e-pública
Revista electrónica sobre la enseñanza de la Economía Pública

Nº 15, septiembre, 2014
Págs. 33-47

What a Difference a Case Makes: Teaching Economic Evaluation of Public Policies to Non-Economists

Álvaro Choi[1] alvarochoi@ub.edu
Josep-Oriol Escardíbul[1] oescardibul@ub.edu
Mauro Mediavilla[2] Mauro.Mediavilla@uv.es

[1] *Departamento de Economía Pública, Economía Política y Economía Española, Facultad de Economía y Empresa, Universidad de Barcelona. Avda. Diagonal 690, 08034-Barcelona, España.*
[2] *Departamento de Economía Aplicada, Facultad de Economía, Universidad de Valencia. Avda. dels Tarongers s/n, 46022-Valencia, España.*

Recibido: 1 de julio de 2014
Aceptado: 5 de septiembre de 2014

Abstract

The adaptation process to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) provides an opportunity for incorporating new methodologies and making students play the main role in the learning process. In this context, a group of teachers from the University of Barcelona began in the 2012-13 academic year a new pedagogical experience, which consisted in the introduction of case-study methodology in the subject Economic Evaluation of Public Policies, taught at the Political and Administration Sciences undergraduate programme. The aims of the experience were the following: Firstly, making more attractive the subject to non-economists; secondly, developing skills such as collaborative work and critical analysis; finally, increasing academic performance. Results from the experience show enhanced levels of student satisfaction and motivation. Additionally, 2012 students outperform their 2011 colleagues.

Key words: economic instruction, academic performance, case-study, political science.

JEL codes: A22, H43, A12.

1. Introduction

The economic evaluation of public policies is a field which has received growing attention during the last decades. The subject Economic Evaluation of Public Policies (EEPP) was included in the syllabus of the undergraduate studies in Political and Administration Sciences of the University of Barcelona in the 2011/12 academic year, during the adaptation process of the Spanish higher education system to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). Teaching economic-contents subjects such as EEPP to non-economists may be a harsh task for teachers (as well as learning for students) due to the shortages in the previous training of the latter in Economics and quantitative methods. Although the theoretically favourable selection of the students, as EEPP is an optional subject with a double filter for access (being fluent in English[1] and having previously passed the subject Public Economics), the economic nature of the subject may lead non-economists to lower levels of motivation, class attendance and, finally, poor performance. However, the students' ability to choose among optional subjects during that academic year was low, given the scarce number of optional subjects offered in the syllabus. Not satisfied with the 2011/12 overall results, the teaching team involved in this subject identified EEPP as a potential candidate for the application of the case-study teaching methodology due to its applied nature, which should in theory guarantee higher levels of intrinsic personal motivation, and the reduced number of students per group (less than 25 students).

The case-study methodology is a learning methodology which was initially developed in business and law schools and is now widespread across a number of fields such as Medicine, Psychology, Engineering, etc. This methodology is based on the analysis of real or fictional problems which should lead students to a deeper understanding of evaluation techniques and to the development of skills such as negotiation and teamwork. In this sense, the case-study methodology makes the student play the main role in the learning process (Boud 1995), one of the principles of the EHEA.

This paper presents the main results of the application of the case-study methodology in two groups of the subject EEPP during the spring semester of the 2012/13 academic year. Students participating in this experience obtained, on average, high scores, accompanied by high attendance rates and levels of motivation. The paper is structured as follows: first, we explain the methodology and its specific implementation. Second, we describe the subject and environment where the experience was developed. The main results are then presented and discussed. Finally, the article closes compiling the conclusions.

2. THE CASE-STUDY METHODOLOGY

The case-study methodology is based in the proposal of real or fictional situations (cases) with multiple solutions which generate collective reflection dynamics and has been used both for research and teaching purposes. Several authors have pointed out its advantages (Bell and von Lanzenauer 2000; Gopinath 2004; Kunselman and Johnson 2004; Raju and Sanker 1999; Singh and Russo 2013; Stonham 1995; Theroux and Kilbane 2004) and it can be classified as an active teaching method, as it puts the student in the centre of the learning process (Grant, 1997). Yin (1994) explains that the case-study methodology is useful for explaining complex causal links of real-life interventions, describing actions and analysing situations with unclear outcomes. This fits perfectly to the aims of evaluating public policies. Additionally, as Wassermann (1994) explains, the case-study methodology allows students to communicate effectively their ideas, increases their critical thinking, helps them to develop skills for making choices and enhances their interest for learning. At the same time, it is an effective method for working respect for other ideas and beliefs, as it often involves confrontation of people with different points of view. All in all, it develops skills applicable at workplaces (Jerrard 2005) and it is therefore an optimal methodology for developing competences, a central aspect of the EHEA. Carlson (1999) previous results on the impact of the case-study methodology for teaching economic education at the university level made us feel confident about the suitability of applying the methodology to the subject EEPP. Indeed, Singh and Russo (2013) showed the positive role of case-study methodology to learn Development Economics for undergraduate students in non-economic grades, since the use of real-world situations increases students' interest and effort.

