offered by Department of Public Policy
with effect from Semester B 2018/19

Part I   **Course Overview**

Course Title:	**Evidence-based Policy and Practice**
Course Code:	POL6202
Course Duration:	One semester
Credit Units:	3
Level:	P6
Medium of Instruction:	English
Medium of Assessment:	**English**
Prerequisites: *(Course Code and Title)*	**NIL**
Precursors: *(Course Code and Title)*	**NIL**
Equivalent Courses: *(Course Code and Title)*	**NIL**
Exclusive Courses: *(Course Code and Title)*	**POL6903A MAPPM Dissertation**

Part II   Course Details

1.   Abstract

This course aims to enable students to discover evidence base for identifying, analysing, and evaluating contemporary and critical policy issues. Both aspects, scientific and political, of policy analysis are highlighted in the course. The course introduces elements in a policy cycle and tools available for analysing them. Specifically, topics covered include, agenda setting, assessing alternative solutions, decision making, policy implementation and impact evaluation. The following approaches will be applied in analysing issues in different policy domains such as education, health, industry, energy and environment: stakeholder analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and institutional analysis. After taking the course, students are expected to be able to engage in debating contemporary policy issues from a more informed, analytical perspective.

2.   Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)
(CILOs state what the student is expected to be able to do at the end of the course according to a given standard of performance.)

No.	CILOs	Weighting (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	*A2*	*A3*
1.	Understanding processes of policy-making, implementation and evaluation and the need for an evidence-based approach	10%	X		
2.	Applying stakeholder analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and institutional analysis and specifying their limitations	30%	X		
3.	Discovering, appraising, and synthesizing evidence arising from research into key policy issues	30%	X		
4.	Creating a policy memo illustrating considerations and complexities underlying analysis and evaluation of policies in Hong Kong, the mainland China, or overseas	30%	X		
		100%			

A1:   Attitude
Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.
A2:   Ability
Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.
A3:   *Accomplishments*
Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)
(TLAs designed to facilitate students' achievement of the CILOs.)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No.						Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4			
Readings	Reading of assigned readings every week	X	X	X	X			
Lectures	These are organized thematically to: • Explain concepts, theories, and methods in evidence-based policy-making and evaluation; • Analyse policy issues from scientific, economic, institutional, managerial, and political perspectives.	X	X	X	X			
Seminars	These are sessions for students to: • Raise questions and make critical observations on the concepts and methods introduced in the lectures;Debate and apply knowledge and methods of evidence-based policy making and evaluation to particular policy issues.	X	X	X	X			
Group Presentation	Offer an opportunity for students to: ▪ Relate abstract theories and concepts to analyse and assess real-life policy issues; ▪ Share findings of their group projects; ▪ Engage in critical assessment of policy-making, implementation and impact evaluation; ▪ Sharpen their critical thinking and problem-solving skills. .	X	X	X	X			
Policy memo	It is the final product of students' group projects (Executive Summary within 1,000 words, elaboration within 4,000 words, plus supplementary information). Students adopt an evidence-based approach in policy analysis and evaluation, integrating and applying political, economic, and institutional analysis to a specific policy issue.	X	X	X	X			

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.						Weighting	Remarks
	1	2	3	4				
Continuous Assessment: 100%								
In-class participation: in order to induce dynamic learn environment, this class encourages students to bring in related policy material to be discussed in each of the class section.	X	X	X	X			10%	Except the first class, a student can earn 1% of the final grade in each class when she brings related policy material for discussions in class.
Group Presentation about a recent policy evaluation project	X	X	X	X			10%	
Policy memo	X	X	X	X			40%	
In class exam	X	X	X				40%	
							100%	

5. Assessment Rubrics

(Grading of student achievements is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities with the following rubrics.)

