

PSJ 540-01/02 (CRN 1790, 2523):

Research Methodology for Peace Studies and Practice

Syllabus

(Version 2015-01-28; content subject to change)

Spring 2015

Section 1: Thursdays, 9:15am-12:05pm, KIPJ 214

Section 2: Thursdays, 1:00-3:50pm, KIPJ 214

Topher L. McDougal

tlm@sandiego.edu

Tel. 619 260 7927

Office: IPJ-275

Office hours: W, 8:30am-12pm, 1-2:30pm

COURSE OVERVIEW

This course is intended for graduate students in Peace and Justice Studies and related social sciences. It is structured so as to introduce students to basic concepts of social science and program research, with a view to enabling students to evaluate the legitimacy and applicability of various research methods in particular settings within the Peace and Conflict field. There will be three primary “modules” within the course: (I) Introduction to Peace Studies research; (II) Research Methods; and (III) Program Monitoring & Evaluation.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to:

1. Generate relevant and answerable research questions;
2. Analyze the philosophical commitments, and practical and behavioral assumptions that underlie different types of social science research;
3. Identify, and evaluate the appropriateness of, different methodologies and types of evidence to construct arguments and test hypotheses;
4. Assess the quality of others’ research methodology and proposals;
5. Identify and assess various strategies employed for program research.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

Each section will meet once per week.

The structure of each session will differ depending on the material being presented and the preferences of the class. A typical session might be broken into the following components:

- Assignment review,
- Recommended reading presentations,
- Lecture,
- Discussion,
- Activity,
- Preview of the following week's readings and/or assignments.

The following components will make up your final grade:

- **Class Participation.** Discussion-heavy classes depend for their effectiveness on the active engagement of all participants. That's you. Please come prepared to discuss the readings, to wrestle with the ideas out loud (< 80 db, please), and to use the richness of your own experience to gauge how convincing/useful the ideas are. Readings are generally listed in descending order of priority, in case you fall behind.
- **Recommended Reading Presentation.** Each week, an average of 1-2 students will present a 10 minute synopsis of a recommended reading. If the recommended reading list includes an example of scholarship showcasing a theme or method in that week's reading, one of the presentations will be on that. In the synopsis, identify (a) the research question, (b) the larger theory that is being extended, restricted, or negated, (c) explain and identify its assumptions/conditions, and (d) anticipate (but do not present) weaknesses in the argument. When the floor opens to questions, you may be pressed to respond to those weaknesses on behalf of the author.
- **Weekly Assignments.** Each week during the first two-thirds of the class, there will be one assignment due, detailed in this syllabus after each of the respective weekly readings lists. Assignments will be geared toward having you put the readings and ideas discussed in class into conversation with a research topic (or topics) of your choice. Each assignment will be due *before the following class session* (with the exception of the first session's assignment, which is just to come prepared to talk). Moreover, you may be required to give a brief overview of your main points on request, so come prepared to do so. There will be no weekly assignments during Weeks 11-14.
- **15-20 Page Research Prospectus ***OR*** a take-home Article Critique.** You will be asked to read two articles that employ differing methods to examine a single issue. Your assignment will be to evaluate the strengths and limitations of each method employed, and their appropriateness given the subject matter. Additional guidance will be provided on Blackboard.

Grades will be calculated using the weighting percentages below:

Assignment	Due Date	Points
Class Discussion	Throughout	15
Recommended Reading Presentation	Variable	10
Weekly assignments (5pts x 10)	Throughout *	50
Final assignment	12 May	25

* Due prior to class time on the due date.

CONDUCT

There is a zero-tolerance policy for breaches of academic integrity in this class. Plagiarism will result, at minimum, in a zero for that assignment – and possibly for the course. It is incumbent upon you, the student, to familiarize yourself with [university policy](#) and abide by it.

This is a professional degree program, and you are expected to treat your classmates and professors professionally – after all, they will shortly be your colleagues in the Peace & Conflict field. Nowhere will this be more important than in our class discussions. The latter are intended to be helpful, and you are encouraged to critique your peers in respectful, constructive, and professional terms.

