EVIDENCE REPORT
No 139

Policy Anticipation, Response and Evaluation

Event Report: Right or Wrong? What Values Inform Modern Impact Evaluation?

Tamlyn Munslow and Chris Barnett

June 2015

EVENT REPORT: RIGHT OR WRONG? WHAT VALUES INFORM MODERN IMPACT EVALUATION?

Tamlyn Munslow and Chris Barnett

June 2015

Contents

Abbreviations

CDI	Centre for Development Impact
DFID	Department for International Development
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IDEAS	International Development Evaluation Association
IDPM	Institute for Development Policy and Management
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
RCT	randomised control trial
SPAIS	School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies
UEA	University of East Anglia
UK	United Kingdom
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFE	wellbeing focused evaluation

Background

This workshop was supported by the Institute of Development Studies' (IDS') Department for International Development (DFID) Accountable Grant, with a view to start a dialogue around the use and application of ethics in impact evaluation. The event was hosted by the Centre for Development Impact (CDI), a joint initiative between IDS, Itad and the University of East Anglia (UEA). Its objective was to open up the debate on ethics and explore how it can become more relevant to the field of impact evaluation. This follows on from an earlier framing event held at IDS in July 2014: Framing Ethics in Impact Evaluation: Where Are We and Which Route Should We Take?

The CDI's working assumption for this event is that all practice – whether evaluations or development interventions – is underpinned by particular value systems. In recent years, the field of impact evaluation within international development has become largely driven by methodology and empiricism. To some extent, this has meant that it has lost touch with the 'value' dimension of evaluation,[1] with values being primarily understood in relation to rigour: the scientific generation of facts or truths which are assumed to be self-evident and universally valid.

Donors, evaluation societies and professional bodies have largely responded to 'ethics' by issuing guidelines, while 'models' from research practice are variously adopted (through ethical codes, research protocols and ethical committees). Yet, there is little empirical evidence of what occurs in practice, and anecdotal insights suggest that there is considerable inconsistency in reality. This may be in part due to 'evaluation' falling between a number of stools: neither being a recognised profession (like that of the medical or legal professions), nor part of formal research. In many instances, evaluation is regarded as an element of project management or the policymaking process – processes that do not have the same ethical imperatives as the research world. The tendency in such cases is to follow guidance advocated by funders (which alone is insufficient), along with an individual's own professional and personal instincts (resulting in uneven ethical practice).

Alongside these very real inconsistencies, recent debates on evaluation ethics have tended to be narrow, often focused upon ethical concerns about 'care of the subject' – such as gaining consent and protecting the anonymity of respondents involved in data collection. This event proposed that such a narrow focus has all too often been to the exclusion of a broader set of ethical issues – such as around an evaluator's role in questioning the values that lie behind development, as well as broader ethical duties to society beyond simply those of respondents. The aim of the day was to initiate and stimulate a dialogue among researchers, consultants and commissioners.

Defining ethics and impact evaluation

The event used a working definition of ethics, with ethics being defined as a set of moral principles that guide an individual's behaviour or the conduct of an activity. But, rather than advocating a single moral framework – which may limit discussion – the event postulated that there is no single, context-free set of (abstract) principles that can be applied to guide ethical judgements in evaluation. Rather, the focus was on the complex *value* judgements that need to be made by evaluators, taking into account a range of factors and competing interests in a particular socio-political context.[2]

---

[1] See Picciotto (2014: 11–12) and Befani, Barnett and Stern (2014: 6–16).
[2] Based extensively on the work of Simons (2006: 243–44).

A broad definition of impact evaluation was used – one which focused on the 'evaluation of impact' rather than a particular subset of methodologies. For the purposes of the workshop, we have adopted the CDI's working definition of impact evaluation. This postulates that:

> Impact evaluations are evaluations that assess the contribution of an intervention towards some outcome or goal. The contribution may be intended or unintended, positive or negative, long-term or short-term. Impact evaluations attempt to identify a clear link between causes and effects, and explain how the intervention worked, and for whom.

