

 <p>THE CENTER FOR JUSTICE & PEACEBUILDING</p> <p>A PROGRAM OF EASTERN MENNONITE UNIVERSITY</p>	<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION THROUGH QUALITATIVE METHODS</p> <p>PAX 516 A</p> <p>Fall 2023 Mondays, 1:45 p.m. – 4:45 p.m. Hartzler Library/LB 121 (JAMAR classroom) or via Zoom</p>
---	--

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT This syllabus draws directly and heavily upon Matt Tibble’s syllabus for PAX516 in 2021, particularly the description, overview, orientation and the required stock institutional themes. The course progression, daily topics and grading process were developed by Mark M. Rogers.

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Instructor: Mark M. Rogers

Office: Remote

*Office Hours: Mondays/Wednesdays 9 a.m. - 12 p.m. or by **appointment***

Phone: (607) 278-4141

Email: markmrogers@hotmail.com

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This blended course is designed to help undergraduate and graduate students understand and practice the implementation of program evaluation through the methodologies of qualitative research. Historic and contemporary sociological and anthropological approaches (Western and Indigenous) will provide the theoretical and philosophical background for our work, but the focus will be on practical applications of qualitative methodology in evaluation. Students will design the evaluation, conducting structured and semi- structured interviews, focus group interviews (depending on the case), coding interview transcripts, and will practice working with a client, determining appropriate methods, collecting data, analyzing the data, interpreting the data, and communicating the findings. This course complements, but does not take the place of other research and evaluation courses that focus entirely on either research or evaluation.

The course format is participatory, experiential and adaptive. Students will conduct an actual professional evaluation of an on-going program; consequently, students will find themselves leading and/or participating in processes with which they may have no prior experience. Further, the syllabus, readings and assignments may need to be adapted to meet the changing needs of the program. The course involves a significant amount of group work in and out of the class. Each participant is advised to consider that requirement in relation to personal obligations, distance from campus, ease of meeting with other students and individual willingness to participate in a work team.

This course may encounter ideas and experiences that have caused harm and traumagenic responses in people’s lives and communities when developing the program evaluation with the

client. With this in mind, we will be utilizing a Trauma-Informed Classroom Care Model [Cless, J. D. & Goff, B. 2017. Teaching trauma: A model for introducing traumatic materials in the classroom. *Advances in Social Work*, 18(1), 25-38.]. Elements of this model include:

- *Trauma Exposure* - Course objectives may expose students to elements of trauma and trigger traumatic stress.
- *Reactions to Trauma* - How a student responds to traumagenic information or events varies from student to student and depends on personal history. This course will utilize three phases of trauma recovery: Safety, Remembrance and Mourning, and Reconnection (integration).
- *Student Disclosure of Trauma* - Students have the opportunity to disclose personal experiences of trauma in a variety of ways. These might include: individual meeting with the instructor, during on-campus discussions, or in writing through personal reflection, email, writing/class assignments.
- *Flexibility* - Students with higher levels of reactivity to course content will be met with a higher level of flexibility.
- *Course Progression* - The instructor will inform students of the topics and progression of the course.
- *Assessment* - Assessments are used to not only measure progress toward stated objectives and student learning but also monitor student reactivity. This will be done through weekly warm-ups, reflection papers, circle processes, and projects.

Pre-requisite: PAX 535 Research Methods for Social Change; or permission of the instructor.

COURSE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will understand the purpose and components of a program evaluation;
- Students will understand how research methods (specifically, qualitative research) are used in program evaluation;
- Students will understand the importance of an alternative hypothesis and the implications for program evaluation;
- Students will implement a program evaluation using qualitative methods of data collection and analysis;
- Students will develop and utilize interview skills;

- Students will develop and use data analysis skills;
- Students will use presentation skills;
- Students will develop and use team building and process skills; and
- Graduate students will lead in the presentations to evaluation stakeholders.

REQUIRED TEXTS AND OTHER RESOURCES

Links to the required texts are found in the daily description under the heading; “reading for next class.” There is also a list of additional resources found at the end of this syllabus.

COURSE PROGRESSION

The course entails an actual hands-on external program evaluation that may not always be under the instructor’s scheduling control. Consequently, the course progression is subject to change with little notice. Some evaluation activities are dependent on the successful completion of prior requirements. Flexibility and responsiveness are important in ensuring a useful evaluation experience.

Day One Change

Key Issues

- Scope and breadth of the field of evaluation
- What is evaluative thinking?
- How do we describe the changes peacebuilding seeks to realize?
- Unpacking a program design

Time	Content
5 min.	Introductions
15 min.	Overview of the course Purposes of evaluation Learning as a discipline for peacebuilders to develop – <i>Re-mystify practice</i> Setting up work teams
10 min.	“This is like evaluation because....”
60 min.	Understanding and Observing Change – <i>De-mystify theory</i> Types of Change Dimensions of change
90 min.	Theories of Change; grand & program theories of change Logic Models

Read for Class:

Church C. and M. Rogers. “Understanding Change, Draft Chapter,” *Designing for Results 2.0*; Forthcoming 2024. This document is not for circulation or citation.

