

PAF 601 (DRAFT)
Seminar in Public Policy Analysis & Evaluation
School of Public Affairs, Arizona State University

Fall 2014

Class Hours: Monday, 3:00 – 5:45 pm
Class Location: Phoenix, UCENT 259

Instructor: Yushim Kim, Ph.D.
Email: ykim@asu.edu
Office: UCENT, Ste 445 (Phoenix)
Office hours: Monday 1:30 - 3:00 pm

Course Objectives

This seminar in public policy analysis and evaluation has a single objective: to develop a critical thinking of theoretical perspectives developed to analyze several dimensions of public policy—policy process, policy analysis, or evaluation. This class will focus on theories and perspectives across specific policy areas since our objective is to get used to analytical lenses not a specific policy area. This objective will be achieved by reading required books each week. This class requires the ability to analyze critically a body of literature as a prerequisite for advancing that literature.

The general format of this course includes reviews of class material and discussion. Prior to each class, students are expected to read the required books listed in the syllabus. Students are responsible for contents included in the readings, even if it is not explicitly reviewed in class. The assignments are explained in more detail below.

Course Readings (Required)

Fischer, F. (1995). *Evaluating Public Policy*
House, E. (1980). *Evaluating with Validity*
Koppenjan, J., and Klijn, E-H. (2004), *Managing Uncertainties in Networks*
Lejano, R. (2006). *Frameworks for Policy Analysis*
Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, Argument, & Persuasion in the Policy Process*
Manski, C.F. (2013). *Public Policy in an Uncertain World*
North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*
Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons*.
Sabatier, P.A., and Weible, C.M. (2014). *Theories of the Policy Process* (3rd ed.)
Stone, D. (2011). *Policy Paradox* (3rd ed.)

Note: These books are not inexpensive. I advise you to buy used books or kindle versions. Make sure that you buy books with a correct edition for Sabatier and Weible (2014) and Stone (2011).

Grading

Please keep in mind that grades are earned through hard work, quality performance on class assignments, and contributing to the class by actively participating in class discussions. If I find that your progress is unsatisfactory, I will inform you in person or via email in the middle of the semester. 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. 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:

Weekly Written Critiques (WWC)	60%
Final Paper	30%
Participation and Discussion	10%

Class Assignments & Evaluations

Weekly Written Critiques (60%)

This assignment consists of two components: 1) 10 written critiques of weekly readings (50%) and 2) leading the class assigned (10%). Students will be evaluated based on the quality of written critiques as well as how they lead and discuss their critiques with other students in class.

First, I expect students to *understand* main points of weekly readings, to be critical on weekly readings and to discuss their understanding with others. At minimum, there should be two components in each critique: 1) key arguments made (or key perspective laid out) in the reading of the week and 2) your critiques on the reading. Take all or some of the questions below to write up your WWCs.

1. What is the main *perspective* that the book (or chapters) holds about public policy process, analysis or evaluation?
2. What is the *essential thesis or arguments* in the book? What normative theory is implicitly *assumed*? What are the *behavioral assumptions* about humans including elected and appointed officials, public servants and citizens, if necessary?
3. What is the *underlying logic* of the thesis and argument? *How* did the author draw such a logic based on *what evidence* (e.g. deductive reasoning, empirical observation, or ideological assumption)?
4. How *persuasive* is the development of the case? Is it defensible? Is it plausible based on what evidence?
5. What is the *implication* of the work to the inquiry and practice of the field?

Please limit your use of direct quotes from readings, except where necessary. You should assume that I have read the materials. You must also write a question at the end of your critique: what

question raised from the weekly reading? You should study unfamiliar concepts by yourself using various resources (i.e. internet, books, and other faculties) prior to class. Appropriate questions might be on the issues, problems, limitations, and weaknesses found from arguments in the readings.

Every student is responsible for WWC. A letter grade will be given for each WWC with my comments. Limit your critique to single-space three pages in length. Keep it simple and succinct. Post your critique to the blackboard (Discussion Board) before every Saturday, 9:00 pm, prior to the class of the readings. For example, WWC1 for readings in Week 3 (September 8) must be posted to the blackboard before September 6, 9:00 pm. The reason for this is to have enough time to read your WWC before the class by the instructor.

Second, each student will be asked to choose one (or two) week (it depends upon enrollments) that they want to lead the class on readings at the beginning of the semester. In class, students are expected to summarize their written critiques and lead class discussion on the readings.

