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About this case
With its focus on policy formulation, this case study is quite distinctive, as it is more common for case studies of policy change to be about the policy implementation process. The case study can therefore be used to support students to analyse and reflect on the typical steps in policy formulation and how they interlink to move (or not) a policy concern from the agenda setting to implementation phase.

The material in this case study is also well suited to stimulating thinking about:

• The context of policy change and the support or opposition of different actors;
• The nature of policy content and how it relates to the interests, values and understandings of actors; and
• The strategies that policy proponents and opponents use in an attempt to influence the outcome of the policy process.
Case study of policy change: the marketing of alcoholic drinks in South Africa

Case study focus
Covering the period from March 2011 to May 2017, this case study explores the process through which the 2013 draft Control of Marketing of Alcoholic Beverages Bill (the draft bill) was formulated in South Africa.

The Liquor Act, which prohibits false or misleading advertising and advertising targeted at minors, currently governs alcohol advertising. These limited prohibitions mean that the alcohol industry largely regulates its own advertising through codes of conduct. Against this backdrop, and in an attempt to tackle societal harms related to the use of alcohol, the draft bill was developed to:

- Restrict the advertisement of alcoholic drinks;
- Ban sponsorships associated with alcoholic drinks, for example of sports teams or events; and
- Prohibit any promotion of alcoholic drinks.

The alcohol industry and advertising

- High rates of alcohol use and abuse accounts for much of the global burden of disease. Alcohol is strongly related to non-communicable diseases.
- The alcohol industry includes some of the largest companies in the world. A few multi-national corporations hold the market share. Globally, alcohol firms spend a lot of money on marketing.

- In 2009, producing and selling alcoholic drinks accounted for 3.9% of South Africa's gross domestic product (GDP). The industry employs ± 30,000 people.
- The tangible and intangible costs of alcohol-related harm equalled 10-12% of South Africa's 2009 GDP.
- In 2012, the South African alcohol industry spent R1.7 billion on advertising; 85% of which came from the then dominant firms of SABMiller, Brandhouse and Distill.
How did government develop the draft bill and what became of it?

In 2010, the South African government established an Inter-Ministerial Committee on Substance Abuse. This committee was made up of the Ministers of Social Development, Correctional Services, Health, Basic Education, Higher Education, Science and Technology, Economic Development, Transport, Trade and Industry, as well as the South African Police Service.

The Inter-Ministerial Committee guided the Second Biennial Anti-Substance Abuse Summit, which took place in KwaZulu-Natal province in March 2011, and was attended by a large number of government, global and civil society actors. A key output from this summit was the Anti-Substance Abuse Programme of Action (2011-2016). The resolutions of the Second Biennial Anti-Substance Abuse Summit included:

- Harmonization of all laws and policies to facilitate effective governance of alcohol, including production, sales, distribution, marketing, consumption and taxation. The regulatory framework must be national and applicable across all provinces and municipalities and should be guided by the principles and proposals agreed to by this summit and the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Alcohol and Substance Abuse.
- Immediate implementation of current laws and regulations that permit the restriction of the time, location and content of advertising related to alcohol and in the medium term banning of all advertising of alcoholic products in public and private media, including electronic media. The short-term intervention will include measures that will ensure that alcohol will not be marketed at times and locations where young people may be influenced and the content of the advertising should not portray alcohol as a product associated with sport, and social and economic status.
- Banning all sponsorship by the alcohol industry for sports, recreation, arts and cultural and related events.

Background: what contributed to the setting of the policy agenda?

At the time of the First Biennial Anti-Substance Abuse Summit in 2007, the banning of advertising and sponsorship was not clearly on the agenda. It was mentioned in the presentation of one academic, but not incorporated in the resolutions of the summit. The summit report noted that the Film and Publication Board should be invited to the next summit because of the link between advertising and substance abuse.

The Anti-Substance Abuse Programme of Action (2011-2016) suggests that, in the period between the two summits, government policymakers were influenced by international and South African researchers. This document cites the World Health Organisation’s Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health and the work of South African individuals and organisations to argue for the harmful effects of alcohol in relation to, among other things:

- The health, and potential death or injury, of the drinker, for example in relation to diseases associated with the use of alcohol, the risk of contracting HIV due to
sexually risky behaviour fueled by intoxication, or the contribution of alcohol to car accidents;
• The health, and potential death or injury, of others, for example through the effect of alcohol abuse on foetal and child development, the mental health of the families of alcohol abusers, or inter-personal violence and aggression;
• The work productivity of the drinker and others;
• The economic costs to society.

Some of this cited work includes discussions of advertising and sponsorship bans in other countries. The policy agenda might also have been shaped by international calls for countries to take stronger action to address the harmful use of alcohol, as evidenced in the World Health Organisation’s 2010 global and African strategies on this topic.