Evaluand's intervention description and documentation

Confronting War, Part I, Chapters 1 and 2 (pp.7-19)

<https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Confronting-War-Critical-Lessons-for-Peace-Practitioners.pdf>

Reflective Peacebuilding, Chapters 1, 5 and 6 <http://kroc.nd.edu/toolkitforpeacemakers.shtml>

An Evaluation Theory Tree, Christina Christie

<https://faculti.net/an-evaluation-theory-tree/>

Evaluative Thinking; the Heart of Meaningful and Useful Evaluation

<https://www.insightsintoimpact.com/evaluative-thinking-the-heart-of-meaningful-useful-evaluation/>

Indicators of Change: Theories of Change and Indicators development in Conflict Management and Mitigation, USAID, 2011

Day Two Commissioning an evaluation

Key Issues: The TOR – what to include when commissioning an evaluation
Managing expectations of evaluands, funders and commissioners
What makes for a good evaluation question?
Standards of practice in program evaluation
Bounding an evaluation

Duration	Content
30 min.	Presentation of logic models
30 min.	Components of the Terms of Reference
30 min.	“The Depot”
30 min.	Assessment of commissioner-generated TOR
15 min.	Evaluability assessment
15 min.	Strategies for increasing evaluability - bounding
30 min.	Good evaluation questions

Read before class:

OECD Glossary of Key Evaluation Terms

https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/evaluation-and-aid-effectiveness-no-6-glossary-of-key-terms-in-evaluation-and-results-based-management-in-english-french-and-spanish_9789264034921-en-fr#page4

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: working draft for application period. DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2008.

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Evaluating Peacebuilding*

© 2023 Rogers (adapted from Tibbles)

PAX 516 Program Evaluation

Fall 2023

Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility. Improving Learning for Results, DAC Guidelines and References Series, OECD Publishing, 2012.

<http://www.oecd>

[library.org/docserver/download/4312151e.pdf?expires=1385557432&id=id&acname=guest&checksum=7B28009E7DED788B5E8147BE700E86E1](http://www.oecd.org/docserver/download/4312151e.pdf?expires=1385557432&id=id&acname=guest&checksum=7B28009E7DED788B5E8147BE700E86E1)

Church C. and M. Rogers. Chapter "Designing an Evaluation," Pg. 37- 55, *Designing for Results 2.0*; Forthcoming 2024. This document is not for circulation or citation.

Bring to class:

- fifty 3"x 5" index cards or posits and a colored marker
- Scissors
- Print out of "Depot" Handout on Moodle
- Final logic model
- Program theories of change implicit in the logic model

Day Three Relevance and standards

Key Issues Relevance – how well does the program design fit the context?
Evaluation rubrics
Evaluation questions
Evaluation Standards

Time	Content
45 min	Conflict analysis Situational assessment Needs assessment
45 min.	Relevance
60 min.	Evaluation questions
30 min.	Program Evaluation Standards

Read before class:

Rogers, Mark; "Evaluating Relevance in Peacebuilding Programs," CDA working Papers on Program Review and Evaluation #1, 2012 <https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Evaluating-Relevance-in-Peacebuilding-Programs.pdf>

Reimann, Cordula; "Evaluability Assessments in Peacebuilding Programming," Working Papers on Program Review and Evaluation #3, 2012 https://cnxus.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Wed20Ready_Reimann_Evaluability20Assessment20Working20Paper_Final_20121221.pdf

Davidson, Jane E.; "Answering Evaluative Questions. How Rubrics Can Help," <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qBNPOt5BktU>

Church C. and M. Rogers. "Evaluability," pg. 71 – 84, *Designing for Results 2.0*; Forthcoming 2024. This document is not for circulation or citation.

© 2023 Rogers (adapted from Tibbles)
PAX 516 Program Evaluation
Fall 2023

The Program Evaluation Standards; a Guide for Evaluators and Evaluation Users
<https://www.oecd.org/dev/pgd/38406354.pdf>

Bring to class: Evaluation Questions

Day 4 Draft data collection protocols

Key Issues

- Semi-structured interviews
- Observation opportunities
- Recording, transcribing, safekeeping
- Consent, IRB course
- Confidentiality, anonymity, privacy

Time	Content
30 min.	Presentations of relevance finding
15 min.	Human subject research
30 min.	Interviewing
75 min.	Interviewing practice
15 min.	Data management and safeguarding

Scan before class:

R. Sartorius and C. Carver “Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for Fragile States and Peacebuilding Programs,” Social Impact. Undated.
https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnady656.pdf

Bring to class: In pairs, prepare a one-page assessment of the relevance of the evaluand to the context. Be prepared to present your conclusions to the class.

