

Public Diplomacy Assessment

- View this program's assessment summary.
- Visit ExpectMore.gov to learn more about how Federal Government programs are assessed and their plans for improvement.
- Learn more about detailed assessments.

Program Code	10004600															
Program Title	Public Diplomacy															
Department Name	Department of State															
Agency/Bureau Name	Department of State															
Program Type(s)	Direct Federal Program															
Assessment Year	2005															
Assessment Rating	Results Not Demonstrated															
Assessment Action Scores	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Section</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Program Purpose & Design</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strategic Planning</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Program Management</td> <td>56%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Program Results/Accountability</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Section	Score		Program Purpose & Design	60%		Strategic Planning	62%		Program Management	56%		Program Results/Accountability	40%
	Section	Score														
	Program Purpose & Design	60%														
	Strategic Planning	62%														
	Program Management	56%														
	Program Results/Accountability	40%														
Program Funding Level (in millions)	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>FY2005</td> <td>\$621</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY2006</td> <td>\$703</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY2007</td> <td>\$762</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	FY2005	\$621	FY2006	\$703	FY2007	\$762									
FY2005	\$621															
FY2006	\$703															
FY2007	\$762															

Questions/Answers

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design			
Number	Question	Answer	Score

1.1	<p>Is the program purpose clear?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> International public diplomacy programs: 1) Articulate the foreign policy objectives of the United States; 2) Engage, inform and influence international audiences; 3) Encourage a better understanding of American values, ideas, language, policies objectives, and initiatives, and the strategies used to employ them; and 4) Create an international environment receptive to American interests through educational, cultural and professional exchanges, training and public outreach activities. In addition to outreach efforts, public diplomacy also provides American policy-makers with information about how the United States and its actions are perceived abroad.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 1. State Department Basic Authorities Act; 2. Fulbright-Hays Act of 1947; 3. Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act 1998 ; 4. Smith-Mundt Act; 5. Public Diplomacy Strategy; 6. State Dept.-USAID Joint Performance Plan; 7. Performance and Accountability Report; 8. U.S. Embassy web site (example); 9. Foreign Affairs Manual; 10. Foreign Affairs Handbook; 11. Executive Resource Handbook for Ambassadors; 12. Foreign Service Institute Public Diplomacy Training Curriculum; 13. Mission Performance Plans; 14. Bureau Performance Plan Assistant Secretary Statement and PD Public Benefit Statement; 15. Congressional Budget Justification; 16. Secretary of State Speeches.</p>	YES	20%
-----	--	-----	-----

1.2	<p>Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest, or need?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Public Diplomacy programs address multiple existing problems, interests and needs. There are several components to the basket of public diplomacy programs. Currently there is no clear overarching strategy nor broader goals related to the broader US foreign policy set to address specific "problems" or "needs." In general, public diplomacy programs work to create an international environment receptive to American interests through educational, cultural and professional exchanges, training, and public outreach programs. Having international publics and elites supportive of the United States helps us implement policies supportive of our national interests. In addition to outreach efforts, public diplomacy also provides American policy-makers with information about how the United States and its actions are perceived abroad.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 5; 6; 16; 17. 9/11 Commission Report; 18. External reports on public diplomacy (over 20); 9. Secretary Rice remarks; 19. Pew Charitable Trusts Report on international attitudes; 20. Department of State Public Polling reports (examples); 21. National Security Strategy; 22. Presidential Quotes; 23. Presidential Decision Directives</p>	YES	20%
-----	---	-----	-----

1.3	<p>Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The State Department programs are collaborative and mutually reinforcing but duplicative per se. Many of the programs are similar to if not duplicative of programs at other USG agencies and the private sector. The engagement of foreign publics is too large and complex for any one federal agency to handle alone. By mandate, the Department of State is supposed to lead the USG efforts to articulate the foreign policy objectives of the United States to foreign audiences. The Department partners with BBG, USAID, DHS, DOD, Education, Peace Corps, Commerce, Energy, HHS, HUD, DOJ to engage, inform and influence foreign audiences. While each agency primarily serves different audiences for different purposes, all are engaged in promoting the interests of the United States with foreign publics and promoting US bilateral and multi-lateral partnerships. Within a foreign country (at post level), public outreach and public diplomacy activities are well coordinated by the U.S. embassy country team, with the DOS public affairs officer as the lead public outreach officer. In the United States, public diplomacy is not as well coordinated but there are multiple interagency groups, such as the Muslim World Outreach Policy Coordinating Committee, the Strategic Communications Fusion Team, and the Interagency Working Group on International Exchanges and Training. There is a daily call</p>	YES	20%
-----	---	-----	-----

between R and the NSC. Within the Department, public diplomacy is coordinated twice weekly through the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs and the PD sections within each regional and policy bureau. State engages the private and non-profit sectors as partners in all of these efforts. All of these groups do not necessarily mean that there are solid tangible results being developed.