This definition does not limit impact evaluation to only experimental and quasi-experimental methodologies – although these can be important methodologies – but maintains a focus on understanding impact and causality. There are a number of distinctive characteristics in this definition:

- Firstly, impacts can be unintended, positive or negative, long- or short-term. The importance of longer-term, sustainable and transformational change is important when assessing impact, and is often overlooked in assessing interventions over a 3–5-year period.
- Secondly, the definition focuses on exploring the links between cause and effect, although importantly, this is not limited to a counterfactual framework of causal inference.[3] This characteristic, in particular, sets 'impact evaluation' apart from other types of organisational or process evaluation.
- Thirdly, there is balance placed on understanding *how* the 'impacts' came about, rather than only measuring the extent (size) of the impact.
- And lastly, this definition highlights the importance of power dynamics, including who defines impact, and who is affected by the impact (the winners and losers). This is important as the impact on one socioeconomic group may negatively or disproportionately affect another part of the same population.

Event programme

The event's agenda addressed three core themes (see Annex 1). Firstly, a theme that explored new ways in which evaluation might challenge what we consider to be 'good' development. The speakers began to explore the relationship between development values and evaluation values, and the role that evaluation might have in challenging the former. The second theme focused on universality and plurality, highlighting the tension between universal guidance and the situated nature and contextualisation of ethical practice. And finally, the last theme highlighted some aspects of the next generation of ethical challenges that evaluators may face.

A background report provided the setting for the key themes: outlining definitions of ethics; the landscape of official ethical guidance in evaluation; and shortcomings of ethical guidance in addressing broader issues such as data availability, lack of transparency, etc. There were several overarching questions that guided the event:

1. How might evaluation move beyond a narrow conception of ethics?
2. How do evaluation values differ from the values within development more broadly?
3. How do we bridge the gap between principles and practice?
4. What are the implications of new methodologies and modalities for ethics in impact evaluation?

The following report provides further details of the themes and a summary of the presentations and discussions.

---

[3] See, for example, Schaffer (2014) for a fuller discussion of different notions of causality.

Participants

Participants were selected to provide a representation of those commissioning and managing evaluations (whether consultants or researchers), as well as those from evaluation societies and professional bodies. On the day, 39 participants took part in the event from a range of backgrounds (see Annex 2 for details). Both academic researchers and practitioners were invited to reflect the range of opinions and values inherent in evaluation practice. The presentations and discussions were captured on video and more information can be found on the Centre for Development Impact events pages.

1   Theme 1: The relationship between development values and evaluation values

This theme suggested that empiricism and analytics alone will not solve our knowledge gap about what works, for whom, and why. A new generation of development policies and interventions are increasingly complex, often overlapping and interrelated, and in contexts that are changing and uncertain. Excellent research methodologies – while a key part of sound impact evaluation – only take us so far, as ultimately, some form of 'judgement' is required. How then, do we create the ethical and policy 'space' where evaluators can challenge the assumptions underpinning evaluations, for example, the focus on outcomes, or question development itself? Does the present system of commissioning limit such opportunities (such as where output-driven contracts dominate evaluation practice)? The following sections provide a brief summary of the presentations and the discussions under each session.

1.1   Framing ethics: an overview of guidance
(Speaker: Rob van den Berg, IDS Visiting Fellow and President of International Development Evaluation Association – IDEAS)

The first session began by framing ethics from a professional evaluator's perspective – taking the current status quo as the starting point rather than a more theoretical perspective based on moral philosophy. Unlike many established professions (doctors, lawyers, accountants, etc.), evaluation is not a formal profession. Therefore, rather than strict codes of ethical conduct – and mechanisms for non-compliance – there are a plethora of guidelines from which the evaluator can select. Most evaluation societies and commissioners (whether bilateral or multilateral donor agencies) have issued guidance for ethical conduct. These typically place the ethical burden on the evaluator's own judgement to decide which ones to follow, and how best to resolve specific ethical dilemmas.