TIMELINE

Week	Date	Topic
1	29-Jan	Why do Peace Research?
2	5-Feb	Philosophical Commitments of Social Science Research
3	12-Feb	RQ Formulation, Research Design, & Writing Proposals
4	19-Feb	Causation, Repeatability, Explanation, and Mechanisms
5	26-Feb	Measurement, Validity & Reliability
6	5-Mar	Case Studies
7	12-Mar	Survey Research Designs, Quasi-Experimental Designs
8	19-Mar	Ethnographic, Participant Observation, and Action Research (Prof. Carpenter)
9	26-Mar	Doing Fieldwork
	2-Apr	EASTER BREAK
10	9-Apr	Research Ethics
11	16-Apr	Intro to M&E Concepts
12	23-Apr	<TBD>
13	30 May	Planning Tools
14	7-May	Evaluating Peacebuilding and Crisis

COURSE MATERIALS

Course materials will be made available on the Blackboard site. There are no required textbooks for this class.

WEB RESOURCES

www.dmeforpeace.org, the learning portal for design, monitoring and evaluation for peacebuilding.

<http://blogs.worldbank.org/impactevaluations/>, the World Bank's impact evaluation blog

WEEKLY READINGS

Week 1. Why do Peace Research?

Key Topics:

- Course overview
- Why qualitative research?
- Why quantitative research?
- “Objectivity” and “values-based” research

Required:

- Höglund, Kristine and Magnus Öberg (2011). “Doing Empirical Peace Research.” In *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges*, New York: Routledge Press.
- Wallensteen, Peter (2011). “The Origins of Contemporary Peace Research.” In Höglund, Kristine and Magnus Öberg, *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges*, New York: Routledge Press.
- Feynman, Richard (1974). “Cargo Cult Science.” Caltech commencement address. Available at: <http://www.lhup.edu/~DSIMANEK/cargocul.htm>

Recommended:

- Shapiro, I. (2004). “Problems, methods, and theories in political science, or: what’s wrong with political science and what to do about it.” (Ch. 2 in in Shapiro, I., Smith, R.M. and Masoud, T.E., *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- McCandless, E. and A. K. Bangura (2007). “Introduction” and “Foundations for Peace-building Research and Development.” In *Peace Research for Africa: Critical Essays on Methodology*. Addis Ababa, University for Peace, pp. 11-19.
- Becker, Howard. 1967. “Whose Side Are We On?” *Social Problems* 14(3): 239-47.

Assignment (same day):

- Come prepared to talk for 3 minutes in a structured way about your own research interests. What question, case or phenomenon are you interested in studying? Why? Where? How might you go about it? Consider writing out talking points.

Week 2. Philosophical Commitments of Social Science Research

Key Topics:

- Philosophical commitments of social science research
- (Post-)Positivist vs./and constructivist approaches
- Behavioral assumptions in social science research

Required:

- McCandless, E. and A. K. Bangura (2007). *Peace Research for Africa: Critical Essays on Methodology*. Addis Ababa, University for Peace. [Ch. 3, 5]
- Casti, John L. (1989). *Paradigms Lost: Tackling the Unanswered Mysteries of Modern Science*. New York: Avon Books: 1-67.

Recommended:

- EX.: Geertz, Clifford (1973). "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." Chapter 1 in *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 3-54.
- Morgan, Gareth and Linda Smircich (1980). "The Case for Qualitative Research." *The Academy of Management Review* 5: 491-500.
- Little, Daniel (1993). "Evidence and Objectivity in the Social Sciences." *Social Research* 60: 363-96.
- Kuhn, T. (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Ch. 2, 3, 9,10].
- Popper, K. (1965). "Normal Science and its Dangers." (in Lakatos, I. and Musgrave, A. (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 51-59).
- Lakatos, I. (1965). "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes" (in Lakatos, I. and Musgrave, A. (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 91-138).

Assignment:

- Write a **1-2 double-spaced paper** that states the epistemological perspective that you believe best encapsulates your approach to research inquiry. Why this and not other competing philosophical frameworks for inquiry? Make reference to the readings.

