

# Assessing the effectiveness of drug policy

**Franz Trautmann**



Netherlands Institute of  
Mental Health and Addiction



# Scope of presentation

1. What are the aims of evaluating drug policy?
2. What do we need to know?
3. What can we know?
4. Some concluding remarks

# 1. What are the aims of the evaluation

- Serve as fact basis for adaptations of policy or new policy plan
- Improve policy making and implementation
  - Political / organisational structure of policy making and implementation (e.g. coordination, leadership, stakeholder involvement)
  - Process of policy making and implementation (e.g. stakeholder consultation, transparency, accountability, evidence utilisation)

# 2. What do we need to know

- Effectiveness / impact of policy measures implemented

## **Influencing factors:**

- Relevance of priorities and objectives
- Consistency of policy plans
  - Internal: objectives – activities – results - assumptions
  - External: Links with other policy fields and with international framework
- Political / organisational structure
- Process

# 3. What can we know: effectiveness

- No direct prove
- Indirect sources of information on how the drug problem and drug policy developed in the period evaluated
- Evt. 'negative' conclusions: the policy did **not** result in...
- *Review of available data on the drug situation*
- *Assessment of view of stakeholders involved in drug policy implementation on the achievements (interviews and focus groups)*

# 3. Relevance of priorities/objectives of policy plan

Does the policy document identify

- The topical priorities?
- The appropriate instruments/interventions?
- The responsibilities for realisation of these objectives?
- *Assessment of stakeholders' view (interviews and focus groups)*
  - *Consensus, commitment*

# 3. Consistency of policy plan

- SMART policy objectives and aims
- Clearly defined results
- Clearly elaborated activities
- Objectively verifiable indicators to verify achievements
- Assumptions and risks
- *Translating policy plan in LogFrame*
- *Assessment of stakeholders' view (interviews and focus groups)*
  - *Shared understanding, consensus*

# 3. LogFrame reconstruction

Overall objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Means of verification	
Priority aims	Objectively verifiable indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions and risks
Results 1. ... 2. ... 3. ...	Objectively verifiable indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions and risks
Activities: 1. ... 2. ... 3. ...	Input		Assumptions and risks



# 3. Political/organisational structure

Is the existing structure appropriate and efficient?

- Involvement of relevant stakeholders
- Coordination
  - E.g. clarity and agreement around roles and responsibilities
- Leadership
  - Accepted authority, consensus seeking
- *Assessment of stakeholders' view (interviews and focus groups)*

# 3. Process

- Did the process of policy formulation and implementation go well
  - Managed appropriately,
  - Allowing and taking-up input from all stakeholders, etc.
  - Transparency
  - Accountability, evidence utilisation)
- Were conditions sufficient to realise the actions formulated in the policy plan?
  - Transparency
  - Resources
- *Assessment of stakeholders' view (interviews and focus groups)*

# 4. Some concluding remarks

- Effectiveness is difficult to measure
- 'Soft' factors can be decisive regarding quality of implementation and effectiveness of policy
  - Motivation
  - Consultation/involvement of all relevant stakeholders
  - Consensus orientation

# 4. Some concluding remarks

- Evaluation (and monitoring of process and outcomes) vital for improving (cost)effectiveness
- Evaluators should be independent
- Transparency of evaluation process
- Feedback of evaluation results to stakeholders and policy makers

**Thank you for your  
attention**

**Franz Trautmann**  
**ftrautmann@trimbos.nl**



Netherlands Institute of  
Mental Health and Addiction

