



NYU

SCHOOL OF
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN GLOBAL AFFAIRS

General Course Information:

Instructor: Kathleen Wetzel Apltauer
Email: kwapltauer@nyu.edu

Course: GLOB1-GC 2151 Monitoring and Evaluation in Global Affairs
Credits: 3.0
Semester: Fall 2017

Class meeting times: Thursdays, 6:30-9:10pm (Eastern)
Classroom location: Room 306, Woolworth Building, 15 Barclay Street (In-person attendance for all sessions is required)

Office hours: In-person, Thursdays, 5:00-6:00pm (Eastern), Location to be determined.
Additional meeting times are possible by appointment.

Course Description:

This course introduces students to monitoring and evaluation (M&E). It includes how monitoring and evaluation are different, why these are performed, how to design and implement both, barriers to successful implementation, how to identify when monitoring and evaluation are done well, how to use what is learned from monitoring and evaluation to advance program or policy goals, and how to integrate monitoring and evaluation findings into operational structures.

This is an introductory course. In other words, it provides students with an overview of the topics and offers resources and directions for those who wish to learn more. As an overview, introductory course, it is useful to both creators and consumers of monitoring and evaluation results.

The course is not aimed at a particular sector, e.g., government, nongovernmental organization or philanthropy. Nor will it focus on a particular domain, such as economic development, human rights, environment, gender, or the like. Rather, it teaches the tools and frameworks needed to work in any of these areas. Students are invited to use the assignments to explore issue areas and regions of particular interest to them.

Course Prerequisites:

GLOB1-GC3035 Analytic Skills for Global Affairs or a similar introductory course to statistics. A basic understanding of statistics is essential to monitoring and evaluation practice and to use of the results, and the presentation of this course assumes you have a grasp of the material included in Analytic Skills course. If you have not already completed Analytic Skills, please contact the instructor to discuss your experience in statistics.

Course Structure/Method:

Course sessions will be a mixture of lectures, interactive discussions, activities, and guest speakers. Readings are to be completed before class so that you may fully participate in discussions and activities.

Attendance is required for each class session. Please arrive on time to avoid disrupting your colleagues and to ensure full participation and learning. Failure to attend or arriving late may result in a lower score for participation.

Please bring paper and pen to each session to take notes. Use of computers and computer note taking are discouraged. You will also need pen and paper for written activities and exercises.

Assignments, their content, when they are due, and how they are to be submitted are described under the sections Course Expectations, Assessment Strategy, and Course Outline. Additional instruction and discussion of assignments will be part of course content.

Any changes to the original syllabus regarding session content, required readings or assignment descriptions will be posted to NYUClasses, with email notice sent to you at their posting.

Course Learning Outcomes:

By the end of this course, you will be able to

- Implement monitoring to advance program goals
- Identify when it is appropriate to perform an impact evaluation
- Understand why a theory of change is essential to M&E and how to develop one
- Design a monitoring plan and an evaluation plan using the C.A.R.T framework
- Critique monitoring and evaluation performed by others; Know good M&E from bad
- Identify barriers to good M&E and tools to overcome these
- Integrate M&E into organizational operations to advance program goals

Communication Policy:

Questions not covered during class time may be sent to me via email at kwapltauer@nyu.edu. I will answer emails within 48 hours of delivery. You are also expected to reply to me within 48 hours to any email with a question or request for information. Reply within 48 hours also applies to emails from your colleagues when working as part of an assigned group or team. A prompt reply is critical to success when working as a group. Information will be delivered using NYU email addresses and/or the NYUClasses messaging system. While participating in this course, it is critical to check your NYU inbox regularly.

Course Expectations:

Successful completion of the course requires submission of the following:

- Introductory survey due by **5pm September 5**, link sent via email before the course.

- National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research, Protecting Human Research Participants online training program, including quizzes, before the start of Session 1 (**September 7**). Upload proof of completion to NYUClasses. Instructions on how to do this are listed under required readings and activities for Session 1.
- All short assignments. Due dates and submission instructions are listed under the Course Outline.
- Monitoring or Evaluation plan, uploaded to NYUClasses by **5pm November 20**. (Description posted to Assignments on NYUClasses.)
- Engagement plan, uploaded to NYUClasses by **5pm December 11**. (Description posted to Assignments on NYUClasses.)

You must complete required readings before class, as well as attend and participate in every class session and activity. Readings will serve as the foundation for classroom discussions and activities.

Clear, concise language and correct grammar is required for all written assignments. Any grade for a written assignment will include assessment of these elements.

Citations must follow MLA 8th Edition citation guidelines. Instructions on how to use these correctly can be found in the NYU Library Citation Style Guides:
<http://guides.nyu.edu/c.php?g=276562&p=1844733>.

Assessment Strategy:

Your grade will be based on the following four elements:

Classroom participation (10%) You must demonstrate through participation in classroom discussions a knowledge of the required readings and consideration of the ideas they contain. Your comments are to advance your and your colleagues understanding of the material and topic. You may at times be assigned to offer comment on a particular article or reading. You may also be asked to present your work on an assignment for discussion with your colleagues. You will be asked to participate in in-class activities and report what is learned from these to your colleagues. Participation will be scored not just on the level of involvement but on the accuracy and acuity of your observations. Attendance at every session is required. Missing even one session may lower your score for participation.

Pop quizzes & short assignments (15%) *Pop quizzes* will be used to ensure that you have a grasp of key terms and concepts from the readings and classroom sessions. Surprise quizzes help with accountability – incentive to do the readings – and studies indicate that random enforcement is the most effective. (Yes, I smiled as I wrote this.) More importantly, short quizzes with quick review are shown to improve retention of the material. Quizzes will generally be unannounced beforehand and will cover only material from previous sessions and readings, up to the readings assigned for that week's session. Please bring paper and a writing implement to every session.

Also part of this score are the *short assignments*. These short assignments have two purposes. One is immediate, practical application of the material just studied in the assigned readings and during the classroom sessions. Each assignment asks you to make use of what you've just learned. The other purpose is to allow you to progressively build

toward the longer papers: your Monitoring or Evaluation plan and your Engagement plan. In addition to my review of each of these draft sections of your final paper, we will use peer review and workshops during class session, helping you to refine and advance your ideas. The goal is to improve both the quality of these longer reports and their usefulness to you as learning tools. Even though the short assignments are drafts, as with all writing assignments, clear prose and proper use of citations are required. More will be explained during class sessions. Due dates for these submissions are listed in the Course Outline section of the syllabus.

Grading for the quizzes and short assignments will be check plus (well done!), check (solid work) and check minus (room for improvement). These are intended to be low stakes but high learning opportunities.

Monitoring or evaluation plan (50%) You will develop the elements of a monitoring or evaluation plan, a working document to describe the what, why and how you would evaluate a program of your choice. The plan is due to NYUClasses by **5pm, Monday, November 20**. A full description of this assignment, including required elements and assessment criteria, is posted to NYUClasses under Assignments. We will also talk about form and content of this paper during class time.

Engagement plan (25%) Even the most accurate, reliably-performed M&E have little value unless what is learned is put to use. This assignment adds the final piece to your Monitoring or Evaluation plan (whichever you chose for your first paper). You are to develop a plan on how to make use of your M or E results within your organization's operations – how you and others will act on what is learned through your M or E. Be thinking about a participatory approach. Simply delivering data and information, without direct engagement of stakeholders, rarely achieves the goal of learning and change.

Your engagement plan will be due to NYUClasses by **5pm, Monday, December 11**. A full description, including required elements and assessment criteria, is posted to NYUClasses under Assignments. We will also talk about form and content of this paper during class time.

Writing: Clear, concise language and correct grammar is required for all written assignments. Any score for a written assignment will include assessment of these elements. Citations must use MLA 8th edition format throughout the paper. Instructions on how to use MLA citations correctly can be found in the NYU Library Citation Style Guides: <http://guides.nyu.edu/friendly.php?s=citations>.

NOTE: The word count does not include source citations or your resource list. Please double-space your lines to allow room for review comments. Please include your paper title and a page number on every page of the text.

All assignments must be submitted on time. They will not be accepted late.

