

Evaluation of Peacebuilding and Development for Practitioners and Donors
DHP 226m
January 2 -11, 2018

Instructor: Professor Scharbatke-Church
Course: Evaluation of Peacebuilding and Development for Practitioners and Donors: DHP 226m
Classroom: Mugar 200 & Night class Mugar 231
Class Times: 9.15 – 12.00 (see table below for exceptions & specifics)
Study Group: Crowe Room
SG Times: 3.30 & 4.20
TA/RA: Maria Selde: maria.selde@tufts.edu
Office: Mugar 232A

Course Overview

The course provides an in-depth, very practical preparation for conceptualizing evaluation needs from a program implementation or donor perspective. The core concepts will be applied primarily to international development and peacebuilding programming. This skills-oriented course should be taken by any student wishing to work in the development or peacebuilding fields. Students must have taken Design and Monitoring (DHP 225m) in order to register for this course. This module is a prerequisite for the Advanced Seminar on Evaluation and Learning for International Organisations (DHP P228m) and Evaluation Colloquium.

Course Format

All students, regardless of section, will attend the same morning lecture(s) in **Mugar 200**. DHP 225M is made up of 13 classes (or lectures) of one hour and fifteen minutes per class, running from January 2 until January 11, 2018 with a final class on January 16. To enable this intensive structure, the course will alternate between one and two classes/day; as per the lecture schedule table below. Attendance at class is required.

As a rule of thumb, classes will be held: 9.15 – 10.30 & 10.45 – 12.00. There are a number of **exceptions**, so please pay careful attention to the schedule below.

Session	Date	Time
Session 1 & 2	Tuesday, January 2	12.00 – 3.30 (includes lunch at 1.00)
Session 3	Wednesday, January 3	9.15 – 10.30
Guest Speaker	Wednesday, January 3	1.00 – 2.00
Session 4 & 5	Thursday, January 4	9.15 – 12.00
Session 6	Friday, January 5	10.30 -12.00
Session 7	Monday, January 8	10.45 – 12.00
Session 8 & 9	Tuesday, January 9	9.15 – 12.00
Session 10	Wednesday, January 10	10.45 – 12.00
Session 11 & 12	Thursday, January 11	9.15 – 12.00
Session 13	Tuesday, January 16	5.30 – 7.00

Supported Learning Opportunities

Similar to design, the application of evaluation concepts is harder than grasping the meaning of the concept. Therefore, in addition to class time there will be three out-of-class opportunities provided by Professor Scharbatke-Church and her TA for students to get additional support.

Study Group Discussions: Students will be assigned to one of three optional study groups. The study group discussions are intended to apply concepts and entertain questions in a small group format with dedicated time from the Professor. A group ***focal point*** will be selected for each group to act as a coordinator and point of contact for incoming student's questions about how to function in the school. A student volunteer will take notes of the discussion and post it on canvas.

Each group will meet for 45 minutes in the ***Crowe Room***. The table below indicates which groups meet on each day. Discussions will start at 3.30 and 4.20. For example where it states 'A & B' under Study Group in the left column below, Group A will meet at 3.30 to 4.15 and Group B will meet at 4.20 to 5.05. *The timing of the final Thursday with Group C is TBD.*

Study Group	Date	Material to discuss
A & B	Thursday, January 4	Foundation decisions & Evaluation Terms of Reference
C	Friday, January 5	Foundation decisions & Evaluation Terms of Reference
A & B	Monday, January 8	Q&A
C	Tuesday, January 9	Q&A
A & B	Wednesday January 10	Social Impact Evaluation
C	Thursday January 11	Social Impact Evaluation

For the E course study group has **preparatory work** to do prior to class.

Session 1: Please review the following TORs and identify their strengths and weaknesses and bring to study group to discuss.

- Eurasia Foundation, *Terms of Reference for a Mid-Term Evaluation Equal before Law: Access to Justice in Central Asia Program* July 13, 2012.
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, *Strategy Evaluation of the Pakistan Hindukush Programme (PHP) 2010 – 2014, Terms of Reference for the Consultant*, 2014.

