PPHA 35560 - Behavioral Policy and Program Design: Translating Evidence for Impact

Prof: Rebecca Wolfe

M, W: 10:30-11:50 AM CT
Keller 0007
Office Hours: Tuesdays, 10 AM – 12 AM: https://calendar.app.google/qDcTMWJr8ihA6T7k9
rebeccawolfe@uchicago.edu

Teaching Assistants
Eddie Andujar: eandujar@uchicago.edu
Gregy Tureah: gregy@uchicago.edu

Overview: A significant proportion of programs and policies aim to change behaviors. As much of the evidence for behavioral science comes from contexts that are considered WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrial, Rich Democratic), a question often emerges: how can we interpret and use evidence for from different contexts to programs and policies relevant to international development. As the demand for the use of evidence in designing international development programs and policy continues to grow, figuring out how to interpret and use the evidence generated also grows. What about human behavior is generalizable? What is context specific? How do we 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 behavioral 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 behavioral science and evidence-informed policy making, including:

- Use of Behavioral Science in International Development
- Elements of Policy and Program Design
  - Theories of Change
- Combining Various Forms of Evidence
- Use of Descriptive Evidence
- Generalizability and Context Specificity
- External Validity
- Scalability of programs
- Ethical Considerations
- Political Barriers

Most weeks, we will dive into at least one evaluation of a behavioral 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 and the TA to provide feedback to students. If any of the 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 case-based discussions and occasional 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, M-F. 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 (or Monday morning if you email after 6 PM on Friday).

Office Hours: I will conduct offices hours between 10 AM 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.

Specialization: This course is eligible for the IPD concentration.

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 a multi-pronged intervention for a Low/Low-Middle Income Country (LMIC). Groups are self-selected with support from the TA.

The first step is selecting a sector you want to work on and a context where you will be designing a program. This could be a program we discuss in class (education in Afghanistan; social protection in Kenya; youth workforce development in Rwanda, etc). You will also have to select a context you want to apply it to. Groups and the selected sector and context are due January 21st 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. **Group Assignment: Describing the Problem (10%): <u>Due January 30th at midnight, 2 pages</u>** (references do not count). The first building block is collecting the evidence for your intervention. This assignment has two parts. Spend 1 page on each section.

    - **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.

2. **Individual Assignment: How has the Problem Been Addressed in your Context and Elsewhere? (10%) <u>Due February 13th at midnight, 2 pages</u>** (references do not count).
    - **Sector**: How has this area been addressed in the context you have selected? In other contexts? What is the evidence for progress in the sector? What intervention gaps do you see? Summarize at least two impact evaluations as part of this section.

3. **Group: Designing an Evidence-Informed Theory of Change (15%): <u>February 27th at midnight, 3 pages, including diagram</u>** (references do not count)**.** For the second paper, you will begin thinking through how your multi-pronged intervention, which includes a behavioral element, will have the effects 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.

4. **Proposing the Intervention (35%)**: <u>**Due March 13th at midnight.**</u> 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 (3 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 (50%)
    - **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? (15%)

    The total page limit for this assignment is **8 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 (10%): <u>**Due March 13 at midnight**</u> . You will have an opportunity to provide feedback about your teammates, how they contributed well to your learning and any challenges you faced.

Class Participation (10%): As I stated above, this is discussion-based class. Most weeks, at least one class, 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. As part of class, I

will ask specific questions from the papers. From time-to-time I may use cold calls. I will also push you to use evidence to support your statements. The purpose of this is that in the workplace, you will be asked by superiors for this information, not always in written form.

Your class participation grade includes not only active participation in class but also contributing to the norms of a supportive learning environment. This includes:
- Attending class consistently
- Arriving on time
- Minimizing disruptions
- Observing the electronics policy

Reading Reflection (10%): For each class (except the first week), please submit 1-2 bullet points (no more than half a page) by 11:59 pm CST the night before class. These are aimed to help you prepare for the class discussion. Reflection points can either be reflections on the readings (e.g., what surprised you, limits to the findings, applications of the findings) or questions on the readings (e.g., something confusing about the findings or methodology). You can use the case guidance questions as prompts for reflection. The bullet points should not be a summary of the readings. Submissions will be graded on a 3-point scale:

2 points (Strong)	Bullet points demonstrate depth of reading and thoughtfulness. There is evidence that the student read carefully, relating their points/questions to specific aspects of the course materials. The points bring together a combination of analysis, application, and integrations with other course materials.
1 point (Good)	Bullet points demonstrate familiarity with reading, with some thought about its applications, limitations, and/or integration with other course materials.
0 points (Unsatisfactory)	No submission or bullet points demonstrate superficial reading of materials (e.g., points could have been written just based on the abstract)

Students may take 2 "passes" and not submit the bullet points over the course of the term.

