Public Affairs 801
Public Policy Formulation and Administration
Autumn 2009

Professor: Alexander C. Heckman

Time/Room: M 1:30-4:18 pm/PA 040 (Section 21074)
M 5:30-8:18 pm/PA 010 (Section 21075)

Phone: 614.292.7423
Email: heckman.17@osu.edu
Office: 310A Page Hall
Office Hours: M: 11-12 and by Appointment

Schedule of Classes

The class will meet on the following days (* paper due):

Session	
1	9/28
2	10/5
3	10/12*
4	10/19
5	10/26
6	11/2*
7	11/9
8	11/16
9	11/23*
10	11/30

Course Objectives

This course is designed to enhance a student's understanding of the public policy process. Emphasis will be placed on understanding the policy formulation and implementation components of the public policy process. In addition to achieving greater knowledge of the workings of the policy process, the course is designed to sharpen the student's ability to think critically.

Performance Assessment

Student grades are calculated on the basis of the following:

Project Papers (30% each)	60%
Assignments/Participation	15%
Take-home Final Exam	25%

Project Papers

Each student will prepare an analysis of a federal government program, established by a public law or subsection of a law. The analysis will consist of two short papers. The first paper will analyze the legislative history of the program. The second paper consists of an analysis of the implementation of the federal program in an intergovernmental network of relationships.

The purposes of the student research paper projects are to provide students with an empirical view of the policy formulation and implementation processes, to familiarize students with primary source materials for federal government programs, and to permit students to learn about a substantive area of interest. Most importantly, the project is intended to heighten a student's analytical capabilities, particularly the ability to apply scholarly theories and concepts to interpret and explain the empirical data collected about the program. The focus of the project should be analysis, rather than description. Each paper counts 30 percent of the course grade.

Detailed instructions on project selection and general guidelines the papers accompany the syllabus (Appendix A). The due date for each component of the student project is as follows:

Program Selection Notification: No later than 10/12
Paper No. 1: No later than 11/2
Paper No. 2: No later than11/23

Much of the information needed for the second paper will not be available in the library. The student is expected to approach government agencies directly, as information regarding implementation will best be obtained in this way. The student is responsible for ascertaining that the information can be obtained in a timely manner.

The project papers will be graded on:

- Your ability to use the readings and frameworks discussed in class to critically assess the legislative evolution of a federal program over time
- Your ability to support your arguments by referenced primary source documents
- Your ability to express yourself clearly (including grammar, syntax, and spelling.)

Assignments/Participation

There will be in-class exercises throughout the term for which students, or groups of students, will turn in completed assignments that will be graded on a completion basis and count toward the participation grade. Frequently students will be expected to prepare outside of class for certain in-class exercises or discussions.

In addition, students are expected to post at least three substantive and meaningful questions/comments/real-world examples from class readings on Carmen during the quarter. The in-class exercises will count for 12% of a student's grade and each discussion board posting counts 1% of the course grade.

Take-Home Final Exam

The Final Exam is due on Monday, December 7 by 4:00pm. Exams may be put in my mailbox (Page Hall room 110), faxed (292-2548), or sent as a Microsoft Word attachment to heckman.17@osu.edu. If you either fax the exam (provide your email address) or email it, I will email you when I have received/opened/printed it. If there are technical problems, it is your responsibility to deliver it in hard copy form by the due date and time. The final exam counts 25 percent of the course grade.

Required Textbook and Readings

Text

- Richard Stillman II. *The American Bureaucracy: The Core of Modern Government* (2004) **(S)** (Text is available at SBX)

Journal Articles and Book Chapters

- Readings marked (**EJ**) can be accessed through the OSU library at http://library.osu.edu/
- Additional readings have been placed on electronic reserve (**ER**). These readings can be accessed through Carmen at http://www.carmen.osu.edu

Tentative Course Schedule

Session 1 **Course Introduction and the Public Interest**

Readings: Marshall, G.S. & Choudhury, E. (1997). Public administration and the public interest: Re-presenting a lost concept. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41(1)*, 119-131. **(ER)**

Weimer, David. (2002). Enriching Public Discourse: Policy Analysis in Representative Democracies. *The Good Society* 11 (1): 61-65. **(ER)**

Session 2 **Introduction to the Public Policy Making System (Who Gets What, When, and How?)**

Readings: Required

James E. Anderson. (2003). *Public Policymaking.* (pp. 1-34). New York: Houghton Mifflin. (**ER**)

Paul Pierson. (2005). The Study of Policy Development. *The Journal of Policy History*, 17 (1), 34-51. **(ER)**

Chapter 1 & 3: American Bureaucracy and the Forces Shaping It **(S)**

For Review

(It is assumed that your undergraduate American Government prerequisite has provided you with a basic understanding of the legislative and policy processes. Please review the House document and Anderson chapter to refresh your understanding.)

