

PubPol 479: Evaluating Public Policies
Fall, 2018
Syllabus

Instructor: Paula Lantz, Ph.D.
Professor and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
4125 Weill Hall, Ford School of Public Policy
E-mail: plantz@umich.edu

Office Hours: Wednesdays 11:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. or by appointment

GSI: Lydia Wileden, PhD student in Sociology & Public Policy
3207 Weill Hall, Ford School of Public Policy
E-mail: lwileden@umich.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays 11:30 am to 1:00 pm, Fridays 10:00 am to 11:30 am, or by appointment

Course Materials: Assigned Readings: Canvas PubPol 479 Website
Purchase of one Harvard Kennedy School Case Study (\$3.95)

Course Requirements:

Exam	15%	10/04/18
Article Critique	20%	10/25/18
Team Evaluation Design	25%	11/29/18
Policy Evidence Memo	15%	12/17/18
Stata Exercises	10%	
Class Participation	<u>15%</u>	
	100%	

Objectives of the Course:

1. To understand the role of program and policy evaluation in the policymaking process.
2. To gain skills needed to understand and critique published evaluations of public policies and programs.
3. To develop expertise in framing evaluation questions and crafting research designs and data analysis plans to answer the questions, including in the format of a funding proposal.
4. To gain skills in using program and policy evaluation research studies to inform and communicate policy recommendations, including in politically-charged environments.

Important Stuff

Class Format: Our class time together will be in a variety of formats: lecture, class discussion of assigned articles and other topics, guest speakers, and small group exercises/discussions. The use of these different formats reflects the fact that learning how to do evaluation research is not a simple

task. The reading assignments and lectures will provide the technical basis required for program and policy evaluation. However, one also needs many opportunities to discuss and apply the terms, concepts, and technical tools. In addition, evaluation research is often a "social" endeavor, meaning that one rarely performs an evaluation all alone. Therefore, having the opportunity to sit down with other people to jointly design evaluation approaches and to interpret evaluation research findings is essential to the learning process.

Students will gain the most out of this course if they read the assignments before class, and actively participate in class discussions and exercises. The days on which there are small group exercises may seem like good times to miss class, but these are the days when most of the learning regarding how to actually perform a program evaluation will take place. They are an important determinant of your class participation grade.

Readings: A variety of readings available on Canvas are required for the course. Students are expected to do the assigned readings for each class period, even though we often will not discuss all of the readings in class. It is assumed that students will do the readings and will gain important information from them, and that class time can be used to go over additional material. The readings are important, because they provide helpful examples of different evaluation designs and measurement approaches, and give you the opportunity to assess the strengths and weaknesses of actual evaluations. They will also be useful for exams and written assignments.

Class Participation: Class participation is 10% of the course grade. An important part of class participation is attending class, especially for the small group exercises. Class participation also involves asking questions, answering questions, sharing experiences or insights, or even challenging comments made by the professor or other classmates. All students are expected to make productive contributions to class discussions and to small-group exercises. Students are also expected to share their opinions/perspectives and to respectfully challenge the perspective of others if they disagree. Program/policy evaluation invokes a wide variety of opinions (many subjective) about what makes "good" public policy, what are desirable outcomes of a policy program, and what the role of evidence is in measuring those outcomes and allocating resources towards the public good.

Assignments: All assignments will be given in writing, with clear instructions. Late work needs to be negotiated *before* the day the assignment is due (just like you would do on a job). Professor Lantz is always willing to negotiate a new deadline with you if you have a reasonable reason for needing an extension. However, assignments that are turned in late without prior discussion or approval will be docked one grade step for every day they are late.

Classroom Expectations/Etiquette:

- **Please arrive to class on time.** We will start promptly at 10:00 a.m. each day.
- Please refrain from going in and out of the room during class, unless absolutely necessary.
- We will be engaging in discussions and debates in class. It is perfectly fine to disagree with each other and to have contrary opinions and perspectives. It is not appropriate to personalize differences of opinions, or to engage in rude, insulting or hostile behavior during our debates or outside of class. The goal is to have lively, respectful and productive exchanges. If you feel uncomfortable with an aspect of class discussion but are not comfortable raising this during class, please reach out to Lydia or Professor Lantz to discuss one on one.
- **The use of laptop computers, iPads or handheld devices will only be allowed on certain days for specific purposes.** The research evidence is mounting that open use of laptops and other devices in classroom settings has a negative impact on student learning, for you and the students around you. We will together figure out what works best in the context of this course, but having laptops or electronic tablets open and in use throughout class will not be the standard