The idea of a ban also appeared to enjoy the personal support of the Minister of Health and Minister of Social Development at that time. In July 2011, the news agency of the South African government reported that “…Despite being criticized for his call to ban alcohol adverts, Health Minister Aaron Motsoaledi has vowed not to back down until his mission is fulfilled.” In December 2011, at the launch of an anti-alcohol and substance abuse campaign, the Minister of Social Development, quoted research on the link between high exposure to alcohol advertising, especially amongst young people, and increased consumption, arguing for measures to reduce the exposure of all people to advertising that “…falsely portray carefully packaged ethanol as a product that is associated with being cool and successful.”

Building on the Second Biennial Anti-Substance Abuse Summit and its resolutions, the bill was drafted by representatives from different government departments. The task team in charge of drafting the bill worked under the direction of the National Department of Health, but also included officials from the National Department of Social Development and the National Department of Trade and Industry. In March 2013 the draft bill was tabled at a meeting of the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Substance Abuse.

Around June 2013, the Forum of South African Directors-General instructed the draft bill to undergo a regulatory impact assessment. The Forum of South African Directors-General brings together the most senior officials of all government departments to provide technical support to Ministers and work towards integrated government planning, decision-making and service delivery. The National Department of Health completed this assessment in September 2013, but the results were not made public. This first impact assessment and the draft bill was tabled at a Cabinet meeting in September 2013.

The Cabinet responded to this submission by ordering a second, independent regulatory impact assessment. In August 2014, the tender for this second assessment was awarded to a private economics consultancy. The assessment was completed in January 2015, but again not released to the public.
After the completion of the second regulatory impact assessment, Cabinet developed the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment System. This was a mandatory new process for appraising all intended legislation that replaced the process of conducting regulatory impact assessments. In line with this new system, the National Department of Health completed a socio-economic impact assessment of the draft in July 2015. This third assessment is also not in the public domain.

Although the draft bill was leaked to the public in April 2012 and government stated in 2013 that it would be published in the Government Gazette for public comment, it never was. As of May 2017, therefore, the draft bill had emerged as an alternative to the provisions of the Liquor Act and the self-regulation of alcohol advertising, but had not yet reached the final stages of policy formulation by getting the go-ahead from Cabinet, being formally Gazetted and subjected to formal, legislative processes of comment and scrutiny, and eventually being enacted by Parliament.

The positions and strategies of key actors – how they engaged with government, the public, and each other – provide some insight into why this might have happened.

**Key actors and their positions**

On the questions of prohibiting the promotion of alcoholic drinks and banning sponsorships associated with alcoholic drinks, various key stakeholders can be grouped into two opposing clusters. These clusters had different interests, articulated different narratives around alcohol use, alcohol abuse and the banning of advertising and sponsorships, and therefore took different positions around the proposals contained in the draft bill.

The first cluster was opposed to the ban on promotion and sponsorships and included the alcohol industry, advertising industry and media industry. The National Department of Sport and Recreation, which opposed the draft bill, also leaned towards this cluster. A final opposing actor to take note of was the South African Broadcasting Corporation.

The second cluster, proponents of the ban and the draft bill, included the National Department of Health, National Department of Social Development, public health researchers, and civil society health promotion advocates.
How did the actors engage with government and each other?

March 2011 – 2013

In the period after the Second Biennial Anti-Substance Abuse Summit and while the draft bill was being crafted, the alcohol industry acted swiftly to set in motion a lobbying / advocacy campaign through which it hoped to influence the thinking and change the minds of other actors inside and outside of government. The alcohol industry retained a person working in the advertising industry and this person and the campaign was paid for by a fund set up by the alcohol industry. This “anti-champion” had strong relationships in the advertising and media industries and her role included seeking to ensure that the media sided with the alcohol industry in this debate, networking with colleagues in the alcohol, advertising and media industries, and seeking to ensure that all these stakeholders “speak with one voice” on the draft bill.
An early step in this campaign was when, in 2011, the alcohol industry funded a marketing analyst to conduct a preliminary impact assessment. Shortly thereafter, consultants were commissioned to compile a report on the economic impact of a ban on alcohol advertising. The preliminary impact assessment and the consultancy report, published in March 2013, were widely cited in press releases, media reports, and presentations to policymakers. Both these documents sought to influence policymakers’ and members of the public’s perceptions about the costs and benefits of the intended policy change.

In September 2012, the Committee on Economic and Business Development of the National Council of Provinces, the second chamber of South Africa’s Parliament, met with representatives of the alcohol industry. In October 2013, the Sport and Recreation Committee of the National Assembly, the first chamber of South Africa’s parliament, hosted a consultative meeting on the role of alcohol advertising and sponsorships in the sport sector. These meetings are summarized below.