Evidence: 1; 4; 6; 7; 13; 14; 24. GAO report on Public Diplomacy Cooperation (GAO-05-323); 25. Compendium of Public Diplomacy reports; 26. Meeting agenda and membership list of Public Diplomacy Office Director Weekly Meeting and of R Coordination Meeting; 27. Meeting agenda/schedule and membership list of Strategic Communication Fusion Team; 28. Meeting agenda of PCC; 29. Meeting agenda of country team meeting; 30. IAWG background information and membership list; 31. PD Sub PCC on Afghanistan documents; 32. PA daily and Foreign Press Center briefings documents; 33. Counter terrorism interagency regional action plan groups documents

1.4	<p>Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> No. Due to the fact that there is no overarching USG PD strategy or a clear understanding of who the target audiences should be for PD programs we cannot say that these programs are as effective as they could be. While the over 20 external reports on public diplomacy in the last two years highlight the need for public diplomacy and suggest areas for improvement, none provide measurable evidence that another approach or mechanism would be more effective in achieving public diplomacy objectives and goals. The reports agree that an overarching communications strategy is needed, but differ on where the development of the strategy should take place, and none offer ideas on the specifics of what that strategy should be. As currently conducted, public diplomacy by the Department of State is relatively effective. Posts and regional bureaus reivew effectiveness every year through the MPP and BPP process.</p> <p>Approximately every five years, the OIG assesses efficiency and effectiveness of missions. The current mix between information activities, exchange programs and broadcasting provides reinforcing messages. Missions are routinely surveyed about the effectiveness and efficiency of public diplomacy activities. These assessments have resulted in the elimination of less effective activities and bolstering of those that demonstrate success in order to</p>	NO	0%
-----	---	----	----

	<p>provide the best mix of programming directly to the field.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 13; 14; 25; 26; 34. 2000 and 2004 Global PD Field Surveys; 35. Field post cuff account</p>		
1.5	<p>Is the program design effectively targeted so that resources will address the program's purpose directly and will reach intended beneficiaries?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> No. There has been no analysis done to determine that these programs are the most effective at reaching target audiences nor whether the current "beneficiaries" targeted are, in turn, making the most short and long term impact based on their experiences with PD programs. At the post level (in the field) the programs are effectively targeted but at the headquarters level and within the broader USG PD community the programs are not clearly targeted nor is there valid data that proves that the resources are reaching their intended beneficiaries. Some components of State's PD programming are very successful and well-targeted including educational and cultural exchanges and speakers series. At a headquarters level it is not apparent that the component programs are targeted based on a specific set of goals based on accurate data in order to meet the greatest need and according to existing foreign policy goals. Currently, the identification and engagement of target audiences is a multi-phase process. State uses academic research, polling data, discussions with experts inside and outside of government, media reaction and</p>	NO	0%

analyses, PD in Washington determines the key audiences, such as youth and youth influencers, women, journalists, religious leaders, that PD activities will engage. R and the regional bureaus communicate these audiences to the field via the regional bureaus daily contact and MPP guidance and strategy cables. In the field, posts further refine the target audiences to the local condition using Media analyses, public opinion polling, influence analyses and direct local contact. PD and other embassy officers engage foreign publics directly, which is measured by an indicator of embassy outreach. Funds are transferred directly to overseas missions to conduct activities. Activities are executed directly with targeted audiences. Mission and media outreach, embassy websites, American Corners, events with key contacts, etc. would not exist without PD funding and staff. Posts maintain databases of key embassy contacts and use a variety of surveying techniques to ensure that the right audiences are being engaged with PD efforts. Posts use their spaces, American corners, and other venues frequently as meeting places for diverse audiences who interact or dialogue on cross-cutting policy issues. Posts write annual influence analysis documents for guiding their outreach efforts.

