PPHA 35560 - Translating Evidence for Public Policy and Program Design (Draft Syllabus)

Prof: Rebecca Wolfe

M, W: 1:30-2:50 PM CT
In person: Keller 2112
Zoom (Link on Canvas)
Office Hours: Tuesdays, 9 AM – 11 AM:
https://calendar.google.com/calendar/u/0/selfsched?sstoken=UUUxd2dNb0o4NnJZfGRlZmF1b
HR8MDlkOGIyODg5YzMwZWRhOTdlYmM1ZjVmYWVmMTY0ZTg

Teaching Assistants
TBD

Overview: The demand for the use of evidence in designing international development programs and policy continues to grow. However, policy makers' often have questions about how to interpret and use the evidence generated. How generalizable are these results? How to interpret null results? Mixed outcomes? Short- and long-term effects? Are these results scalable? Additionally, what are the political barriers to using evidence? In this course, we will explore how to think about these issues and others in relation to designing policies and programs in the international development sphere. We will examine these questions through various development sectors: economic development, governance, food security, refugees, education and peacebuilding.

In this course we will cover various topics related to evidence-based policy making, including:

- Elements of Policy and Program Design
  - Theories of Change
- Combining Various Forms of Evidence
- Use of Descriptive Evidence
- Generalizability and Context Specificity
- External Validity
- Scale a programs
- Ethical Considerations
- Political Barriers

Most weeks, we will dive into at least one evaluation of a program or policy. We will ask ourselves if and how policy makers could and/or should use this evidence. I will bring in guest speakers occasionally, either those who worked on the evaluation or practitioners who are figuring out how to use the evidence.

Teaching Philosophy: I think much learning happens through direct feedback. Therefore, I have structured the course and assignments to allow for me to provide feedback to students. I will

grade all assignments myself in a timely manner. If any of my feedback is unclear, I encourage you to talk with me about it. The point of feedback is to learn.

Course Structure: Class will be a combination of lectures, large group discussions and small group discussions and exercises. Since there are no clear-cut answers to many of these questions, my aim is to have you become more comfortable with the questions and provide some analytical frameworks for how to think through these dilemmas. The course also aims to help you think through why others may or may not accept evidence, and how to address those barriers.

Communication: Direct all administrative questions (e.g., finding a reading, Canvas issues, etc) to the TAs. They are very happy to help you. This also allows me to focus my time on the content of the course, grading and substantive questions.

In terms of replies, you can expect replies from me or the TAs during the hours of 8 AM to 6 PM CT. You may receive replies outside of these times. However, if you contact us after 6 PM, there is a good chance you will not receive a reply until the next day.

The TA will also set up a Slack channel for course discussions and announcements. This is also a good venue to ask questions about course materials and assignments so that everyone can see the answers. Others may have similar questions.

Office Hours: I will conduct offices hours between 9AM and 11 AM on Tuesdays. Please make an appointment with me in advance via the sign-up sheet. You must sign up before 9 AM on Tuesday for that day's slots. Other appointments can be made by email as necessary.

Assignments:
Note: All written assignments are expected to be single-spaced, 12-point font, with one-inch margins. Those submitted that don't follow these instructions will not be graded. All submissions through Canvas.

The crux of your grade will be a three-part assignment that will combine individual and group elements. Over the course of the semester, you will work towards writing a proposal in response to an RFA within some technical sector (economic development, education, governance, etc.) in a country in the Global South. Groups are self-selected with support from the TAs.

The first step is selecting a Request for Application or Terms of Reference to apply for. See Canvas for examples which you are able to use for the assignment or find one similar. Choice of RFA/TOR is due via Canvas by **October 8th.**

The first and third assignments will be a group assignment; the second will be an individual assignment.

1. **Group Assignment: Collecting the Evidence (25%): <u>Due October 22 at midnight, 3 pages</u>**. The first building block is collecting the evidence for your intervention. This assignment has two parts.

