitations to occasional "patrons only" events.</p>

Table A9.1.1 Number, Timing, and Importance of Initiatives

<i>Item</i>	<i>CSD</i>	<i>IUE</i>	<i>CDFE</i>	<i>CASE</i>
Timing				
Year institute founded	1989	1995	1991	1991
Year institute began thinking seriously about diversification	1994	1996	1996	1992
Motivation				
Reduce dependence on primary funding source	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Necessary to engage in new type of work	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Number of initiatives				
Number allied to principal activity	1	2	1	2
Number separate from principal activity	1	0	0	2
Importance of all initiatives to revenue of main company	30%	10%	20 to -30%	40 to 55%
Size				
Number of professional staff (full-time equivalent)	28	36	6 ^a	40

CSD = Center for the Study of Democracy

IUE = Institute for Urban Economics

CDFE = Center for Democracy and Free Enterprise

CASE = Center for Social and Economic Research

^a Excludes parliamentary interns.

Table A9.1.2 Origin, Development, and Rating of Each Initiative

<i>Firm and initiative</i>	<i>Source of idea</i>	<i>Type of analysis undertaken^a</i>	<i>Promotion effort^b (yes/no)</i>	<i>Annual number of orders</i>	<i>Financial success (yes/no)</i>
CSD: radio station	USG rep.; CSD president	2	No	NA	Yes
CSD: marketing surveys	Staff	2, 4	No	25 to 30	Yes
IUE: credit rating	Staff	1, 3, 4	y2	3 to 5 ^c	Yes
IUE: municipal economic development	Staff	1	y2	2	Too early to tell
CDFE: corporate training	CDFE president	1	No	varies	Yes
CASE: tech assist to transition economy	Staff	1	y1	5 to 6 countries, 3 to 4 sponsors ^d	Yes
CASE: corporate sponsors	Staff	1	y2	8 sponsors	Yes

^a 1 = discussed among staff; 2 = sought outside advice from knowledgeable people (volunteers); 3 = paid for outside expert advice; 4 = prepared professional-standard business plan.

^b y1 = Promotion consisted of actively seeking opportunities to make presentations at seminars and conferences; preparing and distributing reports; and mentioning the activity on the organization's web site.

y2 = Formal marketing activities undertaken beyond those listed in y1, such as holding a press conference, organizing seminars, or publishing and distributing special promotional brochures. Also, in rare cases, pilot projects were carried out to provide a "product" to demonstrate (e.g., IUE's economic development team worked on a nonfee basis with a mid-sized Russian city to develop an economic development strategy that the institute could then show other cities).

^c A single "order" can involve ratings for a number of cities (e.g., a multilateral donor requesting information on debt-carrying capacity of several cities).

^d A sponsor sometimes supports work in more than one country.

Table A9.1.3 Summary of Responses on Challenges and Rewards

<i>Reward/Challenge</i>	<i>Number of firms citing reward/challenge</i>
Rewards	
Broader base of experience for policy development	3
Improved efficiency	2
Support for overhead functions	0
Improved visibility and marketing possibilities	4
Challenges	
Agenda-setting and lack of focus	0
Restricted use of data and publications	0
Perceived lack of independence	0
Conflict of cultures within the think tank	0
Restive clients or sponsors	0
Management challenges	2

Table A9.1.4 Summary Status of Innovations as of December 2013^a

Organization		Innovation	Status
Abbrev	Name		
CSD	Center for Study of Democracy	Radio station	Limited success. Station sold when competition reduced performance level
		Marketing surveys	Success. Vitosha Research evolved into substantial research and survey firm, doing much its work for the EU.
IUE	Institute for Urban Economics	Credit rating agency	Success. After the agency established itself, it was purchased by S&P, which provided a basis for an IUE endowment.
		Municipal economic development	Success. The work program in this sphere has been a significant part of the IUE research-policy program.
CASE	Center for Social and Economic Research	Technical assistance to transitional countries	Success. CASE is still active in former Soviet Union countries, primarily through sister think tanks it helped establish in them. Staff is also active in the Middle East and Africa.

a. Only innovations for which current information could be obtained are listed.

Annex 10.1 Tasks Involved in Government Outsourcing for Policy Research

Any agency originating a contract for research undertakes a series of actions. Each action is discussed below. Where appropriate, differences in the way the task is executed depending on how the agency has organized such procurements (the three models) are noted. Think tanks are well advised to understand the procurement cycle, since this is the first step in developing a strategy on how they can operate effectively in this environment.

Determining the annual budget. As part of regular budget preparation, the agency determines the research budget for each office. The process begins the year before the budget year—that is, the year the funds are spent. In model A, the centralized research and evaluation office, after consulting with the program offices, prepares its recommended budget along with a general description of how it will be used. Its proposal is scrutinized and possibly adjusted by the ministry before being sent to the Ministry of Finance, which performs another round of reviews and determines the amount included in the final budget. In the other models, the overall process is similar, except that each program office prepares the proposed budget and research plan. In some instances, only a budget figure is required without a justification statement. Internal review and coordination within the ministry are typically handled by the procurement office. Under all models, detailed research agendas for the year are developed only when the resources available are known.

Two points should be noted. First, the program office is setting the agenda, except in model A. If a think tank wants to influence an agency's future research agenda, then this office is its target. Second, staff in every program office I interviewed stated that the research budget available was far below what they needed. In other words, the process for determining the budget systematically results in underfunding research. *This means that price may often be the paramount consideration in deciding the winner among competing firms.*

Preparing the terms of reference (TOR). In models B and C, the program office often drafts the TOR. In model B, the TOR is then reviewed and possibly modified by the procurement office. In some countries, the agency creates a panel to prepare the TOR that includes staff from the program and procurement offices and other offices in the agency with interest in the subject matter. In model A, the TOR is drafted by the central research office and reviewed by the program office.

Distributing the request for proposals (RFP). The standard procedure is for an RFP to be made widely available. Often, this means it is placed on the agency's web site on a page where all procurements appear. In some instances, an agency also sends a notice to firms who have submitted proposals in the past.

