PCD-5910C Alternative Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation
Course Syllabus

Instructor: James Magnus-Johnston (M.Phil., Cambridge) and Ray Vander Zaag (Ph.D. Carleton)
Email: jmagnus-johnston@cmu.ca and rvanderzaag@cmu.ca
Lecture times: 8:30am-5pm, Monday to Friday
Office hours: After class

Last date for voluntary withdrawal without academic penalty: July 15, 2019
_____

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Community-based initiatives in development, peacebuilding, and social innovation have questioned the appropriateness of mainstream monitoring and evaluation (M&E) approaches, which use logical frames and quantitative indicators to ensure accountability and assess impact. Students will be introduced to a range of alternative approaches to M&E that emphasize relationships, complexity, learning, and collaboration. How do you know when your organization or program is making a difference? How do you maintain focus on the right priorities? We will explore outcome mapping, social frameworks, ethnographic and story-based approaches, as well as developmental and utilization-focused evaluation tools in case study contexts. This course will encourage mutual learning among students on people-focused M&E rather than the development of skills in any single approach.

OBJECTIVES

After successful completion of this course students should have:

- Assessed issues they (will) experience in monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment in specific program contexts where they (will) work
- Reviewed five alternative approaches to monitoring and evaluation, and described how they incorporate more participatory and interpretive approaches to assessment
- Examined selected readings in the academic literature that theorizes how power and politics influences the practice of monitoring and evaluation in development, peacebuilding and social enterprise programming
- Written a monitoring (and/or) evaluation plan for a specific program context

REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS

There is one book (from a list of four) that you will need to purchase or borrow, in order to completed the pre-courses book review – see Assignment 1 on the next page for the book titles. All other required reading assignments are listed either in the Assignments section or in the Class Topics and Readings section, and can be accessed online or from the course Moodle site (https://moodle.cmu.ca/course/view.php?id=215). Contact either instructor if you have difficulty accessing the course Moodle site.

TEACHING APPROACH

In addition to lectures, there will be opportunity for interactive exercises, exploring case studies with guests, student interaction, and a small group project. Students will be expected to keep up with readings and actively engage in class activities.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND DEADLINES (for credit)

The following are the general outlines of requirements for those taking the course for credit. Others taking the course as auditors for personal or professional development are encouraged to read as much as possible in order to receive maximum benefit from the course. Assignments can be submitted in person during the course or via email to the instructor.

ASSIGNMENT SUMMARY

ASSIGNMENTS	DUE DATE	VALUE
1. Book Review	Monday June 10	15%
2. Context Self-Assessment	Monday June 10, 9:00am	15%
3. Group Presentation	Wed or Thurs, June 11 or 12	10%
4. Class Participation		15%
5. Case Study	Friday June 14	10%
6. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	Monday Aug 5	35%

ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION and GUIDELINES

1. **Book Review.** Write a critical book review (4 pages, 1000 words) of one of books listed below. Half of the review should summarize or outline the key ideas and arguments of the book, and half should assessment the relevance, importance and/or applicability of the book's argument to debates on M&E or Social Impact practice.
   a. Eligible books:
      i. Rosalind Eyben et al. (eds.) (2015) The Politics of Evidence and Results in International Development. Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing.
      ii. Skovdal, Morten and Flora Cornish. (2015). Qualitative Research for Development: A Guide for Practitioners. Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing.

      iii.   Epstein, Marc and Yuthas, Kristi. (2014). Measuring and improving social impacts : A guide for nonprofits, companies, and impact investors. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers

      iv.   Honeyman, Ryan. (2014). The B Corp Handbook. San Francisco, Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