At the Spanish level, authors such as Bonache (1999) have discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the case-study methodology, widely applied in business schools. Villarreal and Landeta (2010), for example, provide an interesting example of its application. Likewise, studies such as Pla and Salvador (2011) or Álvarez et al. (2013) show that the case-study methodology can also be very relevant for teaching Public Economics.

2.1. THE CASE-STUDY METHODOLOGY IN EEPP

The cases used in the EEPP subject had the following structure: the description of the case (around 1 sheet) followed by 4 or 5 questions. The first two questions were normally related to very basic theoretical aspects previously introduced during the former sessions. The rest of questions were more complex and open, forcing students to analyse causes and studying alternatives, also giving them the chance to be more creative.

Following Carter and Emerson (2012), we decided to use hand-run class cases, instead of computerized online activities. In their investigation, class sections differed only in the manner through which the experiments were administered (manually in class or computerized online). The authors found no significant difference in student achievement or overall views of the course or instructor between the two treatments. However, students exposed to hand-run experiments reported more favorable views of the experimental pedagogy and reported higher levels of interaction with their classmates.

Stress was put in conceptual and interpretation issues of indicators and methodologies rather than in calculations, due to the students' poor numerical competences. Following Stake's taxonomy (1995), the case studies used in the subject EEPP may be classified as instrumental/collective, as the particular cases were meant to lead to a broader appreciation of the issues involved in the evaluation of public policies using a specific type of evaluation methodology, and the different cases attempted to generate, sequentially, still a broader appreciation of the issues involved in the global process of evaluating public policies.

The students were always asked to answer the questions from the point of view of a professional evaluator. This proved to be challenging task for political science students, used to study public programmes from the policy-maker perspective. In order to match the cases to their interests, students were asked during the first session of the course to point out the different policies they were more interested at.

During the case-solving sessions, students were grouped into teams of 3 or 4 members and were allowed to use (they were indeed encouraged) all the materials they wanted to -including access to ICT devices- during the 60 minutes they were given for solving the case. After that, the groups discussed publicly their answers, trying to reach consensus, the teacher acting as a moderator.

2.2. SOME NOTES ON A SAMPLE CASE

One of the cases used during the course is provided in Appendix I. All cases were newly created by the teaching team. This case, based on a true experience applied in Granada (Spain) for controlling street alcohol consumption by the youth, was used in session 7 (out of 15, as it will be explained in Section 3) in order to assess the students' level of understanding of the first two blocks of the syllabus (see Appendix II).

All the questions in the cases we used had an applied nature. Questions 1 to 3 referred to the first block in the syllabus and, questions 4 and 5, to the second. The first two questions in this case focused on basic issues discussed in class during the previous sessions. These two questions were very relevant, as students were expected to repeat the same reasoning whenever they began a new evaluation. Given the fact that incorrect answers in these two questions could invalidate the rest of the exercise, questions 3, 4 and 5 were designed to be answered independently of questions 1 and 2. Question 3 invited students to go a step further and to link theory to practical issues. Students had here a larger degree of freedom for their answers. Question 4 asked the students to discuss the type of qualitative evaluation they would choose. A final question presented a series of possible results which students should organize using a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) approach. As it has been explained before, students had 60 minutes for completing the exercise. Time management by the teams during this first case was an issue, as some started in a relaxed mood but finished the session with relatively high stress levels. This situation was adjusted during the following cases in several ways: first, students learnt they had to review their materials ex ante and not during the case-solving session; second, students improved their time management; and third, questions in the next cases were calibrated for allowing the teams to work with lower stress levels.

The case was then discussed in class during the next 30 minutes. The teacher read a question and invited each team to present their answer. This modus operandi generated dynamic sessions and provided the chance for teams to interact between them, defend their positions and to, finally, build more complete answers. The teacher only intervened for giving the floor to teams who were not very active, qualifying some answers and stopping some discussions due to time constraints.

3. ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF PUBLIC POLICIES

The subject Economic Evaluation of Public Policies (EEPP) is an optional subject taught during the spring semester of the third year of the four-year undergraduate program in Political and Administration Sciences of the University of Barcelona. It was introduced in the 2011/12 academic year. Each course consists of fifteen sessions of ninety minutes and has an equivalence of 3 credits in the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS).

