**PA397C Fall 2024**

**DRAFT: Evaluation Methods for Global Development**

**and Humanitarian Assistance**

Wednesdays 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm; Room 214

**Dr. Erin Lentz**

Email: erinclentz@utexas.edu

Ph: 1.512.232.8353; Office Hours: TBD

Virtual Meetings via Zoom by appt

**Overview**

This course 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 design projects and collect, analyze and use data to understand what works and what doesn’t work in international development and humanitarian assistance. 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 begin by examining some of the key steps in project design, in order to learn how to construct projects and programs that are well informed by prior experience and “evaluable.” We will emphasize training in qualitative data collection and impact evaluation design. 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 for accountability and learning. The core objective of this class is to understand how to design and conduct evaluations in theory and manage evaluations under real world constraints.

Grades for the course will be determined by in-class participation, written assignments applying evaluation concepts, and a final take-home exam proposing and justifying evaluation designs. Assignments will focus on the critical assessment and application of evaluation tools and the design of an approach paper for a program or project evaluation. This class will not include any formal “problem sets” or quantitative work. Students seeking more exposure to advanced quantitative analysis are highly encouraged to take other sections of AEM and other course offerings that focus on these methods.

**Course Schedule**

The course is designed to follow the lifecycle of an evaluation.

*Preparing for and designing evaluations*

1. **Aug 28:** Results-Based Monitoring, Theory, and Knowledge
2. **Sep 4:** Program Planning: Problem Identification, Needs Assessment and Baseline Assessments
3. **Sep 11:** Learning from prior evaluations
4. **Sep 18:** Stakeholder Analysis

*Collecting data*

1. **Sep 25:** Equity and Ethics in Evaluation
2. **Oct 2:** Logframes and Indicators
3. **Oct 9:** Survey Design and Overview of Quantitative Sampling and Validity
4. **Oct 16:** Participatory Data Collection
5. **Oct 23**: Interviews and Focus Groups

*Conducting analysis*

1. **Oct 30:** Qualitative Data Analysis and Coding
2. **Nov 6:** Costing Evaluations
3. **Nov 13:** Case Studies and Complex Evaluations

*Disseminating findings*

1. **Nov 20:** Producing and Disseminating Results: Learning from Evaluation
2. **Dec 4:** Catch up; feedback on final projects

**Required Books**

***Note:*** The required textbook is available online, free of cost, thanks to the World Bank’s Open Knowledge Portal. You may also purchase a hardcopy of the book.

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](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/2699/52678.pdf?sequence=1) and through the World Bank’s Open Knowledge Portal at

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

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**

***Please note:*** the late penalty is 10% grade deduction for every 24-hour period after the deadline. Extensions due to medical or other valid reasons must be requested at least 24 hours in advance of the deadline.

**I. In-Class Participation (15%)**

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 during in-class exercises.

**II. Evaluation Methods Portfolio (4 assignments @ 15% each = 60%)**

On Canvas are possible assignments that correspond to particular class session topics. Each assignment is brief in length (usually 2-4 pages) and designed to apply or further explore an evaluation approach or methodology that we will read about and discuss in class.

The assignment on Methods Assessment and Evaluation is required. Choose three other assignments and complete them according to the due dates listed in the reading schedule below. Grading rubrics for each assignment will be posted to Canvas. For your convenience, I have constructed a table below that summarizes the topics and due dates.

Pro-tip: The assignments can be done in groups of 3 or fewer folks. Working on assignments with a group is a great way to learn whether you want to work together on the final assignment as well.

In every case, the assignment should be posted to the Canvas Discussion Board by 9:00 pm on the due date.

Please **upload word documents or excel sheets** so I can comment directly into the docs. Upload one copy per group and include everyone’s name on the assignment.