Course completion: All assignments are required and graded. Assignments will not be accepted after the due date and time except in the event of an emergency – an exceptional case. If an assignment is not submitted by the date and time specified, the score for that assignment will be zero (0).

Grading scale:

Grade	Measurement	Quality points
A	Outstanding – Complete, thoughtful, accurate achievement of all required elements for all assignments	4.0
A-	Excellent work – Achieving most of the required elements for all assignments	3.7
B+	Strong, solid work demonstrating a good grasp of the material	3.3
B	Solid work demonstrating a grasp of the material	3.0
B-	Good effort but missing important elements	2.7
C+	Requires improvement to be considered as having achieved the required elements and a grasp of the material	2.3
C	Requires considerable improvement to be considered as having achieved the required elements and a grasp of the material	2.0
C-	Requires extensive improvement to be considered as having achieved the required elements and a grasp of the material (minimum passing grade)	1.7
F	Does not yet meet course expectations	0.0

Required and Recommended Material:

Other than the books immediately below, all required readings for this course are publicly available, available through the NYU Library system, or have authors' permission for use in this classroom. Required readings are (or will be) posted to NYUClasses either through a link or with a copy of the text. Recommended readings and resources will be listed on the syllabus and in NYUClasses.

Books to purchase:

- Wheelan, Charles. *Naked Statistics*. New York: Norton, 2014.
(For most of you, this text was required for Analytic Skills. If you don't have a copy, it is widely available. For example, Amazon offers the paperback new for ~\$11.)
- Weiss, Carol H. *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs & Policies*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998. ("Good" condition, used versions of the paperback are available on Amazon and Barnes & Noble in the \$20-\$35 range.)
- Karlan, Dean & Jacob Appel. *Failing in the field: What we can learn when field research goes wrong*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016. (Hard cover & ebook available: <<http://press.princeton.edu/titles/10872.html#evendors>>. Also on [Amazon](#).)
- Gugerty, Mary Kay & Dean Karlan. *The Goldilocks Problem*. Oxford University Press, 2017 (to be released fall 2017) Once released, readings from this text will be added to the syllabus.

Required readings from *Naked Statistics*, *Evaluation*, *Failing in the field* and *Goldilocks Problem* will appear throughout the semester. Rather than clutter the document with the full citation, the author's name is listed along with the page number(s) assigned for that topic.

Suggested resources for continued learning:

Textbooks:

- Rossi, Peter, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 2015. (3rd Edition is available for far less money. Patton is a leading evaluation theorists and an authority on qualitative evaluation. His book is dense but worth the money and time.)

We will use selected excerpts from Rossi and Patton during class. The pieces will be posted to NYUClasses. Again, rather than the full cite, the syllabus has only the authors' name(s) and the assigned page(s).

- Ritchie, Jane and Jane Lewis (Ed.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 2003. 18 July 2016 <http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Ritchie_2003.pdf>.

Sample IGO/NGO/Foundation evaluation handbooks and materials:

- Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA). *Goldilocks: Right Fit M&E*. <<http://www.poverty-action.org/goldilocks>>.
- EvalPartners.org <<http://www.evalpartners.org>>.
- Asia Development Bank (ADB). *Guidelines for Preparing a Design and Monitoring Framework*. Manila, Philippines: ADB, 2016. <<http://www.adb.org/documents/guidelines-preparing-design-and-monitoring-framework>>.
- IDEO.org. *The Field Guide to Human-Centered Design*. IDEO, 2015. 11 July 2016 <<http://www.designkit.org/resources/1>>.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. New York: UNDP, 2009. 23 June 2016 <<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf>>.
- U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *Developing an Effective Evaluation Plan*. Atlanta, Georgia: CDC National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity, 2011. 13 July 2016 <<http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/downloads/cdc-evaluation-workbook-508.pdf>>.
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*. New York: UNEG, August 2014. 4 July 2017 <<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616>>

- UN Women Independent Evaluation Office. *How to Manage Gender-Responsive Evaluation: Evaluation Handbook*. UN Women, 2015. 4 July 2017 <<http://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/4/un-women-evaluation-handbook-how-to-manage-gender-responsive-evaluation>>.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). *Project/programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guide*. Geneva: IFRC, 2011. 4 July 2017 <<http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-ME-Guide-8-2011.pdf>>.
- Gage, Anastasia J., Disha Ali and Chiho Suzuki. *A Guide for Monitoring and Evaluating Child Health Programs*. MEASURE Evaluation. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, September 2005. (Project sponsored by USAID and coordinated by USAID, WHO and MEASURE Evaluation.) 4 July 2017 <<http://www.coregroup.org/storage/documents/Workingpapers/ms-05-15.pdf>>.
- O'Neill, Kathryn. *Evaluation Handbook*. London: Save the Children, 2012. 4 July 2017 <<http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/library/evaluation-handbook>>.

This is just a beginning list of reputable organizations that share their guidance on how to perform credible, responsible evaluations.

NYUSPS Policies:

PLAGIARISM: “The SPS places highest emphasis on matters of academic honesty and imposes strict penalties for plagiarism. The definition of plagiarism adopted by the SPS is: Plagiarism is presenting someone else’s work as though it were one’s own. More specifically, plagiarism is to present as one’s own a sequence of words quoted without quotation marks from another writer; a paraphrased passage from another writer’s work; creative images, artwork, or design; or facts or ideas gathered, organized, and reported by someone else, orally and/or in writing and not providing proper attribution. Since plagiarism is a matter of fact, not of the student’s intention, it is crucial that acknowledgement of the sources be accurate and complete. Even where there is no conscious intention to deceive, the failure to make appropriate acknowledgement constitutes plagiarism. Penalties for plagiarism range from failure for a paper or course to dismissal from the University” (Source: NYU SCPS CGA Faculty website). Some assignments in this course may be checked for plagiarism using TurnItIn.

For more on SCPS policy on academic integrity, <http://www.scps.nyu.edu/academics/academic-policies-and-procedures/graduate-academic-policies-and-procedures.html> - *Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedures*. For more on citation methods and tools, see the Library’s guides <http://guides.nyu.edu/c.php?g=276769&p=1845890>.

FERPA: NYU-SPS policies regarding Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Turnitin, Academic Integrity and Plagiarism, Disability Access, and Standards of Classroom Behavior can be found on the NYU Classes site for this class as well on the University and SPS websites. Every student is responsible for reading, understanding, and complying with all of these policies.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: Students with disabilities may wish to contact the Moses Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD) to learn more of the tools and assistance available at NYU and to discuss any need for accommodation (<http://www.nyu.edu/students/communities-and-groups/students-with-disabilities.html>). NYU policy is “Any student who needs a reasonable accommodation based on a qualified disability must register with the CSD for assistance.”

NYU STUDENT RESOURCES: <http://www.nyu.edu/life/resources-and-services.html>

The full list of policies can be found at the web links below:

UNIVERSITY POLICIES: <http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance.html>

SPS POLICIES: <http://sps.nyu.edu/academics/academic-policies-and-procedures.html>

CGA Attendance and Lateness policy - All students must attend class regularly. Your contribution to classroom learning is essential to the success of the course. Any more than two (2) absences during the spring will likely lead to a need to withdraw from the course or a failing grade.

CGA Incomplete policy - Incompletes are only granted in extreme cases such as illness or other family emergency and only where almost all work for the semester has been successfully completed and the basis for the Incomplete can be verified. A student’s procrastination in completing his/her paper is not a basis for an Incomplete.

COURSE OUTLINE:

At the discretion of the instructor, the syllabus may be modified to better meet the needs of the students and to achieve the learning outcomes established in the syllabus. In particular, readings will be augmented and revised as needed. We may shift some of the topics to accommodate a guest speaker or to finish covering a topic that we did not finish in the time originally allotted. Whenever possible, we will discuss any changes during class time. Regardless, you will be notified via NYUClasses and email when changes are made to the syllabus and readings are added to the assignment list.

Course themes:

- Sessions 1, 2 & 3: Background

What do you want to know?

- Sessions 3, 4 & 5: Needs, program theory, and landscape
- Sessions 5 & 6: What to measure and measuring accurately

How do you find the answer?

- Sessions 6 & 7: Monitoring and Process evaluations
- Sessions 7 & 8: Impact evaluations – RCT & quasi-experimental
- Sessions 9, 10 & 11: Data gathering – Data sources and tools to gather your own

How do you put it to use?

