

Tecana American University

Post-Doctorate Program in Public Health with an Emphasis in Epidemiology and Research



Analysis and Management of Public Policies

**“I hereby swear and bear witness that I am the sole author of this report and that its
content is the fruit of my work, experience and academic research”**

January/2019

Abstract

The whole has awakened on matters of health whereby recognition of the importance of public health to safe, sustainable health societies is growing. Achievement of public health realized in the 19th century have far much been overshadowed by those in the 20th century due to advances in personal care, in particular in hospital care. Currently, there are inevitable limits of individuals' health care and the need to have such services complimented with effective public health strategies. More so, it has become important to have policies which initiate measures and regulation towards certain acts in the sector. Formulation of public policies has become part of the many strategies which are being used by governments to ensure developments in their states. They essentially capture the intentions of the governments to enhance governance. They act as set of guidelines which enable the public to measure the achievements of the government.

Research Report 4

Anzaku, Peter Joseph

A06870427

Introduction

Public policy happens to be principle guide of action which is followed by administrative branches while solving a particular issue. Its foundation is composed of national constitutional laws and regulations. It has its main partisans who include the judiciary and legislature. The judiciary is involved with the interpretation of the rules which are generally authorized by the legislature. The aim of the report is to systematize the construct of various models which facilitate implementation of public policies. The study consists of literature review of various models and tends to identify; how each of the models integrate the policy process changes and the stability and the explanatory objectives in the dimensions.

General Objective

To offer an understanding on the factors making up the actors who tend to influence public policy development and implementation.

Specific Objectives

- To explore an understanding of public policy and its various actors
- To understand some of the models which are used when creating and implementing public policies

- To outline the methods which are used in evaluating the implementation of public policies to ensure their effectiveness

Justification

It is important to formulate and implements public policies noting that they offer an explanation to a solution which one is likely to achieve once a certain problem has been solved. In other words, it includes some of the problems that the public is likely to resolve. The main aim of a public policy is solving a problem, therefore, the guide of action to various actors who are involved in the process of formulating and implementing the public policy are required to be smart. This is the reason why the whole process has to be redefined, expounded and analyzed to create more insights on the main actors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

Abstract..... ii

Report 4..... iii

Introduction..... iii

General Objective iii

Specific Objectives iii

Justification..... v

1.0 Chapter One: Analysis and Management of Public Policies..... 1

1.1 Definition and Scope 1

1.2 Introduction to Public Policy 1

1.3 Characteristic of Public Policy..... 2

1.4 Characteristic of Public Policy Making 3

1.5 Types of public policy 4

Regulatory public policy 4

Distributive public policy 5

Redistributive public policy 5

1.6 Health policy 6

1.6.1 The health policy triangle 7

1.7 The state and public policy 8

1.7.1 The role of the state in health systems 8

Licensed providers and facilities..... 8

1.8 The for-profit sector and health policy 10

1.9 Ways in which the private sector is involved in health policy..... 10

2.0 Chapter Two: literature Review 12

2.1 The Concept from Policy Process..... 12

2.2 Advocacy Coalition Framework 14

2.3 The multiple streams model.....	17
2.4 The punctuated equilibrium model	18
2.5 Agenda and formulation of public policies.....	18
2.6 Actors of public policy.....	19
2.6.1 The government	19
2.6.2 Characterizing government systems	20
2.6.3 Federal versus unitary system.....	20
2.6.5 Identification of a Problem And Its Magnitude	21
3.0 Chapter Three: Research Methodology.....	23
3.1 Implementation of public policy	23
3.2 Early theoretical models used in policy implementation	24
3.2.1 Top-down approaches.....	24
3.2.2 Bottom-up approaches	27
3.2.3 Other Models Which Can Be Used To Understand Policy Implementation.....	29
Principle-agent theory	29
The nature of the policy problem.....	30
The context of circumstances which surrounds a problem	31
3.3 Factors which shape the policy implementation choices of the governments	32
4.0 Conclusion	34
4.1 Recommendations.....	34
4.2 Monitoring and evaluation of public policies	35
Methodologies or dimensions for analyzing policies.....	36
Dimensions when evaluating policies.....	36
Reference list	38
Appendix.....	39

1.0 Chapter One: Analysis and Management of Public Policies

1.1 Definition and Scope

The study of public policy including various methods of policy analysis is considered to be the most rapidly developing fields in the health sector because it aids in making an advanced analysis of the public health and management policies. For several decades, the study of public policy has emerged as an analysis which enhance better understanding of the policy making process and it supply the policy decision makers with policy relevant knowledge concerning a pressing economic and other social problems.

1.2 Introduction to Public Policy

Public policy can be defined as a principled guide to action which the administrative braches of the state take with regard to a class of issue and in a way that is consistent with law and institutional customs. It can also be defined as proposed course of action of the government, a person or a group within a certain environment providing either obstacles or opportunities which the policy is expected to utilize and overcome in an effort to reach particular goals or realize an objective or purpose. It is a process about selecting strategies and making choices (Bhattacharya & Bhattacharya, 2013). It includes some steps such as getting of agenda, policy adoption, policy formulation and policy implementation. Public policy has been as old as the government.

From the definitions offered above, it is clears that the said public policies are governmental decisions and they result from the activities that the government undertakes while in pursuance of certain goals or objectives. While formulating and implementing a public policy, it is clear

that a well-planned pattern or course of activity will be involved. In this regard, there must be a thorough close-knit relationship between all the government agencies including the executive, judiciary and the legislature.

1.3 Characteristic of Public Policy

They are goals oriented – it is true that public policies are formulated and implemented with an aim of attaining the objectives which the government has in view for the ultimate benefit of the whole population. In this regard, the public policies sell out the programs of the government.

They are considered to be the outcome of the collective actions of the government – public policies tend to be a pattern, or a course of activity designed by the government officials and actors in a collective sense rather than being termed as their discrete and segregated decisions.

