

University of Denver  
Conflict Resolution Program

**CRES 4111**  
**Reflective Practice and Evaluation**  
**Fall 2013**

---

Dr. Tamra Pearson d'Estrée (deSTRAY)  
Office: JKIS Sié 158, 303-871-7685  
Office Hrs: Wed. 10-12

email: tdestree@du.edu  
Class Time: Tuesdays, 2:00-4:50pm  
Class Location: BCH 218

Goals: - to improve the reflectiveness of individual CR practitioners as well as that of the field at large in order to foster cumulative learning and true wisdom  
- to learn tools & techniques for making our theories of practice explicit  
- to learn tools & techniques for generating theory from our practice  
- to explore methodologies for testing and revising our theories in practice  
- to learn basic design, monitoring, and evaluation (DM&E)  
- to examine ways practice and research may modify theory and ways research may modify practice

This course is designed for practitioners who would like to become more reflective and theory-building in their practice, and for researchers wanting contact with actual data and questions from practice. Students will be exposed to actual ongoing evaluation projects and have opportunities to view planning, decision-making, and implementation.

Prerequisite: Field Practicum, or permission of instructor.

Format: Weekly seminar.

Requirements and Grading:

Writing assignments have been developed to coordinate with the issues and the research techniques introduced throughout the course. Details on the writeups of these assignments will be discussed early in each unit; however, some assignments will require substantial advance planning (e.g, Assignment II). The final "term" paper for this course is the resubmission of a revised and polished grant proposal or project assessment, with the addition of an evaluation plan.

- (1) **Bloggng assignment - Joining a DM&E community.** (10%) Design, monitoring, & evaluation specifically tailored for the conflict resolution and peacebuilding field is in a growth phase, with contributions from active practitioners. Seeking Common Ground, an NGO based in Washington, DC, has developed a learning portal to advance sharing among practitioners. Visit this website at

<http://www.dmeformpeace.org/>. Read and blog on an issue or discussion or article posted, ask and discuss a confusing question, or post a challenge you'd like input on - four times during the term. Alert me by email each time when you are ready for me to verify.

- (2) **Writing Assignment I - Making implicit theory explicit.** (1<sup>st</sup> half 25%) This year, you can choose to either develop your own project proposal or document an existing project.

*Option 1: Develop your own project proposal.* Choose a Request for Proposals (RFP) from a local or national funding agency that you have either located on the internet or from class. Draft a brief grant proposal (4 - 7 pages) for a pilot (i.e., small) conflict resolution project, explaining your objectives and justifying your logic for your project and process in both theoretical and practical terms. Include relevant literature, the theory of practice justifying the intervention, your goals and objectives, and a project timeline, as well as the form on p. 54 of the *Logic Model Development Guide* (see below). If you are ready, begin to outline a plan for evaluation linked to these goals and objectives - How will you determine if what you did mattered? Append a copy of the RFP to the grant proposal you turn in.

*Option 2: Document an existing project requesting evaluation planning.* Students will choose from among available real life evaluation projects to assist on. Assessment/detail of program design: Like the Grant Proposal Option, students will include a description of the project, its inherent logic and theoretical justification (relevant literature as well as its theory of practice), its goals and objectives, and a project timeline, as well as the *Logic Model* form filled out. Any current, preexisting practices of assessment/evaluation should be documented as well. If more than one student chooses the same project, you will engage in any meeting with project staff together but write separate reports. Later in the quarter, you will receive the assessment report back with extensive feedback from the instructor that will allow you to revise it to accompany the second half below.

**Due: Oct. 2.** Later in the quarter, you will receive the proposal or assessment report back with extensive feedback from the instructor that will allow you to revise it to accompany the evaluation plan below, which will be written after you learn course techniques.

- (3) **Writing Assignment II - Data Collection: Observation.** (20%) Students will observe two instances of the same type of meeting, in order to use observation tools to make comparisons about process, dynamics, and outcomes. Some possible examples:
- a. One might view two types of mediation, e.g., a small claims case and a case of a different sort, or one where the mediator is known to use "transformative mediation" and one where the mediator usually uses a "problem-solving" approach. The instructor can assist you in arranging opportunities to observe mediations, most likely through Jefferson County Mediation Services, if you do not already have such access.

- b. One might view two different meetings of the same group, such as a student group, a work group, a neighborhood group, a PTA, a church group or other fellowship group, or even a course work group/team that has at least 5 members present during each meeting. If you are part of this group (and thus engaging in “participant-observation”), the group should be even larger so that your observer activities do not distract the group. Alternatively, one might view and compare two different groups’ meetings, e.g., a PTA meeting vs. a homeowner’s association meeting.

