

Administrative Information

Course Title	Policy Evaluation
Code	STG-MA-ECR-PEV
ECTS	5
Professor/ Instructor	Gaia Taffoni(STG), Anne Revillard(SciencesPo), Thilo Bodenstein (CEU)
E-mail	gaia.taffoni@eui.eu
Teaching Assistant(TA)	
Email	
Mode of Delivery	
Academic year	2024/2025
Semester	3

Teaching and Learning Information

Description	<p>This course develops an original perspective on policy evaluation by combining a presentation of the key methods and required skills needed to be a good evaluator with a reflection on the politics and institutional organization of evaluation. Practicing policy evaluation requires a particular set of skills, which are not only methodological but also include the capacity to reflect on values, identify stakeholders and organize their participation to favour evaluation use. However, the evaluation practice can also be enriched by reflexivity on its political and institutional dimensions: who conducts evaluations? What are the political stakes underpinning evaluation practices? How is evaluation institutionalized in different contexts? Combining inputs from policy evaluation and policy analysis, this course thus reflects both on the practice and politics of evaluation. This CIVICA joint course brings together CEU, EUI and Sciences Po students. Thanks to the combination of in-depth research content and professionalization components, the course will interest students keen on working in the field of policy evaluation in the public or the private sector and more fundamental research-oriented students.</p>
--------------------	--

	<p>The first goal of this course is to offer insight into the methodological skills for expert, independent and responsible evaluation of public policies. The second goal is to improve understanding of the usefulness of evaluation for ameliorating governance in contemporary political systems by understanding mistakes and failures (through group work of case studies) to affect accountability and policy learning positively. Third, the course will investigate some criticisms and skepticism towards the professional evaluation of public policies from policy-takers and policy-makers.</p> <p>Finally, an important objective is facilitating student and faculty interaction from all three partner institutions.</p>		
Learning outcomes (LOs) reflecting the objectives	<p>At the end of the course, you will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss key issues and practices in policy evaluation • Apply methodological skills around specific evaluative techniques (experimental and quasi-experimental methods, theory of change, realist evaluation) • Analyse the epistemological differences and complementarity between various approaches to causality • Critically analyse the production and uses of evaluations • Improved capacity to work in cross-university as teams to produce joint work 		
Pre-requisite(s)		Co-requisite(s)	
Teaching and learning methods	<p>The teaching format for this course is highly participative and promotes active learning. The course combines diverse teaching approaches to favor students' efficient appropriation of evaluation practices and theories: hands-on case studies, guided reading of selected texts, and interactive lectures. Group work will be organised in preparation for assignment 1.</p>		
Status	Compulsory		Elective

<p>Learning support</p>	<p>This course will use articles, book chapters, official documentation (such as IOs evaluations) and case study</p>
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Assessment method(s) and percentage of weighting, dates</p> <p>Team presentation video 60% Due TBD (oral exam or written) 40% Due TBD</p> <p>5 ECTS value</p> <p>Assignments should be uploaded to each student’s institution learning platform by the submission deadline (more info will be given in class). Penalties for late submission will apply according to the policy and regulations of the students’ home institution.</p> <p>For the Learning journal exercise, faculty in each institution will grade students enrolled in the same institution. CEU faculty will grade students registered on the course at CEU. STG-EUI faculty will grade students registered on the course at STG-EUI. Sciences Po faculty will grade students registered on the course at Sciences Po.</p> <p>The Team presentation video will be jointly graded</p> <hr/> <p>Specific assessment criteria and grade percentage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment 1: Team evaluation - presentation video <p>For this first assignment, students will work in groups of three to five (ideally one student from each institution) on a topic of evaluation of their choice.</p> <p>Groups will need to be formed by end of week 2 based on exchanges in the first session on students’ policy areas of interest. A collaborative document will be used to list the different groups as a form, and students who are not yet part of a group by week 2 will be assigned to a group by the instructors.</p> <p><u>Expected teamwork includes:</u></p>

- Choosing an intervention to be evaluated (implying a reflection on the relevant scale of evaluation: the intervention needs to be not too broad so that it can be evaluated)
- Searching evaluation repositories and bibliographical databases for examples of evaluations on similar or related topics (the idea is to give you a chance to familiarize yourself with what evaluation reports look like and to inform your reflection on the design of your evaluation)
- Mapping the stakeholders of this intervention (concerning session 4)
- Reflecting on relevant indicators that could be mobilized in an evaluation of this intervention (concerning session 5)
- Imagining and drafting two different evaluation designs on this intervention: What would a counterfactual impact evaluation look like? What would the theory of change of this intervention look like? (concerning sessions 2 and 3)
- Preparing a video presentation (10 minutes maximum) consisting of a PowerPoint with audio comments to present the process and results of your group work.

