UCLA Public Policy
Luskin School of Public Affairs

APPLIED POLICY PROJECTS

A Handbook for Students, Advisors, and Clients

Department of Public Policy
UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs
Updated October 2020

Table of Contents

APPENDICES

I. PURPOSE:
PROFESSIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

The Applied Policy Project (APP) is the capstone of the Master of Public Policy education. It is supposed to be "live" work—not a mere classroom exercise, but rather something that could be published as a piece of applied research or used by a real decision maker in choosing among courses of action or judging the performance of current programs.

The Applied Policy Project is two things at once: a piece of policy work for a client seeking a practical answer to a real-world question and an academic exercise for which students receive course credit.

Each APP team is responsible for finishing a project under real-world conditions: a client who may be interested in a question different from what the team would prefer, deadlines that are too tight to answer a question "perfectly," resource and bureaucratic constraints that prevent the gathering of the data one would ideally like to use, and so on. Advisors are to give counsel on these constraints but not to eliminate them or even to become personally involved. Each APP team is expected, as *part of the exercise*, to negotiate with clients, meet tight deadlines, and find ways to make the team work effectively within existing constraints. Working well with clients is an essential part of this process. The goal is not to tell clients what they expect or want to hear. The goal is to help clients identify key problems and develop useful solutions to help them achieve organizational goals. Sometimes this process will require raising new questions, nudging clients in new directions, even "pushing back" against a client's existing assumptions, ideas, and practices.

Team members are also students. They take part in required seminars (the Public Policy 298A, 298B, 298C, and 298D sequence), and are called upon to give and receive constructive criticism on one another's projects. They are expected, with the help of advisors and other faculty, to employ the skills taught in the program and to draw on relevant and useful social science findings. They are responsible for producing a product that convinces faculty, as well as clients, that their answer to the question posed is well grounded, appropriate, and useful—the "best" answer that could be identified given the constraints of time, resources, access, and availability of data.

Finally, as a piece of classwork the APP report must be capable of being made publicly available. All APPs will be presented before a public audience, and the best ones will be posted on the departmental website. Short appendices containing sensitive information could conceivably be cut or redacted, and proper names need not normally appear in the written or oral versions, but APPs cannot normally be based on secret or proprietary information, and their conclusions must be capable of being made public.

The APP is not intended to be just another assignment, a long term paper, a "fact pack," or an abstract academic essay. It is supposed to be a true act of synthesis that brings to bear the skills and knowledge gained in the MPP program for the purpose of solving a real-world problem of some significance. It should bridge the gaps between academic coursework and public service employment, between intellectually acquired skills and their practical application.

II. GUIDANCE:
THE APP ADVISOR AND ANALYTICAL RESOURCES AT UCLA

Primary Faculty Advisors

In the Fall quarter, teams will be matched with one of the four APP faculty advisors. These primary faculty advisors will help students to refine their questions, develop a structure for their APPs, and formulate an analytical approach and methodology. The advisors have "generalist" responsibility for overseeing the APP process and providing guidance to their assigned students. The role of the APP advisor is not to solve problems or determine the content or methods of the APP. Instead, the advisor is a facilitator who helps teams solve their own problems and advises teams on how to design and execute original, applied policy analysis. Managing the advisor relationship is an integral part of the APP process. To get the most out of the advising process, students should come to all advisor meetings well prepared, with written materials that clearly identify problems, issues, and options about how to address them.

Other Faculty

Teams are encouraged to call upon other faculty in the Department, the School, or other units at UCLA to seek substantive advice on the content and particular subject of the APP or to tap into particular methodological expertise. In fact, the Department's faculty expect to receive these inquiries. When contacting other faculty members, students should be well prepared. Rather than asking how to best approach asking their policy question, students should come armed with several possible approaches and ask for feedback regarding these options. When students have concerns about data analysis, they should prepare specific methodological questions. Faculty members beyond the students' advisors may also be helpful in identifying additional research resources, from people to interview to data sources, and often this form of advice is most helpful *early* in the research process.

Additional Analytical Resources

Various institutes and centers on the UCLA campus may be sources for analytical assistance and relevant data. Students should become familiar with the institutes and centers most relevant to the substantive issues addressed in their APPs. They are easily identified by exploring the links provided by policy area on the Department's web site. A few of the myriad possible resources at UCLA include the following:

STATISTICAL COMPUTING RESOURCES
http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/

SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA ARCHIVE

http://www.library.ucla.edu/location/social-science-data-archive

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS) AND VISUALIZATION
https://idre.ucla.edu/programs/gis-visualization

III. GETTING STARTED: TOPICS, QUESTIONS, CLIENTS, AND FUNDING

Launching an APP requires converging on the policy topic to be addressed, the core question to be answered, and the client to be served, as well as building the team that will do the project, in an iterative fashion. Sometimes interest in a topic and the early state of developing the question lead to identifying a client with a comparable interest; in other cases, a nurtured relationship with a client results in the choice of topic and question.

Teams may form from the start or come together throughout this process of securing a question and a client. During the search and vetting process of clients and APP questions, teams will also be considering the feasibility of the potential project. Once the team, question, and client have been determined, teams can begin planning methods, project goals, timelines, and, (only as needed) apply for external funding or have their project undergo human subjects institutional review board (IRB) review.

From a Topic to a Question

Most broadly, "topic" means "the policy area or subject matter one wants to look at." In this sense, most students have policy or political interests that will guide their topic. For instance, one may be looking for a "health policy topic" or a "topic related to transportation planning." The topic may also be defined by the responsibilities of a type of stakeholder, e.g. a government's implementing authority, a legislator's role in bill writing, or a non-profit's social service provision or role as advocate.

From the broader topic of interest, you will eventually arrive at a particular *problem* to be solved or a specific *question* to be answered. The problem or question must be well-defined and clearly posed. Answering the question will typically result in recommended policies, actions, or strategies that best advance a client's organizational goals. Framing a question that is both clear and manageable, while remaining important to your client and to society, is a fundamental part of the APP process.

Writing about "issues surrounding health insurance in America" is not a proper question or problem; hence it is not the proper subject for an APP. Even a properly defined *research* question is typically not well-suited for the APP. For example, "How have recent state marketing campaigns impacted insurance enrollment among the uninsured?" is an interesting research question, but one that provides no guidance on recommended policies given your client's priorities and constraints. A more suitable version of this question would be: "How can the State of X improve insurance take-up among low income households through new outreach strategies?" Framed this way, the pure research question may be one part of the background research, but fully answering this APP question will guide a client organization's decision-making, and provide it with specific recommended policy options or strategies.

Refining a topic means coming up with a clear question and a plan for answering it. Each team should be able to explain quickly, in plain English, what question the project addresses, how it intends to get the answer, and why anyone should care. Students sometimes forget the last part. People with the power to change policies are busy and face multiple demands; you will be more influential if you are able to explain succinctly and compellingly how things work *and* why they matter.

Developing a good topic is a time-consuming and dynamic process. Almost no APP question remains unchanged from start to finish. Effective teams work continuously to refine their topic and question, keeping focused on the key issues at hand while remaining open to new ideas and alternative avenues, in response to evolving client needs, findings, and methodological barriers. Early on, those having trouble settling on a topic and initial question should consult one of the APP advisors (or other faculty members who have relevant expertise in the policy area). By their nature, APP topics will involve a compromise among student interests, the need to collaborate and compromise to form a team, and the practical needs of a client whose interests may not be exactly those that students would choose.