   - **Context**: What is the important contextual information you need? This will differ depending on the intervention. For example, if you choose an education program, you likely will want basic information about literacy and school access rates. If it is a unconditional cash transfer program, you may want to document poverty levels and the lack of basic needs access (food insecurity, housing, etc). The point of this eventual section of your proposal is to justify the need for the intervention. In this section, you will be focused on *descriptive* evidence.
   - **Intervention**: Has it been conducted in your chosen context? In a similar context (e.g., similar level of fragility/poverty, similar political and economic systems— here you will use some of the descriptive evidence from Part 1)? What are the outcomes? Can you tell how it was implemented? Systematic reviews and Evidence Gap Maps can provide a good starting place for this paper. Note: while ideally there is causal evidence, not all evidence needs to be from RCTs in this section. Quasi-experimental evaluations and strong qualitative evaluations are acceptable. If there is no relevant causal evidence, please make note, and review what does exist.

2. **Individual Assignment: Evaluating the Use of Evidence (25%): <u>November 19 at midnight, 2 pages.</u>** For the second paper, your will grade your group's RFA/TOR on how well the donor has incorporated the evidence you collected under Assignment #1. Did the donor reference relevant evidence? Did it acknowledge mixed outcomes or where the intervention worked and didn't? Will the implementation of the program/policy lead to generation of more evidence (i.e., what is the Monitoring and Evaluation plan)? Please use the following structure:[1]
   - **Summary and Overall Grade:** One paragraph summarizing your conclusion and the grade
   - **What the RFA did well:** Discuss what the RFA get right. Which evidence did it incorporate? How did it account for contextual differences if the evidence was from elsewhere (e.g., if schools are not as strong in El Salvador than in Mexico, how might a CCT need to be adjusted?).
   - **What did the RFA do poorly:** Did it ignore relevant evidence? (e.g, most vocational education programs do not lead to employment gains. Does the RFA acknowledge the lack of evidence of a technical approach?) Did it not adjust for contextual differences?

---

[1] Professor Blattman's grading of the Gates Annual letter is a good model:
https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2015/01/23/grading-the-2015-bill-and-melinda-gates-letter-on-poverty-alleviation/?arc404=true

3. **Using the Evidence (30%)**: <u>Due December 10 at midnight.</u> For the final paper, your group will design a program based on the RFA or policy you identified previously. See the example on Canvas. The paper will include the following sections:

- **Context and Problem Statement: (2 pages).** This is a description of the context, and what is the problem the program will address. You need to write this section to justify why this is a critical issue in this country to solve. For example, in Afghanistan, there are a host of problems to solve: education, governance, poverty. And while they are all interrelated, focus your context analysis on the area of interest. (i.e., girls education lags behind in Afghanistan reducing economic prosperity, etc.). (30%)
- **Theory of Change (hypothesis) and Summary of Evidence (2 pages)**
  - The summary of evidence is to justify your Theory of Change. Why do you think this program will have desirable outcomes? (40%)
- **Activities (1 page)**: What activities are necessary to operationalize the theory. What is the dosage for the program? (e.g., number of trainings) Do you want there to be spillover? Should cash be given in one large tranche or in smaller tranches? You can bullet point this section. (5%)
- **Evaluation Plan (1 page):** How will the program generate further evidence? What type of evaluation will you try to conduct? What is the sampling strategy (e.g., individual, household, community, etc?) What are the main indicators? (25%)

The total page limit for this assignment is **6 pages**. This may seem extremely short, but most donors are requiring shorter and shorter proposals. This will help you hone your writing skills.

Weekly Reading and Class Participation (20%): It is expected students come to class prepared to discuss the topic and the readings. This is your opportunity to engage more with the material, ask me questions, and debate the thorny issues that are at the heart of evidence-based policy making. In your professional career, you will need to back your opinions with evidence (most of the time), and so use class as an opportunity to hone those skills.