- Sessions 12, 13 & 14: Sharing, reporting and integrating M&E results into organizations

Session 1 (September 7) – Introduction to M&E; Introduction to course; Ethics in evaluations

Intro to M&E

What is monitoring? How is it used?
What is evaluation? How is it used?
Why greater emphasis on M&E today?

Introduction to course

Who are we? Why are we here? What can we expect from the course?
Review of syllabus

Class rules: Be kind! Show respect! All peer review comments must be productive, must advance understanding and application of knowledge.

CART framework

We use the CART framework as our lens throughout the course. The approach ensures that M&E are efficient and on target and that the results will be used... from M&E to ME&L, or "learning." This session begins exposure to the framework.

Ethics in evaluations

How do ethics matter to M&E? What are some of the ethical concerns when doing research that involves people? How do you build in protections? How does equipoise affect all M&E? Why is it that ethical behavior actually gets you better data?

Required readings and activities

- Complete ~5-minute survey by **5pm September 5** (link sent via email shortly before semester starts): Who you are, what you hope to learn from this course and how you hope to use it.

Why M&E now?

- Banerjee, Abhijit and Esther Duflo. *Poor Economics: A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty*. New York: Public Affairs, 2011: pp. 1-8, 14-15.
- Easterly, William. *White Man's Burden*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006: pp. 3-13
- Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. High Level Forum 28 February-2 March 2005. Please pay special attention to the "Statement of Resolve," pp. 1-3 in The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. OECD. 13 July 2016 <<http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/34428351.pdf>>.

CART framework

- Goldilocks Toolkit: Finding the Right Fit in Monitoring & Evaluation. Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA), 2016. 11 July 2016 <<http://www.poverty-action.org/goldilocks/principles>>.

Ethics in evaluations

- American Evaluation Association (AEA). Guiding Principles for Evaluators. Revisions reflected herein ratified by the AEA membership, July 2004. 4 July 2017 <<http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>>.
- Wheelan: 8
- Weiss: 92-95

Additional readings and resources

- The Belmont Report - Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. U.S. Department for Health and Human Services, Office for Human Research Protections. 18 April 1979. 4 July 2017
<<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html#>>.
- Spriggs, M. "Canaries in the mines: children, risk, non-therapeutic research, and justice." *Journal of Medical Ethics* 30.2 (2004): 176-181

Assignment 1 due to NYUClasses **before class September 7** – Register (free) and complete National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research, Protecting Human Research Participants online training program (<https://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php>), including quizzes, before the start of Session 1 and upload proof of completion to Assignment 1 on NYUClasses/Assignments.

For proof of completion, you may use a screenshot of the page showing that you have read all the sections and your score for the quizzes. Alternately, if you check that you wish to be eligible for CME credits when you register and log in, you may obtain a certificate of completion for \$25. (Here is a link on how to take a screenshot on a Mac: <<https://support.apple.com/en-us/HT201361>>. Here is a link on how to take a screenshot on a PC: <<http://www.wikihow.com/Take-a-Screenshot-in-Microsoft-Windows>>.)

After registering, a pdf version of the online training program is available at <<https://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/PHRP.pdf>>.

Session 2 (September 14) – Fundamentals – Review of key ideas from Analytic Skills and statistics; Culture/difference/gender's role in evaluation
Review of analytics & statics – Essentials to evaluation understanding and practice

Culture/difference/gender's role in evaluation

How do our known and unknown biases affect our approach to evaluation?

How do we acknowledge and control for these to reduce their influence?

How do the known and unknown biases the people we hope to serve affect our ability to reach to them, or to get accurate information from them once reached?

How do we overcome barriers created by social status and power?

How do we gain access to unempowered in evaluations? How do we hear their voice?

Required readings

Review of Analytic Skills – Topics and assigned readings

- Counterfactual – Wheelan: 112-115; Gugerty & Karlan: "Counterfactual"; Weiss 87-89
- Correlation is not causation – Wheelan: 48-67; 153-154; 188-189; 215-217
- Omitted variable bias – Wheelan: xiv, 5, 10-11; 48-52; 63; 198-207; 217-219; 198 (R²)
- Percent vs percentage points – Wheelan: 27-29; 48-52
- Median vs mean & IQR/min/max, skew... standard deviation – Wheelan: 17-35
- Regression to the mean – Wheelan: 105-107
- Central limit theorem and standard deviation – When a sample is properly drawn (representative), "the sample mean and standard deviation [will] be roughly equal to the mean and the standard deviation for the population from which it is drawn (Wheelan 156).

- Central limit theorem and standard error – “The sample mean for any population will be distributed roughly as a normal distribution around the true sample mean” (Wheelan 156). [If this statement makes no sense to you, take another look at Chapter 8.]
- Statistical significance – What is it and what is it not! (clinically significant) – Wheelan: 11; 154; 193-194
- Problems with probability – Wheelan: 100-109
- Variation hidden within averages (means)
- Opportunity cost: What else could you be doing with this money? Is it more or less valuable than what you plan?

Culture, difference & gender

- Tervalon, Melanie, and Murray-García, Jann. “Cultural Humility versus Cultural Competence: A Critical Distinction in Defining Physician Training Outcomes in Multicultural Education.” *Journal of Healthcare for the Poor and Underserved* 9.2 (May 1998): 117-125.
- Krauss, Beatrice J., et al. “White Researcher in the Multicultural Community: Lessons in HIV Prevention Learned in the Field.” *Journal of Health Education* 28.6 (Nov/Dec Supplement 1997): S67-71.
- Moran, Robert T., Philip R. Harris and Sarah V. Moran. *Managing Cultural Differences: Global Leadership Strategies for Cross-Cultural Business Success* 8th ed. New York: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2011, page 195.
- AEA. Public Statement on Cultural Competence in Evaluation. April 2011. 4 July 2017 <<http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=92>>.
- Thompson-Robinson, Melva, Rodney Hopson and SenGupta, Saumitra. “Editors’ notes.” *New Directions for Evaluation* 102 (August 2004): 1-4.
- SenGupta, Saumitra, Rodney Hopson and Melva Thompson-Robinson. “In Search of Cultural Competence in Evaluation Toward Principles and Practices.” *New Directions for Evaluation* 102 (August 2004): 5-19.
- UN Women Independent Evaluation Office. How to Manage Gender-Responsive Evaluation: Evaluation Handbook. UN Women, 2015: pp. 4-6. 3 July 2017 <<http://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/4/un-women-evaluation-handbook-how-to-manage-gender-responsive-evaluation>>.
- Bright, Kristin. “Flashpoints in global cancer research: Negotiating and building cross-site partnerships.” NYU Public Health Discovery Portal, Public Health in Action. 2009. 3 July 2017. <http://www.nyu.edu/mph/discover/cancer_research.html>.

This does not require a close read, but please reflect on the issues of informed consent discussed in this article and how culture and difference may make the approach used to obtain informed consent in the United States may not be appropriate among some populations and in other settings. Remember this conversation too when we talk about measurement tools, measurement error, indicators and data gathering tools later in the semester.

Additional readings and resources

Review of statistics

- How to interpret coefficients from OLS multivariate regressions – Wheelan: 193-194; 199-200.
- How to understand p -value – Wheelan: 152-153; 159-160; 195-198
- How to understand R^2 – Wheelan: 198
- When OLS isn't the right tool (nonlinear relationships) – Wheelan: 214

Culture, difference & gender in evaluations

- CDC. Practical Strategies for Culturally Competent Evaluation. Atlanta GA: US Dept of Health and Human Services, 2014. 23 June 2016 <https://www.cdc.gov/dhdsp/docs/cultural_competence_guide.pdf>.
- Linkins, Karen W. et al. *Indicators of Cultural Competence in Health Care Delivery Organizations – An Organizational Cultural Competence Assessment Profile*. Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, April 2002. 23 June 2016 <<http://www.hrsa.gov/culturalcompetence/healthdlvr.pdf>>.
- *New Directions for Evaluation* 102 (Summer 2004). The Summer 2004 issue of *New Directions in Evaluation* focuses on cultural “competence” in evaluation. Electronic copies available through the NYU Library system.
- Center for Evaluation and Research, Tobacco Control Evaluation Center. “Culture in Evaluation #11: Making Your Evaluations More Culturally Competent.” 23 June 2016 <http://tobaccoeval.ucdavis.edu/documents/Culture_MakingYourEvaluationsMoreCulturallyCompetent_2012.pdf>.

