Course Name	**: Health Policy Analysis**
Course Code	**: APBPH 2203**
Course Level	**: Level 4**
Credit Unit	**: 4CU**
Contact Hours	**: 60 Hrs**

Course Description

The Course details the nature of policy analysis, different approaches in policy making, and various models in policy designing, characteristics of policy. It further explores numerous steps in policy making, features of policy management, and benefits of policy management.

Course Objectives

- To equip students with knowledge and skills about policy analysis.
- To provide them with a perspective of the country's economic, social and political policies.
- To enable students engage in constant discussions of how different policies should be formulated, managed and implemented.

Course Content

Policy Analysis

- Meaning of Policy analysis
- Approaches of Policy analysis
- Models of policy designing
- Characteristics of policy
- Characteristics of policy questions

Steps in policy making

- Verify, define and define the problem
- Establish evaluation criteria
- Identify alternative policies
- Evaluate alternative policies
- Display and distinguish among alternative policies
- Monitoring the implemented policy

Policy Management

Features of policy management

- Centralize and normalize policies
- Rationalization of policies and control standards
- Communicating policies
- Track acceptance and assessing comprehension
- Managing policy exceptions
- Support enterprise and compliance initiatives
- Report on policy management program

Benefits of policy Management

- Information and Process Centralization
- Time and Cost Savings
- Significant Efficiencies
- Greater Visibility
- Quick Time to Value
- Deployment Flexibility

Mode of delivery, Face to face lectures

Assessment

Coursework 40%

Exams 60%

Total Marks 100%

POLICY ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT

Policy analysis is "determining which of various alternative policies will most achieve a given set of goals in light of the relations between the policies and the goals".[1] However, policy analysis can be divided into two major fields. Analysis **of** policy is analytical and descriptive—i.e., it attempts to explain policies and their development. Analysis **for** policy is prescriptive—i.e., it is involved with formulating policies and proposals (e.g., to improve social welfare).[2] The area of interest and the purpose of analysis determines what type of analysis is conducted. A combination of policy analysis together with program evaluation would be defined as Policy studies.

Policy Analysis is frequently deployed in the public sector, but is equally applicable to other kinds of organizations. Policy analysis has its roots in systems analysis as instituted by United States Secretary of DefenseRobert McNamara during the Vietnam War.[4]

Approaches to policy analysis

Although various approaches to policy analysis exist, three general approaches can be distinguished: the analycentric, the policy process, and the meta-policy approach.[2]

The **analycentric** approach focuses on individual problems and their solutions; its scope is the micro-scale and its problem interpretation is usually of a technical nature. The primary aim is to identify the most effective and efficient solution in technical and economic terms (e.g. the most efficient allocation of resources).

The **policy process** approach puts its focal point onto political processes and involved stakeholders; its scope is the meso-scale and its problem interpretation is usually of a political nature. It aims at determining what processes and means are used and tries to explain the role and influence of stakeholders within the policy process. By changing the relative power and influence of certain groups (e.g., enhancing public participation and consultation), solutions to problems may be identified.

The **meta-policy approach** is a systems and context approach; i.e., its scope is the macro-scale and its problem interpretation is usually of a structural nature. It aims at explaining the contextual factors of the policy process; i.e., what are the political, economic and socio-cultural factors influencing it. As problems may result because of structural factors (e.g., a certain economic system or political institution), solutions may entail changing the structure itself.

Methodology

Policy analysis is methodologically diverse using both qualitative methods and quantitative methods, including case studies, survey research, statistical analysis, and model building among others. One common methodology is to define the problem and evaluation criteria; identify all alternatives; evaluate them; and recommend the best policy agenda per favor.

Models

Many models exist to analyze the creation and application of public policy. Analysts use these models to identify important aspects of policy, as well as explain and predict policy and its consequences.

Some models are:

Institutional model

Public policy is determined by political institutions, which give policy legitimacy. Government universally applies policy to all citizens of society and monopolizes the use of force in applying policy. The legislature, executive and judicial branches of government are examples of institutions that give policy legitimacy.

Process model

Policy creation is a process following these steps:

- Identification of a problem and demand for government action.
- Formulation of policy proposals by various parties (e.g., congressional committees, think tanks, interest groups).
- Selection and enactment of policy; this is known as **Policy Legitimation**.
- Implementation of the chosen policy.
- Evaluation of policy.

This model, however, has been criticized for being overly linear and simplistic. In reality, stages of the policy process may overlap or never happen. Also, this model fails to take the multiple actors attempting the process itself as well as each other, and the complexity this entails.

Rational model

The rational model of decision-making is a process for making logically sound decisions in policy making in the public sector, although the model is also widely used in private corporations. Herbert Simon, the father of rational models, describes rationality as "a style of behavior that is appropriate to the achievement of given goals, within the limits imposed by given conditions and constraints".[6] It is important to note the model makes a series of assumptions in order for it to work, such as:

- The model must be applied in a system that is stable,

- The government is a rational and unitary actor and that its actions are perceived as rational choices,

- The policy problem is unambiguous,

- There are no limitations of time or cost.