For procurements with values below critical thresholds, more limited notification is the rule. As noted, in the case of a limited competition usually three proposals are needed. For very small contracts, a single contractor can be invited to submit a proposal. Many program offices are structuring their procurements to avoid full competitions—a practice that can afford certain firms a clear advantage.

This is typically not a matter of corruption. The general view of program office staff is that they know the firms doing research in their area very well; they know the relative strengths and weaknesses of each on various topics. So they want to choose the firm to do the work. In part this reflects the frequent reality of limited capabilities among firms and therefore limited possibilities for true competition. But it obviously discourages existing firms from expanding their areas of expertise if they believe they will not be selected for a contract when there is an established leader. It is even more discouraging to those considering starting a new think tank to work in such an area. The value (and perhaps necessity) of team leaders marketing to the leaders of these offices is obvious.

Scoring the proposals. For a full and open competition, proposals are formally scored using factors for award announced in the RFP. Under model B, a panel consisting of staff from the program and procurement offices is usually appointed for this task. In Russia, staff from the program office scores the proposals and two or three experts from outside the agency also score them independently. Both use a standard set of 15 factors. The two sets of scores are discussed and reconciled at a meeting that includes those who scored the proposals, along with representatives from the procurement office and other interested offices within the agency. In the next stage, the program office recommends a winner and the same commission meets to review it. Technical quality and price are both considered.

In model A, the panel scoring the proposals consists of a staff member or two from the program and several from the central research office. The panel recommends the winner to a senior official, who usually makes only a pro forma review before giving approval.

For smaller competitions, the procedures are less rigorous. In Hungary, only the program office assesses the proposals for such procurements. Indeed, the competition in some agencies is strictly on the basis of price. Those interviewed in offices with this practice asserted that research proposals were too subjective to use standard criteria for assessment. The RFP requires that a bidder demonstrate it has the basic competence to do the work, but the RFP does not require the proposal to discuss how the contractor would carry out the work. The deliverables required are stated in the RFP. The winner is the firm offering the lowest price among those firms deemed qualified to do the work. Clearly, with only three firms necessary for a competition and with these firms being invited by the program office, considerable scope for collusion and favoritism exists.

Negotiating the contract. For full and open competitions, the universal practice is that strictly contractual matters, such as the conditions stated in the draft contract about the firm's right to publish the results, are the responsibility of the procurement office. Under model B, the procurement office also negotiates with the contractor about adjustments to the scope of work, presumably on the advice of the program office. In model A, the central research office has a more active role in negotiating these changes but works closely with the procurement office.

Again, practices differ for the smaller awards. In many instances the program office negotiates and signs the contract. In other cases the procurement office executes the contract on the recommendation of the program office.

Quality control and acceptance of deliverables. In both models B and C, the program office is responsible for working with the contractor over the life of the project to insure that acceptable quality work is prepared. The same office formally accepts contract deliverables. In model A, these are tasks of the central research office. In short, the program office or central research office is the real client for the research.

In most countries, the responsible offices have some kind of external review of the work being done. In Hungary, one office reported that the oversight consists of checking the physical presence of reports and CD-ROMs submitted for each project. In Russia's Ministry of Economy, an especially appointed commission reviews the products to certify they meet the contract's requirements.

The foregoing outlines the workings of the research acquisition cycle common to government agencies in many countries. The starting point for a think tank to be successful in winning contracts is understanding the specifics of the contracting process of the agencies with which it works. As indicated, not all agencies have the same practices. How to market effectively to each office depends critically on how it organizes its procurement process.

Annex 10.2 Being Competitive in Pursuing Government Support

Winning contracts from government agencies is only partly about writing good proposals. Indeed, the earlier section on challenges and opportunities points to various ways a firm can gain advantage in what appears to be a highly objective process. This section is not about writing proposals. Most think tanks learn this part of the craft early from the requirements of international foundations and donors. Rather, I concentrate here on how to cultivate relationships and develop advantages.

Influencing the Agenda

A good way for an organization to establish itself as keenly aware of policy developments, and to help a government office organize its future research agenda, is to offer ideas for analytic projects that will support upcoming policy considerations. Proposed program evaluations are also good topics in principle, although most managers still do not appreciate the constructive role evaluations can play in improving program performance. Many think tanks use this “insiders” approach, both because it is good marketing and because they sincerely believe the research proposal is in the public interest.

The process of exploring a research idea with a government office begins by looking ahead a year or more to forecast what the office’s analytic needs may be then: what policy topics will be under active consideration? Once a topic is identified where your organization has some credibility, related policy research is identified and carefully considered. It is critical to have a meeting with the relevant officials rather than simply sending a document. The goal is to strengthen personal relationships as well as having a stimulating policy research discussion. Try to organize the meeting through an informal conversation with the official at an event or during a phone call.

It is good practice to have a one- to two-page summary to hand over—this leaves a record of the idea with the officials and indicates seriousness of purpose on the think tank’s part. While the officials will understand that this is a marketing meeting, it is important to focus on the substance of the research. The officials will appreciate the firm’s capabilities from the quality of the presentation and discussion. A successful meeting concludes with the officials believing the analysis will genuinely meet their needs.

Meetings of this type are also good opportunities to inquire about upcoming procurements so the organization can prepare to compete for these contracts. A particular “first mover” advantage is to be able to form a consortium with the best qualified partners.

A common mistake of think tanks is to stay on the same topic too long—that is, to keep proposing additional work on a topic on which analysis has already been done, usually by the firm proposing more analysis. With limited resources, program offices need to address many areas, and continuing to invest in a particular topic is unlikely. If the think tank continues to press, its leaders may find it harder to get appointments with the agency staff.

Reputation

Officials often know what firm they want to do a specific task and work hard to structure the procurement so they get their choice. This means a firm’s reputation in particular areas is critical to being invited to bid on limited competition contracts. Past performance is obviously a factor; and if there is reason to believe the official (perhaps a new official) does not fully appreciate the institute’s record, sending a well-crafted, targeted letter and brochure can be effective.

But it is equally important from time to time to remind these officials of the think tank's capabilities. Common ways of doing this include sending them hard copies of reports that are expected to be of special interest to a particular office; including relevant clients and potential clients on the distribution list for e-mails that summarize new research and include links to reports that can be downloaded; and inviting clients to relevant events the institute organizes, such as roundtable discussions or particularly relevant staff presentations—a personal phone call is often very effective in this all-internet era in encouraging attendance. Where appropriate invite clients to make comments.