Session 2: Evaluation Approaches. Study Group Case

Session 3: Read the main document (pages 1- 46) with particular attention to the process and methodology. Come prepared to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation process and product.

- Abu-Nimer, Mohammed and Richard Blue, *Final Evaluation: The Sri Lanka Transition Initiative (2003-2007)*: USAID, March 9, 2007.

Office Hours: Professor Scharbatke-Church will offer office hours in M232A as time permits. The specific times will be posted on her door and students can sign up on a first come, first serve basis. Students are requested to be conscientious to others and remove themselves from the list if they no longer need the slot so that others can sign up. Once the class sessions are finished, office hours will continue virtually on Skype. Sign-up instructions and expectations for virtual office hours can be found at: <http://doodle.com/poll/62e2k2s4gu7hchz9>.

Canvas Discussion: There will be an online discussion forum hosted on the class Canvas site. This will help address questions about concepts discussed in class, quiz or worksheet questions, or general questions about assignments. Students can access the forum by signing into the class Canvas site, clicking on Discussions on the left-hand side of the site, and either starting a new discussion or adding to an existing one. Questions will be answered on discussions so that all students are able to access the information. Note: canvas discussion participation is included in your participation grade.

Course Requirements

1. Structured Review Process

All students will be expected to have completed the Structured Review process **prior to** the first day of classes. This process consists of a reading pack with practice questions and an online quiz. Quiz completion is achieved by receiving at least 25 correct answers out of 29 on the Review Quiz. The quiz can be taken as many times as necessary in order to get the required score; no later than **Sunday, December 31, 2017.**

2. Course Reading

You are expected to **read** 3-6 texts per class: typically, this amounts to between 50-75 pages. It is anticipated that students will be prepared for class in such a way that they can apply the material to the course discussion. Your participation in class is critical to your ultimate success in the course.

Given the pace of the 2018 schedule it is highly recommended that students do as much pre-reading ahead of the first class as possible.

Due to limited class time it is likely that there will be times when all questions are not able to be dealt during the class as the priority is to work through the new material. Therefore, students are expected to **utilize office hours** or the **canvas discussions** to explore their questions. This is generally a more effective format to tease out nuance and clarify concepts. Whether you have one simple, basic question or ten big ones, office hours and the discussions on canvas are precisely for this purpose – answering questions!

3. Assignments

a.) Quizzes: 10%

During the 2-week intensive class time, two quizzes will be used to test and apply basic knowledge of concepts. Each effort will be worth 5%.

b.) Participation: 5%

Participation will be based on professional conduct throughout the course, contributing to discussion (class, study group or Discussions) and peer reviews from teamwork. Peer reviews are confidential and guidance will be circulated at the end of the class. Peer reviews are due **Monday, January 29 by noon** in hard copy in 2 envelopes – one per team -- to Sheryl at Fletcher Reception.

c.) Projects

While the quizzes will review students' knowledge of basic concepts, the three assignments will require students to apply the concepts to real peacebuilding and development projects. These assignments will be completed in small teams put together by the Professor based on the bios received. To the best of our ability the assignments place students in situations that require them to hone practical skill-sets.

Assignment One (35%): Working in teams in the role of NGO staff who are responsible for implementing a program, students will develop an Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) for their project (either SFCG or CU). Teams will be created by Prof Scharbatke-Church. More information will be forthcoming in an assignment briefing paper.

Due: Sunday, January 7th at 3pm

Assignment one is graded on:

- Complete inclusion of all TOR elements
- Appropriate choices that reflect understanding of the various core decisions and their relationships
- Quality of writing and professional formatting

Assignment Two (35%): Working in **new** teams, the students will now take on the role of evaluators for SFCG or CU. (Students will evaluate whatever program they did NOT write the TOR.) In this role they will develop an Evaluation Proposal in response to a Terms of Reference developed by a different team. Teams will present their proposal to the implementers (team who developed the TOR) and the client's Country Director who is located in Canada and will virtually participate.