Indeed, some of the assumptions identified above are also pin pointed out in a study written by the historian H.A. Drake, as he states:

In its purest form, the Rational Actor approach presumes that such a figure [as Constantine] has complete freedom of action to achieve goals that he or she has articulated through a careful process of rational analysis involving full and objective study of all pertinent information and alternatives. At the same time, it presumes that this central actor is so fully in control of the apparatus of government that a decision once made is as good as implemented. There are no staffs on which to rely, no constituencies to placate, no generals or governors to *cajole. By attributing all decision making to one central figure who is always fully in control and who acts only after carefully weighing all options, the Rational Actor method allows scholars to filter out extraneous details and focus attention on central issues.*[7]

Furthermore, as we have seen, in the context of policy rational models are intended to achieve maximum social gain. For this purpose, Simon identifies an outline of a step by step mode of analysis to achieve rational decisions. Ian Thomas describes Simon's steps as follows:

1. Intelligence gathering— data and potential problems and opportunities are identified, collected and analyzed.
2. Identifying problems
3. Assessing the consequences of all options
4. Relating consequences to values— with all decisions and policies there will be a set of values which will be more relevant (for example, economic feasibility and environmental protection) and which can be expressed as a set of criteria, against which performance (or consequences) of each option can be judged.
5. Choosing the preferred option— given the full understanding of all the problems and opportunities, all the consequences and the criteria for judging options.[8]

In similar lines, Wiktorowicz and Deber describe through their study on 'Regulating biotechnology: a rational-political model of policy development' the rational approach to policy development. The main steps involved in making a rational decision for these authors are the following:

1. The comprehensive organization and analysis of the information
2. The potential consequences of each option
3. The probability that each potential outcome would materialize
4. The value (or utility) placed on each potential outcome.[9]

The approach of Wiktorowicz and Deber is similar to Simon and they assert that the rational model tends to deal with "the facts" (data, probabilities) in steps 1 to 3, leaving the issue of assessing values to the final step. According Wiktorowicz and Deber values are introduced in the final step of the rational model, where the utility of each policy option is assessed.

Many authors have attempted to interpret the above mentioned steps, amongst others, Patton and Sawicki who summarize the model as presented in the following figure (missing):

1. Defining the problem by analyzing the data and the information gathered.
2. Identifying the decision criteria that will be important in solving the problem. The decision maker must determine the relevant factors to take into account when making the decision.

3. A brief list of the possible alternatives must be generated; these could succeed to resolve the problem.
4. A critical analyses and evaluation of each criterion is brought through. For example strength and weakness tables of each alternative are drawn and used for comparative basis. The decision maker then weights the previously identified criteria in order to give the alternative policies a correct priority in the decision.
5. The decision-maker evaluates each alternative against the criteria and selects the preferred alternative.
6. The policy is brought through.

The model of rational decision-making has also proven to be very useful to several decision making processes in industries outside the public sphere. Nonetheless, many criticism of the model arise due to claim of the model being impractical and lying on unrealistic assumptions. . For instance, it is a difficult model to apply in the public sector because social problems can be very complex, ill-defined and interdependent. The problem lies in the thinking procedure implied by the model which is linear and can face difficulties in extra ordinary problems or social problems which have no sequences of happenings. This latter argument can be best illustrated by the words of Thomas R. Dye, the president of the Lincoln Center for Public Service, who wrote in his book `Understanding Public Policy´ the following passage:

There is no better illustration of the dilemmas of rational policy making in America than in the field of health…the first obstacle to rationalism is defining the problem. Is our goal to have good health — that is, whether we live at all (infant mortality), how well we live (days lost to sickness), and how long we live (life spans and adult mortality)? Or is our goal to have good medical care — frequent visits to the doctor, wellequipped and accessible hospitals, and equal access to medical care by rich and poor alike?[11]

The problems faced when using the rational model arise in practice because social and environmental values can be difficult to quantify and forge consensus around.[12] Furthermore, the assumptions stated by Simon are never fully valid in a real world context.

However, as Thomas states the rational model provides a good perspective since in modern society rationality plays a central role and everything that is rational tends to be prized. Thus, it does not seem strange that “we ought to be trying for rational decision-making”.[8]

Decision Criteria for Policy Analysis — Step 2

As illustrated in Figure 1, rational policy analysis can be broken into 6 distinct stages of analysis. Step 2 highlights the need to understand which factors should be considered as part of the decision making process. At this part of the process, all the economic, social, and environmental factors that are important to the policy decision need to be identified and then expressed as policy decision criteria. For example, the decision criteria used in the analysis of environmental policy is often a mix of —

- Ecological impacts — such as biodiversity, water quality, air quality, habitat quality, species population, etc.

- Economic efficiency — commonly expressed as benefits and costs.

- Distributional equity — how policy impacts are distributed amongst different demographics. Factors that can affect the distribution of impacts include location, ethnicity, income, and occupation.

- Social/Cultural acceptability — the extent to which the policy action may be opposed by current social norms or cultural values.

- Operational practicality — the capacity required to actually operationalize the policy. For example,

- Legality — the potential for the policy to be implemented under current legislation versus the need to pass new legislation that accommodates the policy.