Week 3. RQ Formulation, Research Design, & Writing Proposals

Key Topics:

- Discovering a research question
- Designing qualitative research
- Triangulation
- A template for writing proposals

Required:

- *The Capstone Project, 2014-2015.*
- King, G., Keohane, R. and Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.) [Ch. 1].
- **SKIM:** Martin, Joanne (1981). “A Garbage Can Model of the Psychological Research Process.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(2): 131-151.

Recommended:

- EX.: Locke, R. (1995). *Remaking the Italian Economy.* Cornell: Cornell University Press. [Ch. 1 and 4]
- Mills, C.W. (2000). [1959]. “On Intellectual Craftsmanship.” (in *The Sociological Imagination,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 195-228.)
- Abbott, A. (2004). *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences.* W.W. Norton and Company. [Ch. 1, 2].
- McGrath, Joseph E. (1981). “Dilemmatics: The Study of Research Choices and Dilemmas.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(2): 179-211.
- Creswell, John W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* Thousand Oaks: Sage. Pages 3-23.

Assignment:

- Write a **2-3 double-spaced page paper** describing (a) the larger problem driving your research interest, (b) your research question, (c) how you discovered it, (d) the body of literature your research might speak to, and (e) preliminary thoughts on how you plan to answer this question. You will likely also want to consult a professor or advisor who may be advising your capstone or instructing the course for which your paper is destined.

Week 4. Causation, Repeatability, Explanation, and Mechanisms

Key Topics:

- Causation vs. correlation
- Explanation vs. description
- Mechanisms vs. outcomes
- Type I and type II errors

Required:

- King, G., Keohane, R. and Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [Ch. 3 (“Causality and Causal Inference”)]
- Tilly, C. (2001). “Mechanisms in Political Processes.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 4: 21-41
- Buchanan, Marc (2012). “Cause and Correlation.” *Nature Physics* 8: 852.

Recommended:

- EX.: Petersen, R. (2001). *Resistance and Rebellions: Lessons from Eastern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Ch. 1 (pp. 1-27) and Ch. 6]
- Sugihara, George, Robert May, Hao Ye, Chih-hao Hsieh, Ethan Deyle, Michael Fogarty, Stephan Munch (2012). “Detecting Causality in Complex Ecosystems.” *Science* 338 (26 October): 496-500.
- Chandra, K. (2006). “Mechanisms v/s Outcomes.” Essay for Symposium on David Laitin’s Work. Newsletter of APSA Section on Qualitative Methods. Available at:
<http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/faculty/chandra/qualmeth2006.pdf>

Assignment:

- In **2 pages or less**, clearly state (a) your research question (such as it is now stands – could also be expository); (b) three alternative hypotheses, including a null hypothesis; and (c) brief explanations of mechanisms motivating each.

Week 5. Measurement, Validity, and Reliability

Key Topics:

- Constructs vs. indicators
- Typologies of indicators
- Internal vs. external validity
- Units of analysis

Required:

- Schwab, Donald P. (1980). “Construct Validity in Organizational Behavior.” *Research in Organizational Behavior* 2: 3-43.
- Jones, Charles O. (1974). “Doing Before Knowing: Concept Development in Political Research.” *American Journal of Political Science* 18(1): 215-228.
- Lehrer, Jonah (2010). “The Truth Wears Off: Is there Something Wrong with the Scientific Method?” *The New Yorker*, 13 December.

Recommended:

- EX.: Putnam, Robert D. (2007). ‘*E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture*’, *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30 (2), pp. 137-174. Available at:
[http://www.abdn.ac.uk/sociology/notes07/Level4/SO4530/Assigned-Readings/Reading%209%20\(new\).pdf](http://www.abdn.ac.uk/sociology/notes07/Level4/SO4530/Assigned-Readings/Reading%209%20(new).pdf)
- Ioannidis, John P.A. (2005). “Why Most Published Research Findings Are False. *PLoS Med* 2(8): e124.