**Strict regulation strategy in liquor industry: briefing by Distell**

NCOP Economic and Business Development, 10 September 2012, Chairperson: Mr F Adams (ANC, Western Cape)

Meeting Summary
The roles of the government and the liquor industry in addressing the problem of alcohol abuse without creating job losses and causing damage to the economy, were the major issues when the possible impact of the Control of Marketing of Alcoholic Beverages Draft Bill was discussed by the Committee and representatives of Distell, Africa’s leading producer and marketer of spirits, wines, ciders and ready-to-drink alcoholic beverages.

Distell believed that the government’s concerns about the liquor industry related to social, health, transport, policing and education issues. On the other hand, the liquor industry had a role to play in helping other departments to achieve their objectives in areas such as job creation, skills development, economic growth, international competitiveness, sustainable use of natural resources and rural development. The liquor industry was therefore appealing to the government to adopt a “balanced approach”, so that it could operate in a mainly self-regulated environment, combined with strict enforcement of legislation, increased corporate social investment contributions and closer partnerships with government bodies.

The industry was appealing for the government to take a balanced approach by tackling alcohol abuse without strangling the economy which was, in part, driven by the liquor industry. Research had shown that warning labels and the banning of advertisements did not work, and attention should rather be focussed on parental involvement, strictly enforced self-regulation, and partnerships with government – as the problem of alcohol abuse was too big for individual entities to handle on their own. In order to divert young people from irresponsible drinking, it was necessary to create a society which embraced sport, arts and culture, and this would require the establishment of recreational centres.

Members described their personal experience of the misery and hardship created by alcohol...
abuse, which was described as “destroying the fabric of society.” There was extended debate over whether alcohol advertising should be banned altogether, or partially restricted, or whether advertisements should all depict the negative consequences of alcohol abuse.

Beerhalls, which had once destroyed family lives, had now been replaced with a proliferation of illegal shebeens. The great majority of shebeens were long established, operated over weekends and sold low volumes to an established client base. Most shebeen owners were women, who traded liquor as a means of survival. The scale of informal, unregulated, liquor trading in the townships was too large – too many entrepreneur livelihoods were at stake and the demand for a diversity of outlets for drinking (and access to liquor) was too high – for law enforcement to control illegal trade. Regulation could provide a means of empowerment for a broad base of micro-entrepreneurs in the liquor industry.

Distell warned that a blanket ban on liquor advertising would result in job losses throughout the value chain, affecting advertising agencies and their suppliers, media houses and sponsored sports bodies.

A Member proposed that in the light of the impact of alcohol abuse, the liquor industry needed to make major contributions through their corporate social investment (CSI) programmes. A way to address the matter was to link the industry’s CSI contributions to a percentage of its profits. He was supported by the Chairperson, who said the Committee was hammering mining houses, over which it also had oversight, and other companies for not taking charge of their CSI programmes.

Source: Parliamentary Monitoring Group (https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/14838/).
No changes made to original materials.
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/za/

Role and effects of alcohol advertising in sport: meeting with stakeholders
Sport and Recreation, 28 October 2013, Chairperson: Mr M Mdakane (ANC)

Meeting Summary
At the outset, the Chairperson noted that no bill had been presented to Parliament therefore it would be inappropriate for the Committee to discuss the banning of alcohol advertising and sponsorship in sports. Instead the Committee would have an open discussion with stakeholders about the role of advertising in sports and how it pertained to the development of sports in South Africa.

BMI Sports Information informed the Committee that the sport sponsorship market in South Africa had been consistently growing for decades, from being a R63 million industry in 1985 to a R4.596 billion industry in 2012. Since the 2010 FIFA World Cup growth in sport sponsorship had decreased. Sponsors in South Africa were becoming more cautious and moving towards signing short-term contracts and many sports were feeling pressure from
this, including the big three of soccer, rugby and cricket. Whenever sponsors backed out the sporting industry then looked to the government for support and this could put a great strain on the already thin resources of the Department of Sports and Recreation.

BMI Sports Information stated that alcohol companies spent a great deal of funds on advertising on sports events. Television would be the greatest loser as a result of an alcohol ad ban as alcohol advertising was most prominent during live sporting events. Television advertising for alcoholic beverages accounted for 73.5% of spending for companies. When the tobacco ad banning was implemented the industry was a quarter of the size it was in 2012. Many comparisons had been made between the two areas, but this was unfair. The loss of tobacco advertising was not as big of a deal due to the emergence of IT companies and telecommunications companies. Those companies filled the gap that tobacco advertising left. If alcohol advertising was banned there was no new industry to take its place. Furthermore, telecommunications companies were reducing their spending on sports advertising and putting their funding focus elsewhere.