- Uncertainty — the degree to which the level of policy impacts can be known.[13]

Some criteria, such as economic benefit, will be more easily measurable or definable, while others such as environmental quality will be harder to measure or express quantitatively. Ultimately though, the set of decision criteria needs to embody all of the policy goals, and overemphasising the more easily definable or measurable criteria, will have the undesirable impact of biasing the analysis towards a subset of the policy goals.[14]

The process of identifying a suitably comprehensive decision criteria set is also vulnerable to being skewed by pressures arising at the political interface. For example, decision makers may tend to give "*more weight to policy impacts that are concentrated, tangible, certain, and immediate than to impacts that are diffuse, intangible, uncertain, and delayed.*"^8. For example, with a cap-and-trade system for carbon emissions the net financial cost in the first five years of policy implementation is a far easier impact to conceptualise than the more diffuse and uncertain impact of a country's improved position to influence global negotiations on climate change action.

Decision Methods for Policy Analysis — Step 5

Displaying the impacts of policy alternatives can be done using a policy analysis matrix (PAM) such that shown in Table 1. As shown, a PAM provides a summary of the policy impacts for the various alternatives and examination of the matrix can reveal the tradeoffs associated with the different alternatives.

Table 1.Policy analysis matrix (PAM) for SO2 emissions control.

Once policy alternatives have been evaluated, the next step is to decide which policy alternative should be implemented. This is shown as step 5 in Figure 1. At one extreme, comparing the policy alternatives can be relatively simple if all the policy goals can be measured using a single metric and given equal weighting. In this case, the decision method is an exercise in benefit cost analysis (BCA).

At the other extreme, the numerous goals will require the policy impacts to be expressed using a variety of metrics that are not readily comparable. In such cases, the policy analyst may draw on the concept of utility to aggregate the various goals into a single score. With the utility concept, each impact is given a weighting such that 1 unit of each weighted impact is considered to be equally valuable (or desirable) with regards to the collective well-being.

Weimer and Vining also suggest that the "*go, no go*" rule can be a useful method for deciding amongst policy alternatives^8. Under this decision making regime, some or all policy impacts can be assigned thresholds which are used to eliminate at least some of the policy alternatives. In their example, one criterion "*is to minimize SO2 emissions*" and so a threshold might be a reduction SO2 emissions "of at least 8.0 million tons per year". As such, any policy alternative that does not meet this threshold can be removed from consideration. If only a single policy alternative satisfies all the impact thresholds then it is the one that is considered a "go" for each impact. Otherwise it might be that all but a few policy alternatives are eliminated and those that remain need to be more closely examined in terms of their trade-offs so that a decision can be made.

Case Study Example of Rational Policy Analysis Approach

To demonstrate the rational analysis process as described above, let's examine the policy paper "Stimulating the use of biofuels in the European Union: Implications for climate change policy" by Lisa Ryan where the substitution of fossil fuels with biofuels has been proposed in the European Union (EU) between 2005–2010 as part of a strategy to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions from road transport, increase security of energy supply and support development of rural communities.

Considering the steps of Patton and Sawicki model as in Figure 1 above, this paper only follows components 1 to 5 of the rationalist policy analysis model:

1. Defining The Problem – the report identifies transportation fuels pose two important challenges for the European Union (EU). First, under the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol to the Climate Change Convention, the EU has agreed to an absolute cap on greenhouse gas emissions; while, at the same time increased consumption of transportation fuels has resulted in a trend of increasing greenhouse gas emissions from this source. Second, the dependence upon oil imports from the politically volatile Middle East generates concern over price fluctuations and possible interruptions in

supply. Alternative fuel sources need to be used & substituted in place of fossil fuels to mitigate GHG emissions in the EU.

2. Determine the Evaluation Criteria – this policy sets Environmental impacts/benefits (reduction of GHG's as a measure to reducing climate change effects) and Economical efficiency (the costs of converting to biofuels as alternative to fossil fuels & the costs of production of biofuels from its different potential sources)as its decision criteria. However, this paper does not exactly talk about the social impacts, this policy may have. It also does not compare the operational challenges involved between the different categories of biofuels considered.
3. Identifying Alternative Policies – The European Commission foresees that three alternative transport fuels: hydrogen, natural gas, and biofuels, will replace transport fossil fuels, each by 5% by 2020.
4. Evaluating Alternative Policies – Biofuels are an alternative motor vehicle fuel produced from biological material and are promoted as a transitional step until more advanced technologies have matured. By modelling the efficiency of the biofuel options the authors compute the economic and environmental costs of each biofuel option as per the evaluation criteria mentioned above.
5. Select The Preferred Policy – The authors suggest that the overall best biofuel comes from the sugarcane in Brazil after comparing the economic & the environmental costs. The current cost of subsidising the price difference between European biofuels and fossil fuels per tonne of CO_2 emissions saved is calculated to be €229–2000. If the production of European biofuels for transport is to be encouraged, exemption from excise duties is the instrument that incurs the least transactions costs, as no separate administrative or collection system needs to be established. A number of entrepreneurs are producing biofuels at the lower margin of the costs specified here profitably, once an excise duty rebate is given. It is likely that growth in the volume of the business will engender both economies of scale and innovation that will reduce costs substantially.[15]

Group model

The political system's role is to establish and enforce compromise between various, conflicting interests in society.

Elite model

Policy is a reflection of the interests of those individuals within a society that have the most power, rather than the demands of the mass.