What is Not Appropriate for an APP

All Applied Policy Projects *must involve analysis.* General and ongoing staff-work for a client—no matter how necessary and valuable the work—does not constitute an appropriate APP. Activities that are *not* generally part of a viable APP, except as part of a larger analytic project, include: customer or constituent relations, survey research or data collection, fundraising, marketing, computer programming, production of web pages or promotional materials, office management, advocacy, or as mentioned above, a pure research question. Developing background understanding of some or all of the above may be components of your APP, however. Clients and students are urged to remember that this is an *academic* project as well as an exercise in real-world policy making.

As discussed below, students will prepare, in collaboration with their clients, a Client Agreement ensuring that both the students and the client understand the analytic requirements of the project, and have the same expectations about deliverables, timeline, stakeholders to contact, and other supports (e.g. data, survey implementation) that will allow you to provide the best guidance to your client. Clients may be referred to this section for further information. Where there are ambiguities or potential misunderstandings between students and the clients, students should consult with their faculty advisors.

Teams

Even what looks like a straightforward question requires much more work than initially expected to answer convincingly. As a rule of thumb, students should (1) find what seems a manageable topic; (2) cut it in half; (3) understand that the remaining half will take more time than they foresee.

Working in groups is the best way to have the time and intellectual resources necessary to complete an effective project. It also mirrors the usual practice of real-world projects. Very little analytical work in government, nonprofit organizations, or private firms is accomplished by individuals working alone, in isolation. And for good reason. Teams of individuals not only have far more hours to commit in the aggregate to a project, they also can exploit the comparative advantages of individual team members. One person, for example, may have especially close ties to the client and its network; another may have specific subject matter expertise, or be skilled at a specific analytical technique, such as GIS or cost-effectiveness analysis, that is of particular utility to the project; and a third may have a strong background in effective writing and communication. For these reasons, the Department expects that teams will complete the APPs. However, a student who has a project that he or she does not want to share, or who cannot find other students with sufficient interest in the project to form a team, may submit it for approval as an individual project. In these instances, the approval threshold is significantly higher because the risk of running out of time before producing anything of value is higher.

Teams may not normally have more than five members, though special permission is possible for projects where a compelling case can be made that a larger number would have significant payoffs. Students should keep in mind the balance between the advantages of dividing the workload and the costs of coordinating large teams.

The task of working with team members is *part of the project*. Advisors will consult with students about team management or shirking by team members, but will not attempt to step in and solve the problem by fiat. Team members should note that excessively poor behavior may lead to a low grade from the rest of the team (see "Evaluation and Grading" below). They should also note that the teammate grade is much less important than the project grade. Given that these teams are small, shirking will tend to show up not only in the teammate grade but in the overall APP grade, because any individual's lack of contribution will limit what can be accomplished. Thus, it is to the benefit of all team members to elicit meaningful input from every team member—and to the benefit of each member to do their part. For a team selection checklist see Appendix A.

Clients and Client Participation

As noted earlier, APPs are supposed to be "live" work. This requirement normally means that students must identify a client: someone in the real world who wants, or can be persuaded to want, the results of their work. A client can be anyone who has policy puzzles to solve: a government agency (at any level; students are encouraged to consider national and international clients as well as regional or local ones), a nonprofit organization, a corporation, or a private individual. Students are expected to spend much of the summer and early fall thinking about possible clients and making initial contacts with them. Once the relationship with the client is established, the client should agree to facilitate and to review the APP as if it were a piece of staff work or a paid consulting assignment.

Beyond the parameters of the Client Agreement described below, successful APPs require that clients and teams communicate regularly and clearly about the team's progress and any problems that arise. One reason, among many, that APPs should not be done at the last minute is that it makes this kind of communication very hard to accomplish. While advisors will give counsel on these matters and may choose to intervene in extraordinary cases, *client relations are normally part of the project* and teams are responsible for sorting these matters out themselves.

Students may be paid by their client for the project with a grant or scholarship. Receiving financial remuneration, however, should not be permitted to compromise independent and unbiased inquiry, nor undermine the objectivity of recommendations that the students may reach. Professional consultants often reach conclusions and make recommendations that are contrary to their clients' expectations. The same analytic principles should apply with this type of client project. If financial remuneration for the project is not possible, clients should nonetheless cover project expenses including, but not limited to, travel, parking, phone calls, photocopying, etc.

Although the normal and full expectation is that *all* APPs will have actual clients, under truly extraordinary circumstances, teams may, with their APP advisor's permission, work with "imagined" clients. This provision is not meant to be a license to pursue impossible questions or give impractical answers, and teams with imagined clients will work closely with their advisor to mimic the same conditions they would have with a real client.

Choosing a Client

Securing a client is the responsibility of the APP team. Teams are encouraged to be entrepreneurial in seeking out clients: ask around, reach out to contacts, probe personal networks. Many clients come from MPP students' internships or employment. Some come from contacts developed at Luskin School of Public Affairs such as faculty, Senior Fellows, or ongoing projects at the Luskin and Lewis Center. The Department also seeks to cultivate partnerships with programs on campus and off campus clients that may lead to APPs. The Director of Student Services will distribute information about these potential clients who have become connected to the Department.

Another potential source of APPs are the clients of projects that have been successfully completed in recent years. For example, they may need help executing a program evaluation or similar recommendation that was suggested by a previous APP. Some clients may have follow up problems to work on. Teams interested in a former client should contact the students who worked with the client in the past for advice on how to proceed.

The Department does not take a more active role in procuring clients for two reasons. On the one hand, we do not want to be in the position of recruiting potential clients and then disappointing them if there are no students interested in their problems, and on the other, we do not want to curtail student freedom by assigning teams to work with clients in whom they have no interest.

It is important to think carefully when choosing a client for an APP. Client quality can have a major impact on team success. Here are some issues that can make clients difficult to work with:

- Clients who are difficult to get in touch with, non-responsive, or secretive.
- Clients about whose problems there are no available data or data are very difficult to collect. All projects will have data problems of some kind, and nearly all will involve the collection of original data. Teams must evaluate how difficult these problems will be with a given client. Clients who have serious "trade secrets" or other reasons to resist the generation or distribution of data are a red flag.
- International projects are very popular for APPs, but they present special data hurdles. If teams lack the ability to travel to collect data, they will probably rely on clients (who, in development contexts, often lack resources and reliable communications infrastructure). Teams should be wary of projects and clients where data collection is heavily dependent on unreliable (even if well-meaning) partners or data sources.
- Clients who are not working in the public interest. There are many for-profit entities or nominally non-profit entities that are really rent seekers who dubiously seek to justify their actions in terms of the public interest. It can be difficult to work with clients who are fundamentally about profit or self-aggrandizement. However, non-profit or governmental enterprises can also fail to work in the public interest.
- Clients who have already decided on a course of action and are looking for APP researchers to supply justification, validation, or cover.