To foster more engagement, both in class and online, please submit 2-3 bullet points on the readings by Wednesday morning at 10 AM CT on Canvas. These could be reflections, questions, etc. Quality is more important the quantity. This helps me develop a deeper understanding of where students are with the class material and helps me shift lectures and discussions appropriately. Over the course of the term, you may take 1 "pass" and not submit the bullet points.

I also encourage you to use Slack to share thoughts on the readings or share other relevant materials. The TAs and I will also contribute and moderate.

Late policy: Unless arrangements are made in advance, any assignment that is late will receive 10% penalty for each day late.

Academic Integrity: All University of Chicago students are expected to uphold the highest standards of academic integrity and honesty. Among other things, this means that students shall not represent another's work as their own, use un-allowed materials during exams, or otherwise gain unfair academic advantage. All students suspected of academic dishonesty will be reported to the Harris Dean of Students for investigation and adjudication. The disciplinary process can result in sanctions up to and including suspension or expulsion from the University. In addition to disciplinary sanctions, I will impose a grade penalty of 0 on the assignment and cannot earn higher than a C in the course for students who have committed academic dishonesty. The Harris policy and procedures related to academic integrity can be found at https://harris.uchicago.edu/gateways/current-students/policies. The University of Chicago Policy on Academic Honesty & Plagiarism can be found at https://studentmanual.uchicago.edu/academic-policies/academic-honesty-plagiarism/

Pass/Fail Option: Students who wish to take the course pass/fail rather than for a letter grade must use the Harris Pass/Fail request form (https://harris.uchicago.edu/form/pass-fail) and must meet the Harris deadline, which is generally 9am on the Monday of the 5th week of courses. Students who take the course pass/fail must attend class meetings and turn in all assignments, achieving marks on assignments that are overall commensurate with at least a C-letter grade.

ADA student accommodations: The University's policies regarding students with disabilities are available here. Students who have disability accommodations awarded by the University Student Disability Services Office should inform the Harris Dean of Students office by the end of the first week of class. The Harris Dean of Students Office will work with the student and instructor to coordinate the students' accommodations implementation.

Diversity and Inclusion: The Harris School welcomes, values, and respects students, faculty, and staff from a wide range of backgrounds and experiences, and we believe that rigorous inquiry and effective public policy problem-solving requires the expression and understanding of diverse viewpoints, experiences, and traditions. The University and the Harris School have developed distinct but overlapping principles and guidelines to insure that we remain a place where difficult issues are discussed with kindness and respect for all.

- The University's policies are available here. Specifically, the University identifies the freedom of expression as being "vital to our shared goal of the pursuit of knowledge, as is the right of all members of the community to explore new ideas and learn from one another. To preserve an environment of spirited and open debate, we should all have the opportunity to contribute to intellectual exchanges and participate fully in the life of the University."
- The Harris School's commitments to lively, principled, and respectful engagement are available here: "Consistent with the University of Chicago's commitment to open

discourse and free expression, Harris encourages members of the leadership, faculty, student body, and administrative staff to respect and engage with others of differing backgrounds or perspectives, even when the ideas or insights shared may be viewed as unpopular or controversial." We foster thought-provoking discourse by encouraging community members not only to speak freely about all issues but also to listen carefully and respectfully to the views of others.

Some Specific Points Related to Teaching in this Moment:

Class Timing Accommodations and Flexibility: I recognize that there are host of things that may make class attendance challenging: time zones, child or dependent care, illness, etc. All classes will be recorded and posted on Canvas in case you are not able to attend live.

We are intending that class, for most of us, most of the time, will be in person. This, of course, may change. The TAs and I will do our best to communicate any changes as soon as we can. If you are not able to attend in person, please let us know too.