Two groups of EEPP were offered in the 2012/13 academic year: one in the morning shift and another one in the afternoon. The same teacher was in charge of both groups. The reduced number of students enrolled (20 in the morning group, 13 in the afternoon) and the applied nature of the subject suggested a favourable environment for the implementation of the case-study methodology, the main objectives being the development of competences (negotiation, teamwork and oral expression), increasing personal intrinsic motivation and improving overall performance. Table 1 provides a description of some characteristics of the students enrolled in EEPP during course 2012/13.

Table 1. Distribution of students of Economic Evaluation of Public Policies in the grade of Political and Administration Sciences of the University of Barcelona during the 2013 spring semester

	Morning	Afternoon	Total
Group size (number of students)[a]	20	11	31
Mean age (years)[b]	23,1	26,5	24,3
Women (%)	60,0%	45,5%	54,8%
Students working and studying (%)[c]	60,0%	45,5%	54,8%

Source: Self-elaboration from class surveys.
Notes: [a] Data do not include two afternoon students who dropped out during the semester. [b] Age at June 2013. [c] Students who worked (part-time or full-time) anytime between January and June 2013.

Table 1 shows that the morning group was considerably larger and younger than the afternoon one (the minimal theoretical age for students who have studied in the Spanish educational system and enrolled in EEPP is 21). Surprisingly, although the older profile of the afternoon students, the percentage of students who declared were working during the 2013 spring semester was larger in the morning group. However, among the latter, only 25% declared to be working on a full-time basis, while the percentage rose to 50% in the afternoon group. The minimum economic background of these students consisted -or should have consisted, as it will be explained- in a 6 ECTS credits Introduction to Economics subject, and a 4,5 ECTS credits Public Economics subject. The teaching team was well aware of the contents of these subjects, as they have also participated teaching them. At the same time, the subject was designed in order to complement and not to overlap with the non-economic subject titled Public Policies, taught in the Political and Administration Sciences grade.

It must be acknowledged however that both access filters to EEPP (fluency in English and having passed Public Economics) were vaguely respected: some of the students had problems understanding texts and only a minority of them (20% in the morning group and 45% in the afternoon group) had passed Public Economics by the time they enrolled in EEPP. The classes were therefore composed by a mixture of third and fourth year students. In order to reduce this issue, EEPP has been moved, beginning at the 2013/14 academic year, to the last semester of the fourth year of the curriculum in the grade of Political and Administration Sciences.

In order to implement the case-study methodology the fifteen sessions were divided into four blocks. The first block consisted of 4 theoretical sessions, devoted to explain what is meant by EEPP and why it is useful. Blocks 2 and 3 were structured identically: a first theoretical stage where new evaluation techniques were explained (sessions 5 and 8); a second stage where students discussed examples of past applications of the techniques presented in the former session (sessions 6 and 9); and, finally, a third stage where students had to solve a case which involved using the techniques explained until that moment (sessions 7 and 10). The last block consisted in five sessions: 11 and 13 were theoretical explanations; past real applications of public policy evaluations were discussed in sessions 12 and 14; and, finally, students solved a case in session 15. All theoretical sessions were sparkled with mini-cases for scaffolding the contents and training and guiding students in case-solving dynamics. This distribution of the sessions was explained to students in session 1. Students were provided in advance with the material needed for each session (slide presentations and papers) through the Virtual Campus of the University of Barcelona, based on a MOODLE platform.

Students could choose between two different evaluation systems: on the one hand, the default continuous evaluation system; on the other, the extraordinary system. Students who chose the latter had to solve a case, which represented 100% of their final score, at the end of the course. Only 3 students (2 in the morning and 1 in the afternoon group) chose this system. The rest of students (18 in the morning group and 12 in the afternoon) followed the continuous evaluation system, which combined the scores of the three cases solved in sessions 7, 10 and 15 (60% of the final score) and the mark obtained in a final case (40%). The answers to the cases solved in sessions 7, 10 and 15 typically consisted in two handwritten sheets. Students were asked to be precise as possible. These materials provided evidence on the grade of understanding of the theoretical background and their capacity to apply it to real life situations. The teacher took notes during the classes on the participation of students within and between groups for taking into account the oral expression and teamwork skills of each student. This evidence was used at the end of the course, for raising the final mark of those students (for example, upgrading to 9 -excellent- those students who obtained an 8.5 mark). The public solution of cases also provided the teacher with immediate feedback on the length and difficulty of the activities. The final case had to be solved individually, in order to avoid free-rider behaviours. Of all the students enrolled, only two dropped out, both in the afternoon group, one from each evaluation system.

