BLOCK-4
Policy Evaluation

ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

UNIT 11 IMPACT OF SOCIAL PROCESS ON PUBLIC POLICY*

Structure

11.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the nature of social process in India;
- Describe the concept of social policy;
- Assess the impact of social process on public policy; and
- Examine the social policy measures in India.

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Public policy exists to serve the society, to make it a better place to live. Public policy is the expression of the will of the State to fulfill the needs and aspirations of the society. These needs and aspirations of society are continuously shaped by social processes. Since human being is a social animal, the interactions and responses of an individual to group and group members among themselves create social processes. A person's needs and desires are a result of the social processes. Hence, public policy and social processes are interrelated and affect each other immensely.

Public policy aims at social change and development. This is not possible without understanding the social values, customs, beliefs and traditions of people. No public policy works in a vacuum. It is affected by its political, social, economic and cultural environment. In fact, public policy is the course of action taken by the State to satisfy the needs of the society, and to ensure the welfare and development of the society. Without understanding the process of group dynamics of the society, no policy can have positive results. It needs to diagnose the social processes, understand what values and customs hinder the process of development, so that it can replace those values with the ones that are more facilitative.

*Contributed by Ms. Daisy Sharma, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

For public policy to be responsive, it needs to be conscious of the social goals. All these needs, aspirations, values, customs and traditions, as well as social goals are shaped by the social processes of the society. Moreover, social processes provide a framework to government's vision on social development, social action, social policy and social administration. According to Richard M. Titmuss (*Cited* in Motcham,2016), "social administration may broadly be defined as the study of social services, whose object is the improvement of conditions of life of the individual in the setting of family and group relations. It is concerned with the historical development of these services, both statutory and voluntary, with the moral values implicit in social actions, with the rules and functions of the services, with their economic aspects and with the part they play in meeting certain needs in the social processes".

Hence, public policies are greatly moulded by the needs of the society, which are a result of various social processes of the society. This creates a close relationship between social processes and public policy. Social processes determine the nature and scope of public policy, whereas the State through its policies tries to create positive social processes and eliminate the negative ones. This is amply visible in social policy, which is the means to provide solutions to the problems, needs, wishes and ambitions of the society. Social problems keep on changing due to changes in various social processes, social structures and development policies of the State. Every social process has a positive or negative impact on social needs and the government must shape and reshape its policy accordingly.

In the wake of industrial revolution and development, globally, the society witnessed large-scale migration of rural people to industrialised towns. This social process was full of tension and conflict. It led to the formation of various new jobs and working conditions. In order to deal with it, the State adopted liberal economic policy. It was thought that reduced State intervention would help the industries grow better. But the social processes of conflict between the interests of industrialists and working community at large led to the exploitation of workers, who were forced to live in impoverished conditions.

This made the State reshape its policy to make it more welfare-oriented. The State started interfering in economy in the interest and protection of workers against any undue exploitation. This positive intervention of State in economy increased society's expectations of governance. People started looking at the State for all solutions to their problems. In the backdrop of havoc created by the World Wars and the Great Economic Depression of 1930s, the social processes were full of conflict, competition and decay. The need for associative social processes like cooperation, assimilation, accommodation was greatly felt. It needed a great amount of finance, effort and command. This was possible only with the State taking the lead in minimising the negative forces and processes in the society and ensuring the protection and promotion of public interest.

So, the State adopted the welfare model. (India adopted the Mixed Economy in 1950s, with core and important sectors being under the state control). Taking cue from Keynesian economic approach, it gave rise to public expenditure in order to generate employment, reduce poverty and bring prosperity to the society. State's policies had a positive impact on the welfare of people. Situation started reverting to normal. Peace was restored and social security was enhanced. With gained stability, social processes started changing. The developing industries and economies in a stable environment started demanding more freedom and liberty.

Social demand for reduced intervention of State, negative perception on State's efficiency and unrest about excessive State control started paving way for liberal economy and society, and opening up to liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation (LPG). In the Structural Adjustment Programme, LPG became the only option for most countries of the globe, including India.

The LPG model brought prosperity and integration at the global level. This increased the expectations of the society for better public management and governance. New social processes, which had people being aware about their rights made the State alter its policies for larger participation of civil society and effectiveness of administration. As the society witnessed large integration and assimilation at the global level, international and super-national institutions gathered mighty stakes in policymaking.

It is not just that the social processes affect public policy; public policy also affects social processes. State through its social policy ensures that people live in harmony. State tries to avoid conflict in the society. State, through its social policy, tries to strive for social development, integration, balance and justice. Social policies like education inculcate the values of unity and solidarity in the society. Hence, it fosters cooperation. State brings out various policies, which ensure employment. This increases sense of security and responsibilities among youth and leads to peace. By initiating various housing policies, the State removes insecurities and tensions from the society. This leads to assimilation and cooperation. State policy ensures that no one is left behind in the process of development. The State attempts to make a dent in the poverty condition and assimilates the deprived in development process.

11.2 CONCEPT OF SOCIAL PROCESS

A human being, as we mentioned before, is a socio-cultural being, who lives in a society, and mingles with other people in the society. When these interactions are repeated over time, the result is called social process. The fundamental ways in which people establish social relationship and interact are called social processes. Social interaction normally occurs in the form of accommodation, assimilation, cooperation, competition and conflict.

Social processes are pattern or form of interactions among individuals. These social processes can be of *two* types; **conjunctive** social processes like cooperation, accommodation and assimilation and **disjunctive** social processes like competition and conflict. *Conflict* is a negative social process in which individual or a group of individual tries to gain a reward by preventing other competitors from effective competition or eliminating and weakening the opponents. It aims to destroy the competitors. *Competition* is based on rules and regulations. In a competitive context, a person tries to attain the reward by surpassing and outdoing the opponent. Competition and conflict exist in every society although in a different form, degree, scope and intensity. For example, in the US, competition has given way to capitalism and the State policy of non-interference and free market economy. Whereas, in China, competition has made the government control extensive, as government enables the Chinese industries to compete with the entire world by directly involving itself in excessive control of the market.

Cooperation means people working together for shared rewards. This becomes the basis of associations of the society giving various policy inputs and affecting their output. For example, trade unions affect the labour policy. *Accommodation* is a result of social process. For a social process to sustain, conflict must give way to negotiation and accommodation. Riots, war, terrorism are examples of social processes of conflict. To be able to conduct leadership is also a social process in which a person is able to direct the activities of others to achieve a common goal. All these social processes in one way or another develop ideas and beliefs, views and needs. They frame policy debate, develop State interest and priorities. Social processes also help a State to identify the legitimate participants of policy processes by pointing out various conflicts of interest. Social processes also influence the outcome of public policy by different negotiations with the State through social learning and social control. Through social policy, the State tries to reconcile different social conflicts and integrate social values by facilitating assimilation.

Assimilation means interaction between different groups where there is mutual interchange of culture resulting in shared beliefs. We eventually find that all major social activities are basically social processes either by assimilating the values or competing with values. For example, education is a social process of developing new skills, viewpoints and knowledge in the individual. Motivation is also a socio-psychological process, which increases the desires and capacity of an individual to perform an activity.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. What do you mean by the term social process?

....

....

....

....

2. How are social processes and public policy related to each other?

....

....

....

....

11.3 MEANING AND NATURE OF SOCIAL POLICY

Social policy is a policy usually within a governmental or political setting, such as the Welfare State and study of social services. Social policy consists of guidelines, principles, legislation and activities that affect the living conditions, which are conducive to human welfare, such as a person's quality of life. Social policy includes programmes related to welfare and quality of life. It involves policies and programmes related to education, health, housing, equal distribution of income and social work. It deals with elderly people, people with disabilities, issues of poverty and unemployment. Social policy depends on social needs and the nature of all those agencies which address them. We know that governance is not just about government; many stakeholders are involved in it. The NGOs, charities and public-private-sector; all are engaged with social welfare, along with the State. Social policy is a State's mechanism to respond to socio-economic changes and deals with the challenges of globalisation, poverty and mitigation.

Social policy mainly includes social security, shelter, education, health and service. Social policy tries to reduce inequality on the basis of gender, age, socio-economic status, race, ethnicity and disability. In the view of Marshall, "social policy refers to the policy of governments with regard to action having a direct impact on the welfare of citizens, by providing them with services or income". Social policy is concerned with equality and aims at socio-economic justice. It strives hard for egalitarian society by focusing on disadvantaged and weaker sections of the society like children, old people, women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, people with disabilities etc. Social policy does not work in isolation. It is affected by the political, social and economic environment in which it works. Hence, in this modern era of globalisation, social policies like healthcare, zero hunger and education for all have also gone global. On this basis, we can say that social policy has the following objectives:

- It wants to achieve an egalitarian society;
- It aims at social change, so that social tensions are reduced and a cordial society is created;
- It aims at the welfare of weaker sections of society;
- It helps in improving the quality of life of people;
- It attempts to ensure minimum wages and minimum standards of income maintenance;
- It aims at social justice through positive discrimination; and
- It helps in redistribution of resources.

The idea of social welfare is constructed by the social processes. What is welfare for one country may not be needed at all in the other country. For example, reservation and positive discrimination in favour of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes may be a welfare activity in India, while it is not required in many of the developed countries of the world. This is due to certain social processes existing in India like the age-old caste system, gender inequality, and exploitation of lower castes by upper castes. In Western countries, there are other issues like race and inequality which require social policies. However, there are some common activities like health, pension and education, which are considered welfare activities cutting across countries. As the gap between rich and poor, educated and uneducated, old and young people is growing wider, social policy is also enhancing its scope by standing up for all those who are vulnerable.

11.4 SOCIAL POLICY AND PUBLIC POLICY MODELS

Social processes have a deep impact upon policy-making. This can be understood with the *two* models of public policy:

1. Process Model of public policy
2. Systems Model of public policy

Process Model

Policymaking is not an isolated activity. In fact, there is a policy process that is continuously evolving and growing. Process Model talks about the entire process of policy from formulation to evaluation. According to the Process model of public policy, there are following *five* stages in the policy process:

i) Identification of problem that calls for government action;

ii) Response of political parties to problems in the form of various policies;

iii) Policy legitimating i.e., selection of most favourable policy and its enactment in legislature;

iv) Implementation of enacted policy; and

v) Evaluation of policy based on feedback.

In all these stages of policy process, social processes make their contribution. Policy process interacts and adjusts itself with social processes. In fact, these are social processes that attract the attention of political system towards any issue. Social processes either through cooperation or through conflict, draw government's attention to a specific issue or problem. After taking notice of the issue, government and mainly political parties come out with their own policies on that issue. Both start selling their policies to public by trying to have public opinion on their side. When social processes and policy process focus on the same issue, it becomes necessary for legislature to address it. The policy is placed before the legislature for discussion and enactment. During the enactment of public policy, political representatives try to justify their policy in view of the needs of time and public demands. They keep a proper watch on the social processes that are going on and act accordingly.

When a policy goes for implementation, the policy process and social process are in direct interaction. Public expresses its satisfaction or problems with the policies framed. This is an important stage, where through various social processes, government measures public opinion. On the basis of public opinion, policies are amended and readjusted as per the requirements. Thus, the entire policy process takes care of social processes and tries to answer the social needs appropriately. Hence, the policy has a process of its own, which interacts and adjusts itself as per the social processes of the society. At every stage of policy process, the social processes influence it. For example, in 2010, a large number of people came together to fight corruption in administration. This was evident in the massive Jan Lok Pal movement started by Anna Hazare in New Delhi. The support it received from large sections of society speaks a lot of social solidarity and its impact on public policy. When government came with its Lok Pal Draft Bill, people expressed their views freely and demanded that provisions of Anna Hazare's draft be incorporated into it.

Systems Model

Another model, which helps us to analyse the impact of social processes on public policy is the Systems model. David Easton has given this Systems model for the analysis of political systems. The Systems model is equally applicable to policy process also. As the political system takes the inputs from the environment in the form of demands or support and through its institutions, personnel and policy-making converts inputs into outputs, which can be modified on the basis of feedback. We have already discussed it in our earlier Unit.

The Systems model is fully based on the social processes because it is the social processes that raise demands on the government. Government tries to convert these demands into output in the form of various new policies and programmes. For example, due to social attitudes and values, the status of girl child in India is not good, especially in villages and small towns. Many technological advancements (amniocentesis) are being misused to help those who desire a male child over female child. The alarming decrease in sex ratio is not good for the society. This has made the government initiate many policies to arrest it.

Government had brought out a new output/policy in the form of Pre-conception and Pre-natal Diagnostic Techniques Act in 1994. By this Act, sex determination of the child before birth has been prohibited. Besides, the government has initiated various social schemes to uplift the status of girl child. These are: Rashtriya Mahila Kosh (1993), Dhanalakshmi Scheme (2008), Mother and Child Tracking System (2009), Pradhan Mantri Matritva Vandana Yojana (2010), Beti Bachao, Beti Padhao (2015), Sukanya Samridhi Yojana (2015), Central Board of Secondary Education's (CBSE's) Udaan Scheme (2018) among many others. The social schemes give teeth to social policy. It is through social schemes that social policy is implemented at the grassroots level.

