

PA397C Fall 2016
(Unique: 60960)

Evaluation Methods for Global Development and Humanitarian Assistance

Monday 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
SRH 3.312/360

Dr. Kate Weaver

Email: ceweaver@austin.utexas.edu
Ph: 1.512.232.3443
Skype: kateweaverUT
Office: SRH 3.344
Office Hours: Mondays 1-3 + by appt
Virtual Meetings via Skype/Facetime by appt

GTA: Francisca Bogolasky

Email: fbogolasky@utexas.edu
Skype: fbogolasky
Office: PhD Office (2nd floor)
Office Hours: Thursdays 1-3 + by apt.

Overview

This seminar overviews the various methods and tools used in the design and management of programs and policies in international development and humanitarian assistance work. This course strongly emphasizes a practical and mixed methods approach to the means by which we collect, analyze and use data to understand what works and what doesn't in international development and humanitarian assistance work. We will also examine some of the key challenges in managing evaluations at the project and organizational levels, and the ethical and analytical concerns that arise therein.

We will emphasize training in qualitative approaches to Participatory Assessment, Environmental and Social Assessment, Beneficiary Assessment and Stakeholder Analysis, as well as basic approach to quantitative techniques used in impact evaluations (including experimental and non-experimental design). We will also study data collection methods, including interviews, focus groups, surveys, and sampling techniques. We will closely examine the results-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policies and practices of key international organizations and non-profit/ non-governmental organizations that work in international development and humanitarian assistance.

In addition to looking at program/project-level evaluations in issue areas pertaining to social and health policy, we will also discuss examples of sector-wide and organizational strategy approaches on cross-cutting issues such as food security, governance and corruption. At the end of the course, we will also critically examine the feedback mechanisms and learning culture of agencies, and how evaluation is used (or not) within aid and humanitarian organizations.

Assignments will focus on the critical assessment and application of evaluation tools, meta-evaluation strategies, and the design of an approach paper for a program or project evaluation. While this class involves the discussion of some statistical and quantitative techniques, it will not include any formal "problem sets" or quantitative analysis. Students seeking these specific skills are highly encouraged to take other sections of AEM and other course offerings that focus on quantitative methods.

Grades for the course will be determined by three components, detailed below. Students can choose between Option I or II for the final assignment, in accordance with their learning objectives for the course and in consultation with Dr. Weaver and Francisca.

- (1) In-class participation (5%) (see participation guidelines at the end of the syllabus)
- (2) Evaluation methods portfolio (45%). Students choose three out of six options, including: assessment report brief and critique; meta-evaluation methodological summary & critique; project

design matrix; concept note for an experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation design; participatory research design memo; and a sampling strategy for a baseline needs assessment.

(3) Final Assignment, Option I (50%): Small Group Meta-Evaluation Report or Impact Evaluation Design (25-30 pages, single spaced, broken down into five stages: executive summary & outline (5%), rough draft (10%), peer review (5%), presentation and panel defense 10%, and final draft (20%)

(4) Final Assignment, Option II (50%): Meta-Evaluation Rough Draft Peer Reviews (2 reports @ 5% each), Panel Chair & Written Feedback (5%), & Take-Home Final Exam Consisting of Two Essay Questions (8-10 pages total, @ 35%)

Course Schedule:

Aug. 29: Defining the Approaches and Objectives of Evaluation

Sept. 5: Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation (RBME) and Theories of Change

Sept.12: Understanding the Problem: Assessments

Sept.26: Meta-Evaluations

Sept.24: Designing Evaluations

Oct.3: Impact Evaluations, Part I: Strategies and Techniques

Oct.10: Impact Evaluations, Part II: Management and Practice

Oct.17: Case Studies of Impact Evaluations

Oct.24: Designing and Conducting Evaluations: Data Collection Strategies and Tools, Part I

Oct.31: Designing and Conducting Evaluations: Data Collection Strategies and Tools, Part II

Nov.7: Evaluating Complex Interventions in Humanitarian Crises

Nov.14: Evaluation of Organizational Strategies and Sector-Wide Programs

Nov.21: Producing and Disseminating Evaluations; and the Politics of Evaluation and Learning

Nov.28: In-class presentations of final projects

Dec.5: In-class presentations of final projects

Required Books:

Note: The two required textbooks are available on the internet, free of cost, thanks to the World Bank's Open Knowledge Portal. However, many of the links found through a simple Google search are broken, so please use the hyperlinks below. For your convenience, I have also made the PDFs of both book available on the Canvas course site.

Linda G. Morra Imas and Ray C. Rist. 2009. *Road to Results: Designing and Conducting Effective Development Evaluations*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available online as a PDF [here](#) and through the World Bank's Open Knowledge Portal at

<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/2699/52678.pdf?sequence=1>

Paul J. Gertler, Sebastian Martinez, Patrick Premand, Laura B. Rawlings, Christel M.J. Vermeersch. 2010. *Impact Evaluation in Practice*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available [here](#) in PDF format.

All other required readings are available on Canvas in PDF format or available as free downloads on the internet (see links in the reading schedule). NOTE: I reserve the right to add or subtract readings from the required list during the course of the semester.

Assignments and Grading

I. In-Class Participation (5%)

Minimal participation in classroom discussion requires that you read, think about, and bring to class the assigned reading materials; be prepared to discuss the reading materials; and show respect for other

participants as well as the instructor. The discussion evaluation guideline attached to the end of this syllabus differentiates contributors in the following areas: mastery of material, quality of ideas, effectiveness of argumentation, respectful and active engagement of others in the discussion, and general impression.

Positive class participation is not based on a quantitative measure of how many times you speak in class. Rather, good participation entails actively staying engaged during class by asking questions, making useful comments, and posing an argument relevant to the topic at hand. A willingness to play devil's advocate is encouraged. I will assess your participation on two fronts: your participation in general class discussions and your proactive and constructive participation as part of in-class exercises.