Evidence: 8; 13; 14; 36. DRS (Contact management) list screen shot; 37. Flyer for a meeting or agenda for a meeting at post or binational commission or American corner; 38. Ambassador trip schedule; 39. PAO/CAO meeting schedule; 40. Post results reporting example; 41.

	<p>Newsmarket report (information on where stories are placed, where video is placed, and response); 42. Media tenor report (example); 43. Influence Analysis</p>		
Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design		Score	60%

Section 2 - Strategic Planning			
Number	Question	Answer	Score
2.1	<p>Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> No. The measures don't measure or compare changes in behavior or prove that State has achieved in any way "mutual understanding." Public diplomacy serves three long-term global goals, 1) promoting the efforts of the United States Government in the other strategic goal areas; 2) increasing understanding and appreciation of US policies, actions, values, and society policies among key audience members; and 3) creating and maintaining sustainable linkages and partnerships between U.S. and foreign individuals and institutions. A fourth area is the useful and valuable "in-reach" of information provided to American policy decision-makers. Specific regional, thematic and audience goals fall within all of these efforts, making PD a complex matrix of activity. To arrive at common agency level measures for public diplomacy, the Department has had to generalize them at a higher level. The Department continues to explore additional or</p>	NO	0%

	<p>improved long-term measures or goals that address the quality and relevance of public diplomacy programs.</p> <p><i>Evidence: 6; 13; 14;</i></p>		
2.2	<p>Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> "Public diplomacy's end goal of improving how the US is perceived is an on-going effort and measurement is taken at regular points. Public diplomacy intermediate goals (increased public discussion of bilateral and multi-lateral issues with USG viewpoints heard, increased 'positive' actions by program alumni upon their return to their home countries, are etc.) generally are targeted to occur within a one year to five year period after engagement, depending on the specific activity.</p> <p><i>Evidence: 6; 13; 14</i></p>	YES	12%
2.3	<p>Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> There are several annual goals that embassies pursue. For the purpose of the PART, the Department has limited discussion to increasing audience reach. Expanding the number of foreign citizens touched by PD activities increases the scope and extent of our long-term goals. Progress is tracked through several</p>	YES	12%

	<p>performance measures, including: a) number of key audience using DOS information resources (electronic, print, media, events); b) number of key audience members purposefully participating in DOS programs and services (excludes information users from indicator a); c) the number of speaking engagements by mission staff; and d) program funds as a percent of total PD budget. This last indicator is an efficiency indicator. As with the long-term measures, specific regional, thematic and audience goals fall within all of these efforts, making PD a complex matrix of activity. Each mission and regional bureau also has, or is developing, individual annual action steps with milestones tailored to the nature of public diplomacy and specific key audiences.</p> <p><i>Evidence: 6; 13; 14</i></p>		
2.4	<p>Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The common measures have separate baselines and annual targets for each medium of engagement. DOS established these separate targets so that program managers could easily track performance for each country or region, helping them identify areas that need improvement. The baseline for the common measures is the FY 2003 level.</p> <p><i>Evidence: 6; 13; 14</i></p>	YES	12%

2.5	<p>Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Before a PD program/outreach is initiated, it must be evaluated to determine whether it supports the Mission's goals as identified in the MPP (does the MPP in all cases adequately discuss the PD plan annually and how it fits into the mission goals as well as the broader global foreign policy goals?). If a program does not support a specific goal, it is not implemented (or is discontinued) (please provide a couple of examples of this decision making process). Coordination between R, regional bureaus, missions overseas, and ECA, IIP and PA ensure that the direct administration of activities leads to established goals. Weekly country team meetings at each mission ensure that all government partners are committed to the same goals. Grants issued directly by missions to local organizations contain goal and performance reporting requirements. Project solicitations and contract documents and deliverables have measurable outcomes and outputs that contribute to meeting the projects' goals. All grantees sign detailed commitments to ensure their work is completed. TV coops, journalist reporting tours, and other Public Affairs activities require goals and performance reporting through grant documents or Memoranda of Understanding. The Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation reporting has agreed upon goals</p>	YES	12%
-----	--	-----	-----