BMI noted that 26% of all alcohol sold in South Africa was done outside the formal channels and held the belief that it was from this area that alcohol abuse problems stemmed from. This area must be addressed in order for alcohol abuse numbers to decrease. Banning alcohol sponsorship and advertising would affect the GDP of the country as it would be reduced by R7.4 billion and would add to the unemployment problem of the country.

The Industry Association for Responsible Alcohol Use (ARA) highlighted that literature on the influence of advertising on alcohol consumption had proven to be lengthy and mostly contradictory. Alcohol was a mature product category in which consumers were already aware of the product and its basic characteristics. Advertisers did not aim to increase total consumption rather they aimed to encourage consumers to switch to their product and create brand loyalty. Many scientific studies concluded that parental education, poverty, unemployment and peer pressure were more influential in alcohol consumption. There was no statistical relationship between per capita alcohol consumption and per capita advertising expenditure on alcohol beverages. Both government and the industry agreed that alcohol abuse was at unacceptable levels in South Africa, but virtually all scientific evidence demonstrated that alcohol advertising bans had little to no impact on overall consumption. The ARA held the belief that a set of carefully targeted policies, restrictions, and laws covering a range of measures far wider than advertising would be much more preferable.

According to the ARA, the problems in South Africa did not lay with alcohol consumption, rather with alcohol abuse and it was wrong to demonize all consumption. The ARA was open to discuss and make concessions when addressing abuse, as it agreed that the status quo could not remain. The World Health Organisation (WHO) recommended the regulation of alcohol advertising and not an outright ban. New regulations paired with targeted interventions were what the ARA believed to be the proper steps in addressing alcohol abuse. Including tailoring plans to individual, societal, and cultural differences, by doing this the factors leading to alcohol abuse would be better understood.
Members thanked the ARA and BMI for their presentations and despite the fact that they could not comment directly on the proposed bans, they still found the information to be very relevant and helpful. Members asked what kind of education was available to consumers as well as to sellers. Members also praised the common sense approach taken by the presenters but hoped that lessons had been learned from the tobacco advertising ban. Some Members emphasised that stronger regulations would help in the battle against alcohol abuse because banning was not a reasonable solution. The Director General of the Department of Recreation was present and made a brief statement revealing that the Cabinet had approved a draft bill on the matter of banning alcohol sponsorship and advertising and that it would appear in Parliament soon. He noted that the Department had supported the tobacco ban under the impression that it would receive funds through the sin tax, but this did not happen. The Department would ensure that its interests were covered this time and would refuse to rely on an unwritten promise. The revenues generated by the alcohol industry were essential to the Department and their sponsorship of organisations and events was essential.

No changes made to original materials.
[https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/za/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/za/)

During this phase of the policy process, certain actors who were opposed to the draft bill and a ban on alcohol advertising also appeared to use a range of personal and professional attacks to intimidate, discredit and demobilize actors who were in favour of the draft bill and the ban on alcohol advertising. The evidence for this includes:

- An opinion letter that appeared in a major daily newspaper, with the aim of undermining the credibility of a public health researcher (July 2011);
- The owner of a media and communications company placed an advert in a Sunday newspaper attacking the research and credibility of a health promotion advocate, on the grounds that she was a Muslim and therefore had ulterior motives (September 2012);
- A personal and belligerent letter written by a board member of a major South African alcohol company to a public health academic who supported the draft bill (2011-2012);
- A meeting wherein a delegation from the alcohol industry and their legal representative met with the head of the organisation that employed a proponent of the draft bill to complain about newspaper articles the proponent had been quoted in; and
- The same media and communications company owner took out another advert, this time questioning the motives of the funders of a public health advocacy organisation (January 2013)
In addition, outside of parliamentary or other processes, the alcohol industry tried to create their own forums or platforms for engagement with policymakers and the dissemination of their messages. An example of this is a panel discussion / debate on the advantages and disadvantages of banning alcohol advertising that was planned for August 2013, on the initiative of a communications consultancy and the Industry Association for Responsible Alcohol Use (ARA). The potential participants included South Africa’s Minister of Health, the Chairperson of the governing African National Congress’ Education and Health Sub-Committee, the authors of the alcohol industry’s consultancy report, and the Chairman of the ARA. However, the event was cancelled after the National Department of Health withdrew, following complaints by members of civil society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did the alcohol industry want?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The alcohol industry wanted to maintain the status quo, i.e. to have no draft bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alcohol industry argued that government could do more to enforce existing regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alcohol industry wanted to be seen as part of the solution to alcohol-related harms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was argued that corporate social responsibility initiatives made a big positive contribution to addressing alcohol abuse. Increased corporate social initiatives and closer partnership with government bodies were offered. Corporate social responsibility was seemingly used to foster a positive image of the alcohol industry and to offer compromises that would steer the process away from the intended ban.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2014 to May 2017**

In this period, the positions of a further two key stakeholders came to the foreground.