As it has been explained previously, the cases considered for the evaluation of the students (sessions 7, 10 and 15) had to be solved in groups of 3 or 4 students. A conflict arose in one of the groups during session 7, due to the failure of two students to negotiate their opposite ideas. This led to the decision of forcing students to rotate between groups in the following cases. Although this decision could have reduced the motivation of some students, it reinforced their need to develop teamwork and negotiating skills.

The teaching team faced during some additional difficulties which are worth mentioning. First, the lack of mathematical background of students -some had not studied mathematics since age 16- required an extra effort in the selection of papers, especially in the last part of the syllabus, devoted to quantitative evaluation techniques. Methodologies were explained from a conceptual perspective in the session previous to reviewing the papers and were not expected to understand mathematical formulae. Second, while one of the main strengths of team-working is allowing students to develop and assume a role within the group, it may also become one of its' weaknesses, if free-riding or excessive labour division behaviours occur. We only identified in both groups, during the solution of the first case, one case of free-riding. At the end of the class, the teacher asked his fellow team-members if they would be willing their free-rider member to be graded with the same mark as them. Students answered affirmatively and the student was warned this behaviour would not be tolerated again. Labour division strategy did seldom occur, as questions in the case were cumulative, in the sense it would be difficult to answer to the last questions of the case without having answered the previous ones. Finally, the low number of students in the afternoon group limited the possibilities of creating groups and the subsequent discussion between groups. However, we decided to maintain the same methodology as in the morning groups as the benefits of the intense within group discussions outweighed the possible loss of heterogeneity of answers between groups

A survey was conducted ten minutes before starting the final case for obtaining information about the level of satisfaction and motivation of students. This information was matched with the students' results after the publication of their marks, in order to avoid "fear-based" biases. If we do not consider the two students who dropped out during the semester, the response rate of the survey was 100% in both groups. Attendance to the sessions was voluntary. However, as it is shown in the next section, the students' attendance was very high.

4. RESULTS

This section gathers the results of the experience. The performance and levels of motivation of students are presented in first place. The study of the grade of satisfaction of students is presented subsequently.

4.1. THE IMPACT ON PERFORMANCE AND LEVEL OF MOTIVATION

The main objective of introducing the case-study methodology was to enhance the learning process of contents and skills. Two indirect effects may intervene to buttress the process: increased levels of motivation and assistance to the sessions, both potentially positively correlated with performance.

Table 2 compiles information about the results of students enrolled in EEPP. Mean performance in both groups was high, especially in the afternoon group and among continuous evaluation system students. We consequently tried to understand the different channels through which the introduction of case-study methodology might have affected academic achievement. In Table 2 we observe high attendance rates among continuous evaluation students. This is remarkable as the correlation coefficient between attendance rate and performance is positive. It is important to recall at this point that attendance was not compulsory. Most interestingly, Table 2 shows an increase in the levels of motivation. The level of motivation seems to have a positive correlation with performance too. It must be said that levels of motivation were lower, at the beginning of the semester, in the morning group. Although the motivation levels at the end of the semester seem to be equal for both groups, the interest in studying in depth in the future contents introduced in the subject EEPP was still marginally lower in the morning group. This is consistent with the fact (Table 1) that afternoon group students have a more mature profile. In that sense, one out of every four students of the morning group enrolled in EEPP for reasons other than their interest, while this proportion was below one out of ten in the afternoon group. All in all, the mean academic performance (7,8 out of 10 points) was very satisfactory, especially in the afternoon group, exceeding the mean performance in year 2011/12 (6,6). Additionally, no students obtained scores below 6. However, we acknowledge the lack of a control group during year 2012/13 limits the scope of the results.

Table 2. Results and levels of attendance and motivation in the subject Economic Evaluation of Public Policies during the 2012/13 spring semester.

	Morning	Afternoon	Total
Mean performance (0, min; 10, max)[a]	7,3	8,7	7,8
Mean performance (continuous evaluation system students) (0, min; 10, max)	7,4	8,8	7,9
Mean performance (extraordinary evaluation system students) (0, min; 10, max)	6,4	7,0	6,6
Assistance rate of students (percentage of sessions attended)	73,9%	77,3%	75,1%
Assistance rate (continuous evaluation system students) (percentage of sessions attended)	75,6%	85,0%	79,6%
Assistance rate (extraordinary evaluation system students) (percentage of sessions)	21,4%	57,1%	33,3%
Reason for enrollment in EEPP: personal interest (% of students)	75,0%	90,9%	80,6%
Reason for enrollment in EEPP: other reasons[b](% of students)	25,0%	9,1%	19,4%
Self-reported level of motivation at the beginning of the course (0, min; 10, max)	7,4	8,1	7,7
Self-reported level of motivation at the end of the course (0, min; 10, max)	8,6	8,6	8,6
The student wants to study in depth in the future contents introduced in the subject EEPP (0, totally disagree; 10, totally agree)	7,8	8,6	8,1

Source: Self-elaboration from class surveys.