Assignment two is reviewed against two primary criteria:

- Presentation quality:
 - has the team logically structured the material
 - offered useful visuals and professional supporting documentation
 - speaking ability: pace, tone, emphasis etc.
 - ability to hold the audience attention (posture, stance, hand movement, eye contact etc.)
- Content:
 - covers all elements requested in the assignment brief

- represents accurate interpretation of key concepts and their relationship to other concepts in a ‘should world’ context
- appropriately handles TOR demands with best practice recommendations

Document submission for Assignment Two: All slides and any documents you intend to hand out during the presentation must be submitted to Prof Scharbatke-Church (by email) by **7.00 pm EST Tuesday January 23rd, 2018**. **Any document means absolutely anything that you think you will hand over to the implementing team!** This equalizes – somewhat – the difference in timing of the presentations.

Assignment Three (15%): Working in the original Assignment One Teams as the implementer, students will host the presentation of the prospective evaluators. The implementer will have an opportunity to ask questions of the bidding team and will write a short review of the quality of the proposal (no more than 2 pages), concluding with their decision to hire or not. The review should be informed by evaluative thinking and is due **within 5 hours of the end of the presentation**. Further details will be forthcoming.

Assignment three is graded on:

- professional management of the evaluation team experience
- strategic use of question time
- incorporation of evaluative thinking into memo
- quality of writing and argument of memo

Presentations: January 24-26 (Jan 24 & 25: 10.00am – 7.30pm and Jan 26 10.00 – 5.00); exact schedule will be determined the first week of regular semester. We will do our best to respect competing class schedules, however students are also asked to be as flexible and understanding as possible as scheduling so many students during the regular semester is a challenge. Further information on the technology requirements will be forthcoming.

In accordance with federal and state law, Tufts University provides for reasonable accommodation to students with documented disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact Mary Dulatré, Registrar and Manager of Student Academic Programs, Goddard 212, (617) 627-2405.

Reading List

Instructions

Students should follow the syllabus closely as guidance on how to read is often found alongside the required reading material. Most of the required material will be available on the course Canvas site, but many will be available via weblinks in the syllabus. The Canvas site **should not be** considered the comprehensive and definitive source of readings.

Required readings should be read closely and carefully. The readings that are highly recommended are quality contributions to the main idea, but could be reviewed more quickly. Optional readings are just that – optional pending your interest and time. Optional readings are not posted on Canvas; if students are interested and unable to find a reading please email the course TA.

As part of class preparation a set of ***optional worksheets*** will be provided to the class. These are not graded and intended to give students an opportunity to apply the concepts discussed in class. Past students have reported that the worksheets provide invaluable reinforcement and practice applying the concepts covered in the course. Though reviewing them in class would be ideal, as they are optional and time is limited they will generally not be discussed in class. **Students are encouraged to use the Study Groups and office hours to explore questions in further detail or clarify concepts.**

The following table provides a list of all the worksheets and the class material that they cover.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Related Classes</i>
How is the flow?	Evaluation foundation decisions	Class 3 & 4
Developing a TOR	Evaluation Terms of Reference	Class 5 & 6
Evaluation Approaches	Evaluation Approaches	Class 7
Evaluation Management Terminology	Key terms	Class 9 & 10
Evaluation Would NOT sheet	Evaluation plans and foundation decisions	Class 9 & 10
Terminology Talks	Data collection and evaluation types	Class 9 & 10

Two core texts for this class include:

Church C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006.

<http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/training-modules-for-design-monitoring-and-evaluation-for-peacebuilding/>

OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/2754804.pdf>

Professor's Note: this is not to be read, but is good to keep on hand to check terms for clarity.

Additional Resources:

- American Evaluation Association website: www.eval.org.
- BetterEvaluation: <http://betterevaluation.org/>
- The Evaluation Center at University of Western Michigan
<http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/>

Class Schedule

1. Introductions & Overviews

- Learning Objectives: class introductions, review syllabus, what is evaluation and why do it?

Mertens D., Wilson Amy, *Program Evaluation Theory and Practice*, Chapter One: Introduction to Evaluation. Read pages 3-15.

Professor's Note: The e-book is available through [the Ginn Library Website](#), when you are signed into your tufts account. Search for the name of the book in “Jumbo search” and select the e-book option.