Ethical Conduct: The Ford School of Public Policy believes that the conduct of students registered or taking courses in the School should be consistent with that of a professionally-employed person. Courtesy, honesty, and respect should be shown by students toward faculty members, guest lecturers, administrative support staff, and fellow students. Similarly, students should expect faculty to treat them fairly, showing respect for their ideas and opinions and striving to help them achieve maximum benefits from their experience in the School.

Student academic misconduct refers to behavior that may include plagiarism, which is defined as taking the words or ideas of someone else and attempting to pass them off as your own. The preparation of reports, papers, and examinations, assigned on an individual basis, must represent each student's own effort. Reference sources should be indicated clearly and listed in a professional manner. Academic misconduct also includes cheating, fabrication, falsification of records or official documents, intentional misuse of equipment or materials (including library materials), and aiding and abetting the perpetration of such acts. Academic misconduct is taken very seriously, and could result in failing the course or even expulsion.

Ford School Inclusivity Statement:

Members of the Ford School community represent a rich variety of backgrounds and perspectives. We are committed to providing an atmosphere for learning that respects diversity. While working together to build this community we ask all members to:

- share their unique experiences, values and beliefs
- be open to the views of others
- honor the uniqueness of their colleagues
- appreciate the opportunity that we have to learn from each other in this community
- value one another's opinions and communicate in a respectful manner
- keep confidential discussions that the community has of a personal (or professional) nature
- use this opportunity together to discuss ways in which we can create an inclusive environment in Ford classes and across the UM community

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: If you believe you need an accommodation for a disability, please let your instructor know at your earliest convenience. Some aspects of courses may be modified to facilitate your participation and progress. As soon as you make your instructor aware of your needs, they can work with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office to help determine appropriate academic accommodations. Any information you provide will be treated as private and confidential.

Student Mental Health and Well-Being Resources: The University of Michigan is committed to advancing the mental health and well-being of its students. We acknowledge that a variety of issues, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, and depression, directly impact students' academic performance. If you or someone you know is feeling overwhelmed, depressed, and/or in need of support, services are available. For help, contact [Counseling and Psychological Services](#) (CAPS) and/or [University Health Service](#) (UHS). For a listing of other mental health resources available on and off campus, visit: <http://umich.edu/~mhealth/>

Please review additional information and policies regarding academic expectations and resources at the Ford School of Public Policy at this link:

<http://fordschool.umich.edu/academics/expectations>

PUBPOL 479: SYLLABUS

Topic/Reading Assignment

Dates

Introduction to Course Role of Program Evaluation in the Policy Process

9/4/18

O'Hare M. A typology of governmental action. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 1989; 8:670-672.

Evaluation Terms/ Planning an Evaluation

9/6/18

Langbein, L. *Public Program Evaluation: A Statistical Guide*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2015. Chapter 1, pages 3-18.

Utilization-Focused Evaluation. BetterEvaluation Website:
http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/utilization_focused_evaluation

Pain R, Whitman G, Milledge D and Lune Rivers Trust. *Participatory Action Research Toolkit: An Introduction to Using PAR as an Approach to Learning, Research and Action*. Durham University. <http://communitylearningpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/PARtoolkit.pdf>

SKIM—GOOD RESOURCE: Milstein RL, Wetterhall SF, et al. Framework for program evaluation in public health. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. September 17, 1999, pages 1-40.

DISCUSSION SECTION Participatory Action Research

9/7/18

View in Class: Participatory Video for Monitoring and Evaluation:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ktdyjib3Msw>

Arcury TA, Wiggins MF, Brooke C, et al. Using "Policy Briefs" to Present Scientific Results of CBPR: Farmworkers in North Carolina. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*. 2017; 11(2):137-47.

Fundamentals of Research Design

9/11/18

Langbein, L. *Public Program Evaluation: A Statistical Guide*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2015. Chapter 3, pages 51-72.

