

Public Policy 510: Politics of Public Policy Winter 2018

Instructor: Jonathan Hanson

jkhanson@umich.edu

4223 Weill Hall, 615-1496

Office Hours: Mon. 11:30–1:00, Fri. 11:00–12:30, or by appointment

Graduate Student Instructor: Dina Emam

demam@umich.edu

3202 Weill Hall, Mailbox 58

Office Hours: Tuesdays 11:00–1:00, or by appointment

As analysts of public policy, we use social science tools to assess policy options from a technical standpoint. We emphasize systematic analysis of empirical data and a more detached perspective. This is not how the policymaking process typically operates in real-world conditions, where various interests clash and fight to win policy outcomes that are favorable to their own objectives. The perspectives of “experts” with scientific training may be treated with skepticism or regarded as irrelevant.

The central goal of this course is to give policy practitioners the skills necessary to understand the political nature of the policymaking environment and to operate within it effectively. This involves the ability to identify the various stakeholders and participants in the policymaking process, to discern what motivates these actors and shapes their interests, and to understand the institutional, social, economic, and cultural factors that structure this environment. In short, we learn to approach the policymaking process from a political perspective and to think strategically about our actions.

This course is comparative in nature. Although many of the cases we discuss will come from the American political context, we draw upon cases from many other countries as well. By looking across different contexts, the comparative approach helps identify factors that are critical for understanding a particular political context but that are less obvious without a basis for comparison. The comparative approach also enables us to assess a wider range of alternatives, fostering the spread of good ideas.

Course objectives:

- To understand the policy process;
- To identify the range of interests, stakeholders, institutions, and other factors that shape the policymaking environment around an issue;
- To develop strategies that respond to the the particular challenges in a given political context;
- To develop written and oral communication skills critical for being an effective participant in policymaking;
- To build capacity to work well with others in group settings;

Class Meeting Schedule

Unless otherwise noted, class meetings are Tuesdays and Thursdays from 1:00–2:30 pm in 1120 Weill Hall.

Readings

Most reading assignments are available on the course Canvas site or through links to electronic holdings in the University of Michigan library. Some readings must be purchased, such as the cases from the Harvard Kennedy School Case Program (<http://case.hks.harvard.edu>).

Assignments and Grading

Your grade for this course will be determined by your performance on a variety of different assignments and class participation. These assignments are described in detail in the Assignments Guide on Canvas.

Class Participation	15%
Briefing memo	5%
Stakeholder Analysis memo	10%
Policy memo	15%
Policy Environment Assessment group memo	10%
Roundtable presentation	15%
Self-assessments and self-critique	5%
Peer questions and critiques	10%
Strategy memo	15%

Since this course is largely discussion-based, class participation is an important element of this course. It is expected that you will come to class having completed the readings in advance. I reserve the right to give a brief reading quiz without warning should I sense that too many students are not prepared.

All writing assignments are expected to be turned in by their respective deadlines, which will typically be the time that class starts on the day the assignment is due. You will upload a PDF-formatted file to Canvas through links in the Assignments folder. Rather than your name, put only your student ID number at the top of the page.

Late assignments: Since your real-world policy memos will have deadlines that cannot be changed, we will follow the same practice in this course. A grade deduction of 10% per day will be applied for late assignments. Please note that Canvas records the time an assignment is uploaded and will automatically flag any assignment that is turned in late. If there are extenuating circumstances, such as a family emergency or serious illness, please get in touch with me as soon as possible.

Communication skills: a central objective of this course is to help you improve your written and oral communication skills for addressing a policy audience. The ability to write clearly, succinctly, and persuasively is critically important to being an effective practitioner in this field. Policy writing has some unique features, among them an emphasis on clarity and efficiency, that may differ from other forms of writing that you have done in the past. Writing assignments are typically short, but this part of what makes them difficult.

You are encouraged to make use of the Ford School's excellent writing tutors: Alex, Beth, and David. Appointments are available through the following link: <http://www.fordschool.umich.edu/writing-center/>. Another great resource is the Sweetland Writing Center: <http://www.lsa.umich.edu/swc/>. No matter how good the quality of your writing is at present, you will surely benefit from these resources.