While it may be possible to compensate for certain problems if a client has other exceptional qualities, clients who have these tendencies should be considered carefully. When assessing a possible client, look for clients for whom the following is true:

- The problem should be fairly well defined, but not over-defined (i.e., where the client has already decided or will only accept one answer)
- The client is open to communication and reasonably responsive (understanding that most professionals are overburdened)
- The client is interested in the project and willing to assist, especially in providing context, feedback on directions you're considering, and in connecting you to relevant stakeholders and informative contacts for interviewing or other purposes.
- Data are available; there are a diversity of data types so that problems with one type won't doom the project; data aren't stuck in choke points and there is more than one way to acquire them.

Keep in mind that there are no hard and fast rules for identifying "good" and "bad" clients. These indicators are simply factors to consider, and teams must use their professional judgment to decide whether a given client will be viable given the known or probable pros and cons. See Appendix A for a client selection checklist.

General Student Obligations to Clients

Students are expected to act professionally, be responsive to client needs, and respect clients' busy schedules. Students must exercise discretion in interacting with individuals from whom they seek information, since they will be perceived as representing the client. An APP team may never invoke the name of the client in conducting interviews or requesting data without first obtaining the client's permission to do so. Students must remember that their work ethic and final product will reflect on the Department of Public Policy and the Luskin School of Public Affairs, and should act at all times in a manner that represents the program well.

The Client Agreement

Each student team and its client will collaborate in the preparation of a Client Agreement that outlines the question to be asked; the resources (data, access, principals' time, expense, and money) that the client will make available for answering it; and the broad expectations for what will be presented in the report. Clients should realize that they cannot expect an effective answer to a question driving the project unless they give students access to the material, and people, they need to answer it.

Because the nature of clients and APPs vary so significantly, there is no formal, specific template for the Client Agreement, but teams should consider the following topics:

- What the client wants to accomplish with the project

- What research resources will be needed (including data, access, etc.) and by when
- What research resources, such as data or possible interview targets, can the client provide or facilitate
- What expenses will be involved and who will cover them. (It may be helpful to include a budget section in the agreement; it need not require that the client cover any or all expenses but it will help clarify the costs involved in completing the project.)
- An agreed solution to any particular difficulties you anticipate, such as confidentiality, trade secrets, classified information. Do not make these up if they are not actually a problem!
- A general understanding about how often and in what form the client will be available for consultation during the development of the analysis and report (students should meet/talk with the client a *minimum* of two times during the Winter quarter)
- A tentative or hard deadline for presentation of the project conclusions to the client
- A clarification of expectations about giving the client an opportunity to review the project report before it is submitted.

The Client Agreement is ***NOT*** to be signed by the students and the clients as if it were a formal contract. Rather, the agreement memo is intended to facilitate full communication between the students and the client, to ensure *mutual understanding* of the issues involved in the project, and to promote shared expectations, while permitting adaptation as necessary in response to particular challenges and new information.

The Client Agreement should be *drafted by the end of the Fall term*. The conversation around the agreement is the best opportunity for the client and team to come to mutual agreement about the parameters of the project and the data, contacts, and other resources necessary to complete it. It is important, therefore not to write the agreement too early (before the parameters of the project are clear) or too late (when there is not enough time to gather and analyze data).

Conducting Research Ethically

Applied Policy Projects do not automatically trigger the need to secure the approval of the Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP) or the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process. This is good news from the point of view of speeding your research process with a minimum of bureaucratic headaches. However, when in doubt, please consult with your APP advisor early in the process to verify whether your APP would indeed require IRB approval. Even if the IRB is not required this does not abrogate your responsibility to conduct your research ethically and with careful consideration of the dangers or harms that it may pose to the participants in your project. Furthermore, the fact that a project does not need IRB approval does not mean that it is free from other organizations' IRB requirements. If teams are working with a client or partner that requires IRB approval (for example, Los Angeles Unified School District often does, as do many health care organizations), then it must meet their requirements. The Public Policy department is in the process of working up guidelines for ethical and responsible research. Until that point, teams should have an explicit strategy for dealing with the following issues in the research plan:

- **Consideration of potential harms**. What potential harms might your research inflict on research participants and how are you going to mitigate those harms? Even interviewing individuals about the work they do can be potentially dangerous if, for example, their views are at odds with their supervisors. Your research plan must anticipate these harms, especially potential threats to standing, reputation, or position.
- **Consideration of benefits**. Generally, the benefits of research should outweigh the harms. You should consider the ratio among them, and also consider how the burdens and benefits of research are distributed. Only research where benefits outweigh the harms and both are distributed fairly should be done.
- **Vulnerable populations**. If your research will study groups that are particularly vulnerable to coercion (for example, children, prisoners, the ill or mentally ill, those with liminal immigration status), then you must give extra consideration to how you are going to protect their interests and not submit them to coercion.
- **Informed research participation**. Generally, if you are studying people you need to inform them that they are being studied. The exception is the observation of public behavior. What is your plan for informing people and asking for their participation?
- **Coercion, inducements, and the right to withdraw**. What is your strategy for inducing people's participation in your study? If your plan includes inducements, then you should consider whether they constitute coercion. For example, low dollar gift card might be an ethical inducement but making program benefits conditional on talking to the research team is an ethical problem. Remember that ethical research also informs people of their right to withdraw from research without penalty at any time.
- **Confidentiality and anonymity.** What is your strategy for sharing the results of your data collection? Will data be kept confidential to the group, or will it be distributed in some way? The broader it is distributed the greater the potential risk to your research participants. When possible, research subjects should be given the option of being anonymous (meaning that once the information is collected, even the researchers cannot identify individual participants), or when that is not feasible, of having their identities remain confidential (meaning that only the researchers can identify individual participants and those identities will not be shared with anyone, possibly including the client).

  Confidentiality and anonymity are considered effective ways to mitigate some potential harms of research. Consider also that it is sometimes necessary to do more than simply withhold a name to ensure that a research participant is not identifiable. There is a potential tradeoff between protecting interviewees through confidentiality or anonymity and the authority of your data. It is usually more authoritative to be able to identify a quote or an idea with a specific individual. One effective strategy is to gather confidential data from subjects and then offer to contact individuals to ask them if it is okay to quote them a specific point. However, this follow-up can be time consuming. What will be your strategy to navigate the issues of confidentiality and anonymity?
- **Data security**. The risk that data are used in irresponsible ways is greater when those data are not secured. You should specify how you will protect your data, ensure only legitimate users have access to it, and dispose of it properly and securely when the study is finished. If you receive data from another source, make sure you follow their data security rules.

Your faculty advisors will expect you to include a brief statement with your work and data gathering plan for how you will conduct your research ethically.

Project Funding

In the past, many APP teams have been successful in securing funding for the research activities associated with their APP projects (a number of grants, for example, have been obtained in the past from the Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies, the Luskin Center for Innovation, and the Institute on Inequality and Democracy.) The funding has paid for travel, supplies, mailings, and the hiring of research assistants. It requires time to submit a funding proposal, and not all applicants win funding, so it is recommended that you apply only as needed, and after consulting with your advisor.