Requests for Resubmissions: If you receive a B- or below on any assignment, I will allow you to redo the assignment to raise your grade to a B. You can choose this option one time during the quarter.

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/

Use of Artificial Intelligence *(Adapted from PPHA 31941, Behavioral Science and Public Policy, Spring 2024)***:** AI tools offer valuable assistance in writing legibly, research support and idea generation. However, these tools are not substitutes for your intellectual engagement with the material. You are permitted to use AI tools as supplementary aids for refining your ideas, finding research material, and editing language to help with translation, spelling, grammar, and improving sentence flow. No more than 20% of any paragraph or assignment may be generated using AI tools.

Relying on these tools beyond this violates the principles of academic integrity described above and will be addressed as such. You are fully responsible for the content they generate. You should review and edit any generated content to avoid inaccurate information and copyright infringement.

All instances where AI tools are used must be acknowledged. When submitting an assignment in which you used an AI tool, please add a disclosure statement at the end of the assignment which:
- Names the tool(s) used
- Describe use (refining initial ideas, providing research insights, improving your writing, etc.)
- Explains how you further modified the AI-generated content
- Offers a brief reflection of how using the tool helped you learn.

Example AI Disclosure: To check how a student may use ChatGPT to complete an assignment, I prompted ChatGPT with the assignment instructions. I adjusted the assignment based on this feedback. I then asked ChatGPT to review the revised assignment and see if there were ways to make it more difficult for ChatGPT. Using ChatGPT assisted in me in crafting assignments that would require students to use the intellectual prowess and creativity.

Electronics Policy: As this is a course about evidence-informed policy, I have chosen to make an evidence-informed policy about electronics. There is now considerable evidence (see, for example, here, here, here, and here) that the use of electronics in classrooms has adverse impacts on learning. *To optimize the classroom experience, I am restricting the use of electronic screens (laptops, phones) in class, with exceptions for students with a documented Student*

Disability Services (SDS) accommodation. Students may use tablets that lie flat, and take notes, read PDFs, etc.

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 75% of 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.

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.

Recommended books:

Stefan Dercon (2022). *Gambling on Development.* NY: Hurst. Easily bought from your bookstore. If you plan to have a career in development, it's a must read.

Sendil Mullainathan and Eldar Shafir (2013). *__Scarcity: Why Having Too Little Means So Much__*. New York: Henry Holt Times Books.

January 5: Overview of Course

> Read: Ruth Levine, "The Moral Case for Evidence in Policy Making
> https://hewlett.org/moral-case-evidence-policymaking/
>
> Mayne, R., Green, D., Guijt, I. *et al.* Using evidence to influence policy: Oxfam's experience. *Palgrave Commun* **4**, 122 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0176-7

January 7: Where to Intervene? Defining the Policy Problem
Case: Collier, P., & Hoeffler, A. (2004). Greed and Grievance in Civil War. *Oxford Economic Papers*, *56*(4), 563–595. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3488799

> Blattman, C., Fiala, N. & Martinez, S. (2014). Generating Skilled Self-Employment in Developing Countries: Experimental Evidence from Uganda, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 129, Issue 2, , Pages 697–752, https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjt057
>
> Meltzer, R. & Schwartz, A. (2025). Policy Analysis as Problem-Solving. NY: Routledge. Chapter 2.
> https://books.google.com/books?id=0bI1EQAAQBAJ&pg=PA37&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=2#v=onepage&q&f=false

January 12: Who Are We Designing Policies For: Human-Centered Design and Ethics
Case: Coville, A et al (2020). "Enforcing Payment for Water and Sanitation Services in Nairobi's Slums."
https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w27569/w27569.pdf

> Primer on Human-Centered Design: https://www.ideou.com/blogs/inspiration/what-is-human-centered-design?srsltid=AfmBOope9xMI37b8o9YhGN-iaUzrCZCTKS-ahymQwd7b4g4Kc0CjIYgp
>
> Thomas, C. C., & Markus, H.R. (2023). Enculturating the science of international development: Beyond the WEIRD independent paradigm. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 54*(2), 195-214. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221128211.

January 14: Use of Behavioral Science in International Development
> **Case: Scarcity in India**
> **Reading:** Mani, Mullainathan S. Shafir E. Zhao J., A. "Poverty Impede Cognitive Function." *Science* 341 (2013): 976–

980. https://shafir.scholar.princeton.edu/sites/g/files/toruqf4226/files/povertyimpedescognitivefunction.pdf