The first was the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). Initially, the SABC was neutral towards the idea of a ban on alcohol advertising. In July 2015, the Chairperson of the SABC board was of the opinion that any such ban would not affect the organisation and that it would, in fact, be an opportunity to engage other advertisers. However, in April 2016 the Minister of Communications instructed the SABC to gauge the financial consequences such a ban would have. A year later, in May 2017, the SABC switched to a position of opposition, maintaining that it would lose R857 million per year if a ban on alcohol advertising were to be instituted.

The second was the National Department of Sport and Recreation (SRSA). Documents from this department indicated that it was concerned about the draft bill as it could negatively
affect some of its sources of funding. Over time, officials from this department also expressed these and other concerns, as highlighted from these extracts of meetings in Parliament.

**Role and effects of alcohol advertising in sport: meeting with stakeholders**

Sport and Recreation, 28 October 2013, Chairperson: Mr M Mdakane (ANC)

The Director General of the Department of Recreation was present and made a brief statement revealing that the Cabinet had approved a draft bill on the matter of banning alcohol sponsorship and advertising and that it would appear in Parliament soon. He noted that the Department had supported the tobacco ban under the impression that it would receive funds through the sin tax, but this did not happen. The Department would ensure that its interests were covered this time and would refuse to rely on an unwritten promise. The revenues generated by the alcohol industry were essential to the Department and their sponsorship of organisations and events was essential.

Source: Parliamentary Monitoring Group ([https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/16649/](https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/16649/)). Extract from full meeting summary

**Boxing SA, South African Institute for Drug-Free Sport & Department of Sport and Recreation 2016 Strategic & Annual Performance Plan**

Sport and Recreation, 06 April 2016, Chairperson: Ms B Dlulane (ANC)

Speaking to the proposed ban on alcohol advertising, Mr Moemi [Director-General, SRSA] said that SRSA’s interactions with DoH [National Department of Health], Cabinet and the Inter-ministerial Committee were still stagnant because the Department had indicated that it would not support a Bill that would not address the issue of imposing a levy to protect the interests of sport and recreation, arts and culture. The current deadlock was the NT [National Treasury]. [National Treasury] was the only department that could put a levy in that Bill, and it would have to champion the Bill as a Money Bill, but was not keen to do that. Alcohol was a social issue, but in solving that problem it would be creating another. The DoH and Department of Social Development (DSD) were quite frustrated as they had thought they would be done with the Bill by 2016. SRSA was also still waiting for a full report of the regulatory assessment that the two Departments had done, as they had earlier given SRSA a report without recommendations. SRSA had learned since that even the independent regulatory assessor had advised the two Departments that a total ban on alcohol advertising would not only affect sports but would also destroy industries.

Source: Parliamentary Monitoring Group ([https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/22290/](https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/22290/)). Extract from full meeting summary; information for clarification inserted in square brackets

[https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/za/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/za/)
Proponents of the draft bill, as well as discussion documents of the African National Congress and minutes of meetings in Parliament suggested that turning the draft bill into a Money Bill could offset the losses of SRSA. Money Bills are distinguished from other legislation by the fact that they appropriate money, impose national taxes or levies, or changes or grant exemptions from national taxes and levies.

Such bills can only be introduced into Parliament by the Minister of Finance, the political head of National Treasury. With respect to the draft bill, one idea that was mooted was a levy of 2,5% on the sale of alcoholic drinks to fund sporting events. However, for reasons that are not clear National Treasury did not want to do this and so the minutes of the National Assembly’s Committee on Sport and Recreation in April 2016 noted a deadlock due to SRSA’s opposition and National Treasury’s unwillingness to go the route of a Money Bill.

And so, the support of actors such as the Minister of Health, the National Department of Health, the National Department of Social Development, public health researchers, and civil society health promotion advocates combined with the resistance of the alcohol industry, advertising industry, media industry, and National Department of Sport and Recreation, as well as National Treasury’s unwillingness to introduce a Money Bill to ensure that by May 2017 the draft bill had not been published in the Government Gazette, released for public comment, or introduced in the legislature.

This case study is based on:

Background information was drawn from:
Sample student tasks / assessments
This section contains examples of in-class exercises for students and assignments and/or examinations after the completion of course work that can draw on this case study. These are by no means the only way of structuring student engagement and they can, of course, be adapted to suit different courses and contexts.

Option 1: Using the case study to build to a group presentation at the end of the course
This option is feasible when the course stretches over a number of days or weeks. The students typically analyse a different aspect of the case study each day or week, and finally consolidate the different parts into a group presentation on the final day of the course.