	<p>in the solicitation and proposal documents and required reporting. ECA, PA and IIP are partners and coordinate through MPP and BPP process as well as daily and weekly contact with R, regional bureaus and posts. R coordinates with BBG through board meetings. IBB training program coordinated with regional bureaus.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 6; 13; 14; 26; 29; 44. Grant document example from post; 45. MOU for PA program; 46. Medrec cable; 47. Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation cable and documents; 48. IBUCKS overview; 49. English language teaching material placed in China from VOA</p>		
2.6	<p>Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> In July 2004, the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs established an inter-bureau Public Diplomacy Evaluation Council and an independent evaluation unit within the Office of Policy, Planning and Resources. The evaluation unit established an evaluation schedule and launched it's first program evaluation of the American Corners Program. The PDEC and the R/PPR evaluation unit are both led by ECA, at OMB's recommendation, so that ECA's system and success can be transferred to evaluation of public diplomacy.</p> <p>Evaluations use quasi-experimental design where feasible</p>	YES	12%

to assess impact. PA, IIP and ECA, pioneered the use of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) to measure the effectiveness of key websites. US Embassy Brussels has piloted the ACSI on its embassy website in three languages. In the last two years, over 20 independent reports and studies of Public Diplomacy have been published. These studies have looked at strategy, planning, structure, administration, resources, capabilities and results. Public Affairs Sections at Embassies and PD Offices within Bureaus fall under the scrutiny of the Office of the Inspector General, so that quality and scope of operations are evaluated on a regular basis to ensure they meet the required standards of quality. At other times, programs are further examined under the auspices of GAO or OMB studies. Sometimes, we can make use of independent evaluations by reputable polling organizations, the results of which can be independently verified by other experts. PA and ECA are collaborating on evaluation of foreign journalist tours, and several Posts are using ECA's E-GOALS performance measurement system to assess the impact and administration of their exchanges. By law, expanded Public Diplomacy efforts, evaluation and measurement is built into each activity and performance information is reported on a quarterly basis to the Congress.

Evidence: 7; 25; 50. Copy of initial American Corners Evaluation; 51. PDEC charter and establishment memo; 52. OIG inspections/evaluation examples; 53. R/PPR

	evaluation schedule; 54. ACSI Reports; 55. Omnibus Appropriations Act FY 05 Conference Report 108-792 page 820		
2.7	<p>Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Few of the State public diplomacy programs link budget to performance. In addition, the information submitted to OMB does not clearly show the linkage between performance goals and resources (note the PD exercise we went through this spring). In the future all public diplomacy program budgets will be clearly linked in the MPP, BPP and Senior Review processes directly link budget requests to the accomplishment of long-term and annual goals. Budgets will be shifted according to policy, regional, and target audiences. For example shifts in funds for the broader Near East and Middle East has reduced funds going to Europe (we cut money because the programs were phasing out and were not supposed to be long term so can you still say this?). PD funding for activities have shifted from more traditional approaches to activities, such as English Language Microscholarships to reach non-elite Muslim youth. PD position requests are made through the MPP process and the quarterly performance measurement reporting to OMB</p>	NO	0%

	<p>demonstrates the effects of changes in budgets.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 6; 13; 14; 15; 55; 56. Quarterly management reports submitted to OMB (example); 57. PD obligation coding document; 58. Senior review process</p>		
2.8	<p>Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The Department of State is working to address its strategic planning deficiencies. It issues a 90-day Public Diplomacy calendar to all posts and PD functions to provide upcoming events and areas to focus PD efforts on. The Department instituted the Joint Performance Plan with USAID, and joint policy planning committees. One of those committees has a sub committee devoted to Public Diplomacy. To ensure better planning for Public Diplomacy, the Under Secretary established a) the Office of Policy, Planning and Resources, which coordinates strategic planning, resources and evaluation/measurement for public diplomacy; b) weekly meetings between R and the regional and functional bureaus; c) weekly R family meetings with ECA, IIP and PA and others. The Under Secretary or representatives from R sit on interagency coordinating bodies: R/PPR will now include the Strategic Communications office, which oversees the interagency fusion team meetings. The fusion team has membership from multiple agencies including State, USAID and DOD. The MPP, BPP and senior review process have been</p>	NO	0%