Another demand or input for mainstreaming women in politics was considered by the government, which took shape in the form of 73^{rd} and 74^{th} Constitutional Amendment Acts. These have proved to be milestone Amendments, as they have given one third reservation to the women candidates in panchayats and all local bodies respectively. This was possible only because of the social cooperation and needs expressed for a better society for almost half of the population of the country. Thus, a new social process of women empowerment has emerged. This changed social process has created a demand for enlarged participation of women at the state and national levels. New demands are being raised to give representation to women in Parliament and State Legislative assemblies as well. These demands would act as inputs for future policymaking.

Both the models of social process (Process and Systems) explained in this section have a deep impact on public policy making. Although all the social processes affect all types of public policies, be if in the field of politics, economics, finance, sports etc., its impact can be seen the most in the form of social policy. Social processes and the interplay of dialogue and frictions in them lead to social policy. It also works upon the social processes, paving the way for the better and positive social processes. This will become more clear once we understand the nature of social policy in India.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. Describe the Process model of public policy.

....

....

....

....

2. How do social processes affect public policy?

....

....

....

....

11.5 SOCIAL POLICY IN INDIA

Rapid industrialisation resulted in mass urbanisation in India. However, it remained unplanned for a long time. Besides, rural areas never got the attention they deserved. This led to massive migration of rural people to urban areas. It resulted in overcrowding in the cities, rise of slums, social breakdown, increased rates of crime etc. It was therefore thought that only economic growth was not the answer to the present problems; proper social planning was also needed to deal with it. Various social indicators like health, education, housing, rural development were taken into account in social planning, which gradually found place in our Five Year planning.

Indian Constitution aims at social and economic justice based on equality of opportunity. The Fundamental Rights provide for Right to Equality in front of law, end of all sorts of discrimination based on caste, class, gender and region, Right against Exploitation, Right to Freedom of Expression, Right to Religion etc. The Directive Principles of State Policy, enshrined in our Constitution, provide for social, economic and political justice. To fulfill the will of the Constitution, India has adopted planned development to foster social and economic development. Throughout the Five Year Plans, government has stressed on reducing inequalities, exploitation, poverty, hunger and unemployment.

First Five Year Plan (1951-56) aimed at rural development through community development programmes and national extension services. Second Five Year Plan (1956-61) focused on heavy industries. It was accompanied by Industrial Policy in 1956 with a vision of establishment of socialist society. Third Five Year Plan (1961-66) stressed on greater equality of opportunity and reduction of disparities. Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-1974) aimed at distributive justice with popular slogan of *Garibi Hatao* (Removal of Poverty). Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-78) focused on growth with redistribution. The Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85) stressed on eradication of poverty, so it launched various anti-poverty programmes like National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Rural Landless Employment Generation Programme (RLEGP) (later merged into Jawahar Rozgar Yojana), Training Rural Youth for Self-Employment (TRYSEM), Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA).

Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-90) focused on human resource development, employment opportunities, infrastructure development and food security. Eighth Five Year Plan (1992-1997) targeted the structural adjustment policies. The Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2000) aimed at growth with social justice. Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-07) aimed at reduction of poverty by 5 per cent. Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007-12) aimed at “faster and more inclusive growth”. Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17) aimed at faster, more inclusive and sustainable growth. The Thirteenth Five Year Plan (2017-2022) has drawn attention to many areas such as innovation, coordinated development, green growth, openness and inclusive growth. In fact, we can say that all our Five Year Plans have mainly social policy in view. They translate the Constitutional goals and all the inputs they get from stakeholders in the development of policy, which is economic as well as social in nature.

Throughout planning, an understandable relationship between the social process and policy process has been visible. In India, due to age-old social processes, people have been discriminated in the name of caste. Education has been the monopoly of higher castes. Women have been excluded from all sorts of welfare activities. Feudal outlook of the society is the reason behind exploitation of masses resulting in hunger, poverty and unemployment. The colonial rule, only perpetuated rather than mitigated these conditions. Policy makers in India had to face these challenges and act accordingly. The major policies and programmes of the Indian government are the result of these very social processes.

One major challenge has been education, which in itself is a social process. At the time of Independence India's literacy rate was only 18.33 per cent. Universalisation of education was a main task. The objective was to make the benefits of education reach the disadvantaged sections like women, lower castes, scheduled tribes etc. Due to massive poverty, people did not want to send their children to schools. They instead wanted them to take up small jobs and support them economically. Moreover, they did not have much money to pay for school fees. So, India needed an education policy that was free and accessible to all people of the country. Under these conditions, within the ambit of its Education Policy, Government of India initiated a very ambitious plan of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan (SSA), which aimed at the universalisation of primary education by 2010. The 86th Amendment of Indian Constitution gave a new Fundamental Right under Article- 21A. It made education free and compulsory to children between the ages of 6 to 14. With the implementation of the Right to Education Act (RTE) on 1 April 2010, a new era of educational reforms was ushered in India. This has been made more comprehensive with the New Education Policy (2020).

Another crucial policy challenge is related to lack of basic shelter. The government came up with a plan of Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), which was earlier a component of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana. It was launched as an independent Scheme from 1997-1998 onwards. It provided construction of free houses for those belonging to Scheduled Castes/ Scheduled Tribes. It also covered the freed bonded labourers of rural areas and the non-SC/ST rural people. All the beneficiaries had to be selected from the Below Poverty Line (BPL) list approved by the Gram Sabha. From the year 2016-2017, IAY has been revamped and renamed as Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana. Government of India aims to construct 1,31,831 houses under this programme.

Yet another challenge faced by Indian planners is the neglected status of women in the country, compounded by dowry system, child marriage, sexual harassment, domestic violence and lesser wages than men for similar/equal work. From time to time, Indian government has taken up these issues and accommodated them in respective policies. It has come out with so many progressive legislations like the Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Act, 1956, the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961(Amended in 1986), The Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act, 1986, The Commission of Sati (Prevention) Act, 1987, National

Policy for Empowerment of Women 2001. Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. National Mission for Empowerment of Women 2010, and the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. In this way, social processes have thoroughly shaped the policies and programmes directed at women's welfare and women's empowerment.

As people are becoming more educated and aware of the challenges around, they are quite attuned to their rights and duties. Their awareness has made them demand a transparent and accountable administration. With the improvement in education facilities, people of India became aware of their rights and started demanding more transparent and accountable government. This demand of public acted as an input for the Government of India's progressive legislation like Right to Information Act 2005.This Act authorises any citizen of India to seek information from any public authority. Such authority must reply within thirty days. If matter involves a petitioner's life and liberty, the information must be provided within 48 hours. The Act makes it mandatory for every public authority to computerise all their records. They should be made easily accessible to people so as to minimize citizens' demand for information. This has made officers more responsive and answerable to public. Hence it has brought greater efficiency and economy in the administration. This Act has certainly raised the faith of people in public offices and enhanced their social perception for being honest and reliable.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. Define 'Social Policy'.

....

....

....

....

2. Bring out the connect between social policy and social processes.

....

....

....

....

11.6 CONCLUSION

Thus, we may conclude by saying that public policy is deeply influenced by social processes. In order to be responsive, no public policy can ignore social processes. In fact, these are the social processes that determine the need, nature and scope of a public policy. The social processes play a very determined role. They generate demand, make the government act, decide on the form of action and even make the government amend its policy if required. They also affect other fields like political and economic, which have equal bearing on any policy. Social processes represent the shared beliefs and values of the society. They are able to offer explanations to the linkages of one particular public policy and its desired outcome. They decide on what issue a government should act and to what extent. Positive social processes are required for any stable government. Hence, government tries to infuse positivity in the social processes with liberal and progressive values. It tries to remove all impediments in the way of progressive social policy. Through its social administration, government tries to manage social processes. Different social policies are designed to solve various social problems faced by society. These social problems keep on changing their nature due to change in social processes, and social structures, as well as development policies of the State. Every social process has a positive or negative impact on social needs. Government needs to shape and reshape its policy accordingly. Hence, public policies are affected by social processes at each stage of the policy cycle or process.

11.7 GLOSSARY

Amniocentesis: A test conducted on pregnant women to determine if the baby is not suffering from chromosome abnormalities and genetic disorders. The test has been misused by people and medical fraternity to determine the sex of the unborn child. Subsequently, it has been used to abort the female child.

Inclusive Development: Development strategy which ensures that all vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalised sections are included or mainstreamed in socio-economic development in order to reap the benefits.

Policy Process: Every policy has sequential stages of agenda setting, finding the alternatives, policy enactment, implementation and evaluation that are interrelated with each other.

Social Policy: A policy dealing with social issues like health, education, housing etc.

Social Process: Social Process is the manner in which social interactions, with repetition over time, get a distinctive character that decides the pattern of growth in society.

Social Security: Government through its programmes and schemes aims at providing monetary help to the people who are not able to earn due to illness, poverty, old age, disability and unemployment. The larger goal is to create social security for the deprived.

Social Welfare: State's actions that ensure well-being of its citizens by providing quality care and assistance to the disadvantaged and vulnerable groups.

11.8 REFERENCES

Betz, J. (2019). *India's Social Policies: Recent Changes for the Better and their Causes*. GIGA Working Papers No.314. Retrieved From. https://www.giga-hamburg.de/en/system/files/publications/wp314_betz.pdf

Dunn, W.N. (2016). *Public Policy Analysis* (5^{th} ed.). New York: Routledge.

Dwyer, P. & Shaw, S. (eds.). (2013). *An Introduction to Social Policy.* California: Sage.

Ghosh, J. (2004). Social Policy in Indian Development. In Mkandawire T. (eds.) *Social Policy in a Development Context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Govinda, R. & Poornima, M. (eds.). (2020). *India's Social Sector and SDGs: Problems and Prospects*. Oxon: Routledge.

Livingstone, A. (2011). *Social Policy in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge& Kegan Paul.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social class.* London : The Cambridge University Press.

Midgley, J., Tracy, M.B. & Livermore, M. (eds.). (2000). *The Handbook of Social Policy*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Motcham, C.R. (2016). Indian Social Policy: Nature, Emergence and Approaches. *ISRJ*. 3(11).

Spicker, P. (2014). *Social Policy: Theory and Practice.* Bristol: Policy Press, University of Bristol.

11.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Public policy is the decision of government to do or not to do anything.
   - It is an expression of government's will to achieve a goal.
   - It is a result and product of government's decision.
   - It is a course of action taken by government.
2. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Public policy is the expression of will of the State to fulfil the needs and aspirations of the society. These needs and aspirations of society are continuously shaped by the social processes.
   - Public policy aims at social change and development. This is not possible without understanding social values, customs, beliefs, and traditions of the people.
   - Without understanding the process of group dynamics of the society, no policy can have positive results.
   - Policy makers need to diagnose the social processes, understand what values and customs hinder the process of development, so that it can replace those values with the facilitative ones.
   - Public policy needs to be conscious of the social goals, so that it can be responsive. All these needs, aspirations, values, customs and traditions, as well as these social goals are shaped by the social processes of the society.
   - Moreover, social processes shape government's social development, social action, social policy and social administration. Social processes

determine the nature and scope of public policy, whereas State through its policies tries to create positive social processes and eliminate the negative ones.

Check Your Progress 2

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**

   - Policy making is not an isolated activity. In fact, there is a policy process or policy circle that is continuously evolving and growing.
   - Process model talks about the entire process of policy from formation to evaluation.
   - According to Process model of public policy, there are following stages in policy process:

     i) Identification of problem that calls for government action.

     ii) Political parties respond to a problem in the form of various policies.

     iii) Policy legitimating i.e, selection of most favourable policy and its enactment in legislature.

     iv) Implementation of enacted policy.

     v) Evaluation of policy based on feedback.

2. **Your answer should include the following points:**

   - Policy system is fully based on the social processes.
   - This can be understood with the help of Systems Approach given by David Easton.
   - Social processes create demands on the government, which are like inputs for policymaking.
   - Government chalks out its policies and programmes to address the demands created by social processes.
   - Once the new programmes and policies are put in place, they further affect social processes.
   - Thus, new social processes generate new demands for the government.
   - Hence, the system will keep on working, based on the social processes.

Check Your Progress 3

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**

   - Social policy includes the policies related to welfare and quality of life.
   - It involves policies and programmes related to education, health, housing, equal distribution of income and social work.
   - It deals with old people, people with disabilities, people suffering from poverty and unemployment.
   - Social policy depends on social needs and the nature of all those agencies, which address them.

- Social policy is State's mechanism to respond to socio-economic changes and challenges of globalisation, poverty and migration.
- Social policy tries to reduce inequality on the basis of gender, age, socio-economic status, race and ethnicity, disability etc.