2. **Context Self-assessment**. The purpose of this pre-course assignment is identify and assess the knowledge and experiences that students already have with monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment, and their personal goals for learning. It is assumed that all participants in the course either: a) currently work or volunteer in an organization in which monitoring and evaluation of projects, programs or enterprises occurs; or b) aspire to work or volunteer in such an organization and can imagine and/or research case studies of the issues regarding improved and alternative monitoring and evaluation practice. For this assignment, each student should:

   a.   Read:

      i.   Guijt, Irene. 2010. "Accountability and Learning: Exploding the Myth of Incompatibility between Accountability and Learning." Pp. 277-291 in J. Ubels, N.Acquaye-Baddoo and A. Fowler (eds.), *Capacity Development in Practice*. Washington: Earthscan. Online: https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resource/overview/accountability_and_learning

      ii.   Oswald, K., & Taylor, P. (2010). "A Learning Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation". *IDS Bulletin*, *41*(6), 114–120. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2010.00189.x   (If you cannot access this journal, a slightly earlier version, with two additional case studies (Sections 4.1 and 4.2) is available here: http://pool.fruitycms.com/aline/Downloads/Katy-Paper.pdf

      iii.   Tschirhart, M., & Bielefeld W. (2012). *Managing nonprofit organizations*. John Wiley & Sons. Chapter 13: "Program Evaluation".   (This is a good basic introduction to (or 'baseline' for) the principles of program evaluation, from <u>within</u> mainstream approaches.) Most of Ch. 13 is available as part of the preview of this book on Amazon.

      iv.   Eyben, Rosalind. (2013). "Uncovering the Politics of Evidence and Results: A Framing Paper for Development Practitioners." Online: http://bigpushforward.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/The-politics-of-evidence-11-April-20133.pdf

      v.   +Acumen. "Lean Data Approaches to Measure Social Impact." Module 1. New York: Acumen. (This module will be posted on the course Moodle website by May 20.)

   b.   Write:

      i.   A three-part self-assessment of your current experience and knowledge of monitoring and evaluation practice, and their learning goals for the course:

      ii.   Description of your work (organizational) environment (actual or imagined): organizational goals and main types of programming (2 pages, 500 words) and approaches to M&E, including primary purposes, methods used, and how roles/responsibilities are distributed among staff (2 pages, 500 words).

      iii.   Based on the readings (a. above) and description of your actual/imagined organizational work experience (b. ii above), assess what you understand the key issues for better M&E approaches and practice to be (3 pages, 750 words).

      iv.   List four personal learning objectives for this course (1 page, 250 words). Each objective should include WHAT (the content – knowledge, skills, attitudes - you want to learn) and the

WHAT FOR (what specific activity you will be able to <u>do</u> with that content.) *For example, a learning objective could be to know the steps in planning an evaluation ('what'), so that you can write a detailed evaluation plan ('what for').*

3. **Group Presentation.** As part of group of three, make a 20 minute in-class presentation of a selected alternative approach to monitoring and evaluation. The presentation should include up to 10 minutes of powerpoint/prezi slides, an accompanying 'talk', and 10 minutes of class engagement (an exercise, assignment, worksheet, sample activity, etc.) that helps class members understand the approach.

4. **Case Study Summary.** A 4-page summary (1000 words) of a case-study description of an alternative M&E approach (from a website, guidebook, resource manual.)
   - i.   Photovoice
   - ii.   Case studies from DME for Peace
   - iii. (Rapid) Outcome Mapping Approach
   - iv.   Sense-Making
   - v.   Most Significant Change approach
   - vi.   Lean Data
   - vii. Case studies from Human-Centred Design (designkit.org)
   - viii. Case studies from Service Design in business

5. **Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.**
   a. Using a 'how to plan an M&E guide', prepare a detailed monitoring (*and/or?*) evaluation plan for an actual or hypothetical program/project/social enterprise (10-15 pages, 2500-3750 words).
      - i. Options for guides:
        - Better Evaluation "Rainbow Framework" guide. (Answer the relevant questions – in coloured text blocks – for each of the seven steps in the framework.) https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/rainbow_framework
        - Woodrow, Peter, Nick Oatley, and Michelle Garred. "*Faith Matters: A Guide for the Design, Monitoring & Evaluation of Inter-Religious Peacebuilding.*" CDA Collaborative Learning Projects and Alliance for Peacebuilding, September 2017. https://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/faith-matters-guide-design-monitoring-evaluation-inter-religious-action-peacebuilding/
        - Design Thinking (From either "This is Service Design Doing" at www.thisisservicedesigndoing.com/methods / or Human-Centred Design methods at www.designkit.org)
      - ii. The plan should consist of an explanation according to each key step indicated in the selected guide.
   b. Write a self-assessment (3 pages, 750 words) of the plan, describing how well you think the plan addresses the principles and key issues for "good" (accountable and learning-focused) M&E, as studied during the course. Questions to consider: How well does the plan balance accountability and learning? How well does the plan deal with complexity, emergence, partnerships, qualitative change, etc.