NB: This assignment does not require you to perform the evaluation but to reflect on the design of an evaluation.

Online resources:

Suggested list of peer-reviewed evaluation journals:

- [Evaluation](#)
- [Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation](#)
- [American Journal of Evaluation](#)
- [Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation](#)
- [Evaluation review](#)
- [New directions for evaluation](#)
- [African Evaluation Journal](#)
- [Evaluation Journal of Australasia](#)

Suggested list of evaluation repositories:

- [What works centres](#) (UK)
- [Campbell collaboration](#) (USA)
- [What Works Clearinghouse](#) (WWC) in education (US)
- [Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research](#) (CLEAR) (US)
- [Pathways to Work Evidence Clearinghouse](#) (US)
- [Childcare & Early Education Research Connections](#) (US)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment 2: individual assignment (written or oral) <p>This assignment is set to reflect your understanding of the usefulness of evaluation for ameliorating governance in contemporary political systems by understanding mistakes and failures to affect accountability and policy learning, notably through personal reflections and notes on course content or concerning it, individual oral participation, and group discussions.</p>		
Academic Misconduct	<p>During any academic activity, especially but not limited to the completion of assignments and the participation in exams, students are expected to refrain from any form of misconduct as defined by the EUI Code of Ethics in Academic Research. While the EUI Code of Ethics in Academic Research defines “Research Misconduct”, these definitions apply equally to all academic activities within the Master’s programme, including those that are not necessarily research oriented.</p> <p>According to the EUI Code of Ethics, academic misconduct “implies (and is not limited to) fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting results of research and deliberate, dangerous or negligent deviations from accepted practice in carrying out research. [...] Misconduct also includes any plan or attempt to do any of these things.” See also Chapter IV. Misconduct in Academic Research of the Code of Ethics in Academic Research.</p>		
Hours	Total contact hours	Total non-contact hours	Total learning hours
	25 In-class hybrid sessions connecting online with group of students from the other two institutions	100	125

Attendance	According to the Master's programme Rules and Regulations, the minimum attendance requirement is 75%.		
Completion Requirements	In order to obtain the ECTS credits for this course, the student must meet all of the following criteria: Course participants are expected to attend all online sessions, as well as all group work sessions. Each student must be present in class or individually connected to Zoom. When online, participants should always have their cameras on . TAs will check attendance at each session.		

Sessions	
Session # 1	Session title: Introduction
Date: 20 September 2024 Time: 12:30-14:30 Delivery mode: Hybrid	<p>This introductory session presents the original approach of the course, combining reflections on the praxis and politics of evaluation. It then provides students with some key definitions and notions to navigate evaluation. We will draw on several existing definitions of policy evaluation to reflect on three of the key stakes of this practice: the reliance on systematic social science methods, the reflection on values, and the attention paid to knowledge use. We will then introduce some of the keywords of the field: ex-ante/ex-post, formative/summative, inputs/outputs/outcomes, stakeholders, among others, and evoke the main actors and political stakes of evaluation.</p>