It is what the federal authorities actually decides or choose to do – it tends to be the relationship of the government units and specific field of political environment in a specific administrative system. In most cases, it takes various forms such as the law, ordinances, executive orders, court decisions and others.

It is positive in the sense that it indicates the concern of the government and involves various action to a particular problem on which the policy is made – public administration has the sanction of law and authority behind it. in this regard, it may involve certain decisions by the government officials of not taking any action on a particular issue.

1.4 Characteristic of Public Policy Making

Below are some of the major characteristics of public policy making;

Public policy making is considered to a complex process: policy making is comprised of many components which are all interconnected by communication and feedback loops which tend to interact in different ways. Some of the processes of forming the policies are explicit and directly observable, but there are others which proceed through hidden channels that it is only the officials themselves who are aware of (Patel & Rushefsky, 2015). The hidden procedures tend to be difficult and often impossible to observe. In this regard, guidelines are mostly formed by a series of single decisions which in most cases result to a policy with no any decision makers being aware of that process.

It is a dynamic process – policy making is considered to be a continuing activity which takes place within a particular structure. If the process will be sustainable, then it requires a continuing input of resources and motivation. It is considered as a dynamic process which tends to change with time. The sequences of all its sub-process and phases tend to vary internally and are with respect to each other.

It comprises various components – the complexity experienced while formulating public policies is considered to be an important characteristic of policy making. The formulation process mostly involves a great variety of substructures. The identity of the substructures and the degree of their involvement in policy making tends to vary due to various issues, societal values and circumstances.

It lays down major guidelines – in most cases, public policies tend to lay down general directives, rather than detailed instruction on the course of action to be taken. After the main action has been decided, detailed sub-policies that tend to translate the general theory into more concrete terms are usually needed to execute it.

Result into action – decision making in most cases result into action because the policies of the most significant decision –making are intended to result in action. More so, most of the policies are directed at the policy making apparatus itself including the efficiency drive in the government which are action oriented.

1.5 Types of public policy

There are three major types of public policy which include; distributive, redistributive and regulatory policy where each of the type has its own special purpose.

Regulatory public policy

The main aim of having regulatory policies is to maintain order and also to prohibit behaviors that tend to endanger the society. This is a goal that the government has tried to accomplish by restricting its citizens, groups or corporations from being involved in the actions which negatively affect social and political order. Some of the examples involved include the attempts to administer voting procedures, prohibiting people from using certain drugs and providing traffic ordinances. More so, the regulatory policies protect economic activities and business markets by prohibiting the industry from being involved in practices which are detrimental to the free market such as coming up with monopolies. The regulatory evidence also tend to be evident in environments which tend to use laws which are designed to protect the workplace and the environment.

Distributive public policy

This refers to the provision of various benefits to individuals, groups or corporation in a certain country. The governments tend to use the distributive strategy to encourage specific activities. The tax abatements and farm subsidies tend to promote economic development whereas the tax write offs for homeowners tend to promote the housing industry. The distributive policy is also evident when the government tends to promote the purchase of it savings bonds.

Redistributive public policy

The main aim of this kind of a policy is to promote equality. The government tends to redistribute societal wealth from a certain group to another. This process takes place when the government provides specific benefits directly to its citizens via social programs such as the welfares. Progressive taxation, where tax rates tend to increase while income increases is another form of redistributive policy.

The health sector is an important part of the economy in many countries despite the notion of it being like a sponge – absorbing large portion of the national resources. It is viewed as a driver of the economy via innovation and investment in the bio-medical technologies or production and sales of pharmaceuticals, or through ensuring a healthy population which is economically productive. Most of the individuals come into contact with the health sector as clients, patients, health professionals either in hospitals, clinics or pharmacies. Due to the nature of decision making in health which in most cases involves a matter of death and life, health tend to be accorded a special position when compared to other social issues. Health also tends to be affected by decisions which have nothing to do with health care such as poverty, pollution and sanitation.

Economic policies such as taxes on cigarette and alcohol consumption also tend to have some impact on health. In this regard, it is important to understand the relationship that exists between health policy and health, if the stakeholders will be able to tackle some of the major health problems in the society. To understand the relationship, it is important to first define the meaning of health policy.

1.6 Health policy

A policy is often a thought of a decision which is taken by the people who are responsible for a given policy area such as the health sector, environment or in education. Those people who tend to make policies are referred to as policy makers. Policies are made at different levels may it be in the central or local government, local businesses or multinational company, in a school or hospital. The people who make these policies are sometimes referred to as policy elites or a specific group of people who are in high job ranking positions in a company and in most cases, who have privileged access to other top members of the same level. Health policy is considered as the decisions, plans and actions which are undertaken to achieve specific healthcare goals with a particular society. The world health organization has indicated several things which the health policy can achieve whereby; it defines a vision for the future, it builds consensus and informs people and outlines priorities and the expected roles of different groups. There are several categories which are related to public health such as the tobacco control policy, vaccination policy and breastfeeding promotion policy. Health related policies tend to be complex but conceptual model show the flow from health-related policy development to health-related policy and program implementation and to health systems and health outcomes.

It is important to understand policy more than a national law or health policy that tend to support a program or intervention. Nevertheless, the any policy is within the regulatory framework noting that they are primarily regulated by the constitution and the public administration act (Green, 2007). Policies also form an important part of all the regulations of the public service commission. Despite that these policies tend to be enacted by the central government, it is the work of the principal permanent secretary to issue directives.

A health policy may cover both public and private policies about health. These policies are assumed to embrace courses of action that have effect on a set of institutions, services, organization and funding arrangements of a health systems.

1.6.1 The health policy triangle

It is important to look at the content of a policy, the process of making it and how power is used in health policy. In this regard, the role or the notion of the state or the government of health policies ought to be addressed. Understanding the role of the state and other groups which makes up the national and global civil society is important to help in understanding how they interact and influence the health policy. It also helps in understanding the process through which such influences can be played out and the context in which the different processes and actors interact.