Assignment 2 due to NYUClasses by **5pm September 18** – Prepare a description of your program, why it is needed, its goals, etc., along with a *brief* description of the organization running the program. Use no more than 350 words. (There are roughly 250 words per double spaced page.)

NOTES: The word count for this and other assignments does not include source citations or your resource list. Please double-space your lines to allow room for review comments. Please include your name and a page number on every page of the text.

You will notice that few words are allowed for this assignment. This will be the case for other writing assignments as well. We want people to read what we produce, which means that shorter is almost always better. Many of the assignments and activities of this course will help you become accustomed to presenting your ideas succinctly, and hopefully, cogently.

Session 3 (September 21) – Human-centered design & equity in evaluations; Stakeholder analysis

Review and discuss Assignment 2

Human centered design and equity might seem unrelated but they are actually intertwined and must be considered in all evaluation – from needs assessment and program design to monitoring and impact evaluation. Therefore, the concepts, along with issues of culture difference and gender, are a part of our early discussion and will come up again and again throughout the course. This is also true of the basic statistical concepts and ethics discussed last week.

Human-centered design & equity in evaluations

Who knows best what is needed to address a problem? How do we learn from those who know best? How may we use their knowledge in program design and evaluation?

What is equity? How does equity differ from equality? What is horizontal equity? What is vertical equity?

How does opportunity cost impel inclusion of these concepts in program design and evaluation?

Stakeholder analysis

Who are or will be affected by our programs or policies? What is their role? What is their power or influence? How much is at stake? How will we include their concerns in our process?

Required readings

Human-centered design

- IDEO.org. *The Field Guide to Human-Centered Design*. IDEO, 2015: 31-69 11 July 2016 <<http://www.designkit.org/resources/1>>.

Equity

- Bamberger, Michael and Marco Segone. "Section 1: What Is Equity and Why Does It Matter?" *How to design and manage Equity-focused evaluations*. UNICEF, 2011: pp. 2-12. 3 July 2017 <http://evalpartners.org/sites/default/files/EWP5_Equity_focused_evaluations.pdf>.
- Apltauer, Kathleen Wetzel and James Macinko. "Test your knowledge of public health – Question 15." NYU Public Health Discovery Portal, 2009. 3 July 2017 <http://www.nyu.edu/mpd/discover/test_q15.html>

Stakeholder analysis

- Weiss, Carol H. "Where Politics and Evaluation Research Meet." *Evaluation Practice* 14.1 (1993): 93-106.
- Cousins, J. Bradley and Lorna M. Earl. "The Case for Participatory Evaluation." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 14.4 (Winter 1992): 397-418.
- Varvasovszky, Zsuzsa and Ruairí Brugha. "How to (or not to do)... A stakeholder analysis." *Health Policy and Planning* 15.3 (Sept 2000): 333-345.
- Clarkson, Max B.E. "A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance." *The Academy of Management Review* 20.1 (Jan 1995): 92-117. Pages 100-108 are most pertinent to our discussion.
- Preskill, Hallie and Nathalie Jones. *A Practical Guide for Engaging Stakeholders in Developing Evaluation Questions*. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF), 2009. 12

July 2016 <<http://www.rwjf.org/en/library/research/2009/12/a-practical-guide-for-engaging-stakeholders-in-developing-evalua.html>>.

- Putnam-Walkerly, Kris and Elizabeth Russell. "What the Heck Does 'Equity' Mean?" *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. 15 September 2016. Accessed 3 July 2017 from <https://ssir.org/articles/entry/what_the_heck_does_equity_mean>.

The following tip sheets are all very short and will be somewhat repetitive, but they offer insight into the variety of approaches to stakeholder analysis. A close read of all is not needed, but look for the differences and what is gained or lost through the differences.

- CDC. "Step 1: Engage Stakeholders" *Developing an Effective Evaluation Plan*. Atlanta, Georgia: CDC National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity, 2011: pp. 7-10. Accessed 6 July 2017 <<http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/downloads/cdc-evaluation-workbook-508.pdf>>.
- Asia Development Bank (ADB). "B. Undertake Stakeholder Analysis." *Guidelines for Preparing a Design and Monitoring Framework*. Manila, Philippines: ADB, 2016: p. 17. Accessed 3 July 2017 <<https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/institutional-document/32509/guidelines-preparing-dmf.pdf>>.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). "Stakeholder Engagement." *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring & Evaluating for Development Results*. New York: UNDP, 2009: pp. 25-31. 3 July 2016 <<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf>>.
- World Bank. Stakeholder Analysis Note. 13 July 2016 <<http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/politiceconomy/November3Seminar/Stakeholder%20Readings/CPHP%20Stakeholder%20Analysis%20Note.pdf>>.
- World Bank. What is stakeholder analysis? Pages 1-4. 13 July 2016. <<http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/PDFVersion.pdf>>
- Virk, Kulveer. Saliency Model – Stakeholder Analysis. 13 July 2016 <<https://virk.wordpress.com/tag/stakeholder-analysis/>>.

Additional readings and resources

- Segone, Marco and Jim Rugh (Ed.). *Evaluation and Civil Society: Stakeholders' perspectives on National Evaluation Capacity Development*. UNICEF, EvalPartners & IOCE, 2013. 11 July 2016 <[http://www.evalpartners.org/sites/default/files/library/selected/Evaluation and civil society v9 final web.pdf](http://www.evalpartners.org/sites/default/files/library/selected/Evaluation%20and%20civil%20society_v9_final_web.pdf)>.

Assignment 3 due to NYUClasses by **5pm September 25** – Draft stakeholder analysis (no more than 750 words. See notes for Assignment 2)

Session 4 (September 28) – Constraints & when is it ethical/appropriate to do an impact evaluation?; Begin needs assessment & theory of change
Review and discuss Assignment 3

Constraints & when is it ethical/appropriate to do an impact evaluation?

What constraints may exist to collecting data needed for effective monitoring and/or evaluation?

How might CART framework help?

When is it unethical to do an impact evaluation?

Needs assessment & theory of change

What are the needs you want to address with your program or policy? What is the change you want to achieve? Among what groups? In what setting? What do you think it will take to achieve this change (activities & outputs)? What have others identified as effective (literature review)?

What are SMART objectives?

Required readings

Constraints & when is it ethical/appropriate to do an impact evaluation?

- Gugerty & Karlan. "Introduction."
- Goldilocks Deep Dive: Organizational Challenges of Impact Evaluation. IPA, 2016. 22 June 2016. <http://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Goldilocks-Deep-Dive-Organizational-Challenges-of-Impact-Evaluation_0.pdf>.

Is there an unanswered question? Would evaluation results be responsible & transportable? Do you have sufficient capacity to achieve CART?

- Epstein, Diana and Jacob Alex Klerman. "When is a Program Ready for Rigorous Impact Evaluation? The Role of a Falsifiable Logic Model." *Evaluation Review* 36.5 (October 2012): 375-401.
- Bamberger, Michael. Conducting quality impact evaluations under budget, time and data constraints. World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), 2006. 11 July 2016 <<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2006/06/7287644/conducting-quality-impact-evaluations-under-budget-time-data-constraints>>. Nice summary table on page 23.

Come prepared to talk about what is lost and what is gained by making the adjustments discussed in the Bamberger article. Include review of the chart on page 23.

Needs assessment & theory of change

- Goldilocks Deep Dive: Guiding Your Program to Build a Theory of Change. IPA, 2016. 11 July 2016 <http://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Goldilocks-Toolkit-Theory-of-Change_0.pdf>.
- Wydick, Bruce. "Diagnosis and Development Impact." *Across Two Worlds*, June 22, 2016. 15 July 2016 <<http://www.acrosstwoworlds.net/?p=570>>. (Not just what but with whom and in what context!)