II. Evaluation Methods Portfolio (3 assignments @ 15% each = 45%)

In the reading schedule, I have listed six possible assignments that correspond to particular class session topics. Each assignment is brief in length (usually 2-3 pages) and designed to apply or further explore an evaluation approach or methodology that we will read about and discuss in class. Some of the assignments can be done in teams, which you may construct according to your own preferences. Where feasible, I have also built in a lot of choice to each assignment to allow you to explore your particular substantive interests in international development or humanitarian assistance.

You must choose three (3) assignments from this list of six and complete them according to the due dates listed in the reading schedule. See the assignment details in the reading schedule provided in this syllabus. For your convenience, I have constructed a table below that summarizes the topics and due dates. In every case, the assignment should be posted to the Canvas Discussion Board by 9:00 pm on the due date (which is always a Monday to allow time for tackling the required course readings between assignment deadlines and the next class). Importantly, all of these assignments are due before any part of your final project, so there will no opportunity to backload all of your work in the class to the end of the semester!

Assignment	Corresponding Class Session	Number of Students	Due Date (9:00 pm)
1. Assessment Report Summary & Critique	September 12	1-2	Sept.19
2. Meta-Evaluation Methodological Summary & Critique	September 19	1	Sept.24
3. Project Design Matrix (Logframe)	September 24	2-3	October 3
4. Concept note for Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design	October 3	1-3	Oct.10
5. Impact Evaluation Sampling Strategy Memo	October 17	1-3	Oct.24
6. Participatory Research Design Memo	October 24	1-3	Oct.31

III. Final Project, Option 1: Meta-Evaluation Report OR Impact Evaluation Proposal (50%) (in groups of no more than 4 students)

For the final assignment, you will work in teams of 3-4 students to conduct a comprehensive meta-evaluation report or proposal for an impact evaluation. Your group may choose a topic, in consultation with Dr. Weaver. Students are encouraged to work on topics that correspond to their professional interests, PRP activities, or other experiences. For example, students recently returned from internships might wish to propose a meta-evaluation report or impact evaluation proposal for a project or program currently (or hypothetically) under consideration by their interning agency.

Either report should be 20-25 (absolutely no more than 30) pages, single-spaced and 12-point type, inclusive of cover page, executive summary, table of contents, maps, charts and tables, references, and text.

If your group is doing the meta-evaluation paper, pay particular attention to framing the meta-evaluation by explaining how and why you have selected certain evaluation reports as the basis of your review (i.e., meta-

evaluation methodology). The last 2-3 pages of the report should be a summary of key findings and prescriptions on the future of evaluation work on this topic (what kinds of evaluation studies/designs would be optimal, and/or feasible given the nature of the topic under study and resource constraints? Where and how should scarce evaluation resources be put to use in order to learn the most we can about what works or doesn't work in these areas of intervention?)

If your group chooses the impact evaluation design, pay particular attention to explaining the particular impact evaluation method(s) that you choose given the nature of your topic and your underlying hypotheses/theory of change; articulate and justify carefully the treatment, control and sampling strategies; explain how you will observe and collect data (how, with whom, for how long and with what budget); discuss the potential spillover effects or externalities that will require attention during the course of the evaluation implementation, and discuss other potential challenges that may arise during the course of implementing the evaluation, collecting data, conducting analysis and disseminating the findings of your evaluation. Note that this is a proposal for an impact evaluation – not an actual evaluation with analysis of results.

Each student choosing Option I will also conduct one peer review of another group's report. Guidelines for the peer reviews are available at the back of this syllabus.

Your group will also present the report/proposal on the last day of class and defend it in front of a panel of your peers.

We will have five components to this project, which will be staged in such a way to minimize procrastination and maximize feedback opportunities. Each component's weight (in terms of your overall course grade) and due date are listed below.

Executive Summary and Outline (5%).....	Due Monday, October 17 (by email, 9:00 pm)
Rough Draft (10%).....	Due Monday, November 14 (by email, 9:00 pm)
Peer Review (5%).....	Due Monday, November 21 (by email, 9:00 pm)
Presentation and Panel Defense (10%).....	November 28 and December 5 (in class)
Final Draft (20%).....	December 10 (by email, 9:00 pm)

My general late penalty is 10% grade deduction for every 24-hour period after the deadline.

III. Final, Option 2: Meta-Evaluation Rough Draft Peer Reviews (2 reports @ 5% each), Written Feedback on Presentations (5%), & Final Exam (35%). [Total of 50% of overall course grade]

For students not wishing to conduct group research and writing for a meta-evaluation report, you have the option of instead fulfilling this portion of your grade with the following assignments:

- (1) **Peer reviews:** of two of the rough draft meta-evaluation reports or impact evaluation proposal written by your classmates. Peer review guidelines are provided at the back of the syllabus. Each peer review should be 1-2 pages each and should comment on the overall structure, clarity, comprehensiveness, quality, and usefulness of the meta-evaluation. A detailed evaluation rubric will be provided prior to the due date. Peer reviews are due November 21 by email at 9:00 pm (one copy to the report authors, one copy to Dr. Weaver and one copy to Francisca). Each peer review is worth 5% of your overall grade, for a total of 10%.
- (2) **Panel Chair/ Summary Report:** On November, students choosing Option 2 will chair the panel defenses during the final presentations of the group reports. The chair is responsible for keeping the presentation on time and managing the audience Q&A. Finally, each chair will be responsible for providing a summary of the feedback provided on the presentation (based upon the evaluation feedback sheets filled in by the audience and the panel). This written feedback will summarize the positive and negative aspects of the presentation and provide constructive criticism designed to help the authors complete the final drafts of their reports (due December 6). Your performance on the

panel and the quality of the written feedback will be worth a total of 5% of your overall course grade.

- (3) **Take-Home Final Exam:** On Dec.8, I will post on Canvas the final exam at 9:00 am. The exam will consist of 3-4 questions, from which you will choose two to answer. Each question is designed to be answered in 3-4 pages each (single-spaced, 12 point type). This is a take-home exam for which you will have 48 hours (due by email to Dr. Weaver and Francisca by 9:00 am on Monday, December 10. You may use all notes, books and course materials for this exam. The exam is worth 35% of your overall grade.

