

**Public Policy**  
EVSS/PUBA 602  
SPRING 2014  
ROBERT SCOTT SMALL 251  
5:30-8:15PM M

---

**Professor:** Dr. Matthew Nowlin

**Office:** 114 Wentworth, #102

**Office Hours:** Wednesdays 2-4pm; Thursdays 10-12am; and by appointment

**Contact:** Please allow 24 hours for a response

E-mail: [nowlinmc@cofc.edu](mailto:nowlinmc@cofc.edu)

Office Phone: (843) 953-0279

### **Catalog Course Description:**

**EVSS:** This course seeks to develop a firm understanding of the public policymaking process in the United States. Students study policy making through various perspectives on implementation. The roles of major institutions including the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, the bureaucracy and interest groups in this process are addressed. Includes various perspectives and interpretations of policymaking, including incrementalism, rationalism, pluralism and elitism. Selected areas of public policy, including transportation, poverty, energy and the environment are used to illustrate both the process and the different perspectives.

**PUBA:** This course examines the activities of individuals, groups, and institutions that define or ignore public problems, participate or fail to participate in political struggles over these problems and confront or avoid opportunities to develop and implement solutions. The implications of these complexities for public employees and public management are emphasized.

### **Learning Outcomes**

The MPA program has outlined five learning competencies including;

- Lead and manage in public governance
- Participate in and contribute to the public policy process
- Analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make decisions
- Articulate and apply a public service perspective
- Communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry

Each of these competencies will be addressed throughout this course, however the most emphasis will be placed on developing students abilities to a) participate in and contribute to the public policy process, and to b) analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make decisions. In addition, this course has several specific learning objectives.

- Gain an introductory understanding of the academic field of public policy
- Gain a general understanding of the major policy process theories
- Develop a detailed understanding of one substantive area of public policy
- Gain a practical understanding of how the theories of the policy process can help understand and explain a substantive policy area
- Develop oral, written, and group communication skills

These objectives will be achieved through critically reading the course readings; by actively participating in and leading in-class discussions; and by completing a research design applying one of the major frameworks to a particular substantive policy area.

## Required Texts:

The following texts are required and additional readings will be provided on OAKS.

Paul Sabatier (ed). 2007. *Theories of the Policy Process*. 2nd Edition. Westview Press.

Smith and Larimer. 2013. *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. 2nd Edition. Westview Press.

## Additional Readings

Additional readings (e.g., journal articles) will be placed on the OAKS website. For most weeks, readings will be categorized as core readings, discussion readings, and suggested readings.

- **Core Readings (Required):** The core readings detail theoretical concepts and will be covered by lecture.
- **Discussion Readings (Required):** The discussion readings are largely applications of theoretical concepts. They will be covered through class discussion, lead by assigned discussion leaders.
- **Suggested Readings (Not Required):** Suggested readings are additional readings that could help clarify some concepts. They are also useful places to start for the research design.

## Course Requirements and Grading:

Performance in this course will be evaluated on the basis of 10 discussion papers, being a discussion leader, a research design, a take home final exam, and class participation. Points will be distributed as follows:

10 Discussion Papers	10 points each (100 points) (12.5%)
Discussion Leader	100 points (12.5%)
Research Design Proposal	100 points (12.5%)
Research Design	200 points (25%)
Final Exam	200 points (25%)
Participation	100 points (12.5%)
<hr/> Total	<hr/> 800 points (100%)

There are 800 possible points for this course. Grades will be allocated based on your earned points and calculated as a percentage of 800.

A	90 to 100%
B+	86 to 89%
B	80 to 85%
C+	76 to 79%
C	70 to 75%
F	69% and below

*Discussion Papers:* These are short papers that 1) provide a brief summary (about 1 to 2 paragraphs) of the core readings and 2) provide at least one discussion question for each of the discussion readings. **These are due the Friday before class by 5pm EST**, in the dropbox on the OAKS website. The discussion questions will be used by the discussion leaders for that week.

