

Public Policy Analysis
School of Public Affairs
Arizona State University

Spring 2009

Class Hours: Monday, 5:40-8:30 pm
Class Location: Phoenix, UCENT 253
Class Website: Blackboard (<http://my.asu.edu>)

Instructor: Yushim Kim, Ph.D.
Email: ykim@asu.edu
Office: UCENT ste. 445
Office hours: Monday 3:00 - 5:00 pm, and by appointment.

Course Objectives

The objective of this course is to introduce you to policy analysis as a systematic way of thinking about public policies. Throughout the course, you will think about, discuss, and come to understand the crucial components of public policy, as well as analytical approaches to public policy. This will help you to take the first step in becoming a solid policy analyst.

This course is designed to help you develop the skills required to define and critically analyze policy problems, articulate relevant decision making criteria for policy analysis, and evaluate alternative policy options. You are expected to learn: (1) what frameworks are available for policy analysis, (2) how a particular framework is relevant in a given context, and (3) the strengths and weaknesses of each framework. These frameworks, skills, and techniques will be applied to a wide range of substantive public policy issues.

Course Format

The general format of this course includes reviews of previous class material, short weekly lectures, and student case analysis presentations. Prior to each class, students are expected to read the required texts and articles listed in the syllabus. Students are responsible for content included in the readings, even if it is not explicitly reviewed in class. PowerPoint slides will be posted on the class website before each class (when they are ready or if it is necessary). Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions. In this course you will be responsible for case analyses, a policy paper, presentations, and class participation. The assignments are explained in more detail below.

Readings

Required Readings

- [TC] Theodoulou, S. Z., & Cahn, M. A. (1995). *Public policy: The essential readings*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [M] Munger, M. C. (2000). *Analyzing policy*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- [On] Check the class website (<http://my.asu.edu>) – PAF505 – Course Documents – Papers

Grading

Final Grade Determination

Please keep in mind that grades are earned through hard work, quality performance on class assignments, and making contributions to the class by actively participating in class discussions. You should be fully aware of the final grade you may get from your performance. If I find that your progress is unsatisfactory, I will inform you in person or via email by the end of spring break (by March 13, 2009). No incompletes will be given, with the exception of serious unexpected events that prevent course completion. Your final grade will be based on the following assignments/exams:

- | | | |
|----|---------------|-----|
| 1. | Case analyses | 40% |
| 2. | Final paper | 40% |
| 3. | Participation | 20% |

A letter grade will be given for each assignment. Substantively, an A indicates excellent, B indicates average, and C indicates below average. For graduate students, grades of C and D lead to failure of the course. If you satisfy the requirements in this syllabus, you will earn a B. To earn above a B, you must present excellence beyond the minimum requirements in this syllabus.

Class Assignments & Evaluations

1. Case Analyses & Presentation [40%]

1.1. Case Analyses [20%]

Case analyses are one of most important activities in this course, providing an opportunity to understand theoretical discussions in the specific context you choose. The three steps to follow for this assignment are discussed below.

First, each group will pick a policy that they would like to examine at the beginning of the semester. This policy will be the context of your research. A list of example policies that you can choose is provided below. Note that you will work on this policy for all assignments this semester.

Example Areas/Topics

Health Care Policy – i.e. Medicaid, Medicare, Veterans Health Care Program
 Welfare and Social Security Policy – i.e. Social Security, Food Stamps
 Education Policy – i.e. Higher Education, School Reforms, No Child Left Behind
 Environmental Policy – i.e. Environmental Protection, Natural Resources
 Other – i.e. Immigration, Civil Liberties, Science & Technology

Second, each team will write six case analyses as listed in the course schedule (p. 7). Frame and analyze your policy case using a concept, model, or framework from the weekly readings. You should answer the following questions.

Case Analyses on Policy Process

- CA #1: Analyze your policy based on the Gupta's policy process model, focusing on the agenda-setting stage of the policy.
- CA #2: Identify institutional and non-institutional players of your policy. Explain how they influenced in shaping or changing the policy.
- CA #3: Which model best describes the implementation of your policy? Muddling-through, game, or evolution? Explain why and how.
- CA #4: What have previous empirical studies reported on the effectiveness of your policy? Criticize primary findings of these studies.

