

**City University of Hong Kong**  
**Course Syllabus**

**offered by Department of Public Policy**  
**with effect from Semester A 2017/18**

---

---

**Part I     Course Overview**

<b>Course Title:</b>	Evidence-based Policy Issues and Evaluation
<b>Course Code:</b>	POL6202
<b>Course Duration:</b>	One semester
<b>Credit Units:</b>	3
<b>Level:</b>	P6
<b>Medium of Instruction:</b>	English
<b>Medium of Assessment:</b>	English
<b>Prerequisites:</b> (Course Code and Title)	NIL
<b>Precursors:</b> (Course Code and Title)	NIL
<b>Equivalent Courses:</b> (Course Code and Title)	NIL
<b>Exclusive Courses:</b> (Course Code and Title)	POL6903 MAPPM Dissertation POL6903A MAPPM Dissertation POL6904 Capstone Project

## 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%	√		
2.	Applying stakeholder analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and institutional analysis and specifying their limitations	30%	√	√	
3.	Discovering, appraising, and synthesizing evidence arising from research into key policy issues;	30%	√	√	
4.	Creating a policy memo illustrating considerations and complexities underlying analysis and evaluation of policies in Hong Kong, the mainland China, or overseas	30%	√	√	√
		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	√	√	√	√	1-2
Lectures	These are organized thematically to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain concepts, theories, and methods in evidence-based policy-making and evaluation;</li> <li>Analyse policy issues from scientific, economic, institutional, managerial, and political perspectives.</li> </ul>	√	√	√	√	2-3
Seminars	These are sessions for students to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raise questions and make critical observations on the concepts and methods introduced in the lectures;</li> <li>Debate and apply knowledge and methods of evidence-based policy making and evaluation to particular policy issues.</li> </ul>	√	√	√	√	0.5
Group presentation	Offer an opportunity for students to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relate abstract theories and concepts to analyse and assess real-life policy issues;</li> <li>Share findings of their group projects;</li> <li>Engage in critical assessment of policy-making, implementation and impact evaluation;</li> <li>Sharpen their critical thinking and problem-solving skills.</li> </ul>	√	√	√	√	0.5
Individual essays (response papers)	Reading notes and reflection on the scientific, economic, social and political aspects of the policy issue selected as the topic of their group project.	√	√	√	√	N/A
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.	√	√	√	√	N/A

#### 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%						
Discussion / Debate	√	√	√	√	5%	
Presentation	√	√	√	√	10%	
Reading notes / reflection	√	√	√		20%	
Policy memo	√	√	√	√	35%	
In class exam	√	√	√		30%	
					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. Discussion / Debate	Knowledge /Understanding	Participants demonstrate consistent depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding by incorporating relevant and accurate details to support the group's position.	Overall participants demonstrate depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding by incorporating relevant and accurate details to support the group's position.	Some participants demonstrate a depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding by incorporating relevant and accurate details to support the group's position.	Few participants demonstrate a depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding by incorporating relevant and accurate details to support the group's position.	Participants do not demonstrate a depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding by incorporating relevant and accurate details to support the group's position.
	Ability to respond to questions from the audience	Each member of the group effectively and thoroughly responded to audience questions and demonstrated understanding of the issues.	Some members of the group effectively and thoroughly responded to audience questions and demonstrated understanding of the issues.	Members of the group responded to audience questions but failed to demonstrate understanding of the issues.	Members of the group failed to respond to audience questions nor demonstrate understanding of the issues.	Members of the group are not willing to respond to audience questions.
Presentation / discussion	Organization	Presentation effectively draws in the audience, expands on the group's goal or thesis, and concludes with a well-planned ending.	Presentation draws in the audience, expands on the group's goal or thesis, but does not conclude with a well-planned ending.	Presentation draws in the audience and concludes with a well-planned ending, but need improvement on expanding the group's goal or thesis.	Presentation is weak in either its introduction, expansion of detail, or conclusion.	Presentation totally unstructured.
	Content	Presentation consists of well-researched concepts supported by well-researched and articulated details/illustrations.	Presentation consists of well-researched concepts but not necessarily supported by well-researched and articulated details/illustrations.	Presentation is scant in the use of well-researched concepts, though there is evidence of well-researched and articulated details/illustrations.	Presentation does not consist of well-researched concepts nor supported by well-researched and articulated details/illustrations.	Presentation does not define any concepts, provides no evidences, does not come to any conclusions.