Being Attentive

Actions on this list go beyond those designed to keep the institution's good name and reputation before the relevant officials. The following are examples of actual think tank actions to promote themselves to government clients:

Most think tanks have annual parties of some type to which clients can be invited. Christmas and New Year are common occasions. Some have summer outings—picnics or boat cruises.

Many think tanks send greeting cards on the major holidays and remember the milestone birthdays.

One think tank offered to brief a new deputy minister unfamiliar with the subject of his new responsibilities on the general structure and key issues in the sector. The official accepted and spent a half-day being briefed.

A think tank learned that a senior official liked to interact professionally with young people. The institution had several staff who regularly taught university courses and arranged for the official to give a guest presentation to one of the classes.

Occasionally a think tank has the chance to influence the composition of a team being sent abroad on a study tour. Including an important client when the topic is appropriate is generally very appreciated.

Many think tanks take the kind of initiatives listed just above and those under "Reputation." It is important to implement these initiatives systematically and not just as an impulse or afterthought. A junior staffer can easily be tasked with managing the process of keeping track of opportunities and asking his/her superior if certain actions should be taken.

Respect

At a conference in summer 2005 on cooperation between government agencies and policy research organizations, presentations were made on contracting out.¹ Government officials from several countries made the point that it is critical for think tank leaders and experts to show a certain level of respect to the officials. This is not about respect for the office. Rather, the problem is that analysts talk down to officials, making it far too evident that the experts are just that and the officials are not. This may seem a small point, but it is not to the officials. Think tank senior managers should be very alert to the attitudes of their staff and, where required, do the coaching required.

Partnering

A central point in the section on doing business with government agencies is that winning awards in many countries is an insiders' game. An established reputation in the topic area at hand is very important. One way to become more competitive for certain contracts is to partner with another firm with complementary skills. In other words, both organizations benefit from adding the other's capabilities in competing for a specific project.

Consider the example of a housing ministry interested in improving the targeting of its housing allowance program, so subsidies are concentrated on very low income families. One firm has detailed knowledge of

¹ "Beyond Analysis—The Broader Role of Policy Research Organizations in BiH," Jahorina (Sarajevo), Bosnia, July 14–16, 2005.

the country's housing programs but does not know much about targeting social programs. The second firm has a strong reputation in the social assistance area, including the targeting of benefits under cash transfer programs to the very poor, but it knows nothing about housing programs. The combined expertise of the two firms yields very strong credentials for the project. Naturally, not all competitions will lend themselves to such combinations, but it is certainly an option to consider regularly.

Forming the partnership in such cases is clearly very important. But it is equally important to make sure the client office appreciates the capabilities of the combined firms. A joint meeting of the two firms with the program office is a necessity if at all possible, particularly under a limited competition when the program office decides which firms are invited to submit proposals. Sending a written statement about the combination and the intentions to work together on this type of project is probably the next best approach. A follow-up phone call is very important.

A frequent problem is that proposal managers wait too long to identify possible partners and even longer to initiate contact. As soon as there is a reasonable expectation that a competition will be held and the topic fairly well defined, the first task is securing highly qualified partners—both firms and individual consultants.

Learning from Failed Efforts

Most think tanks lose at least as many competitions as they win. Sometimes the reasons for losing are idiosyncratic, but there may be systematic problems with the firm's approach as well. The great majority of think tanks (and for-profit firms for that matter) do not devote sufficient resources to learning from lost bids.²

Institutions can undertake at least two actions to improve future proposals' chances of success. The first is to request a debriefing from the agency that held the competition. At such debriefings, someone involved in the selection process will inform the think tank representatives of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal compared with those submitted by other firms. Perhaps the price was too high, insufficient time was budgeted for the project director, or the proposed approach overlooked a key methodological point. Usually statements will be fairly general; but, if listened to carefully, they will signal the significant problems. This information is clearly very useful for a losing firm. Another, indirect benefit: agency staff often takes note of which firms ask for debriefings and are often impressed by the diligence of those who make the effort to learn for the future.

Think tank leaders participating in such debriefings must guard against complaining and challenging statements made by the official, unless there is clear evidence that the basic procedures governing the competition were violated. Complaining will leave an unconstructive impression and may negatively affect the attitude of those reviewing proposals in the future.

Not all agencies routinely provide such briefings. Whether they are obliged to do so depends on the procurement regulations. It is difficult to generalize on this point, as the provisions differ among countries. If the regulations give bidders the right to a debriefing but the agency resists giving one, the contractor will have to weigh whether it is worth aggravating the agency to get the debriefing.

The second action a think tank can take is to convene a meeting of those who took part in preparing the proposal and systematically go through their technical proposal—both technical and cost elements. The main elements to consider in the technical proposal are the following:

² Darling and others (2005) include an excellent discussion about learning from mistakes.

- Quality of staff proposed—did they really have the right qualifications and experience for their assigned tasks?
- The project’s organizational structure—was the amount of time proposed for each person adequate? Was control over certain functions (for example, a household survey) adequate? If subcontractors were involved, were lines of authority among all parties clear? Was it clear who would be directly answerable to the agency-customer?
- Quality of approach to the research or analysis—was what was being proposed absolutely clear? In rereading the RFP, can any issues be identified that were not explicitly addressed in the proposal? Was the scheduling of the work realistic? Did the different activities logically relate in time to each other?

After the review of this particular proposal, think tank managers should study the findings of similar reviews for other proposals in the past several months to identify patterns. In addition, it should examine the results of other competitions with the same government office to detect a pattern in what the competition offered compared with the think tank’s proposal.

A similar, detailed review of the cost proposal should also be undertaken. The analysis should be especially careful if the institution lost on price by a wide margin. Comments from various think tanks, combined with discussions with government officials in offices that are contracting for research, suggest that government clients often do not really appreciate the relationship between price and the quality of the product they receive. There seems to be a sense that contractors either pad their budgets substantially or have some reserve funds to “top up” the contracted amount if it is necessary to maintain quality. The reality, of course, is that think tanks generally do neither. Unfortunately, it will probably take some years before typical officials contracting for research become more discerning in terms of product quality.