6. **Course Participation.** Students are expected to participate actively in the class sessions, through careful listening, posing of questions, contributing to discussions, and participating in small-group exercises.

STYLISTIC REQUIREMENTS

CMU has adopted the following as its standard guide for all academic writing:

Hacker, Diana. *A Pocket Style Manual.* Sixth edition. Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2012.

The final M&E plan is not an academic document. However, it should follow use some form of accepted academic format (e.g. APA, Chicago, MLA) to indicate sources of key ideas, citations, and a short bibliography. You may choose the format but whichever you use, be sure to use it properly and consistently.

OTHER REQUIRMENTS

Academic Integrity—All material referred to in any assignment MUST be appropriately referenced. Plagiarism is a serious matter. Students should be aware of CMU Academic Policies, particularly those regarding academic misconduct (plagiarism and cheating), which apply to all University courses. These are detailed on CMU's website (http://www.cmu.ca/students.php?s=registrar&p=policies) and in the CMU Calendar. If you still have questions about appropriate referencing and what plagiarism is, a useful tutorial can be found here: http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/.

*Attendance—*In order to maximize the potential of the educational process, and given the intensive nature of CSOP courses, it is necessary that each student attend all classes. On occasion, a student may need to miss some class time. A half-day of class (4 total hours) is the maximum allowable absence, and any student missing more than this may be barred from further class attendance. In such cases the student is responsible to advise the instructor before the class occurs. It is the responsibility of the student to become familiar with all academic policies, including those pertaining to attendance, academic misconduct, and grading.

ACCESSIBILITY

CMU strives to provide a fair and supportive learning environment for academically qualified students with disabilities. If you are eligible for these services or have questions about becoming eligible, please contact Sandra Loeppky, Coordinator of Accessibility Programs at sloeppky@cmu.ca or 204.487.3300 x.340.

In recognition of individuals with asthma, allergies and severe environmental/chemical sensitivities, CMU is striving to become a scent-free campus. Students, staff and guests are asked to refrain from wearing fragrances and scented personal care products at CMU. This includes perfumes, colognes, aftershave and scented hair products. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated by those affected.

EVALUATION

In general, we expect you to *follow the guidelines* of the assignment and to discuss deviations from them with one of us before turning it in. In evaluating your work, *quality* is more important than quantity. We appreciate creativity, clear expression of ideas, evidence of engagement with the reading and class sessions, and projects that are of real interest and value to you.

Assignments are due as scheduled. Marks will be deducted for lateness (5% per day), unless previous arrangements have been made with the instructor. Negotiations are permissible. All assignments should be submitted on paper unless specified otherwise.

Good communication skills are essential for justice and peacebuilding work. Students will be expected to communicate knowledgeably, clearly, effectively, concisely and persuasively. All written work should be well informed, well organized and well documented.

Each completed assignment will be given a numerical grade (according to its value toward the final grade) and the corresponding letter grade. The final mark for each student is determined by the sum total of all numerical grades, which is then assigned a letter grade according to the scale below.

Students to take up any concerns or questions regarding grades first with the instructor. If this does not produce a satisfactory result, the student should submit a written appeal to the Registrar (spenner@cmu.ca).

NOTE: Grades are not final until vetted and approved by the Dean's Office.

For more information on CMU policies regarding grades, academic misconduct, appeals, and other matters, please see the CMU *Student Handbook*.