<p>Session # 2</p> <p>Date: 20 September 2024</p> <p>Time: 14:45-16:45</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: The emergence of evaluation as an experimental approach to policy impact</p> <p>This session will retrace the origins of the field of evaluation in the US context of Johnson’s “Great Society” in the 1960s when the impetus to prove the impact of new social programs led to the development and large-scale use of experimental and quasi-experimental methods in social science. Randomized control trials (RCTs), a method transferred from medical science to social science, became the “gold standard” of evaluation. After presenting this historical context and the broader development of these experimental methods throughout the history of evaluation, this session will familiarize students with the general principles of RCTs and quasi-experimental methods: their methodological foundation in a counterfactual conception of causality, and the specific features of RCTs, regression discontinuity, difference-in-difference, and matching methods. No prior econometric training is required to follow this session since we will not be getting into the technicalities of each method but rather focus on the general principles of how each method works and its uses in evaluation. We will then turn to critiques that have been raised regarding these methods in the field of evaluation, leading to the development of more theory-based approaches presented in the following session.</p> <p>Required Reading:</p> <p>Barone, C. (2023). <i>Randomised Controlled Trials</i>. LIEPP Methods Brief. https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-04021987</p> <p>Duflo, E. (2020). Field Experiments and the Practice of Policy. <i>American Economic Review</i>, 110(7), 1952–1973. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.110.7.1952</p> <p>Further suggested reading:</p> <p>Campbell, D. T. (1969). Reforms as Experiments. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 24(4), 409–429. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027982</p> <p>Fougère, D. and Jacquemet, N. (2023). <i>Difference-in-differences</i>. LIEPP Methods Brief. https://hal.science/hal-04102943</p> <p>Fougère, D. and Jacquemet, N. (2023). <i>The Regression Discontinuity Design</i>. LIEPP Methods Brief. https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-04103359</p> <p>Fougère, D. and Jacquemet, N. (2020). Causal Inference and Impact Evaluation. <i>Economie Et Statistique / Economics and Statistics</i> (510-511-512), 181–200. https://doi.org/10.24187/ecostat.2019.510t.1996</p> <p>Garfinkel, I. (1972). The New Jersey Income Maintenance Experiment. <i>Journal of Consumer Affairs</i>, 6(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.1972.tb00495.x</p> <p>Givord, P. (2023). <i>Matching methods</i>. LIEPP Methods Brief. https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-04106880</p> <p>Mohr, L. B. (1999). The Qualitative Method of Impact Analysis. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 20(1), 69–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/109821409902000106</p>
---	--

<p>Session # 3</p> <p>Date: 4/10/2024</p> <p>Time: 12:30-14:30</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: Opening the black box: theory-based evaluation</p> <p>One of the main critiques leveled at experimental and quasi-experimental approaches to impact assessment regarded their incapacity to explain the impact beyond measurement. To address this limit, theory-based evaluation relies on a different, more generative conception of causality and draws more substantially on qualitative methods. In this session, students will learn to manipulate the main tool of theory-based evaluation, the theory of change, which decomposes the intervention into a series of mechanisms leading to the final impacts. We will then focus on one example of a theory-based approach in evaluation, realist evaluation, showing how it addresses how an intervention works for whom, in what context, based on the idea of context-mechanism-outcomes (CMO) configurations.</p> <p>Required Reading: Weiss, C. H. (1998). <i>Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies</i> (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall, 46 - 59</p> <p>Louart, S., Habitata, B., Robert, E. and Ridde, V [Valery]. (2023). <i>Realist Evaluation</i>. LIEPP Methods Brief. https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-04159261</p> <p>Further suggested reading: Astbury, B. and Leeuw, F. L. (2010). Unpacking Black Boxes: Mechanisms and Theory Building in Evaluation. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 31(3), 363–381. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214010371972</p> <p>Devaux-Spatarakis, A. (2023). <i>Theory-Based Evaluation</i>. LIEPP Methods Brief. https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-04159080</p> <p>Falleti, T. G. and Lynch, J. F. (2009). Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis. <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, 42(9), 1143–1166. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414009331724</p> <p>Manzano, A. (2016). The Craft of Interviewing in Realist Evaluation. <i>Evaluation</i>, 22(3), 342–360. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389016638615</p> <p>Pawson, R. (2006). <i>Evidence-based Policy: A Realist Perspective</i>. London: Sage.</p> <p>Pawson, R. (2013). <i>The Science of Evaluation: A Realist Manifesto</i>. London: Sage.</p> <p>Pawson, R. and Tilley, N. (1997). <i>Realistic Evaluation</i>. London: Sage.</p> <p>Pressman, J. (1973). <i>Implementation. How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland</i>. Berkeley: University of California Press.</p>