Annex 11.1 Additional Information on Indirect Rates

Alternative Classifications of Direct and Indirect Cost Items

Two definitions in use for nonprofit organizations in the United States are provided by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

FASB Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 117 requires nonprofit organizations to report expenses by “functional classification.” The two primary functional classifications are “program services” (direct project costs) and “supporting activities” (management and general administration, fund-raising, and membership development); they are defined as follows:

Program services are activities that result in goods and services being distributed to beneficiaries, customers, or members that fulfill the purposes or mission for which the organization exists. Supporting activities are all activities of a not-for-profit organization other than program services. Management and general activities include oversight, business management, general recordkeeping, budgeting, financing and related administrative activities, and all management and administration except for direct conduct of program services or fundraising activities. Fundraising activities include publicizing and conducting fundraising campaigns; maintaining donor mailing lists; conducting special fundraising events; preparing and distributing fundraising manuals, instructions and other materials; and conducting other activities involved with soliciting contributions from individuals, foundations, government agencies and others. Membership-development activities include soliciting for prospective members and membership dues, membership relations, and similar activities. (FASB Statement No. 117, paragraphs 27 and 28).

OMB Budget Circular A-122, *Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations*, provides the following definition of indirect costs for projects funded by the U.S. government (Attachment A, Paragraphs C.1–C.3):¹

1. Indirect costs are those that have been incurred for common or joint objectives and cannot be readily identified with a particular final cost objective. [Any direct cost of a minor amount may be treated as an indirect cost for reasons of practicality where the accounting treatment for such cost is consistently applied to all final cost objectives.] . . . After direct costs have been determined and assigned directly to awards or other work as appropriate, indirect costs are those remaining to be allocated to benefiting cost objectives. A cost may not be allocated to an award as an indirect cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, has been assigned to an award as a direct cost.
2. Because of the diverse characteristics and accounting practices of nonprofit organizations, it is not possible to specify the types of cost that may be classified as indirect cost in all situations. However, typical examples of indirect cost for many nonprofit organizations may include depreciation or use allowances on buildings and

¹ On December 26, 2013, OMB published a new “supercircular” that supersedes and streamlines requirements from OMB Circulars A-21, A-87, A-110, and A-122 (which have been placed in OMB guidance); Circulars A-89, A-102, and A-133; and the guidance in Circular A-50 on Single Audit Act follow-up. This new document is available online at <http://federalregister.gov/a/2013-30465>. As general guidance, however, A-122 remains a useful resource.

equipment, the costs of operating and maintaining facilities, and general administration and general expenses, such as the salaries and expenses of executive officers, personnel administration, and accounting.

3. Indirect costs shall be classified within two broad categories: “Facilities” and “Administration.” “Facilities” is defined as depreciation and use allowances on buildings, equipment and capital improvement, interest on debt associated with certain buildings, equipment and capital improvements, and operations and maintenance expenses. “Administration” is defined as general administration and general expenses such as the director’s office, accounting, personnel, library expenses, and all other types of expenditures not listed specifically under one of the subcategories of “Facilities” (including cross allocations from other pools, where applicable).

In addition, Attachment B to OMB Circular No. A-122 specifies categories of cost that are allowable, allowable under certain limitations or conditions, or unallowable for funding by U.S. government grants and contracts. Table A11.1.1 summarizes Attachment B.

Nonetheless, the above guidance still allows a range of differing practices and policies for allocating expenses among the indirect and direct cost categories. As a result, how expenses are allocated between categories varies widely from organization to organization. For example, time spent by the executive director developing and overseeing programs can legitimately be considered a program expense, yet some organizations will place the entire director’s salary into the indirect cost category. Similarly, while rent, utilities, insurance, supplies, and other general expenses are typically included in the indirect cost category, there may be circumstances in which it is more appropriate for an organization to allocate these costs directly to projects. Each organization needs to decide which expenses are legitimately programmatic and which are supportive in order to define its direct and indirect costs. The acceptability of these allocations by auditors and funders will depend on how reasonable and justifiable is the rationale for the decision.

Case-by-Case Allocation of Indirect Costs

The case-by-case method of allocating indirect costs is to determine a rate of actual usage for each activity in the organization. In its simplest forms, this approach can be used to account for costs that can easily be tracked. Examples of this approach include keeping track of long distance telephone calls, using a counter or log for photocopying, or using time sheets as a means of allocating the salary cost of managers and administrative staff (such as the executive director, financial manager, or administrative assistant) whose work benefits more than one program or activity. As shown by the example above, a different method can be adopted for each type of cost.

The advantage of this method is that it creates a strong connection between activities and the indirect costs that support them. The disadvantage, however, is that this approach can require a great deal of time-intensive record keeping, even for relatively minor costs. Further, even if complete records are kept, there will still be shared costs that cannot be precisely allocated. (For example, office space costs can be allocated on the basis of the work done by those occupying the space and the amount of space occupied. But how then should the cost of common space, such as hallways, be allocated? Similarly, local telephone service and Internet connections typically have fixed monthly costs, regardless of use, and so do not easily lend themselves to being tracked.)

As a result, most organizations do not rely solely on case-by-case allocation for distributing indirect costs. The choice of whether to rely on case-by-case allocation or use of an indirect cost rate (as described below) depends on two factors:

Ease of record keeping. Where automated systems can track costs by project with minimal effort (such as computerized tracking systems for long distance telephone calls or photocopies), using case-by-case allocation distributes costs more accurately.

Variability of cost across projects. Where costs vary significantly across projects, case-by-case allocation helps limit cross-subsidization of indirect costs. For example, if the typical project of an organization requires only a nominal number of photocopies, but one project requires a large number of copies (because of a requirement for large-scale distribution of reports, for example), case-by-case allocation will ensure the typical projects do not have to bear a disproportionate share of photocopy costs.

Because of the disadvantages outlined above, the indirect cost rate described in the text may be a more appropriate way to allocate those shared costs that cannot be easily allocated directly to specific activities or projects. That said, there are examples of organizations that use the case-by-case approach. One is the National Council of Family Affairs in Jordan.