Note: Data do not include two afternoon group students who dropped out during the semester. [a] Mean performance in 2011/2012: 6,6. [b] Other reasons include: timetable incompatibilities, fellow recommendations and other reasons.

4.2. EVALUATION OF THE APPLICATION OF THE CASE-STUDY METHODOLOGY

The case-study methodology was introduced for the first time in the 2012/13 year in EEPP. We were therefore not only interested in analyzing the impact on academic performance but also on the students' perceptions. The students' assessment of the teacher's activity was very positive (9.2): the mean score obtained by teachers in the grade of Political and Administration Sciences was below 7 in the spring semester of that academic year (Table 3). Factors such as the reduced number of students and the participation of the teacher in a training course on case-study methodology during year 2011/12 might explain the grade of satisfaction of students. However, the use of the case-study methodology by itself seems to have been relevant too. There was broad consensus among the students that the use of case-study methodology had increased their motivation. This is remarkable, as few students were familiar with this methodology, this being the sole subject in their syllabus which used systematically case studies. At the same time, students reported that solving cases was both useful and enjoyable, preferring this methodology to more traditional ones. Indeed, results presented in the last two rows of Table 3 show students valued very positively the case-study methodology itself. These results are consistent with the results of former studies such as Mustoe and Croft (1999), Salvador et al. (2011) or Gallego et al. (2013). Another factor which might have been important for the success of this teaching innovation experience is the good calibration of the difficulty of the cases, which made them neither trivial nor frustrating for students. Nevertheless, this might not be such an important point, as Carlson (1999) showed that although students regularly reported that case projects required considerable effort, they were the most important contribution to their learning. Our results seem to point in the same direction.

Table 3. Students' self-assessment of the application of the case-study methodology in the subject Economic Evaluation of Public Policies during the 2012/13 spring semester.

	Morning	Afternoon	Total
Grade of satisfaction of the students with the teacher (0, min; 10, max).	9,3	9,1	9,2
Percentage of students who had used case-study methodology in the past.	25,0%	18,2%	22,6%
The use of case-study methodology increased the motivation of the student (0, totally disagree; 10, totally agree).	8,5	8,0	8,3
The student enjoyed solving cases (0, totally disagree; 10, totally agree).	7,9	7,7	7,8
The student learnt solving cases (0, totally disagree; 10, totally agree).	8,2	8,5	8,4
The cases were too difficult (0, totally disagree; 10, totally agree).	4,6	5,3	4,8
The student prefers traditional methodologies (0, totally disagree; 10, totally agree).	2,1	1,4	1,8
If he/she were to repeat EEPP, the student would prefer a more traditional methodology (0, totally disagree; 10, totally agree).	1,8	1,6	1,7

Source: Self-elaboration from class surveys.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The results obtained during the 2012/13 academic year seem to confirm the success of the introduction of the case-study methodology. Students following the subject during that course outperformed those enrolled the previous academic year. This is explained by a combination of factors: first, the intrinsic effectiveness of the methodology; second, an increase in the grade of motivation; and finally, the high attendance levels. A good calibration of the level of difficulty and the adequate training of the teacher also seem to be important for understanding the success of the experience.

However, we acknowledge there is certainly room for improvement. Some cases, especially at the beginning of the course, were too long, stressing students. This may be a reflection of a program which might be too ambitious for undergraduate non-economists or a lack of case-solving skills which suggest the importance of dedicating extra efforts to prepare students to case-solving dynamics. This feedback is very valuable for redefining cases for the next course. At the same time, the afternoon classroom did not allow students to move tables and chairs, this situation being a barrier for mobility which could have been very relevant, had students with disabilities enrolled in the subject. Finally, we also acknowledge limitations in this study, such as the size of our sample and the lack of a counterfactual group during the 2012/13 academic year. However, small class size was a key factor for allowing us to introduce effectively this methodology. The impossibility to control for the students' academic and socioeconomic background could be introducing an endogeneity bias too. Nevertheless, the results presented in this study and the students' reports encourage us to maintain the case-study methodology and to apply it to other economic-contents subjects to non-economists.