	<p>Ridde, V., Pérez, D. and Robert, E. (2020). Using Implementation Science Theories and Frameworks in Global Health. <i>BMJ Global Health</i>, 5(4), https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002269</p> <p>Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W. and Freeman, H. E. (2004). <i>Evaluation: A systematic approach</i>. London: SAGE.</p> <p>Weiss, C. H. (1997). Theory-based Evaluation: Past, Present, and Future. <i>New Directions for Evaluation</i>, 1997(76), 41–55. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.1086</p> <p>Weiss, C. H. (1998). <i>Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies</i>. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.</p> <p>Westhorp, G. (2014). <i>Realist Impact Evaluation: An Introduction</i>. Overseas Development Institute. Working Paper. https://odi.org/en/publications/realist-impact-evaluation-an-introduction/</p>
<p>Session # 4</p> <p>Date: 11/10/2024</p> <p>Time: 12:30-14:30</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: Stakeholder analysis and participation</p> <p>Stakeholder analysis is a central component of evaluations. This is also linked to participatory evaluation approaches, which are becoming increasingly important in evaluation practice. In this session, we examine who falls under the stakeholder category and explore techniques for identifying stakeholders and their position in the project context. Building on this, we look at how stakeholders can be engaged in a participatory evaluation approach</p> <p>Required readings:</p> <p>Bryson, J.M, Patton, M.Q., Bowmanc, R.A. (2011) ‘Working with evaluation stakeholders: A rationale, step-wise approach and toolkit’. <i>Evaluation and Program Planning</i>, 34, 1–12.</p> <p>Adams, A. E., Nnawulezi, N. A. and Vandenberg, L. (2015). ‘Expectations to Change’ (E2C): A Participatory Method for Facilitating Stakeholder Engagement With Evaluation Findings. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 36(2), 243–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214014553787</p> <p>Further suggested reading:</p> <p>Haarich, S. N. (2018). Building a new tool to evaluate networks and multi-stakeholder governance systems. <i>Evaluation</i>, 24(2), 202–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389018765797</p> <p>Orr, S. K. (2010). Exploring Stakeholder Values and Interests in Evaluation. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 31(4), 557–569. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214010372668</p>

	<p>Sturges, K. M. (2015). Complicity Revisited. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 36(4), 461–469. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214015583329</p>
<p>Session # 5</p> <p>Date: 18/10/2024</p> <p>Time: 12:30-14:30</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: Values, criteria and indicators</p> <p>While the field of evaluation initially developed around the central question of measuring and explaining policy impact, the questions raised by evaluation are much broader, including addressing the relevance, coherence or sustainability of a given programme. This raises the fundamental question of the criteria against which an evaluative judgment is formulated in the last resort and the underlying values that inform these criteria. This session will explore this more normative – and fundamental – dimension of evaluation by reflecting on the values that inform the evaluation practice and the diversity of possible evaluative criteria. We will stress how these can take into account broader goals of social and environmental change (social and environmental justice, gender equality, respect for indigenous perspectives, etc.). The session will also train students to develop indicators based on evaluative criteria have them reflect on the politics of indicators, and how their use impacts policy-making.</p> <p>Required Readings:</p> <p>OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. (2019). <i>Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria - Definitions and Principles for Use</i>. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf</p> <p>Planas Lladó, A. and Soler Masó, P. (2011). Design and application of a system of evaluation indicators for municipal cultural policies. <i>Evaluation</i>, 17(3), 277–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389011402180</p> <p>Further suggested reading:</p> <p>Chilisa, B. (2020). <i>Indigenous research methodologies</i>. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.</p> <p>Chilisa, B., Major, T. E., Gaotlhobogwe, M. and Mokgolodi, H. (2016). Decolonizing and Indigenizing Evaluation Practice in Africa: Toward African Relational Evaluation Approaches. <i>Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation</i>, 30(3), 313–328. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjpe.30.3.05</p> <p>Fukuda-Parr, S. (2019). Keeping Out Extreme Inequality from the SDG Agenda – The Politics of Indicators. <i>Global Policy</i>, 10(S1), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12602</p> <p>Kelley, J. G. and Simmons, B. A. (2015). Politics by Number: Indicators as Social Pressure in International Relations. <i>American Journal of Political Science</i>, 59(1), 55–70. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12119</p>