2. **Your answer should include the following points:**

- The idea of the social welfare is constructed by the social processes. What is welfare for one country may not be needed at all in the other country.
- Social policy depends on social needs and the nature of all those agencies, which address them. These needs of society and nature of agencies is determined by social processes.
- A policy is a state's mechanism to respond to socio-economic changes and challenges of globalisation, poverty and migration that are the result of various social processes.
- Social processes define the health of any society. For socio-economic justice and egalitarian society, public policy needs to focus on the disadvantaged and weaker sections of the society like children, old people, women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, people with disabilities etc.

UNIT 12 TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES OF POLICY EVALUATION*

Structure

12.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the meaning and characteristics of policy tools;
- Explain the meaning and purpose of policy evaluation; and
- Examine the relative strengths and weaknesses of policy evaluation tools and techniques; and
- Elucidate policy evaluation problems and suggest remedial measures.

12.1 INTRODUCTION

Policy evaluation follows monitoring of implementation of policy programmes. Policy evaluation appears to be the final stage of the policy process, though it is an ongoing activity in the entire policy process. Evaluation is concerned with what happens, once a policy has been put into effect. Evaluation is essentially an important component of the policy process. Yet, it has drawn little attention from the policymakers. Much of the interest in the policy process centres around the dynamic energy that goes into decisions. In fact, it is only during the implementation – evaluation phase that we learn whether the policy was carried out as the policymakers designed and intended or not. It has been observed that evaluation is critical to determining the fact that programmes meet their expectations. And by reviewing the outcome of the objectives we judge the merit of public policy. Viewed as a follow-up experience, evaluation helps us understand the impact of the policy on the target group that it has been designed to address. Gerston (2009) has pointed out that "evaluation provides the ammunition for

*Contributed by Dr. R.K. Sapru, Professor of Public Administration (Retired), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

future changes and policy refinement". However, choice of tools for policy evaluation is equally important; it can be used to achieve the desired outcome.

12.2 MEANING OF POLICY TOOLS

James Anderson (2002) has called the policy instruments or tools "techniques of control", which are "by one means or another, overtly or subtly,... designed to cause people to do things, refrain from doing things, or continue doing things that they would otherwise not do". Lester Salamon and Michael Lund (1989) have suggested a particularly simple and useful definition of a policy tool as "a method through which government seeks a policy objective".

Thinking about tools is particularly useful because, as Salamon and Lund (*op.cit.*) have argued, there are "central characteristics" of tools that distinguish some tools from others. The first is "the nature of the activity in which government is engaged". According to them, there are *four* broad categories of such activities: "i) outright money payments, ii) provision of goods and services, iii) legal protections, and restrictions/penalties," such as regulations or criminal laws.

Besides, there are other scholars, who have also sought useful tool typologies. B.Guy Peters (1999), for example, has categorised policy tools or instruments on the basis of law, services, money, taxes, and other economic instruments. Similarly, Anderson (2002) has categorised instruments on the basis of "directive power, services, benefits, contracts, general expenditures, market and proprietary operations, taxes, loans, subsidies, sanctions, inspection, licensing and informal procedures". Levine, Peters and Thompson (1990) have provided a scheme for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each tool. They have given the following characteristics of policy instruments: "Certainty, Timeliness, Less Cost Efficiency, Effectiveness, Flexibility, Visibility, Accountability and Choice".

12.3 MEANING AND PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

In the words of Wholey *et.al* (1970) "policy evaluation is the assessment of the overall effectiveness of a national programme in meeting its objectives, or assessment of the relative effectiveness of two or more programmes in meeting common objectives". Wollmann (2007) has defined policy evaluation "as an analytical tool and procedure meant to do *two* things.*First* evaluation research, as an analytical tool, involves investigating a policy programme to obtain all information pertinent to the assessment of its performance, both process and results; *second,* evaluation as a phase of the policy cycle more generally refers to the reporting of such information back to the policy-making process".

Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004) have specified evaluation as a systematic application of social research procedures for accessing the conceptualisation, design, implementation and utility of social intervention programmes.Thomas Dye (2004) has defined, "systematic evaluation to mean careful, objective, scientific assessment of the current and long-term effects of policies on both target and non-target situation or groups, as well as an assessment of the ratio of current and long-term costs to whatever benefits are identified" .

In a sense, evaluation helps us to understand the impact of a policy on the political and socio-economic system of the country. By examining the consequences of the public policy on the target people or system, we get to know whether to continue, amend, or possibly scrap the policy altogether.The main objective of policy evaluation is to reduce the problem in the face of policy delivery. Policy evaluation is generally used for one or more of *three* purposes. These are to:

i) Access whether public policy has worked as intended (efficiency assessment);

ii) Gauge the consequences of the public policy (impact assessment); and

iii) Determine whether to continue, amend or scarp the public policy (future action assessment).

Evaluation performs several functions in policy analysis. In the *first* place, it provides reliable information about policy performance. The prime purpose of evaluation is to measure the impact of policies on society. It reveals the extent to which particular goals have been achieved (for example, increase in the life expectancy at birth). It helps us understand the degree to which policy issues have been addressed. *Secondly*, it is a tool whose main purpose is to appraise the operation of a policy programme and provide feedback to those involved in the earlier stages of the policy cycle. Evaluation helps clarify the values that underline the selection of goals and objectives.

Thirdly, evaluation may result in efforts to restructure policy problems. It may also contribute to the emergence of new objectives and potential solutions. For example, by showing whether a previously adopted policy alternative should be replaced with another one or abandoned. In the course of policy implementation, the policy actions may be either restructured to the new conditions or terminated altogether, either because the needs have been met or because policy actions have created more problems than they have resolved. *Fourthly*, often policy evaluation is undertaken to appease policymakers or advisory groups that are pressuring a government agency or department for some accountability.

For Dye (*op.cit*.), evaluation is "learning about the consequences of public policy. Through this activity, policymakers determine future plans and directions. An important function of ongoing evaluation is to feed pertinent information back into the implementing process in order to adjust, correct or redirect the implementation process." Sometimes, we do not evaluate public policies because evaluation involves much time and huge resources in terms of finance and personnel. But, all the more, policy evaluation is very important. It reveals the extent of achievement of goals of a specific policy.

Policy evaluation requires a framework. Hypothetically, it involves several steps. Usually for conducting an evaluation, *five* steps are the most significant: i) Identifying purposes of evaluation; ii) Identifying areas for evaluation; iii) Choosing evaluation methodology; iv) Analysing the results; and v) Reporting evaluation results.

12.4 TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES OF POLICY EVALUATION

Policy evaluation has *two* aspects: i) the evaluation of the policy and its effects on the target population (evaluating policy programme), and ii) the evaluation of the personnel charged with implementation of the policy programme (evaluating personnel). Evaluation in public policy also involves through the appraisal, assessment or performance of the people who work in the public sector, at both street level and at policy or managerial levels. This is important because these are the people who play a major role in framing the discourse of public sector management.

Evaluating Policy Programmes (Techniques)

When evaluating a policy programme, *two* questions need to be addressed: i) how a policy can be measured against the goals it sets out for achievement (this may be called 'formative evaluation'), and the actual impact of the policy (this may be called 'summative evaluation'). Formative or implementation evaluation is that evaluation, which is done when a policy is being implemented. On the other hand, summative evaluation seeks to measure how the policy/programme has actually impacted upon the problems to which it was addressed.

Here an attempt is made to discuss the analysis of evaluation as an activity involved in the measurement of goal performance. Mainly, there are *four* techniques for evaluation analysis.

1. Cost-benefit analysis;
2. Performance measurement technique;
3. Experimental evaluation; and
4. Quantitative and qualitative techniques.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

Cost-Benefit Analysis or Benefit-Cost Analysis (terms are used interchangeably) is an analytical technique that has had a significant effect on policymaking in the public sector. The use of techniques and methods to measure the relationship of costs to benefits and the efficiency and effectiveness of policies and programmes has an obvious application to the evaluation phase in the policy process. This Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) technique suggests that all factors in a decision/ policy should be quantified so as to provide a more rational basis for policymaking. The attractiveness of CBA as a tool of evaluation is obvious in the sense that it provides an apparent neutral technique for identifying costs and benefits of the policy programmes.

However, Cost-Benefit Analysis is not without its critics. Some critics of CBA approach have argued that the quantification is simply politics dressed up in techniques that is termed 'nonsense on stills'. At the same time, there is little doubt that the contribution of CBA has been profound. It has challenged policy evaluators to look at the long-term effects and to articulate its impact in quantitative as well as qualitative aspects of a programme or service.

Performance Measurement Technique

'Implementation' phase of the policy cycle, as suggested by Palumbo (1987) requires formative evaluation, which monitors the way in which a policy/ programme is being implemented so as to provide feedback, which may improve or promote successful implementation. Rossi and Freeman (2004) have described this mode of evaluation as being directed at *three* questions:

i) "the extent to which a programme is reaching the appropriate target population;

ii) whether or not its delivery of services is consistent with programme design specification; and

iii) what resources are being or have been expended in the conduct of the programme".

Information gathered at the phase of implementation may be used to correct or control the policy delivery process more effectively. This may take the form of Management Information System (MIS), which facilitates the collection and organisation of information that can feed into the managerial policy/ decision-making process. In the MIS approach to evaluation, the performance measurement as a technique figures imminent.

Among other features, performance measure aims at arriving at a ratio of inputs to service outputs. Where this is not apt, a performance measure may be expressed as how efficient the use of given resources has been: how much should have been achieved, and how much was actually achieved. Measures of performance can provide an effective substitute for profits so as to improve, for example, the functioning of schools, hospitals, local government and other services.Jackson (1988) has used the term 'Performance Indicators' as "means of assisting responsible management to make efficient decisions. They are not, however, a mechanical substitute for good judgement, political wisdom or leadership". Advocates of this technique have, however, contended that it improves personnel management, indicates progress towards goals, and identifies problem areas.

Experimental Evaluation

It is argued that policy experimentation offers the best opportunity to gauge the impact of public policies. In undertaking impact evaluation at the post-implementation phase, evaluation seeks to arrive at an estimate of the net and gross effects of intervention. It is a comparative mode of inquiry that is comparing before and after intervention. In this method, one could compare the impact of intervention on one group or another (who was not the subject of intervention); and also this method proves that a particular policy has had this or that impact. Palumbo's (*op.cit.*) policy cycle refers to summative evaluation as an impact evaluation, which is done at the post-implementation stage of the policy. In other words, an experiment seeks to study a problem before and after intervention.

In the experimenting society, the focus would be on problems rather than the advocacy of solutions. Dye (*op.cit.*) has observed that the experimenting society is a response to the limited resources facing policy-makers and public, and a way of addressing the problem of inequity in access to power. He also makes a strong case for experimentation when he comments: "It is exceedingly costly for society to commit itself to large-scale programmes and policies in education and welfare, housing, health and so on, without any real idea about what works."

Quantitative and Qualitative Techniques

Evaluation tells us much about the performance of the public policy. It shows whether goals have been met or not. For good results, evaluation should involve a variety of techniques and approaches. Quantitative as well as qualitative techniques are used for evaluating policy performance also. Quantitative measurement "involves evaluation measures, which generate data in a standardised framework of predetermined responses or analysis categories." On the other hand, "qualitative measures are designed to avoid limiting the observations, which can be made about policy performance." Qualitative measures permit the management team to record and understand peoples' reactions to the programme in their own terms in contrast to terms of quantitative research methodologies. There are *three* types of data in qualitative measurement: i) detailed descriptions of observed situations; ii) direct quotations from people explaining their own experiences with programme outcomes; and iii) excerpts from documents, records or case histories.

Quantitative evaluation measures outcomes in terms of the intentions set out in the policy design. Quantitative measures are systematic, standardised and easily presented in a short space. On the other hand, qualitative measures are longer, more detailed and varied in content. By contrast, quantitative measurement injects an element of artificiality into the evaluation situation. The qualitative techniques are valid and feasible alternatives to more quantitative techniques. Further, many problems of artificiality of programme evaluation can be circumvented through the use of qualitative techniques. It may be added that no policy, however, well-crafted can be made immune to such evaluation. The policy-maker cannot fully anticipate the consequences of a policy initiative.

Performance Appraisal of Personnel

Evaluation in public policy also involves performance of the people who work in the public sector at both street and managerial levels. At the core of evaluation of people is the belief that more control through the performance evaluation of personnel can ensure better outcomes of the policy programmes.It may be carried out by those delivering the programme (the concerned government department or ministry), or private agencies outside the government. The communication media, researchers in private and public institutions, organised interests, commissions and public-interest organisations, all make evaluations, of programmes and policies that have greater or lesser impact on the public officials.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. Explain the meaning and purpose of policy evaluation.

....

....

....

....

2. Examine the techniques of policy evaluation.

....

....

....

....

12.5 FORMS OF POLICY EVALUATION

Evaluation of public policy is a complex task and many stakeholders are involved in it. Let us discuss some types of policy evaluation:

Evaluation by Special Agencies

To get the evaluating job done professionally, decision makers often call upon special agencies or individuals with experience in the policy area under review. Often these people are professionals such as economists, statisticians or accountants who have particular skills to evaluate policy programmes. A big advantage of evaluation by specialised staff is that they do not have any vested interest in the continuation of any given programme. However, some tension is bound to take place between the operating staff and the evaluators owing to the unpredictability of the evaluation and its results.