*Discussion Leader:* Students will be placed, at random, into groups and that group will be responsible for leading class discussion over the discussion readings for that week. Discussion leaders should 1) tie the discussion readings to the core readings and 2) use discussion questions provided by other students.

*Research Design Proposal:* **Due March 17th.** Students are required to have their research design topics approved, therefore they must submit a research design proposal. The proposal should be no more than 2 pages and include the 1) research question, 2) the policy theory or framework they wish to use and 3) the policy issue or area they wish to explore.

*Research Design:* **Due April 21st.** For the research design students will formulate a research question based in a policy area or issue of interest to them and develop a research project to address that question using one of the theories or frameworks discussed in class. The major components of this assignment include;

- Research Question
- Literature Review (for the theory)

- Policy Area Review
- Data and Methods
  - Data that will need to be collected
  - Methods that will be used to analyze data
- Discuss Expected Findings

*Final Exam: Due April 28th.* The final exam will be take home. It will be distributed after the final class and due by the end of the scheduled final exam time. Students will be allowed to use books, notes, the internet, or any other source—**except each other**. This is an individual assignment.

*Participation:* Students are expected to participate in the course by asking questions, providing thoughtful comments, and through making contributions to the discussion portion of class. Notes on participation will be taken by the professor for each class.

**All work should be turned in at the course website on OAKS prior to the class period in which it is due. No late work will be accepted.**

## Attendance

Attendance is expected and mandatory for this course. You are allowed to miss one class without penalty. The penalties for missing 2 or more classes are as follows (in addition to the loss of participation points):

Absences	Penalty
1	None
2	20 points
3	30 points (50 points total)
4	40 points (90 points total)
5	50 points (140 points total)

## Schedule

### SUBJECT TO CHANGE

*Readings should be read in the order listed*

#### January 13th: Introduction and Course Overview

##### Suggested Readings

- Smith and Larimer Chapter 1
  - Peter deLeon. The historical roots of the field. In Michael Moran, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, pages 39–57. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006
- 

#### January 27th: Policy Process Theory

##### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 2
- Sabatier: Chapter 1
- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 3, pgs 47–54

##### Discussion Readings

- Peter deLeon. The stages approach to the policy process: What has it done? where is it going? In Paul Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 19–32. Westview, Boulder, CO, 1999
- Frank Fischer. Beyond empiricism: Policy inquiry in postpositivist perspective. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1):129–146, 1998

*Discussion Paper Due*

##### Suggested Readings

- William H Riker. The future of a science of politics. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 21(1):11–38, 1977
  - Mathew D. McCubbins and Michael F. Thies. Rationality and the foundations of positive political theory. *Leviathan*, 19:7–32, 1996
  - Bryan D. Jones. Bounded rationality. *Annual Review of Political Science*, (2):297–321, 1999
  - Charles E. Lindblom. The science of "Muddling through". *Public Administration Review*, 19(2):79–88, 1959
-

## February 3rd: Institutions

### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 3, pgs 54–71
- Elinor Ostrom. Challenges and growth: The development of the interdisciplinary field of institutional analysis. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 3(03):239–264, 2007
- Elinor Ostrom. Background on the institutional analysis and development framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1):7–27, February 2011

### Discussion Readings

- Mark T. Imperial and Tracy Yandle. Taking institutions seriously: Using the IAD framework to analyze fisheries policy. *Society & Natural Resources*, 18(6):493–509, 2005
- Gwen Arnold and Forrest D. Fleischman. The influence of organizations and institutions on wetland policy stability: The rapanos case. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(2):343–364, 2013

### *Discussion Paper Due*

### Suggested Readings

- James M. Buchanan. Public choice: The origins and development of a research program. Technical report, Center for Study of Public Choice, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, 2003
  - Elinor Ostrom. Institutional rational choice: An assessment of the institutional analysis and development framework. In Paul A. Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 21–64. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition, 2007
  - Michael D. McGinnis. An introduction to IAD and the language of the ostrom workshop: A simple guide to a complex framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1):169–183, February 2011
- 