- Cooksy, Leslie J., Paige Gill and P. Adam Kelly. "The program logic model as an integrative framework for a multimethod evaluation." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 24.2 (2001): 119-128.
- Gosling, Louisa. "Chapter 6 – Assessment and Programme Planning." *Toolkits: A Practical Guide to Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment*. London: Save the Children, 2003: 68-91. 13 July 2016
<<http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/resources/online-library/toolkits-practical-guide-planning-monitoring-evaluation-and-impact>>.
- UNDP. "Finalizing the Results Framework (Deliverable Eight)." *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring & Evaluating for Development Results*. New York: UNDP, 2009: 53-73. 3 July 2017 <<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf>>.
- Guijt, Irene. ToC Reflection Notes 3: Working with Assumptions in a Theory of Change Process. Hivos Action Learning Community, March 2013. 23 June 2016
<http://www.theoryofchange.nl/sites/default/files/resource/toc_notes_3_working_with_assumptions_in_a_toc_process.pdf>.
- CDC. "Logic model" (page 98) *Developing an Effective Evaluation Plan*. Atlanta, Georgia: CDC National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity, 2011. 13 July 2016 <<http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/downloads/cdc-evaluation-workbook-508.pdf>>.
- CDC. Developing Program Goals and Measurable Objectives. 13 July 2016
<[https://www.cdc.gov/std/Program/pupestd/Developing Program Goals and Objectives.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/std/Program/pupestd/Developing%20Program%20Goals%20and%20Objectives.pdf)>.
- Kellogg Foundation. "SMART." *Logic Model Development Guide*. Battle Creek MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation, January 2004: 17. 21 July 2016 <<https://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide>>.

Additional readings and resources

- Rugh, Jim. Rosetta stone of logical frameworks. Care International and InterAction's Evaluation Interest Group. 13 July 2016
<<http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/Rosettastone.doc>>.
- Kellogg Foundation. *Logic Model Development Guide*. Battle Creek MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation, January 2004. 21 July 2016 <<https://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide>>.
- Better Evaluation. "Defining what is to be evaluated." 13 July 2016
<http://betterevaluation.org/en/plan/define/develop_initial_description>.
- Center for theory of change: <http://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/>

Assignment 4 due to NYUClasses by **5pm October 2** – Explain why you chose M vs E for your plan – What do you hope to learn? How do you want it used (actionable)? (Use is theoretical at this point. How to implement its use is for later.) No more than 500 words.

Session 5 (October 5) – Continue needs assessment & theory of change; Indicators & measurement tools – CART indicators and theory of change
Review and discuss Assignment 4

Continue needs assessment & theory of change

On what assumptions does this model rely? I.e., why do you think your activities will achieve your goal? How best test your assumptions? (Remember the discussions on human-centered design?)

Indicators & measurement tools: credible data

What do you need to know?:

What is an indicator? Why do we want to track and/or measure these?

How can theory of change guide which indicators to collect?

How measure it accurately?:

Problems with measurement (biases in measurement)...

How can measurement be biased?

Are you measuring what you claim to be measuring (validity)?

Is your measurement reliable, repeatable?

How apply understanding of these to monitoring?

How apply to evaluation?

We will discuss how to develop measurement tools later in the semester. This section is to look at how systematic error can be present when measurement tools are poorly designed or used.

Required readings

Indicators & measurement tools

- Wheelan: 110-126; 178-183; 224. See also 219 on multicollinearity and 221-224 on data mining.
- Rossi: 183-185; 266-279.
- Weiss: 48-71; 136-151.
- Gugerty & Karlan: "Characteristics of high quality data."
- Goldilocks Toolkit: Impact Measurement with the CART Principles. IPA, 2016. 22 July 2016 <<http://www.poverty-action.org/publication/goldilocks-toolkit-impact-measurement-with-cart-principles>>.
- Frechtling, Joy. *The 2002 User Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation* National Science Foundation (NSF), 2002: p. 12, descriptions of performance indicators; pp. 25-31, discussion of errors and comparison groups, etc. Accessed 6 July 2017 <http://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/17870/1/The_2002_user_friendly_handbook_for_project_evaluation.pdf>.
- Twersky, Fay. "What's in a Measure? – Review of Sally Engle's Merry's *The Seductions of Quantification: Measuring Human Rights, Gender Violence, and Sex Trafficking*. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* Summer 2016. 21 July 2016 <http://ssir.org/book_reviews/entry/whats_in_a_measure>.

- Gray, Bobbi. "Measuring Transformation." Center for Financial Inclusion/Accion, 15 April 2015. Accessed 6 July 2017 <<https://cfi-blog.org/2015/04/15/measuring-transformation/>>.
- Gray, Bobbi. "The Heart and Science of Client Assessment." Center for Financial Inclusion/Accion, 15 July 2016. Accessed 6 July 2017 <<https://cfi-blog.org/2016/07/15/the-heart-and-science-of-client-assessment/>>.

Additional readings and resources

- Goldilocks. Resources for Finding and Using Evidence Reviews and Evaluations. IPA, 2016 4 July 2017 <[https://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Resources for Data Collection and Storage.pdf](https://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Resources%20for%20Data%20Collection%20and%20Storage.pdf)>.

The resources in this document are a start when looking to develop questions, indicators and metric for your own projects and evaluations.

- UK Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC). "Question Bank Factsheet 7: Developing Indicators for Concepts." Accessed 24 October 2016 <https://www.ukdataservice.ac.uk/media/262823/discover_developingindicatorsforconceptsfactsheet.pdf>.
- Deworming experiment: Michael Kremer and Edward Miguel. The Illusion of Sustainability." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122.3 (August 2007): 1007-1065.

Assignment 5 due to NYUClasses by **5pm October 9** – Draft description of your theory of change for your program. Use a standard format for theory of change, such as the one found on page 4 of Kellogg Foundation's *Logic Model Development Guide* or pages 98-101 of the CDC's *Developing an Effective Evaluation Plan*. Use the Goldilocks approach and definitions (See Session slides posted to NYUClasses.) Map it. Tie an activity to its output and outcome. You are not required to include description of your assumptions for Assignment 5.

Session 6 (October 12) – Continue measurement tools; Systems and structures to find our answers: Monitoring & process evaluation
Review and discuss of Assignment 5

Measurement tools

More on validity and reliability of tools

Monitoring & process evaluation

Why monitor? What gain does the cost of monitoring bring? How balance cost and gain?

Who gets this benefit?

What to monitor?

"Evaluative thinking" even while monitoring

What is a process evaluation? What does it illuminate? How does it differ from monitoring?

Process evaluation approaches

Required readings

Monitoring and process evaluation

- Goldilocks Toolkit: Monitoring for Learning and Accountability. IPA, 2016. 23 June 2016 <<http://www.poverty-action.org/publication/goldilocks-toolkit-monitoring-learning-and-accountability>>
- Weiss: 8-10; 32-33; 48-51; 130-136; 181-182.
- Rossi: 170-200.
- Saunders, Ruth P., Martin H. Evans and Praphul Joshi. "Developing a Process-Evaluation Plan for Assessing Health Promotion Program Implementation: A How-To Guide." *Health Promotion Practice* 6.2 (April 2005): 134-147.
- **Note to KWA: Get another resource on how to do process evaluations**

Additional readings and resources

- IPA. "Goldilocks Resource: Resources for Monitoring." 2016. <[http://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Resources for Monitoring.pdf](http://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Resources%20for%20Monitoring.pdf)>.
- JPAL. Program Theory and Measuring Outcomes. Case Study 1: Encouraging Community-Based Monitoring of Healthcare in Uganda. <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/resources/RevisedCase1_CommunityMonitoringUganda.pdf>.

Assignment 6 due to NYUClasses by **5pm October 16** – Revised draft description of your theory of change for your program. Build on Assignment 5. Add the assumptions that underlie your model and revise your model accordingly. Include discussion of how you would test your assumptions. Where is your consideration of human-centered design – how will you learn from those who know best? (No more than 300 words on how test assumptions)

Session 7 (October 19) – Finish monitoring & process evaluation; Systems and structures to find our answers: Impact evaluation/research design – RCTs and quasi-experimental design

Review and discuss of Assignment 6

Finish process evaluation

Impact evaluation/research design

Biases in design

Which research designs get you what... how might we achieve a counterfactual?

Research design threats to accurate (credible) measurement of impact?

