

PPHA 35560 - Translating Evidence for Public Policy and Program Design

Prof: Rebecca Wolfe

M, W: 10:30 – 11:50 AM CT

In person: Keller TBD

Zoom (Link on Canvas)

Office Hours: Tuesdays, 9 AM – 11 AM:

<https://calendar.google.com/calendar/u/0/selfsched?sstoken=UUUxd2dNb0o4NnJZfGRIZmF1bHR8MDlkOGlyODg5YzMwZWRhOTdlYmM1ZjVmYWVvMTY0ZTg>

rebeccawolfe@uchicago.edu

Teaching Assistant

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 10 M and 12 PM on Tuesdays. Please make an appointment with me in advance via the sign-up sheet. Other appointments can be made by email as necessary.

Note: If you are a no-show for an appointment, you will need to communicate with me before scheduling another one. If you do not speak with me first, I will cancel the meeting. Additionally, if you are unable to make an appointment and need to cancel, please also cancel the Google invite. This will open the slot for another student.

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. For references, the only requirement is that you are consistent with the format.

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 designing an intervention in a country in the Global South. Groups are self-selected with support from the TAs.

The first step is selecting an evaluation of an intervention you are interested in applying to a new context. This could be a program we discuss in class (education in Afghanistan; cash in Kenya; youth workforce development in Rwanda, etc). You will also have to select a context you want to apply it to. Groups and selected intervention and context are due October 10th before class (I likely will meet with each group in class to discuss intervention and context)

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

1. **Individual Assignment: Collecting the Evidence (20%): Due October 21 at midnight, 2 pages (references do not count).** 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 an 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:** How widely has the intervention you selected been evaluated? In similar contexts as the one you selected? With different target groups (ultra poor vs poor; women vs men)? In humanitarian vs development contexts? Or fragile vs places with more functioning institutions? Summarize the evidence

2. **Group: Designing an Evidence-Based Theory of Change (15%): November 11 at midnight, 3 pages, including diagram (references do not count).** For the second paper, you will begin thinking through how your intervention will have the impact you expect. In class, we will discuss how to diagram theories. You will adapt one of these examples, and then use the evidence you found in Assignment #1 to rate the strength of the evidence for the connections between different parts of the intervention and impacts. Specifically, you will identify:
 - **Inputs**
 - **Outputs**
 - **Short term outcomes**
 - **Long term outcomes**
 - **Impacts**
 - **Risks**

While much of this will be part of the final assignment, I want to give you plenty of opportunity for feedback.

3. **Proposing the Intervention (40%): Due December 9 at midnight.** For the final paper, your group will, in essence, write a proposal for the intervention. 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.). Much of this, if done well, should come from Assignment 1, incorporating feedback (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? This is mostly assignment 2, with adjustments based on feedback (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? (20%)

The total page limit for this assignment is **7 pages, including the diagram** (references do not count). This may seem extremely short, but most donors are requiring shorter and shorter proposals. This will help you hone your writing skills.

Group Participation (5%): Due December 9 at midnight .You will have an opportunity to provide feedback about your teammates, how they contributed well to your learning and any challenges you faced.

Weekly Reading (10%) 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 8 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.

These will be graded on a 3-point scale. Thoughtful comments that incorporate multiple readings will receive a 2; submitting a reflection on one reading (particularly if it was the shortest of the week) will receive a 1; not submitting will receive a 0.

Class Participation (10%): As I stated above, this is discussion-based class. Most weeks, at least one class (likely Wednesdays), we will do a deep dive on an evaluation. I will run this like a case, asking you questions about the paper rather than reviewing the paper. Come prepared.

Zoom will be available for those who need to use it, and please do use it when you need to quarantine. ***If you intend to use Zoom, please let the TA know before class.*** That said, coming to class is a public good and a commons problem. For many of us, it’s easier to not come to class and just turn on our computers. However, it is a better experience when we all come (particularly for discussion). And it is hard to participate if you do not come to class. While I will not take attendance and won’t police the use of Zoom, regular use of Zoom rather than coming to class (without discussing it with me), will negatively affect your participation grade.

I also encourage you to use Slack to share thoughts on the readings or share other relevant materials. We make this available for students who find other ways of participating more comfortable. 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.

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:

- 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.*
- 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 may 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)

Resource for the course: https://macartan.github.io/i/notes/rct_faqs.html

- Here is Macartan Humphrey's take to help practitioners read RCTs. We'll hit on a number of these points throughout the course.

Week 1: September 28

Overview of Course and Types of Evidence

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

Heidi McAnnally-Linz, Bethany Park & Radha Rajkotia (2021). Putting Evidence to Use: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/putting_evidence_to_use

CGD: Breakthrough to Policy Use: <https://pubs.cgdev.org/evidence-to-impact/index.html> (we will come back to this repeatedly)

Optional:

<https://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/passing-baton-data-and-evidence>

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>

Case: Coville, A et al (2020). "Enforcing Payment for Water and Sanitation Services in Nairobi's Slums." chrome-extension://efaidnbmninnibpcjpcglclefindmkaj/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.

<https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/Rapid-evaluation-background-paper.pdf>

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/impooverished-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

- Read Chapters 1 and 8

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>

- Podcast: <https://www.scopeconditionspodcast.com/episodes/episode-01salmamoussa>

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://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Farchive.nyu.edu%2Fbitstream%2F2451%2F39648%2F2%2FJIE.V2.Burde_and_Khan.Dec%252016.pdf&cldn=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.

- Summary: <https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/ihdsc/projects/alse/findings/reports>
- Other summaries of findings (optional):
<https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/ihdsc/projects/alse/findings/research-briefs>

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

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

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>

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/communitydrivenlowresfinalshereeadalyoscia0.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

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, 2018). 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/>

Al-Ubaydli, A et al (2019). THE SCIENCE OF USING SCIENCE: TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE THREATS TO SCALING EXPERIMENTS.

https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w25848/w25848.pdf

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>

Week 7: November 8 & 10

Generalizability, Context Specificity and Aggregation

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): 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 Rwanda <https://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.)

- Quisumbing, 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.)

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-policy-making.pdf> (Links to an external site.)
- Nastios, A. (2010). *The Clash of the Counter-bureaucracy and Development*. https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/1424271_file_Nastios_Counterbureaucracy.pdf

Optional

- Vivalt, E. et al (2021). Weighing the Evidence: Which Studies Count?.
<http://evavivalt.com/wp-content/uploads/Weighing-the-Evidence.pdf>

Week 11: Final Paper Due December 10 at midnight