Why Evaluate: posts from professional evaluation list, November – December 2015.
Updated July 24, 2016. (*not for circulation or citation*)

IIED Briefing “Evaluation: A Crucial Ingredient for SDG Success.” April 2016.
<http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/17357IIED.pdf>

Highly Recommended:

Morariu, Johanna et. al. “State of Evaluation 2016: Evaluation Practice and Capacity in the Nonprofit Sector,” *Innovation Network*, October 2016.

http://www.innonet.org/media/2016-State_of_Evaluation.pdf

Professor's Note: this looks at U.S. domestic non-profits.

Rugh, Jim. “The Expanding World Scene in Evaluation.” *American Journal of Evaluation*. Vol 32, No. 4, (2011): 586 – 591.

Professor's Note: a look to the future for the field of evaluation, with a nice summary of the history

Tarsilla, M., From RBM-ization to Normalisation: A Field Practitioner's Reflection on ECD Current Trends, OECD Development News July 2014.

Professor's Note: For those of you familiar with RBM, this is a concise explanation of the RBM-Evaluation relationship. For those not familiar: optional.

2. Introduction to Evaluation

- Learning Objectives: Results Terms, History of Field; Purposes: Accountability and Learning; Roles

Scharbatke-Church, Cheyanne, 2011. *Peacebuilding Evaluation: Not yet all it could be*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management / Online Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation. (Version II, accessed at www.berghof-handbook.net).

Ebrahim, Alnoor, *Chapter 4: The Many Faces of Accountability*, p101-121, *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*. 3rd Edition, San Francisco: Joseey-Bass (2010)

Guijt, I. (2010) 'Exploding the Myth of Incompatibility between Accountability and Learning'. In J. Ubels, N.-A. Acquaye-Baddoo and A. Fowler, Capacity Development in Practice. London, Washington, DC: Earthscan. It is Chapter 21.

http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resource/overview/accountability_and_learning

The Center for High Impact Philanthropy, "What Are We Talking About When We Talk About Impact?" Working Paper, September 20, 2013. https://www.impact.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/2014/12/What_Are_We_Talking_About_When_We_Talk_About_Impact.pdf

Watch short video: Ricigliano, Rob. *YouTube*, YouTube, 16 June 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=9UgyelNq6xI.

Scharbatke-Church, Cheyanne, Evaluation Manager Guidelines Handout, 2011
Professor's Note: this course trains you to be a great evaluation manager – you should know what the role entails!

Highly Recommended:

Davis Austen, *Concerning Accountability of Humanitarian Action*, HPN Network Paper Number 58, February 2007. <http://odihpn.org/documents/networkpaper058.pdf>.

**** for those interested in humanitarian work a good discussion about accountability and humanitarian work.**

Church C., and J. Shouldice, *The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions: Part I: Framing the State of Play*. <http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/policy/evaluation/> Read pages 9-19

**** for those interested in working in peacebuilding, this explains the history of the field in terms of M&E**

Centre for Development Impact, *Implementing Evaluations Under Severe Resource Constraints*, May 2013

**** first half gives a concise and clear state of play of current development evaluation**

USAID, "Evaluation at USAID: November 2013 Update." Available on Canvas and at: <http://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Evaluation%20at%20USAID%20-%20November%202013%20Update%20-%20FINAL.pdf>

**** for those interested in working for or with the USG in foreign assistance as it covers the state of the USAID on evaluation.**

Optional:

Paffenholz T, Reychler L., "Towards Better Policy and Programme Work in Conflict Zones: Introducing the 'Aid for Peace' Approach", *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development* 2, No. 2, (2005): 6-23

3. Building the Evaluation Foundation: Key First Steps

- Learning Objectives: how the key evaluative decisions that are taken during project design are critical to later evaluation success; evaluation criteria

Professor's note: It is recommended to read in this order as the material will make more sense.

Scharbatke-Church, Cheyanne. "10 Base Evaluation Steps." Powerpoint Slide. Jan 2015.

Professor's Note: you may wish to print and bring the 10 base steps slide to class to take notes on the document.