Assignment:

- Building on last week’s assignment, restate (or revise) your research question and three hypotheses. Then create a table of five columns for the variables used to test your hypotheses: (1) construct, (2) measure, (3) class, (4) type, and (5) hypothesis. Fill in the table with the variables you now deem important for testing your research question.

Week 6. Case Studies

Key Topics:

- What is a case?
- What is the value of case study research?
- Case selection
- Comparative case method

Required:

- McCandless, E. and A. K. Bangura (2007). “Case Study Research Method” in *Peace Research for Africa: Critical Essays on Methodology*. Addis Ababa, University for Peace, pp. 163-171.
- Van Evera, S. (1997). “Chapter 2: What Are Case Studies? How Should They Be Performed?” In *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 49-76.

Recommended:

- EX.: Anguelovski, Isabelle (2007). Understanding the Dynamics of Community Engagement of Corporations in Communities: The Iterative Relationship between Dialogue and Local Protest at the Tintaya Copper Mine in Peru. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- King, G., Keohane, R. and Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.) [Ch. 4].
- Geddes, Barbara. (2003). “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias and Related Issues.” *Paradigms and Sandcastles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. Skim pages 89-129.
- Lijphart, A. (1971). “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method.” *American Political Science Review* 65 (3): 682-93.
- George, A. and Bennett, A. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press. [Ch. 1].

Assignment:

- Write a **double-spaced 2-3 page statement** on the applicability of case study research to your own research topic. If you believe you will use a case approach, is it a single-case or comparative case? What will your selection criteria be for your case(s)? What within- or between- case variation is being explored? What weaknesses with internal or external validity do you foresee, and how might these be mitigated? If you do not plan to do case research, why not? (Touch on the same issues.)

– OR –

- Write a **double-spaced 2-3 page paper** on a scholarly book or major article that employs a case study design. What qualifies as a case here? What unit is chosen (Village? Nation? Firm or institution)? How were the cases chosen, and according to what criteria? Does case selection here impact the robustness of the research findings? Why and how so? What generalizations, if any, can be drawn from the study?

Week 7. Survey Research Designs, Quasi-Experimental Designs

Key Issues:

- Sampling typologies and application to qualitative research
- Types of survey and quantitative designs

Required:

- Bamberger, M., J. Rugh and L. Mabry (2006). “Randomized and Quasi-Experimental Evaluation Designs.” In *Real World Evaluation: Working Under budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press, pp. 194-199.
- Bamberger, M., J. Rugh and L. Mabry (2006). “Sampling for Real World Evaluation.” In *Real World Evaluation: Working Under budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press, pp. 323-336 (also skim: 337-349).
- EX. 1: Roberts, Les, Riyadh Lafta, Richard Garfield, Jamal Khudhairi, and Gilbert Burnham (2004). Mortality before and after the 2003 invasion of Iraq: Cluster sample survey. *The Lancet* 364: 1857-1864.

Recommended:

- Schutt, Russell K. (2012) “5: Sampling” and “8: Survey Research.” In *Investigating the Social World: The Process and Practice of Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Boyd, R.W. and H.H. Hyman (1975). “Survey Research.” In Greenstein, F. and Polsby, N. *Handbook of Political Science, Vol. 7: Strategies of Inquiry*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, pp. 265-300).
- Schaeffer, Nora Cate and Stanley Presser (2003). “The Science of Asking Questions.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 65-88.
- Fowler, Floyd F. (1998). “Design and Evaluation of Survey Questions.” Pp. 343-374 in L. Bickman and D.J. Rog, (eds.), *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Assignment:

- In no more than **1 single-spaced page**, discuss the applicability of survey methods, RCTs, or quasi-experimental methods to your research project (choose just one). How would the chosen method be adapted to your needs, and what problems might you encounter in doing so? You may wish to search the World Bank’s *Development Impact* blog for further considerations.

– OR –

- Choose a scholarly book or article based on survey research, randomized control trials, or quasi-experimental methods. In no more than **1 single-spaced page**, discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the chosen research design. For instance, in the case of survey research, you might discuss whether it was a longitudinal survey, or a one-shot survey, and how that affects the answer to the research question. Or you might discuss the sampling frame and possible selection bias. You may wish to search the World Bank’s *Development Impact* blog for further considerations.