On Academic Integrity

Students are expected to respect the LBJ School's standards regarding academic dishonesty. You owe it to yourself, your fellow students, and the institution to maintain the highest standards of integrity and ethical behavior. A discussion of academic integrity, including definitions of plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration, as well as helpful information on citations, note taking, and paraphrasing, can be found at the Office of the Dean of Students web page and the Office of Graduate Studies. The University has also established disciplinary procedures and penalty guidelines for academic dishonesty, especially Sec. 11.304 in Appendix C of the Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities section in UT's General Information Catalog.

Reading Schedule

August 29: Defining the Approaches and Objectives of Evaluation

Key Concepts: definition, origins, history and purposes of evaluation; subjects and uses of evaluations; monitoring and evaluation; principles and standards of evaluation; agency- and intra-agency governance of evaluation; institutional landscape and key actors in M&E

Required Reading:

Road to Results, ch.1-2 and Appendix on “OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation”

(Skim) OECD/DAC. 2002. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. Paris: OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

Recommended Reading:

Beck, T. 2006. *Evaluating Humanitarian Action Using the OECD-DAC Criteria: An ALNAP Guide for Humanitarian Agencies*. London: ALNAP. Available at http://www.odi.org.uk/alnap/publications/eha_dac/pdfs/eha_2006.pdf

September 5: Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation (RBME) and Theories of Change

Key Concepts: RBME; data collection methods; how to create a logical framework; theories of change models; front-end analysis; stakeholder (beneficiary) analysis.

Required Reading:

Road to Results, Ch.3-4.

USAID Humanitarian Logframes (5-minute podcast): <http://www.ricardo-vargas.com/podcasts/logframe-a-logical-framework/> - .VqD5lZ7CZW0.linkedin

USAID LogFrame Step-by-Step Guide: <http://usaidprojectstarter.org/content/logical-framework-lf>

IFRC Logframe Template: <http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-Logframe-template-definitions-examples-3-2011.doc>

Four brief selections from Duncan Green’s *From Power to Poverty* blog:

“What Does a Theory of Change Look Like?” <http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/?p=5864>

“Theories of Change = Logframes on Steroids? A Discussion with DFID”

<http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/?p=10071>

“Can Theories of Change Help Researchers (or Their Funders) Have More Impact?”

<http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/?p=11181>

“What is a theory of change and how do we use it?” <http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/?p=15532>.

ODI Stakeholder analysis Toolkit: <http://www.odi.org.uk/publications/5257-stakeholder-analysis>

Recommended Reading:

Craig Valters. 2014. *Theories of Change in International Development: Communication, Learning, or Accountability?* Justice and Security Research Programme, the Asia Foundation, August 2014. Available at <http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/research/JSRP/downloads/JSRP17.Valters.pdf>.

African Development Fund. 2013. *Community Roads Project in Support of the National Local Development Program: Appraisal Report*. June 2013. Available [here](#) and on canvas.

Isabel Vogel. 2012. *Review of the Use of 'Theory of Change' in International Development: Review Report*. London, UK: DFID. Available at http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/mis_spc/DFID_ToC_Review_VogelV7.pdf

September 12: Understanding the Problem(s): Program Assessments

Key Concepts: environmental, social, and gender impact assessments; participatory evaluation concepts and tools; rapid assessment.

Required Reading:

Road to Results, Ch.5

USAID Poverty Assessment Tools: <http://www.povertytools.org/> (I recommend viewing the videos provided on this website)

The class will be divided into two groups, each of which will read one of the following:

Child Protection Working Group Somalia. 2011. *Inter-Agency Child Protection Rapid Assessment Summary Report on the Protection Risks for Children as a Result of the Famine in South/Central Somalia*. December 2011. Available [here](#) and on Canvas.

OR

Danish Refugee Council. 2012. *A Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Rapid Assessment – Boro Refugee Camp, Upper Nile State, South Sudan*. Available at <http://www.alnap.org/resource/9878>.

Recommended Readings:

OECD DAC. 2006. *Applying Strategic Environmental Assessment: Good Practice Guidance for Development Co-operation*. Paris: OECD. Available [here](#)

Inter-Agency Standing Committee. 2009. *Initial Rapid Assessment (IRA): Guidance Notes*. Available [here](#).

Kumar, S. 2002. *Methods for Community Participation: A Complete Guide for Practitioners*. Rugby: ITDG Publishing.

Chambers, R. 1994. "The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal." *World Development*, 22(7): 953-969.

Assignment 1: Assessment Report Summary (3-4 pages, single spaced)

~Read/Skim thoroughly one of the following examples of assessment reports. Pay particular attention to the structure of these reports and the general content (not the details of the project or assessment). Your report summary should then encompass two parts: (1) a summary of the report that identifies the core theory of change and the key methods used to conduct the assessment and (2) a brief (2-3 paragraph) evaluation of the quality of the assessment report. You may do this assignment individually or partner with one other student.

USAID. 2010. *Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment: Haiti Earthquake – January 12, 2010*. Available at <file:///Users/cw24387/Downloads/haiti-rea-final-report-march-17,-2010.pdf>

OCHA and WFP. 2014. *Central African Republic: Multi-Cluster/Sector Initial Rapid Assessment*. Available at <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Multi%20cluster%20sector%20rapid%20assessment.pdf>

September 19: Meta-Evaluations

Key concepts: evaluation synthesis; summative versus formative meta-evaluations.

Required Reading:

(Skim for main points and methodology) USAID. 2013. *Meta-Evaluation of USAID's Evaluations, 2009-2012*. Available at <http://usaidlearninglab.org/library/meta-evaluation-quality-and-coverage-usaid-evaluations-2009-2012>

See also the powerpoint presentation here:

<http://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Meta%20Evaluation%20Presentation.pdf>

Assignment 2: Meta-Evaluation Methodological Summary & Critique

Read ONE of the following and then summarize & critique the meta-evaluation report's objectives, methods, challenges, and key findings (3-4 pages). Due Monday, Sept.22.