Church C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Read Chapter 8: Evaluation Preparation – Stage 1, pages 97-135

ALNAP, *Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Guide*, Read pages 41 – 51 (evaluation purpose discussion) and 65-68 (evaluation audience discussion)

<https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/alnap-evaluation-humanitarian-action-2016.pdf>

Professor's Note (for below): For statements of actual evaluation purposes please look at these resources. This is not a comprehensive list to all possible purpose types nor are they each of equal value in terms of being representative of 'good' purposes. They should act as illustrative examples that can be improved upon:

- SIDA, Looking Back, Looking Forward SIDA Evaluation Manual, 2004 Read page 62 - the bulleted list of evaluation purposes
http://betterevaluation.org/resources/guide/sida_evaluation_manual
- Guijt, I. (2010) 'Exploding the Myth of Incompatibility between Accountability and Learning'. In J. Ubels, N.-A. Acquaye-Baddoo and A. Fowler, Capacity Development in Practice. **Table 21.1, Pg. 285**
- Evaluation Class Handout, Table of Examples. 2018 - forthcoming

Professor's Note (for below): When reading the next three (very short) documents, identify similarities and differences and bring your results to class to discuss. The third document offers a table format to compare definitions:

1. OECD, *DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance*, 2011.
<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>
2. OECD DAC, *Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility, Improving Learning for Results*, 2012. Read pages 55-61.
3. OECD D4R Criteria Comparison, 2016, Table created for Fletcher E Class

Optional:

Amnesty International. *Evaluation: A Beginner's Guide*, 1999.

<http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/POL32/003/1999/en>.

OECD, *Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness, Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies*, 1999. Read pages 10-27

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2667294.pdf>

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH Evaluation Unit. *Baseline Studies: A Guide to Planning and Conducting Studies, and to Evaluating and Using Results*. 2010. Read Pages 1-12.

Guest Speaker (optional session): Liz Wojnar, Presentation on Feedback Loops

Feedback loops are a hot topic in the DME world at present. A phrase taken from the systems/adaptive management discourse, it is particularly prevalent now in the humanitarian sphere. This presentation is the culmination of Liz's participation in the Evaluation Colloquium.

- Time: 1.00– 2.00
- Room: M200

4. Building the Evaluation Foundation: Part 2

- Learning Objective: the relationships between decisions, with an emphasis on baselines

Gaarder M., Annan J., *Impact Evaluation of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Interventions*, Policy Research Working Paper 6496, June 2013.

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/ImpactEvaluationofConflictPreventionandPeacebuildingIntervention.pdf>

- For those new to impact evaluation read pages 1-4 carefully to understand 'what are impact evaluations'
- Everyone review pages 5-20 (pay attention to pages 13 - 18 to understand 'why one would select impact evaluations')

Church, C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Read Chapter 5: Baseline

USAID TIPS Baselines and Targets. No. 8. 2nd Edition. 2010.

<http://usaidprojectstarter.org/sites/default/files/resources/pdfs/TIPS-BaselinesandTargets.pdf>

Highly Recommended

Bamberger, Michael. "Strengthening the evaluation of programme effectiveness through reconstructing baseline data", *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 1: 1, 37 — 59.

2009. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19439340902727610>

Paul J. Taylor, Darlene F. Russ-Eft and Hazel Taylor. "Gilding the Outcome by Tarnishing the Past : Inflationary Biases in Retrospective Pretests." *American Journal of Evaluation*: Volume 30 Number 1. March 2009. <http://aje.sagepub.com/content/30/1/31>.

Zivetz, Laurie , et al. "Building the Evidence Base for Post-Project Evaluation: Case Study Review and Evaluability Checklists." Valuing Voices, Faster Forward Fund and Valuing Voices, May 2017, valuingvoices.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/The-case-for-post-project-evaluation-Valuing-Voices-Final-2017.pdf.

Professor's Note: to learn more about post-project evaluations (technically called ex-post).