Recorded material policy: The University has developed specific policies and procedures regarding the use of video/audio recordings: these policies are explicitly described in the University's student manual as well as in the guidelines for instructors available here. A couple of points I want to highlight here:

> *By attending course sessions, students acknowledge that:*
>   i. *They will not: (i) record, share, or disseminate University of Chicago course sessions, videos, transcripts, audio, or chats; (ii) retain such materials after the end of the course; or (iii) use such materials for any purpose other than in connection with participation in the course.*
>   ii. *They will not share links to University of Chicago course sessions with any persons not authorized to be in the course session. Sharing course materials with persons authorized to be in the relevant course is permitted. Syllabi, handouts, slides, and other documents may be shared at the discretion of the instructor.*
>   iii. *Course recordings, content, and materials may be covered by copyrights held by the University, the instructor, or third parties. Any unauthorized use of such recordings or course materials may violate such copyrights.*
>   iv. *Any violation of this policy will be referred to the Area Dean of Students.*

Self Care: Sadly, this is still an uncertain time, and uncertainty elevates anxiety. I want to encourage you to take care of yourself (on Twitter, you will see pictures of my dog and elaborate meals). If you find yourself overwhelmed, please do not hesitate to reach out to Student Counseling Services.

*Note: All SCS services are covered by the Student Life Fee, and there is no additional cost for students to access their services. See https://wellness.uchicago.edu/mental-health/student-counseling-service-spring-quarter-faq/. Students seeking new services/resources can call 773.702.9800 during business hours (Monday–Friday 8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.) and ask to speak with a clinician. **Students needing urgent mental health care can speak with clinicians over the phone 24/7 by calling the SCS at 773.702.3625.***

Course Schedule and Readings (or podcasts, videos)

Week 1: September 27-29

Overview of Course and Types of Evidence

Evidence to Policy: https://www.povertyactionlab.org/evidence-to-policy

Read: Ruth Levine, "The Moral Case for Evidence in Policy Making
https://hewlett.org/moral-case-evidence-policymaking/

Putting Evidence to Use: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/putting_evidence_to_use

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/puar.12475

Watch: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2IrasRtUHO0&feature=youtu.be

Week 2: October 4 & 6

What is (Good Enough) Evidence? Whose evidence? Ethics?
.
Case: Deworming & Water Sanitation
Hamory, Joan, Edward Miguel, Michael Walker, Michael Kremer, and Sarah Baird.
(2020). "Twenty Year Economic Impacts of Deworming", unpublished working paper.
http://emiguel.econ.berkeley.edu/research/twenty-year-economic-impacts-of-deworming

Coville, A et al (2020). "Enforcing Payment for Water and Sanitation Services in Nairobi's Slums." chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Fpages.devex.com%2Frs%2F685-KBL-765%2Fimages%2FKenya%2520Water%2520RCT.pdf&clen=940116&chunk=true

Wolfe, R. (2020). The challenges and promises of using RCTs in conflict environments: A scholar-practitioner perspective. In Acar, O, Moss, S., & Uluğ, Y., eds. *Researching Peace and Conflict: Field Experiences and Methodological Reflections.* London: Springer. (On Canvas)

Isaksson, A. (2021). Rapid and Rigorous Impact Evaluation: Advances in the Methods and Data Available for Timely and Cost-Efficient Evaluation. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Fcgdev.org%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2FRapid-evaluation-background-paper.pdf&clen=521261&chunk=true

Muller, S., Chelwa, G., and Hoffman, N. (2019): https://qz.com/africa/1766686/the-problem-with-economists-using-randomized-trials-in-africa/

Kabeer, N. https://oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/naila-kabeer-on-why-randomized-controlled-trials-need-to-include-human-agency/ (includes podcast)

Reddy. S. (2019)https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/10/22/economics-development-rcts-esther-duflo-abhijit-banerjee-michael-kremer-nobel/

Other criticisms of RCTs (optional): https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/oureconomy/impoverished-economics-unpacking-economics-nobel-prize/

Rao, V: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0305750X19304723

Deaton, A. and Cartwright, N. (2018). *Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials.* https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0277953617307359?token=BF7F8A345E4D6B26AEE3CE172BFB6894E8B26443D8724551336CD6DB801DEC25CB217F2137F2B097531B27977F516824 (Links to an external site.)
Summary: https://voxeu.org/article/limitations-randomised-controlled-trials (Links to an external site.)