Six-step model

1. Verify, define and detail the problem
2. Establish evaluation criteria
3. Identify alternative policies
4. Evaluate alternative policies

5. Display and distinguish among alternative policies
6. Monitor the implemented policy

Policy studies

Policy Studies is the combination of policy analysis and program evaluation.[1] It "involves systematically studying the nature, causes, and effects of alternative public policies, with particular emphasis on determining the policies that will achieve given goals."[2]

Policy Studies also examines the conflicts and conflict resolution that arise from the making of policies in civil society, the private sector, or more commonly, in the public sector (e.g. government).

It is frequently focused on the public sector but is equally applicable to other kinds of organizations (e.g., the not-for-profit sector). Some policy study experts graduate from public policy schools with public policy degrees. Alternatively, experts may have backgrounds in policy analysis, program evaluation, sociology, psychology, philosophy, economics, anthropology, geography, law, political science, social work, environmental planning and public administration.

Traditionally, the field of policy studies focused on domestic policy, with the notable exceptions of foreign and defense policies. However, the wave of economic globalization, which ensued in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, created a need for a subset of policy studies that focuses on global governance, especially as it relates to issues that transcend national borders such as climate change, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and economic development. This subset of policy studies, which is often referred to as international policy studies, typically requires mastery of a second language and attention to cross-cultural issues in order to address national and cultural biases. For example, the Monterey Institute of International Studies at Middlebury College offers Master of Arts programs that focus exclusively on international policy through a mix of interdisciplinary and cross-cultural analysis called the "Monterey Way".[3]

Public policy

This article is about government action. Policy, both public and private, is a broader concept. The article on public policy doctrine discusses the use of the phrase 'public policy' in legal doctrine. For other uses, see Public policy (disambiguation).

Public policy as government action is generally the principled guide to action taken by the administrative or executive branches of the state with regard to a class of issues in a manner consistent with law and institutional customs. In general, the foundation is the pertinent national and substantial constitutional law and implementing legislation such as the US Federal code. Further substrates include both judicial interpretations and regulations which are generally authorized by legislation.[1]

Other scholars define it as a system of "courses of action, regulatory measures, laws, and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives."[2] Public policy is commonly embodied "in constitutions, legislative acts, and judicial decisions." [3]

In the United States, this concept refers not only to the result of policies, but more broadly to the decision-making and analysis of governmental decisions. As an academic discipline, public policy is studied by professors and students at public policy schools of major universities throughout the country. The U.S. professional association of public policy practitioners, researchers, scholars, and students is the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management

Government actions

Shaping public policy is a complex and multifaceted process that involves the interplay of numerous individuals and interest groups competing and collaborating to influence policymakers to act in a particular way. These individuals and groups use a variety of tactics and tools to advance their aims, including advocating their positions publicly, attempting to educate supporters and opponents, and mobilizing allies on a particular issue.[4]

As an academic discipline

As an academic discipline, public policy brings in elements of many social science fields and concepts, including economics, sociology, political economy, program evaluation, policy analysis, and public management, all as applied to problems of governmental administration, management, and operations. At the same time, the study of public policy is distinct from political science or economics, in its focus on the application of theory to practice. While the majority of public policy degrees are master's and doctoral degrees, several universities also offer undergraduate education in public policy.

Policy schools tackle policy analysis differently. The Harris School of Public Policy Studies at the University of Chicago has a more quantitative and economics approach to policy, the Heinz College at Carnegie Mellon uses computational and empirical methods, while the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University has a more political science and leadership based approach. The Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairsprovides traditional public policy training with multidisciplinary concentrations available in the environmental sciences and nonprofit management.

The Jindal School of Government and Public Policy in India offers an interdisciplinary training in public policy with a focus on the policy making processes in developing and BRIC countries. In Europe, the School of Government of LUISS Guido Carli offers a multidisciplinary approach to public policy combining economics, political sciences, new public management and policy analysis.

Traditionally, the academic field of public policy focused on domestic policy. However, the wave of economic globalization, which ensued in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, created a need for a subset of public policy that focuses on global governance, especially as it relates to issues that transcend national borders such as climate change, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and economic development.[5] Consequently, many traditional public policy schools had to tweak their curricula to adjust to this new policy landscape.

Policy Management

Centrally manage policies, map them to objectives and guidelines, and promote awareness to support a culture of corporate governance.

RSA Archer Policy Management provides the foundation for a best-in-class governance, risk and compliance program with a comprehensive and consistent process for managing the lifecycle of corporate policies and their exceptions. The solution offers a centralized infrastructure for creating policies, standards and control procedures and mapping them to corporate objectives, regulations, industry guidelines and best practices. It allows you to communicate policies across your enterprise, track acceptance, assess comprehension and manage exceptions. Powered by the RSA Archer eGRC Platform, the Policy Management software solution gives you a meaningful understanding of what governs your business, and it enables you to formulate policies appropriately to aid in achieving corporate objectives and demonstrating regulatory compliance.

- Features
- Benefits
- Learn More

- **Centralize and Normalize Your Policies**

  Centralize your existing policies, standards and control procedures, establishing the foundation for risk monitoring and compliance measurement activities. Also take advantage of the pre-loaded RSA Archer eGRC Content Library, which provides best-practice policies, control standards, control procedures, authoritative sources and assessment questions.