The last part of the course consists of roundtable discussions. Members of the class will be divided into groups of 5-6 students. Each group will work on a particular policy question, and each member of the group will take on a particular role: government official, interest group representative, etc. Your job will be to advocate for your position on the issue, convincing the members of the audience (i.e. the rest of the class) to support your position on the issue.

In addition to your roundtable presentation, class discussions will offer an important opportunity for you to practice your oral communication skills. There are many ways to be an effective class participant: making an insightful comment, asking a question, showing good listening skills, and through overall engagement. Sometimes we will debate matters that are controversial or generate strong emotions. Your ability to discuss these issues respectfully and without rancor or personal attacks is essential.

The final course letter grade reflects the Ford School's guidelines. An A is awarded for work that is Excellent, an A- for work that is Very Good, a B+ for work that is Good, a B for work that is Acceptable, and a B- for work that is below expectations for graduate work. You should know I do not have a predetermined formula to convert numeric point totals into these categories.

Academic Integrity

It is expected that students are familiar with the Ford School's expectations for academic integrity as described at <http://fordschool.umich.edu/academics/expectations>, which adhere to the academic integrity policies for Rackham Graduate School. Violations of these policies will be taken seriously.

Students with special needs

If you believe you need an accommodation for a disability, please let me know at your earliest convenience. Some aspects of this course may be modified to facilitate your participation and progress. As soon as you make me aware of your needs, we can work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities to help us determine appropriate accommodations. I will treat any information you provide as private and confidential.

Inclusivity

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

Please refer to <http://fordschool.umich.edu/academics/expectations> for a full statement on the Ford School's academic expectations.

January 4: Introduction to the Course

January 9: The Policy Process

James E. Anderson (2014). "The Study of Public Policy." In *Public Policymaking*, chapter 1. Cengage Learning.

Jessica R. Adolino and Charles H. Blake (2010). "The Policy Process." In *Comparing Public Policies: Issues and Choices in Industrialized Countries*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

January 11: Theories of Public Policymaking

Stella Z. Theodoulou (2013). "In Search of a Framework to Understand the Policy Process." In *Public Policy: The Essential Readings*, Stella Z. Theodoulou and Matthew A. Cahn, eds. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

Frank M. Baumgartner, Bryan D. Jones, and Peter B. Mortensen (2014). "Punctuated Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in Public Policymaking." In *Theories of the Public Policy Process*, Paul A. Sabatier and Christopher M. Weible, eds. Boulder: Westview Press.

Bui Thi Thu Ha, Tolib Mirzoev, and Maitrayee Mukhopadhyay (2015). "Shaping the Health Policy Agenda: The Case of Safe Motherhood Policy in Vietnam." *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* 4(11): 741-746.

January 16: Theories of Public Policymaking continued

- Turn in roundtable topic preferences

Christopher M. Weible and Paul A. Sabatier (2007). "A Guide to the Advocacy Coalition Framework." In *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis*, chapter 9. Boca Raton: Taylor & Francis.

Marcela Veselková (2014). "Science, Stories, and the Anti-Vaccination Movement." *Human Affairs* 24: 287-298.

January 18: Policymaking in Comparative Perspective

Kuhika Gupta (2012). "Comparative Public Policy: Using the Comparative Method to Advance Our Understanding of the Policy Process." *The Policy Studies Journal* 40(S1): 11-26.

Wilder, Matt (2017). "Comparative Public Policy: Origins, Themes, New Directions." *The Policy Studies Journal* 45(S1): S47-S66.

January 23: Institutional and Cultural Contexts (Theory)

Margaret M. Polski and Elinor Ostrom (1999). "An Institutional Framework for Policy Analysis and Design." Mimeo.

Elmer E. Schattschneider (1960). "The Scope and Bias of the Pressure System." In *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Miriam Smith. (2005). "The politics of same-sex marriage in Canada and the United States." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 38(2): 225-229.