King EL, Gruseit AC, O'Hara BJ, Bauman AE. Evaluating the effectiveness of an Australian obesity mass-media campaign: how did the 'Measure-Up' campaign measure up in New South Wales? *Health Education Research*. 2013; 28(6): 1029-39. <https://academic.oup.com/her/article/28/6/1029/596301>

Ferraro PJ. Counterfactual thinking and impact evaluation in environmental policy. In M. Birnbaum & P. Mickwitz (Eds.), *Environmental Program and Policy Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*. 2009; 122, 75-84.

OPTIONAL TO SKIM: Campbell DT, Stanley JC. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966, pages 1-50.

Fundamentals of Research Design

9/13/18

Adam E, Chetty R, Duncan GJ, Gennetian LA, et al. Evaluation of the impact of Moving to Opportunity in the United States. J-PAL. <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/evaluation/evaluating-impact-moving-opportunity-united-states>

Zulman DM, Chee CP, Ezeil-Okoye SC, et al. Effect of an intensive outpatient program to augment primary care for high-need veterans affairs patients: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2017; 177(2):166-75.

Optional: Nyguen Viet, C. Impact evaluation of development programmes and policies: Experiences from Vietnam. Munich Personal RePEc Archive. December, 2014. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/60919/1/MPRA_paper_60919.pdf

DISCUSSION SECTION – Discuss Article

9/14/18

Romich, Jennifer, Scott W. Allard, Emmi E. Obara, Anne K. Althausen, and James H. Buszkiewicz. Employer responses to a city-level minimum wage mandate: Early evidence from Seattle. *Urban Affairs*. August 2, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087418787667>

Data and Measurement Issues

9/18/18 – 9/20/19

ER Services. *Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Chapter 6 Measurement of Constructs. <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-hccc-research-methods/chapter/chapter-6-measurement-of-constructs/>

Wintemute GJ, Hemenway D, Webstar D, Pierce GI, Braga A. Gun shows and gun violence: fatally flawed study yields misleading results. *AJPH*. 2010; published online.

DISCUSSION SECTION Measurement of Variables

9/21/18

Resource: SAS -- Basic Concepts in Research and Data Analysis. <https://support.sas.com/publishing/pubcat/chaps/59814.pdf>

Randomized Controlled Trials

9/25/18

Somers JM, Moniruzzaman A, Patterson M, et al. A randomized trial examining housing first in congregate and scattered site formats. *PLOS One*. 2017; <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0168745>

Moves to Opportunity Project in Seattle:

<http://creatingmoves.org/>

<http://creatingmoves.org/research/>

Buck S and McGee Josh. *Why the Government Needs More Randomized Controlled Trials: Refuting the Myths*. Laura and John Arnold Foundation. Houston, Texas: July, 2015.

Randomized Controlled Trials

9/27/18

Harnack L, Oakes JM, Elbel B, et al. Effects of subsidies and prohibitions on nutrition in a food benefit program: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2016; 176(11):1610-18.

Pronyk P M, Hargreaves JR, Kim JC, Morison LA, Phetla G, et al. Effect of a structural intervention for the prevention of intimate-partner violence and HIV in rural South Africa: a cluster randomised trial. *The Lancet*. 2006;368(9551):1973-1983.

SKIM: Nyhan B and Reiffler J. When corrections fails: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior*. 2010; 32:303-330.

DISCUSSION SECTION Exam Preparation

9/28/18

Case Study of “Ban the Box” Policy

10/2/18

Doleac JL. “Ban the Box” does more harm than good. Brookings Institution. May 31, 2016. <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/ban-the-box-does-more-harm-than-good/>

Stacy C, Cohen M. Ban the Box and Racial Discrimination: A Review of the Evidence and Policy Recommendations. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, February, 2017.
http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/88366/ban_the_box_and_racial_discrimination.pdf

Emsellem M and Avery B. Racial profiling in hiring: A critique of new “Ban the Box” studies. National Employment Law Project. August, 2016. <http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/Policy-Brief-Racial-Profiling-in-Hiring-Critique-New-Ban-the-Box-Studies.pdf>

Read pages 1-5 (and more if you like): Agan A and Starr S. “Ban the box, criminal records, and statistical discrimination: A field experiment.” University of Michigan Law and Economics Research Paper No. 16-012. June 14, 2016.

EXAM

10/04/18

NO DISCUSSION SECTION

10/05/18

Class Exercise: Designing a Randomized Trial

10/09/18

Laura and John Arnold Foundation. *Key Items to Get Right When Conducting Randomized Trials of Social Programs*. February, 2016.