This session explored the diversity of available guidelines, ranging from those of the evaluation societies (the American Evaluation Association, plus the societies of Canada, Switzerland, the United Kingdom (UK), Australia, Uganda, Sri Lanka, etc.); through to bilateral and multilateral donor agencies (United States Agency for International Development (USAID), DFID, Global Environment Facility (GEF), United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), etc.).

The discussion highlighted how there had been very little research or evaluation of how ethical guidelines have been applied in practice. Anecdotal evidence suggested that the prevention of conflict of interest and bias are seen as main ethical issues for many organisations – and while there is often quick action on ethical problems in situ, systematic reporting is rare.

1.2   What 'impacts' do we value?
(Speaker: Professor Allister McGregor, Research Fellow, IDS)

This session began to explore what evaluators might instead turn towards in order to frame ethics – particularly given the apparent vacuum between theory, guidance and practice

outlined in the last session. The session argued that the evaluation profession is caught in the crossfire of the struggle to shift from economic growth, production and efficiency, towards notions of human wellbeing. These struggles are evident in current discussions around the Sustainable Development Goals, and debates around growth and inequality. The risk is otherwise that evaluation fails to address the critical issues in development; and, instead, continues to focus on evaluating on a project-by-project basis, rather than evaluating 'good' development more broadly:

> What we measure affects what we do. If we have the wrong metrics, we will strive for the wrong things. In the quest to increase GDP [gross domestic product], we may end up with a society in which citizens are worse off.
> (World Bank 2010: xvii)

Is the purpose of evaluation to be part of a cycle of control and accountability, or to seek better solutions to the problem being addressed? Wellbeing focused evaluation (WFE) was introduced as a means to consider human development objectives alongside material notions of progress. WFE provides a social conception of human wellbeing based not only on the *material* (what you have), but also the *relational* (what you can do with what you have) and the *subjective* (how you evaluate what you have and can do). An example from Zambia was used to demonstrate how a wellbeing framework could help evaluation shift from being part of the dominant, largely technocratic system, to a system that usefully questioned notions of what impacts should be valued, and by whom.

1.3 Ought implies can? Reflections on an evaluator's duty to society

(Speaker: Dr Richard Palmer Jones, Research Associate, UEA)

This session explored how the current imperative to practice 'good science' is underpinned by a particular value system. The purpose of evaluation is fundamentally to 'prove and improve' (*proving* success to ensure future funding, and *improving* how problems and solutions are addressed in development programming). This leads to bias. The case was made for false positives (the incorrect rejection of a true null hypothesis) creating a bias in the reporting of evaluation findings. This, it is said, leads to bias in institutions (over reporting positive results) and bias among individuals (publication of positive results) in evaluation practice.

The session argued that these biases persist for reasons of both supply and demand: public policy institutions have 'mandate-driven' agendas (to do good), leading to institutional isomorphism where people (agents) construct and maintain appearances through coercion and mimicry. Researchers and evaluators also comply: their employment, publication and personal agendas lead to poor practices through cognitive bias. These include: seeing patterns where there are none; seeing causality where there is none; over-valuing confirmatory evidence; seeking out confirmatory evidence and the suppression of disconfirmatory evidence; and valuing confirmatory evidence more than it warrants.

2 Theme 2: Universality and plurality: ethics as a situated practice

Guidance is widespread, and often idealised. Achieving all such principles establishes an unachievable benchmark that is rarely met. Guidance is often abstract, and it is not always clear how such principles should be applied in particular contexts. As such, ethical principles only really become realised when situated in practice and where real decisions have to be taken (e.g. where one person's 'right' principle may need to be offset against another equally valid claim for 'rightness'). How then do we understand such principles and negotiate between them in practice? How can we achieve this in impact evaluations where structures are often complicated, dispersed and overlapping, and where there are many different stakeholder interests?