World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. 2013. *Delivering the Millennium Development Goals to Reduce Maternal and Child Mortality: A Systematic Review of Impact Evaluation*. Available at https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/Data/reports/mch_eval.pdf

OCHA. 2009. *OCHA Meta-Evaluation: Final Report*, July 2009. Available at https://ochanet.unocha.org/p/Documents/OCHA_Meta-evaluation_Final_Report.pdf

September 24: Designing Evaluations

Key Concepts: types and development of evaluation questions (descriptive, normative, cause and effect); elements of and matrices for evaluation design; overview of types of design (experimental, quasi-experimental, non-experimental; case studies); matching questions to appropriate designs (incl. before-and-after; interrupted time series; longitudinal); when and why to use mixed methods.

Required Reading:

Road to Results, Ch.6-7

Michael Bamberger. 2012. *Introduction to Mixed Methods in Impact Evaluation*. Impact Evaluation Notes No.3. Washington, DC: Interaction and the Rockefeller Foundation. Available at [https://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Mixed%20Methods%20in%20Impact%20Evaluation%20\(English\).pdf](https://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Mixed%20Methods%20in%20Impact%20Evaluation%20(English).pdf)

Assignment 3: Project Design Matrix

In teams of 2-3 people each, find a project on the World Bank's Project Database (<http://www.worldbank.org/projects>), the Asian Development Bank's project pages (<http://www.adb.org/projects>) or the African Development Bank's Project Portfolio (<http://www.afdb.org/en/projects-and-operations/project-portfolio/>)

Click on country projects and chose a country. Find one project for which there is fairly robust project information (look for business case and summary, appraisal and approval documents, technical annexes or annual review). You should not pick a complicated project for this exercise. Pull together a design matrix for an impact evaluation that would be conducted at the end of the implementation of this project, using the template provided in the *Road to Results* chapter six. Be ready next week to present this matrix to the class, as well as provide commentary on the participatory elements of this design. Your design matrix is due Monday, October 3 at 9:00 pm.

October 3: Impact Evaluations, Part I: Principles and Approaches

Key Concepts: Causal inference; counterfactuals; randomization; regression discontinuity design; calculating basic differences-in-differences to determine treatment effects; matching techniques; combining methods; evaluating programs with multiple treatments.

Required Reading:

Impact Evaluation in Practice, Chapter 3-9 (note: don't panic - these chapters are short)

Recommended Reading:

Carolyn Heinrich, Alessandro Maffioli, Gonzalo Vázquez. 2010. *A Primer for Applying Propensity-Score Matching*. Impact-Evaluation Guidelines, Technical Notes No. IDB-TN-161, August 2010. Washington, DC: IDB Office of Strategic Planning and Development Effectiveness. Available at <https://publications.iadb.org/bitstream/handle/11319/1681/A%20Primer%20for%20Applying%20Propensity-Score%20Matching.pdf?sequence=1>

Abhijit Banerjee and Esther Duflo. 2008. "The Experimental Approach to Development Economics," MIT Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab.

Dan Levy "Impact Evaluation: Why Randomize?" JPAL Online course: http://ocw.mit.edu/resources/res-14-002-abdul-latif-jameel-poverty-action-lab-executive-training-evaluating-social-programs-2011-spring-2011/lecture-notes/MITRES_14_002S11 lec3.pdf [note that this is a PDF of a powerpoint]

Skim the resources available online from JPAL's executive training: <http://ocw.mit.edu/resources/res-14-002-abdul-latif-jameel-poverty-action-lab-executive-training-evaluating-social-programs-2011-spring-2011/>

Rachel Glennerster and Kudzai Takavarasha. 2013. *Running Randomized Evaluations: A Practical Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Alan S. Gerber and Donald P. Green. 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Thad Dunning. 2012. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lant Pritchett and Justin Sandefur. 2013. "Context Matters for Size: Why External Validity Claims and Development Practice Don't Mix." Center for Global Development Working Paper 336, 7 August 2013. Available [here](#).

Macarton Humphreys and Jeremy Weinstein. 2009. "Field Experiments and the Political Economy of Development," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12: 367-378.

Carlos Barahona. 2010. "Randomised Control Trials for the Impact Evaluation of Development Initiatives: A Statistician's Point of View." Working Paper, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative. Available at http://www.bioversityinternational.org/fileadmin/bioversity/publications/pdfs/1391_Randomised%20control%20trials%20for%20the%20impact%20evaluation%20of%20development%20initiatives.pdf

William Savedoff. 2011. "Incentive Proliferation: Making Sense of a New Wave of Development Programs." Center for Global Development Essay, August 2011. Available at <http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/1425405>

Assignment 4: Experimental Evaluation Concept Note

Draft a 3-4 page concept note (proposal) for an evaluation of a particular intervention, using experimental or quasi-experimental design, of one of the following topics:

- a). A conditional cash transfer program designed to provide monetary incentives to encourage families to send their children to secondary school in (pick a country of your choice).
- b) An unconditional cash transfer program designed to provide incentives for families to vaccinate their children against influenza in (pick a country of your choice).

Your concept note should include: (1) brief summary of the theory of change that discusses the expected impact of the intervention (treatment), (2) a brief justification for the use of experimental or quasi-experimental methods to evaluate the treatment effects, (3) a brief overview of the methods by which you would determine treatment effects, and (4) very brief discussion of the potential limits of the proposed methodology. Note that this would essentially be a long executive summary of what you might choose to do in the final report, option I.

The concept note is due **Monday, October 10 at 9:00 p.m.** You may do this assignment with up to two other students.

October 10: Impact Evaluations, Part II: Management in the Real World

Key Concepts: basic ethical guidelines for approaching impact evaluations; setting up evaluation teams, timelines and budget; sampling strategies and techniques; power calculations (i.e. sample sizes).

