New call for proposals

SIEF announced its fourth call for proposals, which will focus on nimble – or rapid, low-cost – evaluations. Applications are due by May 30, 2018, and more information, including the full call for proposals, online application, and frequently asked questions, is available online.

Impact Evaluation in Practice, now in Portuguese

The Portuguese translation of Impact Evaluation in Practice, Second Edition was published this month. The English version was one of the top most downloaded World Bank books of 2016.

SIEF seminars

In “Looks great, but how much does it cost? How to capture and analyze costs,” SIEF consultant Sam Fishman highlighted the ways in which research and operations can benefit from analyzing costs (recording and slides).

In “Atomic moms: Using stable isotopes to measure the nutrition of children and mothers,” Cornelia Loechl, Section Head of Nutritional and Health-related Environmental Studies at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), described new biometric measurement techniques for measuring typically self-reported practices like exclusive breastfeeding and dietary diversity (recording and slides).

SIEF researchers make the news
Through the 100&Change competition, the MacArthur Foundation awarded a $100 million grant to Sesame Workshop and the International Rescue Committee to educate children displaced by conflict in the Middle East. Researchers J. Lawrence Aber and Hirokazu Yoshikawa, whose SIEF-supported evaluation examined a teacher training program in pre-primary schools in Ghana, will be among the researchers evaluating programs under this grant throughout Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, and Syria. The research into the impacts of a Sesame Street program to help Syrian refugee children and their caregivers deal with stress was also featured in The Gulf Today.

SIEF-supported research evaluating the effects of a home stimulation program for poor families in Colombia was featured in Science Daily. Researchers Alison Andrew, Orazio Attanasio, Emla Fitzsimons, Sally Grantham-McGregor, Costas Meghir, and Marta Rubio-Codina found that two years after the stimulation program ended, there was no evidence that it had benefited children’s development in the long-term—despite short-term improvements to children’s cognition, receptive language, and home environment. The research was published in the journal, PLOS.