2. Final Paper (30%)

Policy sciences are fundamentally problem-oriented. It can be a problem of society, of organizations, or of existing policies. This assignment asks you to develop some knowledge on a policy problem you choose. Write a critical literature review on how the chosen policy problem has been approached and addressed by scholars in the field.

Following steps might be helpful in guiding your write-up: 1) Pick a policy problem in a substantive policy area of your interest; 2) Find a most recent research article about the problem from one of the journals below — published in 2011-2014; 3) Identify two other journals that are most likely to publish several research articles on the topic from the reference list of the chosen article; 4) Identify and review a minimum of 6 – 10 articles published after 2000 on the topic in the three journals (if possible, extra 4-5 articles from other journals that are not listed); and 5) Write a literature review paper.

- Journal of Policy Analysis and Management
- Policy Studies Journal
- Policy Sciences
- Review of Policy Research
- Environment and Planning C
- Social Policy and Administration
- American Journal of Evaluation
- Evaluation Review
- Journal of Urban Affairs
- Urban Affairs Review
- You can discuss with me if you don't see a journal you want to start from the list.

In the paper, I want you to clearly articulate 1) what questions have been studied regarding the problem; 2) which scholars have engaged in the discourse; 3) what theoretical perspectives have been discussed and developed (some theoretical perspectives you find might be already

discussed in class.); 4) which positions different scholars hold; and 4) what is your view on those scholarly positions.

The due date is December 10 (Wed) 9:00 pm via email or in person. Please limit your essay to single-space fifteen pages in length, including a cover (if you want), tables, and references. Make sure that you cite references appropriately and do not plagiarize.

3. Participation (10%)

The participation grade consists of two parts: class discussion (5%) and attendance (5%). If you have to miss a class, please send me the date of your absence via email in advance. You will be expected to complete all required reading assignments prior to each class meeting. Your attendance, participation in class discussions, and completion of class assignments 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 during the following class session.

I am fully aware that speaking among a group of people 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 during the semester. Your absences, due to your job or personal matters, will not influence your assignment grades other than the attendance component. If you miss class more than two times, the best attendance grade you can expect to earn is a B, regardless of your participation in class discussion.

Other

Late Assignments

I expect you to turn in all assignments on time. 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

If you think that you deserve a higher grade on an essay, you may write a letter and explain why you would like to appeal the grade. Before making an appeal, you should re-read your essay with my comments in mind. After I receive your letter, I will re-read your essay 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 of the assignment; failure in the course; course failure with a mark of academic dishonesty, which cannot be removed from one’s 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.

Schedule of Topics and Assignments

Week	Date	Agenda	Notes
1	Aug 25	Introduction	
2	Sep 1	Labor Day	No Class
3	Sep 8	Evaluating Public Policy	WWC1
4	Sep 15	Theories of the Policy Process – Chs.1-3,11	WWC2
5	Sep 22	Theories of the Policy Process – Chs. 4,6,7	WWC3
6	Sep 29	Theories of the Policy Process – Chs. 5, 8-11	WWC4
7	Oct 6	Policy Paradox	WWC5
8	Oct 13	Fall Break	No Class
9	Oct 20	Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance Governing the Commons	WWC6
10	Oct 27	Managing Uncertainties in Networks	WWC7
11	Nov 4	Frameworks for Policy Analysis	WWC8
12	Nov 10	Veteran’s Day	No Class
13	Nov 17	Public Policy in an Uncertain World	WWC9
14	Nov 24	Evaluating with Validity	WWC10
15	Dec 1	Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process	
16	Dec 8	Wrapping-up	

Reading Assignments

Note that supplemental readings are *optional* and not required to read.
For readings with [on], you can find them from the blackboard.

Week 1 Introduction

- [on] Lasswell, H. (1951). "Policy orientation," In D. Lerner and H. Lasswell, *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method*, Stanford: Stanford University Press
- [on] Farr, J., Hacker, F.J., & Kazee, N. (2006). "The policy scientist of democracy: The discipline of Harold D. Lasswell," *American Political Science Review*, 100, 579-587
- [on] Brunner, R.D. (2008). "The policy scientist of democracy revisited," *Policy Sciences*, 41, 3-19
- [on] Farr, J., Hacker, F.J., & Kazee, N. (2008). "Revisiting Lasswell," *Policy Science*, 41, 21-32
- [on] Grover, V. (2007). "Successfully navigating the stages of doctoral study," *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 2.