Case Analyses on Policy Analysis

- CA #5: Frame a problem that your policy aimed to address from at least two different points of view. Discuss a logical solution from each point of view.
- CA #6: Which criteria should be considered when addressing the policy problem you have chosen? Why? Any trade-offs?
- *Extra Analysis*: Submit an assignment on cost-benefit analysis (separately given in class, not included in the case analysis assignment, but bonus points will be given for completion and correct answers)

Third, each case analysis should be posted in the blackboard (Discussion Board) before every Sunday before 9:00 pm. This will allow me and others to read your analysis before class so that we can address major issues and questions after reading your reports.

The grade for this assignment will be given after each group finishes all case analyses. The grade will reflect your overall progress and performance on the overall assignment rather than being based on single case analyses. The same grade will be given to every group members.

1.2. Presentation and Discussion [20%]

Your team will present or discuss your case analysis in class (once during the semester). Since everyone is expected to read all class readings, this assignment will provide us with great context for class discussion. This assignment will help you in two different ways. First, it will allow you to read and explain important concepts in public policy in your own words. Second, it will provide an opportunity to practice for the presentation of your policy paper. The following

aspects of your presentation will be evaluated: (1) whether the presentation is well prepared regarding content, format, and style; and (2) whether you engage other students, raise questions, and present the content with substantial knowledge. Students will evaluate your team's performance. The presentations will be scheduled on the first day of class. Each team can decide how they want to present by themselves. There is no required or preferred format for presentations.

At a minimum, you should present: (1) key points of the reading; (2) your analysis using the concepts and framework in the reading; and (3) what you have learned from the case analysis. You will have approximately 1 hour and 30 minutes. The actual presentation should be no more than 60 minutes. Other students will have an opportunity to discuss your presentation afterwards.

2. Final Paper & Memo [40%]

2.1. Policy Paper

Imagine that you are a policy analyst in an organization (i.e. county agency, state government, or political institute). Writing a good report as a team is one of the most important skills you need to be successful in such a position. There are several different styles of writing (i.e. professional report, policy memo, academic paper). In this class, you will write a policy paper, focusing on a specific dimension of a policy analysis. These are the option you may consider. Please pick one and write a final paper as a group.

A. Defining a Policy Problem

Policy analysts have learned that it is extremely challenging to define a policy problem in an agreeable format. Your team may attempt to structure a policy problem in this assignment. My questions for this assignment are: (1) what is a problem that the policy you chose aim to address?; (2) why is it a problem from whose perspective?; (3) what is a major policy or program that the U.S. has established to address the problem?; (4) is the policy or program appropriate to address the problem you defined?; and (5) why or why not? Recommendations are optional.

B. Identifying and Evaluating Alternatives

It is inevitable that policy analysis has a qualitative aspect especially when we think about policy alternatives and selection criteria. Your team may think about policy alternatives to address your policy problem and evaluate them based on policy criteria selected. Be critical and clear on explaining trade-offs. Your final paper should include a Criteria and Alternative Matrix (CAM). You can add qualitative or quantitative evaluation on alternatives. Recommendations should be reasonable and persuasive.

C. Performing Cost-Benefit Analysis

Despite of well-known issues, cost-benefit analysis is used as one of useful policy tools to make a policy decision. If your team wants to do a quantitative and analytical project for a final paper, you may pick this option. Come up with two or three compelling alternatives to address a policy problem on which your team decided to focus. Identify tangible/intangible costs and benefits (at least 10 items, but no more than 20 items for costs and benefits). Perform a cost-benefit analysis. Consider and discuss discounting. Report the result with shortcomings, limitations, and

weaknesses.