## February 10th: Agenda Setting and Multiple Streams

### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 4, pgs 88–93
- Nikolaos Zahariadis. The multiple streams framework: Structure, limitations, prospects. In Paul A. Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 65–92. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition, 2007

## Discussion Readings

- Joe Blankenau. The fate of national health insurance in Canada and the United States: A multiple streams explanation. *Policy Studies Journal*, 29(1):38–55, 2001
- Sarah B. Pralle. Agenda-setting and climate change. *Environmental Politics*, 18(5):781–799, 2009
- Jessica E. Boscarino. Surfing for problems: Advocacy group strategy in U.S. forestry policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(3):415–434, 2009

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

## Suggested Readings

- Michael D. Cohen, James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1):1–25, 1972
  - John W. Kingdon. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. Longman, New York, NY, 1984
  - Scott E. Robinson and Warren S. Eller. Participation in policy streams: Testing the separation of problems and solutions in subnational policy systems. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(2):199–216, 2010
- 

## February 17th: Advocacy Coalition Framework

### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 4, pgs 73–81
- Paul A. Sabatier and Christopher M. Weible. The advocacy coalition framework: Innovations and clarifications. In Paul A. Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, volume 2nd, pages 189–222. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2007

### Discussion Readings

- Brian A. Ellison. The advocacy coalition framework and implementation of the endangered species act: A case study in western water politics. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1):11–29, March 1998
- Sean Nicholson-Crotty. Bureaucratic competition in the policy process. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 33(3):341–361, 2005
- Christopher M. Weible. An advocacy coalition framework approach to stakeholder analysis: Understanding the political context of California marine protected area policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17(1):95–117, 2007

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

## Suggested Readings

- Paul A. Sabatier and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1993
  - Daniel McCool. The subsystem family of concepts: A critique and a proposal. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51(2):551–570, 1998
  - Michael D. Jones and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. Trans-subsystem dynamics: Policy topography, mass opinion, and policy change. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1):37–58, 2009
  - Christopher M. Weible, Paul A. Sabatier, and Kelly McQueen. Themes and variations: Taking stock of the advocacy coalition framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1):121–140, 2009
  - Christopher M. Weible, Paul A. Sabatier, Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, Daniel Nohrstedt, Adam Douglas Henry, and Peter deLeon. A quarter century of the advocacy coalition framework: An introduction to the special issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(3):349–360, 2011
- 

## February 24th: Punctuated Equilibrium

### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 4, pgs 81–88
- Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones. Agenda dynamics and policy subsystems. *The Journal of Politics*, 53(4):1044–1074, 1991
- James L. True, Bryan D. Jones, and Frank R. Baumgartner. Punctuated-equilibrium theory: Explaining stability and change in public policymaking. In Paul A. Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 155–188. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition, 2007

### Discussion Readings

- Jeffrey Worsham. Up in smoke: Mapping subsystem dynamics in tobacco policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 34(3):437–452, 2006
- Deserai A Crow. Policy punctuations in colorado water law: The breakdown of a monopoly. *Review of Policy Research*, 27(2):147–166, March 2010

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

## Suggested Readings

- Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. University Of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1993
- Jeff Worsham. Wavering equilibriums: Subsystem dynamics and agenda control. *American Politics Research*, 26(4):485–512, October 1998



- Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones, editors. *Policy Dynamics*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2002
  - Bryan D. Jones, Tracy Sulkin, and Heather A. Larsen. Policy punctuations in american political institutions. *The American Political Science Review*, 97(1):151–169, February 2003
- 

## March 3rd: Spring Break

---

## March 10th: Policy Diffusion

### Core Readings

- Frances Stokes Berry and William D. Berry. Innovation and diffusion models in policy research. In Paul A. Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition, 2007