**Portfolio Assignment Schedule**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Portfolio Assignment** | **Start Date**  | **Due Date (9:00 pm)** | **Max # of Students** |
| 1: Problem Tree Analysis | Sep 4 | Sept 16 | 3 |
| 2: Systematic Review | Sept 11 | Sept 23 | 3 |
| 3: Logframe  | Oct 2 | Oct 14 | 3 |
| 4: Survey Design | Oct 9 | Oct 21 | 3 |
| 5: Participatory Research Design Plan | Oct 16 | Oct 28 | 3 |
| 6: IRB Proposal Using Interviews and Focus Groups**Strongly encouraged** for final project teams | Oct 23 | Nov 6 | 3 |
| 7: **Required** Methods Assessment and Evaluation | Oct 30 | Nov 11 | 3 |
| Final Exam  |  | TBC | **1** |
| Final Project |  | TBC | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**III. Final Take-Home Exam OR Final Project (25%)**

Students taking this course for a letter grade can choose to complete either a take-home exam or a final project.

Students taking a 24 hour take-home, open note exam, will be asked to answer one to two essay questions. You will be able to choose which questions you answer from a larger set. You will complete the exam on your own.

1. Each essay will be 2-3 single spaced pages.
2. Each prompt will essentially ask you to propose (in very high-terms) a qualitative evaluation design strategy based upon a hypothetical project. You will need to explain what qualitative methods you would choose to carry out the evaluation and **justify** your answers using course readings.

According to the information on the Registrar’s [Website on Uniform Exams,](https://registrar.utexas.edu/schedules/229/finals#uniform.exams) for Wed classes starting at 9am, the exam is set to take place on TBC. Because this is a 24-hr take-home exam, it will be due on **TBC**.

**OR**

For the final project, students in groups of 3 or less can conduct a comprehensive systematic or scoping report or a design proposal for a qualitative evaluation (including needs assessments). Your group may choose a topic, in consultation with Dr. Lentz. 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. *Students unable to relatively quickly narrow in on a topic are cautioned against doing the final project.*

Note that the proposal for a qualitative evaluation of a program’s impact is a proposal, not an actual evaluation with analysis of results. *Students designing a proposal are strongly encouraged to complete Portfolio Assignment #6 to develop their proposed project idea.*

Reports 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.

The final project will be due on **TBC**.

**Course material delivery**:

Most classes will occur during our scheduled meeting time: **Wednesdays, 2-5pm**. Most classes will involve in-class exercises in small groups and reporting back on findings.

**Some fine print:**

* Before you send me an email asking for a clarification, check the course syllabus, Canvas, and with classmates. Note that I check email at least once a day, usually in the morning. I do not necessarily check email over the weekend or outside of working hours. Therefore, please plan ahead.
* Texting, checking facebook, surfing the web, etc. are unacceptable during class-time. Your participation grade will be impacted if you spend time in class undertaking such activities.
* I may alter the syllabus depending on the pacing of the course and student interests. I may change the readings but will not assign more pages in total.
* Please contact me if you have anything you would like to talk to me about that would help me work with you.
* Students with University-recognized disabilities who may need classroom accommodations should contact me as soon as possible. All discussions will remain confidential.

**Health and Wellbeing**

One absence over the course of the semester is fine. If you know ahead of time that you will be absent, please let me know. If you will be absent more than once, please get in touch.

I urge students who are struggling for any reason and who believe that it might impact their performance in the course to reach out to me if they feel comfortable. This will allow me to provide any resources or accommodations that I can. If you are seeking mental health support, call the Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC) at 512-471-3515 (8a.m.-5p.m., Monday-Friday),  or you may also contact Bryce Moffett, LCSW-S (LBJ CARE counselor) at 512-232-4449. Bryce’s office is located in SRH 3.119 and she holds drop in Office Hours on Monday from 1-2 pm. For urgent mental health needs, please contact the CMHC 24/7 Crisis Line at 512-471-2255.

**Statement on Commitment to an Effective Learning Environment:**

My goal for this class is to foster a learning environment that encourages a range of viewpoints and is welcoming to people who represent the broad spectrum of human backgrounds and experiences.