Week 8. Ethnographic, Participant Observation, and Action Research

Key Topics:

- What is participant observation? Thick description? Ethnography?
- How do these differ from Participatory Action Research?
- Conditions when these approaches are appropriate
- Types of interviews

Required:

- Brounéus, Karen (2011). “In-depth Interviewing: The Process, Skill and Ethics of Interviews in peace Research.” In Höglund, Kristine and Magnus Öberg, *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges*, New York: Routledge Press.
- McCandless, E. and A. K. Bangura (2007). “Ethnographic Methods,” “Focus Group Method,” and “Action Research,” in *Peace Research for Africa: Critical Essays on Methodology*. Addis Ababa, University for Peace, pp. 182-184; 189-196.
- Ex. 1: Scott, J. (1987). *Weapons of the Weak: Of the Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, Ch. 6.

Recommended:

- Ex. 2: Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books. [Ch. 15. “Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight.”]
- Leech, Beth (2002). “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews.” *Political Science & Politics* 35(4):665-668.
- Seidman, I. E. (1998). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research, Second Addition*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Assignment:

- Attend a public meeting and write a brief **ethnographic description (no more than 3 pages)** of what you observe. Examples might include a faculty senate session, a student rally, or a town hall meeting. Your assignment is to derive some insight into the event that a journalist would miss (or at least probably not report). For instance, what symbols, metaphors, or discourses were employed? Can the event be seen itself in metaphorical terms for a larger struggle or belief system? What kinds of social structures can be discerned, and how are they reified or challenged in this context?

Week 9. Doing Field Work

Key Issues:

- Gaining access
- Ethics of fieldwork
- Field notes

Required:

- Höglund, Kristine (2011). Comparative Field Research in War-torn Societies. In *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges*, New York: Routledge Press.
- Barrett, C. and Cason, J.W. (1997). *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. [Ch. 5 and 6]

Recommended:

- Ex.: Rabinow, P. (1977). *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Ch. 4 and 5]
- Emerson, R., Fretz, R. and Shaw, L. (1995). “Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing.” In *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 142-168.
- Read, B., MacLean, L.M. and Cammett, M. (Fall 2006) “Symposium: Field Research: How Rich? How Thick? How Participatory?” *Qualitative Methods*. 4(2) 9-18.

Assignment:

- In no more than **1 single-spaced page**, present some of the most prominent logistical and ethical dilemmas you foresee to any potential field work required for your research project (or, if not applicable, your summer internship). Pay particular attention to the context of the conflict dynamic you seek to understand.

– OR –

- Choose a scholarly book or article based on field research. In no more than **1 single-spaced page**, present some of the most prominent logistical and ethical dilemmas you discern to have affected that research. Did the author recognize these dilemmas? If so, did she/he minimize or mitigate them, and how?

Week 10. Research Ethics

Key Issues:

- Design of ethical research involving human subjects

Required:

- National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research (1978). *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Publication No. (OS) 78-0012. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. Available at:

http://videocast.nih.gov/pdf/ohrp_belmont_report.pdf

- **SKIM:** The USD IRB application

Recommended:

- Mackenzie, David, “How should we understand ‘clinical equipoise’ when doing RCTs in development?” *Development Impact*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank. Available at:

<http://blogs.worldbank.org/impactevaluations/how-should-we-understand-clinical-equipoise-when-doing-rcts-development>

Assignment:

- Complete the CITI program’s human subjects research training and test, entitled “Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research Course: Social & Behavioral Research Investigators,” online at: <https://www.citiprogram.org/default.asp>. Save your results page in HTML or PDF format, and upload them to the corresponding Blackboard assignment.