	Use of presentation tools	Effective use of presentation tools, including the use of links, tables and charts etc.	Moderately effective use of presentation tools.	Not very effective use of presentation tools including spelling mistakes and wrong information.	Ineffective presentation tools, including, spelling mistakes, wrong information, absence or inappropriate use of tables and charts, illegibility etc.	Unacceptable
	Ability to respond to questions from the audience	Each member of the group effectively and thoroughly responded to audience questions and demonstrated understanding of the issues.	Some members of the group effectively and thoroughly responded to audience questions and demonstrated understanding of the issues.	Members of the group responded to audience questions but failed to demonstrate understanding of the issues.	Members of the group failed to respond to audience questions nor demonstrate understanding of the issues.	Members of the group are not willing to respond to audience questions.
2. Reading notes / reflection	Knowledge /Understanding	Demonstrate very good understanding about the reading materials.	Demonstrate good understanding about the reading materials.	Demonstrate fair understanding about the reading materials.	Demonstrate little understanding about the reading materials.	Demonstrate very little understanding about the reading materials.
	Synthesis	Very good synthesis and comparison across different readings.	Good synthesis and comparison across different readings.	Fair synthesis and comparison across different readings.	Little synthesis and comparison across different readings.	Very little synthesis and comparison across different readings.
	Reflection	Relate very well the readings to real life policy issues.	Relate well the readings to real life policy issues.	Relate the readings to real life policy issues.	Slightly relate the readings to real life policy issues.	Do not relate the readings to real life policy issues.
3. Policy memo	Understanding of concepts, relevance and integration of materials	All important materials clearly understood & presented. All materials relevant, examples are well chosen and presented; evidence of wide scope of reading of the subjects.	Most important points presented. Little irrelevant materials, fairly adequate illustration with examples; essential literature utilized in support of the arguments.	Some understanding of basic knowledge demonstrated. Little integration of materials & literature.	Very limited understanding of basic knowledge demonstrated. Occasionally irrelevant materials presented, some inappropriate examples, generally lacking in support from appropriate literature.	Little understanding evident. Mostly irrelevant, totally lacking in support from appropriate literature.

	Analysis and evaluative component	High standard of rigorous analysis and evaluation of issues & concepts	Analysis fairly adequate; study is linked to wider literature	Superficial analysis of the basic materials	Insufficient analysis of basic materials	Lacking in any analysis
	Structure and methodology	Very well structured in terms of its planning and execution of ideas. Methodology well constructed & implemented.	Appropriate structure developed. Methodology appropriate and followed.	Poor structure & weak logic in presentation. Weak methodology.	Lack of structure, not systematically or logically presented. Methodology not clearly set out or followed.	Totally lacking in suitable structure. Methodology lacking or inappropriate.
	Overall Quality of written presentation	Clear, well argued and good use of illustration and other supporting information such as tables, graphs, etc.	Some appropriate illustration and other supporting information such as tables, graphs, etc.	Generally acceptable standard of presentation but some limitations.	Generally acceptable standard of presentation but some significant limitations.	Unacceptable
4. In class exam	Content	Provide very good answers to the questions.	Provide good answers to the questions.	Provide fair answers to the questions.	Provide acceptable answers to the questions.	Provide unacceptable answers to the questions.

### 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; 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. <a href="http://betterevaluation.org/">http://betterevaluation.org/</a>
2.	Hand-outs, reading material and academic journal articles assigned.
3.	Ian Scott. The Public Sector in Hong Kong. 2010. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. (E-book available at CityU library)

##### 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) <a href="http://managementhelp.org/evaluation/program-evaluation-guide.htm#anchor1575679">http://managementhelp.org/evaluation/program-evaluation-guide.htm#anchor1575679</a>
2.	Marco Segone (ed.) Bridging the gap: The role of monitoring and evaluation in evidence-based policy making. Online available at: <a href="http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/evidence_based_policy_making.pdf">http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/evidence_based_policy_making.pdf</a>

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 a bird 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](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\\_et al Evidence-based\\_policy.pdf](http://www.melbourneinstitute.com/downloads/hilda/Bibliography/Other_Publications/Palangkaraya_et al 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](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](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](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](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](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 many 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](http://www.evidencenetwork.org)

Policy Brief: [www.Policybrief.org](http://www.Policybrief.org)

The International Campbell Collaboration: [www.campbellcollaboration.org](http://www.campbellcollaboration.org)

Information for Development in the 21st Century (id21): [www.id21.org](http://www.id21.org)

Policy Hub: [www.policyhub.gov.uk](http://www.policyhub.gov.uk) (tools section)