If a team is planning on submitting an application to a possible funder, it is important to make contact and discuss the proposal budget with the Department's fund manager. They can make certain that a proposed budget conforms with University procedures. The fund manager will also need to be informed immediately if the proposal is funded so that they can set up an account and provide the team with instructions on how to submit requests for reimbursement. For example, one needs to note the types of activities and materials the funding will cover and the specific documentation required for reimbursement. In some cases, for payments made by a credit card or a check, a COPY of the credit card statement/bank statement showing the transaction is required (other statement transactions can be blacked out). Some purchases may be subject to ordering directly through the funding source (e.g., U.S. Postage cannot be reimbursed unless purchased through the funder). Teams must also consider the timing of both expenditures and documentation submission deadlines, and the requirements for handling any deviation from the original budget. Funders can provide many helpful information sources for executing the projects, but funding always comes with strict parameters and documentation requirements for reimbursement. It is essential to know these requirements *before* attempting to spend money on items covered in the grant.

Using the APP as one of the course requirements for a Certificate in Global Public Affairs (GPA)

GPA @ UCLA Luskin provides intellectual and professional preparation to future experts who plan to work within the realm of global public affairs. The program offers four different Certificates in Global Public Affairs: 1. Global Environment and Resources, 2. Global Health and Social Services, 3. Global Processes and Institutions, and 4. Global Urbanization and Regional Development. To earn a Certificate, students need to complete any of the three courses listed under the particular certificate.

MPP students often select an internationally focused Applied Policy Project which relates to the content of one of the Certificates. If a student would like to use the APP to fulfill one of the course requirements for a Certificate in Global Public Affairs, it is possible to do so via petition. Although the APP's are assigned in October, the final APP work plan is due in November. Having developed the APP to this point will enable the student to submit a petition to have the APP course count toward the one of the relevant Certificates. Even though the APP is a multi-course seminar, it will only count as one course for any of the Certificates. To petition, a student should submit the original APP proposal along with the work plan as an attachment in an email to: global@luskin.ucla.edu The Faculty Certificate Leaders will review the proposal and determine if the project would qualify to be counted toward a particular certificate. More information about Global Public Affairs (GPA) can be found here: http://global.luskinucla.edu/

IV. ANSWERING THE QUESTION:
WHAT AN APP SHOULD ACCOMPLISH AND HOW TO GET THERE

APP teams need to be both ambitious and realistic about what can be accomplished in time-limited, resource-constrained policy analysis (which is the norm in the real world). A successful project will be one in which the team knows the parameters of what would be the ideal policy analysis on the topic and then adapts appropriately to what is realistically possible to produce the best possible answer given the circumstances. This targeting is at once a substantial challenge and a routine feature of all policy analysis. The Department has established a structured process—encompassed by the Applied Policy Project sequence of seminars Public Policy 298A (2 credits in the Fall), 298B (4 credits in the Winter), and 298C and 298D (2 credits each in the Spring)—to guide teams through the process, from settling on a policy question that is meaningful but feasible to conducting the necessary research, from deriving appropriate analytical conclusions and recommendations to communicating those findings in written and oral settings.

The Scope of the Objective

Deriving an effective answer to a policy or organizational question does not mean solving the problem definitively for all time. It does mean making a contribution to understanding what ought to be done and why, and how to get it done, or what has been done well and badly in the past. Each APP team's report, both written and oral, should be explicit about:

- Which questions the team has, and has not, addressed.
- How the team arrived at its analytical conclusions and recommendations.
- The range of uncertainty around different parts of the team's answer, and whether there is enough uncertainty to affect legitimately the overall tenor of the conclusion.
- What potential obstacles to implementing the recommendations exist and how to handle them.
- The reason the answer *matters* in the appropriate context: why the proposed course of action is a good use of resources given other ways of improving human happiness by spending resources, including money, authority, and attention; why an initiative is worth the attention of busy decision makers, given other things they could be doing; why a little-known problem is worth as much public attention as other matters that are obviously important or at least appear to be.

Appendix C includes a "Policy Analysis checklist" that goes through the kinds of questions that an ideal project would encompass. Few APP teams will have the time or resources to cover all points on the list. (In fact, *no* actual policy analysis does so fully.) By consulting the ideal, however, one can avoid some common problems of poor projects. A team may not be able to cover the whole list of questions, but it should have adequate ways of explaining—at least inside the heads of team members—why some of the questions do not apply, why their importance is limited in this case, or how the team *would* go about answering those questions, if the time and resources to do so were available.

Examples of honors-awarded APP projects from past years are available to both students and clients on the Department's web site. Teams are strongly encouraged to examine past APPs to see the diversity of ways that teams report on their policy analyses.

The APP Courses

The APP is both a real-world project with a client and an academic exercise supported by the full scholarly resources of the Department of Public Policy and the Luskin School of Public Affairs. The main vehicle of academic support is provided by the faculty advisor, and one's fellow students, in the setting of Public Policy 298A, 298B, 298C, and 298D.

In the Fall term of their second year, students enroll in the 2-unit Public Policy 298A, in the section led by their assigned faculty advisor (these assignments are guided by the expressed preferences of the APP teams, balanced by considerations of faculty expertise and equity in the distribution of enrollments across the four sections). During the quarter the teams will meet in a combination of sessions for the entire MPP class, sessions of their assigned APP seminar, and individually with their faculty advisers. These various meetings will provide the teams with guidance on honing their policy questions, formulating and revising their overall research plans, assessing approaches to data collection, and if necessary submitting the forms for IRB approval. By the end of the Fall quarter each team should have established a firm platform from which to launch the substantive work on their APP projects.

The real "meat" of the APP process takes place in the Winter through the first half of the Spring term. During this time, students will take Public Policy 298B (4-units in the Winter) and 298C (2-units in the Spring), which involve regular structured meetings and seminars devoted to the research, analysis, and writing of APP reports. The individual team advising meeting and seminars led by the four faculty advisors will use a common "syllabus" built around the same schedule of assignments and expectations.

The syllabus will establish a timeline for progress on the APP, with the topic of advising meetings, written chapter submissions, and team presentations, following a set schedule to ensure timely progress. Faculty advisors will provide appropriate and timely detailed feedback to the teams in response to the groups' scheduled submissions and oral presentations during the quarter.

In addition to submitting drafts of chapters and oral presentations in Public Policy 298B and 298C, each student will be assigned to "peer review" the work of another APP team. Peer reviewers will comment in writing on the component chapters of the APP as they are produced and on the full draft of the APP report. They will also respond in seminar with comments in reaction to the oral presentations made by the APP team they are peer reviewing. **During the seminar sessions, all students are expected to provide feedback to presentations made by the APP teams and, in general, to be active participants**.

In the Spring term, students will also enroll in Public Policy 298D, a 2-unit course that will guide teams through the preparation and delivery of the oral presentations of their APPs during the second half of the Spring quarter. Public Policy 298D will encompass practice presentations as well as the formal presentations to the Public Policy faculty and assembled students, whose collective evaluations will be used by each faculty advisor in the process of determining the grades for the oral version of the APPs. **The Department fully expects that all students enrolled in Public Policy 298D will attend all sessions of the formal APP oral presentations, unless there are unavoidable scheduling conflicts.**

A summary timetable of major dates for the Applied Policy Project process can be found in Appendix B.