In our classroom discussions and collaborate work, we will follow the “4-C” Principles (adopted from Alexandra Sedlovskaya, [*Diversity and Inclusion: Building Connection and Community in Physical, Online, and Hybrid Classrooms*](http://app.academic.hbsp.harvard.edu/e/er?cid=email%7Celoqua%7Cthe-faculty-lounge-9-22-20-b%7C590545%7Cfaculty-lounge-newsletter%7Cnewsletter-subscribers%7Cvarious%7Csep20202036&acctID=13922189&s=1578928263&lid=3936&elqTrackId=0c87c9c8cd174d4e91d4c803e0b8a20a&elq=1253b74e91e74e6185f54a7c5616b5fb&elqaid=2036&elqat=1)):

1. ***Curiosity:*** We are all here to learn, and in this course this learning happens through collaboration. If you have a question, please ask it. Do not worry about how it will come across. We’re all in this together.
2. ***Candor:*** As a future policymakers, we must talk about issues candidly. We want to ensure that different perspectives and different voices are heard. This may mean you hear opinions or experiences from other students that you have not been exposed to, or that may counter your values and worldviews. This candor is not just encouraged, it is expected.
3. ***Courtesy:*** Every member of the class must be able to voice their questions and views respectfully. In return, we all must listen and respond respectfully. Many times, we avoid uncomfortable conversations; we don’t speak up for fear we might offend someone, appear “dumb” or face reprisal. We will not let that fear constrain our conversations. We will always operate from a place of good intentions, and will avoid being defensive or judgmental. We will not tolerate attacks on anyone’s personal identity or values. All discussion must be grounded in the principles of courteous and mutually respectful dialogue. Repeated violations of this principle will result in deductions from your participation score.
4. ***Courage:*** It takes a lot of effort and courage to achieve the above three principles. It takes even more courage to listen and truly try to understand perspectives that are different from our own. As Dr. Sedlovskaya argues: “listening and understanding are not the same as agreeing. It’s how learning happens. Learning takes courage.”

***University-wide Resources:***

* If you experience harassment or discrimination on the basis of personal identity, the University of Texas’ **Office for Inclusion and Equity** handles and investigates these complaints. Call to report discrimination 512-471-1849 or email: equity@utexas.edu.
* The **Title IX Office** offers support services and resources to our community members who have experienced or have been accused of sexual misconduct. Call Title IX at 512-471-0419 or email: titleix@austin.utexas.edu.
* The **Campus Climate Response** team has a form online at <https://diversity.utexas.edu/ccrt/> to report incidences of bias.
* **Student Emergency Services** provides outreach, advocacy, intervention, financial and emotional support and referrals to campus and community resources. Call for crisis support 512-471-5017 (Mon-Fri, 8am-4:30pm) or email: studentemergency@austin.utexas.edu.

**Other notifications about UT campus policy are at the end of this syllabus**

**Reading Schedule**

***See Canvas Site for Recommended (optional) Readings***

1. **Aug 28: Results-Based Monitoring, Theory, and Knowledge**

***Key Concepts:*** definition, origins, history and purposes of results-based monitoring and evaluation; subjects and uses of evaluations; monitoring and evaluation; principles and standards of evaluation; situated knowledges; theory of change models.

***Required Reading:***

*Road to Results*, Ch.3-4. [Skim Ch.1-2 only; read more carefully if you have less experience with development]

Haraway, D. 1988. “Situated Knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective.” *Feminist Studies.* 14(3) 575-599.

Duncan Green. 2013. “What is a theory of change and how do we use it?” From *Poverty to Power Blog*, 13 August 2013. Available at <https://frompoverty.oxfam.org.uk/what-is-a-theory-of-change-and-does-it-actually-help/>

Innovations for Poverty Action. 2016. *Guiding Your Program to Build a Theory of Change*. Available at <https://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Goldilocks-Deep-Dive-Guiding-Your-Program-to-Build-Theory-of-Change.pdf>

**2. Sep 4: Program Planning: Problem Identification and Needs and Baseline Assessments**

***Key Concepts:*** key element of project planning: problem tree analysis, poverty assessments, rapid needs assessments, and response analysis.