2.1 Negotiating ethical commitments: evaluation as a situated practice

(Speaker: Dr Michelle L. Bryan, Senior Associate, Bellwether Consulting; Associate Professor, University of South Carolina)

This session set out to bridge two evolving conversations in the field of evaluation: (i) the professionalization of the field through ethical standards of conduct; and (ii) the role of evaluation and evaluators in bringing about a more equitable society. Dr Bryan questioned the extent to which we can make our own values explicit and promote reflective engagement in evaluation by asking the audience to consider: 'How does your philosophy/values system manifest in your current professional evaluation contexts?' She encouraged the audience to differentiate between genuine ethical issues, matters of implementation infidelity and evaluation methodology, and also urged them to think about how far an evaluator's duty *should* extend to citizens and broader society.

The session used examples from education programmes in the Southern United States to explore challenges that arise when evaluators attempt to enact their commitments, including their adherence to ethical guidelines, in their daily practice. In particular, an evaluator's efforts to adhere to a particular standard may violate commitments to another standard within the same framework – and how far should this responsibility be taken, particularly where ethical guidelines are silent on an evaluator's responsibility to state (upfront) their professional commitments to their clients.

3 Theme 3: New challenges

This last theme explored what it is that is changing in the way we do development. The focus was on examples of new methodologies and new modalities: What emerging ethical challenges are stimulated by new modalities (such as 'pay by results' or 'results-based financing') and the use of new technologies and methodologies (such as behavioural games)? How should evaluators respond?

3.1 Behavioural experiments in development: ethical 'moments' and oversights

(Speaker: Dr Vegard Iversen, Senior Research Fellow (Hon), Institute for Development Policy and Management (IDPM), University of Manchester)

In this session, attention turned to ethical concerns in behavioural experiments – a rich thematic canvas that shares much common ground with experiments conducted by psychologists (e.g. Kahneman and others). This presentation explored the related ethical challenges and suggested some ways forward, drawing on examples such as collaborations with anthropologists.

There are clear parallels between behavioural experiments, the medical trial literature, and the accelerating prevalence of social policy and health randomised control trials (RCTs) in low-income settings. Behavioural experiments, however, appear significantly more innocent than medical trials, and social policy and health RCTs: the risk of violating the no-harm principle is, for example, much lower (e.g. Ifgher and Zarghamee forthcoming). Yet, the attention paid to ethical concerns, at least in parts of the behavioural economics literature, is sparse.

The session raised concerns that we know very little about the true extent of the ethical conduct of such experiments, and the implications for interpretation of findings in low-income/low-literacy settings. Emerging evidence highlights concerns that experimenter effects may threaten interpretability – and there is a need for a new research agenda that critically scrutinises designs and approaches, including how vulnerability may be mitigated.

3.2 Ethical considerations with respect to evaluation of results-based financing

(Speaker: Burt Perrin, independent evaluation consultant (specialist in planning, research and evaluation)

This final session explored the more recent shift towards various forms of results-based financing, whether forms of social investment or payment by results. Within such modalities, evaluators are often tasked with a very narrow role – typically one of validating results in order to trigger disbursements. What new ethical challenges does this raise, and how can evaluators be better equipped to take on these challenges? The session raised ethical dilemmas that evaluators need to face:

Firstly, the 'focus on results' raises two core ethical issues: the need for transparency as a safeguard against corruption; and the dominant use of quantitative target(s) despite shortcomings identified in the literature. For the evaluator this raises concerns about:
(i) incentives for outputs/short-term outcomes versus impacts and transformational change;

(ii) it ignores perverse and unintended effects; (iii) it provides no provision for responsiveness (such as to a changing context); and (iv) it raises issues about who should decide on which results.

Secondly, the discretion given to a service provider to decide how results are achieved raises ethical issues about the 'anything goes' imperative (is the end always allowed to justify means?). It also leaves the door open to a wide range of potentially unethical practices, including disincentives to equity, creaming rewards versus dealing with the greatest need, and goal displacement/dishonesty.

And finally, there is the issue of independent verification. In practice, this is essentially an audit to trigger to release payment. And while it may provide greater transparency – resulting in less corruption, and thus safeguarding against unethical use of funds – there are some limitations. This includes a stronger focus on initial targets, where verification does not get at the unintended effects. Beneficiaries are not necessarily part of the process, and unlike independent evaluation, the verification is often more constrained (i.e. is it really independent? Does it have an appropriate focus?).