	<p>strengthened through improved guidance and coordination through R/PPR. The influence analysis process, which provides a snapshot of the PD environment within a country (and a best practice from USIA) was reinstated in 2004. OIG issued a report on public diplomacy in 2005.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 6; 25; 43; 51; 58; 59. R/PPR establishment memos; 60. PD tradecraft curriculum; MPP reviews; 61. OIG summary report; 99. 90-Day PD calendar and plan</p>		
Section 2 - Strategic Planning		Score	62%

Section 3 - Program Management			
Number	Question	Answer	Score
3.1	<p>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The Department collects regular performance data through quarterly performance reports, the annual performance plan and report, and the domestic and overseas cooperative agreements require specific reports from program partners (some quarterly and some annual). In addition, if organizations want to renew their contract or are seeking to renew a cooperative agreement, State program managers make recommendations for renewals and within the details of the agreement regarding budget, staffing, and operations of public diplomacy activities. PD officers in the field submit project debriefing cables or emails on International Visitor, Cultural and U.S. Speaker,</p>	NO	0%

and other programs and receive program agency and, escort-interpreter reports. The data from this two-way communication, usually submitted within three months of the activity, informs program planning and implementation for future projects and follow-on activities. PD officers also provide weekly reports to Washington through the RESULTS database on the outputs and outcomes of activities. Public Affairs sections conduct media analyses on a daily basis and feed that information to the Ambassador and Washington through the regional bureaus. This information is used to help shape outreach efforts. Weekly meetings in Washington between the Public Diplomacy Office Directors, R, ECA, IIP, and PA provide share feedback on initiative performance to inform program management and resource allocation. PAS Madrid developed Media Reaction analysis software and has shared it with other European posts. With the software the post inputs Media Reaction data, organize it by topic, and can rate the extent of pro or anti American tone for a specific policy. The post can then produce charts to track the effect of their press work.

Evidence: 13; 14; 41; 42; 56; 62. Evaluation and reporting inventory; 63; Reporting cable (speaker, IV, etc); 64. Web Trends data; 65. CMS; awards for embassy web sites; 66. Foreign press center reports - journalists provide direct feedback on journalist tours; 67. media placement and op-ed placement reports; 68. INR/R polling Opinion Alerts; 69. FBIS daily reports, which can be

	targeted specifically; 70. Contact management software used to manage outreach; 71. alumni web site and ECA alumni database; 72. PAS Madrid Media Reaction Chart; 73. Weekly highlights reports;		
3.2	<p>Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The performance appraisal system for Public Diplomacy officers requires critical job elements and ratings that are tied to achievement of the Department's strategic goals, including its public diplomacy objectives. Especially, in the embassy setting, managers who are responsible for achieving key program results are clearly identified. Performance standards are also listed in the MPP documents. Contracts awarded identify project requirements and deliverables that support program objectives. Contractors and grantees operate by Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and Anti-Deficiency Act requirements as well as the milestones of performance-based contracts. All bureaus have access to grants officers to ensure compliance with federal regulations. Grantees and contractors only receive renewals based upon successful performance. Project managers and contractors are required to take the Managing State Projects training at the Foreign Service Institute to ensure proper and</p>	YES	11%

	<p>consistent project management. For an Anti-Drug program in the Western Hemisphere region, funding was distributed through a grants process by a board of State officers. The subgrants that couldn't demonstrate performance were not awarded additional grants.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 26; 44; 74. EER example; 75. Grants database;</p>		
3.3	<p>Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Using a funding matrix that links planned funds to activities, public affairs officers and financial management officers work closely to ensure that 100 percent of PD funds are obligated within the fiscal year. Funds are distributed according to a spending plan on a quarterly basis to regional bureaus. The mid-year and 3rd quarter financial reviews provide an opportunity for managers to verify that unliquidated obligations are valid and that once an obligation has been fully expended, remaining balances are deobligated. Financial transactions are coded to both an organization and function or project. Managers also use monthly spending reports to review obligation levels and cumulative obligations. All requisitions must include verification that funds are available to managers. Given the high percentage of fixed costs (salaries), funds must be obligated in a timely manner in order to continue operations.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 76. Spending report; 77. regional bureau</p>	YES	11%