In preparation for the observation of each, develop a plan for what you will observe. Consider which preexisting instruments you will use to record your observations (more on this in class), and/or develop your own checklist, based on your hypotheses about possible dimensions of comparison. **For and this and the subsequent assignment**, report on context, on your data, your analysis, and your reflections on the results, and also reflections on your use of this method. Include references to course materials, and outside literature if relevant. 10-12 pp. **Due: Oct. 16.**

**(4) Writing Assignment III - Data collection and analysis: Interviewing.** (20%)

Choose an established practitioner from whom you would like to learn more about his or her practice of conflict resolution. Develop an interview schedule, to be submitted to the instructor at least a week in advance of the interview for review. Turn in a writeup of the interview, with your own reflections on both content and process. If interviewee consents, consider recording the interview in some form. 10-12 pp. **Due: Nov 6.**

**(5) Writing Assignment IV - Final Project Proposal or Assessment, with Evaluation Plan.** (2<sup>nd</sup> half 25%)

Using the extensive feedback from the instructor on your draft proposal or assessment report, revise it into submission-quality format in which you add an evaluation plan discussing how the project will determine if objectives have been met, and how outcomes will be measured and reported. The document should include a review of relevant literature, the theory of practice justifying the intervention, clear development of goals and objectives, a project timeline, and a clear plan for evaluation linked to goals and objectives. Also include the forms on pp. 54 and 57 of the *Logic Model Development Guide* (see below). Attach original draft with instructor comments as an appendix to your revision. Final revised project proposal or report **due Tuesday, November 19.**

NOTE: For all papers, please use a consistent referencing style, either APA (American Psychological Association), MLA or Chicago is preferred. Submit a paper that you would submit for publication. Grammar, style, punctuation, etc., are considered in grading. More than one draft of each paper is expected, even though only the final version is submitted to the instructor. Informality, disorganization, and improper citation and referencing, etc., will affect a paper’s grade.

## **Texts:**

### **Required texts:**

- Church, Cheyenne, and Mark M. Rogers (2006). *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. Washington, DC: Search for Common Ground. Available at [http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilr/ilt\\_manualpage.html](http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilr/ilt_manualpage.html).
- Gorden, R. (1992). *Basic interviewing skills*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Kellogg Foundation. (2001). *Logic Model Development Guide*. Available at <http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2006/02/WK-Kellogg-Foundation-Logic-Model-Development-Guide.aspx>
- Patton, M.Q (2012). *Essentials of utilization-focused evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Webb, E. (ed.), D.J. Campbell, and R.P. Schwartz, (1965/1999). *Unobtrusive Measures* (revised edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

### **Optional texts:**

The texts below have been ordered into the bookstore for optional purchase, depending on your needs and preferences. Each either focuses more narrowly on one research tool, or deals broadly with issues in reflective practice, evaluation, or research. These are books that are merely made available should you wish to add them to your own library. They are not required, though small sections may be required under certain units and thus are available on the readings disk. These books are also on reserve so that you may check them out on 1-day reserve and/or photocopy any required selections.

- Lang, M.D., and Taylor, A. (2000). *The making of a mediator: Developing artistry in practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. (Should already have from Practicum.)
- Lederach, J.P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, D.C. : United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Univ. Press.
- Patton, M.Q (2011). *Developmental evaluation*. New York: Guilford.

### **Other required individual articles and chapters:**

All other required readings that do not list a website are stored in a file on one of Conflict Resolution Institute's computers and available for you to copy to your own CD or thumb drive. If you make your own personal copy of these articles, there is no copyright charge. Plan to come in to the Institute during business hours so that you can copy this file of articles. This process has proved to be easier than e-reserve or traditional reserve.

## COURSE OUTLINE

- I. Introduction: A Practical Epistemology  
Generating Useful Knowledge & Informed Practice  
Tools Needed for Reflective Practice  
Grant proposal assignment
- II. Design and Monitoring, Logic Models  
Research Method I: Observation
- III. Evaluation Basics
  - A. Types and Uses of Evaluation
  - B. Goals
  - C. Implementation
- IV. Theories of Practice and Theories of Change  
Designing Indicators
- V. Research Method II: Interviewing
- VI. Analyzing Information: Analyzing Interviews, Transcripts & Narratives  
Methods for Evaluation
- VII. Goals Revisited  
Developmental Evaluation
- VIII. Closing the Loop on Useful Knowledge Gathering: Making Change Okay  
Reporting Results; Completing the Reflection Cycle

## COURSE SCHEDULE AND READINGS

Each section has required readings. Only the required readings are expected to be covered in class. Other suggested readings are provided merely to serve as references should you wish to pursue topics further. Required readings listed are expected to be read in preparation for discussion of that unit.