Day 5 – Simulated data analysis

Key Issues

- Prioritizing the evaluation questions
- Testing the utility of data – an analysis rehearsal
- Development of potential data organization options

Time	Content
15 min.	Check in – progress to date, journaling, self-evaluation, overall course
15 min.	Dealing with evaluation questions that are dubious, weak, or marginal
30 min.	Options for organizing qualitative data using excel
75 min.	Development of fictitious data sets for select questions

Read before class:

Patton, Michael Q.; Essentials of Utilization-focused Evaluation. Pg 309 - 321
https://edge.sagepub.com/system/files/ch10_essentials_of_u-fe_chapter_12.pdf

Bring to class:

- IRB certificates
- Draft semi-structured data collection protocols by type of respondent
- Fictitious data set for select evaluation questions

Day 6 Finalize data collection protocols

Key Issues

- Data disaggregation
- IRB
- Data collection logistics and scheduling
- Participatory approaches

Time	Content
30 min.	Participant Safety
30 min.	Who, when, where, how?
90 min.	Most Significant Change
30 min.	Outcome Harvesting

Read before class:

Rick Davies Rick and Dart, Jess, "The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique; A Guide to Its Use," April 2005.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275409002_The_'Most_Significant_Change'_MSC_Technique_A_Guide_to_Its_Use/link/553bd3b60cf29b5ee4b87d86/download

Wilson-Grau, Ricardo, "Outcome Harvesting," Better Evaluation, November 2021
<https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/approaches/outcome-harvesting>

Bring to class:

- Simulation results

Day 7 Inception Report

Key Issues

- Detailed evaluation implementation planning

Time	Content
30 min	Inception report format

60 min.	Assembling the inception report
30 min.	Plan for disseminating to key stakeholders
60 min.	Evaluating conflict sensitivity

Read before class:

Goldwyn, Rachel and Diana Chigas; "Monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity – methodological challenges and practical solutions." DFID, CDA, CARE, UKAid March 2013
<https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Monitoring-and-Evaluating-Conflict-Sensitivity.pdf>

Bring to class: TBA

Day 8 Data collection 1

Key Issues

Semi-structured interviews, interlocutor cohort A

Time	Content
90 min.	Feedback on quality of initial interviews
60 min.	Participant Observer
30 min.	Periodic check-in/needed adaptation in protocols or evaluation questions

Read before class:

Patton, Michael Q.; Essentials of Utilization-focused Evaluation. Pg. 323 - 321
https://edge.sagepub.com/system/files/ch10_essentials_of_u-fe_chapter_12.pdf

Interview Tips from Howard Zehr (From PAX 535: Spring 2021) (1 page) [On Moodle]

Bring to class: TBA

Day 9 Data collection 2

Key Issues

Semi-structured interviews, interlocutor cohort B

Time	Content
60 min.	Periodic check-in/needed adaptation in protocols or evaluation questions
60 min.	Conduct interviews
60 min.	Transcribe interview notes

Day 10 Data collection 3

© 2023 Rogers (adapted from Tibbles)
PAX 516 Program Evaluation
Fall 2023

Key Issues

Semi-structured interviews, interlocutor cohort C

Time	Content
60 min.	Periodic check-in/needed adaptation in protocols or evaluation questions
60 min.	Conduct interviews
60 min.	Transcribe interview notes

Read before class: TBA

Bring to class: TBA

Day 11 Data analysis 1

Key Issues

Organizing data
Data visualization
Lessons from data simulation

Time	Content
45 min.	Qualitative data analysis exercise
15	Data visualization
90 min.	Emergent themes

Read before class:

The full data set: interview transcriptions completed by other data collectors

Church C. and M. Rogers. Chapter on “Data Analysis,” pg. 215 - 225, *Designing for Results 2.0*; Forthcoming 2024. This document is not for circulation or citation.

