Data collection tool to successfully apply the Kaleidoscope model of policy change

Hassen Ouerghemmi, Ali Oumer, Boubaker Dhehibi, Aymen Frija

Sep 2024

Introduction

To effectively implement the Kaleidoscope Model for understanding policy change, for each studied policy a minimum of 20 policy actors (whatever their influence) must be interviewed this sample must include different categories (Government, research, development, private, donors. Etc). The process of data collection can be tracked as presented in Table 1.

The main objectives of these interviews are to gather insights on the policy system and its dynamics, to identify key stakeholders and their roles in policy change and to understand the factors influencing policy decisions.

Table 1. Survey tracking

Category	Policy 1	....		Policy 2	....	
	Actor	**Surveyed / No**	**P1 ID**	**Actor**	**Surveyed / No**	**P2 ID**
Government	…………..	…………..	1.1	…………..	…………..	2.1
Research	…………..	…………..	1.2	…………..	…………..	2.2
Development	…………..	…………..	1.3	…………..	…………..	2.3
Private	…………..	…………..	1.4	…………..	…………..	2.4
Donors	…………..	…………..	1.5	…………..	…………..	2.5
..etc	…………..	…………..	..etc	…………..	…………..	..etc

Semi-Structured Interview

Respondent : …………………………….. (P1/P2)

Institution : …………………………………….

Category : ……………………………………..

Before starting

The purpose of this interview of 1 hour is to map policy actors, define the historical dynamics and to identify the drivers of change and future opportunities. Your responses will remain confidential and treated anonymously.

Background Information

What is the main role of your institution ? since when ? structure/staff /budget ?

……
………………………………………………………………………….

How you classify your institution in policy-making process (Policy formulation, Policy administration and implementation, Oversight, Knowledge sharing) ?

……
………………………………………………………………………….

What is your Policy Agenda Statement (eg : the agenda of Minestery of Energy is " for an energetic transition") and how you judge your influence (low-medium-large)

……
………………………………………………………………………….

Policy Context

Can you describe the current policy landscape related to [the studied policy]?

……
……
……

Who are the main stakeholders involved in this policy area?

……
……
………………………………………

Policy Chronology

Can you please identify the key policy episodes, and the related events (identify the key actor if possible) ?

Year	Policy Events	Political Events	Economic Events	Research and other events
……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..
……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..
……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..
……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..
……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..
……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..	……………..

KM Hypotheses

Measurements / Question	Responses	Test Results (+/-)
H1. Identify evidence used to document the problem and measure its significance. Identify the constituency concerned.	……………..	+ / -
H2. Define the specific event that put a specific issue on the policy agenda.	……………..	+ / -
H3. List actors lobbying for policy change.	……………..	+ / -
H4. List existing or commissioned case studies, research, or examples that informed the design of the policy program	……………..	+ / -
H5. List norms or beliefs that influenced policy design and to whom they belonged.	……………..	+ / -
H6.List particularly salient costs or benefits that influenced policy design.	……………..	+ / -

H7. List the supporters and the opponents of the policy drawing from government, private sector, civil society, donors and other international groups.	…………..	+ / -
H8. List government decision-makers with ultimate authority. Classify actors as proponents, opponents, or neutral. Identify if the veto player opposed reform (negative) or allowed it to proceed (positive).	…………..	+ / -
H9. Identify if timing (political, economic, social) was leveraged to help increase the probability of program adoption. Identify the specific event and how it influenced the probability of adoption, with specific reference to when it occurred vis-a-vis the period of adoption	…………..	+ / -
H10. Identify if funding for the program was sufficient for the new policy over time. Also note if there were periods when funding was not sufficient and the program deviated from stated intent.	…………..	+ / -
H11. List the actors tasked with program implementation. Consider the following factors: 1) Did they have the human resources to implement the program as designed? 2) Did they have the capacity for monitoring and oversight? 3) Did they have the ability to engage in inter-ministerial coordination, if needed? 4) Did they have the decentralized infrastructure to do this, if needed?	…………..	+ / -
H12. Did private sector, NGO or local agency implementers or refuse implementation? Why?	…………..	+ / -
H13. Identify any strong proponents who acted as a watchdog to ensure the program was operating as intended.	…………..	+ / -
H14. List new information or beliefs that emerged post-implementation and influenced how policymakers think programs should be structured	…………..	+ / -
H15. List changes in the policy environment (resources, problem status, technology) that influence the need for the operation of the program	…………..	+ / -
H16. Identify key changes in policy institutions: new administration, new minister, new policy architecture. What new perspectives and priorities did the new players bring to the policy debates?	…………..	+ / -

Hassen Ouerghemmi, h.ouerghemmi@cgiar.org

Ali Oumer, a.oumer@cgiar.org & **alioumer@gmail.com**

Boubaker Dhehibi, b.dhehibi@cgiar.org

Aymen Frija, a.frija@cgiar.org

Hassen Ouerghemmi, h.ouerghemmi@cgiar.org

Ali Oumer, a.oumer@cgiar.org & alioumer@gmail.com

Boubaker Dhehibi, b.dhehibi@cgiar.org

Aymen Frija, a.frija@cgiar.org