***Required Reading***:

*Road to Results*, Ch.5 (review Ch.4 if you did not read it carefully the first time)

Leonellha Barreto Dillon (n.d.). *Problem Tree Analysis*. Available at

<http://www.sswm.info/content/problem-tree-analysis>

“How to Develop a Problem Tree/Solution Tree” Available at

<https://www.evaluationtoolbox.net.au/index.php?option=com_rubberdoc&view=doc&id=39&format=raw&Itemid=139>

Better Evaluations. 2019. “Feminist Evaluation.” <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/themes/feminist_evaluation>

Watkins, R. et al. 2012. “Section 1: Needs Assessment: Frequently Asked Questions.” *A Guide to Assessing Needs.* World Bank.

Inter-Agency Standing Committee. 2009. *Initial Rapid Assessment (IRA): Guidance Notes*. Available [here](http://www.who.int/hac/network/global_health_cluster/ira_guidance_note_june2009.pdf). *Skim.*

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

**Start Portfolio Assignment 1: Problem Tree Analysis**

**3. Sep 11: Learning from prior research**

***Key Concepts:*** systematic review, scoping review, synthesis review, meta-evaluations

***Required Reading:***

Better Evaluations. “Synthesize Data Across Evaluations” <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/rainbow_framework/synthesise/synthesise_across_evaluations>

# W. Mengist et al. 2020. *Method for conducting systematic literature review and meta-analysis for environmental science research.* MethodsX. [Volume 7](https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/methodsx/vol/7/suppl/C), 2020, 100777. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S221501611930353X>

# Munn, Z. et al. 2018. *Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach.* BMC Medical Research Methodology. 18: 143. <https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>

Testing assumptions wrt empowerment in agriculture:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/00220388.2020.1769071?needAccess=true>

[Leveraging Evidence for Access and Development](https://cgspace.cgiar.org/discover?filtertype=author&filter_relational_operator=equals&filter=Leveraging+Evidence+for+Access+and+Development). 2021. CGIAR Gender Platform - *Conducting a Systemic Review: Methodology and Steps.* Chennai, India: LEAD at KREA University. <https://gender.cgiar.org/publications/conducting-systematic-review-methodology-and-steps>

**Start Portfolio Assignment 2: Critique of a Systematic Review**

**4. Sep 18: Stakeholder Analysis**

***Key Concepts:*** Stakeholder analysis

***Required Reading:***

*Road to Results*, Ch.6

“What is Stakeholder Analysis” World Bank PREM Note. Available at

<http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/PDFVersion.pdf>

<https://collaboration.worldbank.org/content/sites/collaboration-for-development/en/groups/communities4Dev/blogs.entry.html/2021/03/22/conducting_a_stakeholderanalysis-m0Bm.html>

Grassroots Collective. “How to Do a Stakeholder Analysis for Community Development,” Available at

<https://www.thegrassrootscollective.org/stakeholder-analysis-nonprofit>

Varvasovszky, Zsuzsa, and Ruairi Brugha. 2000. “How to Do (Or Not to Do) A Stakeholder Analysis,”

 *Health Policy and Planning* 15(3); 338-345.

LaFrance and Nichols. 2010. “Reframing Evaluation: Defining an Indigenous Evaluation Framework.” *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation.* 32(2): 13-31.

1. **Sep 25: Equity and Ethics in Evaluation**

***Key Concepts:*** planning for unintended consequences; evaluating for domains of sustainable development: gender equity, environment and marginalized voices; systems thinking; review of ethics and human subjects requirements; reflexivity.