Week 3: October 11 & 13

Elements of Program and Policy Design
Theories of Change Readings:
Brown, A. (May 2016). What is this thing called "Theory of Change"
https://www.annmurraybrown.com/post/2016/03/09/what-is-this-thing-called-theory-of-change

Examples from DFID:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08a66ed915d622c000703/Appendix_3_ToC_Examples.pdf

Case: Contact Theory and Peacebuilding
Social Impact Report: https://www.dmeforpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/CMM20Evaluative20Learning20Review_Synthesis20Report20Final20March202014_USAID_040714.pdf

Choose at least 1:

Scacco, A. and Warren, S. (2018). Can social contact reduce prejudice and discrimination? Evidence from a field experiment in Nigeria. Am. Polit. Sci. Rev. **112**, 654–677 doi:10.1017/S0003055418000151: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/can-social-contact-reduce-prejudice-and-discrimination-evidence-from-a-field-experiment-in-nigeria/230FAEB8E4E9E756BF8560FE62E2FBAC

Mousa, S. (2020). Building social cohesion between Christians and Muslims through soccer in post-ISIS Iraq. Science 369 (6505), 866-870. https://science.sciencemag.org/content/sci/369/6505/866.full.pdf

Lowe, M. Types of contact: A field experiment on collaborative and adversarial caste integration (CESifo Working Paper Series 8089, 2019); **https://osf.io/u2d9x/**.

Paler, Laura, Leslie Marshall, and Sami Atallah. 2020. "How Cross-Cutting Discussion Shapes Support for Ethnic Politics: Evidence from an Experiment in Lebanon." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 15(1): 33-71: https://laurapaler.files.wordpress.com/2020/01/leb_diag_qjps_final.pdf

Week 4: October 18 & 20

Use of Descriptive Evidence
> Case: Education in Afghanistan

Burde, D & Khan, J. (2016). Will You Send Your Daughter to School? Norms, Violence, and Girls' Education in Uruzgan, Afghanistan. *Journal on Education in Emergencies¸* Vol 2, No 1 (December 2016), pp 42 - 80. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Farchive.nyu.edu%2Fbitstream%2F2451%2F39648%2F2%2FJEiE.V2.Burde_and_Khan.Dec%252016.pdf&clen=338873

Burde, Dana; Joel Middleton & Cyrus Samii. (2019). *The Assessment of Learning Outcomes and Social Effects of Community-Based Education: A Randomized Field Experiment in Afghanistan, Phase Two Outcomes Report.* New York: Steinhardt School, New York University.

Pritchett, L. & Sandfeur, J. (2013). Context Matters for Size: Why External Validity Claims and Development Practice Don't Mix. https://www.cgdev.org/publication/context-matters-size-why-external-validity-claims-and-development-practice-dont-mix

Week 5: October 25 & 27

Mixed Results, Null Results and Operationalization of Concepts
Case: Cash and CDD

For Cash, choose either Haushofer or Blattman

Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2016). The Short-Term Impact of Unconditional Cash Transfers to the Poor: Experimental Evidence from Kenya. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131(4), 1973–2042.
https://www.princeton.edu/haushofer/publications/Haushofer_Shapiro_UCT_QJE_2016.pdf

Haushofer, J. & Shapiro, J. (2018b). The Long-Term Impact of Unconditional Cash Transfers to the Poor: Experimental Evidence from Kenya. Working Paper.
https://www.princeton.edu/haushofer/publications/Haushofer_Shapiro_UCT2_2018.pdf

Blattman, C., Fiala, N., & Martinez, S. (2014). "Generating skilled self-employment in developing countries: Experimental evidence from Uganda," Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129(2), p. 697–752.
https://chrisblattman.com/documents/research/2014.GeneratingSkilledEmployment.QJE.pdf

Blattman, C., Fiala, N., & Martinez, S. (2019, April 16). The long term impacts of grants on poverty: 9-year evidence from Uganda's Youth Opportunities Program.
https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/vctuh: https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/vctuh/