Suppl. readings

[Book] Bobrow, D.B., & Dryzek, J.S. (1987). *Policy Analysis by Design*

Week 2 Labor Day Observed – No Class

Week 3 F. Fischer, **Evaluating Public Policy**

Week 4 P. Sabatier & C. Weible, **Theories of the Policy Process – Chs. 1-3, 11**

Suppl. readings

- [on] Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., Olsen, J.P. (1972). "A garbage can model of organizational choice," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-25.
 - [Book] F.R. Baumgartner, & B.D. Jones, (2002). *Policy Dynamics*
 - [on] Nowlin, M.C. (2011). "Theories of the policy process: State of the research and emerging trends," *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1), 41-60
-

Week 5 P. Sabatier & C. Weible, **Theories of the Policy Process – Chs. 4,6,7**

Suppl. readings

- [on] John, P. (2003). "Is there life after policy streams, advocacy coalitions, and punctuations: Using evolutionary theory to explain policy change," *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(4), 481-498

- [on] Schneider, A. (2006). Patterns of change in the use of imprisonment in the American states: An integration of path dependence, punctuated equilibrium and policy design approaches. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(3): 457-470
- [on] Jones, M.D., & McBeth, M.K. (2010). "A narrative policy framework: Clear enough to be wrong," *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(2), 329-353
- [Book] P. Sabatier & H. Jenkins-Smith, (2003). *Policy Change and Learning*
-

Week 6 P. Sabatier & C. Weible, **Theories of the Policy Process – Chs. 5,8-10**

Suppl. readings

- [on] Bardach, E. (2006). Policy dynamics, In M. Moran, M. Rein, and R.E. Goodin. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, Oxford University Press
- [on] Weible, C.M. "An advocacy coalition framework approach to stakeholder analysis: Understanding the political context of California Marine protected area policy," *JPART*, 17(1), 95-117
-

Week 7 D. Stone, **Policy Paradox**

Week 8 Fall Break – No Class

Week 9 D. North, **Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance**
E. Ostrom, **Governing the Commons**

Week 10 J. Koppenjan & E-H. Klijn, **Managing Uncertainties in Networks**

Suppl. readings

- [on] Long, N.E. (1958). "The local community as an ecology of games," *American Journal of Sociology*, 64(3), 251-261
- [on] Ostrom, V., Tiebout, C.M., & Warren, R. (1961). "The organization of government in Metropolitan areas: A theoretical inquiry," *The American Political Science Review*, 55(4), 831-842
- [on] Lubell, M. (2013). "Governing institutional complexity: The ecology of games framework," *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 537-559.
-

Week 11 R. Lejano, **Frameworks for Policy Analysis**

Suppl. readings

- [on] Berk, R. (2010). "What you can and you can't properly do with regression," *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 26, 481-487

- [on] Desai, A. (2008). "Quantitative methods, economics, and OR models," *JPAM*, 27(3), 640-669
- [on] deLeon, P. (1998). "Models of policy discourse: Insights versus prediction," *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1), 147-161
- [on] Maynard, R.A. (2006). "Evidence-based decision making: What will it take for the decision makers to care?" *JPAM*, 25(2), 249-265
-

Week 12 Veteran's Day Observed – No Class

Week 13 C.F. Manski, **Public Policy in an Uncertain World**

Week 14 E. House, **Evaluating with Validity**

Suppl. readings

- [on] Peck, L., Kim, Y. & Lucio, J. (2012). "An empirical examination of validity in evaluation," *American Journal of Evaluation*, 33(3), 350-365
- [on] Kvale, S. (1995). "Social construction of validity," *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1, 19-40
- [on] Sager, F., & Andereggen, C. "Dealing with complex causality in realist synthesis: The promise of Qualitative Comparative Analysis," *American Journal of Evaluation*, 33(1), 60-78
-

Week 15 G. Majone, **Evidence, Argument, & Persuasion in the Policy Process**

Week 16 Wrapping-up

Notes

Please turn off your cell phone (blackberry, iPhone, etc) before the class starts.

No laptop use in the class.

No email response from the instructor during the weekend.

It is your responsibility to check information on the class website.

The syllabus is subject to change by the instructor.