	<p>Mathison, S. (2018). Does evaluation contribute to the public good? <i>Evaluation</i>, 24(1), 113–119. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389017749278</p> <p>Mertens, D. M. (2017). Transformative research: personal and societal. <i>International Journal for Transformative Research</i>, 4(1), 18–24. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijtr-2017-0001</p> <p>Merry, S. E. (2011). Measuring the World: Indicators, Human Rights and Global Governance. <i>Current Anthropology</i>, 52(3), 83-95. https://doi.org/10.1086/657241</p> <p>Patton, M. Q. (2020). <i>Blue marble evaluation: Premises and principles</i>. New York: The Guilford Press.</p> <p>Scriven, M. (1991). Prose and Cons about Goal-Free Evaluation. <i>Evaluation Practice</i>, 1(12). https://doi.org/10.1177/109821409101200108</p> <p>Scriven, M. (1993). <i>Hard-won Lessons in Program Evaluation</i>. <i>New Directions for Program Evaluation</i>, (58), 1-107.</p> <p>Teasdale, R. M. (2021). Evaluative Criteria: An Integrated Model of Domains and Sources. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 42(3), 354–376. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214020955226</p>
<p>Session # 6</p> <p>Date: 25/10/2024</p> <p>Time: 12:30-14:30</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: Informing policy design: Evaluation and Impact Assessment</p> <p>The field of evaluation stresses that policy appraisals should happen through the whole policy-making cycle. This is called <i>ex ante</i>, <i>ex post</i> and ongoing evaluation. While <i>ex post</i> evaluation regards the “did it work” kind of assessment, <i>ex ante</i> evaluations (also referred to as impact assessment) focus on the policy options at the design stage of a policy. With the method of impact assessment analysis, policy-makers can consider the impact along different dimensions of a policy and thus determine what is most effective. In this session, we will investigate how impact assessment informs policy design while it is happening. We will then focus on the European Commission guidelines for better regulation and get hands-on with a central aspect of impact assessment: problem definition and stakeholder’s consultation. We will then conclude by looking at the policy cycle and situate the evaluation of public policies by looking at some practical cases of institutionalized (and not institutionalized ones) processes of <i>ex post</i> evaluations.</p> <p>Required readings:</p> <p>Radaelli, C. M. (2020). Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA). In P. Harris, A. Bitonti, C. S. Fleisher and A. S. Binderkrantz (Eds.), <i>The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Interest</i></p>

	<p><i>Groups, Lobbying and Public Affairs</i> (1–7). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13895-0_136-1</p> <p>Bunea, A. (2017). Designing stakeholder consultations: Reinforcing or alleviating bias in the European Union system of governance? <i>European Journal of Political Research</i>, 56(1), 46–69. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12165</p> <p>European Commission. (2023). <i>Chapter 2: How to carry out an impact assessment</i>. European Commission. https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox/better-regulation-toolbox_en</p> <p>Further suggested reading:</p> <p>Flückiger, A. and Popelier, P. (2023) Policy Evaluation in the legislative cycle, in Varone, Jacobs, Bundi (eds.) <i>Handbook of public policy evaluation</i>, Edward Elgar</p> <p>Radaelli, C. and Taffoni, G. (2021) The Trustworthiness Test for Regulatory Impact Assessment and Judicial Review, in Benedetto, Lupo and Rangone (eds.) <i>The crisis of confidence in legislation</i>, Nomos.</p>
<p>Session # 7</p> <p>Date: 25/10/2024</p> <p>Time: 14:45-16:45</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: Group work</p> <p>Groups (of 3 to 5) will be allocated during week 2 at the latest so that you know in advance who you will be working with later in the semester. Depending on enrolments, there will be a student from each partner institution in every group. By this time, everyone will have read your report/topic allocated, and each person in the group will have reflected on a specific aspect of the report/topic concerning course content: theory of change, indicators, and stakeholder involvement. During this session, each group will be required to work and interact online to start preparing their final assignment based on a discussion of individual contributions, and a more collective moment of exchange between groups will be organized.</p> <p>This is a formative session about what you must do to develop your full presentation at the end of the semester.</p>
<p>Session # 8</p>	<p>Session title: Policy Evaluation and the role of evidence</p>