Optional:

Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (Asareca). "Guidelines for Project Baseline Studies." October 2010. <http://usaidprojectstarter.org/sites/default/files/resources/pdfs/Guidelines-for-Project-Baseline-studies.pdf>

5. Translating Ideas to Operations: Terms of Reference Part 1

- Learning Objectives: Setting up the Terms of Reference as a conceptual and practical roadmap

Rossi, P.H. and Freeman, H.E. *Evaluation: A Systemic Approach*. (6th Ed.) California: Sage Publications, 1998. Read Chapter 3, pages 79-90.

Church C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Read Chapter 9: Evaluation Management. Pages 137-153.

American Evaluation Association, Program Evaluation Standards. <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=103>

Wingate, Lori, and Daniela Schroeter. "Evaluation Questions Checklist for Program Evaluation." The Evaluation Center, School of Public Affairs and Administration Western Michigan University, 2016. https://www.wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u372/2016/eval_questions_checklist-2016-03.pdf

6. Terms of Reference Development Part 2

- Learning Objectives: Setting up the Terms of Reference as a conceptual and practical roadmap

Quiz: This quiz will focus on knowledge acquisition and cover all topics reviewed to date. It will consist of multiple choice and true/false questions. It will take place at the end of class.

Study Group Preparation: Please review the following TORs and identify their strengths and weaknesses and bring to study group to discuss.

- Eurasia Foundation, *Terms of Reference for a Mid-Term Evaluation Equal before Law: Access to Justice in Central Asia Program* July 13, 2012.
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, *Strategy Evaluation of the Pakistan Hindukush Programme (PHP) 2010 – 2014, Terms of Reference for the Consultant*, 2014.

Highly Recommended:

Besa, Evaluation Terms of Reference General Template, 2016

Optional:

Skolits, Morrow, Mehlic Burr, “Reconceptualizing Evaluator Roles,” *American Journal of Evaluation*, Volume 30, Number 3, Sept 2009.

National Science Foundation, Directorate for Education and Human Resources. *User Friendly Handbook for Mixed Method Evaluation*, 1997. Read Chapter 7.

http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1997/nsf97153/chap_7.htm

OECD DAC, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, 2010.

<http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf>

7. Evaluation Approaches

- Learning Objective: explore the impact of approach selection on the evaluation process

Professor’s Note: it is recommended to read in the order provided:

Church C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Re-read pages 114-123.

Professor’s Note: this article is an important read to understand the breadth and depth of the evaluation field. It is used in far more detail in Advanced Evaluation, so at this stage a macro level read is sufficient.

Alkin, Marvin, ed. *Evaluation Roots: Tracing Theorists’ Views and Influences*. Sage Publications, 2004. Read “Chapter 2: An evaluation theory tree.”

BetterEvaluation, Approaches: <http://betterevaluation.org/approaches>

Professor’s Note: Use the BetterEvaluation page as a ‘cheat sheet’ to different evaluation approaches.

Quinn Patton, M., *Utilization Focused Evaluation Checklist*, 2002.

Sherriff, Bronwyn, and Porter, Stephen. “An Introduction to Empowerment Evaluation, Teaching Materials.” Read Pages 6-9. <http://www.mrc.ac.za/crime/evaluation.pdf>

Professor's Note: these are examples illustrating (bullet 1) UFE evaluation and (bullet 2) its connection to adaptive management.

- [PANACeA Formative Network Evaluation, May 2011](#). Read pages 10-22.
- For an example of how UFE informs adaptive management in a public health project. Zaveri, Sonal. "How Evaluation Embraces and Enriches Adaptation: A UFE Approach." *Better Evaluation*, 18 July 2017, www.betterevaluation.org/en/blog/using-UFE-for-adaption.

8. Evaluability Assessment

- Learning Objective: core evaluation steps and where and how to use evaluability assessment

DFID, *Planning Evaluability Assessments, A Synthesis of the literature with recommendations*, DFID, 2013.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/248656/wp40-planning-eval-assessments.pdf.