TYPES OF INDIRECT COST RATES

As described earlier in Chapter 11, the calculation of indirect cost rates is based on the ratio of indirect costs to a defined direct cost base. The actual ratio of indirect to direct costs can be known only after the accounting period (typically an organization's fiscal year) for which the rate is defined has been completed; this is typically called a "final" rate. However, because both the organization and funders typically cannot wait until the accounting period is over to bill expenses and pay these bills, indirect rate structures based on a prospective analysis of costs ("provisional" rates or "predetermined" rates) are often used. These different kinds of rates are described below:

Final rate. A final indirect cost rate is established after an organization's actual costs for a given accounting period are known. Once established, a final indirect cost rate is used to adjust the indirect costs initially claimed through provisional rates (see below). The adjustment to actual costs is for the period in which the actual costs were incurred and thus cannot be determined until the end of the period.

Provisional rate. A temporary indirect cost rate is established for a future prospective period to permit budgeting and billing/payment of expenses to/by funders until the actual indirect costs can be determined and a final rate established. The provisional rate is usually based on the planned budget of an organization (based on expected expenses and activities). A final rate for a particular year may also be used as a provisional rate in the ensuing year, if anticipated changes in funding levels or costs are expected to be small.

Because the provisional rate is based on the expected activity of the organization (which is likely to be somewhat different than the actual outcome), a provisional rate is subject to later adjustment by issuance of a final indirect cost rate based on actual indirect costs incurred. The organization may then need to either seek additional payment from funders (if the provisional rate was too low and there was under-recovery of indirect costs) or provide refunds to funders (if the provisional rate was too high and indirect costs were over-recovered) for the cost-reimbursement type of agreements between the organization and its funders.

Not all funders ask for this kind of post project reconciliation even when a provisional rate is accepted as the basis for payment.

Predetermined rate. A fixed rate is established for a specified current or future period and is not subject to adjustment. A predetermined rate may be used on contracts or grants where there is reasonable assurance that the rate is not likely to vary significantly from a rate based on the organization's actual costs. This type of rate would be used where the organization has a consistent indirect cost rate over time (for example, because it has a very stable cost structure and funding).² Organizations can incur significant financial risk in using this rate, particularly for projects lasting several years.

The use of provisional and final rates is preferable for most organizations for the following reasons:

- actual indirect costs are allocated to projects in the period incurred, creating accurate cost information;
- there are no prior period indirect costs carried into a future period to burden new or continuing funding;
- all indirect costs are properly funded in the period incurred, creating no profit or loss for the organization;
- the organization's accounting system must determine actual costs each year, a capability that ultimately must exist to synchronize accounting, budgeting, and cost allocation; and
- the actual cost of services or programs is determined annually and is therefore available for internal management and informed budgeting.

² Another type of indirect cost rate is a "fixed rate with carry-forward." In this structure, a fixed rate is established for a period of time to permit budgeting and billing/payment of expenses to/by funders. Actual costs are determined by the organization's accounting system and the difference in indirect costs as calculated by the fixed indirect cost rate and actual indirect costs is carried forward to a future period (usually the organization's fiscal year) in order to adjust the fixed rate in the next period for any over- or under-recovery of indirect costs. This structure would only be used where the structure of funding for an organization remains stable over time; otherwise, the structure could result in inappropriate allocation of indirect costs to funders because of the mismatch between a changing funding structure and the shifting of indirect cost recovery out of the period in which the costs were incurred.

Table A11.1.1 Allowability of Costs under OMB Circular No. A-122

<i>Allowable costs</i>	<i>Allowable costs (limited)</i>	<i>Unallowable costs</i>
Bid and proposal costs	Advertising and public relations	Alcoholic beverages
Bonding	Defense/prosecution of	Bad debts
Communications	criminal/civil proceedings	Contingency provisions
Compensation for staff	Equipment/capital improvements	Contributions/donations to
Depreciation/use allowances	Fringe benefits (including	other organizations
Employee	pensions)	Entertainment
morale/health/welfare	Housing and personal living	Fines and penalties
Independent research and	expenses	Fundraising
development	Idle facilities/idle capacity	Goods/services for personal use
Insurance and indemnification	Indirect costs associated with	Interest on borrowed capital
Labor relations costs	donated labor	Investment management costs
Maintenance and repair costs	Interest on debt for capital asset	Lobbying
Materials and supplies	acquisition	Losses on other projects
Meetings and conferences	Overtime	Organization costs (in
Memberships, subscriptions,	Patent costs	connection with
and professional activity costs	Pre-award costs	establishment/reorganization)
Page charges in professional	Profits/losses on disposition of	
journals	depreciable property or other	
Participant support costs	capital assets	
Plant security costs	Publication and printing costs	
Professional service	Rearrangement/alteration costs	
costs/consultant fees	Reconversion costs	
Rental costs	Recruiting costs	
Royalties/costs for use of	Relocation costs for staff	
patents and copyrights	Selling and marketing costs	
Taxes	Severance pay	
Training and education for staff	Specialized facilities	
Transportation costs	Termination costs	
	Travel costs for staff	
	Travel costs for trustees	

Annex 11.2 Model Cost Policy Statement

The model Cost Policy Statement in this annex is adapted from the U.S. Department of Labor *Indirect Cost Rate Determination Guide: Cost Principles and Procedures for Non-Profit Organizations*. It is provided here as an example of the kind of documentation organizations should develop in order to demonstrate to funders that they have a well-defined, reasonable, and justifiable method of allocating and recovering indirect costs. Of course, individual funders may have particular requirements for indirect costs (such as a ceiling on the amount of indirect costs that can be reimbursed or particular types of costs that cannot be reimbursed) that may be in conflict with the example provided below. Each organization must decide how to structure its indirect cost recovery to reflect its own particular funding situation.

This model Statement assumes that the example organization (EO) uses the direct allocation method of charging costs (i.e., in addition to direct costs), and that EO has in place accounting procedures that enable it to direct charge some costs that would otherwise be considered indirect costs (see, for example, the description below on how the photocopy costs are charged).