Threats to accuracy when gathering data?

Threats to internal validity?

Threats to external validity (generalizability)?

Necessary but not sufficient?

Ethics and equipoise (again) What's in it for them?

Experimental design – Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) as solution

Counterfactual

Randomization to create equivalent groups

Unit of randomization

Statistical power (sample size, variation & effect size)

Necessary but not sufficient

Attrition

Maturation

Context, trends and threats to external validity

Spillover

Role of multivariate regressions, variability and omitted variable bias; subgroups

What an RCT does NOT tell you!

Required readings

Theory of Change

- ActKnowledge and the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. Theory of Change Guided Example: Project Superwomen, 2004. Accessed 13 October 2016 <https://www.theoryofchange.org/pdf/Superwomen_Example.pdf>.

Other than Impact

- Goldilocks Deep Dive: Introduction to Rapid-Fire Operational Testing for Social Programs. IPA, 2016. 28 July 2016 <<http://www.poverty-action.org/publication/introduction-rapid-fire-operational-testing-social-programs>>.

Impact evaluation/research design

- Watch Esther Duflo's TED Talk on foreign aid and evaluation: <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0zvrgiPkVcs>> (17 minutes)
- Wheelan: 79-80, 110-126; 178-180. (randomization)
- Wheelan: 79-80; 138-139; 145; 156-160. (statistical power & representativeness)
- Karlan & Appel: 62-69 (statistical power)
- Wheelan: 220-221. (external validity & generalizability)
- Gugerty & Karlan: "Unit of Analysis"
- Wheelan: 185-196. (unit of analysis)
- Rossi: 274-275.
- Weiss: 185-186; 213-234.
- JPAL. "Experimental Methodology Table." 20 June 2016 <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/documents/Experimental_Methodology_Table.pdf>.

Study this table carefully! Each entry matters to understanding the issues around research to identify impact

- Pannucci, Christopher & Edwin G. Wilkins. "Identifying and Avoiding Bias in Research." *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* 126.2 (August 2010): 619-625. Accessed 27 July 2017 <<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2917255/>>.

Easy to read explanations designed for practitioners rather than scientists.

- Duflo, Esther, Rachel Glennerster, and Michael Kremer. 2004. "Randomized Evaluations of Interventions in Social Science Delivery." Development Outreach March 2004. 12 July 2016 <<https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/documents/random-eval.pdf>>.
- Goldilocks Deep Dive: Organizational Challenges of Impact Evaluation. IPA, 2016. 28 July 2016 <<http://www.poverty-action.org/publication/organizational-challenges-impact-evaluation>>.

Additional readings and resources

- Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis and Interpretation*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2012
- Glennerster, Rachel and Kudzai Takavarasha. *Running Randomized Evaluations: A Practical Guide*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Both the Gerber & Green and Glennerster & Takavarasha texts offer detailed descriptions of research designs to answer different questions, how to do credible RCTs. Glennerster & Takavarasha emphasize research design. Gerber & Green have more on the statistical analysis. These are important text should you plan to work on RCTs.

- Cohen, Jessica & Pascaline Dupas. "Free distribution or cost-sharing? Evidence from a randomized malaria prevention experiment." *The Quarterly Journal Of Economics* 125.1 (February 2010): 1-45.

This is the study mentioned by Esther Duflo in the TEDTalk on the value of free bednets to combating malaria.

- Dupas, Pascaline & Jonathan Robinson. "Why Don't the Poor Save More? Evidence from Health Savings Experiments." *American Economic Review* 103.4 (2013): 1138–1171.

This is an example of an RCT as an R&D experiment, using four different treatment modalities.

- United States General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation & Methodology Division. *Designing Evaluations*. March 1991. Accessed 1 November 2016 from <http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/10_1_4.pdf>.

Nice summary of approaches to evaluation; writing overseen by one of the pioneers of evaluation.

Assignment 7 due to NYU Classes **5pm October 23** – Initial layout of CART indicators for your M or E plan. What indicators, how will you measure them (what data gathering tool and what metric) and one to three sentences for each indicator on why these indicators? Tie them to your theory of change – Why is it important to measure this?

Note on Assignment 7: When performing this exercise (for the assignment or in life), the best approach is to look all along your theory of change (activities to outputs to outcomes) to identify what matters most to achieving your program goals/outcomes. What are the assumptions underlying these? Think, how do I define these critical pieces? How would I

measure them? How would I gather these measurements in the field so that the results are not biased? If the answer to these questions is not obvious, think, who else might have wanted to investigate this question in a different setting? What did they do? How did they measure and gather the data? In short, who are the agencies and researchers interested in producing credible data on this topic, and what have they done in these circumstances? How did they gather data to answer their questions? These considerations will help with developing indicators and metrics.

That said, while you can see another's indicators in their findings report, they often do not share their data gathering tool. Alternately, what is shared may not fit your circumstance and needs.

No matter what, your imagination remains your first and most important tool. How do I define this concept, and how might I measure that accurately?

Session 8 (October 26) – More on impact evaluation/research design – RCTs & quasi-experimental design
Review and discuss Assignment 7

More on RCTs

Quasi-experimental designs (nonequivalent comparison groups)
Not quite counterfactuals but often close enough

Required readings

- Karlan & Appel: 29-39
- JPAL. "Experimental Methodology Table." 20 June 2016
<[https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/documents/Experimental Methodology Table.pdf](https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/documents/Experimental%20Methodology%20Table.pdf)>.

Yes, please read this over again, seeking to absorb what lies beneath the claims

- Gillespie, Colleen. *Research Designs*, 2009.

A visual description of the JPAL list and the Weiss descriptions. Shows how each design is implemented.

- Weiss: 191-214
- Rossi: 289-300
- Finkelstein, Amy, Sarah Taubman, Bill Wright, Mira Bernstein, Jonathan Gruber, Joseph P. Newhouse, Heidi Allen, Katherine Baicker, and Oregon Health Study Group. "The Oregon Health Insurance Experiment: Evidence from the First Year." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127.3 (2012 August): 1057–1106. Accessed 10 October 2016
<<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3535298/>>

It is not necessary to scrutinize the discussions of economic formulas. Rather concentrate on the experimental/quasi-experimental design and why they can claim a valid counterfactual. Also pay attention to their main findings.

- Taubman, Sarah L., Heidi L. Allen, Bill J. Wright, Katherine Baicker & Amy N. Finkelstein. "Medicaid Increases Emergency-Department Use: Evidence from Oregon's Health Insurance Experiment." *Science* 343.6168 (17 January 2014): 263-268. Accessed 10 October <<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3955206/>>.

This article is from the same team and using the same data as the Finkelstein article but investigating a different aspect and later in the process. Again, no need for a close read, unless you want to. Instead please consider the answers to these questions: What does the finding that people increased use of emergency rooms tell us? (This is the opposite result than the anticipated one.) What causal story may lead to this result?

- Jensen, Robert. "(Perceived) returns to education & demand for schooling." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 125.2 (May 2010): 515-548.

This article here is because it found different impact from the intervention among different income groups. Isolating impact among subgroups requires larger samples, but isolating subgroups can be essential to identifying whether a program has the intended impact, and especially, among whom. Again, no need for a close read.

Additional readings and resources

- Raghobendra Chattopadhyay and Esther Duflo. 2004. Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India. *Econometrica* 72.5 (September, 2004), 1409-1443.

Another example of randomized delivery of services that provides a valid counterfactual but which was not designed as an experiment.

- Jensen, Robert & Emily Oster. The power of TV: Cable television and women's status in India." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124.3 (August 2009): 1057-1094.
- La Ferrara, Eliana, Alberto Chong & Suzanne Duryea. "Soap Operas and Fertility: Evidence from Brazil." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 4.4 (October 2012): 1-31.

Two examples of using difference in difference to identify impact, along with triangulation to confirm causal inferences.

- Duflo Esther. "Schooling and Labor Market Consequences of School Construction in Indonesia: Evidence from an Unusual Policy Experiment." *American Economic Review* 91.4 (September 2001): 795-813.

An example of the use of regression discontinuity to isolate impact, using additional data to confirm causation.