	budget example; 78. PD funding matrix		
3.4	<p>Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The majority of PD funding covers the salaries of foreign service nationals and Americans at missions abroad. An overseas staffing model analysis was conducted by HR/RMA to measure the staffing needs and adjustments have been made based on the model. Given the limited discretionary PD resources that are provided to the field, PD officers have implemented procedures for achieving efficiencies and cost effectiveness. For example, Fulbright Commissions co-locate with other organizations to share administrative costs such as rent and utilities and establishing "virtual presence through embassy websites (managed by PD) , American Corners (where salary and space are provided by host organizations); and sharing speakers who come to a particular region. PD is taking the lead for the Department in reviewing and securing standardized contact management software. PA has streamlined its competition for competitive sourcing for the office of broadcast services and for competing commercial activities. AF/PD realigned funding to be more effective. PD also conducts training of officers at regional centers, which saves travel funds. Working together with IIP, the PD family has developed the PD Knowledge</p>	YES	11%

	<p>Management system and the PD Global Forum that facilitates communication and best practices among PD practitioners. During the last year, all PD staff were moved onto the Department's OpenNet system and PDNet was abolished. This saved funding and now all are on one unclassified system. The transition also boosted the power and capabilities of OpenNet.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 79. Overseas staffing model; 80. Memo on changes (example); 81. CAJE description; 82. RPO Vienna training curriculum; 83. PDKM; 84. PD Global Forum; 85. PDNet-OpenNet Transition documents;</p>		
3.5	<p>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> There is a disconnect between coordination in the field, in Washington and between agencies. The Department's public diplomacy and related programs coordinate regularly, in the field, however, there appears to be a gap in coordination at the headquarters level despite the creation of PD working groups and committees. In the field, coordination of programs, agencies, staff and audiences is done through the outreach of the public affairs section and the embassy country team. Two recent examples of collaboration include the paper show jointly developed by State, USAID and DOD regarding Tsunami relief efforts and Public Affairs outreach on coverage of the Iraq elections. Typical examples of collaboration and coordination abound and</p>	NO	0%

include: 1) SA spent \$2m between ECA and USAID on Muslim Outreach activities. Proposals from contractors were jointly solicited, reviewed and selected. The awards were then put under existing USAID contracts. 2) NEA through PASA uses USAID money for PD grants and activities. The country team decides on the projects and expenses. 3) Pakistan USAID recently agreed to fund a graduate program that will be managed by Fulbright Commission. 4) AF PD worked on a strategy for AGOA 4 with Commerce, USTR, DOT, USDA, USAID, PAS Dakar, NGOs. 5) South African LLM program in US funded by USAID, but selection by PD. Other examples are highlighted in an evidence document.

Evidence: 6; 13; 86. Tsunami Relief paper show brochure; 87. Iraq election collaboration document; 88. Examples of DOS - Peace Corps collaboration; 89. Examples of DOS - DOD collaboration

3.6

Does the program use strong financial management practices?

YES

11%

Explanation: The Department uses a standard Financial Management System and has received clean audits and a finding of no material weaknesses. The annual performance and accountability report demonstrates no issues with public diplomacy. Internal controls are in place to minimize erroneous payments. Admin Officers obligate financial transactions, and the State Department

processes the payments, thus ensuring checks and balances on PD accounts. No OIG reports show internal control weaknesses for PD activities. Cost comparisons are used when awarding grants or contracts. PD coordinates with FMOs on PD expenditures and the FMOs are in charge of actual expenditures. The Department uses the RFC 60 (a monthly burn rate report) and the quarterly exchange rate reports to review its financial standing.

Evidence: 7; 9; 10; 52; 90. RFC 60

3.7

Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

YES

11%

Explanation: The OIG inspects posts every five years. Their reports make management recommendations that must be resolved within a specific timeframe. In an inspection of Bonn, one recommendation was to gather evidence of the impact of the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program. The post and ECA launched a joint program evaluation to gather that evidence. As noted elsewhere, multiple reports from external sources cite management opportunities for improvement for public diplomacy. One of these reports, commonly referred to as the Djerjian Committee and generally regarded as one of the best of the reports, recommended a stronger planning and evaluation capacity for public diplomacy. Building on this recommendation, in July 2004, the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy established the Office of Policy, Planning and Resources. R/PPPR's purpose is to coordinate