Charles Johnson. (2003). *How Our Laws Are Made.* (108-93). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. (**ER**)

Randall B. Ripley. (1995). Stages of the Policy Process. In Daniel C. McCool (Ed.), *Public Policy Theories, Models, and Concepts: An Anthology* (pp. 157-162). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. **(ER)**

Sessions 3 & 4 **Policy Formulation—Conflict and Agenda Formation**

Session 3 Readings: John Kingdon. (2002). Wrapping Things Up. In J. Kingdon (Ed.), *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* (pp. 205-218). Longman: New York. (**ER**)

Cobb, R., & Ross, M. H. (1997). Agenda Setting and the Denial of Agenda Access: Key Concepts. In R. Cobb & M. Ross (Eds.), *Cultural Strategies of Agenda Denial: Avoidance, Attack, and Redefinition* (pp. 3-24). Lawrence: University of Kansas Press. (**ER**)

Scheufele, D. A. & Tewksbury, D (2007). Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models. *Journal of Communication 57*, 9-20. **(ER)**

John Kingdon. (1973). Dynamics of Agenda Formation in Congress. In James Anderson (Ed.), *Cases in Public Policy Making* (pp. 25-38. (**ER**)

Deborah A. Stone. (1989). Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. *Political Science Quarterly*, 104 (2), 281-300. **(EJ)**

Session 4 Readings: Chapter 5: Outputs of the Bureaucracy **(S)**

Sabatier, P.A. & Pelkey N. (1987). Incorporating Multiple Actors and Guidance Instruments into Models of Regulatory Policymaking: An Advocacy Coalition Framework. *Administration and Society, 19*, 236-263. (**ER**)

Kubler D. (2001). Understanding policy change with the advocacy coalition framework: An application to Swiss drug policy. *Journal of European Public Policy, 8(4)*, 623-641. **(ER)**

Smith, A. & Rainie, L. (2008). The Internet and the 2008 Election. Pew Internet & American Life Project. **(ER)**

`

Session 5 **Influence of Groups, Agenda Formation, and Decision Making in the Legislature**

Readings: Michael Howlett & Ramesh, M. (2003). Public Policy Decision-Making—Beyond Rationalism, Incrementalism, and Irrationalism. In Michael Howlett & M. Ramesh, *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems (*pp. 137-152). (**ER**)

Allan J. Cigler and Bundett A. Loomis. (2002). The Changing Nature of Interest Group Politics. In Allan J. Cigler & Burdett A. Loomis (Eds.), *Interest Group Politics, Sixth Edition* (pp. 1-33). Washington: CQ Press. (**ER**)

Richard A. Smith. (1995). Interest Group Influence in the U.S. Congress. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20:1: 89-139. (**EJ**)

Chapter 4: Inside the Bureaucracy **(S)**

Session 6 **Intergovernmental Relations, Models of Implementation, and Evaluation**

Readings: Deil S. Wright. (1982). Models of National/State/Local Relations. In Deil S. Wright, *Understanding Intergovernmental Relations* (pp. 26-40). Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing. **(ER)**

Cho, C & Wright, D.S. (2001). Managing Carrots and Sticks: Changes in State Administrators' Perceptions of Cooperative and Coercive Federalism during the 1990s. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 31(2)*, 57-80. **(ER)**

Sabatier, P. & Mazmanian, D. (1980). The implementation of public policy: A framework of analysis. Policy Studies Journal, 8(4, Special No. 2), 538-558. **(ER)**

Matland, R.E. (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *5(2)*, 145-174. **(ER)**

<u>Optional</u>

George F. Break. (1980). The Economics of Intergovernmental Grants. In George F. Break, *Financing Government in a Federal System* (pp. 144-146). Washington: Brookings Press. **(ER)**

Session 7 **Public-Private Organizations**
Similarities/Differences/Implications

Readings: Lyons, Sean, Duxbery, Linda, & Higgins, Christopher. (2007) A Comparison of the Values and Commitment of Private Sector, Public Sector, and Parapublic Sector Employees. *Public Administration Review* 66 (4): 605-618. **(EJ)**