A question may arise, whether it is proper for an organisation to be wholly responsible for its own evaluation. As Wildavsky (1972) has observed: "no matter how good its internal analysis, or how persuasively an organisation justifies its programmes to itself, there is something unsatisfactory about allowing it to judge its own case." The goals of independent evaluation studies would be to find out whether the impact of various programmes are significantly different from one another, and if so, what particular actions or unforeseen events might explain the difference.

Evaluation by Operating Staff

Evaluation may be conducted as an internal evaluation. Most government agencies make some efforts to review the policy-programme by their own staff. Evaluation by those delivering the programme has important implications. A big advantage is that an insider will have little problems regarding access to information. He has detailed knowledge of just what is involved. *Secondly*, the possible clashes of interest between operating staff and policymakers would be minimal. In this form, evaluation requires a well-established internal reporting system, which permits the continuous generation of programme-related information. However, those who are insiders may lack the requisite skills to carry out evaluation in their areas of work. Another disadvantage of evaluation by the operating staff is that it may fail to obtain a fully rounded evaluation of results of the activity of the organisation engaged in policy delivery.

The evaluation studies undertaken by the states' or Central government agencies are designed to assess the performances, and examine the process of implementation, as well as effectiveness of the delivery systems and impact of programmes. These studies also aim at identifying the factors contributing to success and failure of various programmes and deriving lessons for improving the performance of existing programmes and designing better future programmes.

Evaluation by Legislative Committees

Although evaluation takes places at every level of government, yet much of the evaluation lacks objectivity. To seek better information, the Parliament who gives authority to policy appoints its own committees to assess the worth or success of a policy. Parliamentary evaluation may be exercised through a number of techniques, including committee hearing and investigations, and casework. In India, the Public Accounts Committee, the Estimates Committee, the Committee on Public Undertakings, and the Select Committee attached to Parliament also conduct evaluation of public policies. The reports of the Public Accounts Committee, for example, have made perceptible impact on the Union executive by making the latter agree to conduct performance reviews, institute enquiries in the cases of frauds, and financial irregularities, investigate leakages of revenue, streamline the functioning of autonomous bodies and generally improve procedures and tighten financial control. For example, the PAC took up the Augusta Westland Chopper scam in 2013, as the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) of India made some adverse comments against it in its report alleging bribery charges in the Rs. 3600 crore deal to buy 12 helicopters for use of VVIPs.

In the course of investigations, members of the parliamentary committees reached certain conclusions, regarding the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of particular policies and programmes. Parliament is a natural candidate for initiating and conducting evaluation of policies inaugurated by them. However, members of Parliament are also more likely to be concerned with policy initiation and adoption rather than with the evaluation of policy programmes.

Evaluation by Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General

The office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG), which is regarded as an arm of the Parliament/state legislatures has broad statutory authority to ensure the accountability of the executive to Parliament or the state legislature. It assists the legislatures in the effective exercise of their financial control. In recent years, the office of the CAG has become increasingly concerned with comprehensive reviews and appraisal of schemes and with systems audits, to ensure value for money. The Parliament, by passing the Comptroller & Auditor General's (Duties, Powers and Conditions of Service) Act, 1971, has also increased its authority and responsibilities.

In the 2G spectrum allocation, the CAG of India in its Report to the Supreme Court (November 2010) showed a national loss of Rupees 1.76 trillion to the Indian exchequer. In the performance audit report on the PPP projects in the Indian Railways, which was laid in both Houses of Parliament on 18 July 2014, the CAG reported that "the execution of the projects is marred by arbitrary concession periods, weak project execution and additional financial burden of Rs. 125 crore. The Report says the Indian Railways executed eight PPP projects since 2000 through Special Purpose Vehicle out of which CAG sampled six projects for clarity, transparency, and completeness of concession agreement and financial prudence. These six projects, which cost about Rs. 2167 crore include four gauge conversion projects and two ongoing new line projects.

The Report says the Railways faltered in assessing the economic viability of Hasan-Mangalore gauge conversion and Obulavaripalle-Krishanpatnam new line project. The internal rate of return in both these projects was less than the benchmark provided by the Ministry of Finance.

A decision to evaluation studies may be taken up by the office of the CAG on its own initiative, on the basis of directives in legislation, at the request of financial committees, or sometimes at the request of individual members of Parliament. Such review conducted by the CAG through a process of dispassionate and searching analysis, based on records, makes a significant contribution in reviewing public policies and in bringing about the improved performance of the administrative system.

Evaluation of Statutory Commissions

In addition to the CAG's evaluation studies, Inquiry Commissions constituted under the Commissions of Inquiry Act (1952), the Central Vigilance Commission (1964), National Commission for Scheduled Castes (2003), National Commission for Backward Classes (1993), National Commission for Minorities (1993), National Commission for Women (1992), National Police Commission (1977-80), the First (1985) and the Second (2010) Commission on Centre-State Relations, Commission on the Review of Administrative Laws (1998), the National Commission on Urbanisation (1989), the First (1966-70) and the Second (2005-09) Administrative Reforms Commissions, and many more have been set up and can also be used as a means of policy evaluation. Whether set up specifically for evaluation in some areas or for other purposes, such as fact-finding, making policy recommendations or simply creating the appearance of concern, most Commissions do involve themselves in policy evaluation. They are commissioned to ensure greater public confidence in the evaluation results, either for reasons of expertise, or because a report from the Commissions might appear to be objective. However, it appears that the policy evaluation made by Commissions do not have much immediate effect on policymaking.

An evaluation commission is likely to have the largest effect when its findings are in accord with the ruling party's policy preferences or when some members can influence the acceptance of its recommendations. The Supreme Court as well as High Courts often ask governments to review certain laws and policies in the context of changed situations. For example, the Supreme Court of India on a PIL by Punjab – based NGO, Youth Kamal Organisation on 21 August, 2015 asked the Central Government to deal with the problem of farmers' suicide in the country seriously and to ascertain as to whether the suicides were linked to possible shortcomings in the National Policy for Farmers 2007, and review it if necessary.

Evaluation of Policies for HRM

Thomson (1988), a leading scholar of Personnel Management has defined performance evaluation in Human Resource Management (HRM) as involving:

(i) The identification of tasks to be performed, together with the criteria to be used to measure successful performance.

(ii) The evaluation of the performance given, by assessment either of the results where these are measureable, or of input of relevant effort or behaviour where they are not.

(iii) The determination of the amount of reward, remuneration, or 'reinforcement' to be given to improve, maintain, or advance the current level of performance.

In addition to the development of Management of Information System (MIS) or Knowledge Management (KM) techniques for evaluating policies, there has also been an emphasis on adoption of 'Human Resource Management' and 'Organisational Development' techniques in the public sector. These techniques of people evaluation largely drawn from HRM and OD comprise: (a) performance-related pay schemes, (b) personnel assessment and appraisal, (c) organisational development strategies. For Thompson (*ibid.)*, the aim of an HRM strategy is to change people so as to become more:

(i) "committed (commitment can be improved);

(ii) competent (competencies can be developed and can bring improved product quality and productivity);

(iii) cost-effective (ideally costs should be low and performance high); and

(iv) in sympathy with the aims of the organisation (are the values and expectations of all parties in agreement)".

The focus in HRM approach is to improve performance by developing a sense of commitment in each employee, rather than just compliance to hierarchical command or instruction. This increase in commitment is to be achieved through recruiting the right kind of people, training, regular staff appraisal and rewarding them for their performance. The idea of rewarding performance in practice has meant that there is an attempt to link pay and performance.

Performance evaluation and reward is a political minefield, as well as problematic at a level of personnel management. Nevertheless, the performance-based pay systems have been in operation in both public and private sectors around the world. In the USA, an Act was passed which includes amongst its major features, a requirement to develop and institute systems that strengthen the link between pay and performance (OECD, 1992).

In the appraisal of people, it is argued that more control is needed over bureaucrats and professionals to ensure that objectives set out by the policymakers are implemented efficiently and effectively. This kind of managerialism is seen as the extension and continuation of Taylorist 'madness' to those 'white-collar' and professional domains, which were for so long regarded as different to the factory or the profit-driven office. The use of Taylorist methods used in private sector are now challenged, as they erode the professional autonomy and bureaucratic rationality in the public institutions (Doray, 1988).

In this context, 2nd Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC) in its 10th Report (November 2008) has recommended: "a good employee performance appraisal system is a pre-requisite for an effective performance management system." The trend in evaluation has been to move increasingly towards modifying the behaviour of people in organisations, rather than organisations as systems.HRM is now concerned with improving rationality in terms of performance by changing the attitudes, motivation and culture of the people who work in policy delivery areas.

12.6 POLICY EVALUATION: PROBLEMS AND REMEDIAL MEASURES

At one level, policy evaluation appears to be simple. But the job really is not as easy as it looks. Guy Peters (1986) has observed that the evaluation process right from the initial stage of goal specification to that of measurement of performance may appear to be simple policy, but in the public arena, it is quite arduous. Evaluating a policy programme is a difficult exercise. It involves specifying the goals of the programme, measuring the degree to which these goals have been achieved, and perhaps suggesting changes that might improve the performance of the organisation. The evaluation of public programmes under different policy measures and plans is confounded by many factors. Some of these are as follows:

Confusing Policy Goals

Evaluation, majorly, is a matter of comparing outcomes with desired policy goals and objectives. But invariably policy goals are drawn from the Constitution, the United Nations' objectives and principles, and policy agenda of the political party in power. Theoretically, these goals look fine and attractive, but when they are translated to form a policy statement, a lot of confusion creeps in. The policymakers cannot fully anticipate the effects and consequences of a policy initiative or what a court of law might say about it (Financial Express, 2015).

On the other hand, if policy goals are unclear or are not specified in any measurable form, determining the extent to which they have been achieved becomes a complex and cumbersome task. Officials such as legislators and administrators who are in different positions in the policy system may define goals of a programme differently and reach conclusions about the accomplishment of the policy-programme which are at variance. Despite the fact that goals are clear, they may not be practical. The Preamble to the Indian Constitution, for example, expresses a number of goals for the government but very few, if any, are expressed in concrete language that would enable an evaluator to verify whether the goals are being achieved or not. Specifying such goals and putting them into effect would require further political action within the organisation. The specification of goals may also lead to the division of responsibilities among those who implement the policies. Therefore, there is an important role for the policy-makers to specify goals to be achieved in a particular policy. Once it is done, the evaluator's job becomes easy.

Unreliable Criteria for Measurement

However, systematically, we may have defined our goals and objectives, and selection criteria, often we cannot account for all of them. It is observed that our criteria are not always reliable. There is always the difficulty of measuring the extent to which these goals have been achieved. In the public sector, measuring results is still more difficult. It is tough to measure the performance of the public sector programmes in the absence of any ready means of judging the performance. For example, although the short-term goal of education is to improve reading, writing and learning, in the long run, the goal of education is to improve the quality of life for those who receive it.

Problems of Methodology and Statistics

It is argued that statistics are not relevant and valid. The facts are often distorted, in the study of public organisations. For example, the Rangarajan Panel puts the number of poor at 363 million in 2011-12 compared with the 270 million in 2011-12. According to the Report, the number of poor in India was much higher in 2011-12 at 29.5 per cent of the population, which means that 3 out of 10 persons were poor. As per Rangarajan panel estimates, a person spending less than Rs. 1407 a month (Rs. 47/day) would be considered poor in cities. In villages, those spending less than Rs. 972 a month (Rs. 32/day) would be considered poor. This is at variance with the Suresh Tendulkar methodology under which poverty was estimated at 29.8 per cent in 2009-10 and declined to 21.9 per cent in 2011-12.

Even when the facts are neatly organised for evaluation, the evaluators must be careful about the conclusions they draw. For example, if we are to evaluate the effectiveness of a health programme on poorer sections of the community, we may find it difficult to isolate the effects of that health programme from those of a nutrition programme or those of an education programme. In fact, all these programmes may have the effect of improving the health of the population, and we may find it difficult to determine which programme is the more efficient means of improving the health of that community. All these problems indicate the measurement in policy analysis is a cumbersome exercise.

Little Effect on Target Population

Data necessary to evaluate the policy programme may not be true or misleading. The information gathered in the course of delivery of policy may highlight much about the characteristics of the people actually receiving the benefit but little regarding the target population. Programmes that have significant effects on the population as a whole may not have the desired effects on the target population. In a number of cases, it is observed, that the advantageous sections of the society grab the programme benefits, though the benefits are, in fact, meant for the disadvantaged strata (Tiwari, 2013).

Again, administrative procedures and the real difficulties in utilising the benefits produced may make the programme less effective than desired. The Social Justice Bench of the Supreme Court, for example, on 22 August, 2015 slammed the Centre and state governments for virtual non-utilisation of a whopping Rs. 27,000 crore collected in the form of one per cent cess on the construction industry. It noted that instead of spending the money for providing healthcare to the workers' families and education to their children, some of the states had misused the funds. It directed the Delhi government to return back to the welfare fund about Rs. 2.7 crores utilised for publicity over the years.