***Required Reading:***

Fraser, B. 2019. “Scientists sample Earth’s highest tropical glacier: Researchers race to retrieve ice amid protests by local residents in Peru.” *Nature.* 573: September 12.

Thomas, V. et al., “Racism, Social Programming, and Evaluation: Where do we go from here?” *American Journal of Evaluation.* 39(4): 514-526.

Dei, G. S., 2005. “Critical Issues in Anti-Racist Research Methodologies: An Introduction.” 252: 1-27. *Peter Lang: Counterpoints.*

Tools4Dev. (n.d.).“How to Get Informed Consent,” Available at <http://www.tools4dev.org/resources/how-to-get-informed-consent/>

University of Texas IRB Application Process Guide: <https://research.utexas.edu/ors/human-subjects/irb-application-process-guide/>

Jonathan Morrell, 2014. Powerpoint on “Strong Evaluation Designs for Programs with Unexpected Consequences.” Presented to UNDP. February 20. *skim*

If you have time: Michael Bamberger (2012): Unanticipated consequences of development interventions: (25 minute lecture) <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/unanticipated_consequences_of_development_interventions>

The Unintended Side-Effects of a Major Development Strategy: Commercialization of Smallholder Production and Women Empowerment in Uganda

Mertens, D. 2014. “A transformative feminist stance: inclusion of multiple dimensions of diversity with gender.” *Feminist Evaluation and Research: Theory and Practice.* Guilford Press.

**6. Oct 2: Logframes and Indicators**

***Key Concepts:*** Logframes,indicator selection;characteristics of good measures; global nonresponse; item nonresponse; sensitive questions;

***Required Reading:***

*Road to Results*, Ch.8 “Selecting and constructing data collection instruments”

“How to Write a Logframe: a Beginner’s Guide” *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/aug/17/how-to-write-a-logframe-a-beginners-guide>

Tools4Dev (n.d.). *Logical Framework Template*. Available at <http://www.tools4dev.org/resources/logical-framework-logframe-template/>

A good start with SMART (indicators)

<https://eca.state.gov/files/bureau/a_good_start_with_smart.pdf>

Evans, D. 2019. “CGD Blog: Do the poor want cash transfers or public services?” April 10. <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/do-poor-want-cash-transfers-or-public-services>

**Skim:** Peterman, A. et al. 2021. “Measuring Women’s Decisionmaking: Indicator Choice and Survey Design Experiments from Cash and Food Transfer Evaluations in Ecuador, Uganda and Yemen,” *World Development* 141. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105387>.

**Start Portfolio Assignment 3: Logframes**

1. **Oct 9: Survey Design for Quantitative Research; Overview of Quant Sampling and Validity**

***Key Concepts:***  addressing threats to validity in quantitative and qualitative evaluations; sampling strategies and techniques;

***Required Reading:***

*Real World Evaluation, “*Chapter 7: Strengthening the Evaluation Design and the Validity of the Conclusions.” **Focus on qualitative validity.**

*Road to Results,* Chapter 9 (Review 8 if you did not read it closely).

Tools4Development. “How to Write Awesome Survey Questions,” <https://www.tools4dev.org/resources/how-to-write-awesome-survey-questions-part-1/> (please also read Part II - the link is at the bottom of Part I)

Chatterjee R, 2019. “The famous big 5 personality test might not reveal the true you.” <https://www.keranews.org/post/famous-big-5-personality-test-might-not-reveal-true-you>

Lanthorn, H. and Stern, D. 2019. “Survey says: I don’t know.” May 15. ID insight blog. <https://medium.com/idinsight-blog/survey-says-i-dont-know-b3f7efa587ab>

Grosh, M. and P. Glewwe, eds. 2000. *Designing Household Survey Questionnaires for Developing Countries: Lessons from 15 years of the Living Standards Measurement Study.* 3 volumes. Washington: World Bank. Chapter 2.

