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Good evaluation is not just “How did we do?”

Also “How should we do it?”

• Key components:
  – Identify implementers’ questions
  – E.g. cost-benefit estimate, scalability of program, ability to reach some population group

• Answer them

Make research a win-win for operations
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Start with clinical trial benchmark

• Double blind trial: Take 1000 people and give them a pill. Randomly assign half the drug and half the placebo

• Can we simply apply this approach to social programs?
What are the constraints when we randomize in social situations?

• Cannot interfere significantly with program operations
• Must be perceived as fair
• Must be politically feasible
• Must be ethical
Oversubscription or “Why resource constraints are an evaluator’s best friend”

• Many programs have limited resources
• Many more eligible recipients than resources will allow services for
• Quite common in practice:
  – Housing lotteries
  – School vouchers

How do you allocate these resources?
Lotteries are simple, common and transparent

- Randomly chosen from applicant pool
- Participants know the “winners” and “losers”
- Simple lottery is useful when there is no a priori reason to discriminate
- Perceived as fair
- Transparent
- Often politically feasible
... and flexible

• When: Target the interested or the qualified?

• At what level: Individuals or groups?
  – Microcredit borrowers, groups or branches
  – Over communities: which villages should we enter?
  – Over schools (e.g., the balsakhi program)
What if you have 500 applicants for 500 slots?

Consider non-standard lottery designs

• Could increase outreach activities
• Is this ethical?
• Consider carefully what you are trying to evaluate
  – Would you evaluate the program if it never grew beyond these original 500 applicants?
Sometimes screening matters

- Suppose there are 2000 applicants
- Screening of applications produces 500 “worthy” candidates
- There are 500 slots
- A simple lottery will not work

What are our options?
Consider the screening rules

• What are they screening for?
• Which elements are essential?
• Selection procedures may exist only to reduce eligible candidates in order to meet a capacity constraint
When screening matters: Partial Lottery

- Program officers can maintain discretion
  - "Worthy" individuals are selected
  - Others are allocated slots via lottery
- Example: Training program
  - 2000 candidates
  - 1000 meet key criteria: poor enough to qualify
  - 250 out of 1000 chosen based on particular attributes
  - NGO allocates remaining 250 slots by lottery
- Example: Expansion of consumer credit in South Africa
  - Top applicants were all selected
  - Below a certain cutoff, all were rejected
  - Between the two, credit was randomly assigned
Sometimes exclusion is not desirable

Consider other points of interaction

• Programs expand
• They also have initial stages

Think creatively about when to randomize
Phase-in design takes advantage of expansion

- Everyone gets program eventually
- Natural approach when expanding program faces resource constraints
  - “In five years, we will cover 500 schools”
- What determines which schools, branches, etc. will be covered in which year?
  - Some choices based on need, geography, etc.
  - Others largely arbitrary

Can randomize order of phase-in
Phase-in designs

Advantages

• Everyone gets something eventually
• Provides incentives to maintain contact

Concerns

• Can complicate estimating long-run effects
• Care required with phase-in windows
• Do expectations of change actions today?
When program benefits are necessary to ensure cooperation of control groups

- Phase-in may not provide enough benefit to late round participants
- Cooperation from control group may be critical

Consider within-group randomization

- E.g., balsakhi program
- All participants get some benefit
- Concern: increased likelihood of contamination
Encouragement design: What to do when you can’t randomize access

- Sometimes it’s practically or ethically impossible to randomize program access
  - Flu vaccines. Employee savings programs.
- But most programs have less than 100% take-up
- Randomize encouragement to receive treatment
What is “encouragement”?

• Something that makes some folks more likely to use program than others
• Not itself a “treatment”
  – Bad idea: Training as encouragement for credit
  – Good idea: Marketing efforts
• For whom are we estimating the treatment effect?
• Think about who responds to encouragement
  – Are they different from whole population
Multiple Treatments

• Sometimes core question is deciding among different possible interventions
• You can randomize these programs
• Does this teach us about the benefit of any one intervention?
• Do you have a control group?
• Advantage: win-win for operations, can help answer questions for them, beyond simple “impact”!
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Getting started

“But I already know the answer…
... and I don’t want to risk learning that we do not have an impact.”