LETTER GRADE/PERCENTAGE SCALE

Letter Grade	Percentage	Grade Points	Descriptor
A+	95-100	4.5	Exceptional
A	88-94	4	Excellent
B+	81-87	3.5	Very Good
B	74-80	3	Good
C+	67-73	2.5	Satisfactory
C	60-67	2	Adequate
D	50-59	1	Marginal
F	0-49	0	Failure

Criteria	A - Excellent	B - Competent	C - Below Expectations
CONTENT (quality of the information/ideas and sources/details used to support them)	- has clarity of purpose - has depth of content - displays insight or originality of thought -demonstrates quality and breadth of resources	- has clarity of purpose - has substantial information and sufficient support - contains some originality of thought -uses quality resources	- has clarity of purpose -lacks depth of content and may depend on generalities or the commonplace - has little originality of thought -uses mostly quality resources
STRUCTURE (logical order or sequence of the writing)	- is coherent and logically developed -uses very effective transitions	- is coherent and logically developed -uses smooth transitions	- is coherent and logically (but not fully) developed -has some awkward transitions
CONVENTIONS (appearance of the writing: sentence structure, usage, mechanics, documentation)	- has virtually no errors of conventions	- has minimal errors of conventions	- is understandable <u>but</u> has noticeable problems of sentence structure, usage, mechanics or documentation
STYLE (personality of the writing: word choice, sentence variety, voice, attention to audience)	- is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective -has nicely varied sentence structure -is engaging throughout and enjoyable to read	- displays concern for careful expression -has some variation in sentence structure -is generally enjoyable to read	- has some personality <u>but</u> lacks imagination and may be stilted and may rely on clichés -has little variation in sentence structure -is not very interesting to read

EXTENSIONS

The last date within the semester an instructor can grant as an extension is AUG 15. If a student is unable to complete the requirements of a course by this date, the student must submit a written appeal for an "incomplete" to the Registrar's office (spenner@cmu.ca). The student should seek the instructor's support for the appeal and must submit it by AUG 16.

If the student's appeal is granted, the instructor will enter a grade of I (for incomplete) accompanied by a temporary grade (which is based on completed work and assigns a value of zero for uncompleted work). Instructor grades are due by AUG 21. If the student completes the remaining work within the extension period, the grade will be recalculated and the incomplete status will be removed. If the student does not complete the work within the extension period, the incomplete status will be removed and the provisional grade entered alongside the "incomplete" will become the final grade. The maximum extension for courses ending in August is DEC 1.

SCHEDULE, TOPICS & READINGS*

*This schedule, along with assigned readings, may be adjusted slightly in response to pace of discussion, availability of guests, and other scheduling issues. The instructor will provide advance notice of any changes. Students should complete readings BEFORE the beginning of class for listed day.

1. **Monday, June 10**

CSOP Opening:

Morning: Introductions. Review of student self-assessments, learning objectives.

Afternoon: Issues in Monitoring, Evaluation and Social Impact: The Mainstream, the Critique, the State of the Art.

Readings (same readings as for pre-course)**:**

Funnell, S., & Rogers, P. (2011). Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Parts of

Oswald, K., & Taylor, P. (2010). "A Learning Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation". IDS Bulletin, 41(6), 114–120. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2010.00189.x

2. **Tuesday, June 11**

Morning: Case Study: Canadian Foodgrains Bank (guest speakers – program officers from CFGB.)

Afternoon: Outcome Mapping: Theory and Practice

Readings:

Young, J, et al. (2014). ROMA: A guide to policy engagement and influence. London: ODI. Available online: https://www.odi.org/features/roma/download-pdf

Outcome Mapping Practitioner Guide. Online resource on the Outcome Mapping Learning Community website: https://www.outcomemapping.ca/outcome-mapping-practitioner-guide. Review the guide and two examples of the use of OM from section 9 on the 'start here' page: https://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/start-here

3. **Wednesday, June 12**

Morning: Social Impact Assessment (Fools + Horses case study)

Afternoon: Problem-solving workshop: Using design methods for M&E problems in small business

Readings:

An Entrepreneur's Guide to Certified B Corporations and Benefit Corporations. New Haven: Yale Center for Business and the Environment. Online: http://cbey.yale.edu/sites/default/files/BCORP_Printable.pdf