The session concluded that while results-based financing may have potential to focus attention on what is needed (i.e. achievements), it poses considerable ethical risks, with a strong potential for perverse effects. It is therefore timely for evaluation to have the courage to question underlying assumptions and values, and not become limited to a purely verification/auditing function.

4 Concluding reflections

Professor Stern noted that we have yet to make a serious attempt to understand *what* development priorities should guide ethical evaluations. We still have a basic understanding of ethics that needs to be separated from other issues. There are ethical issues related to management, for example where responsibility is increasingly devolved to intermediaries who are risk adverse; which in turn creates a demand to evaluate *what* the commissioners pay us to evaluate. There are also ethical issues related to the policy system that creates exclusion and negative effects for development more broadly. These systems are nationally specific, and avoiding becoming UK-dominant is an important point moving forwards. Professor Stern also warned of remaining careful when using stereotypes of disciplines and their values, as there will always be a counter voice to the stereotype.

Overall, the day reinforced why it is important to raise the debate about ethics and values. Some important questions were considered for further inquiry, including the topics highlighted below:

- **Language and definitions:** Is there a language around ethics that is not discussed? Are ethical issues talked about enough in relation to evaluation? What is needed to fill this gap?
- **Ethical guidance and practice:** Is more research needed around the ethical practice of evaluators, and ethical breaches? Whilst donor organisations seem to have standards for reviewing evaluations, these do not seem to make a difference. Is there an underreporting of problems, as there is no requirement to report on ethical breaches? Is there an overlapping of behaviour and codes of practices? Ethics is often not a written agreement but is a part of the culture. Whilst there are usually mechanisms to prevent ethical breaches from happening, such as signing codes of conduct (e.g. GEF in the World Bank Group), difficulties are often 'resolved internally' so many ethical decisions are not recorded as part of the evaluation process.
- **Evaluation or research:** Is evaluation separate from other research? Should it be? Is evaluation subject to greater pressure and politics that undermine 'good science'? Is it risky to mix evaluation with management consultant activities, as it becomes too utilitarian-focused? To what extent should evaluation borrow from research-based notions of ethics?
- **Professionalization and ethics:** Since evaluators are not required to be part of professional bodies, what should the role of the client/funder be beyond issuing guidance? Is the professionalization of evaluation essential for achieving consistent ethical practice? How far can and should evaluation societies and professional bodies support and control ethical practice?
- **Wellbeing as a value-based framework:** How do evaluators address the struggle between growth, inequality and human development objectives? Does the conceptual framework need to change? If the development process is about changing aspirations and giving critical autonomy and voice to citizens, does the use of a wellbeing framework provide evaluators with a way forward – away from purely material notions of poverty?
- **Competing values:** If we focus more on people, with the range of different values and worldviews (of evaluators, researchers, economists, donors, people affected by projects), is it possible to have one overarching approach to ethics? Can we think differently about principles that could be adopted to recognise how to address conflicts in situ, rather than simply leaving it to the evaluator to do the 'right' thing in the 'right' situation? As ethics guidelines are not universally adopted and not universal in nature, is there sufficient knowledge among evaluators about what to do in particular contexts? What does situated ethical practice really look like?