- Evans, David. "What's new in education research? Impact evaluations and measurement – October round-up." World Bank Development Impact blog. Accessed 29 October 2016 <<http://blogs.worldbank.org/impac evaluations/what-s-new-education-research-impact-evaluations-and-measurement-october-round>>.

World Bank summary of impact & R&D findings in education innovations. It offers examples of M&E science thoughtfully done (credible) and shared (transportable).

Assignment 8 due to NYUClasses by **5pm October 30** – Describe any ethical concerns to your plan, to your research design? Is there equipoise? Respect for persons? Beneficence? Justice?). What about your approaches to gathering data? Do they create any risk of harm to program participants, administrators or key stakeholders, etc. Also describe the steps you will take to eliminate or mitigate those risks. For this draft, use no more than 400 words.

Session 9 (November 2) – How to gather our answers: Data sources and gathering your own.

Review and discuss Assignment 8

Data gathering

Biases in data gathering... sampling, gathering tools and gathering methods

Qualitative vs quantitative data

What are they?

What each gives you that the other cannot.

When do mixed methods add?

Data sources:

Public data, process data (monitoring), measurements, observations, surveys, interviews (highly-structured & semi-structured), and focus groups.

How to gather?

Vulnerable populations, sensitive information, informal economies...

Integrate into operations? What's in it for me?! – Those who gather and those who give

Required readings

- Kellogg Foundation. Evaluation Handbook. 2004: pp. 72-87. 23 June 2016
<<https://www.wkcf.org/resource-directory/resource/2010/w-k-kellogg-foundation-evaluation-handbook>>. (Qual vs quant & gathering your own; great layman's summary).
- Weiss: 152-163. (Data sources and gathering your own).
- Collins, Daryl, Jonathan Morduch, Stuart Rutherford and Orlanda Ruthven. *Portfolios of the poor: How the world's poor live on \$2 a day*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009: pp. 185-189; 197; 205-210. (Real world example.)
- Patton, Michael Quinn. "Qualitative Research." *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*, Vol 3. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2005: 1633-1636.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. "Enhancing the Quality and Credibility of Qualitative Analysis." *Health Services Research* 34.5 Part II (December 1999): pp. 1189-1208.
- Chen, Huey-tsyh. "Applying Mixed Methods Under the Framework of Theory-Driven Evaluations." *New Directions in Evaluation* 74 (Summer 1997): 61-72. (Figure 5.1 offers a nice summary.)
- Jick, Todd D. "Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods – Triangulation in action." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24.4 (December 1979): 602-611

- Feeney, Laura, et al. Using Administrative Data for Randomized Evaluations. JPAL North America, 2015. 4 July 2017
<<https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/resources/2017.02.07-Admin-Data-Guide.pdf>>. See also <<https://www.povertyactionlab.org/na/administrative-data-and-evaluation-guides>>.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. Qualitative Evaluation Checklist. September 2003. Accessed 1 November 2016 <<http://irantvto.ir/uploads/qec.pdf>>.

Data gathering tools

- Karlan & Appel: 51-61

Surveys

Moore, D. W. "Measuring new types of question-order effects: Additive and subtractive." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66.1 (March 2002): 80–91.

Additional readings and resources

- Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 2015. (3rd Edition is available for far less money. Patton is a leading evaluation theorists and an authority on qualitative evaluation. His book is dense but worth the money and time.)
- Ritchie, Jane and Jane Lewis (Ed.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 2003. 18 July 2016 <http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Ritchie_2003.pdf>.

These two are large books. If you end up working in M&E, the Patton is well worth the money.

- Goldilocks Resource: Resources for Data Collection and Storage. IPA, 2016.
<[https://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Resources for Data Collection and Storage.pdf](https://www.poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/publications/Resources%20for%20Data%20Collection%20and%20Storage.pdf)>.

This offers ideas on physical tools to collect and store data.

- Corbin, Juliet & Anselm Strauss. "Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria." *Qualitative Sociology* 13.1 (1990): 3-21.

Summary article from primary developers of the grounded theory approach to research.

Assignment 9 due to NYUClasses by **5pm November 6** – Draft data gathering and data analysis plans. Use no more than 750 words.

Session 10 (November 9) – More on data gathering tools
Review and discuss Assignment 9

Qualitative data gathering tools

We will do only an overview of these tools. Creating and performing these so that they gather credible, reliable data involves considerable study and testing.

More on representativeness

More on data gathering tools

Surveys

Interviews

Focus Groups

Observations

Coding and summarizing responses

Required readings

Data gathering

- Representative samples – Wheelan: 141-142; 188; 195-196.
- Rogelberg, Steven G. and Jeffrey M. Stanton. "Introduction: Understanding and Dealing With Organizational Survey Nonresponse." *Organizational Research Methods* 10.2 (April 2007): 195-209.
- Karlan & Appel: 73-83; 92-93. (Must create "space" for those who are to gather your data. This is about additional duties for those implementing the new program, but the concern applies similarly when we add data gathering to program staff's current tasks.)
- Karlan & Appel: 94-104. (Contamination, representative samples and incentives gone awry.)

Data gathering tools

- Weiss: 252-269 (Qual methods generally)
- Frechtling, Joy. *The 2002 User Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation* National Science Foundation (NSF), 2002: 31-34. (Basic data collection instructions).
- The CDC has a number of short but valuable descriptions and checklists for various data collection methods on its Adolescent and School Health Program Evaluation site <<http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/Evaluation/index.htm>>. These offer a nice overview of various data collection methods, including when each is a better choice to gather the data you want. Give these a look.

Surveys

- Dillman, Don A. *et al.* "Response rate and measurement differences in mixed-mode surveys using mail, telephone, interactive voice response (IVR) and the Internet." *Social Science Research* 38.1 (March 2009): 1-18.
- Presser, Stanley *et al.* "Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questions." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68.1 (March 2004): 109-130.
- Collins, Debbie. "Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods." *Quality of Life Research* 12.3 (May 2003): 229-238.

The Presser *et al* reading and the Collins article discuss the same issue from different perspectives. For now, these may be skimmed rather than requiring a close read. The purpose of including both is to give you the two perspectives and to reinforce that preparing a credible (valid and reliable) survey is difficult, which is also demonstrated in the Moore article from last week.

- Wheelan: 180-183

Interviews

- Britten, Nicky. Qualitative interviews in medical research." *British Medical Journal* 311.7000 (29 July 1995): 251-253.
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWFJ). Interviews. 18 July 2016 <<http://www.qualres.org/HomeInte-3595.html>>.
- ——. Structured interviews. 18 July 2016. <<http://www.qualres.org/HomeStru-3628.html>>.
- ——. Semi-structured interviews. 18 July 2016 <<http://www.qualres.org/HomeSemi-3629.html>>.

Additional readings and resources

- RWJF. Interviews. 18 July 2016 <<http://www.qualres.org/HomeInte-3595.html>>. Like the CDC guides, these are simple, concise descriptions of various data gathering tools and their uses.
- Grosh, Margaret and Paul Glewwe. *Designing Household Survey Questionnaires for Developing Countries: Lessons from 15 Years of the Living Standards Measurement Study*. 3 vols. Washington DC: World Bank, 2000. 28 July 2016 <<http://go.worldbank.org/ZAWINK6M10>>.
- Tourangeau, Roger and Thomas J. Plewes. *Nonresponse in Social Science Surveys: A Research Agenda*. Washington DC: The National Academies Press (NAP), 2013. 4 October 2013 <<http://www.nap.edu/catalog/18293/nonresponse-in-social-science-surveys-a-research-agenda>>. (This book may be downloaded for free after registering with NAP, also free. Pages 40-50 are particularly on point to our discussion.)
- Tourangeau, Roger, Kenneth A. Rasinski, Norman Bradburn & Roy D'Andrade. "Carryover effects in attitude surveys." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 53.4 (Winter 1989): 495-524.
- Minigan L., Survey Monkey blog. "Pros & Cons of Scrolling and Multiple Pages in Surveys." 7 April 2016. 26 July 2016 <https://www.surveymonkey.com/blog/2016/04/07/pros-cons-of-scrolling-and-multiple-pages-in-surveys/?adid=&utm_campaign=RE_NL&utm_content=survey.86205&source=&utm_source=&recent=&utm_medium=SM_CRM_MKTG_PA&program=&family=&cvosrc=email-rps.sm_nl.survey.8620>.
- Dillman, Don A., Jolene D. Smyth & Leah Melani Christian. *Internet, mail & mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. 3rd ed. Hoboken NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2009. Available on NYUClasses, pages 1-2; 23-28; 65-71; 105-106; 157-164.
- Hinkin, Timothy R. "A Brief Tutorial on the Development of Measures for Use in Survey Questionnaires." *Organizational Research Methods* 1.1 (January 1998): 104-121.