Political Interferences and Biases

Elected officials and ministers sometimes express themselves about their favourite public policies and want them to be evaluated in their language. It has been pointed out in a study that "extremist forces have accrued so much political and economic capital that states ignore women's rights' violations in order to appease these forces" (Singh and Mishra, 2015). It is ironical how political leaders in competition focus on different facts within the same data set.

To this extent, the evaluators would need to be careful in evaluating the predetermined favourites. It is because their conclusions are very important to policymakers, administrators and sometimes certain segments of the public. The expectation is that evaluators will do everything possible to keep their own subjective feelings away from the policy that they are asked to evaluate. Nevertheless, it is sometimes very difficult for the public policy evaluators to step outside of their own values. Alternatively, if policy-makers perceive a bias on the part of evaluators, they may request another evaluation as a form of insurance. Professionalism of a high order can enable objective evaluation.With the renewed importance given to evaluation, there is a felt need of strengthening evaluation capacity in public organisations and also network with the evaluation capacity that exists outside the government.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. Write a note on the forms of policy evaluation.

....

....

....

....

2. Examine policy evaluation problems and suggest remedial measures.

....

....

....

....

12.7 CONCLUSION

Evaluation examines whether public policies have brought about changes as predicted. It offers an opportunity to assess outcomes of the public policymaking process and reshape the direction of that process. It is a technique that compares objectives with performance, as well as the linkage between the present and the future. Evaluating public policies is important to achieve the policy objectives. Quality evaluation of scores of policy-programmes would not only ensure good performance in the functioning of public institutions, but would also address a broad range of issues relating to economy, efficiency and relevance of public investment in many a critical policy area. Evaluation of public policies, therefore, helps policymakers understand the extent to which their policies have succeeded or failed, as well as the emergence of issues and policies they never predicted. This Unit has discussed various challenges before policy evaluators besides bringing to the fore different types of evaluation tools and techniques.

12.8 GLOSSARY

Effort: The quality and quantity of activity that takes place.

Resources: A piece of equipment or data or information that can be used to produce something useful. It can be personnel, financial, material and so on.

Structure: Structure refers to certain stable organisational roles and relationships, which are relevant to policy.

Translation Stability: There must be clear communication between the public policymaking authority and the bureaucracy.

12.9 REFERENCES

Anderson, J. (2002). *Public Policymaking* (5th ed.).Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dye, T.(2004). *Understanding Public Policy* (11th ed.). Delhi, India: Pearson Education.

Doray, B. (1988). *From Taylorism to Fordism: A Rational Madness.* London: Free Association Books.

Financial Express. (17th October, 2015). *Supreme Court Scuppers NJAC*. Will Stick to Collegium System. New Delhi.

Gerston, L.N. (2009).*Public Policymaking in a Democratic Society* (2nded.). New Delhi: PH1 Learning.

Jackson, P. (1988). The Management of Performance in the Public Sector.*Public Money and Management.* 8(4), 11-16.

Levine, C., Peters, G. & Thompson, F. (1990). *Public Administration: Challenges, Choices. Consequences.* Glenview, Il: Little Brown.

OECD. (2011). *Public Management Development Survey*. Paris.

Palumbo, D. (ed.) (1987).*The Politics of Programme Evaluation*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Peters, B.G.(1986).*Public Policy in America: Process and Performances* (2nd ed.).London: Macmillan.

Peters, B.G. (1999). *American Public Policy*. New York: Chatham House.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. & Freeman, H.(2004).*A Systemic Approach* (7th ed.). California: Sage.

Salamon, L.M. & Lund, M.S.(1989).The Tools Approach: Basic Analytics. In L.M. Salamon (ed.), *Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Government Action.* Washington: Urban Institute Press.

Second Administrative Reforms Commission. (2008). *Refurbishing of Personnel Administration.* New Delhi, India: Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions.

Singh, R.K.& Mishra, A. (2015). Religion, Politics and Women in South Asia.*South Asian Journal of Socio-Political Studies.*15(2), 59.

Thomason. G. (1988).*A Textbook of Human Resource Management*.London: Institute of Personnel Management.

Thompson, J.L. (1990).*Strategic Management: Awareness and Change*. London: Chapman.

Tiwari, A.(2013). Rethinking the Microfinance Recovery Framework.*Indian Journal of Public* Administration. 59(2), 370-372.

Wholey, J.S.*et al.* (1970).*Federal Evaluation Policy.*Washington: Urban Institute.

Wildavsky, A. (1972). The Self-evaluating Organization.*Public Administration Review*, 32(5), 509-520.

Wollmann, H.(2007).Policy Evaluation and Evaluation Research. In F. Fischer, G.J. Miller &M.S. Sidney (Eds.). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis*.Boca Raton: CRC Press.

12.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Policy evaluation is the assessment of a programme's effectiveness.
   - It is a research and analysis tool.
   - It is an important phase of policy cycle.
   - It determines the current and long-term effect of policies.
   - It tries to understand the impact of policy on political and socio-economic system.
   - It reduces the problems of policy delivery.
   - It appraises the operation of a policy programme.
   - It may restructure policy problems.
   - It attempts to appease stakeholders in policy process.
2. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Cost-benefit Analysis
   - Performance Measurement
   - Experimental Evaluation
   - Quantitative and Qualitative Techniques

Check Your Progress 2

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Performance Appraisal of Personnel.
   - Evaluation by Special Agencies.
   - Evaluation by Operating Staff.
   - Evaluation by Legislative Committees.
   - Evaluation by CAG.
   - Evaluation of policies for HRM.
   - Evaluation of Statutory Commissions.
2. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Confusing policy goals.
   - Unreliable measurement criteria.
   - Target population not benefitted.
   - Political interferences and biases

UNIT 13 NATURE OF POLICY ANALYSIS*

Structure

13.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Describe the term 'policy analysis';
- Bring out the significance of policy analysis;
- Explain the development of policy analysis as a field of enquiry;
- Discuss the different types of policy analysis; and
- Examine the limitations to the use of policy analysis.

13.1 INTRODUCTION

Policymaking is a cumbersome exercise. It requires the efforts of government (politicians in authority), the administrators (civil servants), as well as the support of the people (for whom the policy is meant). But in the first instance, policymaking needs feedback, adequate information and data, as well as the support and interest of the government. Public policies have failed in the delivery of goods and services because they were not adequately formulated and implemented in the public interest. The development of policy analysis is related to the pertinence of the role of the State and politics in policymaking activities.

Policy analysis is a study that deals with acquisition of information and facts about the public problems so as to formulate public policies (in the forms of laws, Acts, enforceable decisions and likewise). By systematising choices through the use of information and knowledge, policy analysis is seen as a better way for identifying and solving the policy problems, and to overcome the limitations of individual and political rationality through scientific knowledge. The progress in

*Contributed by Dr. R.K. Sapru, Professor of Public Administration (Retired), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

'intellectual technology' and information offered the prospect of substituting problem-solving techniques for intuitive judgements and guesses. The development of information, knowledge and techniques of analysis is based on stipulated research, which is used by decision/policy-makers for policy problems. The generic name for this is 'policy analysis'. In a way, there are *two* aspects of policy analysis:

i) Policy analysis: concerned with information in and for the policy process;

ii) Analysis of policy process: concerned with information about the making and implementation of public policy.

13.2 ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY ANALYSIS

Meltsner (1976) notes that the modern terms 'policy analysis' and 'policy analyst' began to be used frequently in the 1960s. He believes that it was Charles Lindblom in 1958, who probably first used this term.

Historically speaking, 'policy analysis' is as old as the State itself. Although its origin can be linked to the beginning of civilisation, when kings sat with their councillors to discuss 'policy'.The present policy analysis has a twentieth century colour. Lasswell (1968) has observed:

> "In some measures, the importance of basing policy on knowledge has been recognised in every civilisation…Ancient Indian civilisation gave prominence to teachers and advisers of the prince, who were more concerned with the invention and weighing of strategic alternatives than with religion or magic".

As the State grew and intellectual technology became more available, particularly in the 20th century, the nature of the analysis of choices and strategy changed. In the changed context, the rational quality of the information was employed to come to a decision. As the State acquired more power and control, the need for application of rationality as a basis for policy increased. Many of the techniques of policy analysis had their origins in the decision sciences developed during the war, particularly operations research, which is used to support military logistics (DeLeon, 1988).

In the 1960s and 1970s, policy study centres and think-tanks were set up in many developed countries. For example, in Britain, the Centre Policy Review Staff (CPRS) was set up in 1970. The CPRS was composed of a multi-disciplinary staff, whose job was to enable the government to take better policy decisions. The aim of the CPRS and its US equivalents was to provide a more strategic long-term analysis of problems in terms of policies in specific areas. In the recent years, the government has come to rely on a mix of internal (executive, legislative and judicial sources) and external (unofficial sources) bodies to provide information, analysis and evaluation.

There has been considerable growth in research and training in policy analysis since the early 1970s in many developed and developing countries. In most developed countries, policy analysis has been substantially stimulated by the government's increased concern for public policy problems. However, at present, there is a marked shift towards a more 'anti-analytical' approach to policymaking. The other kind of policy analysis deals with analysis of the policy process as an alternative focus to the study of Constitution, legislatures, interest groups, and public administration. This is most closely associated with the contribution of four scholars: Harold Lasswell, Herbert Simon, Charles Lindblom and David Easton.

Harold Lasswell (1902-1978) is considered as the moving spirit behind the development of the public policy approach. His writings on public policy may be dated back to the 1930s. Lasswell was also instrumental in setting up an early think-tank called the American Police Commission. He was also involved in another think-tank known as the RAND Corporation. Lasswell also made attempts to formulate a set of 'stages' in the policy process.

David Easton's (1917-2014) work provided a model of the 'political system', which greatly influenced the way in which 'policy process' is viewed in terms of conversion of 'inputs' to 'outputs' and 'outcomes'. The combination of rational stages and systems approaches thus afforded a more dynamic model of policy analysis.

Another contributor to the development of public policy approach is Herbert Simon (1916-2001). His concern with human decision-making has centred on the idea of rationality as 'bounded', but capable of improving itself. Simon's idea of analysing decision-making in terms of a sequence of rational stages: intelligence, design, and choice, has formed a key element of policy analysis.

Finally, Charles Lindblom's (1917-2018) contribution to the development of policy analysis has been quite significant. He is concerned with the 'process' of policymaking. He is best known for his advocacy of an alternative to Simon's rational approach in the form of 'incrementalism'. His article, published in *Public Administration Review* in 1959 on the 'science of muddling through,' is a classic text in the area of policy studies.

13.3 DEFINITION AND ISSUES OF POLICY ANALYSIS

Questions of policy ultimately rest on the application of knowledge to political decisions. Such knowledge is generated both within and outside the government agencies, as well as other public affairs institutions. An understanding of the causes and consequences of policy decisions permits us to apply the knowledge of social sciences to the solution of practical problems. The acquisition and dissemination of information about public policies have become a major theme in social sciences, especially in the discipline of public administration. The use of such knowledge for making, managing and evaluating public policy is generally termed as 'policy analyses'. Public policy analysis is thus nothing more than estimating the impact of public policy on the government programmes.

Edward Quade (1975), is often considered a pioneering proponent of the Policy Analysis approach. In his *Analysis for Public Decision*, he saw both operations research and systems analysis as synonyms for a policy framework. He has observed that policy analysis remains a "reasonable strategy for discovering good solutions". Its main purpose is to "help a decision-maker with a better choice than he would otherwise have made. It is thus concerned with the more effective manipulation of the real world".

The Dictionary of Public Administration defines 'policy analysis' as "a systematic and data-based alternative to intuitive judgements about the effects of policy or policy options. It is used "(a) for problem assessment and monitoring, (b) as a 'before the fact' decision too, and (c) for evaluation". Policy analysis encourages social scientists and policy makers to examine policy issues and decisions with scientific tools. Thomas Dye (1980) has labelled policy analysis as the 'thinking man's response' to demands. He has observed that specifically public analysis involves:

- **"A primary concern with explanation rather than prescription:** Policy recommendations, if they are made at all, are subordinate to description and explanation. There is an implicit judgement that understanding is a prerequisite to prescription, and that understanding is best achieved through careful analysis rather than rhetoric or polemics.
- **A rigorous search for the causes and consequences of public policies:** This search involves the use of scientific standards of inference. Sophisticated quantitative techniques may be helpful in establishing valid inferences about causes and consequences, but they are not really essential.
- **An effort to develop and test general propositions about the causes and consequences of public policy and to accumulate reliable research findings of general relevance:** The goal is to develop general theories about public policy that are reliable and that apply to different governmental agencies and different policy areas. Policy analysts clearly prefer to develop explanations that fit more than one policy decision or case study, explanations that stand up over time in a variety of settings".

Policy analysis, in other words, is a technique which puts data to use in, or deciding about, estimating and measuring the consequences of public policies. Its purpose is *two fold*. It provides maximum information with minimal cost about:

(i) the likely consequences of proposed policies, and

(ii) the actual consequences of the policies already adopted.