January 25: Institutional and Cultural Contexts (Cases)

Ellen M. Immergut (1990). "Institutions, Veto Points, and Policy Results: A Comparative Analysis of Health Care." *Journal of Public Policy* 10(4): 391-416.

Katherine Boothe and Kathryn Harrison (2009). "The Influence of Institutions on Issue Definition: Children's Environmental Health Policy in the United States and Canada." *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 11(3): 287-307.

January 30: Agenda Setting

- Briefing memo due by beginning of class.

Thomas A. Birkland (2011). "Agenda Setting, Power and Interest Groups." In *Introduction to the Policy Process*. New York: Routledge.

Anne Schneider and Helen Ingram (1993). "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *The American Political Science Review* 87(2): 334-347.

February 1: Actors Inside Government

Thomas A. Birkland (2011). "Official Actors and Their Roles in Public Policy." In *Introduction to the Policy Process*. New York: Routledge.

Donald P. Haider-Markel, Mark R. Joslyn, and Chad J. Kniss (2000). "Minority Group Interests and Political Representation: Gay Elected Officials in the Policy Process." *The Journal of Politics* 62(2): 568-577.

February 6: Actors Outside Government

- Group Stakeholder Proposal due February 6 by 5 pm

John W. Kingdon (2011). "Outside of Government, But Not Just Looking In." In *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. Boston: Longman.

Jack Walker (1991). "The Mobilization of Political Interests in America." In *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

February 8: Political Activists

Jelani Cobb (2016). "The Matter of Black Lives: A New Kind of Movement Found its Moment. What will its Future Be?" *The New Yorker*, March 14, 2016.

Elahe Izadi (2016). “Black Lives Matter and America’s Long History of Resisting Civil Rights Protesters.” *The Washington Post*, April 19, 2016.

Dan Gunderson (2017). “‘Not Invisible Anymore’: Standing Rock a Year After Pipeline Protests.” Minnesota Public Radio, September 13, 2017.

Peter Walker (2016). “Malheur Occupation is Over, but the War for America’s Public Lands Rages On.” *The Conversation*, February 19, 2016.

February 13: Social Movements

David A. Snow (2010). “Conceptualizing Social Movements.” In *A Primer on Social Movements*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

David S. Meyer (1993). “How Social Movements Matter.” *Contexts* 2(4): 30-35.

Sarah A. Soule and Brayden G. King (2006). “The Stages of the Policy Process and the Equal Rights Amendment, 1972-1982.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111(6): 1871-1909.

Corrine McConnaughey (2017). “4 Lessons for Today’s Women’s Marchers from the Suffrage Movement.” *The Washington Post*, January 26, 2017.

February 15: In-Class Writing Exercise

February 20: Public Opinion

John Zaller (1992). *Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapt. 3 and 12)
<https://doi-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/10.1017/CBO9780511818691>.

Alan Sung-Soo Yang (2003). *Mass Opinion Change and Social Activism: The Politics of Knowledge and the Modern Lesbian and Gay Movement*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Chapter 1.

February 22: Public Opinion and Truth

- Stakeholder Analysis memo due February 22 by 11:59 pm

Deborah Stone (2012). “Facts.” In *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Amanda Taub (2017). “‘Kompromat’ and the Danger of Doubt and Confusion in a Democracy.” *The New York Times*, January 15, 2017.

Elizabeth Kolbert (2017). “Why Facts Don’t Change our Minds: New Discoveries About the Human Mind Show the Limitations of Reason.” *The New Yorker*, February 27, 2017.

Megan Sharma et al. (2016). “Zika Virus Pandemic: Analysis of Facebook as a Social Media Health Information Platform.” *American Journal of Infection Control* (in press).

Quealy, Kevin (2017). “How Readers React to Political News Stories They Don’t Like: By Ignoring Them.” *The New York Times*, February 21, 2017.

February 27 & March 1: Winter Break

March 6: The Politics of Expertise

Sheila Jasanoff (1991). “Acceptable Evidence in a Pluralistic Society.” In *Acceptable Evidence: Science and Values in Risk Management*. New York: Oxford University Press.