**Skim:** Banerjee et al. 2010. “Improving immunization coverage in rural India: clustered randomized controlled evaluation of immunization campaigns with and without incentives.” *BMJ.* 340 (c2220).**Read abstract, introduction and methods sections.**

**Start Portfolio Assignment 4: Survey Design**

**8. Oct 16: Participatory Data Collection Tools**

***Key Concepts:*** data collection strategies; data audit; qualitative data; tools (including participatory data collection and observation).

***Required Reading:***

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

Robert Chambers. 2007. Poverty Research: Methodologies, Mindsets and Multidimensionality. IDS Working Paper 293. Available at <https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/20.500.12413/4149/Wp293.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Cornwall, Andrea and Alia Aghajanian. 2017. “How to Find Out What’s Really Going On: Understanding Impact through Participatory Process Evaluation,” *World Development*, 99: 173-185.

World Bank’s *Participatory Tools for Micro-Level Poverty and Social Impact Analysis:* [http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTTOPPSISOU/0,,contentMDK:21421096~menuPK:4028954~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:1424003,00.html](http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTTOPPSISOU/0%2C%2CcontentMDK%3A21421096~menuPK%3A4028954~pagePK%3A64168445~piPK%3A64168309~theSitePK%3A1424003%2C00.html) [Note: this includes a long list of tools. Each attachment is very short – usually one page describing each tool]

Lentz, E. C. 2018. “Complicating narratives of women’s food and nutrition insecurity: domestic violence in rural Bangladesh.” *World Development.* 104: 271-280.

**Start Portfolio Assignment 5: Participatory Research Design Plan**

**9. Oct. 23: Qualitative Interviews and Focus Groups**

***Key Concepts:*** How to construct and conduct open-ended interviews and focus groups, human subjects review; access to respondents and participants; gaining trust; eliciting useful responses.

***Required Reading:***

Review *Road to Results*, Ch.8, tools 4 and 5.

Kate Weaver. 2016. *A Brief Primer on Interviewing*. [On Canvas]

USAID. (n.d.). *Conducting Key Informant Interviews*. Available at

 <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNABS541.pdf>

USAID (n.d.) *Conducting Focus Groups*. Available at

 <https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/USAID%20Guide_Conducting%20Focus%20Groups.pdf>

Bleich and Pekkanen. 2013. “Ch 4: How to report interview data” in Mosley (ed.) *Interview Research in Political Science.* Cornell.

Filipovic, J. 2017: Why have four children when you can have seven? Family planning in Niger” *The Guardian.*

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2017/mar/15/why-have-four-children-when-you-could-have-seven-contraception-niger>

Camber Collective. 2017. “Niger Family Planning Demand Analysis: Qualitative Research Brief” *Read Executive Summary only.* [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/55723b6be4b05ed81f077108/t/58c8571d29687fd3a5bf86dd/1489524521084/Niger\_Qualitative+Research+Brief\_Final.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/55723b6be4b05ed81f077108/t/58c8571d29687fd3a5bf86dd/1489524521084/Niger_Qualitative%2BResearch%2BBrief_Final.pdf)

*Skim:* David W. Stewart, Prem N. Sahmdasani, & Dennis W. Rook. 2011. “Conducting the Focus Group,” in *Focus Groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, pp.89-107. [On Canvas]

*Skim:* He, Lulu. 2019. “Identifying Local Needs for Post-Disaster Recovery in Nepal.” *World Development*, 118: 52-62.

*Skim:* Bailur, Savita and Silvia Masiero. 2017. “Women’s Income Generation through Mobile Internet: A Study of Focus Group Data from Ghana, Kenya, and Uganda,” *Gender, Technology, and Development*, 21(1-2): 77-98.

**Start Portfolio Assignment 6: IRB for Qualitative Interviews or Focus Groups**

**10. Oct 30: Qualitative Data Analysis and Coding**

***Key concepts: analysis of qualitative data; coding software; identifying themes***

***Required Reading***

*Road to Results* “Chapter 10: Planning for and conducting data analysis”

Ryan and Bernard. 2003. “Techniques to Identify Themes.”