Brown, Tim and Wyatt, Jocelyn. Design Thinking for Social Innovation. Stanford Social Innovation Review. Online: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/design_thinking_for_social_innovation#

Stickdorn et al. This is Service Design Doing: Methods. Online: www.thisisservicedesigndoing.com/methods

4. Thursday, June 13

Morning: Story-based, Ethnographic Approaches

Afternoon: Small group presentations on Alternative Approach

Readings:

Davies, Rick and Jess Dart. (2005) *The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique: A guide to its Use.* Online: https://mande.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/MSCGuide.pdf

Asadullah, S. and Muniz, S. (2015) Participatory Video and The Most Significant Change: A guide for facilitators. InsightShare, Oxford, UK. Online: www.insightshare.org/resources/pv-and-msc-guide

5. Friday, June 14

Morning: Strategic M&E in a large business context: Using the balanced scorecard; The Political Economy of Evaluation and Evidence.

Afternoon: Evaluate Learning and Process, Plan Utilization of Learning. CSOP closing @ 3:00 p.m.

Readings:

Kaplan, Robert and Norton, David. Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work. Harvard Business Review. Online: https://hbr.org/1993/09/putting-the-balanced-scorecard-to-work

Guijt, Irene. (2015). "Playing the rules of the game and other strategies." Ch. 11 in Rosalind Eyben *et al.* (eds.), *The Politics of Evidence and Results in International Development.* Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing.

SCHEDULE NOTES
Coffee Breaks are normally 10:30-11:00 am and 3:30-4 pm.

Class photos will be taken on Monday or Tuesday: plan for 15 minutes for the photo taking.

July 15	The final date to withdraw from the course without academic penalty.
Aug 15	Instructors cannot grant extensions past this date.
Aug 16	The last day for students to appeal in writing to the Registrar's office for extensions past Aug 15.
Aug 21	Last day for instructors to submit grades.

Important Resource Websites:

DME for Peace. A global online community of practitioners, evaluators and academics sharing best and emerging practices on how to design, monitor and evaluation peacebuilding programs. https://www.dmeforpeace.org/

Better Evaluation. An international collaboration for improving the practice and theory of evaluation by creating and curating information on evaluation methods and processes. https://www.betterevaluation.org

Monitoring and Evaluation NEWS. A news service focusing on developments in M&E methods relevant to development programming. https://mande.co.uk

This is Service Design Doing. A library of 54 hands-on descriptions of how to do the key methods of service design. https://www.thisisservicedesigndoing.com/

Center for Evaluation Innovation. "Our aim is to push philanthropic and nonprofit evaluation practice in new directions and into new arenas." www.evaluationinnovation.org

Other Readings:

Davies, Rick. 2018. "Participatory approaches to the development of a Theory of Change: Beginnings of a list." Post on Monitoring and Evaluation NEWS website. https://mande.co.uk/2018/lists/participatory-toc-development/participatory-approaches-to-the-development-of-a-theory-of-change-beginnings-of-a-list/

Van Es M, Guijt I and Vogel I (2015) *Theory of Change Thinking in Practice.* HIVOS. http://www.theoryofchange.nl/sites/default/files/resource/hivos_Theory of Change_guidelines_final_nov_2015.pdf.

Guijt, Irene. (2008). "Critical Readings on Assessing and Learning for Social Change: A Review." Sussex: Institute of Development Studies. http://bigpushforward.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/guijt-assessing-social-change.pdf

Mowles, Chris. (2010). "Post-foundational Development Management – Power, Politics and Complexity." *Public Administration and Development* 30: 149-158.

Mowles, Chris (2010). "Successful or not? Evidence, emergence, and development management." *Development in Practice*, 20 (7), 757-770.

Hall, Matthew (2014). "Evaluation Logics in the Third Sector.*" International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 25 (2), 307-336. https://cmulibrary.on.worldcat.org/oclc/5679068702

Preskill, Hallie and Tanya Beer. (2012). "Evaluating Social Innovation." Center for Evaluation Innovation/FSG. http://www.evaluationinnovation.org/sites/default/files/EvaluatingSocialInnovation.pdf