To achieve these *two* purposes, various methods or approaches are applied. Among the principal methodologies are: (i) cost-benefit analysis; (ii) economic forecasting; (iii) systems analysis and simulation; (iv) financial planning; (v) policy evaluation and impact assessment; and (vi) social indicators.

As we have seen, policy analysis is interdisciplinary, drawing upon data from other disciplines. It essentially impacts research. A number of trends have occurred in policy analysis research since the early 1970s. Stuart S. Nagel (1989) has identified *four* key elements to it, which have been undergoing a change over the past decades. These are:

i) *Goals* with which policy analysis is concerned;

ii) *Means* for achieving those goals;

iii) *Methods* for determining the effects of alternative means on goal-achievement; and

iv) *Profession* of policy analysis, which is applying these methods in relating means to goals.

Policy analysis is not a discipline like economics, sociology or political science. It is thriving as a sub-discipline of the various social sciences and as an inter-discipline, depending on the existing fields of economics, political science, and other social and even natural sciences. As Eugene Bardach (1974) observes: "Unlike most social science research, most policy research is derivative rather than original. That is, it is produced by creative play with ideas and data already developed by others".

Concerns of Policy Analysts

There are a variety of people and groups (academics, independent research institutions, pressure and interest groups, political parties, freelance consultants) who are involved in policy analysis and are therefore concerned with:

- Problems and the relationship of public policies to these problems;
- The content of public policies; and
- What the policy makers do;the likely consequences of policy in terms of outputs and outcomes.

Some analysts, for example, may be interested in the role of political parties in shaping policy, others in the impact of bureaucracy on decision-making, or the role of professionals in policy delivery. Analysts may focus on different stages of the policy process, such as policy formulation, implementation, or evaluation. From the notion of policy analysis, majority of experts, are involved in a political process in which norms are set, and a case is made out on a specific policy problem.

13.4 TYPES OF POLICY ANALYSIS

As with models of the policymaking process, types of policy analysis vary. In main, there are *three* types of policy analysis:

Ex-ante Analysis and Ex-post Analysis

Policy analysis is *ex-ante* analysis, which takes place before a decision or analysis. On the other hand, policy analysis is ex-post analysis, which takes place after a decision is made to assess or evaluate policy. The *ex-ante* and ex-post policy analyses are also termed as prospective and retrospective policy analyses.

Scientific and Pragmatic Approaches Analysis

At one end of a continuum, there are advocates such as Stokey and Zeckhauser (1978) who would take a heavily scientific and positivist view as to what policy analysis is and can be. At the other, a more pragmatic and more politically informed approach,which accepts the limitations of rationality, whilst accepting the need for improving public decision-making. In this former category, for example, is Edward Quade (*op.cit.*) who has conceded that policy analysis can never be an exact science, as it is concerned with helping "a decision-maker make a better choice than he otherwise would have made", and it thus aims to facilitate an "effective manipulation of the real world". He has asserted that policy analysis remains a "reasonable strategy for discovering good solutions".

Prescriptive and Descriptive Policy Analysis

The prescriptive analysis recommends actions that result in a particular outcome.

On the other hand, descriptive policy analysis refers to historical or retrospective analysis of past policies. Here policy analysis is done after policy implementation. Policy analysis is thus seen as an approach to public policy, which aims to contextualise research from those disciplines, which have a policy orientation.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. Define Policy Analysis and examine the views of Thomas. R. Dye.

....

....

....

....

2. Discuss the types of Policy Analysis.

....

....

....

....

13.5 POLICY ANALYSIS PROCESS AND FRAMEWORK

Policy analysis models and techniques aim at providing a more rational basis for decision-making. However, policymaking framework of rational analysis vary. For Harold Lasswell (1956), following categories of functional analysis act as the base:

- Intelligence;
- Promotion;
- Prescription;
- Invocation;
- Application;
- Termination; and
- Appraisal.

For Quade (*op.cit.*), the decision-making process involves *five* key stages which he defines in terms of:

i) **Formulation:** clarifying and constraining the problem and determining the objectives;

ii) **Search:** identifying, designing, and screening the alternatives;

iii) **Forecasting:** predicting the future environment or operational context;

iv) **Modelling:** building and using models to determine the impact;

v) **Evaluation:** comparing and ranking the alternatives.

Rational analysis maintains that a decision is the result of a series of logical steps. The role of analysis is to facilitate a rational choice of means and ends, within the limitations recognised by Quade (*op.cit.*).That in the real world, decision-making is often constrained and bounded by interests and involves clashes of values and beliefs.The rational analysis depends upon the use of information, advice and knowledge. The data for analysis comes from formal and informal sources. Formal information consists of data on the economy and society. These are compiled in the form of official statistics. This formal data constitute the basis of official statistics and problem formulation. However, informal source of information is also employed. Non-formal channels and forms of information may in reality prove far more determining than the official data in shaping the decision-making process.

Since policy analysis makes use of the required information in examining, deciding about, and finally, measuring the consequences of public policies, a framework for policy analysis may be required. Such a policy analysis framework would identify both the kinds of information used to define policy, and also the analytical processes.

Rational decision-making and the policy stage approach continue to be the basis of policy analysis, which often consists of the following steps:

- Identifying problems and objectives;
- Specifying and evaluating policy alternatives;
- Recommending policy action;
- Monitoring policy outcomes; and
- Evaluating policy performance.

The basis to the framework is a process of information for policy analysis, which is derived from system or programme performance in terms of the interaction among:

- Inputs that indicate needs and demands;
- Processes related to series of actions for achieving long-term care services;
- Outputs in terms of the use of services and costs of care; and
- Outcomes that identify the end results of certain courses of action.

Based on the appraisal of systems performance using the above linkages, issues regarding various goals can be identified. Once these issues are identified, information is analysed in terms of how it pertains to the larger issues (for example, health, illness and the quality of life). In this way, issues related to needs and demands are defined in terms of health and illness, as well as other coexisting social problems. For example, in the context of the National Health Policy, the inputs (in term of needs and demands) comprise health, illness, and the quality of life, expressed in physical, psychological, social, and environmental terms. Needs are the conditions that ask for action. They are among the most important predictors of utilisation, and are mostly described in terms of diagnosis, functional limitation, perceived illness, symptoms, or poor self-related health status. On the other hand, demands are expressed as desires in relation to the services sought, whether they are needed or not.

Other inputs include resources, such as manpower, facilities and equipment, and performance standards. On the process linkage, it is concerned with the delivery of services to meet the needs and demands of clients and professionals. Services are described in such terms as their delivery, management and controls of cost and quality. Other services include support such as legal aid, income support, consumer education and professional development. The outputs of service-related programmes are described in terms of the use of those services and costs. Finally, the outcomes (in terms of impact of services) are responses to services expressed in terms of quality. They identify the end results of the courses of action taken. Thus, the energy which frames rational policy analysis involves *five* key stages and each stage has its own complexity of exercises.

13.6 CRITICISM OF RATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

It has been observed that countless policy studies have led nowhere. Sometimes, the fault is attributed to the public decision makers who do not take advantage of readily accessible data. Too often, it is the producers of the analysis who are to blame. Most policy analyses are gathering dust because they have not been properly understood. The analysis should be brought out in such a way that the essential points can be easily grasped and communicated. The choice among competing policy alternatives is complex, as the future is always uncertain. But, by enhancing capability of the analysts to forecast the consequences of the alternative courses of actions, and providing a framework for valuing those consequences, the techniques of policy analysis lead them to formulate better policies. There are severe limitations on the use of analytical work in real policy/ decision-making. These are:

No Substitute for Politics

The usefulness of the idea of policy analysis as involving a series of logical stages: problem identification, setting objectives, analysing alternatives, decision-making, and implementation, appears to be weak vis-à-vis political and bureaucratic interests (Heineman *et al*., 1990). Political realists view policy as a threat to politics. Analysis is not a substitute for politics or ‘anti-political’, but essentially supplementary and subordinate to the political process. As Majone (1989) notes: “As politicians know only too well but social scientists often forget, public policy is made of language”.

Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) have also argued: “The quality of public policy depends on a vast network of thought and interaction, in which professional policy analysts play a small role…In principle, those who analyse public policy can help to deepen political debates about problems, opportunities, and policy options”. Lindblom has argued that the real issue is not rationality so much as improving the capacity of societies to flexibly cope with uncertainty.Wildavsky (1980) has looked at the role of analysis as contributing to the improvement of politics, rather than as a substitute for it. Policy analysis is thus an art and a craft, rather than a science. The idea that policy analysts can be neutral is a myth.

Weak Involvement in Policy Implementation

Heineman (*op.cit.*) notes that the analysis may be strong on the diagnosis of problems and formulation of policy, but it is weak in terms of how a policy should be implemented. A policy analysis is of no use if it cannot be communicated to others. Often administrators are unhappy to find that the policy analysis research hinders the pursuit of policies on which they have already embarked. Moreover, the policy analysts lack a power base. The experience of analysts in the policy process tends to be weak vis-à-vis political and bureaucratic interests.

Weak in Resolving Social Values

Policy analysis cannot provide solutions to problems when there is no general consensus on what the problems are. It is incapable of resolving societal value conflicts. It is also very difficult for the government to cure all or even most of the maladies of society. The government is constrained by many forces, both from within and outside such forces, as population growth, patterns of family life, class structure, religious beliefs, diversity of cultures and languages, financial resources and so on, cannot be easily managed by the government. In such a situation, the decision-makers choose the decision, which is already made and is plausible.

Difficulty in Predicting Policy Impact

Society's ills are so complex that analysts are incapable of predicting the impact of proposed policies. Social scientists largely fail to provide proper advice to the policy-makers owing to lack of knowledge about individual and group behaviour. The fact that social scientists offer many contradictory recommendations indicates the absence of reliable scientific knowledge of social problems. Most of society's ills are shaped by so many forces that a simple explanation of them is hardly possible.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. Discuss the process and framework of policy analysis.

....

....

....

....

2. Make an appraisal of rational policy analysis.

....

....

....

....

13.7 CONCLUSION

With all the limitations, the idea of analysing policymaking and policy analysis is not without its advantages and as such it should not be abandoned. Those who advocate abandoning the stage model argue for a different framework to take its place. On the whole, it is fair to say that social scientists can at least attempt to measure the impact of present and past public policies and make this knowledge available to policymakers. Reason, knowledge and scientific analysis are always better than the absence of any knowledge. Robert Lineberry (1977) notes that "policy analysis rests on the assumption that information is better than no information, and that right questions are better than no questions asked, even when the answers may not be definitive".

It may be noted that policy analysis may not provide solutions to society's ills, but it is still an appropriate tool in approaching policy questions. Policy analysis enables us to describe and explain the causes and consequences of public policy. In broad terms, this framework does allow us to analyse complexities of the real world. The strength of the analytical approach is that it affords a rational structure within which we may consider the multiplicity of reality. Policy analysts study all the issues that are of interest to policymakers, which means that policy analysis is wide-ranging. This Unit analysed the development of the concept of policy analyses, its framework and its process. It also made a brief appraisal of policy analysis.

13.8 GLOSSARY

Ex-ante**:** It is a phrase which means 'before the event'. An *ex-ante* analysis is based on forecasts rather than actual results.It is a prediction of things to come, which become ex-post if proven right.

Incrementalism: A model of decision-making in which policy change is accompanied through small, incremental steps that allows decision-makers to adjust policies, as they learn from their successes and failures.

Policy Environment: The structural, social, economic, political, and other factors that influence and are influenced by policymaking.

Public Interest: The assumed broader desires and needs of the public, in whose name policy is made. The public interest is hard to define, but is something to which all policy advocates appeal.

13.9 REFERENCES

Bardach, E. (1974). Gathering Data for Policy Research.*Journal of Urban Analysis*. 2,117-144.

Chandler, R.C. & Plano, J.C. (1982). *The Public Administration Dictionary*. New York: John Wiley.

DeLeon, P. (1988).*Advice and Consent: The Development of the Policy Sciences.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dye, T.R. (1980). *Understanding Public Policy* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Heineman *et al*. (Eds.).(1990). *The World of the Policy Analyst*. New Jersey: Chatham House.

Lasswell, H. (1951). The Policy Orientation. In D. Lerner & H.D. Lasswell (Eds.), *The Policy Sciences*.Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lasswell, H. (1956). *The Decision Process*. Maryland: University of Mayland.

Lasswell, H. (1968). '*The Policy Sciences' in The Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences(Vol. 12)*. New York: Free Press.

Lindblom, C.E. & Woodhouse, E.J. (1993). *The Policy-Making Process* (3rd Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lineberry, R.L. (1977). *American Public Policy: What Government does and What differences it makes*.New York: Harper Row.

Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Meltsner, A.J. (1976). *Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nagel, S.S. (1984). Policy Analysis. In G. Ronald Gilbert (Ed.), *Making and Managing Policy*. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Quade, E.S. (1975). *Analysis for Public Decisions*. New York: Elsevier.