Required Readings:

Impact Evaluation in Practice, Ch.10-11

(skim – there are parts here that are repetitive) *Road to Results*, Ch. 9 and Ch.12

Suggested Readings:

Michael Bamberger. 2006. *Conducting Quality Impact Evaluation Under Budget, Time and Data Constraints*. Washington, DC: World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. Available at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/4585672-1251461875432/conduct_qual_impact.pdf

Emergency Capacity Building Project. (2007). *The Good Enough Guide: Impact Measurement and Accountability in Emergencies*. Oxford: Oxfam International. Available at: <http://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/oxfam/bitstream/10546/115510/1/bk-impact-measurement-accountability-090207-en.pdf>

October 17: Case Studies of Impact Evaluations

Key Concepts: theory of change; impact evaluation design; sampling and matching strategies

Required Readings:

Note: *the class will be divided into two groups, each of which will read one of the following and prepare a summary and critique for in-class discussion):*

Macartan Humphreys, Raul Sanchez de la Sierra, Peter van der Windt. 2012. *Social and Economic Impacts of Tuungane: Final Report on the Effects of a Community Driven Reconstruction Program in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo*. <http://cu-csds.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/20120622-FINAL-REPORT.pdf>

OR

Heinrich, Carolyn J., John Hoddinott and Michael Samson. Forthcoming. “Reducing Adolescent Risky Behaviors in a High-Risk Context: The Effects of Unconditional Cash Transfers in South Africa.” *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. [Available as PDF on Canvas]

****Due Monday, October 17: Executive Summary and Outline for Final Projects, Option 1****

Assignment 5: Impact Evaluation Sampling Strategy Memo

In teams of 1-3 students, construct a 2-3 page (single spaced) strategy memo that discusses the various sampling strategies to be included as part of an impact assessment to be conducted for a joint UNHCR and UNDP proposed program to provide better access to sanitation services (e.g. clean water, trash disposal) to the refugees communities in the Nakivale refugee camp in southern Uganda. Note that the impact assessment cannot exceed a budget of \$100,000, inclusive of staff and materials costs, and must be conducted and written up within one month of the approval of funding for the baseline needs assessment.

Your sampling strategy memo is due on Monday, October 24 at 9:00 pm.

October 24: Designing and Conducting Evaluations: Data Collection Strategies and Tools, Part I

Key Concepts: data collection strategies, characteristics of good measures, quantitative and qualitative data; tools (including participatory data collection, observation, structured and semi-structured surveys and interviews; focus groups, expert judgment).

Required Reading:

(Skim) Road to Results, ch.8

(Skim) Impact Evaluation in Practice, Ch.12

World Bank's *Participatory Tools for Micro-Level Poverty and Social Impact Analysis*: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTTOPSISOU/0,contentMDK:21421096~menuPK:4028954~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:1424003,00.html> [Note: this includes a long list of tools. Each attachment is very short – usually one page describing each tool]

Recommended Readings:

Drever, E. 2003. *Using Semi-Structured Interviews in Small-Scale Research: a Teacher's Guide* (revised ed.). Glasgow: Scottish Council for Research in Education

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. 2008. *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage

Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage

Krueger, R., & Casey, M. 2009. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage

Krueger, R. A. 2002. *Designing and Conducting Focus Group Interviews*. St Paul: University of Minnesota. Last viewed on 20 September 2008.

Yin, R. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed. Applied Social Research Methods Series: 5). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. 2007. *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge

Fowler, F. 2009. *Survey Research Methods* (4th ed. Applied social research methods: 1). Los Angeles: Sage Publications

Assignment 6: Participatory Research Design Memo (choose one of the following options)

(a) Write a 3-4 page memo that describe how various participatory tools might be used to conduct a gender impact assessment of a hypothetical micro-lending project focused on ethnic minority women living in the slums (favelas) of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. You may do this assignment with one other student.

(b) Design a 3-4 page strategy plan (in the form of a memo) for focus group analysis, to be implemented as part of a larger set of qualitative, participatory tools in a social assessment of a women's political empowerment project in Afghanistan that is designed to integrate women more into the political arena through a voting rights awareness campaign and the recruitment and training of women to run for elected political offices at the local and national levels. You may do this assignment with one other student.

Post your memo on Canvas by **Monday, October 31 by 9:00 pm**. Note: please be prepared to discuss your memos in class on October 31.

October 31: Designing and Conducting Evaluations: Data Collection Strategies and Tools, Part II

In-class exercises on interviews and focus groups. No required reading.

November 7: Evaluating Complex Interventions in Humanitarian Crises

Key Concepts: joint evaluations; country program evaluations; thematic evaluations; sector program evaluations; thematic evaluations; evaluations of global and regional partnership programs

Required Reading:

Road to Results, Ch.11

Skim (thoroughly): John Borton et al. 1996. "Humanitarian Aid and Effects," Chapter 3 in *Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda*. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/derec/50189439.pdf> (175 pp - skim accordingly!)

John Borton. 2004. "The Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda, *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine*, no.26, March 2004. <http://www.odihpn.org/humanitarian-exchange-magazine/issue-26/the-joint-evaluation-of-emergency-assistance-to-rwanda>

Recommended Readings:

OECD/DAC. 2000. *Donor Support for Institutional Capacity Development in Environment: Lessons Learned* (Evaluation and aid effectiveness: 3). Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/27/2667310.pdf>

OECD Development Assistance Committee. 2008. *Guidance of Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities*. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/39774573.pdf>

World Bank. 2007. *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards*. Washington: The Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTGLOREGPA/RPRO/Resources/sourcebook.pdf> OECD/DAC. 2000. *Effective Practices in Conducting a Joint Multi-Donor Evaluation* (Evaluation and aid effectiveness: 4). Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/28/2667318.pdf>

OECD/DAC. 2006. *Guidance for Managing Joint Evaluations*. Paris: OECD/DAC. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/28/37512030.pdf>

OECD/DAC. 1999. *Evaluating Country Programmes: Vienna Workshop, 1999* (Evaluation and aid effectiveness). Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/26/2667302.pdf>

World Food Programme. 2009. *Humanitarian Assistance in Conflict and Complex Emergencies: June 2009 Conference Report and Background Papers*. Rome, Italy: World Food Programme. <http://home.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp225450.pdf>

Jyotsna Puri, Anastasia Aladysheva, Vegard Iversen, Yashodhan Ghorpade, and Tilman Bruck. 2015. What Methods May Be Used in Impact Evaluations of Humanitarian Assistance? IZA DP No.8755, January 2015. Available at <http://ftp.iza.org/dp8755.pdf>

Joint Humanitarian Impact Evaluation: Report for the Inter-Agency Working Group (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs).