QUASI EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS

10/11/18

Carpenter C, Eppink ST, Gonzales G, McKay T. Effects of access to legal same-sex marriage on marriage and health: Evidence from BRFSS. NBER Working Paper No. 24651. June, 2018
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w24651>.

Rossman SB, Roman JK, Zweig JM, et al. The Multisite Adult Drug Court Evaluation: Study Overview and Design, Volume 1. December, 2011. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237109.pdf>

Rossman SB, Zweig JM. The Multisite Adult Drug Court Evaluation. National Association of Drug Court Professionals. May, 2012. <http://www.nadcp.org/sites/default/files/nadcp/Multisite%20Adult%20Drug%20Court%20Evaluation%20-%20NADCP.pdf>

Benneer LS, Coglianese. Evaluating Environmental Policies. University of Pennsylvania Law School. 11-1-2004. https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1105&context=faculty_scholarship

DISCUSSION SECTION: Statistical Analysis for Program Evaluation

10/12/18

Fall Study Break - No Class

10/16/18

Time-Series Designs/Natural Experiments

10/18/18

Leatherdale ST. Natural experiment methodology for research: a review of how different methods can support real-world research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2018. DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2018.1488449
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13645579.2018.1488449>

Silver LD, Ng SW, Ryan-Ibarra S, et al. Changes in prices, sales, consumer spending, and beverage consumption one year after a tax on sugar-sweetened beverages in Berkeley, California, US: A before-and-after study. *PLOS Medicine*. 2017. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002283

DISCUSSION SECTION: Statistical Analysis for Program Evaluation

10/19/18

Quasi-Experimental Designs Evaluating Medicaid Expansions

10/23/18

Guest Speaker: John Ayanian, MD, MPP; Professor of Internal Medicine and Public Policy; Director of the U-M Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation

Sommers BD, Baicker K, Epstein AM. Mortality and access to care among adults after state Medicaid expansions. *NEJM*. 2012;367:1025-34.

Ayanian JZ, Ehrlich GM, Grimes DR, Levy H. Economic effects of Medicaid expansion in Michigan. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2017; 376:407-410.

Team Evaluation Design Assignment **10/25/18**
Assignment will be explained; teams will meet for the first time

DISCUSSION SECTION - Statistical Analysis for Program Evaluation **10/26/18**

Evaluation in Practice: **10/30/18**
GUEST RESEARCHERS will present their evaluation studies

William Elliot III, PhD. Professor of Social Work, University of Michigan
Silvia Robles, PhD, Post-Doctoral Fellow, Education Policy Initiative, Ford School of Public Policy

Elliot W. An asset-building agenda for the twenty-first century: giving families something to live for. *Journal of Children and Poverty*. 2018: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10796126.2018.1493802>

STATA LAB or Meet with Team **11/01/18**
STATA LAB or Meet with Team **11/02/18**

Logic Models/Systems Thinking **11/06/18**

Kaplan SA, Garrett KE. The use of logic models by community-based initiatives. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 2005;28:167-172.

Sterman JD. Learning from evidence in a complex world. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2006; 96(3):505-514.

Root causes of inequality: addressing structural racism (Figure 3-2 and Box 3-2 Massachusetts)
<https://www.nap.edu/resource/24624/RootCausesofHealthInequity/>

STATA LAB or Exercise Designing a Quasi-Experiment **11/08/18**
STATA LAB or Exercise Designing a Quasi-Experiment **11/09/18**

Process Evaluation **11/13/18**

Durlak JA. The importance of implementation for research, practice, and policy. *Child Trends Research Brief*. Publication #2011-34, December, 2011.

Miller JM, Khey DN. An implementation and process evaluation of the Louisiana 22nd Judicial District's Behavioral Health Court. *Am J Crim Justice*. 2016;41:124-135.

Braga AA, Schnell C. Evaluating place-based policing strategies: Lessons learned from the smart policing initiative in Boston. *Policy Quarterly*. 2013; 16(3):339-257.