- **Listen**

- Consider others’ perspectives & objectives

- Find ways to make research operationally useful

- Everyone should have interest in *successful* evaluation, not necessarily *favorable* evaluation
Address specific concerns

- Gossip and individual perceptions
- Fairness
- Cost
- Incentives
- Ethics
- Timing
Gossip: People will talk

- The control group will find out about the treatment
- You can take steps to minimize this (grouping, etc.) but it will happen
- This can be good: everyone wants word-of-mouth advertising
- But be mindful of impact
  - Set up experiment to measure this effect
- Often a key concern for partners
Fairness

- Rare is the case of unlimited resources
- When resources limited, “fairness” is in the framing:
  - Provide everyone with 50% of treatment
  - Provide treatment first-come, first-served: the first 50 have 100% probability of treatment; the rest 0%
- Randomization can help learn more about target participants
Cost

• What is the cost of getting it wrong?
• Often cheaper than non-experimental evaluations
  – Which costs more for survey work?
  – Which has more downside risk by yielding imprecise or biased results?
  – Key questions is not ex post versus randomized trial, but evaluation vs. no evaluation

Almost *certainly* cheaper when benefits included
Timing

- Almost all incremental work for a randomized evaluation happens up front
- Projects usually want to happen "yesterday"
- Begin thinking about evaluation concurrent with thinking about project
Ethics

*It’s wrong to use people as guinea pigs*
*If it works, then it’s wrong not to treat everyone*

Some answers

- Why are prescription drugs different?
- All limited initiatives in some way an ‘experiment’
  - Here, we control the experiment to learn & improve
- Allocation of limited resources happens somehow
  - Why not learn while we are doing it?
  - Produce a public good for future generations.
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Randomization Timeline

Plan  →  Pilot  →  Implement
Plan  ➔  Pilot  ➔  Implement

1. Identify problem and proposed solution
2. Identify key players
3. Identify key operations questions to include in study
4. Design randomization strategy
5. Define data collection plan
1. Identify problem and proposed solution
   • Define the problem (which should lead to the key hypotheses)
   • Define the intervention (sometimes already established)
   • Learn key “hurdles” in design of operations (maybe opportunity to help answer them)
2. Identify key players
   - Top management
   - Field staff
   - Donors
3. Identify key operations questions to include in study
   • Find win-win opportunities for operations
   • How to best market?
   • How to sustain the program?
     – Pricing policy
     – Generating demand through spillovers
   • Types or extent of training?
Plan  ➔  Pilot  ➔  Implement

4. Design randomization strategy
   
   More on this later today
   
   – Basic strategy
   – Sample frame
   – Unit of randomization
   – Stratification

5. Define data collection plan
   
   More on this tomorrow
Plan → Pilot → Implement

- Pilots vary in size & rigor
- Pilots & qualitative steps are *important*
- Something always goes wrong
- Better to find this out before study begins
- Often discover other interesting questions when you see the program working
- Complements lessons from other studies
1. Identify “target” population
2. Collect baseline information (if applicable)
3. Randomize
4. Implement intervention to treatment group
5. Measure outcomes
6. Analyze & assess results
1. Identify actual “target” population
   *More on this later today*

2. Collect baseline data
   *More on this later*
3. Randomize

More details later and in exercises

- Real-time randomization (e.g., credit scoring)
- All-at-once randomization
  - All villages known up front
- Waves
  - Want to learn from one wave to the next
  - Expansion plans not well defined throughout country. Selected districts in each wave
4. Implement intervention to treatment groups
   - Internal controls are critical
   - Nothing worse than doing all this work, but not having control on the field!

5. Measure outcomes
   - Common question: “How long should we wait?”
   - No one-size-fits-all answer
   - Operational considerations must be traded off
   - Wait long enough for impacts to materialize
   - Be clear about time-period with partners
6. Analyze & assess results

More on this later

• Must follow through on promises to partners