The triangle mainly focuses on three things which include context, process and content. The triangle is a simplified approach to complex set of inter-relationship and in most cases gives the impression that the four factors can be considered separately. Actors in the triangle include the individuals, organizations and the state or the government.

1.7 The state and public policy

Considering much of the twentieth century, the state has been a dominant player in the role of economies of most countries noting that; airlines were mainly owned and operated by the state which is the same with other utilities such as water, railways, telephones and electricity. Most of the government presided over commands and control economies in the context of rigid five-year development plans. In most of the newly independent countries, the government is considered to be a major employer.

1.7.1 The role of the state in health systems

By early 1980s, the state tends to have assumed a leading place in health care finances and also in-service delivery in various countries. More so, it played a central role in allocating resources among the health priorities which are competing and regulating a range of activities which impinge upon health. For the state to regulate the quantity and distribution of services, the state has;

Licensed providers and facilities

Placed controls on the size and number of medical schools and also controlled the number of doctors practicing in various areas. It has also limited the introduction of high technology.

The government has also provided incentives to practice in rural areas

To regulate the prices of services, the governments have;

- Negotiated salary scales
- Set charges
- Negotiated the reimbursement rates

To regulate the quality of health services, the government has;

- Licensed practitioners
- Registered facilities
- Controlled the nature of services provided
- Required providers to come up with complaints procedures
- Required the provision of information to enable them monitor quality
- Controlled the training curricula
- Set the requirements for continuing education
- Introduced accreditation of facilities

Despite that the state is the financier of health policies and facility, it is involved in the provision and regulation of health services and has assumed a range of public health functions. For example, the state;

- Ensure safe water and food purity
- Regulate roads and workplaces to reduce the threat of injuries
- Establish border and quarantine measures so as to stop the spread of infectious disease
- Legislate, aimed at curbing noise and environment pollution
- Set the standards for food labeling, the level of tar and nicotine in cigarettes and lead in petrol
- It regulates license industries as well as forcing them to adopt different technologies on public health grounds

1.8 The for-profit sector and health policy

As a result of the assault on the state both in the 1980s and 1990s, the private for-profit sector got an opportunity in health. Before the two decades mentioned above, the private sector was still active in terms of health service delivery, it did overlook the issues concerning health policies and regulation. Private for-profit sector is in most cases characterized by its market orientation whereby it encompasses the organizations that aim at making profits for their shareholders. The sector in most cases may consist of firms which may be large or small, domestic or multinational. In the health sector, they comprise of single doctor's surgeries and large group practices, generic drug manufacturers, pharmacies, major pharmaceutical companies, private hospitals, nursing homes and medical equipment suppliers.

Currently, the private sector is one of the most powerful actors in health policy due to the large amount of resources that it has. Power is the ability to achieve desired results and in most cases it is conferred by resources. The revenue being earned by private sectors has increased significantly which has made them significant players in the field. It is the core role of firms to provide the government with tax revenues, and having them as the major employers, they tend to gain influence on international affairs. In other cases, they have specialist knowledge which forces the government to rely on while making policies and regulations.

1.9 Ways in which the private sector is involved in health policy

One of the major ways through which the private sector has been involved in health policy is through self regulation. Self regulation concepts the efforts by private companies to come up with their own rules and policies which tend to operate within certain domains.

Some of these rules include the rules that govern how to design, categorize, produce and handle various goods and services which are routinely adopted by certain groups of companies and industry. There are two types of self regulation which include those attempts aimed at regulating the so-called private market standards and the regulation of social standards.

In the case of regulating market standards, concepts such as the aspects of products, business and process practice are some of the subject to self regulation which is taken into consideration to facilitate commerce. In the case of social standards, self-regulation is generally undertaken mainly to respond to some of the concerns which are raised by shareholders, consumers or due to the threat of impending public regulation which tend to be more onerous.

Apart from self regulation, the private sector has other tactics through which it influences public policy. There are firms which provide finances to the political parties during political campaigns aiming that once those parties are in office will be more responsive to the demands that they make in the policy process. More so, the private organization lobby for or against some of the policies that have been made by the government. It is also possible to wield influence through corporate participation in government committee and working groups. More so, corporate executive tends to compete for public office and if successful they take positions which are in line with business interests.

2.0 Chapter Two: literature Review

2.1 The Concept from Policy Process

The main aim of this section is to broaden the understanding pertaining policy process starting from the systematization of its main constructs while presenting various theoretical reflections and research agenda. This literature review is based on three models which include advocacy coalition's framework, multiple streams and the punctuated equilibrium theory which tend to be used in certain countries such as Brazil. The above theories tend to consider policy process as a product of the interaction of various variables, including institutions, ideas, actors and beliefs assuming that public policy is likely to result from these interactions after a certain time.

Public policy as a field of knowledge is known to have originated in the 1950s in the American political science. There are several definitions of the public policy some being captured on the introduction but one of the definitions indicate that policy creates politics and it has led to the understanding that public policy tends to originate from a process of disputes in various decision arenas (Friis, 2012). Currently, definitions indicate that public policy is more than just governmental decision because it may result from decisions and actions of other actors. More so, it can be influenced by ideologies, needs and interests of specific actors either formally or informally.

In early 1970s and 1980s, public policy begun to be presented as a science based on the development of various models of analysis which characterized the public policies inform of sequential steps. In most cases, models considered public policy to incorporate phases of agenda setting, policy formulation implementation and evaluation. The models mentioned have been criticized because they fail to incorporate the casual relationship, they undervalue the role played

by analysis and they are not precise when it comes to being descriptive. After the 1980s, scholars have been by trying to understand public policy by investigating 6 key elements which include; institutions, actors, subsystems, ideas, beliefs, events and contextual factors. It is the above-mentioned factors which tend to interact in what is known as policy process.