Elliott, V. (2018). Thinking about the Coding Process in Qualitative Data Analysis. The Qualitative Report, 23(11), 2850-2861.

Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2011). Beyond constant comparison qualitative data analysis: Using NVivo. *School Psychology Quarterly, 26*(1), 70–84. [https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022711](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0022711)

Comparing features of qualitative data analysis (QDA) software <https://guides.nyu.edu/QDA/comparison>

**Start REQUIRED Portfolio Assignment 7: Methods Assessment and Evaluation**

**11. Nov. 6: Costing Interventions**

***Key concepts:***Cost efficiency; cost-effectiveness; social return on investing

***Required Reading***

Cost Benefit Analysis: <https://www.betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/CostBenefitAnalysis>

Social Return on Investing: <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/approach/SROI>

Starting out on Social Return on Investment: <http://www.socialvalueuk.org/app/uploads/2016/03/Starting%20Out%20Guide.pdf>

ANH Academy Technical Brief: Economic Evaluations of Multisectoral Actions for Health and Nutrition.

ANH Academy Case Study: Mama SASHA background powerpoint.

Holla, A. 2019. “Capturing cost data: a first mile problem.” Development Impact. <http://blogs.worldbank.org/impactevaluations/capturing-cost-data-first-mile-problem>

US Millennium Challenge Corporation. “Economic Rates of Return.” <https://www.mcc.gov/our-impact/err> and Ghana Feeder Roads Excel chart: <https://www.mcc.gov/where-we-work/err/ghana-compact>

Trenouth, L. et al. 2018. “The cost of preventing undernutrition: cost, cost-efficiency, and cost-effectiveness of three cash-based interventions on nutrition outcomes in Dadu, Pakistan.” *Health Policy and Planning.* 33: 743-754

**12. Nov 13: Case Studies and Complex Evaluations**

***Key Concepts:*** case study design and analysis; sector program evaluations; thematic evaluations; complex evaluations; organizational learning and change.

***Required Reading:***

*Real World Evaluation*, Ch.16.

Yin, R. 2017. “Chapter 4: Collecting Evidence.” *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed. Applied Social Research Methods Series: 5). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Yin, Robert K. 2013. “Validity and Generalization in Future Case Study Evaluations,” *Evaluation*, 19(3): 321-332.

Goodrick, Delwyn. 2014. *Comparative Case Studies*. UNICEF Methodological Briefs Impact Evaluation No.9. Available at <https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/brief_9_comparativecasestudies_eng.pdf>

Small, M. L. 2008. “How many cases do I need? On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research.” *Ethnography.* (1): 5-38.

***Read ONE of the following:***

* World Bank Group Independent Evaluation Group. 2013. *The World Bank Group and the Global Food Crisis: An Evaluation of the World Bank Group’s Response*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group IEG. <http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/Data/reports/chapters/food_crisis_eval.pdf>
* International Monetary Fund Independent Evaluation Office. 2017. *The IMF and Social Protection*. Washington, DC: IMF IEO. Available at <http://www.ieo-imf.org/ieo/pages/CompletedEvaluation279.aspx>.
* Wakefield, S. and Koerppen, D. (Oxfam). 2017. “Applying Feminist Principles to Program Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning.” <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620318/dp-feminist-principles-meal-260717-en.pdf?sequence=4>

**13. Nov 20: Producing and Disseminating Results:** **Learning from Evaluation**

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

***Required Reading:***

*Road to Results*, Ch.13-14.

Gugerty, Mary Kay, George E. Mitchell, and Francisco J. Santamarina. 2021. “Discourses of Evaluation: Institutional Logics and Organizational Practices Among International Development Agencies,” World Development 146: 1-11.. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105596>.

