

# MEASURE-BiH

May 8 - 19, 2017

### Program Evaluation Learning Resources

European Commission, Agriculture and Rural Development, Evaluation of Policy Measures in Agriculture: [https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation_en)

Think Tank Directory Europe (TTDerope):  
<http://www.eu.thinktankdirectory.org/>

### Recommended News Articles and Blog Posts

[Using Multi-Dimensional Poverty Outcomes in Measurement by Heather Esper and Yaquta Fatehi](#)

[The Pay for Success Model by Brian Beachkofski and Jeannie Friedman](#)

[The Currency of Social Impact Measurement by Mishkah Jakoet and Amreen Choda](#)

[Will Impact Investing Fulfill Its Development Promise? By Robert Picciotto](#)

[The Many Faces of Social Impact Measurement by Leah Goldstein Moses and Jill Lipski Cain](#)

[To Promote Peace and Development, Let's Talk About Government Spending On Security and Criminal Justice](#)

[What Our Government Clients Think in Fragile Countries: A Perspective from the Country Surveys](#)

[Collecting Data With Surveys is Easy, Right?](#)

[What Can You Measure with Cellphone Metadata?](#)

[Financing Economic Growth in LDCs: A Tale of National Savings and Natural Resources](#)



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

### Upcoming Events

#### **September 7**

[Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning \(MERL\) Tech 2017, Washington DC, USA](#)

#### **September 19**

[6<sup>th</sup> Biennial International Conference of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association, Colombo, Sri Lanka](#)

### Useful Sites

<https://councilforeuropeanstudies.org/>

<http://www.cer.org.uk/>

### Examples of Evaluation Projects

[Investment and Support Under Rural Development Policy, Final Evaluation Report, European Commission, November 2014](#)

[European Innovation Partnerships \(EIPs\) as a Tool for Systematic Change, Independent Evaluation Report, Aho E., Serger S.S., Monig W., Wilson P., Garmendia C., Steinberg M., Swieboda P., February 2014](#)

## Relevant Publications

### [A Systematic Review of Positive Youth Development Programs in Low- and Middle-Income Countries by USAID](#)

This report presents the results of a rigorous analysis of existing evidence of positive youth development (PYD) in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Commissioned by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) through the YouthPower Learning project, this systematic review aims to document how PYD approaches have been applied in LMICs, as well as what the evidence demonstrates about the effectiveness of such programs.

The YouthPower Learning team developed the following definition of PYD, based on existing literature, expert consultations, and key stakeholder surveys.

*“PYD transitions away from traditional approaches of responding to young people in a risk or problem frame and toward proactively building skills, fostering healthy relationships, and supporting youth to be active partners in development efforts. It suggests that if young people have the knowledge, skills, and support they need, they will thrive as adults, enjoy good health, succeed economically, and make meaningful contributions to their communities.”*

One of the most important findings from this review is that the evidence base regarding the effectiveness of PYD programs in LMICs is rather thin, with little data comparing effectiveness of PYD programs against those that are not using a PYD approach, and infrequent measurement of PYD outcomes.

Although youth programs are implemented across the globe, few are explicitly identified as PYD. Though all of the programs included in the review met the criteria for PYD, only 11% described themselves using terminology specific to PYD. This could be an indication that program implementers and evaluators are not aware of PYD as a distinct approach to youth programming.

While adult-led educational programs were the most frequently cited activity type (81%), no programs conducted only one type of activity. Instead, all programs combined activities and they varied widely. These included workshops led by adults and after-school classes led by teachers. Peer education was the second-most common category, followed by activities using media and youth-friendly services that were not home based. Opinion leader-led activities, which rely on the program participation of opinion leaders to disseminate messages, or parent/youth activities and home-based services, were the least common.



### Recommended Reading

#### [Real-World Challenges to Randomization and Their Solutions by Hear, O'Toole, Naimpally, and Bressler](#)

Randomized evaluations, also called randomized controlled trials (RCTs), have received increasing attention from practitioners, policymakers, and researchers due to their high credibility in estimating the causal impacts of programs and policies.

Certain features of a program may present challenges to using a RCT design. This document showcases four of these program features and demonstrates how to alter the design of an evaluation to accommodate them: 1) Resources exist to extend the program to everyone in the study area; 2) Program has strict eligibility criteria; 3) Program is an entitlement; 4) Sample size is small. This document also features two implementation challenges and demonstrates how to design a RCT that mitigates threats and eliminates difficulties in the implementation.