The concept from policy process bring the idea that most of the public policies are shaped at all stages by various types of actors and institutions who tend to establish the relationship based on their beliefs and interests in the defense of an idea. Their actions in most cases tend to be affected by the context in which they operate and influenced by external factors. Therefore, when one is analyzing the policy process, he or she is supposed to understand how the six factors mentioned above interact and influence the trajectory of public policies as they undergo different phases or stages. Therefore, when one is studying the policy process, he or she is trying to analyze the interactions which tend to occur over time between the public polices and actors, outcomes, events and contexts.

There are various theoretical models which have been developed to enhance detailing various aspects of policy process. Those that tend to be important are those known in the international literature and have been applied in various countries. These models include the multiple stream models which was proposed by John Kingdom in 1984, the punctuated equilibrium model from Baumgartner and Brian Jones in 1993, the advocacy coalition framework from Jekins-Smith and Paul Sabatier in 1993 and improved by the same authors in 1999. These models depict public policy as an unstable, complex and a process that is subject to power relations among other diverse actors.

Additionally, the policies include crucial variables such as ideas, public and media opinion where it considers them as important influences in the consolidation of any policy. These models have become attractive tools to study the process involved in constructing different policies and different realities as a result of their reach and potential to adapt thus allowing the analysis of various types of public policy.

Despite their similarities in many ways, each of the three model tend to have several analytical goals. The multiple streams model tends to focus on the various ways through which particular theme ascends to the government agenda. The advocacy coalition model on the other hand seeks to understand how arrangements are created between actors during the decision-making processes and how they happen to change over time. Additionally, the punctuated equilibrium model tends to explain the moment of abrupt change where most of the public polices happens to go through. This is a sign that the three models were formed and developed independently and parallel. The people who developed them did not present an initial concern regarding a common language or the comparability among the tools used. Nevertheless, the presented characteristics happen not to make the comparison unfeasible; on the contrary, they tend to reinforce the necessity of having a systematic review.

2.2 Advocacy Coalition Framework

The main aim of the model was to provide an alternative process of implementing policy implementation different from other models of public policy that used the notion of stages. According to the developers of the framework, models that make use of stages tend to lack conceptual robustness for the construction of casual hypothesis which are empirically testable.

The framework emphasizes more on the role of values and ideas which are embodied in the beliefs used to defend coalitions, it also seeks to build an overview of the functioning process of the public policy subsystem. The policy is characterized by an open system which is always subject with the environment and whose primary unit of the analysis happens to be the subsystem of the public policies. More so, it is an open system formed by a diversity of actors which are actively involved and concerned with particular political problems or issues.

Outside the subsystem of public policies, it happens that there are stable factors which sometimes are difficult to change which have great effect on the actor's actions which are within the subsystems. Some of these factors include: the distribution of natural resources, basic attributes of the field of the problem, social structure and socio-cultural value, and the structure of basic rules which are in the political systems. People who are actors in the described subsystems happen to be led by the beliefs which in most cases are shared on a specific area, while in an attempt to influence most of the decisions concerning the policy. In this regard, the coalition mostly has various interests which are either complementary or otherwise, happens to present a high degree of coordination of their activities so as to push forward their proposals for intervention in specific public policies. There are decisions on a public policy which result from the conflict between coalitions that happen to contribute to the development of constraints and/or incentives used for the adoption or change in a certain public policy.

Therefore, the model has been formulated to explain the moments of change, thus establishing hypothesis which indicate the necessary conditions which influence the change to occur. It has been stipulated that the change occur as a result of factors which are external to the subsystem. These factors include; the relatively stable parameters, major external shock and coalition

opportunity structures. Stable parameters happen to be the basic attributes of the problem recommended by a researcher to conduct an analysis. They include attributes such as the distribution of natural resources, social and constitutional structure, socio-cultural values which happens to present little change within a period of 10 years. Coalition opportunity structures tend to be the specific features of the political system that offer greater or lesser opportunity for coalitions to act based on their rules. Opportunity structures happen to be influenced by the parameters of the system which are relatively stable. Finally, some of the major external shock depicts changes in socioeconomic conditions found in the political regime, impact of decisions which are made in other subsystems and events of force majeure example being disasters.

As for the internal factors which are responsible for changes in the process of formulation and implementation of public policies they include; internal shocks, negotiate agreements and the political learning which has been built through the interaction of factors found in the subsystem over a particular span of time. Internal shocks include all the major events which have impact on the beliefs of the dominant coalition and have the capacity to cause a change of understanding on a particular problem and the way through which it is conducted (Hammaker, 2010). Negotiated agreements tend to be indicated as a path used to change when there are impasses, but there neither external nor internal shock to the subsystem. Finally, there is the political learning process which is a consequence of the negotiation process which takes place between members of several coalitions who are interested in understanding the reality to improve their political objectives. The political learning process tend to favor the accumulation of knowledge about specific characteristic of a problem and the factors that have effect on it, thus promoting the assessment of alternatives adopted and which have impact on the adoption of changes found in specific public policies.

2.3 The multiple streams model

As seen on the advocacy coalition framework, the multiple streams model was established aiming at providing a more comprehensive explanation pertaining the process of public policy formulation. The emphasis of this model is directed on the government agenda –setting which tend to highlight the role of policy entrepreneurs while rejecting the rational and linear representations of the models while using sequence or stages. The agenda-setting process happens to be highly competitive having participation from different actors. Some of the agenda which occurs when the three streams converge include; the policy stream, the political stream and the problem stream.

To understand the problem stream, it is important to differentiate between a problem and a condition. A condition is defined as a social situation which does not trigger action in return. On the other hand, a condition becomes a problem when the policy formulators believe that they should act on it. as for the policy stream, it takes place without necessarily being related to the perception of the problem. Alternatives happen to be generated in policy communities and those that happens to technically feasible and cost-effective are disseminated not via the policy communities but also to the general public which happens to progressively build acceptance of the idea. Finally, the political stream incorporates elements such as pressure groups, public opinion, election results, partisan or ideological distribution in congress and changes seen in administrations.