### **Unit 1            Introduction of Course** **Weeks 1-2      A Practical Epistemology; Tools Needed for Reflection** **Logic Models**

#### **READ, in this order:**

- Schön, pp. 14-69.
- Lang and Taylor, Preface, Ch. 2, and Ch. 6 first part (pp. 119-132).
- Argyris, C.R., Putnam, and D.M Smith (1985). *Action Science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Ch. 1 (pp. 4-35).
- Patton (2012), Intro/Overview & Ch. 1
- Kellogg Foundation *Logic Model Development Guide*, chs. 1 & 2, pp. 1-25.

#### **Suggested Further Reading:**

- Schön, pp. 1-13; 73-169; 267-283.
- Patton, Chs. 2 & 3.
- Lang and Taylor, Ch. 1.
- Campbell, D.T. *The Experimenting Society*. In Campbell, D.T. & Russo, M.J. (1999). *Social Experimentation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lederach, JP, Neufeldt, R., & Culbertson, H. (2007). *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring and Learning Toolkit*. South Bend, IN: The Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies and Catholic Relief Services.  
[http://crs.org/publications/showpdf.cfm?pdf\\_id=80](http://crs.org/publications/showpdf.cfm?pdf_id=80)

### **Unit 2            Design and Monitoring** **Week 3           Gathering Information: Observation**

#### **READ:**

- Church & Rogers. Introduction and Chs. 1, 2, & 3.
- Webb, E., (et.al.). (1999). (pp. 1-52, 113-142). A reprint of a classic text, which though using dated language and examples, still has some of the best ideas for nonobtrusive observation.
- Sarat, A. (1994). "Patrick Phear: Control, Commitment, and Minor Miracles in Family and Divorce Mediation" In D. Kolb, *When Talk Works*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Pp. 191-237. An example of how observation can complement (and even challenge) interview data.

**Suggested Further Reading:**

- Webb, et al. (1999), (pp. 53-112).
- Whyte, W.F. (1994). *Street Corner Society* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). University of Chicago Press. Engaging example of good participatory observation.
- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. (pp. 78-101).
- Janesick, V. (1998) "*Stretching*" *Exercises for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Part 2

**Unit 3            Evaluation Basics**  
**Weeks 4-5****READ:**

- Patton, Chs. 5-8.
- Church & Rogers, Ch. 6.

**Unit 4            Theories of Practice and Theories of Change**  
**Weeks 5-6      Designing Indicators****READ:**

- Patton, Ch. 9.
- Church & Rogers, Ch. 4
- Kellogg Foundation *Logic Model Development Guide*, chs. 3 & 4.
- Davies, R., and Dart. J. (2005). *The 'most significant change' (MSC) technique: A guide to its use*. Care International, UK. Available at <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf>. pp. 8-14.

**Suggested Further Reading:**

- Lang and Taylor, Part Two, pp. 69-118; 133-149.
- Argyris, C.R., Putnam, and D.M Smith (1985). *Action Science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Ch. 2 (pp. 36-79), and Ch. 3 (pp. 80-102). Optional, but great if you like philosophy.
- Kolb, D., & Kressel, K. (1994). "The Realities of Making Talk Work." In D. Kolb, *When Talk Works*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 459-493. Read this if you did not do so in CRES 4222.
- Ross, M.H. (2000). Creating the conditions for peacemaking: Theories of practice in ethnic conflict resolution. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(6), 1002-1034.
- Shapiro, I. (2002). *Training for Racial Equity and Inclusion: A Guide to Selected Programs*. Section 3, "Similarities and Differences Across Programs," pp. 99-106.
- NIDR (1994) *Bridging Theory, Research, and Practice*. Forum, 26. Washington DC: NIDR

**Unit 5      Gathering Information II: Interviewing**  
**Week 7**

**READ:**

- Gorden, Chs. 2-5 (pp. 9-59; exercises excluded). Glance at Ch. 1.
- Patton, Ch. 10.