January 19: No Class

January 21: Discerning Evidence
> .
> **Case:** Deworming
>
> Miguel, Edward and Kremer, Michael (2004). Worms: Identifying Impacts on Education and Health in the Presence of Treatment Externalities. Econometrica, Vol. 72, No. 1, , 159–217: https://cega.berkeley.edu/assets/cega_research_projects/1/Identifying-Impacts-on-Education-and-Health-in-the-Presence-of-Treatment-Externalities.pdf
>
> *Skim*: Hamory, Joan, Edward Miguel, Michael Walker, Michael Kremer, and Sarah Baird. (2021). "Twenty Year Economic Impacts of Deworming", PNAS.
> https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2023185118
>
> de Silva N, Ahmed B-N, Casapia M, de Silva HJ, Gyapong J, Malecela M, et al. (2015) Cochrane Reviews on Deworming and the Right to a Healthy, Worm-Free Life. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 9(10): e0004203.
> *https://journals.plos.org/plosntds/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pntd.0004203&type=printable*
>
> Podcast (only listen to after reading): https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/the-worm-wars/id1535408667?i=1000567966538

January 23: Group Meetings
> From 10 AM-1 PM, each group will meet with Prof. Wolfe to discuss their projects. We will send a signup sheet around.

January 26: 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

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
   o Podcast: https://www.scopeconditionspodcast.com/episodes/episode-01salmamousa

January 28: 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.
   • 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

February 2: What to do with Mixed Results? How Should we Adapt Programs?

Case: Cash
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

February 4: When is a Null Really a Null? Operationalization of Concepts
Case 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

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

EGAP, 10 Things Your Null Might Mean: https://egap.org/resource/10-things-your-null-result-might-mean/

February 9: Scaling #1: 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. (Forthcoming). The Weakness of Bottom-Up Accountability: Experimental Evidence from the Ugandan Health Sector. *Journal of*

Politics. https://danielnposner.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/RPP-ACT-Health-240214.pdf
> Summary of study: https://voxdev.org/topic/health-education/does-bottom-accountability-work-evidence-uganda

February 11th: Scaling #2: Issues of Targeting

Case: Urban-Rural Migration in Bangladesh

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
- Related study (skim): https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w23929/w23929.pdf

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/

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

February 16th: Generalizability vs Context Specificity
> Case: Community Health, Redux

Darin Christensen, Oeindrila Dube, Johannes Haushofer, Bilal Siddiqi, Maarten Voors (2021). Building Resilient Health Systems: Experimental Evidence from Sierra Leone and the 2014 Ebola Outbreak. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.

Bates, M. A., & Glennerster, R. (2017). The Generalizability Puzzle. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, *15*(3), 50–54. https://doi.org/10.48558/EYY5-3S89 https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_generalizability_puzzle

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)

February 17th: Dealing with Bundled Programs
Case: Graduation Program
https://www.poverty-action.org/impact/ultra-poor-graduation-model

Banerjee, Abhijit, Esther Duflo, Nathanael Goldberg, Dean Karlan, Robert Osei, William Parient, Jeremy Shapiro, Bram Thuysbaert, and Christopher Udry. 2015. "A Multi-faceted Program Causes Lasting Progress for the Very Poor: Evidence from Six Countries." *Science* 348(6236), doi: 10.1126/science. 1260799.

Banerjee, Abhijit, Dean Karlan, Robert Osei, Hannah Trachtman, Christopher Udry, 2018. "Unpacking a Multi-Faceted Program to Build Sustainable Income for the Very Poor."https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w24271/w24271.pdf

Optional:
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.)

February 23rd: Systems Thinking

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.)

Ricigliano, Rob (2021). The Complexity Spectrum
https://blog.kumu.io/the-complexity-spectrum-e12efae133b0

February 25th: Deciding to Use Evidence
Case: Effective Altruism
https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/08/15/the-reluctant-prophet-of-effective-altruism

https://blog.givewell.org/2022/08/17/changes-to-top-charity-criteria/
Give Directly's response: https://www.givedirectly.org/giving-directly-still-means-giving-well/

https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2022/8/8/23150496/effective-altruism-sam-bankman-fried-dustin-moskovitz-billionaire-philanthropy-crytocurrency

Deaton, A. Limitations of randomized controlled trials:: https://voxeu.org/article/limitations-randomised-controlled-trials (Links to an external site.)

March 2nd: Political and Organizational Barriers and 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.)

Nastios, A. (2010). The Clash of the Counter-bureaucracy and Development.
https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/1424271_file_Natsios_Counterbureaucracy.pdf
Dercon, S. Chapters 12-13

March 4th: Psychological Barriers to Evidence Use/Wrap Up
- Summary of Difficult Conversations (Stone, Heen & Patton): https://charles.io/difficult-conversations/. Focus on the Identity Conversation
- Baggini, Julian (2018). Stories help us understand the world—but our human impulse towards narrative has a dark side. Prospect Magazine. https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/philosophy/how-the-human-craving-for-narrative-can-lead-us-astray%E2%80%A8
- Grelle, S., & Hofmann, W. (2023). When and Why Do People Accept Public-Policy Interventions? An Integrative Public-Policy-Acceptance Framework. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *19*(1), 258-279. https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916231180580 (Original work published 2024)

Final Paper Due March 13th at midnight