Patton, Michael Q.; [Essentials of Utilization-focused Evaluation](https://edge.sagepub.com/system/files/ch10_essentials_of_u-fe_chapter_12.pdf). Pg. 323 - 335
https://edge.sagepub.com/system/files/ch10_essentials_of_u-fe_chapter_12.pdf

Bring to class:

All data collected and any preliminary findings

Day 12 Data analysis 2

Key Issues

Contribution and attribution
Findings & their implications

Time	Content
15 min.	Check-in on data collection completion
30 min.	Contribution analysis
60 min.	Fine art of developing findings – sense making DfR 2020 pg. 219
30 min	Patton’s Claims Matrix – importance and rigor
45 min	Gaps & follow-up

Read before class:

Mayne, John. “Contribution analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect.” Better Evaluation, ILAC Brief 16, undated
https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/ILAC_Brief16_Contribution_Analysis.pdf

or

Mayne, John. “A Brief on Contribution Analysis; Principles and Concepts. evaluating advocacy.org, 2020
<https://evaluatingadvocacy.org/doc/A-brief-on-contribution-analysis-Principles-and-concepts.pdf>

Bring to class: TBA

Day 13 Presentation of findings to key stakeholders

Key Issues

- Validation
- Capturing feedback
- Negotiating final framing

Day 14

Key Issues

- Completion of the evaluation report following stakeholder review
- Self - evaluations due

Time	Content
30 min.	Presentation of criteria used in self-evaluation
30 min.	Challenges and ways to facilitate self-evaluation
30 min.	Sharing self-evaluation methods
90 min.	Meta-evaluation – evaluating the evaluation

Read before class:

Better Evaluation; “Review Evaluation (do meta evaluation)” 2022
<https://www.betterevaluation.org/frameworks-guides/rainbow-framework/manage/review-evaluation-do-meta-evaluation>

Bring to class: TBA

Day 15 Wrap up and “what’s next

Time	Content
120 min.	Wrap up outstanding commitments to evaluand
30 min.	Careers in evaluation
30min.	Continuing education

Bring to class: all data relating to the evaluation

DELIVERABLES

The deliverables are key milestones in an evaluation process, not just those at the end of the evaluation. These deliverables model those typically found in an evaluation. Work will be split among the teams. Work involving the entire class will likely build on the deliverables prepared in teams. Everyone is expected to contribute to elements of every step in the process.

<i>Working alone</i>	<i>Teams</i>	<i>Class</i>
Journal	Data collection protocols	Inception Report (Overall)
Self-evaluation	Inception Report (portions)	Presentations of inception report
	Presentations on simulated findings	Evaluation Report
		Presentation of evaluation report.

Graduate students are expected to assume the lead in PowerPoint presentations to stakeholders.

GRADES

Grades present an excellent opportunity for learners to document, assess, and value their own engagement with the material. Each student will independently develop their own self-evaluation criteria. Each student will collect pertinent data over the course. Students may request the class’ time for data collection. Data sources are not limited to the evaluand alone. Students are encouraged to be creative in how they collect data. Their analysis should be convincing, supported by evidence and model evaluative thinking and evaluation practice. The self-evaluation paper should not exceed four pages and should conclude with students assigning their own grades and applying evaluative thinking and evaluation methods to justify their grade.

ATTENDANCE

This course is intended to be hands-on and group oriented. As such, student attendance and participation are crucial for the success of the project. Consequently, the success of the learning experience depends on active student participation.

© 2023 Rogers (adapted from Tibbles)
PAX 516 Program Evaluation
Fall 2023

Students are expected to attend class having read and analyzed the main materials and contribute to class discussions and to the conceptual and practical development of the deliverables. Class discussions should involve an exchange of informed ideas among students and not just the instructor. Students are expected to listen to the comments of others, responding with supporting and/or challenging ideas.

IRB ETHICS TRAINING

The Institutional Review Board requires all researchers submitting proposals to complete the online [researcher training provided by EMU](#) (the website is accessed through Moodle). This training covers basic concepts, principles, and issues related to the protection of research participants. When training is successfully completed, the researcher will receive a certificate. This certificate should be saved (as an image or pdf file) and kept on file – proof of training is required when submitting an IRB proposal.

It is likely that most class participants have completed the online researcher training. If so, participants are required to submit a verification of their certificate to the course instructor. If not, participants must complete the online researcher training (about three hours) and submit a verification of their certificate to the course instructor. It is recommended that the training be completed prior to the week three class session.

The EMU training is only valid for EMU. You can also receive training by PHRP (Protecting Human Research Participants) at this [link](#). There is a cost for PHRP at \$49.97/year. This option is not required for this course. If you plan to do human research work in your professional career, the PHRP option is recommended.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR COURSE SYLLABI:

Last reviewed July 2023

Writing Guidelines:

Writing will be a factor in evaluation: EMU has adopted a set of [writing guidelines](#) for graduate programs that include six sets of criteria: content, structure, rhetoric & style, information literacy, source integrity, and conventions (see page 3). It is expected that graduates will be able to write at least a “good” level with 60% writing at an “excellent” level. For the course papers, please follow the APA style described in CJP’s *GUIDELINES for GRADUATE PAPERS* (see CJP Student Resources Moodle page or request a copy from the Academic Program Coordinator), unless directed otherwise by the instructor. Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects can be found at the end of this document.