**Suggested Further Reading:**

- Hedeén, T. (2002/2007). *Using participant feedback to evaluate and improve quality in mediation*. CADRE Briefing Paper.
- Brounéus, K. (2011). In-depth Interviewing: The process, skills and ethics of interviews in peace research. In K. Höglund & M. Oberg (Eds.), *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges* (pp. 130-145). London: Routledge.
- Chataway, C. J. (1998). The Evolution of Diplomacy: Coordinating Tracks I and II. In *Building World Order*. Conflict resolution interviewing example.
- Lee, R.M. (1993). Asking Sensitive Questions: Interviewing. Ch.6 in *Doing Research on Sensitive Topics*.
- Cohen, N., & Arieli, T. (2011). Field research in conflict environments: Methodological challenges and snowball sampling. *Journal of Peace Research*, 48(4), 423-435.

**Unit 6      Analyzing Information: Analyzing Interviews, Transcripts, & Narratives**  
**Week 8      Methods for Evaluation**

**READ:**

- Gorden, Chapters 6-10 (pp. 65-165; exercises excluded)
- Patton, Ch. 11.
- Church & Rogers, Ch. 12.

**Suggested Further Reading:**

- Janesick, V. (1998) *“Stretching” Exercises for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Part 3
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). Depth Interviewing. Chapter 5 in *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. CA: Sage Publications.

**Unit 7      Goals Revisited**  
**Week 9      Developmental and Participatory Evaluation**

**READ:**

- Lederach, J.P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, Ch. 10, “Strategic and Responsive Evaluation,” pp. 129-148.

- d'Estree, T. P., L.A. Fast, J.N. Weiss, and M.S. Jakobsen. (2001). Changing the Debate about 'Success' in Conflict Resolution Efforts. *Negotiation Journal*, 17 (2), 101-113.
- Patton, Ch. 13.
- Patton, M.Q (2011). *Developmental evaluation*. New York: Guilford. Ch. 1, pp. 1-27. Also available at <http://www.guilford.com/excerpts/patton.pdf>.

### **Suggested Further Reading:**

- Lang and Taylor, Ch. 7, pp. 153-189, on process goals.
- Patton, M.Q (2011). *Developmental evaluation*. New York: Guilford. Ch. 5, "Systems Thinking and Complexity Concepts for Developmental Evaluation," pp. 111-151.
- Chataway, C. J. (1997). "An Examination of the Constraints on Mutual Inquiry in a Participatory Action Research Project." *Journal of Social Issues*, 53 (4), 749-767.
- Rothman, J. (2004). "Action Evaluation in Theory and Practice." G. Burgess & H. Burgess (Eds.), *Beyond Intractability*. **Download from:** [http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/action\\_evaluation/](http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/action_evaluation/)
- Mayer, B.S. (2004). *Beyond Neutrality*. New York: Jossey-Bass. Ch. 1, pp. 3-40.
- Rothman, Jay (1999). "Articulating Goals and Monitoring Progress in a Cyprus Conflict Resolution Training Workshop." In Ross, M.H., & J. Rothman (Eds.) *Theory and Practice in Ethnic Conflict Management: Conceptualizing Success and Failure*. London: Macmillan. Pp. 176-194.
- Ross, Marc Howard. "Action Evaluation in the Theory and Practice of Conflict Resolution." *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 8 (1) , May 2001  
Available at: <http://www.gmu.edu/academic/pes/Ross81PCS.htm>.
- Scriven M., "Evaluation in the New Millennium: A Transdisciplinary Approach." In *Evaluating Social Programs and Problems, Visions for The New Millennium*. eds Stewart Donaldson and Michael Scriven, 19-42. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, London. 2003.
- Paffenholz T, Reyhler L., "Towards Better Policy and Programme Work in Conflict Zones: Introducing the 'Aid for Peace' Approach", *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development* 2, No. 2, (2005): 6-23
- Coghlan A., Preskill H., and Tzavaras T. (2003). An Overview of the Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation. *Using Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation*, Eds Preskill and Coghlan.
- Estrella M. and J. Gaventa, *Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review*, IDS Working Paper 70. Available from: <http://www.ntd.co.uk/idsbookshop/details.asp?id=421>

## **Unit 8            Closing the Loop on Useful Knowledge Gathering: Making Change Okay**

### **Week 10        Reporting Results; Completing the Reflection Cycle**

#### **READ:**

- Lang and Taylor, Ch. 8, pp. 191-212.
- Patton, Chs. 14 & 15.

- Church & Rogers, pp. 138-162. Discusses how to include a plan for evaluation in a proposal.

Suggested further reading:

- Church C. (2005). *Mind the Gap: Policy Development and Research on Conflict Issues*. INCORE. pages 22-35 Available at: <http://www.incore.ulster.ac.uk/policy/rip/RIP.pdf>

**Final**                      **Informal reporting on projects; discussion of lessons learned**  
Nov. 19, 2-3:50      **Final proposal/report due.**