The policy paper should be single-spaced, 12-point font, and no more than a total of 5,000 words (excluding references, tables, and figures). A cover sheet should be included with your name, title, course number, date, and word count. There should be a minimum of 10 references in the paper. Your references should include government documents, peer-reviewed articles, and books. A maximum of 6 web articles will be counted as references. All in-text citations and references should follow APA citation format. At the end of the paper, you must add an acknowledgment which explains who contributed to what or how for the final paper with signature of each member (exclude acknowledgment for word counting).

The policy paper will be submitted by **May 6, 2009, 9:30 pm in person (UCENT 439), in my mailbox, via fax (602.496.0950), or via email (ykim@asu.edu)**. The paper will be graded on the following components: Content, Clarity, Comprehensiveness, Creativity, and Evidence.

2.2. Policy Memo

You will practice writing a short and concise policy memo, which is a common communication medium in public agencies. As a policy analyst, you will be in situations where you have to write a memo for policy makers or stakeholders. The policy memo should include key information you want to communicate to them. Guidance on writing the policy memo from Dunn (2004) is provided on the class website.

Use your policy paper to write the policy memo. You should be able to touch on and highlight key points in the paper and write a short memo directed to relevant decision makers or stakeholders. The memo should be single-spaced with 12-point font. You will submit the memo with your final copy of the policy analysis paper by **9:30 pm on May 6, 2009**.

2.3. Presentation

At the end of the semester, each team will present your policy paper in class. Each team should prepare for approximately 30 minutes of presentation and 15 minutes for questions. You may prepare PowerPoint slides, keeping in mind that it will take approximately 2 minutes to present each slide. Please limit your slide to no more than 15 slides. We will schedule the presentations in class on **April 14, 2009**.

3. Participation [20%]

You will be expected to complete all required reading assignments prior to each class meeting. Your attendance, participation in class discussions, completion of class assignments, and discussions with me via e-mail or during office hours will influence your participation grade. I value a good attitude, passion, and process in the learning environment. I will consider these aspects in all assignments. If you wish to receive clarification of anything you have read or heard in class, but do not wish to ask a question in class, send me an email and I will respond to it in the following class session.

I am fully aware that speaking among a group of strangers is often an anxiety-producing experience. However, each student will be asked to contribute to the learning process through discussion. No one will be allowed the luxury of passive anonymity. I want to assure you, therefore, that your thoughts and opinions will always be treated with respect.

I also understand that some of you might be out of town throughout the semester. Your absences due to your job or personal matters will not influence your grade assignments other than the participation component. If you miss class more than two times this semester, the best participation grade you will earn is a B.

Finally, I would like to meet with each team for about 20 minutes after class at the beginning of the semester. This meeting serves two functions: (1) to get to know you better, and (2) to discuss your interest in public policy. We will discuss what policy topic your team are interested in and how you will develop the final paper. Please sign up for a date and time on the list that I will provide on the first day of class.

Schedule of Topics and Assignments: Spring 2009

Week	Date	Topic	Assignment
1	1/19	Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday	No class
2	1/26	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabus • Policy science 	Submit class survey Schedule case analysis presentation
3	2/2	PAF504 Review - Rationales <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market, expert, and democratic decisions 	
4	2/9	Public Policy - Nature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is public policy? • Policy analysts – Role, ethic, & value 	
5	2/16	Public Policy - Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy process • Agenda-setting 	<i>Due for a case analysis (1)</i>
6	2/23	Public Policy - The Players <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional and noninstitutional actors 	<i>Due for a case analysis (2)</i>
7	3/2	Ex Post: Formative Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation • Performance monitoring 	<i>Due for a case analysis (3)</i>
8	3/9	Spring Break	No class
9	3/16	Ex Post: Summative Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation • Impact/outcome evaluation 	<i>Due for a case analysis (4)</i>
10	3/23	Ex Ante: Problem Definition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structuring problems • Stakeholder analysis 	<i>Due for a case analysis (5)</i>
11	3/30	Ex Ante: Selection of Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision criteria • Trade-offs 	<i>Due for a case analysis (6)</i>
12	4/6	Ex Ante: Comparison of Alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost-benefit analysis • Discounting 	<i>Due for an extra analysis</i> Schedule paper presentation
13	4/13	Practice of Policy Analysis (I) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative policy-making • Experiencing the Decision Theater 	<i>Draft of policy paper due (optional)</i>
14	4/20	Wrapping up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evolution 	
15	4/27	Student Presentation (I)	
16	5/4	Student Presentation (II)	<i>Due for a final paper and a memo (May 6, 9:30 pm)</i>