> Summary: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/02/19/to-win-hearts-and-minds-in-afghanistan-some-aid-programs-worked-better-than-others/

Katherine Casey (2018). Radical Decentralization: Does Community-Driven Development Work? Annual Review of Economics 2018 10:1, 139-163.
https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-economics-080217-053339

Humphreys, M. , Sanchez de la Sierra, R., and Van der Windt, P. (2019). Exporting democratic practices: Evidence from a village governance intervention in Eastern Congo. Journal of Development Economics. Volume 140, Pages 279-301.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0304387818305078

> Skim to compare with academic article:
> http://3ieimpact.org/sites/default/files/2019-01/ie7_1.pdf

Bennett, S. and D'Onofrio, A. (2015). Community-Driven? Concepts, Clarity and Choices for Community-Driven Development in Conflict-Affected Countries. IRC. https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/567/communitydrivenlowresfinalshereeandalyoscia0.pdf

White, H., Menon, R., and Waddington, H. (2018). Community-driven development: does it build social cohesion or infrastructure? A mixed-method evidence synthesis. 3ie Working Paper 30. https://www.3ieimpact.org/sites/default/files/2018-08/wp30-cdd.pdf

> Related Brief: http://www.3ieimpact.org/sites/default/files/2018-08/CDD-brief-wp30_0.pdf

> Humphrey's commentary: http://macartan.nyc/posts/cdd-what-is-it-good-for/

Week 6: November 1 & 3

Scaling: Issues of Implementation
Case: Community Health
Björkman, M and J Svensson (2009), "Power to the people: Evidence from a randomised field experiment on community-based monitoring in Uganda", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(2): 735-769.: https://academic.oup.com/qje/article-abstract/124/2/735/1905094

Björkman Nyqvist, M, D de Walquen and J Svensson (2017), "Experimental evidence on the long-run impact of community based monitoring", *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 9(1): 33-69. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/app.20150027

Raffler, P., Posner., D and Parkerson. D. (under review). The Weakness of Bottom-Up Accountability: Experimental Evidence from the Ugandan Health Sector. http://piaraffler.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/RPP_Weakness-of-Bottom-Up.pdf
> Summary of study: https://voxdev.org/topic/health-education/does-bottom-accountability-work-evidence-uganda

Mobarack, M., Levy, K., and Reiamo, M. (Nov 14, 2017). The path to scale: From randomized control trial to scalable program. VoxDev. https://voxdev.org/topic/methods-measurement/path-scale-randomised-control-trial-scalable-programme

Mobarack, M., Levy, K., and Reiamo, M. (Nov 21, 2017). The path to scale: Replication, equilibrium effects and new settings. VoxDev. https://voxdev.org/topic/methods-measurement/path-scale-replication-general-equilibrium-effects-and-new-settings

Piper, K. (Nov. 29, 20198). A charity just admitted that its program wasn't working. That's a big deal. https://www.vox.com/2018/11/29/18114585/poverty-charity-randomized-controlled-trial-evidence-action

Mobarak, M. Davis, C.A. (2020). https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0305750X19304668

Optional Readings:
DellaVigna, S. & Linos, E. (2020) "RCTs to Scale: Comprehensive Evidence from Two Nudge Units"
https://www.nber.org/papers/w27594?utm_campaign=ntwh&utm_medium=email&utm_source=ntwg19
        Summary: https://www.bi.team/blogs/do-nudges-actually-work/

Week 7: November 8 & 10

Generalizability and Context Specificity
        Case: Information and Elections, plus a return to Community Health and Contact Theory

The Metaketa Initiative; Chapter 2 (2019). In T. Dunning, G. Grossman, M. Humphreys, S. Hyde, C. McIntosh, & G. Nellis (Eds.), Information, Accountability, and Cumulative Learning: Lessons from Metaketa I (Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics, pp. 16-49). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108381390.003 (On Canvas Reserve)