2.4 The punctuated equilibrium model

This model is inspired by elements from biology to offer explanation on the occurrences of long periods of stability, occasionally interrupted by abrupt changes that mark the history of various public policies. This model tend to assume that individuals operate with limited rationality. In this regard, for stakeholders to deal with multiplicity of political issues, governments tend to delegate authority to its agents who along with their sub-groups of legislators and groups of interest sit down and discuss several issues in parallel. All the involved parties are known as a subsystem which is responsible for building an image of the policy, thus producing a strong idea that tend to connect values which can be communicated in a simpler way with emotional appeal. This kind of an image tends to legitimize a monopoly both on the understanding of a particular policy and on institutional arrangements which deal with it.

2.5 Agenda and formulation of public policies

The term agenda tend to be used in various ways where there are people who use it to describe the sequence of business which ought to be conducted at a committee meeting. Other people tend to be accused of having a hidden agenda which means that they tend to have ulterior motive for their actions. Based on the policy making, the term agenda is defined as the list of subjects or problems to which government officials tend to pay serious attention at a certain given time. It is considered to be out of all the conceivable subjects or problems to which the involved parties could be paying attention. An agenda can be broadly be classified into two whereby there are public and government agenda.

A government agenda is any subject or problem that the government itself is required to take close examination of the issue at a specific time period of time.

Obviously, the list of problems under this category varies from one section of the government to another. In this regard, it is the work of the president or the prime minister to consider major items such as the state of the economy or relations with other countries. On the other hand, a public agenda is said to be an issue or subject that a non-profit making organization is acting on and which helps diverse leaders and citizens navigate complex and divisive issues. By using non-partisan research and engagement, the parties involved are able to provide individuals or groups with insight and support which they require to arrive at solutions on critical issues which are workable regardless of the differences involved.

2.6 Actors of public policy

There are various actors in the policy process who mainly include the government and other interested parties. In most countries, the government is very influential in policy setting but there are other bodies which have mandate and some influence on the same agendas which ought to be considered during the committee sitting.

2.6.1 The government

Government in most countries is capable of setting policy agenda due to their influence. It is important to note that most of these governments control the legislative process and in most cases they initiate policy change. Nevertheless, the government has various players who take part in the devising and enacting policy and some of these include; the executive, legislature, federal system, bureaucracy, parliamentary system, presidential system and the unitary system. These arms tend to control the policy agenda based on the power and their formation. All what matters on the stake they have is the autonomy and the capacity.

2.6.2 Characterizing government systems

There are two features which are vivid in various government systems and play a major role when the government is making and implementing a policy. These features include autonomy and capacity. Autonomy means the ability of the government institutions in resisting from being captured by self interest groups and to act fairly in a manner that it is an arbiter of social conflicts. Capacity on the other hand refers to the ability of the government system to formulate and implement policies. This tend to spring from expertise, resources and coherences of the machinery that the government has. Autonomy of the government all depend on the form (Howlett et al, 2009). On the other hand, the unitary governments or systems are associated with far more rapid policy change and less need to promise while formulating a policy.

2.6.3 Federal versus unitary system

All governments tend to operate at a variety levels which are between the national and local. Nevertheless, there is a major difference between unitary and federal systems which sometimes is overlooked when thinking about policy change in the health systems. In the federal systems, there are at least two levels of government which are separate within a country which ahs powers shared between them. This means that the sub-national level of government is not subordinate to the national level but it enjoys a high level of freedom over all matters which are under its jurisdiction. The central government is not in a position to remove these freedoms without a consent which means that the constitution of the country has to be re-written.

Apart from the government, there are other groups which have stake in policy formulation and implementation which are known as interest groups.

Some of these groups include; the cause group, civil society, discourse community, insider groups, interest groups, interest network, iron triangle, issue network, Non-governmental organization, outsider groups, peak association, policy community, sectional group and social movements.

2.6.5 Identification of a Problem And Its Magnitude

Problem identification is what leads to agenda setting noting that a problem becomes an agenda when there is dire need to address it. to understand the magnitude of any problem, it has to be identified and measured (Bayer et al, 2006). Public policy making will always start by clearly defining the policy question of a problem. a problem will only be identified when there is a unsatisfactory set of conditions for which relief is sought from the government. In most cases, problems are identified by ministries, the presidency, cabinet, departments and agencies, think tanks and academia, civil society organization and citizens. When identifying a problem, several questions ought to be answered which include;

- What is the nature and magnitude of the problem?
- Which groups in the population are being affected by the identified problem?
- How did the problem come and to be and why does it continue?
- What are the immediate and underlying causes?
- What should be done about the problem?

After the problem has been identified, the next step is agenda setting which is a problem through which alternatives solutions and problems which requires government response are awarded government attention.

Since there are several problems which require government response, to ensure only a few come to the attention of the government, a filtering process is used. It is the work of the cabinet, sector working groups, the parliament and other actors to handle a collection of issues that tend to be available for discussion and disposition (Wildavsky, 2017). If the policy issue and alternative happen to occupy a slot on the agenda, then policy drafting begins.

After agenda settings, the next process is policy design which is the development of an effective course of action to attain policy goals via specific projects, programs and activities. This is the process where policy analysis is carried out, planning and resource scheduling. After planning, there are several committee meetings which gather to approve or reject the policy, then it goes via a parliamentary or county assembly for approval, and if it succeeds, then it is published waiting for presidential assent which make it a bill.

3.0 Chapter Three: Research Methodology

3.1 Implementation of public policy

From the above analysis, it is now apparent that the policy process is complex and interactive because there are many groups and organizations which are at both international and national level who try to influence what gets into the policy agenda and the process through which policies are formulated (Dunn, 2015). It is also important to understand that the policy making process does not come to an end once course of action has been determined. It would be wrong to assume that a policy will be implemented as intended because there is a dependency which exists between the decision makers to have their policies turned into action.