COST POLICY STATEMENT EXAMPLE ORGANIZATION

I. General Accounting Policies

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| A | Basis of account | Accrual basis |
| B | Fiscal period | July 1 through June 30 |
| C | Allocation basis | Direct allocation basis |
| D | Indirect cost rate allocation base | Direct salaries and wages including applicable fringe benefits |
- E. Example Organization (EO) Fringe Benefit Base-Direct Salaries.
- F. EO maintains adequate internal controls to insure that no cost is charged both directly and indirectly to contracts or grants.
- G. EO accumulates all indirect costs and revenues in accounts titled “Indirect Cost-Expense” and “Indirect Cost-Revenue,” respectively.

II. Description of Cost Allocation Methodology

A. Salaries and Wages

1. Direct Costs—The majority of EO’s personnel direct-charge their salary costs since their work is specifically identifiable to specific grants, contracts, or other activities of the organization. The charges are supported by auditable labor distribution reports that reflect the actual activities of employees.
2. Indirect Costs—The following personnel charge 100 percent of their salary costs indirectly:
Financial Manager
Administrative Assistant
3. Mixed Charges—The following personnel may charge their salary costs to both direct and indirect activities:
Executive Director
Technical Staff

The distinction between direct and indirect is primarily based on the functions performed. For example, when the positions shown are performing functions that are necessary and beneficial to all programs they are indirect. When functions are specific to one or more programs they are direct because they do not benefit all programs.

Auditable labor distribution records that reflect the actual activities of employees are maintained to support the mix of direct/indirect charges. The time records are certified by the executive director.

B. Fringe Benefits

Leave time costs (vacation leave earned, sick leave used, and holiday pay) are considered fringe benefit costs. EO’s accounting system records leave time as a fringe benefit cost in the same

manner that salary costs are recorded. Vacation leave earned but not used during each fiscal period is recorded as a cost in the period earned.

EO contributes to the following fringe benefits for its personnel: social/health insurance (including unemployment insurance and worker's compensation) and matching contributions to retirement fund.

C. Travel

Travel costs may be charged as either direct or indirect costs depending on the purpose of the trip. For example, the executive director travels to a regional office to give employees a quarterly update. This trip is indirect in nature and should be charged as an indirect cost. However, if the executive director travels to a regional office to perform a specific task for a contract, the trip would be considered a direct cost.

D. Board Expenses

Board expenses charged on an indirect basis are for travel to/from board meetings and an annual fee of \$250 paid to each board member. Other board expenses are absorbed by EO and are not charged either directly or indirectly to contracts or grants.

E. Supplies and Material

To the maximum extent possible, office supplies and materials are direct-charged to the contract/grant that uses the supplies or materials. Supplies and materials used by personnel engaged in indirect activities will be charged on an indirect basis.

F. Facility Expenses

EO occupies space it leases from Lessor Corporation. The lease provides for equal monthly payments during the term of the lease. All rent is charged as an indirect cost.

EO's lease includes the cost of all utilities except electricity. The cost of electricity is charged as an indirect cost.

G. Communications

1. A log is maintained of all fax transmissions. The cost of fax services is charged either directly or indirectly based upon whether a direct or indirect activity benefits from the transmission.
2. Long distance telephone calls are charged either directly or indirectly based upon whether a direct or indirect activity benefits from the transmission.
3. Local telephone service costs are treated as indirect charges.
4. EO uses a meter system for postage charges. The postage meter has been programmed to identify the specific project or activity to charge costs against. Express mail costs are also specifically identified to the project or activity incurring the cost.

H. Photocopying and Printing

EO maintains a photocopy activity log. From this log, EO is able to prorate its photocopy expenses to each project based on the specific volume of copies made for each program.

Administrative personnel will record copies made to the benefiting project to the maximum extent practical. In situations where the photocopies being made by administrative personnel cannot be identified to a specific project and the matter being copied relates to the activities of EO in general, the cost of such copies will be charged to the “Indirect Cost-Expense” account. Printing expenses are charged to the benefiting activity.

I. Outside Services

EO incurs outside services costs for its annual audit, legal fees, and for staff development specialists.

1. The cost of the annual audit is charged indirectly.
2. In general, legal fees are charged directly to the benefiting project or activity.
3. Legal fees not identifiable to specific direct projects are charged indirectly.

J. Capital Items

Capital expenditures are charged directly to projects only in cases where a contract or grant specifically authorizes such charges. No capital item is charged indirectly. The cost of capital items purchased with non-contract/grant funds is recovered through depreciation charges. EO’s capitalization threshold is \$500.

K. Depreciation

The cost of capital items purchased with non-contract/grant funds used in a manner that benefits projects is recovered through depreciation charges. EO recovers the cost of capital items using straight line depreciation methods in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Depreciation is charged indirectly.

L. Unallowable Costs

EO recognizes that the costs listed below are unallowable charges to contracts/grants and has internal controls in place to insure that such costs are not charged to contracts/grants:

- Advertising and public relations
- Entertainment/alcoholic beverages
- Capital expenditures
- Bad debts
- Interest
- Lobbying and fund-raising

(Signature)

(Date)

(Title)

Example Organization

(Address)

Annex 12.1 Example Tables for Performance Reports to Management

Table A12.1.1

Performance Indicators from the Funder Perspective: Project Work

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Period 1</i>	<i>Period 2</i>	<i>Period 3</i>	<i>Period 4</i>
No. of reports <i>not</i> delivered to clients on time as a percent of all reports delivered				
<i>No. of projects with cost overruns</i>				
No. of projects with cost overruns that were closed this period—total <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of projects where additional funds were received from the sponsor No. of projects where overrun was funded internally 				
No. of grants and contracts in past 12 months from prior clients <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. as percent of all grants and contracts No. of contracts/grants in past 12 months from established clients as percentage of all contracts/grants				
<i>Seminar on municipal budgeting</i>				
Date course offered				
Mean student evaluation score % of scores < 3.5 ^a				
No. of attendees				
<i>Certified Mortgage Lender course</i>				
Date course offered				
Mean student evaluation score % of scores < 3.5				
No. of attendees				
<i>Course on municipal economic development</i>				
Date course offered				
Mean student evaluation score % of scores < 3.5				
No. of attendees				
<u>Transparency</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Think tank's rating for transparency in its funding sources computed using the Tranparify 5-star rating protocol^b 				

^a Using a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 indicating the highest level of student satisfaction.