SKIM: Butts JA. Process evaluation of the Chicago Juvenile Intervention and Support Center. John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York, April, 2011.
<https://jeffreybutts.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/jisc20112.pdf>

Using Program Evaluation Results to Design/Promote Public Policy **11/15/18**

White House. *Economics of Early Childhood Investments*. December, 2014

Heritage Foundation Head Start. http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2013/pdf/ib3823.pdf

Medicaid Work Requirements:

Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Memo SMD: 18-002 Re: Opportunities to Promote Work and Community Engagement Among Medicaid Beneficiaries. January 11, 2018. <https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/smd18002.pdf>

Urban Institute. Work Requirements in Social Safety Net Programs. A Status Report of Work Requirements in TANF, SNAP, Housing Assistance, and Medicaid. December, 2017.

Citizens Research Council of Michigan. Work Requirements Don't Work, But Medicaid Beneficiaries Do. <https://crcmich.org/work-requirements-dont-work-but-medicaid-beneficiaries-do/>

Rector, R. Work Requirements in Medicaid Won't Work. Here's a Serious Alternative. Heritage Foundation. March 19, 2017. <https://www.heritage.org/health-care-reform/commentary/work-requirements-medicaid-wont-work-heres-serious-alternative>

DISCUSSION SECTION Check in for Team Projects **11/16/18**

Ethical Issues in Program Evaluation **11/20/18**

American Evaluation Association. Guiding Principles for Evaluators, 2013. <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>

Parker SW, Teruel GM. Randomization and social program evaluation: The case of Progres. *Annals, AAPSS*. 2005; May, 199-219.

Wallis, C. How fake surgery exposes useless treatments. *Scientific American*. February 1, 2018. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-fake-surgery-exposes-useless-treatments/>

No Class -- Happy Thanksgiving **11/22/18**
11/23/19

Understanding and Using the Policy Evaluation Research Literature **11/27/18**

Guest: David Thacher, Associate Professor, Ford School of Public Policy and Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning

Thacher D. The aspiration of scientific policing. *Law & Social Inquiry*. July 31, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsi.12367>

The contribution of literature reviews to public policy design: From anecdote to evidence. 2013. <http://www.avaluacio.cat/the-contribution-of-systematic-reviews-to-public-policy-design-from-anecdote-to-evidence/?lang=en>

Doleac, JL. Study after study shows ex-prisoners would be better off without intense supervision. Brookings Institution. July 2, 2108. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2018/07/02/study-after-study-shows-ex-prisoners-would-be-better-off-without-intense-supervision/>

DeAngelis, CA. The Evidence on School Choice is Far from Mixed. The Cato Institute. 2018; <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/evidence-school-choice-far-mixed>

Optional Readings:

Head Start

<https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2015/08/03/report-scant-scientific-evidence-for-head-start-programs-effectiveness>

Teen Pregnancy Programs

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0193841X16664658>

Cash Transfers

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10749.pdf>

STATA LAB or Mexico Case Study of Income Security Policy

11/29/18

STATA LAB or Mexico Case Study of Income Security Policy

11/30/18

Harvard Kennedy School Case Study. *Providing Pensions for the Poor: Targeting Cash Transfers for the Elderly in Mexico*. <https://case.hks.harvard.edu/providing-pensions-for-the-poor-targeting-cash-transfers-for-the-elderly-in-mexico/>

Pay for Success – Role of Evaluation

12/04/18

Galloway, I. (2014). Using pay-for-success to increase investment in the nonmedical determinants of health. *Health Affairs*, 33(11), 1897-1904.

Lantz, P. M., Rosenbaum, S., Ku, L., & Iovan, S. (2016). Pay for Success And population health: Early results from eleven projects reveal challenges And promise. *Health Affairs*. 2016; 35(11): 2053-61.

Third Sector Capital Partners, Inc. (2016). *Developing the Cuyahoga Partnering for Family Success Program*. Retrieved from <https://www.thirdsectorcap.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Final-Cuyahoga-Partnering-for-Family-Success-Program-Lessons-Learned-Report.pdf>

Case Study: IRB Review of Proposed Program Evaluation

12/06/18

Davis MM, Lantos JD. Ethical considerations in the public policy laboratory. JAMA. 2000;284:53-59.

Unite for Sight. Module 15: Ethics of Evaluation.

<http://www.uniteforsight.org/evaluation-course/module15>

DISCUSSION SECTION: Final Assignment-Policy Evidence Memo **12/07/18**

Course Wrap-Up **12/11/18**