### Discussion Readings

- Daniel C. Matisoff. The adoption of state climate change policies and renewable portfolio standards: Regional diffusion or internal determinants? *Review of Policy Research*, 25(6):527–546, 2008
- Sean Nicholson-Crotty. The politics of diffusion: Public policy in the american states. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(01):192–205, 2009
- Graeme Boushey. Punctuated equilibrium theory and the diffusion of innovations. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1):127–146, February 2012

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

### Suggested Readings

- Jack L. Walker. The diffusion of innovations among the american states. *The American Political Science Review*, 63(3):880–899, September 1969
  - Virginia Gray. Innovation in the states: A diffusion study. *The American Political Science Review*, 67(4):1174–1185, December 1973
  - Frances Stokes Berry and William D. Berry. State lottery adoptions as policy innovations: An event history analysis. *The American Political Science Review*, 84(2):395–415, June 1990
  - Charles R. Shipan and Craig Volden. Policy diffusion: Seven lessons for scholars and practitioners. *Public Administration Review*, 72(6):788–796, 2012
-

## March 17th: Policy Learning and Information Processing

### *Research Design Proposal Due*

#### Core Readings

- Peter J. May. Policy learning and failure. *Journal of Public Policy*, 12(4):331–354, December 1992
- Hank C. Jenkins-Smith and Paul A. Sabatier. The dynamics of policy-oriented learning. In Paul A. Sabatier and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, editors, *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, pages 41–56. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1993
- Bryan D. Jones and Frank R. Baumgartner. A model of choice for public policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(3):325–351, July 2005
- Samuel Workman, Bryan D. Jones, and Ashley E. Jochim. Information processing and policy dynamics. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1):75–92, 2009
- Dan M. Kahan, Ellen Peters, Maggie Wittlin, Paul Slovic, Lisa Larrimore Ouellette, Donald Braman, and Gregory Mandel. The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks. *Nature Climate Change*, 2(10), 2012

#### Suggested Readings

- Bryan D. Jones and Frank R. Baumgartner. *The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizes Problems*. University Of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, October 2005
- 

## March 24th: Policy Analysis

#### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 5

#### Discussion Readings

- Deven Carlson, Robert Haveman, Thomas Kaplan, and Barbara Wolfe. The benefits and costs of the section 8 housing subsidy program: A framework and estimates of first-year effects. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30(2):233–255, 2011
- Abigail Jones, Nigel Purvis, and Cecilia Springer. Trading up: The case for an international carbon market reserve to reduce volatility at the limits in 2020 and beyond. Technical report, Brookings Institution, 2013
- Nancy Shulock. The paradox of policy analysis: If it is not used, why do we produce so much of it? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 18(2):226–244, 1999

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

## Suggested Readings

- David L. Weimer. Policy analysis and evidence: A craft perspective. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1):114, 1998
  - William T. Gormley. Public policy analysis: Ideas and impacts. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10(1):297–313, 2007
  - Mark S. Reed. Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biological Conservation*, 141(10):2417–2431, October 2008
  - Deven Carlson. Trends and innovations in public policy analysis. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(s1):13–26, April 2011
- 

## March 31st: Policy Evaluation

### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 6

### Discussion Readings

- Rahel Aichele and Gabriel Felbermayr. The effect of the kyoto protocol on carbon emissions. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 32(4):731–757, 2013
- Charles J. Courtemanche and Daniela Zapata. Does universal coverage improve health? the massachusetts experience. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Forthcoming, 2013
- Thomas E. James and Paul D. Jorgensen. Policy knowledge, policy formulation, and change: Revisiting a foundational question. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1):141–162, 2009

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

## Suggested Readings

- David J. Webber. The distribution and use of policy knowledge in the policy process. In William N. Dunn and Rita Mae Kelly, editors, *Advances in Policy Studies Since 1950*, volume 10 of *Policy Studies Review Annual*, pages 383–418. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ, 1992
  - Gary T. Henry. Influential evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(4):515–524, 2003
  - Maureen Berner and Matt Bronson. A case study of program evaluation in local government: Building consensus through collaboration. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 28(3):309–325, 2005
-