Source:
Health Policy and Policy Analysis: Training Manual
http://www.hpsa-africa.org/index.php/modules-courses/modules-courses/16-teaching-resources/modules-courses/54-health-policy-analysis-module

Group Policy Analysis
Introduction to the Group Work Sessions

Your group’s tasks:
1. To read, discuss and analyse the policy scenario (using the questions provided as a guide)
2. To make an overall judgement about the success or failure of the experience of policy change described in your scenario
3. To prepare a presentation that outlines your overall judgement on the success or failure of this policy change and explains this judgment with reference to the main strengths and weaknesses of the policy process described in the scenario.

Time allocated for the analysis and preparation of presentation: three sessions of 2.5 hours each, plus evening work as needed.

Time allocated for the presentation: 15 minutes

Homework to prepare for the first meeting of the group:
1. Read your group’s scenario.
2. Complete Form 1: a timeline for the policy process described in your scenario.
3. Consider this question: Does the scenario report a success or a failure in policy change? Record your ideas.

Form 1: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year / date</th>
<th>Key event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Group Work Sessions

Beware:
- Some of the guiding questions may not be relevant to your group’s scenario;
- To answer some questions you may need more information than presented in the scenario outline: if so, identify the gaps and decide whether they are important to raise in your presentation;
- Always look for evidence and examples to explain or justify your responses to the questions AND the conclusions you make in your presentation;
- You will need a system to help you keep track of ideas and group similar ideas together (use diagrams, charts, coloured crayons...); and
- Time is limited – avoid spending too long discussing irrelevant or relatively minor issues.

Group work skills
Everyone in your group has a contribution to make to the analysis and the presentation. Develop some ‘ground rules’ so you can all work effectively together (for example, listening, allowing each person an equal time to speak, sharing roles to allow different people to record, chair or keep time).

Group Work Session 1

Introductory discussion – using the completed homework, briefly consider:
- What was the policy of focus?
- What and when were the key events in the policy process?
- Do you judge the policy experience to have been a success or failure? (you will keep reviewing this point so you don’t need to come to a final conclusion yet!)

Understanding actors:
- Who were the key actors involved in:
  - the policy development process/es?
  - the policy implementation process/es?
  (Were there any alliances or networks among the actors?)
- Which actors had most influence over the policy process as a whole or particular elements within it? In what way/s did they influence the process? How and why were they able to exert that influence?
• Which actors were not involved that could have been involved?
• How did actors’ decisions and actions (or lack of decisions/actions) influence the success or failure of the policy experience (according your judgement)?

Planning your presentation
• Which of the issues that you have discussed today would be useful to include in your final presentation?

Group Work Session 2

Identifying key contextual features:
• What are the contextual factors that led to the initiation and development of this policy, and how did they influence the success or failure of policy development?
• What contextual factors were important in the implementation phase? How did they influence the success or failure of policy implementation? (remember to consider, in particular, how context influenced actors).

Considering policy content:
• Were there any important differences between key actors in how they understood the policy?
• How did the key characteristics of the policy influence the success or failure of the experience of policy change? (Remember to consider how the policy content influenced actors’ responses to it).

Stakeholder analysis:
• Complete the attached stakeholder analysis tables (forms 2 and 3).

Planning your presentation
• Which of the issues that you have discussed today would be useful to include in your final presentation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM 2: ANALYSING ACTORS’ POSITIONS AND POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### FORM 3: THE ACTOR POSITION AND POWER MAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER OF ACTOR</th>
<th>Enthusiastic</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
<th>Hesitant/indifferent</th>
<th>Uncooperative</th>
<th>Hostile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Group Work Session 3

Remember you also have to develop your plan for your presentation in this session!

**Analysing strategies (micro-processes)**
- What were the key strategies used in this policy experience to a) manage actors, b) enable policy development (e.g. structures, committees) and c) support implementation (e.g. communication, phasing, capacity development etc.)?
- In terms of the overall success or failure of the policy experience, which strategies had most influence and why? How, if at all, did features of the policy content or context impact shape the relative influence of these key strategies?

**Planning your presentation**
- Which of the issues that you have discussed today would be useful to include in your final presentation?
Assessment criteria: Group Policy Analysis Presentation

**Group Work Presentation**
Your presentation will need to:

- Outline your group’s overall judgement on the success or failure of this policy change; and
- Explain your judgement by reference to the main strengths and weaknesses of the policy process described in the scenario.

**Assessment criteria**
In marking the presentations we will be looking for evidence of your understanding and abilities in relation to two broad areas:

1. Content i.e. knowledge and understanding of the material covered in the course;
2. Form, i.e. ability to present a clear and logical argument using this knowledge.