APPENDIX I

Sample case: El botellódromo

A pesar de que las ordenanzas municipales prohíben y castigan el consumo de bebidas alcohólicas en las vías públicas, el alcalde de Barcelona se muestra preocupado por la proliferación de la denominada "cultura del botellón" entre los jóvenes. Considera que, además de reflejar un problema de valores de la juventud, la imagen de la ciudad se ve dañada por grupos de personas consumiendo bebidas alcohólicas en las vías públicas -si bien reconoce que parte del turismo de la ciudad precisamente valora positivamente la posibilidad de desarrollar esta actividad-. La gota que ha colmado la paciencia del alcalde ha sido un artículo publicado en un conocido semanario de tirada internacional en el que se presenta la ciudad como destino ideal para despedidas de soltero y fines de semana *low-cost*, destacándose la tolerancia con el botellón, y relacionándose esta tolerancia con la suciedad de las calles, las molestias a los vecinos y los crecientes niveles de delincuencia. El alcalde dice carecer de recursos suficientes para controlar y multar a todas las personas que practican botellón.

Conocedor de la situación, el Gerente de Calidad de Vida, Igualdad y Deportes del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona se reúne con el alcalde para explicarle un programa que se viene aplicando desde el año 2006 en Granada para abordar el fenómeno del botellón desde una perspectiva totalmente diferente: el **"botellódromo"**. Durante los fines de semana, a pesar de la existencia de una ordenanza municipal que lo prohibía explícitamente, resultaba rara la plaza o espacio público de Granada en el que no se reunieran jóvenes realizando un botellón. Aprovechando una nueva normativa autonómica que toleraba la construcción de espacios para dichos fines, el consistorio conservador habilitó en zona urbana una explanada de unos 9.500 metros cuadrados (capacidad aproximada de 20.000 personas), sito entre la autovía de circunvalación A-92 y un conocido centro comercial, a unos 20 minutos a pie del centro de la ciudad. El recinto, abierto y al aire libre, está dotado de unos servicios mínimos: lavabos públicos, bancos, varias pérgolas y, de jueves a sábado, de 23 a 5hs, varios equipos de ambulancias y patrullas de la policía local supervisan la zona. Durante el fin de semana, a su vez, el "botellódromo" está comunicado con el resto de la ciudad a través de un autobús público. El botellón sigue estando prohibido en el resto de la ciudad. Entre semana, el solar es utilizado como pista polideportiva en la que suelen patinar *skaters*. El Ayuntamiento de Granada está muy satisfecho con los resultados, ya que ha conseguido eliminar los botellones del centro de la ciudad. El "botellódromo" aparece anunciado también en varias *webs* como un reclamo turístico más de la ciudad. Sin embargo, también se han identificado algunos problemas asociados al "botellódromo", como peleas puntuales. A su vez, se realiza anualmente una convocatoria informal *online* en primavera para batir el récord del mayor botellón de España (existe una "competición" entre ciudades), habiéndose superado en alguna ocasión las 27.000 personas (población aprox. de Granada: 240.000 personas), generándose serios problemas logísticos y saturándose por completo las vías de acceso a la ciudad. Simultáneamente, el Gobierno está elaborando un plan de prevención juvenil del consumo de alcohol y el delegado del Plan Nacional sobre Drogas ha alertado acerca de los peligros de la "normalización" del consumo de alcohol entre los menores.

Muy interesado, el alcalde delega en el Gerente de Calidad de Vida, Igualdad y Deportes la responsabilidad de estudiar la posibilidad de trasladar esta experiencia a Barcelona, quedando emplazados para una nueva reunión para dentro de tres meses. Éste, carente de personal capaz de llevar a cabo esta tarea dentro de su área de administración, se pone en contacto con vosotros, investigadores de una universidad pública catalana, para que llevéis a cabo la evaluación del servicio. Os han llamado hoy a las 9hs y os han convocado para el próximo viernes.

En concreto, **se pide**:

1. Determinad el <u>tipo de evaluación</u> que consideráis más adecuado realizar, teniendo en cuenta las diversas clasificaciones que conozcáis.

2. <u>Planificad la evaluación</u>, respondiendo a las preguntas clave de la evaluación.

3. Haced llegar al Gerente de Calidad de Vida, Igualdad y Deportes del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona los <u>puntos que pueden dificultar la evaluación</u> y tratad de prever cómo solventarlos.

4. Considerando que se os ha pedido una evaluación de tipo <u>cualitativo</u>, estableced los agentes a los que consideráis resultaría conveniente entrevistar. Pensad también en la conveniencia de que las entrevistas sean personales, por videoconferencia, telefónicas o por escrito; estructuradas, semi-estructuradas o abiertas; individuales, por parejas, en grupos focales o en dinámicas de grupo; y si grabaréis o no las entrevistas. <u>Justificad</u> vuestra respuesta.

5. A continuación se muestran las transcripciones de algunas afirmaciones obtenidas en las entrevistas. Elaborad un cuadro de tipo <u>DAFO</u> a partir de dichas observaciones.