Implementation can be defined as process that takes place between policy expectations and policy results. Most of the policy scientists tend to have focused their attention on policy formulation, agenda setting and decision-making stages of the policy process till 1970s. During this time there was a notion that formal stages in the policy implementation existed but the pure truth is that most policy process are in a messy form. There have been several changes that have been put in place on policy implementation, but they tend to be neglected making it difficult to have implement most of the policies exactly as they were planned.

Currently, it is easy to note a gap between what had been planned and the result achieved after a policy has been implemented. To elaborate this more, there are several case studies on the effect of health policies which have been imposed by international donor on the third world countries which indicate that there have been less than positive results due to several reasons. An exact example is the loans received by El Salvador from the Inter-American Development Bank with an aim of improving health infrastructures.

Despite that there was a main agenda; there was no concomitant closing of the old facilities or improvement of the ones that were in existence or the dilapidated facilities. As a result, the budget of the ministry of health in El Salvador could not cope with maintaining the large capital stock and facilities which resulted to them falling further into disrepair. Most of the government in the world are in attempt of coming up with ways which will increase the likelihood that policies in the government will be implemented in a manner that ministers intended and those that come up with information that has impact on policies.

An example is the labor government in UK which in the 1990s emphasized on the term delivery which was defined to ensure that policies were well implemented. The government had the term to mean that policies had to be verifiable and make a difference on the lives of people. The government currently set a series of quantitative targets with explicit achievement dates and has been holding individual ministries and agencies accountable if they fail to deliver. The UN is also another body which set Millennium Development Goals in the year 2000 so as to focus on efforts of its own agencies and world governments. The agency ensures that its targets on reducing poverty, malaria, AIDS and increase in education by the year 2015 was quantitative and timed. Unfortunately, the goals were not met by that year.

3.2 Early theoretical models used in policy implementation

3.2.1 Top-down approaches

While using the top-down approaches to understand policy implementation, one closely allies them with other rational models of the entire policy process which happens to see it as a linear sequence of activities where there is a clear division which exist between policy formulation and policy execution.

The notion seen on the former is explicitly political and the latter is largely technical, managerial or administrative activity. Policies which were set out during international or national level ought to have been communicated to the subordinate group who were then given the task of putting them into practice. The development of the top down approach was from the early studies of the implementation deficit or gap which offered the policy makers with a better understanding of the systems that were needed to be put in place so as to minimize the gap that exist between aspiration and reality. Most of those studies were considered empirical but were being led by prescriptive conclusions. Devising effective implementation provided the ability to come with a system in which the casual link between setting of the goals and successful actions designed to achieve them were clear and robust. There is a need to define clearly the goals and understand them where all the necessary political, administrative, financial and technical resources have to be available. It was also important to establish a chain of command from the center to the periphery, a control and communication system also had to be in place to keep the whole system on course. Failure in most cases was caused by using wrong machinery and wrong strategy.

Later, theorist who had devised the top-down strategy came up with a list of six necessary and sufficient conditions for effective policy implementation indicating that if the conditions were followed, then the policy would be implemented as intended. The conditions include;

- Clear and logically consistent objectives
- Adequate casual theory – there ought to be valid theories which indicate how certain actions would result to desired outcomes.
- The implementation process has to be structured in a way that enhance compliance by implementers

- Skillful and committed implementing officials
- Support from interest groups and the legislature
- No particular changes in socio-economic conditions that tend to undermine the political support or the casual theory underlying on the policy

The proponents of the above approach had an argument that it could distinguish empirically between successful and failed implementation process. Therefore, they offered useful guidance to the policy makers. The observed weakness was that the first condition was rarely fulfilled, therefore, most public policies were found to have fuzzy objectives which were potentially inconsistent. There was other policy scientist who were more critical still.

Nevertheless, there were critics who found the approach inconsistent with-it main agenda where they indicated that it was messier and did not reduce the gap between expectation and reality. In this regard, they termed the approach to be largely and indicated various conditions to support their notions. These conditions which indicate that the approach was unrealistic include;

- The circumstances which were external to the agency never imposed crippling constraints
- Adequate time and sufficient resources tend to be available
- The combination of resources that is required is available
- The policy is formulated on the basis of valid theories of cause and effect
- The relationship that exist between cause and effect tend to be direct
- The dependency relationships tend to be minimal
- An understanding of, and agreement of various objectives tend to be available
- Tasks in most cases tend to be fully specified in the correct sequence
- Communication and coordination processes are in most cases perfect

- Those who are in authority have the ability to demand and obtain perfect compliance

Since there is a likelihood that all the ten pre-condition will be present at the same time, the theorist criticizing the top-down approach were on the argument that the approach was neither a good description of whatever took place in practice nor helpful to offer guidance on how to improve implementation.

3.2.2 Bottom-up approaches

The view that exists on the implementation process of the bottom-up strategy is that implementers tend to play an important function in the whole process. The view of the strategy is of the notion that it is not only the managers of the policy from down from above who handles the whole process but involves other active participants in process that is complex who informs those higher up in the system on the best insights through which the policy can be made. Even in the systems which are highly centralized, there are some powers which are usually granted to subordinate agencies and their staffs. Therefore, through the knowledge offered by the subordinates, it is possible to have implementers change the way a policy is being implemented and during the whole process even redefine the objectives of the policy.

One of the most influential studies which exists in the implementation of the bottom-up perspective on implementation was structured by Lipsky in the year 1980 after studying the behavior of what was termed as street-level bureaucrats and related them to their clients. The street-level bureaucrats were inclusive of the front-line staffs who administered the social welfare benefits, teachers, social workers, local government officials, nurses and the doctors.

He indicated that even the people who were working in the most rule-bound environments happened to have some discretion in the way they were dealing with their clients and that some of the staffs such as the doctors, teachers and social workers happened to have high levels of discretion which give them the opportunity to get round the dictates of central policy and reshape policy for their own ends.