Dunning, T. et al (2019) Voter information campaigns and political accountability: Cumulative findings from a preregistered meta-analysis of coordinated trials. *Science Advances*: EAAW2612: https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/5/7/eaaw2612

Adida, C., Gottlieb, J., Kramon, E., & McClendon, G. (2020). When Does Information Influence Voters? The Joint Importance of Salience and Coordination. *Comparative Political Studies*, *53*(6), 851–891. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414019879945

Murdoch, J. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0305750X1930467X

Humphreys, M. and Scacco, A. (2020): https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0305750X19304553

Return to Community Health:

Darin Christensen, Oeindrila Dube Johannes Haushofer, Bilal Siddiqi and Maarten Voors "Building Resilient Health Systems: Experimental Evidence from Sierra Leone and the 2014 Ebola Outbreak": http://odube.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Ebola_Sierra_Leone.pdf

Week 8: November 15 & 17
Systems Thinking and Adaptive Management

Case: Training vs Cash in Rwanda

- McIntosh, Craig, and Zaitlin, Andrew (2020). *Using Household Grants to Benchmark the Cost-Effectiveness of USAID Workforce Readiness Program. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2009.01749.pdf (Links to an external site.)*
  - [Summary] Benchmarking Cash to an Employment Program in Rwandahttps://www.poverty-action.org/study/benchmarking-cash-employment-program-rwanda (Links to an external site.)
- Examining New Data on Workforce Development (2020). https://www.edc.org/examining-new-data-workforce-development?utm_source=edc&utm_medium=tw&utm_content=cash&utm_campaign=smedcorg (Links to an external site.)
- Quisiumbing, A. et al. (2020). *Randomized controlled trials of multi-sectoral programs: Lessons from development research.* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X19304711 (Links to an external site.)
  - ○
- Pett, Jamie (2020). *Navigating adaptive approaches for development programs: a guide for the uncertain.* https://www.odi.org/publications/17367-navigating-adaptive-approaches-development-programmes-guide-uncertain (Links to an external site.)
  - Related blog: https://medium.com/learnadapt/four-ways-development-practitioners-can-borrow-from-private-sector-adaptive-approaches-e5af0689ca78 (Links to an external site.)
- Harold, Jacob (2020). *A whole greater than the sum of its parts: What philanthropy can learn from complex systems theory.* https://www.issuelab.org/resources/35980/35980.pdf (Links to an external site.)

Optional
- Oakes, M. (2018). *The tribulations of trials: A commentary on Deaton and Cartwright.* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S027795361830193X (Links to an external site.)
- Raudenbush. S (2018). *On randomized experimentation in education: A commentary on Deaton and Cartwright, in honor of Frederick*

Mosteller. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0277953618301977 (Links to an external site.)
- Sampson, R. (2018). *After the experimental turn: A commentary on Deaton and Cartwright.* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277953618301783

Week 9: Thanksgiving week (no classes)

Week 10: November 29 & December 1
Political Barriers to Evidence Use

- Das., S. (2020). *(Don't) leave politics out of it: Reflections on public policies, experiments, and interventions.* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0305750X19304413 (Links to an external site.)
- Dreze, J. (2020). *Policy beyond evidence.* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0305750X19304462 (Links to an external site.)
- Michael Callen, Adnan Khan, Asim I. Khwaja, Asad Liaqat and Emily Myers (2017). *These 3 barriers make it hard for policymakers to use the evidence that development researchers produce* https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/08/13/these-3-barriers-make-it-hard-for-policymakers-to-use-the-evidence-that-development-researchers-produce/ (Links to an external site.)
- [chapter 3 & 6] Justin Parkhurst (2017). *The Politics of Evidence* http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/68604/1/Parkhurst_The%20Politics%20of%20Evidence.pdf (Links to an external site.)
- OECD (2018). *Building Capacity for Evidence-Informed Policy Making: Towards a Baseline Skill Set http://www.oecd.org/gov/building-capacity-for-evidence-informed-policymaking.pdf (Links to an external site.)*

Week 11: Final Paper Due December 10 at midnight