Annex 1　Programme

Timing	What	Who
0830–0900	**Coffee and registration**	Hannah Hudson
0900–0915	**Introduction to the event**	Dr Chris Barnett, Director of CDI
0915–0930	**Tracking the debate: development values, professional ethics and evaluative judgements** Professor Elliot Stern will keep track of what we might learn in the course of this CDI event: Right or Wrong? What Values Inform Modern Impact Evaluation? The agenda reflects different themes ranging from the traditional preoccupation with 'ethical conduct' by evaluators through to notions of 'good' development against which programmes and policies should be evaluated. The event's title suggests that there is something distinctive about ethical behaviour and evaluative judgements when 'modern impact evaluation' is commissioned and conducted. How this is understood also needs to be tracked. Elliot expects to briefly elaborate on his starting framework at the beginning of the day; indicate some emergent or salient themes part way through; and try to collate what participants have highlighted by the end.	Elliot Stern, Emeritus Professor of Evaluation Research, Lancaster University; Honorary Research Fellow, School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies (SPAIS), University of Bristol
Theme 1: The relationship between development values and evaluation values Empiricism and analytics alone will not solve our knowledge gap about what works, for whom, and why. A new generation of development policies and interventions are increasingly complex, often overlapping and interrelated, and in contexts that are changing and uncertain. Excellent research methodologies – while a key part of sound impact evaluation – only take us so far, as ultimately, some form of 'judgement' is required. How then, do we create the ethical and policy 'space' where evaluators can challenge the assumptions underpinning evaluations, for example, the focus on outcomes, or question development outcomes? Does the present system of commissioning limit such opportunities (e.g. as output-driven contracts dominate evaluation practice)?		
0930–1015	**Framing ethics** 'Professional evaluators' are becoming trained with a narrower and narrower focus on methodologies and analytics, where ethics are framed in terms of universal guidelines.	Rob D. van den Berg, Visiting Fellow, CDI; President of IDEAS

1015–1100	**What 'impacts' do we value?** What is it about the present political structure and organisation of evaluation system that leads to a focus on questions and impacts that fail to address the critical issues in development? How can we shift from a project-by-project basis, to evaluating 'good' development more broadly? Specifically, how can evaluators go beyond a narrow focus on assessing stated objectives, and better assess the impact on human wellbeing?	Professor Allister McGregor, Research Fellow, IDS
1100–1130	**Coffee**	
1130–1215	**Ought implies can? Reflections on an evaluator's duty to society** What role do evaluators have in public debate? Are normative exhortations to practice good science and be better people sufficient, or do we need to look in depth at the politics of evaluation? The presentation outlines the many ways in which evaluations can be biased and explores some of the motivations for this.	Dr Richard Palmer Jones, Research Associate, UEA
1215–1230	**What have we learned so far?**	Professor Elliot Stern
1230–1330	**Lunch**	

Theme 2: Universality and plurality: ethics as a situated practice

Guidance is widespread, and often idealised. Achieving all such principles establishes an unachievable benchmark that is rarely met. Guidance is often abstract, and it is not always clear how such principles should be applied in particular contexts. As such, ethical principles only really become realised when situated in practice and where real decisions have to be taken (e.g. where one person's 'right' principle may need to be offset against another equally valid claim for 'rightness'). How then do we understand such principles and negotiate between them in practice? How can we achieve this in impact evaluations where structures are often complicated, dispersed and overlapping, and where there are many different stakeholder interests?

1330–1430	**Negotiating ethical commitments: (education) evaluation as a situated practice (in the Southern United States)** How can evaluators make the link from theories and concepts, to the principles and procedures that inform their work? What is our role as evaluators? What does 'ethical evaluator behaviour' look like? To whom do we owe our ethical allegiances? How are different stakeholder interests taken into account, and what is the role of the evaluator in negotiating between the powerful and the marginalised towards a more equitable society?	Dr Michelle L. Bryan, Senior Associate, Bellwether Consulting; Associate Professor, University of South Carolina

Theme 3: New challenges

What is it that is changing in the way we do development? What emerging ethical challenges are stimulated by new modalities (such as 'pay by results' or 'results-based financing') and the use of new technologies and methodologies (such as behavioural games)? How should evaluators respond?