Week 11. Introduction to M&E Concepts

Key Topics:

- Interrelations between program management, implementation, and M&E
- Defining “program,” “evaluation,” and “program evaluation” (PE)
- Rationale behind PE
- Objectives, milestones, benchmarks, and indicators
- Key Issues to be asked in PE
- Goal-attainment versus system model approaches to PE
- Strategy, sector, and process benchmarks specific to peace consolidation
- Results-Based Management

Required:

- OECD (2008). *Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities*. Development Assistance Committee (DAC), Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: Paris, pp. 11-49. Available at:
<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationofdevelopmentprogrammes/dcdndep/39774573.pdf>
- Lederach, John Paul, Reina Neufeldt, and Hal Culbertson (2007). *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring, and Learning Toolkit*. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, UND and Catholic Relief Services, Southeast Asia Regional Office: Mindanao, Philippines, pp. 1-44. Available at:
http://kroc.nd.edu/sites/default/files/reflective_peacebuilding.pdf
- United Nations (2010). *Monitoring Peace Consolidation: United Nations' Practitioners' Guide to Benchmarking*, United Nations. [Ch. 1-2] Available:
http://www.un.org/peace/peacebuilding/pdf/Monitoring_Peace_Consolidation.pdf

Recommended:

- As a resource: DM&E for Peacebuilding at <http://dmeforpeace.org/>.
- Bamberger, M., J. Rugh and L. Mabry (2006). “RealWorld Evaluation and the Contexts in Which It Is Used” (Chapter 1). In *Real World Evaluation: Working Under budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press, pp. 18-33.
- Bamberger, M., J. Rugh and L. Mabry (2006). “First Clarify the Purpose: Scoping the Evaluation” (Chapter 2). In *Real World Evaluation: Working Under budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press, pp. 36-50.
- Management Sciences for Health. “Using Evaluation as a Management Tool” (Chapter 10). In *Management Strategies for Improving Health Services: A Compendium of the Manager Series, Vols. V-IX*. Eds. Miller, Bahamon, Lorenz, Atkinson (2002): pp. 265-287.
- UNDP (2002). *Results-Based Management: Concepts and Methodology*. New York: United Nations Development Programme. Available:
<http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/RBMConceptsMethodgyjuly2002.pdf>

Week 12. <TBD>

Week 13. Planning Tools

Key Issues:

- Understanding and developing the common program planning tools (results frameworks, logic frameworks (LogFrames), Gantt charts, and milestone charts)
- PERT/CPA techniques used in planning, monitoring and evaluating
- The link between tools and PE

Required:

- USAID (2000). Building a Results Framework. Performance Monitoring and Evaluation TIPS. No. 13. Washington, D.C.: USAID Center for Development Information and Evaluation, pp. 1-6.
- **SKIM:** World Bank. “The LogFrame Handbook: A Logical Framework Approach to Project Cycle Management.” Washington, D.C.: World Bank. Available: http://www.wau.boku.ac.at/fileadmin/_/H81/H811/Skripten/811332/811332_G3_log-framehandbook.pdf

Week 14. Evaluating Peacebuilding and Crisis

Key Topics:

- Indicators used in peace consolidation

Required:

- Bush, Kenneth and Colleen Duggan (2013). Evaluation in Conflict Zones: Methodological and Ethnical Challenges. *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development* 8(2): 5-25.
- United Nations (2010). Monitoring Peace Consolidation: United Nations' Practitioners' Guide to Benchmarking, United Nations. [Ch. 3-4]
- Lederach, John Paul, Reina Neufeldt, and Hal Culbertson (2007). Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring, and Learning Toolkit. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, UND and Catholic Relief Services, Southeast Asia Regional Office: Mindanao, Philippines, pp. 45-70. Available at: http://kroc.nd.edu/sites/default/files/reflective_peacebuilding.pdf
- Take a look at: <http://www.peacebuildingdata.org/>

Recommended:

- Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (2005). Conducting a Conflict Assessment: A Framework for Strategy and Program Development. Washington, D.C., US Agency for International Development.
- **SKIM:** Bamberger, M., J. Rugh and L. Mabry (2006). “Not Enough Money,” “Not Enough Time,” “Critical Information Is missing or Difficult to Collect,” and “Reconciling Different Priorities” (Chapters 3-6). In *Real World Evaluation: Working Under budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press, pp. 51-130.