V. THE APP WRITTEN REPORT

Audience

The target audience for the APP report is the “generalist” reader, someone conversant with public policy issues broadly defined, but who is not likely to be a specialist on the specific topic, question, and issues addressed in the report. You might think of the potential audience as constituencies of importance to the client, who could influence the success or failure of the client’s actions. The audience could also be policy makers (or their staffs) whose support would be necessary to adopt proposals supported by the client, or advocacy organizations that could become allies of the client. The “2nd reader” of the APP report, whose evaluation accounts for 15% of the PUB PLC 298B and 298C grades, represents this generalist reader. (A common grade for both courses will be assigned once the APP report is evaluated; see “Evaluation” section below). Note: some clients may, for their own purposes, request that you also prepare an abridged version of the report.

Format

1. The Department does not impose a detailed outline or template for the APP reports. All APP reports, however, should include what are effectively two separate documents: the body of the report itself and an executive summary, each of which can stand on its own. Some uses of these types of reports read only the Executive Summary, while others read only the report itself. The Executive Summary, which immediately follows the table of contents, should be brief—no more than a few pages—and clearly present the client, the nature of the analysis, and the conclusions. For the benefit of readers who skip the Executive Summary, the body of the report should have an introduction that draws the reader into the report, signals broadly what the reader will gain from the report, and sets up or provides a road map to the rest of the report. The APP report may also have any number of appendices.

In one way or another, the body of the report should include the following elements (which emerge as natural products of the written assignments in PUB PLC 298B and 298C):

- The identity of the client
- The nature of the problem, policy question, or decision confronting the client, its importance, and why the client wants this problem solved
- The analytical approach used to address the problem or answer the policy question, and why it best serves the client’s needs and produces the most convincing answer. Note: Complete methodological details may be presented in an appendix to the report, but the text of the report itself should furnish sufficient detail on the analytical approach to give credibility to the findings, conclusions, and any recommendations.
- Identification of policy options and the criteria for choosing among them (the terms “policy options” and “criteria” are general placeholders for whatever elements of choice and bases of judgments among choices are appropriate for the particular project).
- Analysis and findings
- Recommendations (if appropriate) and conclusions

2. The reports are to be **between 5,000 and 13,000 words** of text. This amount is roughly equivalent to 15-35 pages in Times New Roman font, 12 point, double-spaced; **the word limit, not the page limit, is controlling.** The Title page should indicate the word count. The word count applies only to the body of the report, not the Title Page, Table of Contents, Acknowledgments, Executive Summary, footnotes or endnotes, or Appendices. Words in tables and figures in the body of the APP are also not included in the word count. Note that there is no guarantee that a reader or grader will read the footnotes or endnotes, or even the appendices, so you should refrain from putting important elements of your analysis or argument in the footnotes or endnotes, or appendices. Fonts other than Times New Roman 12 point may be used as long as they ensure comparable readability. The version of the report submitted for grading on April 15th **must be double-spaced—**as a draft document this makes it easier for the graders to read, mark-up, and write comments.

Extra supporting material may be included in appendices *with the understanding that the appendices might not be read* (as would likely be true in the real world). As with footnotes and endnotes, Appendices are not a way of avoiding the word limit; the argument should hang together as it stands in the main text.

3. All APPs should include Executive Summaries. Most readers will read your Executive Summary first and then decide based on it whether to read your full report. Many readers, especially busy policy makers and members of other potentially important and influential constituencies, will never read anything beyond your Executive Summary. Therefore, your Executive Summary should be a compelling introduction to and summary of your analysis. It should briefly highlight your purpose, your methods, and your main conclusions, and it should the draw the reader into wanting more details.

4. The APP reports are to be printed **single-sided**, **double spaced,** and with **margins of at least one inch on each side** (the convention for manuscripts submitted to book presses and journals for publication consideration, facilitating ease of review and evaluation).

5. The reports are **not to be bound**; a binder clip is sufficient.

6. **Submit one copy of the report.**

Citations, Plagiarism, and Academic Integrity

Full, consistent, and proper citation of all source materials is required by university policy and norms of professional conduct. For citation format guidelines inclusive of all forms of source material—and whether using notes (footnotes or endnotes) or parenthetical author-date references—teams should consult the most recent edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. The Table of Contents and links to specific chapters is available online at https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/book/ed17/frontmatter/toc.html. Part III, Chapters 14, "Notes and Bibliography," and 15, "Author-Date References," present the format details and examples.

As a general rule, any idea, concept, argument, or fact that is not one's own, that was created or reported by someone else, and that does not involve an empirical fact reasonably widely known to the general public (e.g., the number of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives) should be cited. In close cases it is wise to err on the side of citation. All direct quotations **must** be indicated with quotation marks or set off as a block quotation. For details and guidance about quotations and paraphrasing, see

Chapter 13, "Quotations and Dialogue," in *The Chicago Manual of Style*. The faculty advisors are also available to answer any questions about citation requirements. Don't guess. Ask.

APP writers are fully expected to know the details on academic integrity in the UCLA Student Conduct Code, available at https://www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/Individual-Student-Code#academicdis7, as well as departmental resources and the materials from the plagiarism orientation for first-year MPP students. APP writers are responsible for informing themselves about necessary policies and how to avoid violating them. Failure to comply with the University's plagiarism policy can result in expulsion from the MPP program.

In order to ensure and maintain academic integrity, particularly with such an important academic endeavor as the APP, the Department will be using *Turnitin*™. In addition to submitting one hardcopy of the report to the Department, the APP report is to be submitted electronically to *Turnitin*. The *Turnitin* link can be found when you log on to ccle.UCLA.edu and go to the course PP 298C. For APP reports prepared by a team, only one team member needs to submit the electronic version.

To help avoid inadvertent errors, the *Turnitin* system will be set up to allow APP teams to "pre-screen" their reports for potential problems (e.g., incomplete citations or improperly paraphrased text) approximately a week before the final draft is handed in. One team member must take responsibility for submitting the first and revised drafts to the system. The report that *Turnitin* produces must be reviewed very carefully in order to identify any changes and corrections that must be made prior to the final draft.

Grammar

APP reports must be well written to be persuasive. Grammatical and careless errors will be penalized substantially in the APP grading process. Students are strongly encouraged to purchase and use Strunk and White, *The Elements of Style*.

Disclaimer

Each APP must contain the following disclaimer, placed prominently near the front: "This report was prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master in Public Policy degree in the Department of Public Policy at the University of California, Los Angeles. It was prepared at the direction of the Department and of [client name] as a policy client. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department, the UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs, UCLA as a whole, or the client."

Academic Integrity

In a statement to students on academic integrity, the UCLA Office of the Dean of Students explains that "UCLA is a community of scholars….[F]aculty, staff, and students alike are responsible for maintaining standards of academic honesty." The Dean of Students makes clear that plagiarism, multiple submissions unauthorized by the respective professors, and all other forms of cheating and academic dishonesty result in formal disciplinary proceedings, which may involve **suspension** or **dismissal** from the program (https://www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/Individual-Student-Code). The Department of Public Policy has a "zero-tolerance" policy and is required by the University to report to the Office of the Dean of Students suspected violations of academic integrity. **MPP students have been caught, investigated, and severely punished by the Office of the Dean of Students.** Future careers are put at risk. Be absolutely certain that you understand what constitutes violations of academic integrity. Ignorance is neither an excuse nor an effective defense. **Plagiarism**, for example, is described by the Office of the Dean of Students as "Presenting **another's words *or* ideas** as if they were one's own," including "submitting as your own…part of or an entire work produced verbatim by someone else" and "paraphrasing ideas, data or writing without properly acknowledging the source." Readers of APP reports need to be able to easily recognize and distinguish between when the words and ideas they read are your own and when they are from others. There can be no ambiguity. But please also know that we on the faculty are always available to help you avoid mistakes. **Please do not hesitate at any time to ask questions. Bottom line: *ASK, ASK, ASK*! Our fervent desire is to help, not punish.** You can also find more information in *The Chicago Manual of Style,* Chapter 13, "Quotations and Dialogue."