Available <https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/JHIE%20Final%20Report.pdf>

Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, Synthesis Report (January 2007). Available at <http://www.alnap.org/resource/5536>

November 14: Evaluation of Organizational Strategies and Sector-Wide Programs

Key Concepts: sector program evaluations; thematic evaluations; organizational change

Required Reading (note: these readings will be divided in class):

Note: the class will be divided into two groups; each will thoroughly skim one of the following World Bank IEG Reports (note: these reports appear long at first glance, but you only need to read the overview section, and then skim the main body of the report and the appendices. Read smartly.)

IEG. 2013. *The World Bank Group and the Global Food Crisis: An Evaluation of the World Bank Group's Response*. http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/Data/reports/chapters/food_crisis_eval.pdf

OR

IEG. 2010. *World Bank Country-Level Engagement on Governance and Anticorruption: An Evaluation of the 2007 Strategy and Implementation Plan*. World Bank: Washington, DC. http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/Data/reports/gac_eval.pdf

**** Monday, Nov.14: Rough Drafts of Final Papers Due by email at 9:00 p.m. (three copies – one to Dr. Weaver, one to Francisca and one to peer reviewers)****

November 21: Producing and Disseminating Evaluations; and Politics of Evaluation and Learning in International Development and Humanitarian Agencies

Key Concepts: writing, presenting and disseminating evaluation reports; ensuring ethical standards in evaluation; independence of evaluation units; organizational feedback and learning

Required Reading:

Road to Results, Ch.13-14

Impact Evaluation in Practice, Ch.13

Recommended Reading:

Ocampo, J.A., S. Pickford, and C. Rustomjee. 2013. *External Evaluation of the Independent Evaluation Office: Report of the Panel Convened by the IMF Executive Board*. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund. <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2013/010113.pdf>

OECD/DAC NDE. 2006. *DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (for test phase application)*. Paris: Network on Development Evaluation, Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/30/62/36596604.pdf>

OECD/DAC NDE. 2008. *Evaluating Development Cooperation: Summary of Key Norms and Standards (Evaluation and aid effectiveness)*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee Network on Development Evaluation. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/12/56/41612905.pdf>

Borton, J., ed. 1994. *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief: Network Paper 7* (Network paper - Relief and Rehabilitation Network: 7). London: Relief and Rehabilitation Network, Overseas Development Institute.
<http://www.odihpn.org/documents/networkpaper07.pdf>

Good Humanitarian Donorship. 2003. *Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship*. Stockholm: Germany, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the European Commission, Denmark, the United States, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Switzerland. <http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/a%2023%20Principles%20EN-GHD19.10.04%20RED.doc>

**** Peer Reviews Due on November 21 at 5:00 pm (one copy to Dr. Weaver; one copy to Francisca, and one copy to paper authors)****

November 28: Evaluation Design Proposal Presentations and Panel Defense (in class)

December 5: Evaluation Design Proposal Presentations and Panel Defense (in class)

****Final reports due by email on December 10 at 5:00 pm by email to Dr. Weaver and to Francisca****

**** Option II Final Exams (Take Home): Posted December 8, 2016 at 9:00 am; due December 10, 2016 at 9:00 am by email to Dr. Weaver and to Francisca****

News Sources

You are expected to keep on top of the news, especially as it pertains to the themes of this course. Below are some of the most common placed you might find good news on international development and humanitarian crises and assistance. Please come prepared each day in class to answer the question, “what’s going on in the world?” and be ready to apply the current news to the course topic of the day.

The Economist <http://www.economist.com>

Financial Times of London: <http://www.ft.com>

Wall Street Journal: <http://www.wsj.com>

New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com>

Reuters World News: <http://www.reuters.com/news/world>

BBC World News: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world/>

The Guardian Global Development page: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development>

All Africa: <http://allafrica.com/> (news digest)

United Nations Development Program News Bulletin: <http://www.undp.org/dpa/journalists/subscribe.html>

United Nations High Commission for Refugees news: <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home>

IRIN: <http://www.irinnews.org/>

World Bank Press Reviews, Development News, and Research Bulletins:

<http://www.worldbank.org/news>

Other regional news, as appropriate.

Blogs

Blogs are often informal opinion editorials, written quickly and often without substantial supporting evidence. Never read a blog uncritically. That said, blogs can be an excellent source of very timely analysis and can point you in the direction of the latest information on policy issues. Here are some of the blog sites I follow:

Duncan Green writes a daily blog, *From Poverty to Power*, for Oxfam International: <http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/>. It is one of the best places to find out about the newest reports on international development and the aid industry.

Owen Barder is a British national who has worked for over 20 years in development and is now a Senior Fellow and Director for Europe at the Center for Global Development in Washington, D.C. He runs a very interesting blog called “Owen Abroad: Poverty Matters” at <http://www.owen.org/>.

Center for Global Development: CGD, a leading development think tank based in DC, is ground zero for some of the most timely and policy relevant research papers, briefs and op-eds on global development. Their policy blogs are quite interesting (<http://blogs.cgdev.org/globaldevelopment/>), but for the purpose of this class you should pay special attention to the various working papers and op-eds from their Evaluation Gaps working group at <http://www.cgdev.org/page/evaluation-gap-updates>.

World Bank Blog on Development Impacts: <http://blogs.worldbank.org/impactevaluations/>

Shanta Devarajan, World Bank Chief Economist for Africa runs a great blog on “Africa Can End Poverty” at <http://blogs.worldbank.org/africacan/>. It also contains occasional commentaries from other prominent World Bank officials.