^bThis is described in Tranparify (2014); a slightly easier to compute 5-star system is presented in Mendizabal (2014c).

Table A12.1.2
Performance Indicators from the Internal Business Perspective: Project Expenditures

<i>Project number</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Total budget^a</i>	<i>% spent to date</i>	<i>Work period (months)</i>	<i>% period elapsed</i>	<i>% spent/% elapsed</i>
0722-00	Economic forecasting	\$120,000	35	12	42	0.83
0745-00	Regional seminars	32,000	75	6	50	1.50

^a Excludes fixed fee or profit, if included in the award amount.

Table A12.1.3

**Performance Indicators from the Internal Business Perspective: Staff Utilization—January–August 2013
(percentage distribution of hours)**

<i>Center</i>	<i>Overhead Accounts</i>							<i>Fringes</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>Proposals</i>	<i>General admin.</i>	<i>Center develop.</i>	<i>Center management</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>External research^a</i>	<i>General support^b</i>		
Research									
Housing	6.5	—	4.5	13.7	0.4	64.1	—	10.9	100.0
Law	4.7	—	1.3	6.5	—	75.1	0.2	12.2	100.0
Reform									
Local Gov.	7.4	—	3.1	4.4	—	71.1	0.1	14.0	100.0
Social	5.3	—	4.5	3.2	—	74.1	—	13.0	100.0
Asst.									
Health	6.2	—	5.4	3.0	—	70.4	0.3	14.7	100.0
Support									
Accting	—	88.0	—	—	—	—	—	11.2	100.0
Comm/PR	—	—	14.3	0.5	36.8	9.0	26.2	13.3	100.0
Ex. Office	—	78.2	0.4	—	7.1	0.1	2.8	11.4	100.0
Human	—	4.1	0.9	6.3	1.8	3.6	10.9	72.4	100.0
Res.									
IT	1.3	—	0.1	—	55.8	30.5	—	12.4	100.0
Office	0.1	61.1	—	—	24.1	0.1	—	14.6	100.0
Mngt.									
Total	5.2	8.5	4.7	3.6	6.3	56.2	1.7	13.7	100.0

Note: A similar table can also be prepared for the staff in each center to track billable hours and utilization of individual researchers.

^a Funded by grants for specific projects and contracts.

^b Funded from fee income and unrestricted grants to the institution.

Table A12.1.4
Performance Indicators from the Internal Business Perspective: Proposal Funds Efficiency—2013

<i>Center</i>	<i>Proposals submitted with results known</i>			<i>Proposals won</i>		<i>Efficiency measures^a</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>Award amt</i>	<i>PD funds^b</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Award amt</i>	<i>PD\$/no. won</i>	<i>Award\$/PD\$</i>
Housing	2	\$35,000	\$2,400	1	\$20,000	\$2,400	8.33
Law Reform	5	240,000	6,000	2	97,000	3,000	16.16
Local Gov.	12	74,000	9,000	6	48,000	1,500	5.33
Social Asst.	3	640,000	7,500	1	450,000	7,500	60.00
Health	7	370,000	6,600	3	220,000	2,200	33.33
Total	29	1,359,000	31,500	13	825,000	2,423	26.19

Note: Includes proposals submitted in 2012 on which funders made decisions in 2013.

^a Proposal development funds expended on all proposals. ^b Proposal development funds expended.

Table A12.1.5
Performance Indicators from the Internal Business Perspective: Accounting Office, Aged Receivables—August 15, 2013

<i>Project number</i>	<i>Project name</i>	<i>Invoice number</i>	<i>Invoice date</i>	<i>Invoice amount</i>	<i>Amount unpaid</i>	<i>0–30 days</i>	<i>31–60 days</i>	<i>61–90 days</i>	<i>>90 days</i>	<i>Total</i>
07230	Armenia	2131	9/27/12	23,400	23,400				23,400	23,400
		3154	12/12/12	37,500	19,600				19,600	19,600
07274	Local Gov.	4431	6/20/13	44,736	21,678		21,678			21,678

Note: Includes only those projects with outstanding invoiced amounts.

Sample Table A12.1.6**Performance Indicators from the Internal Business Perspective: Accounting Office, Aged Invoicing Delays, August 15, 2013**

<i>Project number</i>	<i>Project name</i>	<i>Payment type^a</i>	<i>Target invoice date</i>	<i>Invoice amount</i>	<i>0-30 days^b</i>	<i>31-60 days</i>	<i>>60 days</i>
7188	Banking seminars	M	6/30/13	30,000		30,000	
7201	Ag evaluation	TM	4/30/13	7,491			7,491

- a. M = mobilization payment; WP = payment against completion of work product, e.g., specific report accepted; TM = payment for time and materials
- b. Delays are days after the end of the earliest month when an invoice could be submitted.

Sample Table A12.1. 7**Performance Indicators from the Internal Business Perspective: Annual Accounting Office Review—2013**

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2010</i>
Total projects under contract				
No. of projects from bilateral and multilateral donors				
No. of projects from foundations				
No. of projects supported by other sponsors				
Total projects under contract/staff ^a				
No. of projects closed				
No. of projects closed/staff				
No. of proposal budgets prepared/reviewed				
No. of proposal budgets/staff				
No. of new employees and employees leaving the institution ^b				
No. of new employees and employees leaving the institution/staff				
No. of business trips taken by staff ^c				
No. of business trips taken by staff/staff				

^a Full-time equivalent members of the accounting staff

^b Extra work is required to set up income and other payroll tax deductions and, in some cases, arrange for direct bank deposit of pay.

^c This entry is an example to illustrate certain special features of a tax system that require extra accounting staff effort. In some countries such as Russia, per diem payments above a very low minimum are counted as income to traveler. This extra income must be recorded and taxes assessed, which is a significant burden at a think tank with a high volume of travel.