<p>Date: 8/11/2024</p> <p>Time: 12:30-14:30</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Evaluation is central to good governance. In the policy cycle, ex-post evaluations provide evidence about what works and what does not. This is why evaluation and evidence are interlinked and crucial for the policymaking process to be successful. We will introduce the concept of evidence-based policymaking and reflect on the role of evaluation in providing evidence for policymaking. We will specifically look at some of the conditions that make policymakers learn from the evidence produced by policy evaluations and hence use it.</p> <p>We will look at concrete cases of different kinds of evidence that are created by policy evaluations and the challenge of translating evaluation outputs into insights that can inform policy actions and contribute to the policy process.</p> <p>Required Reading: <i>TBD possible case study on role of evidence generated by evaluation and used in policymaking (highlight the unpredictability of the policy cycle and importance of issue salience)</i></p> <p>Further suggested reading for those interested:</p> <p>Weiss, C. H. (1979). <i>The many meanings of research utilization. Public Administration Review</i>, 39(5), 426–431. https://doi.org/10.2307/3109916</p> <p>Schlauffer, C., Stucki, I., & Sager, F. (2018). <i>The political use of evidence and its contribution to democratic discourse. Public Administration Review</i>, 78(4), 645–649.</p>
<p>Session # 9</p> <p>Date: 15/11/2024</p> <p>Time: 12:30-14:30</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: Evaluation use</p> <p>The aim of the evaluation is not just to produce knowledge on the functioning and impact of public policies. It also centrally aims for this knowledge (and its production process) to be useful. What exactly is to be useful? To whom? How and what for? How to promote evaluation use, and what are the actual uses of evaluations? These are some of the questions we will address in this session. We will investigate how the field of evaluation has conceptualized evaluation use, as well as the debates around evaluators' responsibility for evaluation use. We will then look into some of the tools that have been developed to favour evaluation use, such as evidence repositories and systematic reviews, knowledge brokering and evaluation capacity building.</p>

Required Readings:

Alkin, M. C. and King, J. A. (2016). The Historical Development of Evaluation Use. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 37(4), 568–579.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214016665164>

Hong, Q. N. and Pluye, P. (2018). Systematic reviews: A brief historical overview.

Education for Information, 34(4), 261–276. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180219>

Further suggested reading:

Alkin, M. C. and King, J. A. (2017). Definitions of Evaluation Use and Misuse, Evaluation Influence, and Factors Affecting Use. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 38(3), 434–450. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214017717015>

Alkin, M. C. and Taut, S. M. (2002). Unbundling evaluation use. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 29(1), 1–12. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X\(03\)90001-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X(03)90001-0)

Henry, G. T. and Mark, M. M. (2003). Beyond Use: Understanding Evaluation's Influence on Attitudes and Actions. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(3), 293–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821400302400302>

Kirkhart, K. E. (2000). Reconceptualizing evaluation use: An integrated theory of influence. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2000(88), 5–23.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.1188>

Patton, M. Q. (1988). Reports on Topic Areas. *Evaluation Practice*, 9(2), 5–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/109821408800900201>

Patton, M. Q. (2018). Evaluation Science. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 39(2), 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214018763121>

Picciotto, R. (2019). Is evaluation obsolete in a post-truth world? *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 73, 88–96.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2018.12.006>

Sturges, K. M. (2015). Complicity Revisited. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 36(4), 461–469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214015583329>

Weiss, C. H. (1988). If Program Decisions Hinged Only on Information: A Response to Patton. *Evaluation Practice*, 9(3), 15–28.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F109821408800900302>