- **Rationalize Your Policies and Control Standards**

  Map policies and standards to your corporate objectives and authoritative sources, such PCI, ISO/IEC, COBIT, FFIEC, HIPAA, NIST and privacy legislation. Also add objectives and sources over time as your business evolves and new regulations, best practices and internal requirements emerge.

- **Communicate Policies, Track Acceptance and Assess Comprehension**

  Communicate policies through dashboards, prompts at login, and email notifications that are relevant to specific roles, departments and business functions. Also promote policy comprehension and attestation through targeted Training and Awareness campaigns, and report results to senior management and regulators.

- **Manage Policy Exceptions**

  Initiate and manage requests for policy exceptions automatically using built-in workflow and alert notifications. Also report on exceptions across the enterprise, monitoring them by control, department, severity or other meaningful criteria.

- **Support Enterprise Compliance Initiatives**

  Issue questions from the RSA Archer eGRC Content Library within the RSA Archer Risk Management, Vendor Management and Compliance Management solutions to deliver targeted, online assessment campaigns that map to internal controls and external requirements.

- **Report on Your Policy Management Program**

  Use real-time reports and dashboards to display policies and control standards mapped to specific regulatory requirements, identify gaps between your policies and the authoritative sources that govern your business, and monitor policy exceptions enterprise-wide.

Advocacy evaluation

Advocacy evaluation, also called *public policy advocacy design, monitoring, and evaluation,*evaluates the progress or outcomes of advocacy, such as changes in public policy. This is different from policy analysis, which generally looks at the results of the policy, or mainstream program evaluation, which assesses whether programs or direct services have been successful. Advocacy strives to influence a program or policy either directly or indirectly; therefore, the influence is being evaluated, rather than the results of that influence. Advocacy evaluators seek to understand the extent to which advocacy efforts have contributed to the advancement of a goal or policy. They do this in order to learn what works, what does not, and what works better in order to achieve advocacy goals and improve future efforts.

Goals of advocacy (dependent variables)

In order to evaluate something, one must know the goals of the program/activity, in this case - advocacy efforts. Policy advocacy evaluation focuses on the contribution towards achieving policy, and not on the results of that policy. Policy advocacy evaluators look at these dependent variables (many of which interrelate significantly with movement in the policy cycle):

Intermediate Goal Examples:

- Increased awareness of constituents about the need for policy (Problem Identification -> Agenda Setting)
- Change in rate of key-words use by politicians, sometimes starting from 0 (Problem Identification -> Agenda Setting)
- Increase in ratio of policy being implemented according to the adopted legislation (Adoption->Implementation)
- Developed capacity of advocacy actor or network of actors to conduct advocacy efforts

Ultimate Goals

- Policy change itself in the desired direction (of the policy cycle). This is the highest level intermediate outcome, and as an inherent best practice, is the goal of most policy advocacy efforts. Policy Advocacy works to move a policy through the policy cycle.

Distinct challenges of advocacy evaluation

- Contribution vs. attribution: Since multiple actors campaign simultaneously for and against any given policy, it is difficult to ascertain attribution. Evaluating contributions is preferred in this case as it allows multiple actors to influence the degree of success.
- Long term nature of advocacy: Since many advocacy goals are long term, measuring impact can be a challenge. Instead, outcomes, interim progress, and intermediary goals are the preferred measures of influence.
- Shifting strategies: Since the context that advocates work within is ever-changing, advocates adapt their strategies, which creates a difficult environment in which to monitor progress.
- Complexity and theories of change: logic models and theories of change for advocacy campaigns are inherently complex; for example: protests+lobbying+media campaigns -> contribution to policy change. These kinds of theories of change have so many layers, nuances, and uncontrollable factors to them that intra and inter organizational agreement is difficult, making strategic planning, and evaluation all the more challenging.

Typology of policy advocacy

Direct Advocacy (Directly trying to influence policy makers):

- Lobbying (also known as direct lobbying) is the act of attempting to influence decisions made by government officials, most often legislators or members of regulatory agencies. Various people or groups, from private-sector individuals or corporations, fellow legislators or government officials, or advocacy groups use lobbying.

Indirect Advocacy (Indirectly influencing policymakers by getting their constituents to advocate):

- Grassroots lobbying (also known as indirect lobbying) is a form of lobbying that focuses on raising awareness of a particular cause at the local level, with the intention of reaching the legislature and making a difference in the decision-making process. Grassroots lobbying is an approach that separates itself from direct lobbying through the act of asking the public to contact legislators and government officials concerning the issue at hand, as opposed to conveying the message to the legislators directly.
- Activism consists of intentional efforts to promote or prevent social, political, economic, or environmental change. Activism can take a wide range of forms including, from writing letters to newspapers or politicians, political campaigning, economic activism such as boycotts or preferentially patronizing businesses, rallies, street marches, strikes, sit-ins, and hunger strikes.
- Astroturfing supports political, organizational, or corporate agendas, and is designed to give the appearance of a "grassroots" movement. The goal of such campaigns is to disguise the efforts of a political and/or commercial entity as an independent public reaction to some political entity—a politician, political group, product, service, or event.

Think tank

A **think tank** (or **policy institute**) is an organization that conducts research and engages in advocacy in areas such as social policy, political strategy, economics, military, technology issues and in the creative and cultural field. Most think tanks are non-profit organizations, which some countries such as the United States and Canada provide with tax exempt status. Other think tanks are funded by governments, advocacy groups, or businesses, or derive revenue from consulting or research work related to their projects.