Jack H. Knott. (1993). Comparing Public and Private Management: Cooperative Effort and Principal-Agent Relationships. *J-PART 3 (1):* 93-119. **(EJ)**

Boyne, George A. (2002). Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies* 39 (1): 97-122. **(EJ)**

Session 8 **The Role of the Public Organization in the Policy Process**

Readings: Chapters 2, 6 & 7: Rise, Evolution, and Future of American Bureaucracy **(S)**

Sessions 9 & 10 **Evaluation and Institutional Design Alternatives – Reinventing Government: Prospects, Problems, and Accountability**

Session 9 Readings: Behn, R. (2003). Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review* 63 (5): 586-605. **(EJ)**

Behn, R. (2002). The Psychological Barriers to Performance Management: Or Why Isn't Everyone Jumping on the Performance-Management Bandwagon? *Public Performance & Management Review* 26 (1): 5-25. **(EJ)**

Hatry, Harry. (2002). Performance Measurement: Fashions and Fallacies. *Public Performance & Management Review* 25 (4): 352-358. **(EJ)**

Session 10 Readings: Paul C. Light. (2006). The Tides of Reform Revisited: Patterns in Making Government Work, 1945-2002. *Public Administration Review* 66 (1): 6-18. **(EJ)**

Jonathan Koppell. (2006). Reform in Lieu of Change: Tastes Great, Less Filling. *Public Administration Review* 66 (1): 20-23. **(EJ)**

Hodge, Graeme & Coghill. (2007). Accountability in the Privatized State. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 20 (4): 675-702. **(EJ)**

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration, 69(1),* 3-19. **(EJ)**

Take-home final exam distributed

Appendix A

801 Public Program Analysis Project Guidelines

Student Project

The purposes of the student public program research project is to provide students with an empirical view of public policy formulation and implementation, to familiarize students with primary source materials for Federal Government programs, and to permit students to learn about a substantive area of interest. Most importantly, the project is intended to heighten a student's analytical capabilities, particularly to apply course theories and concepts to interpret data collected. The accent of the project is on analysis, rather than description; that is to explain why something happened and its significance rather than just tell how something happened.

Public Program Selection

A statement of public program project selection, not to exceed one page, is required. The following criteria should be used in selection of a program:

1. The program must be a domestic program. The *Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance* https://www.cfda.gov/ contains a comprehensive list of currently funded programs and addresses of administering agencies.

2. The program must be one authorized during the years from 1970-2004 (reauthorizations and amendments after 2004 are acceptable)

3. In order to gain some sense of change (or lack thereof) over time, the program should have at least two public laws within the appropriate timeframe

4. The program must be one implemented through an intergovernmental network of relationships. This means state, local, or not-for-profit organizations must be involved.

5. The program should be one in which the student has some personal or professional interest

6. There must be sufficient materials are available to complete both parts of the analysis.

Program Selection Notification

Students must submit to the instructor by the date indicated in the syllabus a statement notifying the instructor as to the student's program selection. The instructor will provide feedback and guidance regarding the selection, but does not "approve" or "disapprove" a program selection. Ultimately, program selection is the responsibility of the student.

The statement of topic selection should consist of the following:

1. The number and date of the public law establishing or amending the program with a brief summary of the program;

2. The number and date of the most recent significant public law relating to the program;

3. The subsection of the law and title of the program, if appropriate

4. A statement that there is sufficient materials available to complete both papers. (You do not need to provide the material; only verify that sufficient material is available to you.)

Technical Requirements for Program Analysis Project Papers

Detailed substantive requirements for the two project papers will be provided by the instructor in class. Technical requirements include:

- Each paper may not exceed **six** typewritten, double-spaced, not less than 12 pt font, one-inch margin, pages

- Tabular material, organizational charts, and other similar material should be placed in the appendix. (Though material in the appendix is not included in the page limit, students are discouraged from writing a long paper via the appendix.)

- The papers are sequential components in a single analysis. Consequently, when the second paper is handed in, the first paper should be attached to it. Note that the course syllabus roughly follows the sequence in the papers. Course materials are therefore expected to be useful and used. <u>The student is advised to read ahead</u>

- One major purpose of the project is to familiarize the student with the primary documents--reports, hearings, regulations--of the federal government. Papers must give evidence that **primary source** materials have been used extensively, though secondary literature may supplement the analysis

- A bibliography (separated by primary and secondary sources) should be attached to each paper; this should provide a precise indication of materials used including relevant pages.