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
1. In-class participation	Bring the related part of the program evaluation to discuss in each of the lecture	Bring cases 8-10 times and very willing to discuss in class.	Bring cases to class around 5-7 times and occasionally engage into the discussions.	About 2-4 times brings the case back to class and discuss the policy in a few times.	Seldom bring the cases to class only one time.	Never bring case into class for discussion.
2. Group Presentation	**1.** synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. 2. competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. 3. abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation	A strong ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. High degrees of competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of	A good ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Clearly competent in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of	Some ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Weak competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue.	Very basic ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Minimum competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. Little ability or skill in evaluating the utilization of evidence	Fails to understand or lacks the ability to synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Lacks competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. Minimal abilities in evaluating the

	to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. 4. skills in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	systematic reviews to a policy issue. Excellent abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Very strongly developed skills in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	systematic reviews to a policy issue. Well-developed abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Generally competent in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	Basic abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Research, writing, team-work, oral presentation and communication skills present, but not much higher than minimum standards.	in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy or in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Underdeveloped competence in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy or in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Inadequate competence in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.

3. Policy Memo	1. synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. 2. competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. 3. abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically	A strong ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. High degrees of competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. Excellent abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in	A good ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Clearly competent in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. Well-developed abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in	Some ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Weak competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. Basic abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation	Very basic ability to understand, synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Minimum competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. Little ability or skill in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy or in assessing	Fails to understand or lacks the ability to synthesize and appraise critically research-based evidence relating to key policy issues. Lacks competence in drawing upon various electronic data bases to facilitate the assessment of policy-related evidence and in the application of the principles of systematic reviews to a policy issue. Minimal abilities in evaluating the utilization of evidence in relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social

	inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. 4. skills in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Very strongly developed skills in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	relation to the development and implementation of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Generally competent in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	of policy in a selected area of public or social policy and in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Research, writing, team-work, oral presentation and communication skills present, but not much higher than minimum standards.	critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Underdeveloped competence in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.	policy or in assessing critically inclusive or other approaches to generating and analyzing policy-related data. Inadequate competence in research, writing, team-work and in oral presentations and communication.
4. In-class Examination	1. knowledge of key theories, methods and practices entailed in the identification, evaluation and	An excellent standard of knowledge of key theories, methods and practices entailed	A generally good standard of knowledge of key theories, methods and practices entailed	Rudimentary standard of knowledge of key theories, methods and practices entailed in the	Poor knowledge of key theories, methods and practices entailed in the identification, evaluation and utilization of evidence	Almost no knowledge or understanding of key theories, methods and practices entailed in the identification, evaluation and

	utilization of evidence for policy making and practice. 2. ability to discuss relative strengths and limitations of different methods.	in the identification, evaluation and utilization of evidence for policy making and practice and a highly developed ability to discuss relative strengths and limitations of different methods.	in the identification, evaluation and utilization of evidence for policy making and practice and a sound ability to discuss relative strengths and limitations of different methods.	identification, evaluation and utilization of evidence for policy making and practice and a basic ability to discuss relative strengths and limitations of different methods.	for policy making and practice and a very little ability to discuss relative strengths and limitations of different methods.	utilization of evidence for policy making and practice. No discernible ability to discuss relative strengths and limitations of different methods.

Part III   Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

1. **Keyword Syllabus**
    (An indication of the key topics of the course.)

Evidence–based policy-making; policy evaluation; systematic review; inclusive policy making; agenda setting; policy instruments; policy implementation; monitoring and evaluation; comparative policy; issue framing; stakeholder analysis; cost-benefit analysis; public participation; education policy; healthcare policy; industrial policy; economic policy; energy policy; environmental policy; quality of government.
.

2. **Reading List**
2.1 **Compulsory Readings**
    (Compulsory readings can include books, book chapters, or journal/magazine articles. There are also collections of e-books, e-journals available from the CityU Library.)

1.	Online material at BetterEvaluation.org: An international collaboration to improve evaluation practice and theory by sharing and generating information about options (methods or processes) and approaches. http://betterevaluation.org/
2.	Hand-outs, reading material and academic journal articles assigned.

2.2 **Additional Readings**
    (Additional references for students to learn to expand their knowledge about the subject.)