Academic Accountability & Integrity:

EMU faculty and staff care about the integrity of their own work and the work of their students. They create assignments that promote interpretative thinking and work intentionally with students during the learning process. Honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility are characteristics of a community that is active in loving mercy and doing justice. EMU defines plagiarism as occurring when a person presents as one’s own someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source (Adapted from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). This course will apply [EMU’s Academic Accountability Policy](#) to any events of academic dishonesty. If you have doubts about what is appropriate, [Indiana University’s Plagiarism Tutorials and Tests](#) may be a useful resource.

Turnitin:

Students are accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. You should be familiar with EMU's Academic Integrity Policy (see link above) in order to meet the academic expectations concerning appropriate documentation of sources. In addition, EMU is using [Turnitin](#), a learning tool and plagiarism prevention system. For CJP classes, you may be asked to submit your papers to Turnitin from Moodle.

Moodle:

[Moodle](#) is the online learning platform that EMU has chosen to provide to faculty, administrators and students. Students will have access to course information within Moodle for any class they are registered for in a given term. The amount of time a student has access to information before and after the class is somewhat dependent on the access given to students by the individual faculty member. However, please note that courses are not in Moodle permanently – after two years the class will no longer be accessible. Please be sure to download resources from Moodle that you wish to have ongoing access to.

Technology Requirements and Communication/Zoom Best Practices:

Communication will largely be accomplished via the Moodle platform utilized by EMU and your EMU email. Check both frequently during the semester. Zoom will be used for synchronous online course sessions. Please review these [best practices](#) for online classes!

Graduate & Professional Studies Writing Center:

Please utilize the [writing program](#). They offer free individual sessions with a graduate student writing tutor. Please visit the website to schedule an appointment or request additional information from CJP's Academic Program Coordinator.

Grading Scale & Feedback:

In most courses grades will be based on an accumulation of numerical points that will be converted to a letter grade at the end of the course (several CJP courses are graded pass/fail). Assignments will receive a score expressed as a fraction, with the points received over the total points possible (e.g. 18/20). The following is the basic scale used for evaluation. *Points may be subtracted for missed deadlines.*

95-100 = A outstanding very good	80-84 = B good	90-94 = A- excellent	85-89 = B+
73-75 = C+ passing		76-79 = B- satisfactory	
70-72 = C unsatisfactory		Below 70 = F failing	

Graduate students are expected to earn A's & B's. A GPA of 3.0 for MA students and 2.75 for GC students is the minimum requirement for graduation.

Regarding feedback on papers/projects: Students can expect to receive papers/assignments back in a class with faculty feedback before the next paper/assignment is due. This commitment from faculty assumes that the student has turned the paper in on the agreed upon due date.

Library

The [Hartzler Library](#) offers research support (via e-mail, chat, phone, or SSC campus) and the library home page offers subject guides to help start your research. The library can help you acquire resources not held by EMU through the Interlibrary Loan (ILL) system. The link to ILL is on the left side of the library homepage.

© 2023 Rogers (adapted from Tibbles)
PAX 516 Program Evaluation
Fall 2023

Office of Academic Access:

If you have a physical, psychological, medical or learning disability that may impact your work in this course, it is your responsibility to contact the [Office of Academic Access](#). They will work with you to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. All information and documentation is treated confidentially.

Class Attendance (for in-person and synchronous online courses):

Students are expected to attend all class meetings. If unusual or emergency circumstances prevent class attendance, the student should notify the professor in advance if possible. Multiple absences from class will result in lower grades. The student is responsible for the material presented in classes missed. Students should be aware of the importance of regular class attendance, particularly in the case of CJP classes that only meet once a week or over several weekends. Being absent for more than one class leads to a student missing a large portion of the class content. In addition to consistent class attendance, students should make every effort to arrive to class on time out of respect for the learning process, fellow students and faculty.

Religious Holidays

EMU respects the diversity of religious holidays and wishes to provide reasonable accommodations for students who may be unable to fully participate in class, lab, exams, or other assignments due to observation of a significant religious holiday. Students should provide adequate notice (a week in advance) to the faculty of such requests.

Classroom Culture & Related Policies

EMU's [Life Together](#) statement describes the sort of learning community that we aspire to be. Learning thrives where there is free and open exchange of ideas, thoughts, emotions, and convictions. Open discourse requires trust and safety. While I anticipate that you may find that some aspects of the class challenge your views and theoretical frameworks, I invite you to respectfully express either agreement or disagreement without fear of consequences. If you feel that I am violating this commitment, please make an appointment to meet outside of class so that we can discuss the issue.