Reading Assignments

Week 1 (1/19): **Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday (No Class)**

Week 2 (1/26): **Introduction**

[On] Syllabus

[On] Lasswell, H. D. (1951). "The Policy Orientation." In D. Lerner & H. D. Lasswell. *The policy sciences: Recent developments in scope and methods*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 3-15.

[M] Chapter 1: Policy Analysis as a Profession and a Process: An Overview, pp. 3-29.

[On] Schwindt, R., Vining, A., & Weimer, D. (2003). A Policy Analysis of the BC Salmon Fishery, *Canadian Public Policy*, 29(1), 73-94 **(CASE)**

Online*

How a bill becomes law [Video] <http://youtube.com/watch?v=mEJL2Uuv-oQ>

Marvel, M. (2006). How a Bill becomes Law. OSU Library Website.
<http://library.osu.edu/sites/reference/govdocs/leghis.htm>

Marvel, M. (2006). Analysis of a Federal Government Program. OSU Library Website.
<http://library.osu.edu/sites/reference/govdocs/ppm801~1.htm>

* You need to learn these sites for case analyses.

To access LexisNexis, see the blackboard – External Links – LexisNexis Congressional

Week 3 (2/2): **PAF 504 Review - Rationales for Public Policy**

[M] Chapter 2: Deciding How to Decide, pp. 30-53.

[M] Chapter 3: A Benchmark for Performance: The Market, pp. 54-88.

[M] Chapter 4: "Evaluation and Market Failure": Criteria for Intervention, pp. 101-130.

[M] Chapter 5: "Experts and "Advocacy": The Limits of Policy Analysis, pp. 134-161.

[M] Chapter 6: Democratic Decisions and "Government Failure": The Limits of Choice by the People, pp. 162-199.

Week 4 (2/9): **Public Policy – Nature & Policy Analysts**

[TC] Chapter 1: The Contemporary Language of Public Policy: A Starting Point

[TC] Chapter 3: Distribution, Regulation, Redistribution: The Functions of Government

[TC] Chapter 5: The Analysis of Public Policy

[TC] Chapter 9: Group Politics and Representative Democracy

[TC] Chapter 10: The Power Elite

[On] Weimer, D., & Vining, A. (2005). Chapter 3: Toward Professional Ethics, pp. 39-53.

[On] Majone, G. (1989). Chapter 2: Analysis as Argument, pp. 21-41

[On] Majone, G. (1989). Chapter 3: Analysis as Craft, pp. 42-68.

Week 5 (2/16): **Public Policy - Process**

- [On] Gupta, D. K. (2001). Chapter 3: The Policy Process. *Analyzing public policy: Concepts, tools, and techniques*, pp. 46-69.
- [TC] Chapter 11: How Public Policy Is Made
- [TC] Chapter 12: Issues and Agendas
- [TC] Chapter 13: Agenda-Setting
-

Week 6 (2/23): **Public Policy - The Players**

- [TC] Chapter 22: The Players: Institutional and Noninstitutional Actors in the Policy Process
- [TC] Chapter 24: Congress: The Electoral Connection
- [TC] Chapter 25: The Presidential Policy Stream
- [TC] Chapter 27: The Rise of the Bureaucratic State
- [TC] Chapter 32: News That Matters
- [TC] Chapter 34: Parties, the Government, and the Policy Process
- [TC] Chapter 35: The Advocacy Explosion
- [TC] Chapter 36: The Consultant Corps
-