1.	Basic Guide to Program Evaluation (Including Outcomes Evaluation) http://managementhelp.org/evaluation/program-evaluation-guide.htm#anchor1575679
2.	Marco Segone (ed.) Bridging the gap: The role of monitoring and evaluation in evidence-based policy making. Online available at: http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/evidence_based_policy_making.pdf

Akerlof, George A. 1970. "The market for lemons: Quality, uncertainty and the market mechanism." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84: 488-500. (adverse selection)

Civic Exchange. 2008. *A price too high: The health impacts of air pollution in Southern China*. Hong Kong: Civic Exchange.

Cropper, Maureen L., Sema K. Aydede, and Paul R. Portney. 1991. "Discounting human lives." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 73 (5, Proceedings Issue):1410-1415.

Darnall, Nicole, and Stephen Sides. 2008. "Assessing the performance of voluntary environmental programs: Does certification matter?" *Policy Studies Journal* 36 (1):95-117.

Freedman, Lee S. 2002. *The microeconomics of public policy analysis*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Gürlük, Serkan, and Erkan Rehber. 2008. "A travel cost study to estimate recreational value for abird refuge at lake Manyas, Turkey." *Journal of Environmental Management* 88 (4):1350-1360.

Levy, John M. 1995. *Essential microeconomics for public policy analysis*, Westport, Conn.: Praeger, pp. 1-104.

Negev, Maya, Hagai Levine, Nadav Davidovitch, Rajiv Bhatia, and Jennifer Mindell. 2012. "Integration of health and environment through health impact assessment: Cases from three continents." *Environmental Research* no. 114:60-67.

Nesheim, Ingrid, Pytrik Reidsma, Irina Bezlepkina, et al. 2014. "Causal chains, policy trade offs and sustainability: Analysing land (mis)use in seven countries in the South." *Land Use Policy* no. 37:60-70.

Pearce, David. 1998. "Cost benefit analysis and environmental policy." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 14 (4):84-100.

Radaelli, Claudio M. 2010. "Regulating rule-making via impact assessment." *Governance* no. 23 (1):89-108.

Sappington, David E.M. 1991. "Incentives in principal-agent relationships." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5(2): 46-66. (moral hazard)

Seik, Foo Tuan. 1998. "A unique demand management instrument in urban transport: The Vehicle Quota System in Singapore." *Cities* 15 (1):27-39.

Simon, Herbert A. 1982. *Models of bounded rationality*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press (Part IV, Behavioural Economics and Bounded Rationality).

Van Rafelghem, Marcos, and Rob Modini. 2007. *Lessons for Hong Kong: Air quality management in London and Los Angeles*, edited by C. Exchange. Hong Kong: Civic Exchange.

Winston, Clifford. 2006. *Government failure versus market failure: Microeconomics policy research and government performance*, Washington, D.C.: AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies.

Zhang, Junfeng, Denise L. Mauzerall, Tong Zhu, Song Liang, Majid Ezzati, and Justin V. Remais. 2010. "Environmental health in China: progress towards clean air and safe water." *The Lancet* no. 375:1110-1119.

Other Recommended Readings:

Blundell, R. and Costa Dias, M. 2000. Evaluation Methods for Non-Experimental Data, Fiscal Studies, 21, 427–468.

Boaz, A., Grayson, L., Levitt, R. and Solesbury, W. 2008, 'Does Evidence-based Policy Work? Learning from the UK experience', Evidence & Policy, 4, 233-53.

Bonnal, L., Fougère, D., and Sérandon, A. 1997 'Evaluating the Impact of French Employment Policies on Individual Labour Market Histories', Review of Economic Studies, 64, 683–713.

Brian Head "Evidence-based policy: principles and requirements"
http://www.pc.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/96208/03-chapter2.pdf

Burtless, G. 1995 'The Case for Randomized Field Trials in Economic and Policy Research', Journal of Economic Perspectives, 9(2), 63–84. DOI:10.1257/jep.9.2.63.