Zaveri, Sonal. 2020. “Making Evaluation Matter: Capturing Multiple Realities and Voices for Sustainable Development,” *World Development* 127: 1-3. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104827

Balka, S. et al. 2019: Powerpoint Presentation on “The Benefits of Participatory Dissemination Methods on a Nutrition-Sensitive Agricultural Project in Rural Tanzania.” For the Singida Nutrition and Agroecology Project (SNAP).

*Skim:* 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>

Impact evaluation and synthesis – how far are they being used in low- and middle-income countries

Download citation <https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2022.2102056>

1. **Dec 4: Catching up / feedback on final projects**

**Additional Course Materials**

**Campus safety and wellness resources**

Information on how to sign up for emergency text alerts, contact information for various UT offices, wellness resources, and campus initiatives relating to safety and/or wellness can be found at <https://www.utexas.edu/campus-life/safety-and-security>

**University Electronic Mail Notification Policy**

I will use e-mail as a means of communication with students in this course. You will be responsible for checking your e-mail regularly, recognizing that certain communications may be time-critical. The University of Texas recommends that you check e-mail daily and requires you to check at least twice per week. You are responsible for keeping the University informed of e-mail address changes. The complete text of this policy and instructions for updating your e-mail address are available at <http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/emailnotify.html>.

**About Canvas and Zoom**

Check the course Canvas site regularly for class work and announcements or request that Canvas sends you a daily update. The university's IT staff occasionally schedules downtimes for the Canvas site, as noted on the Canvas login page. Scheduled downtimes are not an excuse for late work. The ITS Help Desk at 475-9400 provides technical support for Canvas Monday - Friday, 8 am to 5 pm. <http://www.utexas.edu/its/helpdesk/>

Zoom links are available through our Canvas site.

**Students with disabilities**

Students with disabilities may request appropriate academic accommodations from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, <http://ddce.utexas.edu/disability/>

**Academic dishonesty/plagiarism**

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. (<http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/conduct/>) and the Office of Graduate Studies (<http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/ethics/transcripts/academic.html>). The University has also established disciplinary procedures and penalty guidelines for academic dishonesty, especially Sec. 11.504 in Appendix C of the Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities section in UT's General Information Catalog.

**Emergency evacuation routes**

The following recommendations regarding emergency evacuation from the Office of Campus Safety and Security, 512-471-5767, <http://operations.utexas.edu/units/csas/terms.php>:

* 1. Occupants of buildings on The University of Texas at Austin campus are required to evacuate buildings when a fire alarm is activated. Alarm activation or announcement requires exiting and assembling outside.
	2. Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of each classroom and building you may occupy. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when entering the building.
	3. Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructor in writing during the first week of class. In the event of an evacuation, follow the instruction of faculty or class instructors.
	4. Do not re-enter a building unless given instructions by the following: Austin Fire Department, The University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.
	5. Behavior Concerns Advice Line (BCAL): 512-232-5050
	6. Link to information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at: <https://preparedness.utexas.edu/emergency-plans>

**Religious holidays**

By UT Austin policy, you must notify me of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

**Harassment Reporting Requirements.**

[Senate Bill 212 (SB 212)](http://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/86R/billtext/html/SB00212F.htm), which took effect as of January 1, 2020, is a Texas State Law that requires all employees (both faculty and staff) at a public or private post-secondary institution to promptly report any knowledge of any incidents of sexual assault, sexual harassment, dating violence, or stalking "committed by or against a person who was a student enrolled at or an employee of the institution at the time of the incident". Please note that both the instructor and the TA for this class are mandatory reporters and MUST share with the Title IX office any information about sexual harassment/assault shared with us by a student whether in-person or as part of a journal or other class assignment. Note that a report to the Title IX office does not obligate a victim to take any action, but this type of information CANNOT be kept strictly confidential except when shared with designated confidential employees.  A confidential employee is someone a student can go to and talk about a Title IX matter without triggering that employee to have to report the situation to have it automatically investigated. A list of confidential employees is available on the [Title IX website](https://t.e2ma.net/click/zvo1jc/nagzvw/rp219q).