Week 7 (3/2): **Ex Post – Formative Evaluation**

- [TC] Chapter 14: The Science of “Muddling Through”
- [TC] Chapter 16: Implementation Game
- [TC] Chapter 17: Implementation as Evolution
- [On] O’Toole, L. J. (2000). Research on Policy Implementation: Assessment and Prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 263-288.
- [On] Kim, Y. (2007). Using spatial analysis for monitoring fraud in a public delivery program. *Social Science Computer Review*, 25(3), 287-301. **(CASE)**
-

Week 8 (3/10): **Spring Break (No Class)**

Week 9 (3/16): **Ex Post – Summative Evaluation**

- [TC] Chapter 19: The Role of Evaluation in the Public Policy
- [On] Rossie, P., Freeman, H.E., & Lipsey, M. W. (1999). Chapter I: Programs, Policies, and Evaluations. pp. 3-35
- [On] Zvoch, K., & Stevens, J. J. (2008). Measuring and Evaluating School Performance: An Investigation of Status and Growth-Based Achievement Indicators. *Evaluation Review*, 32, 569-595. **(CASE)**
- [On] Herbst, C. M. (2008). Do Social Policy Reforms Have Different Impacts on Employment and Welfare Use as Economic Conditions Change? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(4), 867-894. **(CASE)**
- [On] Hicks, D., Larson, C., Nelson, C., Olds, D.L., & Johnston, E. (2008). The Influence of Collaboration on Program Outcomes: The Colorado Nurse Family Partnership. *Evaluation Review*, 32, 453-477. **(CASE)**
-

Week 10 (3/23): *Ex Ante* - Problem Definition

- [On] Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155-169.
- [On] Rosenhead, J., & Mingers, J. (2001). Chapter 1: A New Paradigm of Analysis. pp. 1-20.
- [On] Dunn, W. N. (2004). Chapter 3: Structuring Policy Problems. *Public Policy Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. pp. 96-120.
- [On] Coughlin, J. F. (1994). Chapter 7: The tragedy of the concrete commons: Defining traffic congestion as a public problem. In D. A. Rochefort & R. W. Cobb. (Eds.). *The politics of problem definition: Shaping the policy agenda* (pp. 138-158). Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas (**CASE**)
-

Week 11 (3/30): *Ex Ante* - Selection of Criteria

- [On] Stone, D. (2002). Chapter 2: Equity, *Policy paradox*. pp. 35-60.
- [On] Stone, D. (2002). Chapter 3: Efficiency, *Policy paradox*. pp. 61-85.
- [On] Stone, D. (2002). Chapter 4: Security, *Policy paradox*. pp. 86-107.
- [On] Stone, D. (2002). Chapter 5: Liberty, *Policy paradox*. pp. 108-130.
- [On] Kraft, M. E., & Furlong, S. R. (2007). Chapter 6: Assessing Policy Alternatives. *Public Policy*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, pp. 147-157.
-

Week 12 (4/6): *Ex Ante* - Comparison of Alternatives – C/B Analysis

- [On] Stokey, E., & Zeckhauser, R. (1978). Chapter 9: Project Evaluation: Benefit-Cost Analysis, pp. 134-158.
- [On] Stokey, E., & Zeckhauser, R. (1978). Chapter 10: The Valuation of Future Consequences: Discounting, pp. 159-176.
- [On] Gupta, D. K. (2001). Chapter 14: Choosing the Best Alternative: Cost-benefit Analysis. pp. 357-383.
- [On] Gramlich, E. M. (1981). Chapter 4: Benefit-Cost analysis and Governmental Decision-Making. *Benefit-cost analysis of government programs*. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., pp. 41-52.
- [On] Weimer, D., & Vining, A. (2005). Chapter 17: Benefit-Cost Analysis in a Bureaucratic Setting: The Strategic Petroleum Reserve, pp. 426-451. (**CASE**)
-

Week 13 (4/13): **Practice of Policy Analysis**

We will meet at the Decision Theater.

