

Public Affairs 801
Public Policy Formulation and Administration
Autumn 2009

Professor: Tomas M. Koontz
Time/Room: M 5:30-8:18pm/PA 020
Phone: 688-8166
Email: koontz.31@osu.edu
Office: Page 210 A
Office Hours: M 4:30-5:30pm and by appointment

TAs: Young Woon Kim (kim.2145@osu.edu)
Blair Russell (russell.515@osu.edu)
Reena Uppal (uppal.4@osu.edu)

Schedule of Classes

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

| Session | |
|---------|----------------------|
| 1 | 9/28 |
| 2 | 10/5 |
| 3 | 10/12* (paper topic) |
| 4 | 10/19^ |
| 5 | 10/26^ |
| 6 | 11/2* (paper 1) |
| 7 | 11/9^ |
| 8 | 11/16 |
| 9 | 11/23* (paper 2) |
| 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 (25%, 30 %) | 55% |
| Assignments/Participation | 17 |
| Take-home Final Exam | 28 |

The following letter grades are assigned to the student's final percentage:

| | | | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|
| | 87 % | B+ | 77 % | C+ | 67 % | D+ | |
| 93 % | A | 83 % | B | 73 % | C+ | 63 % | D |
| 90 % | A- | 80 % | B- | 70 % | C- | 60 % | D- |

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.

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

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Topic selection | no later than 10/12 |
| Paper No. 1 | 11/2 |
| Paper No. 2 | 11/23 |

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 purposes of the student project 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. The accent of the project is on analysis, rather than description. The first paper counts 25 % of the course grade, the second paper counts 30 %.

Assignments/Participation

Three assignments, accessed through Carmen (<http://www.carmen.osu.edu>), are due at the beginning of class in sessions 4, 5, and 7. In addition, students are expected to participate actively in class discussions, based on the reading question sets provided. The three assignments count three percent each; class participation counts eight percent of the course grade.

Take-home Final Exam

The Final Exam is due on Monday, December 7 by 4:00pm. Exams may be delivered in person (Page 110A, in care of Susie Cinadr), or sent as a Microsoft Word attachment to koontz.31@osu.edu. If you 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 by the due date and time. The final exam counts 28 % of the course grade.

Required Book

The following book is required and available at SBX:

Richard Stillman II. *The American Bureaucracy: The Core of Modern Government* (2004) (S)

Readings marked (EJ) can be accessed through the OSU library at <http://library.osu.edu/>

Additional readings have been placed on electronic reserve. **(ER)** The readings can be accessed through Carmen at <http://www.carmen.osu.edu>

Session 1 (Sep 28): Course Introduction and the Public Interest

Welcome and introductions

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

Session 2 (Oct 5): Introduction to the public policy making system (Who Gets What, When, How?)

Guest speaker: accessing legislation information through the library

Required Readings

- 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)**

Optional Readings

(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 verify your understanding.)

U.S. House of Representatives. (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)**

Session 3 (Oct 12): Policy Formulation—Conflict and Agenda Formation

* *turn in paper topic selection*

Required Readings

- 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)
- John Kingdon. (2002). *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* (pp. 205-218). Longman: New York. (ER)
- Deborah A. Stone. (1989). Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. *Political Science Quarterly*, 104 (2), 281-300. (EJ)
- John Kingdon. (1973). Dynamics of Agenda Formation in Congress. In James Anderson (Ed.), *Cases in Public Policy Making* (pp. 25-38. (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)

Session 4 (Oct 19): Policy Formulation—Conflict and Agenda Formation Part 2

In-class discussion of agenda setting assignment

Required Readings

- Paul A. Sabatier and Christopher M. Weible. (2007). The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Innovations and Clarifications. In Paul A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 189-220). Boulder: Westview Press (ER)
- Smith, Aaron & Rainie, Lee. The Internet and the 2008 Election. (2008). Pew Internet & American Life Project. (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)
- Chapter 5: Outputs of the Bureaucracy (S)

Session 5 (Oct 26): Influence of Groups, Agenda Formation, and Decision Making in the Legislature

In-class discussion of “money and politics” assignment

Required Readings

- Michael Howlett/M. Ramesh. (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 (Nov 2): Intergovernmental Relations, Models of Implementation and Evaluation

* paper No. 1 due

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

Optional Reading

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 (Nov 9): Public-Private Organizations: Similarities/Differences/Implications

In-class discussion of public-private organization assignment

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

Session 8 (Nov 16): The Role of the Public Organization in the Policy Process

Required Readings

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

Session 9 (Nov 23): Institutional Design Alternatives and Performance Management

* paper No. 2 due

Required Readings

- Behn, R. (2003). Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review* 63 (5): 586-605. (EJ)
- Hatry, Harry. (2002). Performance Measurement: Fashions and Fallacies. *Public Performance & Management Review* 25 (4): 352-358. (EJ)
- Behn, Bob. (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)

Session 10 (Nov 30): Reform and Accountability

Take-home final exam distributed

- 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.

Appendix A

801 Public Program Analysis Project Guidelines

Student Project

The purposes of the student public program research project are 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 in 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.

General Requirements

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* <http://12.46.245.173/cfda/cfda.html> 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 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;
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.)

General Requirements for Program Analysis Project Papers

Students are required to prepare an analysis of a federal government program consisting of two short papers. Detailed substantive requirements for the papers will be provided by the instructor. 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. The student is advised to read ahead.
- 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.