	<p>management issues, including budget, planning and measurement for all of Public Diplomacy. Required leadership and management training. Extensive PD tradecraft training. Mid-year reviews are conducted each year to review for unanticipated funding shortfalls.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 25; 51; 52; 59; 91. CBYX evaluation (American and German versions)</p>		
Section 3 - Program Management			Score 56%

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability

Number	Question	Answer	Score
4.1	<p>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> PD has established four long-term goals for this program, of which three are new and have no existing data. For the fourth goal, "Percentage increase of key audience members who implement positive change within their own organizations," data from 2003 and 2004 show that the program is meeting its targets for these years and is on track to meet its target for 2005. Targets for 2006 and beyond are needed however in order to show the long-term objectives of this program. Qualitative data show that the program is making progress in areas covered by all four long-term goals. For example, while unpredictable, the opposition movements in Georgia, Ukraine and</p>	SMALL EXTENT	7%

	<p>Kyrgyzstan have been led by alumni of public diplomacy programs. Interim and new government cabinets are comprised of individuals with significant exposure and experience with the U.S. through exchanges, information products and other PD engagement.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 6; 7; 13; 14; 54; 92. RESULTS database examples</p>		
4.2	<p>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> PD has established three new annual goals for this program, of which all are new and have no existing data. Anecdotal evidence shows that PD has made progress in all three areas covered by the new goals.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 6; 7; 13; 14; 92</p>	SMALL EXTENT	7%
4.3	<p>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Production efficiency measures such as electronic page views or unique visitor to embassy website per dollar demonstrate that embassies are reaching and retaining increasing numbers of visitors while costs remain constant.</p>	LARGE EXTENT	13%

	<i>Evidence:</i> 6; 7; 13; 14; 92;		
4.4	<p>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The ability to measure the effectiveness of public diplomacy is recognized universally as a very difficult task. The U.K. is conducting a review of its public diplomacy efforts (similar to a GAO study) and finding similar challenges with those identified in reviews of U.S. public diplomacy. Norway issued a paper on public diplomacy, which also addresses the same issues that are addressed in the U.S. reviews. In comparison to the BBG and others involved in public diplomacy-like efforts, State PD is comparable in its level of effectiveness. For exchange programs, ECA is recognized as the USG leader in outcome evaluation and measurement and has provided consultation to DOD, US ED, the World Bank, the British Council, NAFSA (the Association of International Educators) on measurement activities.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 93. IAWG Reports and Country studies; 94. U.K. Public Diplomacy Review (not yet released); 95. BBG PART; 96. Norwegian Public</p>	LARGE EXTENT	13%

	Diplomacy Paper		
4.5	<p>Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Some PD programs are clearly effective at achieving results, however, overall it is not clear that all PD programs are even being evaluated by independent entities on a regular basis. Independent evaluations of DOS exchange programs clearly demonstrate that exchange programs administered jointly by posts, regional bureaus and ECA are effective at achieving their goals. This is supported by the multitude of public diplomacy reports that suggest exchanges and direct engagement as the most effective means of public diplomacy. Independent assessments such as the ACSI scores on public websites show DOS sites are effective. Newsmarket reports provided to PA demonstrate its activities are effective. Training activities funded through EUR/ACE have evaluations demonstrating the effectiveness. Surveys of exchange participants, data from web sites including customer satisfaction data, data from American corners visitors, etc. show that PD is reaching its goals.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> 25; 97. ECA evaluation list and website; 98. ACSI scores for Brussels;</p>	NO	0%

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability

Score

40%

Program Performance Measures

Term	Type													
Long-term	Outcome	<p>Measure: The percentage of key audience members who consider themselves more informed about the United States? policies, actions and society, resulting from engagement with DOS public diplomacy programming</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i>The measure is an indicator of being informed</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>95%</td> <td>Data Not Available</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>Develop Baseline</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>95%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2005	95%	Data Not Available	2006	Develop Baseline		2007	95%	
Year	Target	Actual												
2005	95%	Data Not Available												
2006	Develop Baseline													
2007	95%													
Long-term	Outcome	<p>Measure: The development of independent and sustainable country-specific alumni associations and groups</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i>This measure helps tracks engagement with primary audiences</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>Baseline</td> <td>Data not yet avail</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail						
Year	Target	Actual												
2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail												
Annual	Output	<p>Measure: Number of key audience using DOS information resources (electronic, print, media, events)</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i>The measure tracks scope and audience reach of activities and links resources to outcomes. Similar measure used by BBG and the British Council</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>Baseline</td> <td>Data not yet avail</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail						
Year	Target	Actual												
2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail												