ODI (Overseas Development Institute)’s blog at <http://blogs.odi.org.uk/blogs/main/default.aspx>

The Guardian’s Poverty Matters blog: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters>

General Data Sources on International Development and Humanitarian Assistance

GapMinder: <http://www.gapminder.org/>

~ Hans Rosling's amazing world of visualized development and global health data.

www.WolframAlpha.com:

~a computational knowledge engine that digests simple searches and spits out answers in graphical and other data visualization forms (e.g. punch in "GDP per capita Ireland and Iceland" and it instantly produces a line graph).

MEDevEcon: <https://sites.google.com/site/medevecon/development-economics/devecondata>

~website that aggregates development data

Developmentdata: <http://www.developmentdata.org>

~a useful website that collects links to sources of data from international organizations and other official agencies on all kinds of things related to development (governance, population, debt, trade, etc).

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

~ your one-stop guide to all kinds of country-level information, ranging from GDP to literacy rates to per capita cell phone use.

World Bank Poverty & Equity Data: <http://povertydata.worldbank.org/poverty/home/> and PovCalNet: <http://iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/index.htm>

~World Bank's interactive data sites on regional poverty and inequality.

World Bank Microdata Library: <http://microdata.worldbank.org/>

~ another World Bank site that aggregates development data

United Nations Human Development Reports and HDI: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

~The counterpart to the World Bank's World Development Indicators, produced annually and now with an online interactive data site.

UNDP/ Millennium Development Goals Monitor: <http://www.mdgmonitor.org>

IMF World Economic Outlook (WEO), Global Financial Stability Reports and Global Monitoring Reports: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubind.htm>

~The World Economic Outlook (WEO) and the Global Financial Stability and Global Monitoring reports present the IMF staff's analysis and projections of economic developments at the global level, in major country groups (classified by region, stage of development, etc.), and in many individual countries. The WEO and GFSR focus on major economic policy issues as well as on the analysis of economic developments and prospects.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Statistics: <http://www.unctadstat.org>

~ Statistics, policy analysis and other information on global trade, finance and development with a particular focus on issues relevance to developing countries.

United Nation World Income Inequality: http://www.wider.unu.edu/research/Database/en_GB/database/

~data on income inequality for developed, developing, and transition countries

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: <http://www.oecd.org>

~ a good source of macroeconomic data on the OECD member states, as well as many analytical reports on salient economic policy issues

OECD Development Assistance Committee: <http://www.oecd.org/dac>
~ the OECD's site for tracking official development aid data from the OECD donors. It also includes several analytical reports, evaluations, and links.

OPHI's Multidimensional Poverty Index: <http://www.ophi.org.uk/policy/multidimensional-poverty-index/>
~ a new development index developed by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, now adopted by the United Nations Development Program for integration into the annual Human Development Reports.

AidData: <http://www.aiddata.org>
~ An independent source of data on international aid flows and analysis on aid, in partnership with Development Gateway.

World Food Programme: <http://www.wfp.org/>
~ the UN's main agency for provide assistance in periods of food emergencies, as well as long term food security aid. The website has great stats on hunger rates and other data.

World Health Organization: <http://www.who.int/en/>
~ the WHO's site also includes great statistics and data on global health issues

United Nation Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA): <http://www.unocha.org/>
~ The UN's main office for coordinating inter-agency responses to most humanitarian emergencies and long-term crises. OCHA's Humanitarian Bulletins are especially useful.

ReliefWeb: <http://reliefweb.int/>
~ sponsored by UNOCHA, ReliefWeb is one of the best places to get the latest news, information and analyses on humanitarian crises and international responses.

IRIN: <http://www.irinnews.org/>
~ more great news and analysis on humanitarian relief efforts

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): <http://www.unhcr.org/>
~ The UN's main refugee agency. Its resources page is especially good for new, analysis and timely data on refugee and IDP situations, as well as evaluation reports.

Useful Resources for Evaluation (Guides, Handbooks, Evaluation Research Sites and Evaluation Databases)

Please note that nearly all major international aid and humanitarian assistance organizations have independent evaluation offices. There are too many to list here, so I only highlight a few here.

3ie (International Initiative for Impact Evaluation): <http://www.3ieimpact.org/>
~ 3ie was set up to promote enhanced development effectiveness by providing financial resources and technical expertise to support rigorous impact evaluations that address questions of importance to policymakers and program managers in low- and middle-income countries. They advocate for "evidence based evaluation" (usually through quasi- and full experimental design).

Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab: <http://www.povertyactionlab.org/>
~ Ground zero for development evaluation work and analysis using experimental (RCT) methods. Founded by Banerjee and Duflo of the *Poor Economics* fame. They have a lot of examples of experimental evaluations on the website, as well as training modules.

Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP): <http://www.alnap.org/>

- ~ ALNAP is a network of key humanitarian organizations and experts from across the humanitarian sector, including donors, NGOs, the ICRC, UN and academic groups. It is designed to be a “learning” network that seeks to improve humanitarian action through learning, peer-to-peer sharing and research. ALNAP also provided extensive “meta-evaluations”, including through its annual Review of Humanitarian Action. It also has a training module for evaluating humanitarian action available at <http://www.alnap.org/resource/5795.aspx>
- African Development Bank Evaluation: <http://operationsevaluation.afdb.org/en/>
- Asian Development Bank: Independent Evaluation: <http://www.adb.org/site/evaluation/main>
- Monitoring and Evaluation News: <http://mande.co.uk>
 ~ A news service focusing on developments in monitoring and evaluation methods relevant to development programmes with social development objectives
- Innovations for Poverty Action: <http://www.poverty-action.org/>
 ~ Affiliated with JPAL, this is another NGO that conducts randomized evaluation for development.
- Inter-American Development Bank Office of Evaluation and Oversight: <http://www.iadb.org/en/office-of-evaluation-and-oversight/ove-homepage.1556.html>
- International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE):
 Interactive Map: <http://ioce.net/interactivemap/mapindex.html>
- International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS): <http://www.ideas-int.org/home/index.cfm>
 ~ Network devoted to promoting best practices and lessons for international development evaluation.
- OECD Development Assistance Committee: Evaluation Resource Center (DERec):
<http://www.oecd.org/derec/>
 ~ The OECD DAC’s evaluation resource center.
- United Nations Development Program Evaluation: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Evaluation and Research:
<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a1d28526.html>
- USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse: <https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/home/Default.aspx>
- World Bank Development Impact Evaluation ([DIME](#))
- World Bank: [Poverty Impact Evaluations Database](#)
 ~ the Bank’s database of impact evaluations data and results
- World Bank Independent Evaluation Group: <http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/>
 ~ see especially the IEG’s list of impact evaluations