<p>Session # 10</p> <p>Date: 22/11/2024</p> <p>Time: 12:30-14:30</p> <p>Delivery mode: Hybrid</p>	<p>Session title: Organizations of policy evaluation</p> <p>Evaluation is carried out by actors – individuals and organizations. The ‘Monitoring and Evaluation’ sector has become an enormous industry and provides a career path for many graduates. In many countries, evaluation has become an activity and occupation of a self-standing group and community of specialized researchers and analysts. This is seen in the increasing professionalization of M&E with the formation of professional associations, the appearance of professional publications, and the arrival of evaluation as a subject matter in university and vocational training.</p> <p>This session will investigate some of the actors engaged in evaluative work, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultancy firms and ideas of ‘consultocracy’ • Think tanks • Evaluation units inside the bureaucracies of government departments and international organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Audit offices - Development agencies - IEG at World Bank / IEO at IMF • Professional associations, conferences and journals • Higher education institutions as both evaluators and trainers. <p>This session will seek to draw in some practitioner insight, incorporating a visiting speaker from the sector (possibly from an international agency), to talk about working in the field of evaluation.</p> <p>Required Readings / Materials:</p> <p>Abrahams, M. (2022). Growing and nurturing monitoring and evaluation on the African continent. <i>African Evaluation Journal</i>, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v10i1.674</p> <p>West Meiers, M. (2021). The Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank Group: Influences on Evaluation Structures and Practices Globally and in the Americas. In R. Stockmann, W. Meyer and L. Szentmarjay (Eds.), <i>The institutionalisation of evaluation in the Americas</i> (417–447). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81139-6_15</p>
---	--

Further suggested reading:

- Bornstein, L. (2006). Systems of Accountability, Webs of Deceit? Monitoring and Evaluation in South African NGOs. *Development*, 49(2), 52–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.development.1100261>
- Chaplowe, S. G. and Cousins, J. B. (2016). *Monitoring and evaluation training: A systematic approach*. SAGE.
- Kirkpatrick, I., Sturdy, A. J., Alvarado, N. R., Blanco-Oliver, A. and Veronesi, G. (2019). The impact of management consultants on public service efficiency. *Policy & Politics*, 47(1), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557318X15167881150799>
- Lamdany, R. and Edison, H. (2012). Ten Years of Independent Evaluation at the IMF: What Does It Add Up To? In R. Lamdany and H. Edison (Eds.), *Independent Evaluation at the IMF: The First Decade (1–12)*. International Monetary Fund.
<https://ieo.imf.org/-/media/IEO/Files/Publications/Books/first-decade/first-decade-full-text.ashx>
- Revillard, A., Corno, L., Fernandez, J. L., Mason, D., Umbauch, G., Bodenstein, T., Cartwright, A., Melenciuc, I.-R., Wegrich, K. and Stone, D. *Developing Policy Evaluation in an Academic Setting: Assets and Challenges*. Débat du LIEPP.
<https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-04074380/>
- Mazzucato, M. y Collington, R. (2023). *The Big Con: How the consulting industry weakens our businesses, infantilizes our governments and warps our economies*. London: Allen Lane.
- van den Berg, C. (2020). *Policy Consultancy in Comparative Perspective: Patterns, Nuances and Implications of the Contractor State*. *Cambridge studies in comparative public policy*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108634724>
- Welfens, N. y Bonjour, S. (2023). Seeking Legitimacy Through Knowledge Production: The Politics of Monitoring and Evaluation of the EU Trust Fund for Africa. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 61(4), 951–969.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13434>

Session 11

Date:29/11/20
24

Evaluator skills and ethics

Evaluators need a number of different skills to conduct an evaluation successfully. Mastery of social science methodology is only one aspect. Reflective, situational, and interpersonal practices are other essential components for successfully conducting an evaluation. An essential element is the consideration of ethical standards, which can go beyond the approval of an internal review board and must be adapted to the specific situation. In this session, we explore how evaluation skills and ethical approaches interact and complement each other.

Core reading:

- Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G. and Minnema, J. (2005). Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(1), 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214004273180>
- Schwandt, T. A. (2018). Acting together in determining value: A Professional Ethical Responsibility of Evaluators. *Evaluation*, 24(3), 306–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389018781362>

Further reading:

- Perrin, B. (2019). How to Manage Pressure to Change Reports: Should Evaluators Be Above Criticism? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 40(3), 354–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214018792622>
- Guillemin, M. and Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and “Ethically Important Moments” in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2), 261–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403262360>
- Humphreys, M. (2015). Reflections on the Ethics of Social Experimentation. *Journal of Globalization and Development*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/jgd-2014-0016>

<p>Session 12</p> <p>Date: 29/11/2024</p>	<p>Discussion of student presentations and conclusion</p> <p>This last course session will be dedicated to a collective discussion of pre-recorded student presentations. All students must have watched all team videos before class and prepared comments and questions. An evaluation of the course by students will follow before we conclude.</p>
---	---