    1. "Se transmitirá a la juventud que hacer un botellón es algo normal".
    2. "Permitirá atender con mayor velocidad a los jóvenes que hayan bebido en exceso".
    3. "¿Patinar allí? No sé no sé… me cae muy lejos y aquí hay de todo".
    4. "Desde luego facilitaría nuestra labor de atención a los jóvenes ebrios".
    5. "¿En enero? ¿Allí arriba? Fua, con la rasca que pega ni en broma".
    6. "No queremos el *botellódromo* aquí. Que lo ponga el alcalde frente a su casa".
    7. "¿Tantos jóvenes juntos y borrachos? Acabará en peleas día sí y día también".
    8. "Esto en mi juventud no pasaba. Lo que hace falta es más mano dura. Como pongan el *botellódromo* ese, que se olviden de mi voto".
    9. "Desde la Generalitat apoyaremos la idea".
    10. "*Bowtewhat? Sorry, I don't know what you're talking about*".
    11. "¡Qué ganas tengo de que el Barrio Gótico amanezca más limpio los domingos por la mañana!".
    12. "Tengo familia en el sur y la verdad es que mola. Fijo que batiremos el récord".
    13. "¿Aumentarán los controles de alcoholemia? ¿Mejorará el transporte público?".
    14. "Je, para esto sí hay dinero, pero no para lo que de verdad importa".
    15. "Me parece genial, pero aquí la gente suele quedar en bares o en casa de amigos".

APPENDIX II

Syllabus of the subject Economic Evaluation of Public Policies

Department of Public Economics
Degree in Political Science and Administration
Subject: elective (30 hours)
Academic year: 2012-2013;
Teacher:

TOPIC I. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Lesson 1. Introduction to Economic Evaluation of Public Policies

1.1. Concept and Rationale
1.2. Typologies of Economic Evaluation of Public Policies

Recommended reading:

- Drummond, M.F., et al. (2005). Chapter 3 & 11.1.
- García, J.I. (2009). Chapter 2.
- IVALUA (2009).
- Pinto, G., et al. (2001).
- Khander, S.R., et al. (2009). Chapter 2.

Lesson 2. Key elements in the design of Economic Evaluation of Public Policies

2.1. Objectives of the Economic Evaluation of Public Policies
2.2. Planning of the Economic Evaluation of Public Policies
2.3. Methodological Strategy

Recommended reading:

- AEVAL (2010). Chapter 2.
- García, J.I. (2009). Chapter 3.
- IVALUA (2009).
- Pinto, G., et al. (2001).
- Khander, S.R., et al. (2009). Chapter 2.

TOPIC II. METHODS OF QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Lesson 3. Methods of qualitative evaluation

3.1. Design and analysis of the research
3.2. Examples

Recommended reading:

- IVALUA (2011).

Nº 15, septiembre, 2014
Págs. 33-47

TOPIC III. METHODS OF QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION (I): MACRO APPROACH

Lesson 4. Methods of quantitative evaluation: macroeconomic approach

4.1. Macroeconomic methodology: concept, types, and applications
4.2. Examples

Recommended reading:
- Calero, J. (1995). Chapter 1 y 6.
- De Rus, G. (2010). Chapter 1.
- Drummond, M.F., et al. (2005). Chapter 7.
- Belfield, C.R. y Levin, H. (2007).
- IVALUA (2009).

TOPIC IV. METHODS OF QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION (II): MICRO APPROACH

Lesson 5. Methods of quantitative evaluation: non-parametric approach

5.1. Data envelopment analysis (DEA)
5.2. Experiments
5.3. Quasi-experimental analysis

Recommended reading:
Experiments: Schlotter et al. (2011)
DEA & Quasi-experiments: to be provided.

Lesson 6. Methods of quantitative evaluation: parametric approach

6.1. Econometric models
6.2. Microsimulation model

Recommended reading:
Instrumental variables: Khandker, S.R., et al. (2009). Chapter 6; Schlotter et al. (2011).
Panel models: Albalate, D. (2008); Schlotter et al. (2011).
Microsimulation: Bourguignon F., and Pereira, L.A. (2003) ; Bourguignon, F., and Spadaro, A. (2006); Spadaro, A. (2007).

Notas

[1] Fluency in English was needed as most of the selected texts were in that language. It also gave greater flexibility to the teachers, given the wider literature on EEPP available in that language. Nevertheless, sessions were carried out and exercises were solved in Spanish.

Agradecimientos

Los autores desean manifestar su reconocimiento a los evaluadores por sus sugerencias y correcciones que han contribuido a mejorar la versión inicial, así como el papel desempeñado por el editor ponente.