Stokey, E. & Zeckhauser, R. (1978).*A Primer for Policy Analysis*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Wildavsky, A. (1980). *The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. London: Macmillan.

13.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXCERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Public policy analysis is nothing more than estimating the impact of public policy on the government programmes.
   - A primary concern with explanation rather than prescription.
   - A rigorous search for the causes and consequences of public policies.
   - An effort to develop and test general propositions about the causes and consequences of public policy and to accumulate reliable research findings of general relevance.

2. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Ex-ante Analysis and Ex-post Analysis.
   - Scientific and Pragmatic Analysis.
   - Prescriptive and Descriptive Policy Analysis.

Check Your Progress 2

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Policy analysis makes use of the required information in examining, deciding, and finally measuring the consequences of public policies.
   - Policy analysis framework would identify the information used to define policy, and also the analytical processes.
   - The basis to the framework is a process of information for policy analysis, which is derived from system or programme performance.
2. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - No substitute for politics.
   - Weak involvement in policy implementation.
   - Lack of desire in resolving conflicts of social values.
   - Difficulty in predicting policy impact.

UNIT 14 POLICY MONITORING AND ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES*

Structure

14.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Describe the concept of public policy evaluation;
- Elucidate the purpose and objectives of policy evaluation;
- Explain the nature of policy evaluation tools;
- Discuss the techniques of policy monitoring; and
- Examine the constraints in policy performance.

14.1 INTRODUCTION

Implementation of a public policy programme (including delivery of goods and services to the target subjects) carries no meaning or serves no purpose for which it is intended, unless it is adequately monitored. Policy monitoring is of critical importance to the government, as well as to the public in general in terms of achievement of intended results or goals of the public policy. It must be realised that a policy, if it is to achieve its intended goals, and better its performance, must be monitored and controlled.

Monitoring is essentially a subject of the implementation process. It is an activity which occurs in the course of implementing a programme or policy. It is in the

*Contributed by Dr. R.K. Sapru, Professor of Public Administration (Retired), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

process of monitoring that the implementor actually gets to begin seeing the results of policy. The significance of monitoring of public policy lies in seeing that intended results are achieved in time and through an efficient use of resources. This Unit will explain the concept of policy monitoring and explain its different techniques. It will also examine the constraints in policy monitoring process.

14.2 MEANING AND OBJECTIVES OF POLICY MONITORING

'Monitoring' is the process of observing what goes on. It is "the process of inducing action for adherence to schedule" (Choudhary, 1986). Policy monitoring has come to mean the process of observing policy implementation progress, utilising resource and anticipating deviations from policy expectations. Its implications are that management takes steps to ensure that all activities related to policy implementation are completed within time and budget.

For Mantel (*et al.*, 2009), "monitoring is the collection, recording and reporting of project information that is of importance to the project manager and other relevant stakeholders….Control uses the monitored data and information to bring actual performance into agreement with the plan".

But monitoring is not controlling, as controlling is the process of making adjustments, which tend to correct the deviations from planned progress. The purpose of control is: (i) the stewardship of organisational assets, and (ii) the regulation of results through the alteration of activities (*Ibid.*). For example, if the factory management fails to install pollution-control devices to prevent air pollution, we may simply decide to proceed against the factory management under the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981. On the other hand, if monitoring shows that a particular activity is deviating from planned parameters then the management takes required measures to replan that particular activity. But if there is a significant variance from planned parameters, it is important to analyse the source of deviation before deciding what measures are needed (Sunny and Baker, 1998).

The objective of policy monitoring is to ensure through the policy implementation process that resource inputs are used as efficiently as possible to yield intended results. The standards which are used for both efficiency of resource utilisation and effectiveness of policy implementation are inherent in the policymaking process (Anderson, 2000). The monitor has to be able to appraise resource use, technical activities and policy implementation results, with an amount of detail, which permits the monitor to make changes or corrections when necessary.

On the contrary, if the monitor flies too high, as it were, then the details will be lost and the opportunity for effective policy control will be over. The monitor often becomes buried in the details of policy programme and loses sight of overall policy performance standards and objectives. Policy monitoring helps in designing and implementing systems for the processes, which provide just the right amount of detail for effective control of policy execution. Experience has shown that effective monitoring can ensure the proper execution of policy with good results in the shortest period of time.

An effective monitoring of public policies aids in cost reduction, time managemnt and effective resource utilisation. The key issue in monitoring is to create an information system that gives policy makers and policy implementers the information they need to make timely decisions and policies that will keep policy programme's performance as close as possible to the objectives of the policy. Therefore, it is important that monitoring and control processes are given due importance and are designed properly. Further, monitoring also helps in communicating the need for coordination among those working on the tasks and subtasks of the policy activity (Mantel *et al.,op.cit.*).

14.3 TECHNIQUES FOR POLICY MONITORING AND ANALYSIS

For the promotion of successful implementation of public policies, monitoring is the best technique. And to this effect, research scholars have promoted a variety of approaches and techniques. Some of the approaches in regard to monitoring of public policies are:

(i) **Formative Approach:** Increasingly, this monitoring of the process of implementation provides policymakers and managers with techniques for evaluating the way in which a programme is being managed or delivered, so that this information is utilised to correct or improve the policy delivery process more effectively. This takes the form of Management Information System (MIS) including the use of computers to provide a centralised information system.

(ii) **Performance Measurement Approach:** Measurement is akin to monitoring. It means watching Performance Indicators (PIs) on all parameters with a view to detecting the earliest available signs of any deviations from desired results or performance.

(iii) **Managerial Approach:** Managerial approach to monitoring has more or less a business-like style in order to generate the best policy outcomes. In this context, three approaches, namely (i) Critical Path Method (CPM), (ii) Programme Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) and (iii) Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) have gained wide recognition not only in the private sector, but also in the public sector.

(iv) **Systems Approach:** Carter (*et al.*, 1984) suggest that a successful implementation system involves *four* types of control: (i) coordination over time; (ii) coordination at particular times; (iii) detailed logistics and scheduling; and (iv) defending and maintaining structural boundaries. It may be emphasised that systems approach lays stress on attaining good levels of cooperation and coordination within the policy programmes by focusing on the importance of teamwork for effective monitoring.

(v) **Power and Compliance Approaches:** Implementation, monitoring and control compliance of policy delivery in the form of goods and services finally fulfil the intentions of policymakers. In this context, Boulding (1990) distinguishes between *three* kinds of power: *threat, exchange and love*. Enforcement through threats can have productive and integrative consequences (Exercise of power by income tax authorities). The use of exchange power may involve bargaining to settle terms of trade. The power of love may involve an appeal to a moral sense or a sense of citizenship.

Besides these approaches to policy monitoring, there are a variety of techniques of policy monitoring. Now, we will discuss the main techniques. Monitoring like other activities in the policy cycle requires a significant level of effort, including investment. Monitoring has a role in several aspects of public policy delivery.

From policy performance perspective, there are *three* areas in which policy monitoring has to play its role: 1. Technical performance; 2. Time performance; and 3. Cost performance. Monitoring of these *three* areas involve several techniques, which are applied in the policy delivery. Let us focus on these now:

14.3.1 Monitoring Technical Performance

A number of technical activities, which are involved in the policy delivery are required to be monitored and controlled through the application of certain techniques to achieve the desired targets. Some important techniques are briefed here:

Activity Team as Monitor: In the first place the activity team, which is most directly responsible for conducting the work that leads to the deliverable should be assigned the task of monitoring. To be effective, monitoring team must be delegated to the operational levels of policy delivery.

Activity Bar Chart: For monitoring technical performance of the policy, an Activity Bar Chart is a fundamental instrument. The Chart can provide information relating to: (i) list of objectives to be achieved; (ii) calendar for the policy delivery; (iii) list of programmes / activities to be performed with starting and ending dates; and (iv) list of people (personnel) with allocated functions and responsibilities. The Activity Bar Chart plans each technical activity by time and deliverables. The is one place, where deliverables become important instruments for policy management. They are tangible (can be seen and ascertained) results, which indicate performance. Sometimes they are only written reports of tasks completed and results of those tasks. At other times, a planning document can be developed for showing Staff Allocation Matrix, which can be used to decide how we should assign available programme personnel.

Proportion – Completed Measures: Some monitoring specialists think of other types of policy management in which a proportion-completed measures could be used to monitor technical performance.For example, the National Health Policy, 2017 (replacing the NHP, 2002) lays down certain targets to be achieved over time. The NHP has come up with a comprehensive roadmap to a healthier India by ensuring better access to healthcare by the poor. Another example of this Proportion-Completed Measure would be construction of a road. The new BJP government (w.e.f., 26 May, 2014) announced policy measures in the 2014 budget to achieve 25 km/day of road construction in Financial Year 2015—a big jump from 8 km/day in Financial Year 2014.

How then is technical performance monitoring done. As with all monitoring, it starts in the planning phase. At that time, the activity team predicts its rate of achievement on scale. It is, then, possible for the activity team to measure the actual proportion of road constructed at the end of say one month of this policy project. Tied to the policy deliverables approach, it becomes a very reliable tool for the government activity teams.

Peer Review: The term 'peer' simply refers to a group of technically qualified people, for instance, judges, doctors, engineers etc. Peers are used when more objective measures of technical performance are not available. The technique of measuring technical performance of policy delivery depends on the ability of the group (peer review) to estimate the degree of technical completion at any point in time. The fact that they are peers suggests that they are colleagues with the programme implementing staff. It is useful especially to evaluate the quality of work done. The technical peers review the purpose and relevance of the policy programme, the technical problems faced and the path to completion of policy programme. The peer review depends on the knowledge, capacity and attitude of the peers for its effectiveness.

Third Party Technical Review: In the case of third party technical review, the monitoring is done by a third party. The third party technical review works like a peer review, but people in it are largely unknown by those most intimately involved in the policy programme. Sometimes, programme sponsors, funders or Steering Committee members want to get technical performance monitored by parties, which have no interest or stake in the policy programme. Sometimes this approach is adopted for phases of crisis in the programme. But in large and complex policy programmes (forestry, health and education), they can be planned to occur at periods, which help ensure adequate policy control. The main advantage is the objectivity and expertise, which a third party can bring to the programme. It is especially effective if it is planned as part of the ongoing project management process. Further, it is added here that these five techniques to monitoring technical performance are more powerful, when applied in combination.

14.3.2 Monitoring Time Performance

The purpose of monitoring time is to ensure timely policy delivery. Time, in the context of a policy delivery, is planned in the form of schedules. If one indicates on the Activity Bar Chart regarding when programmes are expected to be completed or actually delivered, one has a useful method of monitoring time in relation to technical performance of a given policy. For monitoring time performance, two techniques are found to be useful. These are Resource Bar Chart and Schedule of Expenditure.

Resource Bar Chart: Mantel (*et al.*, 2009) and his associates argue that "the amount of resources that can be allocated, of course, depends on the timing of the allocation as well as on the total supply of resources available for allocation." Resources Bar Chart helps us to consider what the impact of schedule delays will be on all activities of the policy programme. For example, of the 500 cities to be rejuvenated over five years under the Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT, launched on 25 June 2015) programme, 476 cities have been selected.

With the help of the Resource Bar Chart, any kind of resources can be arrayed against time in the chart and then one can find, for example, whether there has been some delay in mobilising the consultants for policy manpower and management. Hence, this monitoring device helps us predict when logistics people have to make arrangement for consultants etc. Matters relating to delay in the arrival of the specialists can be recorded in the Resource Bar Chart.

Schedule of Expenditure: Policy activities need to be carried out on schedule. It is also possible to array costs against the time dimension. Much as with technical performance of the policy programme, it is possible to plan the schedule of expenditure for the programme. For instance, once the budgeting of individual activities is over, the budgets can be aggregated by output. Then the division heads can calculate the monthly expenditures expected throughout the programme. Thus, on the basis of activity-level monitoring data, the format permits the policy management team to monitor the rate of expenditure for the policy delivery (Peart, 1971). The chart can be developed for the purpose of knowing the rate of expenditure across all activities of the policy programme.

14.3.3 Monitoring Cost Performance

Budget generally reflects the policies the government pursues. Since the 1980s, with the advance of computer-aided technology and better standardisation, budgeting has made significant advances both in terms of techniques and methodology (PPBS, ZBB, POB, etc. are popular) (Schick, 1995).

Budget as a Tool for Monitoring: The overall policy programme budget can be a tool for monitoring, if it is compared to actual costs, as they are incurred. Its primary shortcoming, however, is that notice of a financial deviation may come too late to do anything about it. This is because the programme budget is comprised of aggregated cost category totals. But if we have cost category budgets at that level, then we can begin to find financial deviations earlier in the process. For this purpose, the financial expert can help the activity team set up a simple monthly statement, which compares actual to planned expenditures per category. This periodic statement reflects financial activity during the current period for the entire programme up to this point in time, how much is committed, what is expected to be spent and an anticipated variance (Mantel, *op.cit.*).