Long-term	Outcome	<p>Measure: The index score of customer satisfaction of American policy-makers to in-reach products and services</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The measure is an indicator of PD's ability to provide timely and useful information to decision-makers</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="511 468 1383 699"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>Baseline</td> <td>Data not yet avail</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>3% over baseline</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>4% over baseline</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail	2006	3% over baseline		2007	4% over baseline	
Year	Target	Actual												
2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail												
2006	3% over baseline													
2007	4% over baseline													
Annual	Efficiency	<p>Measure: Program funds as a percent of total PD budget</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="511 993 1214 1113"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>Baseline</td> <td>Data not yet avail</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail						
Year	Target	Actual												
2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail												
Long-term	Outcome	<p>Measure: The percentage increase of key audience members who implement positive change within their own organizations (influence)</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> This measure is an indicator of ability to influence key audiences</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="511 1549 1214 1780"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>Baseline</td> <td>80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>80%</td> <td>84%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>85%</td> <td>Data not yet avail</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2003	Baseline	80%	2004	80%	84%	2005	85%	Data not yet avail
Year	Target	Actual												
2003	Baseline	80%												
2004	80%	84%												
2005	85%	Data not yet avail												

Annual	Output	<p>Measure: Number of key audience members purposefully participating in DOS programs and services (excludes information users from indicator 1)</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i>The measure tracks scope and reach of activities and links resources to outcomes</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="513 464 1214 579"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>Baseline</td> <td>Data not yet avail</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail
Year	Target	Actual						
2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail						
Annual	Output	<p>Measure: The number of speaking engagements by mission staff</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i>RM/SPP generated measure to track outreach activities</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="513 945 1214 1060"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>Baseline</td> <td>Data not yet avail</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail
Year	Target	Actual						
2005	Baseline	Data not yet avail						

Program Follow-up Actions

Year Began	Follow-up Action	Status	Comments
2005	Combine evaluation elements of public diplomacy offices, including ECA, IIP and R/PPR into one unit to coordinate evaluation and measurement.	Action taken, but not completed	One unit was established in November 2005.

2005	Creation of new performance measurement framework for measuring effectiveness of public diplomacy.	Action taken, but not completed	Public Diplomacy has hired the Performance Institute, the leading think tank on performance measurement for government, to assist in the design of a set of common performance measures for public diplomacy. PI professional sits in evaluation office full time to coordinate. New guidance is being issued to embassies for preparation of the annual Mission Performance Plan (MPP) to provide more clearly articulated PD strategy guidance and measurement.
2005	Articulate a strategic vision for public diplomacy for USG and partners.	Action taken, but not completed	Under Secretary Hughes has set out a 3-point strategic and a four point tactical plan (plus evaluations) for all of PD. The 3-point strategy is to offer a vision of hope, marginalize the extremists, and emphasizing common values, not common threats. The four-point tactical plan is to engage, educate, exchange and empower foreign audiences. Strategy and tactics have been prominent in all testimony and have been sent to the field via cable, DVC and other communication.

2005	Improve coordination and communication for all public diplomacy related organizations.	Action taken, but not completed	-- The President has publicly tasked U/S Hughes to coordinate PD interagency -- U/S has created a high level interagency group to work on key PD issues -- R has established issue-specific working groups on PD issues -- Created the Rapid Response Unit which produces daily messages -- R sends "echo chamber" messages to all embassies on priority topics -- Two positions in R/PPR are devoted to inter-agency coordination
2005	Address management deficiencies in public diplomacy	Action taken, but not completed	--R/PPR drafting new precepts for Foreign Service promotion which encompass PD -- Creation of integrated Evaluation Office, led by SES public diplomacy expert -- Initiative of U/S Hughes to hold all Chief of Mission (COM) and PAO conferences concurrently. WHA and EAP thus far and remaining regions by early 06. Same PD message gets to Ambassadors and PAOs.

- View this program's assessment summary.
- Visit ExpectMore.gov to learn more about program assessment and improvement by the Federal Government.
- Learn more about detailed assessments.

Last updated: 01172006.2005UPD