Annex 12.2 Policy Community Survey*

The following survey was used in the evaluation of the project administered by the Global Development Network briefly described in Chapter 1 and from which the GDN-15 data often used in this book were obtained. The survey administered to each respondent contained the name of the specific think tank about which information was being sought. The survey below was adjusted slightly to take account of the greater prominence of digital communication now than in 2009 when it was originally prepared.

The survey was successfully administered both through in-person interviews and as on-line format similar to Survey Monkey and a physical questionnaire completed by the respondent and then submitted to NORC, the evaluator for the project.

The survey consists of four principal blocks, besides basic information on the respondent, that obtain information on the respondent's views on:

1. sources used in learning about or addressing policy issues
2. extent of use of research and analysis in policymaking by government officials and MPs
3. openness of government and parliament from organizations like this think tank
4. regarding the specific think tank:
 - a. general questions on effectiveness
 - b. strength in certain policy areas
 - c. degree to which it focuses on priority policy issues
 - d. ratings of various types of publications and communications, including events.

Survey on Sources of Information for Policy Development and the Performance and Role of the XYZ Institute

Introduction

The purposes of this survey are to (a) find out where key decision makers, opinion leaders, and stakeholders like yourself get the information you use to inform policy discussions or policy formation, and (b) obtain your views on the performance of [insert organization's name]. This information is being solicited to provide feedback to the Global Development Network(www.gdnet.org), an international organization that works with policy research organizations, on how successful they have been in improving the quality of these organizations' analytic work and in improving the communication of their findings to policymakers and concerned citizens.

Completion of this survey will typically take 10 to 15 minutes. The identities of all respondents and their individual responses will be kept confidential and only aggregate data (i.e., the combined responses of all or groups of persons who took the survey) will be published. The identities of all respondents and any information from which an identity may be obtained will be removed before disclosing individual responses to GDN.

The survey is being conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, part of the University of Chicago (www.norc.org). If you have questions about the survey, please email _____ at ____@norc.org.

The completed survey can be returned by any of the following options:

Email: To _____ at _____@norc.org
Post: _____, NORC, 4350 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814, USA¹

We thank you in advance for assisting us with the completion of this survey. Your input is greatly valued and appreciated.

Respondent's name: _____

[We ask for your name only so that we can contact you to clarify answers, if necessary. Your name will NOT be entered into the data base with your answers.]

In conformation with NORC policy we are disclosing the following information. This study is funded by the UK Department for International Development (DfID). Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. The study will help policy research organizations improve their capabilities and will help the donor community better support such organizations. We may ask your opinions on this subject again in a few years. This survey is being conducted under the direction of Ray Struyk who can be reached at struyk-ray@norc.org.

¹ The organization will gather all forms mailed and send them to NORC. They will not open the packages.

A. Respondent Type

A.1 Which area and position (maximum of two) best characterize your current professional life? Place an "X" in the empty column to indicate applicable areas.

A.2 Have you ever received money for services or provided money to the organization to perform services for you, i.e., through a grant or contract work?

_____ yes _____ no

B. Sources of Policy Information

B.1 When a new policy issue for which you have responsibility or which directly concerns you arises, where do you typically look for information? Rate each source on the following scale: 0= never use
1=go to occasionally
2=use or consult quite often
3=this is one of my primary sources

B.2 How would you rate each of these sources as to the quality of their work and the applicability of the information and analysis to the actual problems in your country? For both parts use a rating scale from 1 to 5 with 5 indicating the highest quality or best applicability and 1 indicating the lowest and least. You also have the option to enter N/A (not applicable) if you do not use this information source.

B.3 In the past year have you consulted with anyone at the types of organizations listed below on a particular policy issue? "Consulted" means you met with them or called them to get information for a general policy discussion or to learn of the results of the organization's work, etc. The consultation could have been organized by either party. For each type of organization consulted write the number of times you consulted with this type of organization, e.g., if you consulted think tanks 3 times, place a 3 in the response cell next to "Local think tanks or policy research NGOs."

C. Use of research and analysis in policymaking

C.1 How would you rate the frequency with which well-organized data, research and analysis are used in policymaking in this country, by government ministries? Mark the answer that best describes the situation for each.

C.2 How would you rate the frequency with which such research and analysis are used in the following specific policy areas, by government ministries? *Place an “X” in the one box that best applies for each column.*

C.3 How would you rate the frequency with which well-organized data, research and analysis are used in policymaking in this country, by the parliament? *Mark the answer that best describes the situation for each.*

C.4 How would you rate the frequency with which such research and analysis are used in the following specific policy areas, by the parliament? *Place an “X” in the one box that best applies for each column.*

C.5 Do you think that senior Government officials are really willing to accept input or use reports from think tanks and research-advocacy NGOs when they are making policy? *Answer on a scale from 1 – 4 (4=very willing).*

Rating: _____

C.6 Do you think that a significant share of members of parliament are really willing to accept input or use reports from think tanks and research-advocacy NGOs when they are making policy? *Answer on a scale from 1 – 4 (4=very willing).*

Rating: _____

C.7 How would you rate government funding for policy analysis by private organizations such as think tanks, now and compared with two years ago? *Place an “x” in the box next to the answer in each column that best fits your view.*

C.8 Please rate the change in policies in the past year or two in the following areas. *Place an “X” in the box for the answer that best applies.*

D. Questions about [name organization]

D.1 How familiar are you with the organization’s work? *Place an “x” next to the most accurate response.*

If you answered, “not at all,” stop here and submit the form. Many thanks for your help!

D.2 How many years have you been familiar with their work? *Place an “x” next to the most accurate response.*

D.3 General views.

D.4 How would you rate the value to you of each of the following aspects of the organization’s work? *Use a rating scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating the highest value to you and 1 the least. If you have no opinion for a category, leave the answer blank.*

D.5 Agenda. *For the following question, please mark the answer that best describes your opinion.*

D.6 Over the past three years have you personally used any of the organization’s publications?

_____ yes – continue to the next question

_____ no – go to question D.8

D.7 Views on publications. *Check the answer box that most closely corresponds to your view.*

a. The publications differ in their quality, etc. a great deal so that one cannot give a single response.

D.8 Communications *Check the answer box that most closely corresponds to your view.*