In addition, we will be considering some basic issues about the presentation and group work experience. The specific criteria we will use are outlined in the table below. Each presentation will be marked by two people using these guidelines and the final mark will represent the combination of their marks. Each group will also conduct its own assessment of its own group work functioning, to be drawn into this evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Allocation of mark (out of a total of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set (1): Knowledge of subject area (policy analysis)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shows understanding of the key approaches of policy analysis</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriately includes issues from all group work sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated understanding of terms and concepts introduced in the course sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies how interactions between elements of the policy triangle influence the experiences considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriately and correctly uses information from the scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set (2): Structure and argument</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answers the question posed and presents a clear and logically ordered argument</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides adequate justification for argument through the appropriate selection and use of evidence</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of originality in argument, extra work and initiative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set (3): Verbal presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeps to time</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legible overheads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-assessment of your own group’s functioning

Group name (or policy scenario):

Think about the way you have worked as a group during the Group Work Sessions.

1. Take 2-3 minutes initially to reflect individually on your group functioning, considering questions like:
   a. Has everyone participated in some way?
   b. Was anyone too dominant or too quiet?
   c. Has there been openness and courtesy to all?
   d. Did you share tasks appropriately?
   e. Have you learnt from others in the group through the discussions?
   f. Were you able to manage the time available effectively?
   g. Did you manage the process of preparing the presentation as effectively as possible within the time available?
   h. Did you enjoy the group work?

2. Take 5-10 minutes to share your views with each other.

3. As a group, make a final overall judgement about your group functioning (circle one):

   Bad   Poor   Fair   Good   Excellent

*Please think about the lessons you can draw for yourself from this experience, to take forward into group situations in the future.*

*Finally, please return one form per group to the course organisers.*
Option 2: An essay-type assignment with limited guidance on the policy analyses to include
This assignment mentions the application of the policy analysis triangle, but otherwise gives students substantial freedom to decide on specific aspects of analysis and the theories and concepts they want to incorporate into the analysis.

Source:
Health Policy and Policy Analysis: Training Manual
http://www.hpsa-africa.org/index.php/modules-courses/modules-courses/16-teaching-resources/modules-courses/54-health-policy-analysis-module

Individual assignment

Tasks:
Prepare an individual report of between 5000 and 6000 words that provides:

• Part 1: An analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the policy change experience presented in your scenario, that
  o provides an initial brief and basic description of the experience
  o presents a reasoned and justified argument about whether it was a success or failure (or had elements of both), explaining this judgement through a careful assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the experience
  o uses a policy analysis approach to describe and explain this experience in an integrated way.

• Part 2: A set of relevant and justified proposals about EITHER (a) How ‘you’ would have strengthened policy development and implementation over the period considered in the scenario; OR (b) How ‘you’ would strengthen policy development and implementation from the time at which the scenario ends.

NB For Part 2, always make clear whose perspective you are adopting in presenting your response i.e. spell out who ‘you’ are; and think carefully which option is most relevant to your scenario.

Important notes about assignment topic:
• Your response to part 1 requires an analysis that recognises the inter-linkages between the four elements of the policy triangle as influences over the policy process, and might be undertaken by applying particular concepts and/or a specific conceptual framework.
• Only answer one part of (a) or (b) for section 2.

Marking criteria and approach:
Assignments will be awarded a final percentage mark that can be broadly categorised as below.
Using the detailed criteria outlined below, the award of a:

- fail mark will reflect consistently poor levels of performance;
- pass mark will reflect more adequate than poor performance levels;
- fair pass mark will reflect generally adequate performance levels;
- good pass mark will reflect some adequate and some good performance levels;
- distinction mark will reflect generally good performance levels.

**Assessment criteria:**
In marking the assignments we will be looking for evidence of your understanding and abilities in relation to two broad areas:

- Content i.e. knowledge and understanding of the material covered in the module;
- Form i.e. ability to present a clear and logical argument using this knowledge.

In addition, we will be considering some basic issues about how you addressed the question.

Given the assignment tasks we will assess these areas of understanding and ability using the following criteria sets (together accounting for around 75 out of 100 marks with items 2, 3 and 4 counting most).