Deadline

The deadline for the applied policy project report is **Thursday, April 15**, at 4:00pm PST. This deadline includes three submissions:

1. A digital copy of the APP sent as an attachment to pubpolinfo@luskin.ucla.edu. If the file is too large to send as an attachment, students can bring it to the Department office on a flash drive or share a link to the file in Box, Dropbox, Google Drive, or other cloud based program.

2. ***Turnitin* ™** - The digital version of the report must be submitted to *Turnitin* ™

3. One **hard copy** of the APP printed in black and white and delivered to the Public Policy Department Office on the third floor. Reports may not be turned in to your advisor nor slid under office doors. Binder clips will be provided. This requirement may be revised in light of remote instruction in the Spring of 2021.

All three submissions are due by 4:00 PM PST Thursday, April 15th. No excuses for late submission will normally be accepted. The deadline is intended to mimic government requirements, under which proposals for work that arrive a few minutes late are generally discarded regardless of how much preparation went into them (in some cases, months of work by many people and tens of thousands of dollars in costs). Students are advised to plan ahead and leave a margin for error. Late reports will be penalized in the grading. The penalty will be based on a sliding scale reported blow.

Late Submission Penalties

- Up to twenty-five hours late [i.e., Friday, April 16th by 5 p.m. PST]: 1/3 of a grade (e.g., A minus becomes B plus, etc.).
- 25 to 49 hours late (i.e., by Saturday at 5 p.m. PST): 2/3 of a grade, 7 points subtracted.
- After Saturday at 5p.m. PST (digitally submitted) but before Monday at 9 a.m. PST: one full grade, 10 points subtracted.
- After Monday 9 a.m. but before Tuesday 5 p.m. PST: two full grades, 20 points subtracted.
- After Tuesday at 5 p.m. PST: APP reports will not be accepted. Grade of F will be assigned.

All late submissions should be emailed to the Department at PubPolInfo@luskin.ucla.edu Because the Department office is closed on the weekend, late submission after Friday 5:00 p.m. PST needs to be done as an e-mail attachment, followed by the one hard-copy submissions the following Monday.

Evaluation

Projects will be graded for "overall persuasiveness." The grader will ask how much he or she is convinced, in the end, that the solution proposed or the answer given is a good solution or answer to a clear—and significant—problem or question, and is well supported by an effective analysis using appropriate information.

The usual criteria apply: scope; clarity; appropriateness of method; quality of quantitative, qualitative, and logical analysis; overall argument and synthesis. In addition, *form or presentation matters*. A project with serious lapses in spelling, grammar, writing style, or graphic presentation will be graded down. A real-world decision maker might discount or even ignore a piece of work subject to these flaws. A reader is likely to believe that sloppiness in the presentation signals potential sloppiness in the analysis.

Each student's APP grade (i.e. PUB PLC 298B and 298C) will be made up of the following components:

- 85%: Grade assigned by each team's APP advisor, broken down as follows:
  - 10%: Participation in the Winter APP seminar (298B), including one's formal "peer reviewer" role in critiquing another team's work, as judged by both the advisor and the authors of the APP report that the student peer reviewed.*
  - 15%: Relative effort within one's team, as determined by each student's teammate grading of the quantity and quality of effort put in by other team members.*
  - 60%: The faculty advisor's assessment of the development and achievement of the project, reflected in the written report. This portion includes known difficulties in the process that the team encountered and had to overcome.
- 15%: Grade given by the "2nd Reader"—an APP faculty member who is *not* the advisor of the team in question. This grade, without reference to the process of producing the APP report, is intended to assess the quality of the final product from the perspective of an informed but "generalist" reader.

An In Progress (IP) grade will be issued and noted on your transcript for Winter PP298B. Upon the completion of PP298B coursework, a final grade will be issued for Spring PP298C and students will earn 6 graded credits for the grade received for PP298C. Department APP honors will be based on the final report due April 15th.

*Note that these are based on individual effort, and grades may vary among students even within the same team.

Optional Non-Graded Revision of the Written Report

Students have the opportunity to revise their APP based on advisor feedback and 2nd reader comments.

This revised version of the APP report is due on Tuesday, May 11th, at 4:00 p.m. PST, and will not be graded. This final version should incorporate the production values associated with a professional report (that may include single spacing, specially selected fonts, two- sided printing, color graphics, etc.). The revision period is designed to give teams a chance, if they choose, to provide an improved product to the client and the Department's APP Archive, to have a better piece of work to show potential employers. The deadline for these changes will be as firm as the original deadline for the reports.

Changes made at this point will not affect the project's grade—they will be taken into account for award purposes only. All teams have the opportunity to re-submit their projects on this date, and it is based on this version that each advisor will nominate teams to be judged for the departmental awards.

The Department will take no notice of changes to the APP made after this mid-May date. Awards will be based on the version turned in by this second deadline. Further improvements may of course be made by teams for their own benefit or client requirements.

Awards

The authors of exceptional APP reports will be given departmental awards of Honors. These awards are based on the absolute, not relative, quality of the reports; there is no set number of awards to be conferred in any particular year.

Evaluation for honors will be based on the final written report that is due on May 11th , as well as the oral presentation. The oral version of the APP report is a crucial part of the APP exercise, and constitutes the graded material for PUB PLC 298D, but it is separate from the award process. The honors designation is determined by the APP advisors, and takes into consideration the quality of the analytical work, the appropriateness and persuasiveness of the conclusions, and the quality of the written and oral presentations (honors will not be awarded to reports hampered by multiple typos, spelling errors, poor grammar, etc.).

VI: THE APP ORAL PRESENTATIONS

As future policy analysts and managers you will often have to make oral presentations to audiences of decision makers who are relatively or sometimes totally uninformed about your topic. You will typically have to take material that is complex and often lengthy in its written form, with extensive empirical documentation and analysis, and present it orally in a very compressed time frame. That is the reality in policy making in all settings. An effective presentation needs to be succinct, yet comprehensive, informative, and persuasive. More detailed guidance about how to structure oral presentations and make effective use of presentation software will be provided by the faculty advisors, but here we offer some general guidelines.

The oral presentations of the APP reports are scheduled at the end of the Spring quarter as part of Public Policy 298D.

Audience

In order to simulate a real-world policy-making environment, we require that you dress professionally, the way you would when making any kind of formal presentation. Imagine that your audience is your client or a decision-making body, such as the city council, Senate committee, foundation grant review panel, a board of directors, a community group, interest group representatives, etc. (Indeed, the Department encourages you to invite your client to attend your oral presentation, or to view your taped presentation if instruction is remote.) Do not think of the audience as a gathering of faculty and classmates, but rather as a set of decision makers or other significant individuals of relevance to the client's concerns who may have some influence or authority over your APP's policy recommendations.