Scharbatke-Church, C., and Rogers, M. Evaluability Assessments – DRAFT Chapter, Forthcoming 2018

Highly Recommended

Professor's Note: this paper explores 9 other ways of assessing whether an evaluation is 'worthy' of the cost. Barr, Julian, et. al. "The Value of Evaluation: Tools for Budgeting and Valuing Evaluations," Discussion Paper, DFID, August 2016. Read pages 1 – 8. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57b44793e5274a096b000000/Value_of_Evaluation_Discussion_Paper_-_FinalVersion_for_Publication_03082016_clean.pdf

9. Developing Evaluation Plans #1

- Learning Objective: ability to develop appropriate evaluation plans and how to include methods

Professor's Note: It is recommended to read in the order listed below.

Church C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Read Chapter 9: Evaluation Management – Stage 2, pages 153-177.

M. Quinn Patton, *Utilization Focused Evaluation*, 3rd Edition, (Sage, 1997). Read Chapter 11, pages 241-264.

Church C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Read Chapter 12: Methods, pages 201-222

Professor's Note: For those who have not taken a Methods class read this one before the USAID Technical Note

USAID, *Technical Note: Conducting Mixed-Method Evaluations*, Monitoring and Evaluation Series, USAID, June 2013. Available on Canvas and at: http://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Mixed_Methods_Evaluations_Technical_Note_final_2013_06.pdf

Highly Recommended to read at least during your assignment #2:

Scharbatke-Church and Chebuske, Sample Evaluation Plan, 2012.

Laursen, B., Visual Evaluation Plans, 2015, <http://bethanylaursen.com/portfolio/visual-evaluation-plans/>

Optional:

National Science Foundation, Directorate for Education and Human Resources. *User Friendly Handbook for Mixed Method Evaluation*, 1997. Read Chapter 5.

http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1997/nsf97153/chap_5.htm

OECD, *Peacebuilding Evaluation Guidance Notes*.

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/39774573.pdf>

Social Impact, *Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Fragile States and Peacebuilding Programs*. Read pages 26-156.

<http://www.gsdr.org/document-library/monitoring-evaluating-and-learning-for-fragile-states-and-peacebuilding-programs-practical-tools-for-improving-program-performance-and-results/>

10. Evaluation Plan #2 & Evaluation Challenges

- Learning Objectives: understand the common challenges associated with evaluations

IDRC Evaluation Unit, *Addressing the Question of Attribution in Evaluation*, March 2004. <http://p-shift.care2share.wikispaces.net/file/view/Annex+4+Attribution+in+Evaluations+sheet.pdf>

Clements, P., Chianca, T., Sasaki, R., “Reducing World Poverty by Improving Evaluation of Development Aid,” *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 29, Number 2, June 2008, 195-214.

Bush, K., and Duggan, C., “Evaluation in Conflict Zones, Methodological and Ethical Challenges,” *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 8:2, 5-25, 2013.

Raftree, L., and Bamberger, M., *Emerging Opportunities: Monitoring and Evaluation in a Tech-Enabled World*, ITAD and the Rockefeller Foundation, September 2014. Read pages 1-7 and pages 37-40.

<https://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20150911122413/Monitoring-and-Evaluation-in-a-Tech-Enabled-World.pdf>.

Highly Recommended:

Church C., and J. Shouldice, *The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions: Part I: Framing the State of Play*, INCORE, 2002. Read pages 41-52.

Bollen, Kenneth, Pamela Paxton and Rumi Morishima, "Assessing International Evaluations: An Example From USAID's Democracy and Governance Program." *American Journal of Evaluation* Vol. 26 No. 2, June 2005.

Optional:

Spencer, T. *A Synthesis of Evaluations of Peacebuilding Activities Undertaken by Humanitarian Agencies and Conflict Resolution Organizations*. London: Active Learning Network on Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Assistance (ALNAP), 1998. Read pages 6-9. <https://www.alnap.org/help-library/a-synthesis-of-evaluations-of-peacebuilding-activities-undertaken-by-humanitarian>

Ajay Chibber, Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank "[Development Evaluation: Meeting New Challenges](#)" (PowerPoint document) Accessed June 19, 2007.

Jo Anne Yeager Sallah, Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP) Mid-Term Evaluation Final Report, February 6, 2006.
http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACG877.pdf#search=%22community%20youth%20peace%20education%20midterm%20evaluation%22.