Lipsky's work offered great help in re-conceptualizing the implementation process, more so on the delivery of health and social services which tend to be dependent on the actions of various numbers of professional staff. They also enhanced more interactive political process which was characterized by largely inescapable negotiation and conflict between levels and interests within the policy system. Due to the help, more researchers started focusing their attention on the actors involved in the implementation process, their goals, strategies, activities and their links to one another. Interestingly, the studies carried out in the bottom-up strategy indicated that where there were some conditions which were specified as necessary by the top-down strategy, rational models were put in place but their policies which were still implemented in ways which were not intended. Indeed, there were well-meaning policies which made things worse.

Since the inception of the strategy, studies on street-level bureaucrats are still relevant. Insights that have developed from the bottom-up perspective while implementing policies offers guidance on a wide range of studies in the health care system on how relationship between central, regional and local agencies influence policies. The ability of the center to have control of the lower levels of system tend to vary widely and it depend on the factors such as where funds happen to come from and the person controlling them, legislation, operating rules and the ability of the government to enforce them.

The relationships which exist between the center and peripheries in health systems tend to influence the fate of various policies. An example can be noted from South African hospitals where policies were diverted to a certain degree during their implementation and at certain times they were rejected. The same situation took place in New Zealand in the early 1990s when the government introduced some of the user charges for the hospital outpatients and in-patients so as to remove the perceived incentive for patients to go to hospital rather than using primary care where they were faced with charges (Weissert & Weissert, 2008). Despite the strategy's intellectual merits, the policy happened to be extremely unpopular among most of the people, patients, hospital managers and staffs who had to collect the fees. What followed is that the user charges were progressively withdrawn till they disappeared after two years when they were introduced.

3.2.3 Other Models Which Can Be Used To Understand Policy Implementation

There are other models which are beyond top-down and bottom which have been developed by scientists and sociologists to enhance more understanding of policy implementation. The top-down and bottom-up theories were devised by political scientists and sociologists, but management scientists and economists have gone ahead and came up with new approaches.

Some of these approaches include;

Principle-agent theory

The principal – agent theory is on the view that sub-optimal implementation happens to be an inevitable result of the result of the structure of the institutions of modern government in which decision makers have the mandate to delegate responsibility to implement policies to their officials and other agent whom they indirectly and incompletely control and who are difficult to

monitor. These agents tend to have discretion in the way they operate on behalf of their political principals and sometimes do not see themselves as if they are primarily engaged in making a reality of the wishes of these principals. For example, when some of the publicly employed doctors tend to see themselves as members of the medical profession first and foremost instead of civil servants. Discretion tends to open up the potential for ineffective or inefficient translation of the government's intent into reality since the agents have their own views, ambition, loyalties and resources which might hinder policy implementation.

The inherent problem facing politicians is to access the compliance of their officials and others who tend to be contracted to deliver services at all levels indicated. The more levels of hierarchy in existence indicate that there is a more principal agent relation which exists as each level is dependent on the next level which is below and beside it, and the more complex a task is of controlling the process of implementation.

The factors which affect the amount of discretion and the complexity of principle-agent relationship include;

The nature of the policy problem

There are several features such as the macro versus the sectoral or micro, simple versus the complex, many causes versus the single causes, ill-defined versus clear, highly politically versus neutral politically, costly versus inexpensive and those requiring a short or long period.

In general, the long term, ill-defined, interdependent and high-profile problems tend to have more problems affecting a large number of people are tending to be for more difficult to dealt with when compared to short-term, specific issues which have single cause and large technical component. Most of the public debate tend to focus o the former which are well known, the understandably and those which there is never likely to be an easy solution.

The context of circumstances which surrounds a problem

Some of the context which can easily be depicted include the political situation, availability of resources, whether the economy is growing or not and technological change.

The organization of the machinery which are required to implement the policy

In most cases the individuals who are involved in the organization have several numbers of formal and informal agencies which are involved in making the desired change and the skills and resources which have to be included to bear.

Due to the above-mentioned factors, there are officials who typically remain in the post longer than some politicians who often become subject areas experts and have the capability of exercising considerable discretion. In this regard, most of the politicians are dependent on the goodwill of their officials to further their own interest and careers.

There are various insights of the principle agent theory such s economics and transaction costs which tend to focus on reducing the costs of relating buyers to sellers in the market and public services which in a way are led to a greater appreciation of the importance for policy implementation of the designs of institutions and the choice of policy instruments using the knowledge that top requires to be able to control and monitor the street level at a reasonable

costs. One of the noticeable aspects of this was growing focus on the actual and implied contracts which happens to define the relationship which exist between principles and agents so as to ensure that all the principal's objectives are adhered to by the agents. In this regard, there are central governments in a number of countries in the 1980s and 1980s which reformed their civil services to ensure that there was a more explicit of what officials were expected to deliver to their ministers in return for their salaries. They also put some performance targets and performance indicators which were used to assess whether their performance did meet the government objectives and indicate whether they were improving or not.

There are certain public services whereby the convectional role of the government includes acting as the direct provider of services which are critically reviewed in most of the countries. They are all in the view of improving the efficiency and responsiveness of most of their services both to the objective of their ministers and the needs indicated by their consumers. The catch phrase that most of the reformers had was that they should be steering and rowing the ship of their country. In this regard, most of the services were being offered directly by the public sector and they were being contracted out to private for profit or not for profit providers which made the roles of the purchaser and provider to be more explicit.

3.3 Factors which shape the policy implementation choices of the governments

Features of the policy instruments – there are various instruments which tend to be intrinsically more demanding when they are being used technically and politically. These instruments tend to vary on at least four dimensions which include; degree of coerciveness, political risk, targeting and resource intensiveness (Teitelbaum & Wilensky, 2016).

Distributive policies tend to be relatively easy to implement when compared to regulatory policies which are moderately more difficult. More so, redistributive policies happen to be very difficult to implement since they are obvious losers from the last category, whereas, costs at the first category were spread across the population less visibly.

Political style and political culture – in many countries, there are various policy fields, participants and the public happen to be accustomed to, for instance, different degrees of government control and/or provisions. Policies which happen to depart from these traditional tend to be more difficult to implement.