Coffey, Kevin "Evaluation, Experimentation, and Evidence Based Policy." UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre. http://www.unescap.org/stat/di6launch/session4.1-UNDP-Regional-Centre.pdf

Davis, S. J. and Haltiwanger, J. 1990 'Gross Job Creation and Destruction: Microeconomic Evidence and Macroeconomic Implications", in National Bureau of Economic Research Macroeconomics Annual, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 123–168.

Gerfin, M. and Lechner, M. 2002 'A Microeconometric Evaluation of the Active Labour Market Policy in Switzerland", The Economic Journal, 112, 854–893.

Head, B. 2010 'Evidence-based policy: principles and requirements', Strengthening Evidence-based Policy in the Australian Federation, Chapter 2, Roundtable Proceedings, Productivity Commission, Canberra, 17-18 August 2009 Volume 1: Proceedings

Heckman, J. 2000, 'Microdata, Heterogeneity and The Evaluation of Public Policy', Bank of Sweden Nobel Memorial Lecture in Economic Sciences December 8, 2000 Stockholm, Sweden.

Heckman, J.J., LaLonde, R. and Smith, J.A. 1999, 'The Economics and Econometrics of Active Labor Market Program', in O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.), Handbook of Labor Economics, vol. III A, pp. 1865-2097, Amsterdam: North-Holland.

LaLonde, R. 1986 'Evaluating the Econometric Evaluations of Training Programs with Experimental Data', American Economic Review, 76(4), 604–620.

Palangkaraya, Alfons, Elizabeth Webster and Ittima Cherastidtham "Evidence-Based Policy Data Needed for robust evaluation of industry policies: A Report for the Australian Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education." Intellectual Property Research Institute of Australia, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, The University of Melbourne. http://www.melbourneinstitute.com/downloads/hilda/Bibliography/Other_Publications/Palangkaraya_etal_Evidence-based_policy.pdf

Rogers, Patricia, Bob Williams, Kaye Stevens. "Evaluation of the stronger families and communities strategy." http://mams.rmit.edu.au/2taw7vrtfd76.pdf

Sophie Sutcliffe and Julius Court (2005) "What is it? How does it work? What relevance for developing countries?" Overseas Development Institute, November 2005. http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/3683.pdf

Segone, Marco (ed.) "Bridging the gap: The role of monitoring and evaluation in Evidence-based policy making." UNICEF http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/evidence_based_policy_making.pdf

Social Work Policy Institute, EVIDENCE-BASED Practice. http://www.socialworkpolicy.org/research/evidence-based-practice-2.html#resources

Susan St John & M. Claire Dale "Evidence-based evaluation of social policy." http://nzae.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/St_John_and_Dale_Evidence__Based_Evaluation_of_Welfare_Reform.pdf

World Bank (2011) Writing Terms Of Reference For An Evaluation: A how-to-do guide http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/ecd_writing_TORs.pdf

World Bank (2009) Institutionalizing Impact Evaluation Within the Framework of a Monitoring and Evaluation System. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/4585672-1251461875432/inst_ie_framework_me.pdf

Wong, Christine (2012) "Toward Building Performance-Oriented Management in China: The Critical Role of Monitoring and Evaluation and the Long Road Ahead." ECD Working Paper Series No. 27. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/wp_27_china_me.pdf

Additional, policy-specific readings will be recommended by the lecturers concerned.

Other online Resources:

International impact evaluation initiative (3ie): an important initiative to push for impact evaluations and systematic reviews that generate high quality evidence on what works in development and why. http://www.3ieimpact.org/

World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group has a website which consists of may hands-on countries' experiences and how to do guides. http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTOED/EXTEVACAPDEV/0,,contentMDK:22314660~menuPK:6362030~pagePK:64829573~piPK:64829550~theSitePK:4585673,00.html

ERC Evidence network: www.evidencenetwork.org

Policy Brief: www.Policybrief.org

The International Campbell Collaboration: www.campbellcollaboration.org

Information for Development in the 21st Century (id21): www.id21.org

Policy Hub: www.policyhub.gov.uk   (tools section)