I hope we can welcome differences and demonstrate a willingness to analyze issues from frameworks that may or may not feel comfortable. I have opinions, which I may express from time to time. Please be sensitive in your class participation by not unfairly dominating discussions. Be aware of others' right to speak and welcome questions from your classmates. My goal is to create a brave space in which everyone learns to participate in scholarly dialogue that values listening, thinking, feeling, study, and professionalism. (*Adapted from Margaret Sallee and Kathryn Roulston*)

1. Our primary commitment is to learn from each other. We will listen to each other and not talk at each other. We welcome differences amongst us in backgrounds, skills, interests, and values. We realize that it is these very differences that will increase our awareness and understanding through this process.
2. We will trust that people are always doing the best they can.
3. Challenge the idea and not the person. We debate ideas, not the individual sharing this idea or practice.
4. Each of us will strive to speak our discomfort. When something is bothering you, please practice sharing this with the group. Often our emotional reactions offer valuable learning opportunities.

5. Step Up, Step Back. Be mindful of taking up much more space than others. On the same note, empower yourself to speak up when others are dominating the conversation.
6. Stay engaged. When overwhelmed or stressed, it can be tempting to slip away from the class or group while meeting. Let us honor one another with focused connection. When we catch ourselves disengaging, let us gently refocus on the tasks at hand.

Course Extensions and Outstanding Grades:

For fall and spring semesters, all coursework is due by the end of the semester. **If a student will not be able to complete a course on time, the student must submit a request one week before the end of the semester for an extension (up to 6 months), by emailing the instructor, academic advisor and the Academic Program Coordinator.** If the request is granted the student will receive an "I (incomplete) for the course which will later be replaced by a final grade when the work has been turned in on the agreed upon date. If the request for an extension is denied, the student will receive a grade for the work that has been completed up until the time the course was expected to have been completed. If no work has been submitted, the final grade will be an F (or W under unusual circumstances and with permission of the Program Director). Extensions will be given only for legitimate and unusual situations. Extensions are contracted by the student with the program for up to a maximum of 6 months after the deadline for the course work. *PLEASE NOTE: Grades for coursework submitted late may be reduced at the instructor's discretion and in line with their course policy on turning in coursework after the due date. If the extension deadline is not met, the instructor will submit the final grade based on what has been received to date.*

Inclusive, Community-Creating Language Policy:

Eastern Mennonite University expects all its faculty, staff, and students to adopt [inclusive written and spoken language](#) that welcomes everyone regardless of race or ethnicity, gender, disabilities, age, and sexual orientation. We will use respectful and welcoming language in all our official departmental documents and correspondence, including those put forth by way of Internet communication, and throughout all academic coursework, inclusive of classroom presentations and conversations, course syllabi, and both written and oral student assessment materials.

As an inclusive community, we strive to sustain safety and belonging for students of all gender and sexual identities expressed in the [LGBTQIA+ Student Support Policy](#).

Bias Response:

Bias incidents are harmful to the EMU community and/or individuals within the EMU community. Bias can be intentional or unintentional and may be directed toward an individual or group. A bias incident may take the form of a verbal interaction, cyber-interaction, physical interaction, or interaction with property. Bias reporting is a resource for anyone who needs to communicate an incident or explore a better understanding around issues of discrimination and learning how to effectively respond. All members of the university community are encouraged to [report](#) incidents of bias.

Title IX:

The following policy applies to any incidents that occur (on or off campus or online) while you are a student registered at EMU. It does not apply if you are talking about incidents that happened prior your enrollment at EMU. It is important for you to know that all faculty and staff

members are required to report known or alleged incidents of sexual violence (including sexual assault, domestic/relationship violence, stalking). That means that faculty and staff members cannot keep information about sexual violence confidential if you share that information with them. For example, if you inform a faculty or staff member of an issue of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination they will keep the information as private as they can, but is required to bring it to the attention of the institution's [Title IX Coordinator](#). You can also report incidents or complaints through the [online portal](#). You may report, confidentially, incidents of sexual violence if you speak to Counseling Services counselors, Campus Ministries' pastors, or Health Services personnel providing clinical care. These individuals, as well as the Title IX Coordinator, can provide you with information on both internal & external support resources.

Academic Program Policies:

For EMU graduate program policies and more CJP-specific graduate program policies, please see the complete [Graduate Catalog](#).

Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

CRITERIA	A – Excellent	B – Minimal expectations	C – Below expectations	Comments
<p>Goals & Audience <i>Are the goals or learning objectives of the project clear? Have they been met? Is the intended audience clearly specified? Is the project appropriate for this audience? Does the project communicate to the intended audience?</i></p>	<p>-audience & goals/learning objectives clearly identified. -project appropriate for, and likely to meet, its goals -project is appropriate for specified audience -project understandable to & likely to engage and/or communicate to audience</p>	<p>-audience and goals identified though not as clearly as they could be - project may meet its goals but this is not entirely clear - project is at least somewhat appropriate for, and likely to communicate to audience.</p>	<p>-audience and goals inappropriate or inadequately identified -project unlikely to meet its goals and/or communicate to the audience</p>	
<p>Methodology <i>Is the overall methodology clear and appropriately used? Has the project incorporated specific methods required by the assignment? If intended as a form of intervention, has thought be given to how it will be implemented?</i></p>	<p>-project incorporates inquiry methods required by the assignment -all methodologies & technologies have been appropriately used, with attention to ethical and methodological issues -if intended as intervention or advocacy, project has given adequate</p>	<p>- methodology basically appropriate to the project and appropriately used, but could be strengthened -sources and methods identified but not as fully as they could be -more thought should be given to implementation issues</p>	<p>-methodology inadequate and/or inadequately articulated. -sources not appropriately identified -inadequate attention to implementation issues</p>	

	thought to implementation -sources & methods are adequately identified			
Analysis <i>Is there evidence of critical thinking and analysis?</i>	- evidence of critical thinking about methods, sources, information and analysis or editing. -uses analysis/editing methods appropriate for the project -method of analysis or editing is adequately articulated	- some evidence of critical thinking but could be stronger -analytical approach and the analysis itself is basically appropriate but could be stronger and/or articulated better.	-inadequate evidence of critical thinking -analysis lacking or inadequate -analytic approach inappropriate or inadequately specified	
Craft & Coherence <i>Is the level of artistic and/or technical craft adequate for the specified goals and audience? Did it involve an appropriate amount of work? Does the final product have coherence and "resonance?"</i>	- level of craft is clearly adequate for the audience & to meet project goals (whether or not it meets "artistic" standards) -project is coherent & likely to resonate with the intended audience -product shows an appropriate amount of effort for this assignment	-level of craft is minimally adequate for the audience and goals -project coherence could be stronger	-level of craft inadequate for purposes and/or audience -project is not coherent	
Content <i>Is the content appropriate & adequate, given the goals, audience & assignment? Is there evidence of insight, originality &/or creativity?</i>	- information conveyed is clearly adequate for goals, audience & assignment -shows depth & breadth of content -shows insight, originality &/or creativity	-information conveyed is adequate but could be strengthened -some evidence of insight, originality, or creativity	-inadequate information -little or no evidence of insight, originality and/or creativity	
				Grade

Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

Background notes:

- Arts approaches can be used in several different stages of a project:

1. To gain or create knowledge. (For example, research “subjects” or participants might be engaged in an arts-based project as a way of soliciting information or encouraging insight.)
2. To add complexity or nuance to created knowledge. (For example, an arts practice may serve as one method in a multi-method research project, creating an integrated, reflective methodology for the project. Alternatively, an arts practice could be used to analyze and/or interpret data collected by conventional methods.)
3. To test knowledge. (For example, researchers might verify their interpretation of findings from a more traditional research process by creating a play or exhibit and testing it for resonance with their subjects.)
4. To share findings. (For example, a play or exhibit might be created to (re)-present data collected or analyzed via conventional methods in order to impart the particular kinds of meaning the researcher considers important, and as a way to reach and engage a broader audience.)
5. As a form of intervention. (For example, a project might be designed to raise awareness of an issue or conflict, to promote dialogue on a contested issue, or to advocate for a cause.)

- Arts-based products often do not specify methodologies used. Thus it may be important for a project to be accompanied by a short paper discussing analysis, theory of change, audience, goals, and methods used.

- Patricia Leavy, in *“Method Meets Art: Arts-based Research Practice”* (New York: Guilford Press) 2009, argues that “[t]raditional conceptions of validity and reliability, which developed out of positivism, are inappropriate for evaluating artistic inquiry.” (p. 15). She suggests that authenticity, trustworthiness, and validity can be assessed through attention to such elements as aesthetics, resonance, and vigor.

- For a discussion of standards, see “Method Meets Art” (Leavy, 2009: 15ff and Chapter 8).

Resources In Addition To Specified Reading In The Syllabus

Anderson, Mary B., and Lara Olson. *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge: The Collaborative for Development Action (CDA), Inc., 2003.

<https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Confronting-War-Critical-Lessons-for-Peace-Practitioners.pdf>

Anouka van Eerdewijk and Jan Brouwers. "Gender and theories of Change." *Hivos*, June 2014

https://www.academia.edu/11475035/Gender_and_THEORIES_OF_CHANGE

Babbett, Eileen, *et. al.* "Theories and Indicators of Change Briefing Paper Concept and Primers for Conflict Management and Mitigation." USAID March 2013

https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnaed181.pdf

Bamberger, Michael, Mary Church, Lucia Fort, and Jim Rugh. "Shoestring Evaluation: Designing Impact Evaluations under Budget, Time and Data Constraints." *American Journal of Evaluation* 25, no. 1 (2004)