REFERENCES

Álvarez, X.C., González, X.M., Gago, A., Labandeira, X., Lago, S., Picos, F. and Vaquero, A. (2013). "La docencia de la fiscalidad aplicada en las nuevas titulaciones de administración de empresas: experiencia y resultados", *e-pública, Revista electrónica sobre la enseñanza de la Economía Pública*, **12**:36-65.

Bell, P.C. and C. H. von Lanzenauer. (2000). "Teaching Objectives: The Value of Using Cases in Teaching Operational Research", *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, **51**: 1367-1377.

Bonache, J. (1999). "El estudio de casos como estrategia de construcción teórica: características, críticas y defensas", *Cuadernos de Economía y de Dirección de la Empresa*, **3**: 123-140.

Boud, D. (ed.) (1995). *Enhancing Learning through Self-assessment*. London: Kogan Page.

Carlson, W. L. (1999). "A Case Method for Teaching Statistics", *The Journal of Economic Education ,* **30 (1)**: 52-58.

Carter, L. K. and T. L. N. Emerson. (2012). "In-Class vs. Online Experiments: Is There a Difference?", *The Journal of Economic Education,* **43 (1)**: 4-18.

Gallego, A, Fortunato, M. S., Rossi, S. L., Korol, S.E. and J. A. Moretton. (2013). "Case Method in the Teaching of Food Safety", *Journal of Food Science Education*, **12 (3)**: 42-47.

Gopinath, C. (2004). "Exploring Effects of Criteria and Multiple Graders on Case Grading", *Journal of Education for Business*, July/August: 317-322.

Grant, R. (1997). "A Claim for the Case Method in the Teaching of Geography", *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, **21 (2)**:171-185.

Jerrard, M. A. (2005). "Assessing Student Learning and Skills Using the Case Study Method", *Journal of New Business Ideas and Trends*, **3 (1)**:27-36.

Kunselman, J.C. and K. A. Johnson. (2004). "Using the Case Method to Facilitate Learning", *College Teaching*, **52 (3)**:87-92.

Mustoe, L. R. and A. C. Croft. (1999). "Motivating Engineering Students by Using Modern Case Studies", *European Journal of Engineering Education*, **15 (6)**:469-476.

Pla, Á. and Salvador, C. (2011). "La docencia en la materia 'Tributación de la Empresa': Viejos y nuevos planteamientos en constante revisión", *e-pública, Revista electrónica sobre la enseñanza de la Economía Pública*, **9**: 1-27.

Raju, P. K. and C. S. Sanker. (1999). "Teaching Real-World Issues through Case Studies", *Journal of Engineering Education*, **88(4)**:501-508.

Salvador, L.. Argos, J., Exquerra, M.P., Osoro, J.M. and Castro, A. (2011). "Perfiles de estilos de aprendizaje de los estudiantes universitarios y metodologías docentes", *Bordón*, **63(2)**: 41-52.

Singh, P. and A. Russo. (2013). "A Dream Experiment in Development Economics", *The Journal of Economic Education*, **44 (2)**: 158-168.

Stake R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Stonham, P. (1995). "For and Against the Case Method", *European Management Journal*, **13 (2)**: 230-234.

Theroux, J. and C. Kilbane. (2004). "The Real-Time Case Method: A New Approach to an Old Tradition", *Journal of Education for Business*, January/February: 163-167.

Villarreal, O. and Landeta, J. (2010). "El estudio de casos como metodología de investigación científica en Dirección y Economía de la Empresa. Una aplicación a la internacionalización", *Investigaciones Europeas de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa*, **16 (3)**: 31-52.

Wassermann, S. (1994). *Introduction to case method teaching: A guide to the galaxy*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Resumen

El proceso de adaptación al Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior (EEES) supone una oportunidad para la incorporación de nuevas metodologías y para convertir a los estudiantes en los protagonistas del proceso de aprendizaje. En este contexto, un equipo de profesores de la Universidad de Barcelona comenzó, en el curso académico 2012-13, una nueva experiencia pedagógica consistente en la introducción de la metodología del estudio de casos en la asignatura Evaluación Económica de Políticas Públicas, correspondiente al programa de grado de Ciencias Políticas y de la Administración. Los objetivos de la experiencia fueron los siguientes: en primer lugar, incrementar el atractivo de la asignatura a no-economistas; en segundo lugar, desarrollar habilidades como el trabajo cooperativo y el análisis crítico; finalmente, mejorar el rendimiento académico. Los resultados de la experiencia muestran niveles elevados de satisfacción y motivación de los alumnos. Adicionalmente, en los resultados de los alumnos del año 2012 superaron a los de los del año 2011.

Palabras clave: enseñanza en economía, rendimiento, estudio de caso, ciencias políticas.

Códigos JEL: A22, H43, A12.