Useful (English-language) Journals

African Evaluation Journal
Development and Change
Development in Practice
Development Studies
Economic Journal
European Journal of Development Research
Evaluation: The International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice
Evaluation and Program Planning
Gender and Development: An Oxfam Journal
Journal of Development Economics
Journal of Development Effectiveness
Journal of Economic Literature
Journal of International Development
Journal of International Relations and Development
Journal of International Trade & Economic Development
Oxford Development Studies
Public Administration and Development
Peace, Conflict, and Development
Studies in Comparative International Development
Third World Quarterly
World Development
World Politics

Evaluation Criteria for Participation

“A” Contributor

- Contributions in class reflect exceptional preparation as evidenced by frequent authoritative and/or creative use of textual/material evidence.
- Ideas offered are always substantive (i.e., unusually perceptive, original, and/or synthetic) and provide one or more major insights as well as direction for the class.
- Agreements and/or disagreements are well substantiated and persuasively presented.
- If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished markedly.

“B” Contributor

- Contributions in class reflect thorough preparation as evidenced by competent and occasionally authoritative and/or creative reference to textual/material evidence.
- Ideas offered are usually substantive, provide good insights and sometimes direction for the class.
- Agreements and/or disagreements are fairly well substantiated and/or sometimes persuasive.
- If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished.

“C” Contributor

- Contributions in this class reflect satisfactory preparation as evidenced by at least some acquaintance with textual/material evidence.
- Ideas offered are sometimes substantive, but seldom offer a new direction for discussion.
- Sometimes disagreements and agreements are voiced with little to no substantiation.
- If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would not change.

“D-F” Contributor

- Contributions in class reflect inadequate preparation.
- Ideas are seldom substantive, provide few if any insights, and provide no constructive direction for the class.
- Integrative comments and effective challenges are absent.
- If this person were not a member of the class, valuable air-time would be saved.

Non-Participant

- Little or nothing contributed in class; hence, there is not adequate basis for evaluation.
- If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would not be changed.
- Said persons need to leave this category and move into a contributor category.

Guidelines For Peer Reviews of Rough Drafts of Final Projects

Constructive peer reviews contain the following elements:

1. A concise summary of the driving questions, objectives, and proposed methods of the meta-evaluation approach paper or evaluation design report. This is essential, as it compels the reviewer to pay close attention and reiterate in his or her own words the key elements of the approach paper. If this summary is off, it signals to the author(s) that the arguments and organization are not clear and more work needs to be done on this front.
2. Comments on the overall organization of the paper, pointing out areas of confusion and offering helpful suggestions for reorganization, if needed.
3. Explanations of the weaknesses or flaws in the underlying methodology.
4. Helpful suggestions on additional literature or data sources to consult, if needed, as well as suggestions on where visuals (charts, graphs, maps, etc) can be edited (for clarity), added or subtracted.
5. Generally corrects grammar, misspellings, awkward sentences, etc. However, please note it is not the job of the peer reviewer to micro-edit the paper. If you see consistent problems in the grammar or style of writing, point out an example, explain what is wrong, and tell the author that this occurs throughout the paper and needs to be fixed.
6. End the peer review with a concise summary of the key problems to address in revisions. While the tone should not be overly critical, it is not the job of the peer review to play cheerleader unless the draft approach paper is really in good shape. The majority of the peer review will be focused on the weaknesses of the paper so that the authors will be well prepared for the panel defense that will follow their in-class presentations.

A proper review can be done in 2-3 pages, single spaced.

RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING METAEVALUATION PAPER

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Comments
Structure and Style					
Paper is well organized.					
Paper uses stylistically consistent voice.					
Paper makes excellent use of visuals as needed (e.g. charts).					
Paper is clearly worded, uses correct grammar, and does not contain misspellings.					
Background and Context					
Paper briefly summarizes the topic					
Paper clearly lays out why a metaevaluation or impact evaluation is needed (ie: significance of study)					
Audience for evaluation is clear.					
Papers addresses the roles and interests of stakeholders.					
Objectives and Scope					
Paper clearly states objectives and scope of the report					
Evaluation questions are concise, clearly defined, and measurable.					
Methodology					
Paper describes type of data needed, data collection methods, sources of data, and strengths/limitations of data.					
Paper offers a clear sampling/selection criteria for studies examined as part of this evaluation					
Lessons/Policy Recommendations					
Paper provides defensible conclusions drawn from the evidence					
Paper provides key lessons for evaluators and policymakers informing future intervention and M&E designs					

Overall Score for Approach Paper (out of 10):

General Comments on Approach Paper:

Panel Presentation Rubric

Group:

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Comments
Visual Presentation					
Ppt and presentation are well organized.					
Visual presentation is clear and uncluttered.					
Oral Presentation					
Presenters do not read off ppt or rely excessively on notes.					
Group demonstrates good time management.					
Oral presentation is engaging.					
Group demonstrates professionalism during presentation and defense.					
Content					
The content of the presentation is comprehensive in presenting the background and evaluation plan.					
Visual and oral presentation makes excellent use of graphs, tables, charts, photos, etc.					
Defense					
Group members are able to thoroughly defend their evaluation methodology, selection criteria, and conclusions					

Overall Score for Presentation and Defense (out of 10):

General Comments on Presentation and Defense: