

FROM: Herb Weisberg [weisberg.1@polisci.osu.edu]
SENT: Thu 6/4/2009 8:51 AM

Dear Trevor,
Thanks for sharing these with us.

The overlap is, in most cases, less than originally, but it turns out to be considerable for PA 200, which is very similar to how we now teach PS 305. Both rely on numerous case studies, in-class discussion, and policy memos, coupled with exams. The topics and cases will naturally differ by instructor, but to a large extent these classes will be viewed by future students as substitutes for one another: the overlap is so substantial that having taken one course, there would be little added value in taking the other course. I'm attaching a recent version of the PS 305 syllabus, from winter 2009, since it may be more recent than the version you worked from.

Also, on PA 589, the internship course, our internship program is a long-standing program that primarily deals with students who have internship opportunities in central Ohio, including the state legislature - we recognize that the Glenn Institute has taken over the Washington D.C. internship program that we previously administered and we have no problem with that. We see that the PA 589 syllabus makes clear that this is a Washington internship; we hope that the corresponding forms for course approval make clear that this is course is outside of Columbus, so that approval of this internship course does not eventually mutate into a Columbus-based internship course.

Again, thanks for letting us preview this material,
Herb

**The Ohio State University
Department of Political Science**

Political Science 305: Introduction to the Public Policy Process

Winter 2009 (Mondays and Wednesdays: 2:00-3:48 p.m., Page Hall 0010)

Craig Volden
Professor of Political Science
Office Hours: Tues., 2:00-3:30 p.m.

E-mail: volden.2@osu.edu
Phone: 614-292-9026
Office: 2147 Derby Hall

Teaching Assistants:

Josh Kertzer; kertzer.1@osu.edu; 2043 Derby Hall; Office Hours: Fridays 11:30-12:30.
Chaekwang You; you.36@osu.edu; 2081 Derby Hall; Office Hours: Thurs. 11:30-12:30.

Course Description: Introduction to the Public Policy Process is a course designed for undergraduate students with an interest in political science, economics, or public policy, although students in a variety of fields may find the class interesting and useful and are thus encouraged to enroll. The course is also part of the College of Social and Behavioral Science's new Minor in Public Policy (for more details, see: <http://polisci.osu.edu/ugrads/ppolicy/index.htm>). The course has three main purposes: (1) to provide students with exposure to a number of lenses through which scholars and practitioners view the policymaking process, (2) to examine many of the steps in that process, and (3) to illustrate the public policy process in action through more than a dozen case studies. The course is structured to follow the assembly-line model of policymaking, with additional readings included to display various approaches to the study of public policy.

The course is conducted on a lecture, discussion, and case analysis basis. A typical class session will contain a lecture that addresses the theoretical aspects and conceptual tools raised in the session's readings, a case presentation by a group of students, and then a guided discussion about how the case illustrates class concepts.

Course materials:

The course materials include two required and one recommended books available in the campus bookstore (Barnes & Noble/Long's) or online, and overheads used in class discussions:

Required: Stella Z. Theodoulou and Matthew A. Cahn. 1995. *Public Policy: The Essential Readings*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. (Henceforth **T&C**)

CQ Researcher. 2009. *Issues for Debate in American Public Policy, 9th Ed.* Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Recommended: Deborah Stone. 2002. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making, Revised Edition*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Class overhead notes, made available before class on Carmen (<http://carmen.osu.edu>), should be downloaded, printed out, and brought to class.

Course requirements and grading:

The course requirements are: mastery of the course content, as illustrated through constructive contributions to class discussions, a group presentation, two policy memos, a midterm exam, and a final exam.

Grades will be assigned a weighted average of six components—class participation (10%), group presentations (15%), policy memos (10% each), the midterm exam (25%), and the final exam (30%). Students are expected to attend class, to have read the material, and to be prepared for occasional discussions in class. Several students will be called upon in each class session to contribute to class discussion, as the basis for their *class participation* grade.

Students will be self-organized into groups to lead discussions of the cases for each class. *Group presentations* are to be no shorter than 20 minutes and no longer than 30 minutes, followed by questions and a class discussion. Group presentations should include the following components: (a) summarize the case reading, (b) tie that material to the theoretical concepts explored earlier in the quarter, (c) raise a particular public policy problem based on the case reading, (d) present and advocate for a policy to address the problem (also raising alternative solutions), (e) discuss the arguments *against* the proposed policy change, (f) detail which policymakers support and which oppose the policy change and why, and (g) assess the likelihood of this policy change occurring, based on the politics of the public policy process as detailed in case materials, in outside research, and in class concepts from earlier in the quarter. It should be noted that these presentations are *NOT* intended to lead to policy debates. Students should be concerned less with persuading others of the benefits of their policy proposal than in using that proposal to help the class better understand the policy process. The format will be different for the groups in Session 7 and Session 17, during which we will have two groups taking opposing positions regarding the likelihood of policy change. The format of those presentations will be discussed with the groups well in advance of their presentations.