The following article lists global think tanks according to continental categories, and then sub-categories by country within those areas. These listings are not comprehensive, given that more than 4,500 think tanks existworld wide. In general, this article is an introduction to the think tank landscape, and provides a way to quickly navigate to those of interest.

History

While the term "think tank" originated in the 1950s such organizations date to the 19th century. The Institute for Defence and Security Studies (RUSI) was founded in 1831 in London. The Fabian Society in Britain dates from 1884. The Brookings Institution began in Washington in 1916.

After 1945, the number of think tanks grew, as many smaller new think tanks were formed to express various issue and policy agendas. Until the 1940s, most think tanks were known only by the name of the institution. During the Second World War, think tanks were referred to as "brain boxes" after the slang term for the skull. The phrase "think tank" in wartime American slang referred to rooms where strategists discussed war planning. The term think tank itself, however, originally referred to organizations that offered military advice—most notably the RAND Corporation, founded originally in 1946 as an offshoot of Douglas Aircraft, and which became an independent corporation in 1948.

For most of the 20th century, independent public policy think tanks that performed research and provided advice on public policy were an organizational phenomenon found primarily in the United States, with a much smaller number in Canada and Western Europe. Although think tanks existed in Japan for some time, they generally lacked independence, having close ties to government ministries or corporations. There has been a veritable proliferation of “think tanks” around the world that began in the 1980s as a result of the forces of globalization, the end of the Cold War, and the emergence of transnational problems. Two-thirds of all the think tanks that exist today were established after 1970 and over half were established since 1980.[2]

The impact of globalization on the think tank movement is most evident in regions such as Africa, Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and parts of Southeast Asia, where there was a concerted effort by the international community to support the creation of independent public policy research organizations. A recent survey conducted by the Foreign Policy Research Institute’s Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program underscores the significance of this effort and documents the fact that most of the think tanks in these regions have been established in the last 10 years. Today there are over 4,500 of these institutions around the world. Many of the more established think tanks, having been created during the Cold War, are focused on international affairs, security studies, and foreign policy.[2]

Also see the United Nations Development Programme definition.

Types

Think tanks vary by ideological perspectives, sources of funding, issue focus and prospective audience.[3] Some think tanks, such as the Heritage Foundation, which promotes conservative principles, and the Center for American Progress on the progressive front, are more partisan in purpose. Others, including the Tellus Institute, which focuses on social and environmental topics, are more issue-oriented groups. Still others, such as the Cato Institute, promote libertarian social and economic theories based on Friedrich von Hayek's idea of free markets and individual liberty.

Funding sources and the targeted audiences also define the workings of think tanks. Some receive direct government support, while others rely on private individual or corporate donors. This will invariably affect the levels of academic freedom within each think tank and to whom or what the institution feels beholden. Funding may also reflect who or what the institution wants to influence; in the United States, for example, "Some donors want to influence votes in Congress or shape public opinion, others want to position themselves or the experts they fund for future government jobs, while others want to push specific areas of research or education."[3]

A new trend, resulting from globalization, is collaboration between think tanks across continents. For instance, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace operates offices in Washington, D.C., Beijing, Beirut, Brussels and Moscow.[3]

The Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP) at the University of Pennsylvania annually rates think tanks worldwide in a number of categories and presents its findings in the "Global Go-To Think Tanks" rating index.[4] However, this approach to the study and assessment of think tanks has been criticised by think tank researchers such as Enrique Mendizabal and GoranBuldioski, Director of the Think Tank Fund, supported by the Open Society Institute.[5][6]

Several authors have outlined a number of different ways of describing think tanks in a way that takes into account regional and national variations. For example from Diane Stone Diane Stone (2005):

- Independent civil society think tanks established as non-profit organisations –ideologically identifiable or not[7]
- Policy research institutes located in or affiliated with a university
- Governmentally created or state sponsored think tank
- Corporate created or business affiliated think tank [8]
- Political party think tanks and legacy or personal think tanks
- Global (or regional) think tanks (with some of the above)

Alternatively, one could use some of the following criteria:

- Size and focus: e.g. large and diversified, large and specialised, small and specialised[9]
- Evolution of stage of development: e.g. first (small), second (small to large but more complex projects), and third (larger and policy influence) stages[8]
- Strategy, including: Funding sources (individuals, corporations, foundations, donors/governments, endowments, sales/events)[9] and business model (independent research, contract work, advocacy);[10][11][12][13][14] The balance between research, consultancy, and advocacy; The source of their arguments: Ideology, values or interests; applied, empirical or synthesis research; or theoretical or academic research (Stephen Yeo); The manner in which the research agenda is developed—by senior members of the think tank or by individual researchers, or by the think tank of their funders;[15] Their influencing approaches and tactics (many researchers but an interesting one comes from Abelson[16]) and the time horizon for their strategies: long term and

short term mobilisation;[9][12] Their various audiences of the think tanks (audiences as consumers and public -this merits another blog; soon) (again, many authors, but Zufeng[17] provides a good framework for China); and Affiliation, which refers to the issue of independence (or autonomy) but also includes think tanks with formal and informal links to political parties, interest groups and other political players.[18]