Organizational culture – these include the operating experience in the past and different ways of doing things of the implementing organizations.

Context of the problem – these include the timing, the range of actors who are involved and the likely public reaction.

Administrative decision makers' subjective preferences – these are based on their background, training, personal affiliations, cognitive style and so on.

4.0 Conclusion

Public policy is a wide and important notion of the whole society because it is the means through which most of the societal problems are handled. Different parties are involved in this process where both the government and other private parties take part to ensure that policies catering for certain problems have been developed and implemented. There are various models which are used when developing the public policies to ensure that they follow the required procedures and that they meet the ultimate objectives which they are designed for (Buse et al, 2012). It is important to ensure that effectiveness is adhered to, therefore, various evaluation methods are used to ensure that quality and efficiency has been met. Most of the highlighted issues in this document provide guidance to not only the ministry of health but also all involved stakeholders in policy making. The report has issues which ensure that policies are responding to the real needs of the community, which in-turn is devised to lead to better outcomes. Through evaluation process, it is a report which can help the government reduce its expenditure by monitoring polices and doing away with those do not meet the efficiency standards.

In conclusion, the paper has provided an understanding of public policy and some of the main actors, various models used in creating and implementing public policies have been highlighted and the methods to use in evaluating public policies are in the recommendations to ensure that all the policies enacted are effective.

4.1 Recommendations

To ensure that there is efficiency in the policy formulation and implementation, the concepts below can be of great use if relied on.

4.2 Monitoring and evaluation of public policies

To evaluate the validity of any policy, a policy analysis process or an evaluation process on public policy takes place. Policy analysis is a technique which used in most of the public administrations to enable the civil servants, activists and other actor to examine and evaluate options that available for implementing goals of laws and elected leaders. This is a process which administrations or large organization which tends to have complex policies rely on. Monitoring and evaluation is done I two fields which include on the existing policy and new policies.

4.3 Approaches used in policy analysis

There are various approaches which are relied on to ensure the validity of public policies which are in existence or which ought to be put in place. Some of these include; analysis –centric, policy process and meta-policy.

Analysis centric – is an approach which focuses on individual problems and their expected solutions. It has a micro-scale scope and its problem resolution tend to involve technical solutions. The main agenda of the approach is to come up with the most effective and efficient solution in economic and technical terms.

Policy process – it is an approach that tends to put its focal points into political process and the involved stakeholders. It has a meso-scale scope whereby it interprets problems via political lens. The main aim of the approach is to determine the process, means and policy instruments which will be used.

Meta-Policy - it is a system and context approach whose scope is macro-scale and its problem interpretation is mostly structural in nature. The main aim of the approach is to explain the contextual factors of the policy process such as the economic, political and socio-cultural factors which have influence on it. While using this approach, there is a likelihood that problems may result due to structural factors, therefore, solutions may entail changing the structure itself.

Methodologies or dimensions for analyzing policies

Policy evaluation and analysis tend to use both quantitative and qualitative methods where the qualitative one-use case studies and interviews with community members and the quantitative tend to use survey research, statistical analysis and model building. A common practice between the two is that they define the problem and evaluation criteria, identify and evaluate alternative, and recommend a certain policy accordingly.

Dimensions when evaluating policies

There are six dimensions which can be used to policy analysis and they categorized as effects and implementation of the problem across a certain period of time.

On the effect's dimensions, there are several categories which include;

Effectiveness – what effect does the policy have on the targeted issue

Unintended effects – what are the unintended effects of the policy?

Equity – what are the effects of this policy on various population groups?

On the implementation dimension, these issues are evaluated;

Cost – what is the financial cost of this policy?

Feasibility – can the policy be considered technically feasible?

Acceptability – do the relevant policy stakeholders view the policy as acceptable?

After an effect dimension has been carried out on the whole process, stakeholder's ought to carry out a process and impact evaluation. Process evaluation is a systematic assessment of the program for the purpose of improving its design, the delivery system and usefulness of the quality of services delivered to the consumers. Impact evaluation on the other hand analyzes the effect or outcome.

The ex-post evaluation processes include; deciding on the evaluation objectives, choosing the evolution method to use, data collection, conducting the evaluation and reporting the results and disseminating results and utilizing them in future program design.

References

- Bayer, R., Gostin, L.O., Jennings, B. and Steinbock, B. eds., 2006. *Public health ethics: theory, policy, and practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Buse, K., Mays, N. and Walt, G., 2012. *Making health policy*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Bhattacharya, D. and Bhattacharya, D., 2013. *Public health policy: issues, theories, and advocacy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Dunn, W.N., 2015. *Public policy analysis*. Routledge.
- Friis, R., 2012. *Essentials of environmental health*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Green, A. (2007). *An introduction to health planning for developing health systems*. Oxford university press.
- Hammaker, D., 2010. *Health care management and the law: Principles and applications*. Nelson Education.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M. and Perl, A., 2009. *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems* (Vol. 3). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Patel, K. and Rushefsky, M.E., 2015. *The politics of public health in the United States*. Routledge.
- Teitelbaum, J.B. and Wilensky, S.E., 2016. *Essentials of health policy and law*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Weissert, C.S. and Weissert, W.G., 2008. *Governing health: The politics of health policy*. JHU Press.
- Wildavsky, A., 2017. *Speaking Truth to Power: Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. Routledge.

Appendix

Policy – it is a broad statement of goals, objectives and means which tend to create a particular framework for an activity.

Policy agenda – it is a list of issues which a certain organization or state tend to offer serious attention at any given time with a view of taking a certain action

Policy elites – it is a specific group of policy makers who tend to hold high positions in an organization, and they are in most cases privileged to access other top members of similar or other organizations

Political system – the process through which governments transform inputs from citizens into outputs in the form of policies

Policy windows – it is the point in time when an opportunity arises for an issue to come onto policy agenda and be taken seriously with a view of action