The presentation will be worth 15% of the students' grade. Half of the group's grade will be based on Prof. Volden's evaluations of the group presentation. The other half will be based on group members' evaluations of one another's contributions to the group (which should be emailed to Prof. Volden following the group presentation). Overheads for group presentations should be emailed to Prof. Volden after the presentation to be posted on Carmen. All students (whether presenting or not) are, of course, expected to have read the material and to be prepared for discussion of the cases for each class.

Students will complete two individual *policy memos* advocating policy change in issues covered by the case study topics for particular classes. One of these memos will deal with the issue about which the student is making a group presentation; the other will be chosen from the alphabetical list below. Students must write their two memos on two different topics, and so should not choose to do a group presentation in the same sessions when their other memo is due.

Students with last names beginning with the following letters must write on one of these cases:
A-D: Due January 28 on topics “Health Care” or “Oil Jitters” from Sessions 7 or 8.
E-K: Due February 11 on topics “Torture” or “Domestic Poverty” from Sessions 11 or 12.
L-R: Due February 18 on topics “U.S. Iran Policy” or “Infrastructure” from Sessions 13 or 14.
S-Z: Due February 25 on topics “Gun Violence” or “Superbugs” from Sessions 15 or 16.

Students must complete these memos by themselves, without the assistance of others. Any questions about the memos should be addressed directly to Prof. Volden. Memos are due at the start of the class session on the indicated date. Unless students contact Prof. Volden ahead of the due dates with major problems, no late memos will be accepted. Students who do receive extensions will have their grade reduced, with the exception of those facing medical or other accepted emergencies.

Memo length is to be no shorter than 2 pages and no longer than 3 pages, single-spaced, 12-point font, one-inch margins, standard paper size. Each memo must be addressed to an actual policymaker who will be making a relevant decision over the issue in question. The memo should: (a) provide background on the issue, (b) lay out the options available to the policymaker and a description of why this policymaker has jurisdiction over this policy decision, (c) advocate a specific action, (d) address why your position should be supported by this policymaker (why is it in his or her self interest, for example?), (e) address counter-arguments and alternative positions that the policymaker will care about, and (f) be persuasive, clear, and factually correct. Obviously, policy memos in the real-world will not include academic citations; nevertheless, to avoid plagiarism concerns (see below), all referenced books, articles, websites, and ideas should be noted clearly in endnotes (which can appear on a fourth page, if necessary). Each memo will be equivalent to 10% of the student’s grade.

The *midterm exam* will be held in the course classroom at the scheduled course time on Feb. 4. The exam will contain true/false, short answer, and essay questions. The exam will be closed-notes and closed-book. The midterm exam will comprise 25% of each student’s grade.

The *final exam* will be held in the course classroom at **1:30-3:18** on the **WEDNESDAY** of exam week (**March 18**). The exam will cover material from throughout the quarter, and will be composed of true/false, short answer, and essay questions. The exam will be closed-notes and closed-book. The final exam will comprise 30% of each student’s grade.

Academic Honesty: Dishonest practices on the examinations, on memos, or in the course generally are unacceptable. All work is to be the student’s own. There will be no collaboration beyond the group projects. Absolutely no cheating or plagiarism (using someone else’s words or ideas without proper citation) will be tolerated. Any cases of cheating or plagiarism will be reported to the university committee on academic misconduct, and they will be handled according to university policy. Specifically:

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with

examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335-5-487). For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct (http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_csc.asp).

Disability: Students in need of an accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact Prof. Volden to arrange an appointment as soon as possible, to discuss the course format, anticipate student needs, and explore potential accommodations. Disabled students who have not previously contacted the Office for Disability Services are encouraged to do so. The Office for Disability Services is located in 150 Pomerene Hall, 1760 Neil Avenue; telephone 292-3307, TDD 292-0901; <http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/>.

Course Outline:

Session 1: Monday, January 5—Introduction to the Public Policy Process

This introductory session will be used to introduce students to one another and to the course. We will go over the syllabus, discuss why we are interested in public policy, and describe various ways to study the public policy process.

Session 2: Wednesday, January 7—Studying the Public Policy Process

This session allows students to view the steps of the public policy process. From the formation of ideas to the mobilization of individuals in support of action through the political decisions to implementation and evaluation, the public policy process takes various forms and involves complex decisions and analysis. Students are here exposed to different frameworks through which they can view the policy process. The scholars and practitioners we focus on provide a broad range of insights and overviews of public policy.

Readings: Theodoulou, Stella Z. 1995. The Contemporary Language of Public Policy: A Starting Point. Chapter 1 in T&C, pp. 1-9.

Sabatier, Paul A. 1991. Political Science and Public Policy. Chapter 2 in T&C, pp. 10-15.

Lowi, Theodore J. 1964. Distribution, Regulation, Redistribution: The Functions of Government. Chapter 3 in T&C, pp. 15-25.

Theodoulou, Stella Z. 1995. How Public Policy Is Made. Chapter 11 in T&C, pp. 86-96.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Preface and Introduction, pp. vii-xv, 1-14.

Session 3: Monday, January 12—Stage I: Problem Recognition and Issue Identification

This session addresses the first stage of the public policy process, that of problem recognition and issue identification. Where do ideas come from, and what is the role of the public in the process? Are good ideas among the public raised by policymakers? Can policymakers remain isolated from public responsiveness? Is broad consensus behind an idea needed for it to successfully navigate its way through the public policy process? In this session we confront our assumptions about where public policies come from.

Readings: Dahl, Robert A. 1967. With the Consent of All. Chapter 6 in T&C, pp. 38-45.

Miliband, Ralph. 1969. Imperfect Competition. Chapter 8 in T&C, pp. 58-66.

Mayhew, David. 1974. Congress: The Electoral Connection. Chapter 24 in T&C, pp. 220-224.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 1, The Market and the Polis, pp. 17-34.

Session 4: Wednesday, January 14—Controversy 1: Is the Public Policy Process

Sufficiently Responsive to the Public?

In this session we explore the responsiveness of the public policy process to the public. Do public preferences translate smoothly into public policy outcomes, or are there pervasive biases in the policy process resulting in policies that are non-responsive to the will of the people? We thus continue our discussion from the previous class, with a specific focus on those who are economically more or less advantaged. To what extent do the elite make policies that are harmful to the masses? We explore these issues within the context of the recent and ongoing mortgage crisis. Prof. Volden offers a model of a case presentation that groups can follow throughout the quarter.

Case: Mortgage Crisis, Chapter 12 in *Issues for Debate*.

Readings: Beard, Charles. 1935. An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution. Chapter 38 in T&C, pp. 342-350.

Domhoff, G. William. 1983. Who Rules America Now? Chapter 46 in T&C, pp. 393-402.

Session 5: Monday, January 19—No Class—Martin Luther King Day

Session 6: Wednesday, January 21—Stage II: Agenda Setting

Public policies begin as ideas that eventually work their ways onto political agendas. Where do these ideas come from and how do they enter the political arena? Today we confront different views of agenda setting and discuss how these views help us understand the initial steps in the public policy process.

Case: Immigration Debate, Chapter 14 in *Issues for Debate*.

Readings: Truman, David B. 1971. Group Politics and Representative Democracy. Chapter 9 in T&C, pp. 66-72.

Cobb, Roger W., and Charles D. Elder. 1983. Issues and Agendas. Chapter 12 in T&C, pp. 96-104.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 2, Goals: Equity, pp. 37-60.

Session 7: Monday, January 26—Stage II: Agenda Setting (cont.)

Building on the ideas advanced last week, we examine Kingdon's model of agenda setting. To add substantive context to this model, we explore the recurrence of universal health care on the political agenda, and its prospects for successfully navigating the public policy process in the near future.

Case: Health Care: Universal Coverage, Chapter 3 in *Issues for Debate*. (Note: Two groups will present today, one arguing that the U.S. government will significantly overhaul our health care system during President Obama's first term, the other arguing that an overhaul will not occur in this time frame.)

Readings: Kingdon, John W. 1984. Agenda Setting. Chapter 13 in T&C, pp. 105-113.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 3, Efficiency, pp. 61-85.

Session 8: Wednesday, January 28—Controversy 2: Is the Public Suitably Informed and Do Policymakers Adequately Weigh Public Opinion?

Once an idea is advanced in a democracy, it may gain momentum or be thwarted based on the reactions of the public. Proposals that are not supported by the public are far more difficult to pass through political processes, especially when politicians are focused on reelection. Yet, public opinion is not always easy to understand. The public may be uninformed about important issues, and media involvement may affect what is learned about policies over time. The public may be persuaded by the ways in which arguments

are advanced, or members of the public may turn a deaf ear to information that would lead them to a conclusion other than the one they already support.

Case: Oil Jitters, Chapter 7 in Issues for Debate.

Readings: Cahn, Matthew A. 1995. The Players: Institutional and Noninstitutional Actors in the Policy Process. Chapter 22 in T&C, pp. 201-211.

Graber, Doris. 1988. Processing the News: How People Tame the Information Tide. Chapter 33 in T&C, pp. 305-311.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 4, Security, pp. 86-107.

*****Memo due today for students with last names starting with letters A-D.*****

Session 9: Monday, February 2—Stage III: Policy Formulation

While the public may have strong views about an issue, little will be accomplished without collective and active pressure on politicians to adopt policy changes. Moreover, policies may sound more attractive in the abstract than when given deep consideration of their consequences. This session raises these issues as we enter a discussion of the heart of the public policy process: policy formulation. Debates over the politics and policy choices surrounding student aid add context to our discussion.

Case: Student Aid, Chapter 2 in Issues for Debate.

Readings: Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald Kinder. 1987. News That Matters. Chapter 32 in T&C, pp. 295-305.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 5, Liberty, pp. 108-130.

Session 10: Wednesday, February 4—Midterm Exam

Students will take the closed book, closed notes exam in class today. The exam is made up of true/false, short answer, and short essay questions, and is worth 25% of the student's grade.

Session 11: Monday, February 9—Controversy 3: Are Public Policy Decisions Made Based on Symbolism or Substance?

Often symbolic politics trumps the substance of important policy proposals. How are such symbols constructed and utilized? To what extent are beneficial policies brushed aside as too difficult to explain or to sell to the public? This class session explores how policymakers frame public policy ideas and the facts upon which those ideas are based. These issues will be raised again and again throughout the quarter.

Case: Torture Debate, Chapter 10 in *Issues for Debate*.

Readings: Edelman, Murray. 1964. Symbols and Political Quiescence. Chapter 4 in T&C, pp. 26-33.

Friedman, Milton. 1982. Capitalism and Freedom. Chapter 42 in T&C, pp. 372-376.

Edelman, Murray. 1988. Constructing the Political Spectacle. Chapter 44 in T&C, pp. 381-389.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 6, Problems: Symbols, pp. 133-162.

Session 12: Wednesday, February 11—Stage IV: Policy Adoption

Public preferences are translated into policy through political institutions. In today's class we begin to explore the workings of two of the main national policymaking institutions – Congress and the presidency. What role does each play in the formation and then the adoption of policies? Is a healthy balance of powers struck between these two branches of government? Or does this balance lead to gridlock and a failure to adopt valuable policy proposals?

Case: Domestic Poverty, Chapter 5 in *Issues for Debate*.

Readings: Fiorina, Morris. 1989. Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment. Chapter 23 in T&C, pp. 212-220.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 7, Numbers, pp. 163-187; and Chapter 8, Causes, pp. 188-209.

*****Memo due today for students with last names starting with letters E-K.*****

Session 13: Monday, February 16—Stage IV: Policy Adoption (cont.)

In this session we continue our discussion from the previous class, with the case study of U.S. foreign policy toward Iran adding useful additional context. What have been the roles of Congress and the President in formulating foreign policy? Given the difficulties resolving serious issues of foreign policy, does Congress willfully abdicate its responsibility to critically examine the policy choices of the President?

Case: U.S. Policy on Iran, Chapter 15 in *Issues for Debate*.

Readings: Wildavsky, Aaron. 1966. The Two Presidencies. Chapter 26 in T&C, pp. 237-250.

Neustadt, Richard. 1986. Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership from FDR to Carter. Chapter 43 in T&C, pp. 376-381.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 9, Interests, pp. 210-231.

Session 14: Wednesday, February 18—Controversy 4: Do Policy Changes Tend to Be Incremental or Dramatic, and Why?

In this session and the next we continue our in-depth study of the political institutions that make crucial policy-formation and adoption decisions. In a system of checks and balances, policymaking may be very incremental in nature, or it may take sudden turns. Given uncertainty and technological change, policymakers may be too slow to act or may act with excessive haste. When does each occur?

Case: Aging Infrastructure, Chapter 13 in *Issues for Debate*.

Readings: Dahl, Robert A. 1985. A Preface to Economic Democracy. Chapter 45 in T&C, pp. 389-393.

Lindblom, Charles E. 1959. The “Science” of Muddling Through. Chapter 14 in T&C, pp. 113-127.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 10, Decisions, pp. 232-257.