- Pohlmann, Tom & Neethi Mary Thomas. "Relearning the Art of Asking Questions." *Harvard Business Review*. March 27, 2015. <<https://hbr.org/2015/03/relearning-the-art-of-asking-questions>>.
- Payne, Stanley L. *The art of asking questions*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1951. Free download available at <<https://archive.org/details/artofquestioning>>. (Foundational text on interviews in social science research.)
- Schlink, Frederick J. "Variance of measuring instruments and its relation to accuracy and sensitivity." *Bulletin of the Bureau of Standards* 14 (July 1919): 741-764. Accessed 7 November 2016 from <<https://archive.org/details/var147417641919328328schl> or <http://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/bulletin/14/nbsbulletinv14n4p741_A2b.pdf>.

More on what is meant by "sensitivity" in a measurement tool. Can it measure change?

Session 11 (November 16) – More on qualitative data gathering tools
Finish data gathering tools

Required readings

Observations

- McLeod, Saul A. *Observation Methods*. 2015. Accessed on 28 October 2016 from <<http://www.simplypsychology.org/observation.html>>.
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF). *Observation*. 28 October 2016 <<http://www.qualres.org/HomeObse-3594.html>>.
- CDC. "Data Collection Methods for Program Evaluation: Observations." *Evaluation Briefs* 16 (December 2008). 27 October 2016 <<https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/evaluation/pdf/brief16.pdf>>.

McLeod, RWJF & CDC offer layman's guides to observation, in general, simple, accessible terms.

- Patton, 4th ed: 353-357; 364-380; 383; 387-391.
- Altmann, Jeanne. *Observational Study of Behavior: Sampling Methods.* *Behaviour* 49.3/4 (1974): 227-267 (Major paper but close read is not needed.)
- Danny L. Jorgensen. "Participant Observation." *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource*. Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2015. (A major author on this approach. A close read is not necessary.)

Focus groups

- Kitzinger, Jenny. "Introducing focus groups." *British Medical Journal* 311.7000 (29 July 1995): 299-302.

- Kidd, Pamela S. and Mark B. Parshall. "Getting the Focus and the Group: Enhancing Analytical Rigor in Focus Group Research." *Qualitative Health Research* 10.3 (May 2000): 293-308. 18 July 2016
<https://moodle.med.lu.se/pluginfile.php/16690/course/section/3465/Fokusgrupp_Kidd_Parshall_2000.pdf>.
- Rabiee, Fatemeh. "Focus-group interview and data analysis." *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 63.04 (November 2004): 655–660.
- Basch, Charles E. "Focus Group Interview: An Underutilized Research Technique for Improving Theory and Practice in Health Education." *Health Education Quarterly* 14.4 (Winter 1987): 411-449.
- CDC. "Data Collection Methods for Program Evaluation: Focus Groups." *Evaluation Briefs* 13 (July 2008). 20 July 2016
<<https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/evaluation/pdf/brief13.pdf>>.
- Sinickas, Angela D. "How many focus groups do you need?" *Total Communication Measurement*, April 2000. 18 July 2016 <<http://www.sinicom.com/subpages/pubs/articles/article11.htm>>.

Additional readings and resources

- Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Los Angeles: Sage Publishing, 2012. 18 July 2016
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=bgekGK_xpYsC&oi=fnd&pp=PR15&ots=tH9DnMrbPb&sig=QKP1PeknH-5J9-avLRTR4P0d1fs-v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- Becker, Howard S. & Blanche Geer. "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison." *Human Organization* 16.3 (Fall 1957): 28-32.

Monitoring or Evaluation plan due to NYUClasses by **5pm November 20**. Please submit both a Word version and a pdf version of the document.

School closed November 23

Session 12 (November 30) – Data visualization; Integrate monitoring and evaluation into organization structures to improve program effectiveness.

Review and discuss Monitoring or Evaluation Plan assignment

Data visualization – Making data accessible to nondata geeks – Guest presenter

Approaches to developing a learning organization

Lecture/discussion, Guest presenter

Required readings

Data visualization

- Explore Gapminder World: <<https://www.gapminder.org/world/>> and <<https://www.gapminder.org/tools/bubbles>>. Consider how it makes change over time

and relative population size easier to comprehend.

Learning organizations

- CDC. "Step 6: Planning for Dissemination and Sharing of Lessons Learned." *Developing an Effective Evaluation Plan*. Atlanta, Georgia: CDC National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity, 2011: pp. 33-37 13 July 2016
<<http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/downloads/cdc-evaluation-workbook-508.pdf>>.
- Hovland, Ingie. "Successful Communication: A Toolkit for Researchers and Civil Society Organisations." Overseas Development Institute (ODI), 2005: pp. 19-28. 13 July 2016
<<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/192.pdf>>.
- Gertler, Paul J., Sebastian Martinez, Patrick Premand, Laura B. Rawlings and Christel M. J. Vermeersch. "Chapter 13-Producing and Disseminating Findings." *Impact Evaluation in Practice*. Washington DC: World Bank, 2011: pp. 211-222. 14 July 2016
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTHDOFFICE/Resources/5485726-1295455628620/Impact_Evaluation_in_Practice.pdf>.
- UNDP. "8.2 Learning and generating knowledge from monitoring and evaluation." *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring & Evaluating for Development Results*. New York: UNDP, 2009: pp. 182-189. 4 July 2017
<<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf>>.

Additional readings and resources on data visualization

- NYU Library Data Visualization Resources. <<http://guides.nyu.edu/viz>>. (Guides, instructions, links to outside resources.)
- Nathan Yau and his blog Flowingdata <<http://flowingdata.com/>>
- Data is beautiful (blog) <<https://www.reddit.com/r/dataisbeautiful/>>.
- Gapminder videos <<https://www.gapminder.org/videos/>>
- Stephanie Evergreen, her blog <<http://stephanieevergreen.com/>> and her book, [Effective Data Visualization](#)
- Ann K. Emery and her blog <<http://annkemery.com/>>
- Chris Lysy and EvalCentral <<http://evalcentral.com/>>
- Visual illustration that "correlation is not causation." <<http://tylervigen.com/spurious-correlations>>
- If you have a favorite data visualization resource, let me know and I will share it with your colleagues

Additional readings and resources on learning organizations

- IRC. "How we use evidence" <<https://www.rescue.org/page/how-we-use-evidence>>, "Outcomes and Evidence Framework." <<https://www.rescue.org/resource/outcomes-and-evidence-framework>>.

- Siahpush, Ameneé, Jo Sanson and Matthew Bombyk. Pathways out of Poverty for the Ultrapoorest. TrickleUp Research Brief, June 2016. 20 July 2016 <<http://trickleup.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Ford-Pathways-Report-Research-Brief-FINAL.pdf>>. (This is an example of one use of monitoring data to advance organization goals.)

Assignment 10 due to NYUClasses by **5pm December 5** – Initial draft outline/discussion of Engagement plan. Layout of your ideas in a logical order.

Session 13 (December 7) – Learning organizations continued
Review and discuss Assignment 10

Learning organizations continued

Required readings

- Apltauer, Kathleen Wetzel. Consolidation of sources on developing a learning organization (2010).

This is an annotated list of bullet points put together to feed into a white paper I prepared for an organization deciding on when and how to scale up. While the context is scale up, the concepts apply to any organization seeking to incorporate evidence into its practice so that it may grow in quality and effectiveness. The sources and page numbers for the content are included (endnotes). The resources are posted to NYUClasses under Session 12. Please read the pages identified.

- Karlan & Appel, 44-50 (What's in it for them?!)

Engagement plan due to NYU Classes by **5pm December 11**.

Session 14 (December 14) – Discussion, review and wrap up.
Review and discuss Engagement plan

Discussion, review and wrap up of the course. What next?