Bennett, Gavin and Nasreen Jessani, *The Knowledge Translation Toolkit*, IDRC and SAGE Publications, 2011

<https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspacedirect.org/bitstream/handle/10625/46152/IDL-46152.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Bengtson, Bjorn, Ivar Evensmo, Joakin Gundel, Barbro Ronnmo, Dan Smith, and Hilde Henriksen Waage. *Assessment of Lessons Learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peacebuilding*. http://www.sida.se/?d=118&a=2433&language=en_US

Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2005

<http://www.berghof-handbook.net/>

Britton, Bruce. *Learning for Change: Principles and Practices of Learning Organizations*. Swedish Mission Council, 2002

Carver, Christopher, and Rolf Sartorius. *Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Fragile States and Peacebuilding Programs*. Social Impact/ Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI), 2005

(available online at: <http://www.socialimpact.com/resource-center/downloads/fragilestates.pdf>)

Church, Cheyanne, and Mark M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. Search for Common Ground/United States Institute of Peace (USIP), 2006. (available on-line in two parts at:

http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilt/ilt_manualpage.html)

Corlazzoli, Vanessa and White, Jonathan, "[Back to Basics, A Compilation of Best Practices in Design, Monitoring & Evaluation in Fragile and Conflict-affected Environments](#)," DFID and Search for Common Ground, 2013

Cross, Jeni. "[Three Myths of Behavior Change - What You Think You Know That You Don't](#)." TedX-CSU Talk.

© 2023 Rogers (adapted from Tibbles)
PAX 516 Program Evaluation
Fall 2023

Earle, Lucy. "Lost in the matrix: The logframe and the local picture." Paper presented for INTRAC's 4th Evaluation Conference 2002. <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Lost-in-the-Matrix-The-Logframe-and-the-Local-Picture.pdf>

Fast L., Neufeldt R., "Envisioning Success: Building Blocks for Strategic and Comprehensive Peacebuilding Impact Evaluation," *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development* 2, No. 2, 2005

Garfinkel, Renee. "What Works? Evaluating Interfaith Dialogue Programs." Special Report 123. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2004. <http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr123.html>

GIZ, "[Social and Behavior Change: Insights and Practice](#)," 2019

Morell, Jonathan. Prepared for Catholic Relief Services, 2018. "[Revealing Implicit Assumptions: Why, Where, and How?](#)"

Nairobi Peace Institute (NPI)-African and the National Council of Churches of Kenya Community Peace Building and Development Project (NCCCK-CPBD). Strategic and Responsive Evaluation of Peacebuilding: Toward a Learning Model. Kenya: NPI-African and the NCCCK-CPBD Project, 2001. https://cnxus.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Strategic20and20Responsive20Eval_NPI.pdf

Neufeldt, Reina C. "Frameworkers and Circlers – Exploring assumptions in Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment." Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2007 http://mars.gmu.edu/bitstream/handle/1920/12902/neufeldt_handbookII.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility. Improving Learning for Results, DAC Guidelines and References Series, OECD Publishing, 2012. (available online at: <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/4312151e.pdf?expires=1385557432&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=7B28009E7DED788B5E8147BE700E86E1>)

Patton, Michael Quinn. Utilization-Focused Evaluation: The New Century Text, 3rd edition. Sage Publications, 1996.

Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods, Third Edition*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, 2002

Patton, Michael Quinn, *Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*, The Guildford Press, New York, 2010

Phillips, Cynthia and Lisa Wyatt Knowlton, *The Logic Model Guidebook, Better Strategies for Great Results*, Sage Publications, 2009. Read Chapter 2: Building and Improving TOC Logic Models

Ross, Marc Howard. "Action Evaluation in the Theory and Practice of Conflict Resolution." Peace and Conflict Studies, Vol. 8, No. 1 (2001).
<http://www.gmu.edu/academic/pcs/Ross81PCS.htm>

Rothman, Jay. "Action Evaluation." Beyond Intractability. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Posted: October 2003
http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/action_evaluation/

Sarah Stachowiak. Pathways for Change: 6 theories about how policy change happens. Organizational Research Services

Supernatural Belief and the Evaluation of Faith-based Peacebuilding
<https://www.cdacollaborative.org/publication/supernatural-belief-evaluation-faith-based-peacebuilding/>

The World Food Programme's Contribution to Improving the Prospects for Peace in Mali
<https://www.sipri.org/publications/2019/working-paper/world-food-programmes-contribution-improving-prospects-peace-mali>

USAID, Theories and Indicators of Change. Concepts and Primers for Conflict Management and Mitigation, 2013. <http://www.cdacollaborative.org/media/89750/THINC-Full.pdf>)

Vogel Isabel, [Theory of Change Review](#), DFID, 2014

Stake, Robert E. *Qualitative Research: Studying How Things Work*. The Guildford Press, New York, 2010