Functional approach in Latin America

Research done by Enrique Mendizabal[19] shows that Latin American think tanks play various roles depending on their origins, historical development and relations to other policy actors. In this study, OrazioBellettini from Grupo FARO suggests that they:[20]

1. Seek political support for policies.
2. Legitimize policies – This has been clearer in Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru. New governments in Ecuador and Peru have approached think tanks for support for already defined policies. In Bolivia, the government led by Evo Morales has been working with NGOs and other research centres to do the same. However, in the Chilean context, many think tanks during the 1990s appeared to support and maintain the legitimacy of policies implemented during the previous decade by the dictator Augusto Pinochet.
3. Spaces of debate – In this case think tanks serve as sounding boards for new policies. In Chile, during the Pinochet dictatorship, many left wing intellectuals and researchers found 'asylum' in think tanks. In Ecuador, think tanks are seen as spaces where politicians can test the soundness of their policies and government plans.
4. Financial channels for political parties or other interest groups – In Ecuador and Bolivia, German foundations have been able to provide funds to think tanks that work with certain political parties. This approach has provided support to the system as a whole rather than individual CSOs.
5. Expert cadres of policy-makers and politicians – In Peru after the fall of the Fujimori regime, and in Chile after the fall of Pinochet, think tank staff left to form part of the new governments. In the U.S., the role of leading think tanks is precisely that: host scholars for a few months or years and then see them off to work in policy.

How a think tank addresses these largely depends on how they work, their ideology vs. evidence credentials, and the context they operate in (including funding opportunities, the degree and type of competition they face, their staff, etc.).

This functional approach addresses the inherit challenge of defining a think tank. As Simon James aptly noted in 1998, "Discussion of think tanks…has a tendency to get bogged down in the vexed question of defining what we mean by 'think tank'—an exercise that often degenerates into futile semantics.[21] It is better (as in the Network Functions Approach) to describe what the organisation should do. Then the shape of the organisation should follow to allow this to happen. The following framework (based on Stephen Yeo's description of think tanks' mode of work) is described in Enrique Mendizabal's blog "onthinktanks":

First, think tanks may work in or based their funding on one or more ways, including:[22]

1. Independent research: this would be work done with core or flexible funding that allows the researchers the liberty to choose their research questions and method. It may be long term and could focus on 'big ideas' with no direct policy relevance. On the other hand, it could focus on a key policy problem that requires a thorough research and action investment.
2. Consultancy: this would be work done through commissions with specific clients and addressing one or two key questions. Consultancies often respond to an existing agenda.
3. Influencing/advocacy: this would be work done through communications, capacity development, networking, campaigns, lobbying, etc. It is likely to be based on research based evidence emerging from independent research or consultancies.

Second, think tanks may base their work or arguments on:

1. Ideology, values or interests
2. Applied, empirical or synthesis research
3. Theoretical or academic research

According to the National Institute for Research Advancement, a Japanese think tank, think tanks are "one of the main policy actors in democratic societies ..., assuring a pluralistic, open and accountable process of policy analysis, research, decision-making and evaluation".[23] A study in early 2009 found a total of 5,465 think tanks worldwide. Of that number, 1,777 were based in the United States and approximately 350 in Washington DC alone.[24]

Criticism

In some cases, corporate interests have found it useful to create "think tanks." For example, The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition was formed in the mid 1990s to dispute research finding a link between second-hand smoke and cancer.[25] According to an internal memo from Philip Morris referring to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "the credibility of the EPA is defeatable, but not on the basis of ETS (environmental tobacco smoke) alone. It must be part of a larger mosaic that concentrates all the EPA's enemies against it at one time."[26]

According to the left-wing non-government organization Fair.org, right-wing think tanks are often quoted and rarely labeled. The result is that sometimes think tank "experts" are depicted as neutral sources without any ideological predispositions when, in fact, they represent a particular perspective.[27] In the field of education, think tank publications are subjected to expert review by the National Education Policy Center's "Think Twice" think tank review project

A think tank is often a "tank", in the intellectual sense: discussion only in a closed circle protected from outside influence isolates the participants, subjects them to several cognitive biases (groupthink, confirmation bias) and fosters members' existing beliefs. This leads to surprisingly radical and even unfeasible ideas being published. Many think tanks, however, purposefully attempt to alleviate this problem by selecting members from diverse backgrounds.

Eightfold Path (policy analysis)

The **Eightfold Path** is a method of policy analysis assembled by Eugene Bardach, a professor at the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley.[1] It is outlined in his book *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*, which is now in its fourth edition.[2] The book is commonly referenced in public policy and public administration scholarship.[3]

Bardach's procedure is as follows:

1. Define the Problem
2. Assemble Some Evidence
3. Construct the Alternatives
4. Select the Criteria
5. Project the Outcomes
6. Confront the Trade-offs
7. Decide
8. Tell Your Story

A possible ninth-step, based on Bardach's own writing, might be "Repeat Steps 1 - 8 as Necessary."

The New York taxi driver test

The New York taxi driver test is a technique for evaluating the effectiveness of communication between policy makers and analysts. Bardach contends that policy explanations must be clear and down-to-earth enough for a taxi driver to be able to understand the premise during a trip through city streets. The New York taxi driver is presumed to be both a non-specialist and a tough customer.