1430–1515	**Behavioural experiments in development: ethical 'moments' and oversights** Experimental economics spans a rich thematic canvas and shares much common ground with experiments conducted by psychologists. This presentation explores the related ethical challenges and suggests some ways forward, drawing on examples such as collaborations with anthropologists.	Dr Vegard Iversen, Senior Research Fellow (Hon), IDPM, University of Manchester
1515–1545	**Coffee**	
1545–1630	**Ethical considerations with respect to evaluation of results-based financing** There has been a more recent shift towards various forms of results-based financing, whether forms of social investment or payment by results. Within such modalities, evaluators are often tasked with a very narrow role – typically one of validating results in order to trigger disbursements. What new ethical challenges does this raise, and how can evaluators be better equipped to take on these challenges?	Burt Perrin, independent evaluation consultant (specialist in planning, research and evaluation)
1630–1645	**Concluding reflections: values in impact evaluation today** Optimistically this CDI event will have implications for both practice – among evaluators and those who commission evaluation – and for future research and development priorities. It would, however, be foolish not to recognise the political dimensions of evaluation and that different interests and values are an integral part of the evaluation community as any other 'community of practice'. We will be surprised if the debate reveals only consensus, but nevertheless, the surfacing of different ethical and moral positions is also a worthwhile output of this event.	Professor Elliot Stern

Annex 2 List of participants

No.	Name	Organisation or agency
1	Allister McGregor	Institute of Development Studies
2	Anna Henttinen	Department for International Development
3	Anne-Marie O'Riordan	University of Bath
4	Burt Perrin	Independent
5	Catherine Harbour	Children's Investment Fund Foundation
6	Chris Barnett	Itad/Institute of Development Studies (Centre for Development Impact)
7	Claire Hutchings	Oxfam
8	Colin Jacobs	United Kingdom Evaluation Society (British Council)
9	Doha Abdelhamid	King Abdullah Bin Abdulaziz International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue (KAICIID)
10	Elliot Stern	Lancaster University; SPAIS, University of Bristol
11	Emily Richardson	Itad
12	Gary Edwards	Institute of Development Studies
13	Hannah Hudson	Institute of Development Studies (Centre for Development Impact)
14	James Sumberg	Institute of Development Studies
15	Jos Vaessen	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
16	Juliette Siebold	University of Bath
17	Kate Bingley	Christian Aid
18	Kate Hale	Itad (Centre for Development Impact)
19	Kathi Welle	Itad (Centre for Development Impact)
20	Laura Camfield	University of East Anglia (Centre for Development Impact)
21	Leslie Groves	Consultant
22	Maren Duvendack	University of East Anglia (School of International Development) (Centre for Development Impact)
23	Megan Kennedy-Chouane	Children's Investment Fund Foundation
24	Mel Punton	Itad
25	Michael O'Donnell	Bond
26	Michelle Bryan	University of South Carolina; Senior Associate, Bellwether Consulting
27	Penny Hawkins	Department for International Development
28	Rashid Zaman	Oxford Policy Management
29	Richard Longhurst	Institute of Development Studies
30	Richard Palmer Jones	University of East Anglia
31	Rick Davies	Independent
32	Rob D. van den Berg	IDEAS; King's College London; Institute of Development Studies (Centre for Development Impact)
33	Saltanat Rasulova	University of Bath
34	Sandra Maignant	International Rescue Committee
35	Simon Hearn	Overseas Development Institute
36	Susan Johnson	University of Bath (Centre for Development Studies)
37	Tamlyn Munslow	Institute of Development Studies (Centre for Development Impact)
38	Tiina Pasanen	Overseas Development Institute
39	Vegard Iversen	University of Manchester, IDPM

References

Befani, B.; Barnett, C. and Stern, E. (2014) 'Rethinking Impact Evaluation for Development', *IDS Bulletin* 45.6

Picciotto, R. (2014) 'Have Development Evaluators Been Fighting the Last War… And If So, What is to be Done?', *IDS Bulletin* 45.6: 6–16

Shaffer, P. (2014) *'Production' vs. 'Difference-Making' in Causal Analysis: Implications for Poverty*, Q-Squared Working Paper 62, Winter 2013–2014, Peterborough Ontario, Canada: Department of International Development Studies, Trent University

Simons, H. (2006) 'Ethics in Evaluation', in I.F. Shaw, J.C. Greene and M.M. Mark (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Evaluation*, London and Thousand Oaks CA: SAGE

World Bank (2010) *Innovation Policy: A Guide for Developing Countries*, Washington DC: World Bank

Brighton BN1 9RE

T +44 (0)1273 606261
F +44 (0)1273 621202
E ids@ids.ac.uk
www.ids.ac.uk