U.S. Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking (2017). “Introduction: Vision for Evidence-Based Policymaking.” In *The Promise of Evidence-Based Policymaking*, chapter 1.

Michelle Cottle (2017). “The Congressional War on Expertise.” *The Atlantic*, July 9, 2017.

Lena H. Sun and Juliet Ellperin (2017). “CDC Gets List of Forbidden Words: Fetus, Transgender, Diversity.” *The Washington Post*, December 15, 2017.

March 8: The Politics of Expertise

Kristin Anderson Moore (2006). “How Can Basic Research and Children and Families Be Useful for the Policy Process?” *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 52(2): 365-375.

Tom Nichols (2017). “How America Lost Faith in Expertise: And Why That’s a Giant Problem.” *Foreign Affairs* 96(2): 60-73

Eric Lipton and Brooke Williams (2016). “How Think Tanks Amplify Corporate America’s Influence.” *The New York Times*, August 7, 2016.

Annie Waldman (2017). “Big Pharma Quietly Enlists Leading Professors to Justify \$1,000-Per-Day Drugs.” *ProPublica*, February 23, 2017.

Anthony N. Washburn and Linda J. Skitka (2017). "Science Denial Across the Political Divide: Liberals and Conservatives are Similarly Motivated to Deny Attitude-Inconsistent Science." *Social Psychological and Personality Science* (online first), 1-9.

March 13: Bureaucratic and Regulatory Politics

Cornelius M. Kerwin and Scott R. Furlong (2011). *Rulemaking: How Government Agencies Write Law and Make Policy*, 4th Edition. Washington, DC: CQ Press. Chapter 2 (Canvas).

Matthew McCubbins, Roger G. Noll, and Barry R. Weingast. "Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control." *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 3(2): 243-277.

March 15: Bureaucratic and Regulatory Politics

- Policy memo due Thursday, March 15 by 5 pm.

KSG Case 1349.0. "Taking on Big Tobacco: David Kessler and the Food and Drug Administration."

KSG Case 1737.0. "'Dealing With The Devil': The Tobacco Control Negotiations Of 1997-98."

March 20: Policymaking Through Litigation

Martha Derthick (2003). *Up in Smoke: From Legislation to Litigation in Tobacco Politics*. Washington: CQ Press.

Evan Gerstmann (2005). "Litigating Same-Sex Marriage: Might the Courts Actually Be Bastions of Rationality?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38(2): 217-220.

Molly Ball (2015). "How Gay Marriage Became a Constitutional Right." *The Atlantic*, July 1, 2015.

March 22: Policymaking Through Litigation

- Policy Environment Assessment group memo due Friday, March 23 by 5 pm.

David S. Meyer and Steven A. Boutcher (2007). "Signals and Spillover: Brown v. Board of Education and Other Social Movements." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(1): 81-93.

John P. Heinz, Ann Southworth and Anthony Paik (2003). “Lawyers for Conservative Causes: Clients, Ideology, and Social Distance.” *Law & Society Review* 37(1): 5-50.

Robinson Meyer (2016). “The Legal Case for Blocking the Dakota Access Pipeline.” *The Atlantic*, September 9, 2016.

March 27: Politics of Program Evaluation

- Roundtable Press Release due by 10 am.

Lant Pritchett (2002). “It Pays to Be Ignorant: A Simple Political Economy of Rigorous Program Evaluation.” *Policy Reform* 5(4): 251-269.

Eleanor Chelimsky (1987). “What Have We Learned about the Politics of Program Evaluation?” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 9(3): 199-213.

KSG Case 1958.0. “Michelle Rhee’s IMPACT on the Washington D.C. Public Schools.”

March 29: Policy Roundtable # 1

April 3: Policy Roundtable # 2

April 5: Policy Roundtable # 3

April 10: Policy Roundtable # 4

April 12: Policy Roundtable # 5

April 17: Wrapping Up

Tuesday, April 25: Strategy Memo due