Policy Management

Centrally manage policies, map them to objectives and guidelines, and promote awareness to support a culture of corporate governance.

RSA Archer Policy Management provides the foundation for a best-in-class governance, risk and compliance program with a comprehensive and consistent process for managing the lifecycle of corporate policies and their exceptions. The solution offers a centralized infrastructure for creating policies, standards and control procedures and mapping them to corporate objectives, regulations, industry guidelines and best practices. It allows you to communicate policies across your enterprise, track acceptance, assess comprehension and manage exceptions. Powered by the RSA Archer eGRC Platform, the Policy Management software solution gives you a meaningful understanding of what governs your business, and it enables you to formulate policies appropriately to aid in achieving corporate objectives and demonstrating regulatory compliance.

- Features
- Benefits
- Learn More

- **Information and Process Centralization**

  The ability to author policy content, communicate it to end users, conduct training campaigns and view exceptions all from a single web portal

- **Time and Cost Savings**

  Reduction in the time and effort required to create and update policies, manage exceptions and demonstrate compliance with multiple regulations

- **Significant Efficiencies**

  Dynamic, flexible workflows that allow you to distribute content to appropriate subject-matter experts for review and approval

- **Greater Visibility**

  The ability to map your policy content to the RSA Archer control framework and easily see gaps when new authoritative sources are rolled out

- **Quick Time to Value**

  Rapid return on your investment from a solution that you can implement out of the box (using predefined access roles, workflow, reports, dashboards, etc.) or easily tailor to your needs through point-and-click configuration

- **Deployment Flexibility**

  The freedom to choose an on-premise or software as a service (SaaS) deployment and to move the solution from one environment to another as your needs change

> **The [RSA] Archer Policy Management solution will give us an even more comprehensive tool to effectively manage standards and regulations as we continue to actively pursue the highest level of compliance in our organization and for our customers.**
>
> Scott Wiggins, Bank of America

References

1. ^Nagel, Stuart S., ed. (1999). *Policy Analysis Methods*. New Science Publishers.
2. ^ [ab]Bührs, Ton; Bartlett, Robert V. (1993). *Environmental Policy in New Zealand. The Politics of Clean and Green*. Oxford University Press. ISBN 0195582845.
3. ^Hambrick, Ralph Jr.; Bardach, Eugene; Chelimsky, Eleanor; Shadish, William R.; Deleon, Peter; Fischer, Frank; MacRae, Duncan; Whittington, Dale (November–December 1998). "Review: Building the Policy Studies Enterprise: A Work in Progress". *Public Administration Review***58** (6): 533–9. doi:10.2307/977580. JSTOR 977580.
4. Radin, Beryl (2000). *Beyond Machiavelli : Policy Analysis Comes of Age*. Georgetown University Press. ISBN 0878407731.
5. Young, John and Enrique Mendizabal. Helping researchers become policy entrepreneurs, Overseas Development Institute, London, September 2009.
6. Herbert, Simon (1976). *Administrative Behavior* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press. ISBN 0684835827.
7. Drake, H.A., ed. (2002). *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
8. ^ Patton, C., Sawicki, D. (1986). *Basic methods of policy analysis and planning*. NJ: Prentice-Hall. ISBN 013060948X.
9. ^ Dye, Thomas R. (2007). *Understanding Public Policy* (12th ed.). Prentice Hall. ISBN 0139369481.
10. ^ Morgan M.G., Kandlikar M., Risbey J., Dowlatabadi H. (19 March 1999). "Why Conventional Tools for Policy Analysis Are Often Inadequate for Problems of Global Change". *Climatic Change***41** (3-4): 271–281. doi:10.1023/A:1005469411776.
11. ^ Loomis, John; Helfand, Gloria (2001). *Environmental Policy Analysis for Decision Making*. Kluwer Academic. ISBN 0792365003.
12. ^ Ryan L., Convery F., Ferreira S. (November 2006). "Stimulating the use of biofuels in the European Union: Implications for climate change policy". *Energy Policy***34** (17): 3184–94. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2005.06.010.

Further reading

- Eugene Bardach, *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*
- Wiemer, David L.; Vining, Aidan R. (1989). *Policy Analysis Concepts and Practice*. Prentice Hall.
- Fischer, Frank; Miller, Gerald J.; Sidney Mara S. (2006). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Methods, and Politics*. New York: Marcel Dekker. ISBN 1574445618.
- Dunn, William (2003). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Prentice Hall. ISBN 0131839934.

- Eugene Bardach, *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*
- Wiemer, David L.; Vining, Aidan R. (1989). *Policy Analysis Concepts and Practice*. Prentice Hall.
- Fischer, Frank; Miller, Gerald J.; Sidney Mara S. (2006). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Methods, and Politics*. New York: Marcel Dekker
- Radin, Beryl (2000). *Beyond Machiavelli : Policy Analysis Comes of Age*. Georgetown University Press. ISBN 0878407731.
- Young, John and Enrique Mendizabal. Helping researchers become policy entrepreneurs, Overseas Development Institute, London, September 2009.
- Herbert, Simon (1976). *Administrative Behavior* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press. ISBN 0684835827.
- Drake, H.A., ed. (2002). *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press