## April 7th: Policy Implementation

### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 7

### Discussion Readings

- Peter J May and Sren C Winter. Politicians, managers, and street-level bureaucrats: Influences on policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(3):453–476, July 2009
- Robbie Waters Robichau and Laurence E. Lynn Jr. The implementation of public policy: Still the missing link. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1):21–36, 2009
- Stephen B. Page. Theories of governance: Comparative perspectives on seattle’s light rail project. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(4):583–608, 2013

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

### Suggested Readings

- Jeffrey L. Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky. *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1973
  - Paul A. Sabatier. Top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation research: A critical analysis and suggested synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1):21–48, March 1986
  - Micheal Hill and Peter Hupe. *Implementing Public Policy*. SAGE Publications, London, 2002
  - Harald Saetren. Facts and myths about research on public policy implementation: Out-of-fashion, allegedly dead, but still very much alive and relevant. *Policy Studies Journal*, 33(4):559–582, 2005
- 

## April 14th: Policy Design and Policy Narratives

### Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 8
- Helen Ingram, Anne L. Schneider, and Peter deLeon. Social construction and policy design. In Paul A. Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 93–126. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition, 2007

## Discussion Readings

- Jill Nicholson-Crotty and Sean Nicholson-Crotty. Social construction and policy implementation: Inmate health as a public health issue. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(2):240–256, 2004
- Gary Reich and Jay Barth. Educating citizens or defying federal authority? a comparative study of in-state tuition for undocumented students. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(3):419–445, 2010
- Michael D. Jones. Cultural characters and climate change: How heroes shape our perception of climate science. *Social Science Quarterly*, Forthcoming, 2013

### *Discussion Paper Due* *Discussion Leaders*

## Suggested Readings

- Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram. *Policy Design for Democracy*. University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, KS, 1997
  - Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram, editors. *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, 2005
  - Michael D. Jones and Mark K. McBeth. A narrative policy framework: Clear enough to be wrong? *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(2):329–353, 2010
- 

## April 21st: Conclusion

### *Research Design Due*

## Core Readings

- Smith and Larimer: Chapter 10
  - Edella Schlager. A comparison of frameworks, theories, and models of policy processes. In Paul A. Sabatier, editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 293–320. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition, 2007
  - Christopher M. Weible, Tanya Heikkila, Peter deLeon, and Paul A. Sabatier. Understanding and influencing the policy process. *Policy Sciences*, 45(1):1–21, 2012
- 

**Final Exam due Monday April 28th by 10:30pm**

## **Students with Disabilities:**

The College will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. Students should apply at the Center for Disability Services located on the first floor of the Lightsey Center, Suite 104. Students approved for accommodations are responsible for notifying me as soon as possible and for contacting me at least one week before any accommodation is needed.

## **Cheating or Plagiarism:**

A grade of zero will be given to anyone cheating on any exam, homework assignment or committing plagiarism in a paper. As commonly defined, plagiarism consists of passing off as ones own ideas, the words, writings, music, graphs/charts, etc that were created by another. In accordance with this definition, you are committing plagiarism if you copy the work of another person and turn it in as your own, even if you have the permission of that person. It does not matter from where the material is borrowed a book, article, material off the web, another students paperall constitute plagiarism unless the source of the work is fully identified and credited. Plagiarism is cheating and a violation of academic and personal integrity and will not be tolerated. It carries extremely serious consequences. To avoid plagiarism it is necessary when using a phrase, a distinctive idea, concept or sentence from another source to reference that source in your text, a footnote, or end-note. Please contact me if you need assistance in citing a source.

## **Religious Holiday Policy:**

It is the policy of the College to excuse absences of students that result from religious observances and to provide without penalty for the rescheduling of examinations and additional required class work that may fall on religious holidays. Please see me immediately if you will need to miss class any time during this semester.