**Assignment task Part 1**

a) Provides an initial brief and basic description of policy experience of focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor answer</th>
<th>Adequate answer</th>
<th>Good answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Poorly structured: no sense of chronology, repetition, some points not necessary, contradictions</td>
<td>• Offers generally clear structure and chronology of events, using enough and appropriate information, little or no unnecessary information</td>
<td>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No sense of context of experience</td>
<td>• Contextualises problem and experience</td>
<td>• Offering better structured presentation of greater clarity, whilst being succinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too long in relation to rest of assignment</td>
<td>• Appropriate length relative to rest of assignment</td>
<td>• Using policy analysis ideas and approaches appropriately in way structures and presents description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Presents a reasoned and justified argument about whether it was a success or failure (or had elements of both), explaining this judgement through a careful assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor answer</th>
<th>Adequate answer</th>
<th>Good answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does not make clear</td>
<td>Clear judgement made which</td>
<td>Moves beyond adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judgement OR Judgement not based on evidence or analysis of strengths and weaknesses as presented in assignment AND/OR
• Judgement based on poor review of evidence available (ignoring some important elements of experience that contradict judgement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor answer</th>
<th>Adequate answer</th>
<th>Good answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No analysis – only outlines features of experience in limited detail, without use of policy analysis concepts or frameworks OR • Only limited use of relevant analytic framework, e.g. only categorises issues using elements of the policy analysis triangle, does not consider interactions between elements, uses policy analysis concepts incorrectly and without explanation • Colloquialism: style of language and use of description couched in common sense evaluation (could have written without doing module)</td>
<td>• Mostly works coherently with the policy analysis triangle as an integrated analytic framework, e.g. appropriately categorises issues, analysis structured in way that draws out and discusses some of the interactions between issues in different categories • Uses policy analysis concepts appropriately and with adequate explanation</td>
<td>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g. • offering more comprehensive use of policy analysis concepts and approaches, perhaps drawing on additional concepts or frameworks • critically reflecting on the policy analysis approach as applied in assignment, developing or adapting frameworks used in relation to the problem of focus or critiquing the approach (author provides own ideas or views, appropriately justified)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assignment task Part 2**

a) Perspective

   a. Poor performance = actor perspective being adopted not made clear and/or does not make clear which option addressing in response and/or tries to address both options of Part 2.

   b. Adequate/Good performance = actor perspective and option addressing clearly stated and only one option considered.

b) Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor answer</th>
<th>Adequate answer</th>
<th>Good answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• inappropriate to stated perspective</td>
<td>• appropriate to stated perspective</td>
<td>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• based on everyday knowledge rather than conclusions or ideas that are drawn from the analysis presented in the assignment</td>
<td>• derived from analysis presented in essay</td>
<td>• using policy analysis ideas or concepts to generate ideas about strategic interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• addresses only small part of experience as presented in part 1</td>
<td>• addresses main issues in experience raised in part 1</td>
<td>• taking into account contextual opportunities &amp; constraints for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• focuses on a few individual problems as presented and so does not take comprehensive approach to addressing problems outlined</td>
<td>• attempts to address problems as a whole</td>
<td>• critically reflecting on interventions proposed (e.g. author presents own ideas that clarify the purpose of using them, the potential for unintended consequences, the need to link up strategies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Both parts of assignment**

a) Use of concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor answer</th>
<th>Adequate answer</th>
<th>Good answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Little or not use of concepts OR largely confusing and inappropriate use of concepts</td>
<td>• Largely tacit use of concepts, where concepts not spelt out, explained or critiqued, but underlie analysis and largely used appropriately</td>
<td>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Generally explaining concepts clearly when used, and uses them appropriately in analyzing experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Justifying and explaining meaning and/or concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given normal expectations of post-graduate work, we will also apply the following additional sets of criteria in assessing your essay (together accounting for around 25 out of 100 marks).

**Evidence of reading and research around the problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor answer</th>
<th>Adequate answer</th>
<th>Good answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Course material not used OR little used</td>
<td>• Course material used within analysis</td>
<td>• Course material and perhaps other relevant texts used in assignment in ways that illuminate experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structure and argument**

- Poor: language and argument unclear: difficult for reader to grasp issues at stake; assignment consists of description and/or discrete points that are not linked to other points through logical connectors (e.g. I judge/think xx because yy)
- Adequate: has a clear structure – introduction, body and conclusion with generally clear arguments within sections
- Good: not only carefully structured but also clear and logical interconnections between points and sections

**Academic literacy**

- Good/Adequate performance: Appropriate spelling and grammar; uses appropriate referencing conventions; appropriate word length
- Poor performance: Poor spelling and grammar; does not reference material correctly; considerable over or under word limit
Option 3: An essay-type assignment with stronger guidance on the policy analyses that students should include

Unlike the assignment in Option 2, this assignment specifically requires a stakeholder analysis and an analysis of the policy characteristics.

Source:
Understanding and Analysing Health Policy – Module guide (2016)

Assignment:

Analyse the process of formulation / implementation of the policy described in the scenario, using the policy triangle and some of the tools introduced in the module:

• Conduct a stakeholder analysis.
• Sketch the policy context.
• Do a policy characteristics analysis.
• Explore the strategies employed in policy implementation.
• Argue what you think the strengths and weaknesses of the policy process have been, and how actors, contexts and policy content have interacted with each other
• Make two or three suggestions about measures which could have improved the policy process and success and motivate each with a few paragraphs. Draw particularly on the last two sessions of the module and what you learned about strategies for policy change.

Please submit and essay of between 3000 and 4000 words. Use the literature used in this module and reference correctly.