- [On] Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2003). Chapter 1: Collaborative Policymaking: Governance through Dialogue. In M. A. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (eds.). *Deliberative policy analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press., pp. 33-59.
- [On] Koontz, T.M., & Thomas, C. W. (2006). What do we know and need to know about the environmental outcomes of collaborative management? *Public Administration Review*, December: Special Issue, pp. 111-121.
- [On] Kim, Y., & Desai, A. Operationalizing complexity: The role of agent-based models. Manuscript.

Week 14 (4/20): Wrapping Up

- [TC] Chapter 20: Trends in Policy Analysis
- [On] Rosenbloom, D. H. (2002). The evolution of policy analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 504-505. (Book Review)
- [On] Desai, A. (2008). Teaching quantitative and analytic methods. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. DOI: 10.1002/pam, 640-669
- [On] Fischer, F. (1995). Public Policy Analysis as Practical Deliberation: Integrating Empirical and Normative Evaluation. pp. 1-24
-

Week 15 (4/27): Student Presentation (I)

Week 16 (5/4): Student Presentation (II)

Other

Late Assignments

I expect you to turn in all assignments on time. Assignments not turned in on time will be marked down *by 1 point for each day they are late* from your total score for final grade. You are welcome to turn papers in early if you expect to be absent on the due date. You should plan your schedules accordingly.

Grade Appeal Policy

I take the evaluation and grading of your exams very seriously. I read each paper and exam several times before assigning a grade to it. In arriving at a grade for a particular project, I first assess whether it meets the basic criteria mentioned. I then compare your essay to the essays which I believe represent excellence, both in content and presentation of that content. I am happy to provide you with a copy of these essays on the class website.

If you think that you deserve a higher grade on a paper or exam, you may write a letter and explain why you would like to appeal the grade. Before making an appeal, you should re-read your paper with my comments in mind. After I receive your letter, I will re-read your paper/exam within 1-2 class periods. Depending on my re-reading, your grade may stay the same, be raised, or be lowered. This system is designed to minimize frivolous grade appeals and to ensure that you have carefully examined and reflected on the quality of your work before deciding to initiate a grade appeal.

Academic Integrity

Both the university and I take issues related to academic integrity very seriously. If you have any questions about how to cite someone else's work, please ask. Though it may be acceptable to cut and paste without attribution into documents or reports, the academic community has a different set of standards in this regard. If I find that a student has plagiarized on an assignment, the possible consequences are: failure on the assignment; failure in the course; course failure with a mark of academic dishonesty, which can not be removed from the transcript; or dismissal from the graduate program. If you fail a class assignment, you can restore some points by working harder in other assignments. However, *once you violate the academic conduct guidelines, there is no way that you can reverse the damage*. Please be alert to the academic integrity guidelines.

Notes

1. You will be asked to participate in group projects and discussions. You won't get any formal credits for the projects. However, your participation will influence my decision on your participation grade.
2. Please turn off your cell phone before the class starts.
3. No laptop (blackberry, iPhone, etc) in the class
4. No email response from the instructor during the weekend.
5. It is your responsibility to check information on the class website.
6. The syllabus is subject to change by the instructor.

Resources

Big Picture

Parsons, W. (1995). *Public policy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. (for Ph.D. students)

Wildavsky, A. (1987). *Speaking truth to power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers

Policy Process

Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation* (3rd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fischer, F. (1995). *Evaluating public policy*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Sabatier, P. A. (2007). *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wright, D. S. (1988). *Understanding intergovernmental relations*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.

Policy Analysis

Stokey, E., & Zeckhauser, R. (1978). *A primer for policy analysis*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Rosenhead, J. & Mingers, J. (2001). *Rational analysis for a problematic world revisited* (Rev. ed.). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, LTD.

Stone, D. (2002). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (Rev. ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Weimer, D., & Vining, A. (2005). *Policy analysis: Concepts and practices* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, argument, & persuasion in the policy process*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rossie, P., Freeman, H.E., & Lipsey, M. W. (1999). *Evaluation* (6th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc., pp. 3-35.

Hajer, M. A., & Wagenaar, H. (2003). *Deliberative policy analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

CQ Researcher. (2008). *Issues for debate in American public policy*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.