Content

The audience needs to know the policy question, the nature of the analysis, why it is important and compelling, and the "take away" message. Also be sure to provide evidence to support the conclusions that you have reached. Imagine that you have before you representatives of constituencies that are vital to your client's interests (policy makers, funders, potential skeptics who have the power to influence others, etc.) and your 20 minutes with them is your only opportunity to persuade them. What do they absolutely need to know? What bottom line do you think they must retain as they leave the room? What do you have to provide in the presentation for them to believe your conclusions and accept your recommendations? Keep in mind that the question and answer period can provide an opportunity to discuss facts or issues that you decide cannot fit into the 20-minute presentation. Public Policy 298D will provide each team with the opportunity to rehearse its presentations with the APP faculty advisor and student colleagues so that one can test out and receive feedback on the initial presentation design and subsequent revisions.

Presentation Time

Each team presentation is allocated exactly 20 minutes for content. In live presentations, teams will also have 10 minutes for questions and answers. It is vital to practice extensively and know the presentation well. (These down-to-the-minute time constraints are prevalent in legislative and other professional environments.) The audience members will complete evaluation forms that you and the faculty advisers will receive once all the presentations are completed. Appendix D contains an example of the evaluation form that has been used in prior years.

Presentation Format and Logistics

Successful presentations depend on having well-considered, well-designed, and clearly readable slides that enhance what the speaker is saying, rather than distracting from the speaker and the message. Remember what you learned about developing presentation slides. Do not put all of your content on the slides or spend the presentation just reading the slide content. Either one is a presentation killer. Remember that the slides are a visual instrument for guiding spoken content and highlighting critical points. It is important to pay attention to font sizes, so that slides can be easily read at a distance. Readers should be able to read all content without difficulty, including all charts, graphs and figure notes. Figures should be easily interpreted, and colors should work well together.

Under remote instruction, teams will submit a video recording of their presentation, which the Department will upload for viewing and evaluation. For live oral presentations, the Department will provide a PC laptop computer and a digital projector. Rehearsals will be organized by the faculty advisors in Public Policy 298D.

APPENDIX A: CLIENT AND TEAMMATE SELECTION CHECKLISTS

Client Checklist

This checklist is a tool to help you evaluate the suitability of a potential client for an Applied Policy Project. This checklist should be used by the team and not be given to the client. Clients for which you can check off the most boxes offer you the best chances of success. It is unlikely that all the boxes will be checked off for any potential client, so you must use your judgment to evaluate the client's ultimate suitability for your team. However, clients for which you can check off very few of the boxes are likely to present major difficulties for the team as projects move forward.

- ❑ Client has a problem that is a *policy* problem—it involves finding an answer to a strategic course of action (as opposed to an academic research question, promotional work, advocacy, office management and staffing duties, etc.)
- ❑ Policy problem is fairly well defined, doable in the APP time frame, can be adjusted as necessary
- ❑ Policy problem is *NOT* already answered in the client's mind (i.e., where the client simply wants justification for a decision already made or a conclusion already reached)
- ❑ Client's policy problem involves the public interest (rather than pure profit or organizational promotion)
- ❑ Client is easy to contact, is responsive, and open in communications
- ❑ Client is interested in the project and willing to assist (in making contacts, procuring data, etc.)
- ❑ Client has no serious "trade secrets" or barriers to communicating publicly APP results
- ❑ Data are available already or are possible to collect (given constraints of time and resources)
- ❑ A diversity of data types and evidence bear on the policy question (so if one cannot be obtained there are others to pursue)
- ❑ For projects relying on a proxy or partner to collect data (common in international projects), that partner is reliable, has the necessary resources to gather data, and has a reliable means of communication

Teammate Checklist

This checklist will help you think about selecting potential teammates. It will also help you think about how to be a better teammate yourself.

- ❑ The team has 3-5 members. If there are more or fewer members, there is an *overwhelmingly good justification* for this deviation
- ❑ The team members have complementary, rather than similar, skill sets to allow the team to capitalize on comparative advantage
- ❑ At least one team member has a strong relationship with the client
- ❑ The prospective teammate comports themselves as a *professional*—is responsive, responsible, meets deadlines, takes work seriously, offers and takes constructive criticism, etc.
- ❑ The prospective teammate responds as a *professional* even when others fail to act professionally—she or he maintains cool, does not hold grudges, does not act with aggression or passive aggression, does not engage in tit-for-tat retaliation

APPENDIX B: APP OVERALL TIMELINE FOR 2020-2021

Late Spring - Early Summer	Begin thinking about topics, clients, and possible teammates. Talk to professors (APP advisors and others), senior fellows, and summer employers as relevant, and use library and other resources to research ideas. Explore integrating APP work with summer internship—but this linkage is not required.
Mid-Late Summer	Continue, with potential teammates, to research topic, find client, and start looking for a policy *question*.
September - October	"Wrap-up" meetings with fellow students and faculty to finalize a proposal, formulate a draft policy question, and develop with your client the tentative scope of your project.
Monday, October 5	Class-wide meeting: Introduction to Fall quarter tasks
Monday, October 19	Class-wide meeting: Overview of methodology Submit to Prof. Wes Yin (via Annie Kim) team roster, APP proposal (tentative title and brief description), and ranked choice of advisors
Friday, October 23	Advisor-team assignments made
Week of November 2- Week of December 7	Meetings with APP advisor and small group seminar
Monday, November 9	Submit to faculty advisor a draft of APP question and work plan
Monday, November 23	Submit to faculty advisor a final draft of APP question and work plan for project completion.
Week of November 30	Seminar Presentation: Launching of the APP's and data collection
Week of December 7	Last meeting with your adviser for Fall
Winter Session	Work on the APP according to work plan and departmental deadlines
January - March 2021	Applied Policy Analysis adviser meetings and seminars (PUB PLC 298B), Work on the APP according to plan and departmental deadlines
April - June 2021	Complete and submit final draft (298C), give APP presentation (298D)
Thursday, April 15 4:00 p.m. PST	**APP written report due at departmental office (third floor), and electronic version due at *Turnitin* ™.** APP reports will be time stamped upon submission; any APP reports received after the deadline will be penalized substantially.
Mid-end of April	Students given grades and comments from their advisors and 2nd readers (via Annie Kim)
Tuesday, May 11	Last day to make changes to APP written report for final bound copy to be submitted for the Department Archives.
Late May - early June (dates TBA)	**APP oral presentations (3 sessions)**

*Bolded dates indicate a Due assignment

APPENDIX C: POLICY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Public policy analysis is the discipline that considers what actions would best serve the public interest in a given situation, and how those actions can be implemented through actual institutions. Like any discipline, it seeks the truth, but the truth sought is pragmatic, in the original sense of that term: truth about what is to be done, rather than merely about how the world is to be described. That differentiates policy analysis from social science. Policy analysis differs from policy advocacy in that it does not start with a preferred course of action but works up to it by asking about which means best serve certain ends.

The summary below assumes a project in the form of a "problem"—what is to be done in the future—but would, with small changes, be equally applicable to a "question"—e.g. "which of the following state after-school programs has produced the best overall results at the lowest cost?"