Mayer, DFID SEA Evaluation of International Alert Grant AG3056, Final Report, January 2005.

11. Evaluation Use

- Learning Objectives: What is use; Primary barriers to use; Strategies to enable great evaluation uptake

Church, C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Read Chapter 10: Evaluation Utilization – Stage Three

Grasso Patrick G., "What Makes an Evaluation Useful? Reflections from Experience in Large Organizations," *American Journal of Evaluation* 2003 24: 507.

Highly Recommended

Church, C. *Mind the Gap: Policy Development and Research on Conflict Issues*. INCORE, 2005. Read pages 22-35. <http://www.incore.ulster.ac.uk/policy/rip/RIP.pdf>.

Engineers without borders Canada, "2011 Failure Report: Learning From our Mistakes". <http://www.ewb.ca/sites/default/files/2011%20EWB%20Failure%20Report.pdf>

Optional:

Bamberger M., Rugh J. and L. Mabry, *Real World Evaluation*, Sage 2006. Read Reconciling Different Priorities and Perspectives – Making It Useful – Helping clients and Other Stakeholders Utilize the Evaluation. Read pages 156-167.

Danida, Evaluation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2005, *Lessons From Rwanda - Lessons For Today*, Copenhagen, Denmark. Read pages 107-111 and 11-21. <http://www.oecd.org/countries/rwanda/35084497.pdf>

Operations Evaluation Department, *Influential Evaluations: Detailed Case Studies*, January 2005. Read pages 1-12, 38-44, 50-57, 64-69. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/4585672-1251727474013/influential_evaluation_case_studies.pdf

12. Evaluation Plan QUIZ & PRACTICUM

Quiz: This quiz will focus on knowledge acquisition and cover all topics reviewed since the last quiz. It will consist of multiple choice and true/false questions.

Practicum: There is no new reading for the practicum, though you may find it useful to bring your copy of *Designing for Results*.

13. Two Fine Lines: Ethics & Politics and then Closing

- Learning Objectives: Knowledge of the role politics plays in the evaluation process; Understanding of common ethical dilemmas; Knowledge and ability to apply guiding principles

Professor's Note: there are a number of readings here, but they are all quite short and offer different insights.

Church C. and M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. SFCG, USA, March 2006. Read Chapter 11: Ethics in Evaluation

O'Flynn, Peter, Chris Barnett, and Laura Camfield. "Assessing Contrasting Strategies for Ensuring Ethical Practice within Evaluation: Institutional Review Boards and Professionalisation." *Journal of Development Effectiveness* 8.4 (2016): 561-568.

Hendricks M., and Bamberger M., "The Ethical Implications of Underfunding Development Evaluations," *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31:549, 2010.

Quin Laura, Forcing nonprofits to lie about data. Blog. Oct 21, 2014. <http://www.marketsforgood.org/forcing-nonprofits-to-lie-about-data/>

American Evaluation Association, Guiding Principles, Accessed: December, 21, 2013
<http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>.

For Closing

Please bring the 3 most important lessons you have taken away from the course.

Highly Recommended:

Grasso, Patrick. "Ethics and Development Evaluation: Introduction." *American Journal of Evaluation*. 31:533 2010.

Blum, Andrew, and Kawano-Chiu, Melanie. "Guiding Principles for Donors to Foster Better Peacebuilding Evaluation: An Update on the Consultation Process." *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*. 8:2, 105-109, Sept 2013.

Optional:

Bamberger M, Rugh J. and L.Mabry, *Real World Evaluation*, Sage, 2006. Read Pages 113-131: "Reconciling Different Priorities and Perspectives – Addressing Political Influences."

De Lay & Manda, "Politics of Monitoring and Evaluation: Lessons from the AIDS Epidemic." *Global Advances in HIV/AIDS Monitoring and Evaluation, New Directions in Evaluation* 103. Fall 2004.

Bamberger, M. "Ethical Issues in Conducting Evaluation in International Settings" *Current and Emerging Ethical Challenges in Evaluation New Directions in for Evaluation* 82, 1999.

United Nations Evaluation Group, *Ethical Guidelines*. 2008.
http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=102.