*****Memo due today for students with last names starting with letters L-R.*****

Session 15: Monday, February 23—Controversy 4: Do Policy Changes Tend to Be Incremental or Dramatic, and Why? (cont.)

Here we continue to understand the connections between politics and policy. The incremental decision making of last class is set in contrast with dramatic policymaking of the punctuated equilibrium discussed today. What policies follow which model over time? What political circumstances might affect whether we see incremental or dramatic policy change? What “Change” should we expect early in the Obama administration?

Case: Gun Violence, Chapter 6 in Issues for Debate.

Readings: Rubin, Irene S. 1993. The Politics of Public Budgets. Chapter 21 in T&C, pp. 185-200.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 11, Solutions: Inducements, pp. 261-283.

Session 16: Wednesday, February 25—Stage V: Policy Implementation

Once formulated, public policies are often interpreted, modified, and administered by public agencies. Politicians cannot usually specify in as great detail as they would like all of the specific conditions of their policy proposals. As such, they make broad legislative advancements, relying on bureaucrats to carry out the politicians’ desires. However, the workings of complex organizations, and the possibility that bureaucrats have different goals than do politicians, lead to the conclusion that policy outcomes derived through bureaucratic involvement often differ from those desired in the idea-formation stage. As such, the study of bureaucracy is crucial in developing an understanding of the public policy process.

Case: Fighting Superbugs, Chapter 4 in Issues for Debate.

Readings: Hecl, Hugh. 1978. Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment. Chapter 7 in T&C, pp. 46-58.

Weber, Max. 1946. Bureaucracy. Chapter 28 in T&C, pp. 259-265.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 12, Rules, pp. 284-304.

*****Memo due today for students with last names starting with letters S-Z.*****

Session 17: Monday, March 2— Stage V: Policy Implementation (cont.)

Building on our understanding of the bureaucracy from last session, in this class we focus further on policy implementation. After policies are specified through the public policy process, they still must be carried out. And often the most difficult decisions are confronted when policies on paper meet facts on the ground. This week we explore the implementation stage of the policy process in more detail, examining how implementation decisions may ultimately differ from the desires of policymakers with earlier roles in the process.

Case: Cost of the Iraq War, Chapter 16 in *Issues for Debate*. (Note: Two groups will present today, one arguing that the U.S. government will not play a significant military role in Iraq by the end of President Obama's first term, the other arguing that we will still have such a role at the end of 2012.)

Readings: Wilson, James Q. 1975. *The Rise of the Bureaucratic State*. Chapter 27 in T&C, pp. 251-258.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 13, *Facts*, pp. 305-323.

Session 18: Wednesday, March 4—Controversy 5: What Causes Policies to Fail?

Throughout the quarter, we have attempted to understand the politics behind the public policy process. Such politics may be the basis for some policies not performing as well as we would wish. Still other policies fail because of the complexity of the policy problem. And still other policies deemed failures by some are considered successful to others. Today we confront the normative arguments behind the success and failure of public policies.

Case: Hate Speech, Chapter 11 in *Issues for Debate*.

Readings: Majone, Giandomenico, and Aaron Wildavsky. 1984. *Implementation As Evolution*. Chapter 17 in T&C, pp. 140-153.

Sabatier, Paul A., and Daniel Mazmanian. 1980. *A Conceptual Framework of the Implementation Process*. Chapter 18 in T&C, pp. 153-173.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 14, *Rights*, pp. 324-353.

Session 19: Monday, March 9—Stage VI: Policy Analysis and Evaluation

We conclude our discussions of the consequences of policy implementation decisions in this session, with a brief discussion of policy analysis and evaluation. These issues are illustrated in today's case, which explores the federal government's involvement in education through the No Child Left Behind Act.

Case: No Child Left Behind, Chapter 1 in Issues for Debate.

Readings: Glazer, Nathan. 1975. Towards an Imperial Judiciary? Chapter 31 in T&C, pp. 288-295.

Nachmias, David. 1980. The Role of Evaluation in Public Policy. Chapter 19 in T&C, pp. 173-180.

Optional Recommended Readings: Stone, Deborah. 2002. Chapter 15, Powers, pp. 354-375; and Conclusion, pp. 376-383.

Session 20: Wednesday, March 11—Wrap Up and Review for Final Exam

Today we review the major themes from throughout the quarter. Prof. Volden will address student questions in advance of next week's final exam.

*****Final Exam: WEDNESDAY, March 18, Page Hall 0010, 1:30-3:18 p.m.*****