A full policy analysis, if one were feasible, would answer the following questions:

1. What is the situation to be considered?
2. What suggests that this situation calls for a specific policy intervention, rather than being left to individual choices; markets; existing regulations, government mandates or services; or interventions or services currently engaged in by the nonprofit sector?
3. What is at stake? What are the positively or negatively valuable outcomes of alternative policies, or of inaction?
4. On what basis should those outcome dimensions be weighed against one another?
5. What specific options exist, or can be invented? (Your answer to #2 ought to provide some hints. Remember that "doing nothing" and "continuing current policies" are always options.)
6. What is the likely result of each option (and *how* likely) in terms of each of the goods and bads we are concerned with?
7. Given (6), which option has the best distribution of possible outcomes, appropriately weighted?
8. What actions would need to be undertaken to implement that option? What agencies exist that could undertake such actions? What changes would need to be made in those agencies if they were to do so? Are those changes feasible, and if so what would the costs be of bringing them about? Would the agencies in question then be more or less capable of producing public value in other ways?
9. Alternatively, what new institutions would need to be created, and what is the likelihood of doing so successfully? What would be the side-effects of creating such agencies?
10. What are the predictable implementation problems, both operational and political? How can they be overcome, or at least ameliorated?
11. What decision-makers would need to agree to the proposed course of action? What are the prospects of their doing so?
12. What social and political dynamics would the proposed policy set in motion? In particular, would the policy itself evolve appropriately over time, or would it instead tend either to degrade toward a less desirable policy or to fossilize as the conditions making it desirable changed?
13. Are there second-best options with greater administrative or political feasibility, or more desirable likely long-term dynamics (see [12]), than the chosen policy?
14. Given the multiple uncertainties, both analytic and political, are there on balance still good reasons for a skeptic (not a sympathizer with your view) to be reasonably confident that your proposed course of action is a good one to attempt?

Any actual analysis will fall short of giving a full answer to those questions, and is to be judged, among other things, by how carefully it indicates the questions it has omitted and the associated ranges of uncertainty.

Answers to any of the following questions would be instances of policy analysis (though *much too broad* for an APP):

1. What are the agency losses involved with the practice of channeling development assistance through frequently corrupt governments, and what alternative mechanisms could reduce those losses?

2. How do alternative vote-counting mechanisms compare on the dimensions of ease of use, transparency of counting, protection of voter anonymity, and cost?

3. Would it be desirable, all things considered, to increase the supply of human organs for transplantation? If so, how can organ donation and organ allocation practices be changed to accomplish that end?

4. Is drinking water quality over- or under-regulated?

5. Given the decision to use mass testing as a tool of educational management, what is the right mix of "census" testing and sampling?

6. Is the current overall level of alcohol taxation adequate, and is the current preferential treatment of beer compared to wine and alcohol (based on comparable amounts of absolute alcohol) justified?

The following would be analytical projects involving all the analytic complexity of the above, but *possibly* manageable as APPs:

1. What is the optimal sentencing structure for burglary, and what mix of mandatory sentencing, guidelines sentencing, and judicial discretion would best implement that structure?

2. Are there economically and administratively feasible approaches to stimulating the use of lighter (more reflective) colors in rooftops, roadways, and other urban surfaces to reduce summertime air temperatures? Are the potential benefits significant?

APPENDIX D: ORAL PRESENTATION EVALUATION FORM

____

(Presentation # / Title)

Evaluator (check one)

____ Student ____ Faculty ____ Client/Visitor

1	The policy problem was clearly identified in the presentation (you understand the problem and why it is important).	Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2	You understood the methods used and consider them well suited for this policy problem.	Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3	You understood the conclusions presented; the conclusions were clearly delineated and supported by evidence.	Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4	The presentation was clearly articulated and the slides effectively communicated the oral content.	Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5	Overall evaluation of presentation on a 1 to 7 scale (where 1 is low, 7 is superb)	Low Superb 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6	Other Comments:	

APPENDIX E: HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH CERTIFICATION

If your APP projects requires Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval you will need to follow these procedures: Human Subjects Research certification requires taking an on-line course, and test, to ensure that students (and all researchers at UCLA) understand human subjects issues in general. Most APP teams will need only certification as "social/behavioral" researchers. Students need to become certified by completing the on-line course. This certification can be done completed online in a few hours. The training course requires that web browser "cookies" be enabled. All relevant information, and links to all the necessary explanations and documents, may be found at: http://ohrpp.research.ucla.edu/ (under "*Resources*" click on "*Go! Getting Started*").

The direct web address for UCLA online training is:
http://ora.research.ucla.edu/OHRPP/Pages/CITITraining.aspx Click on the "*Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI)*" link. This direct link can also be used: www.citiprogram.org

When you register on the CITI site make sure you choose "Social & Behavioral Researchers & Staff" as your learner group. You are **required** to sign up for the "Basic Course: Social & Behavioral Researchers & Staff." The other courses on clinical practice, responsible conduct of research, and animal research are optional; however, the responsible-conduct-of-research course may have information you will find useful. It is unlikely that you will need to affiliate with another organization or will need to go through any biomedical or clinical training. If your project involves working in health or educational institutions, though, please check with your APP advisor to figure out if extra approvals might be necessary.

IRB Review

Once students have completed the CITI training and have decided on the research methods they will use for their APPs, they should apply either for IRB approval. For an overview and details on this process, once again go to http://ohrpp.research.ucla.edu/ and the "*Go! Getting Started*" link. Once there, review the section "Assess Risk & Determine Level of Review" which will help you evaluate the risk level of your research procedures and the corresponding level of review required.

Since the IRB needs to be certain that APP research is being conducted ethically and human subjects being properly protected, they require detailed information about the APP's research plan. Thus each team will need to formulate the specifics of its subject sample, contact/recruitment protocol, informed consent procedures, interview protocol or survey instrument, data management strategy, etc., concurrent with filling out the IRB application. Some of the information that may be required for the application includes:

- The text of letters or e-mail messages to be used to recruit interview subjects
- Informed consent procedures: Verbal or written assurance that subjects who are verbally recruited will be informed about the procedures for maintaining confidentiality of the data, how the information will be identified when the results are reported, that telephone interviews will be taped only with the subjects' permission, and that subjects will be provided with students' faculty sponsor's contact information upon request. OHRP has templates for this information on the website. These can be adapted and simplified for APPs.
- The questions to be asked in the interviews or surveys.

- How any data involving individuals will be stored and protected, what identifiers will be used, what methods will be employed to prevent specific identification of individuals, what will happen to the data after the completion of the project (protected storage or destroyed), etc.

The department will secure IRB accounts for all APP team members, as soon as possible the team should log onto the online system and peruse the categories of information required. The forms are elaborate and can be difficult to fill out. Teams should be aware that this is a sizeable task.

The IRB Exemptions Administrator, Wendy Brunt, has acquired considerable experience with our APP applicants. She usually reports problems early and responds quickly to inquiries, submissions, and amendments to the exemption forms. Below is her contact information:

Wendy Brunt, North General IRB Principal Analyst
Office of the Human Research Protection Program
wbrunt@research.ucla.edu
Phone: (310) 825-4810