Performance to Budget as a Tool for Monitoring:Performance to Budget statement with time component has also been developed as a tool to monitor cost performance. Before it computes a sub-total of actual expenditures to completion of the policy programme, which is calculated on the basis of an average expenditure per unit of time. It is based on an assumption that the programme will continue spending, on an average, at the same rate it has over the first, say six months. As long as that assumption is more or less correct, this appears to be a good way to monitor cost performance.

Cash Flow Projection: Cash flow is another useful tool for monitoring policy programme finances (Robbins and Coulter, 1998). Cash flow projection combines the parameters of cash (budget) and time. It is useful in situations in which the authorities wish to monitor expenditures in comparison to income from donors (Peart, *op.cit.*) (Such as World Bank for funding Primary School education in select districts in Haryana). It may be stated that the Cash Flow Projection is often used because programmes generally are funded on a schedule of payments, which is designed to match the plan of expenditures. This helps in estimating the costs and actual incomes of the policy programme. The Cash Flow Projection, in a way, permits the monitoring staff not only to assess the costs and incomes but also anticipate cash shortages regarding the whole programme.

14.3.4 Monitoring all Factors Together

It is essential to remain sensitive to deviations in all the three elements, that is technical, time and cost performance. Policy results can be best realised, when monitoring of all the performance criteria is done simultaneously. As already emphasised in the preceding sections of this Unit that it is not sufficient to monitor cost or time performance alone. It is possible, for example, for a programme to be on schedule and within cost and still in problem. The graph, properly developed, can show what has been achieved and what remains to be achieved. The plan can call for about 15 per cent of the technical work to be completed by the end of March; 30 per cent by 30 September; 45 per cent by 31 December; and so on. The chart is a very useful tool for monitoring a policy programme. It should present *three* dimensions – technical, time and cost performance. The difficulty in maintaining such a chart is in determining the percentage completed in a valid manner. The graph can be used to assist considerations of when a noted deviation is requiring correction or change and when it is not. The policy monitoring and control system, through its reports and meetings assist in deciding what corrective action is feasible and effective.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. What do you understand by the term Policy Monitoring?

....

....

....

....

2. Briefly describe the techniques of Policy Monitoring and Analysis.

....

....

....

....

14.4 CONSTRAINTS IN POLICY MONITORING

Policy programmes or activities have to be properly monitored in order to produce the greatest efficiency in resource utilisation. But quite often, monitoring is constrained by many factors and forces operating at the internal and external levels.

In the **first** place, problem relates to *poor design* of the policy monitoring and control system. Poorly designed monitoring framework affects the efficiency in resource utilisation, while ensuring the probability of quality policy results. **Second,** *time is a constraint* for policy monitoring. Too often the implementing staff feel so hard-pressed to achieve results that they take shortcuts and avoid management steps like monitoring and control. Experience has shown that monitoring and control, when adequately designed and executed, are processes which can generate the highest quality results in the shortest amount of time.**Third,** a common constraint for the policy implementation manager is the *shortage of* *corrective actions,* which could be applied when the programme is shown to be deviating in some respect from projected performance. For example, cost overruns owing to fluctuations in financial markets often leave managers with the feeling that their implementation task is becoming difficult. **Fourth,** a pervasive obstacle to policy monitoring is *ignorance about its role and methods*. It is often observed that the monitoring staff and key personnel associated with implementing policies are not well-prepared to monitor and control policy programme performance. **Fifth,** there is no *in-built mechanism* introduced in the policy programme for making an analysis of the monitored information. It has been observed that projects suffer,as developers are given projects without due clearances.

14.5 REMEDIAL MEASURES FOR EFFECTIVE MONITORING

As already mentioned in the beginning of this Unit, monitoring is an activity, which occurs in the process of implementing a policy programme. To generate the highest quality policy output, monitoring requires a significant level of effort. Investing in monitoring is a direct investment in policy management. Following are some ways and means of enhancing the capacity of policy monitoring:

Designing the Monitoring System

One of the most important roles of the policy management director in monitoring is to design and implement systems for the process, which can provide good control of the policy delivery programme. In this connection, Mantel (*et al*., *op.cit.*) observe that "the key to setting up a monitoring system is to identify the special characteristics of performance, cost, and time that need to be controlled in order to achieve the projects' goals as stated in the action plan." It is important to remain sensitive to deviations in all *three* factors – technical, time and cost performance. It is possible for a policy delivery to be on schedule and within budget and still in deep trouble. Activity Bar Chart, Resource Bar Chart, Cash Flow Projection tools can be properly designed and developed for monitoring policy performance. These charts and tools can be used to assist considerations of when a noted deviation is worthy of correction and when it is not.

Communicating about Performance

A good monitoring and control system requires monitoring of communication system, which works efficiently from the activity level of the programme to planning/policy market level. Monitoring system ought to be constructed with the use of electronic mechanism so that it addresses every level of policy management. Policy progression, deviations from planned progress, corrections and plans to completion are key components of policy communication. Every person involved in the policy programme requires ongoing communication at various levels of detail. The objective of communication is to keep people informed, on track and involved in the policy. Further, regular meetings to review policy progression must be held at all levels in the organisation.

Monitoring Progress

The objective of monitoring and control is to ensure through the policy implementation process that resource inputs are used as efficiently as possible to produce the high quality of policy outputs. Policy managers must compare the time, cost and technical performance of the policy to the budget, schedule and tasks defined in the policy programme. This should be done in a systematic manner at regular intervals and not in a haphazard way. Any significant deviations from the planned performance (technical, cost and time) must be reported immediately, as these anomalies affect the viability and success of the whole policy programme. In a report tabled in Parliament on 18 July 2014, the CAG said: "Railways needs to strengthen its mechanism for effective monitoring of all projects". It asked the national transporter to adopt a uniform approach to all Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) projects and frame a 'model concession agreement' for execution of projects within the stipulated time-frame.

Improving Capacity of Monitoring Staff

Effective monitoring largely depends upon the ability, commitment and attitude of the monitoring staff. The process of monitoring requires some level of effort on the part of the people who are particularly skilled in the process. It requires skills in planning and accounting as well as general management. The monitoring staff need to be delegated adequate powers to monitor and control. Key individuals should be made responsible for meaningful contributions and presenting and monitoring data.

Control Alternatives

Policy monitoring through its regular reports and meeting should also decide as to what corrective action to take or recommend in order to secure effective monitoring. *Three* general types of actions are suggested to be taken:

(i) **Correction:** It means reallocation of resources, which also include time. With a corrective action, it is presumed that the policy programme will be completed in time.

(ii) **Replanning:** This is another control mechanism. It means changing people's expectations of the results of the policy programme. Here the same technical outputs may be changed, but at greater cost and more time. However,replanning should not be undertaken without the concurrence of the Steering Committee.

(iii) **Cancellation:** It is the most drastic action. In the worst possible case, the manager may desire to recommend to the Steering Committee cancellation of the whole policy programme, where it appears that the increase in cost, or technology, or the expected decrease in benefits no longer make the programme worthwhile. Sometimes, this is needed, particularly in situations in which the policy has been poorly conceived or when the policy is doomed to fail.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1. Examine the constraints in policy monitoring.

....

....

....

....

2. What are the remedial measures for effective policy monitoring?

....

....

....

....

14.6 CONCLUSION

Monitoring is at the heart of policy management. Its objective is to ensure, through the policy programme implementation, that resource inputs (like people, money) are used as efficiently as possible to generate the highest quality policy outputs. In setting up any monitoring system it is important to identify the key factors in the programme / policy action plan to be monitored and controlled. These are performance (specifications), cost (budget) and time (schedule). These, after all, encompass the fundamental objectives of any policy. There is no doubt that organisations, especially public, do not spend sufficient time and effort on monitoring policy. Monitoring should concentrate primarily on measuring various facets of policy output/outcome rather than data collection. But monitoring, like all other aspects of the policy management, requires a significant level of effort, including investment. The investment in monitoring policy programme is a direct investment in public policy management. For the policies to succeed, it is imperative that focus should shift to creating an inclusive and engaging working environment that empowers employees to contribute and help the organisation achieve the policy objectives. This Unit highlighted the characteristics, techniques, constraints and remedies of policy monitoring process.

14.7 GLOSSARY

Critical Path Method (CPM): It is also called Critical Path Analysis. It sets the sequence of project activities, by identifying the longest stretch of dependent activities and measuring the time required to start and finish an activity.

Impact Assessment: It is undertaken to estimate whether or not interventions produce their intended effects.

Policy Design: It is the process by which policy is designed, both through technical analysis and the political process to achieve the desired goals.

Performance Measurement: It is seen as an indicator to improve the functioning of outcome of the enterprise.

Programme Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT): It is a strategic tool designed to analyse and represent the tasks involved in a given project.

Planning Programming Budgeting System (PPBS): It is an integration of a number of techniques in planning and budgeting process. It aims to identify as well as analyse and assign resources for establishing priorities and strategies in a major programme.

14.8 REFERENCES

Anderson, J. (2000).*Public Policy Making*. Boston, M.A.: Houghton Miffin.

Boulding, K. (1990).*Three Faces of Power*. California: Sage.

Carter, R.J. *et al.* (1984). *Systems, Management and Change: A Graphic Guide*. London: Paul Chapman.

Choudhury, S. (1986).*Project Scheduling and Monitoring in Practice*. New Delhi, India: South Asian Publishers.

Mantel, S. J. *et al.* (2009).*Project Management.* (1st ed.). New Delhi, India: Wiley India.

Peart, A.K. (1971). *Design of Project Management Systems and Records*. London: Lower Press.

Robbins, S. &Coulter, M. (1998).*Management*. (5thed.).New Delhi, India: Prentice-Hall of India.

Schick, A. (1995). *The Federal Budget Politics, Policy, Process*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Sunny&Baker, K. (1998). *Project Management*. New Delhi, India: Prentice-Hall of India.

14.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**

   - Policy monitoring is the process of inducing action for adherence to schedule.
   - Monitoring is not controlling, which is the process of making adjustments that correct the deviations from planned progress.
   - The objective of policy monitoring is to ensure through the policy implementation process that resource inputs are used as efficiently as possible to yield intended results.
   - An effective monitoring of public policies aids in cost reduction, time saving and effective resource utilisation.

2. **Your answer should include the following points:**

   - Monitoring all three factors together.
   - Techniques for monitoring cost performance.
   - Techniques for monitoring time performance.
   - Techniques for monitoring technical performance.

Check Your Progress 2

1. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Poorly designed monitoring framework affects the efficiency in resource utilisation, while ensuring the probability of quality policy results.
   - Time is a constraint for policy monitoring.
   - A common constraint for the policy implementation manager is the shortage of corrective actions, which could be applied when the programme is shown to be deviating in some respect from projected performance.
   - A pervasive obstacle to policy monitoring is ignorance about its role and methods.
   - There is no in-built mechanism introduced in the policy programme for making an analysis of the monitored information.
2. **Your answer should include the following points:**
   - Designing the monitoring system.
   - Communicating about performance.
   - Monitoring Progress.
   - Improving capacity of monitoring staff.
   - Controlling alternatives.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Anderson, J. (2000). *Public Policy Making*. Boston, M.A.: Houghton Miffin.

Berkland, T. (2011). *An Introduction to the Policy Process* (3rd ed.). New Delhi, India: PHI Learning.

Chakrabarty, B. & Chand, P. (2016). *Public Policy Concept, Theory and Practice*. New Delhi, India: Sage Texts.

Dhameja, A. & Mishra, S. (2016). *Public Administration Approaches and Applications*. New Delhi, India: Pearson.

Dror, Y. (1968). *Public Policy Making Re-examined.* Pennsylvania: Scranton.

Dye, T.R. (2004). *Understanding Public Policy* (17th ed.). New Delhi, India: Pearson Education.

Dye, T.R. (2016). *Understanding Public Policy* (15th ed.). Pearson.

Farazmand, A. & Pinkowski, J. (Eds.) (2007). *Globalization, Governance and Public Administration.* New York: Taylor and Francis.

Fischer, F., Miller, G.J. & Sidney, M.S. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis.* Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Gerston, L.N. (2009). *Public Policymaking in a Democratic Society* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: PH1 Learning.

Henry, N. (2012). *Public Administration and Public Affairs* (12th ed.). New Delhi, India: Prentice-Hall.

Lasswell, H. (1951). The Policy Orientation. In D. Lerner & H.D. Lasswell (Eds.), *The Policy Sciences*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lindblom, C. & Woodhouse, E.J. (1993). *The Policy-making Process.* New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

Lindblom, C. (1968). *The Policy-Making Process*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Medury, Uma (2010). *Public Administration in Globalisation Era. The New Public Management Perspective.* New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.

Moran, M., Rein, M. & Goodin, R.E. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government.* New York: Addison – Wesley.

Sapru, R.K. (2017). *Administrative Theories and Management Thought*. Delhi, India: PHI Learning.

Sapru, R.K. (2017). *Public Policy: A Contemporary Perspective*. New Delhi, India: Sage Texts.

Wildavsky, A. (1980). *The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. London: Macmillan.