

POLICY FORMATION, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION
POLS/PPA 541, SPRING 2004

INSTRUCTOR: Barry S Rundquist CLASS MEETS: Weds.3:30 to 6

OFFICE: 1122C BSB

WHERE: 1115 BSB

E-MAIL: barryr@uic.edu

Public policy is government's way of correcting market failures and providing goods and services that the market often will not. In a sense, public policy formation, implementation, and evaluation is a non-market process of societal problem solving. In democracies, the forms that public policies tend to take is often difficult to predict and difficult to explain. The purpose of this course is three-fold: 1) to address some of the difficulties in explaining why public policies take particular forms; 2) to probe the extent to which political science theories can help understand different kinds of public policy processes; and 3) to identify problems in political science theories and in the research on which they are based with an eye to improving the quality of theory in this area.

This course has traditionally welcomed students from a variety of disciplines, including Urban Planning, Public Administration, Public Health, Economics, Education, Criminal Justice, Nursing, Sociology, and Social Work, as well as Political Science. Non-political scientists are encouraged to make the materials in this course as relevant as possible to their graduate programs and research interests. It is fully possible that great insights into the nature of public policy processes will come from students who are troubled that political science theories do not fit their disciplinary worlds. On the other hand, they might find that these theories help them understand characteristics of public policy that their disciplines do not.

The course focuses on whether there are characteristics of policy making processes that explain why public policies take the form they do? Specifically, can characteristics of policy making processes help explain why public policies tend to be economically efficient or inefficient, fragmented and incoherent or holistic and coherent, effective or ineffective, promote social equality or promote inequality, and/or bring about change in or maintain the policy *status quo*? The answer is "yes:" major characteristics of public policy *can* be traced to the way policy preferences and institutional structures are combined in a particular political system. Thus, for example, in the United States, the nature of public policies will be determined by how people tend to form their policy preferences, how elections tend to work as instruments of democratic policy making, and how parties, interest group, legislative, executive, bureaucratic, and judicial politics

tend to shape and modify policy decisions. In other countries and sub-national and international contexts, the way preferences are formed and distributed and the way policy making institutions are configured will also determine the form of government solutions to policy problems.

The course will introduce both time-honored and recent theory and research on how policy preferences and institutional structures influence public policy. Literature based on three general methodological approaches to studying policy making processes, the rational choice, behavioral, and American Political Development (APD) approaches, will be considered. The literature review part of the course will be evaluated in take home mid-term and final examinations. These will be evaluated for writing coherence as well as familiarity with and understanding of course material.

Most of the readings focus on American politics and especially national level policy making in the U.S., but many of the ideas in the course apply to policy making in other countries and/or governmental settings.

In addition to the required reading for each week, each student will write and present a report on two individually assigned readings during the semester (a written report should be turned in on the day before the seminar meets). A short list of recommended readings is suggested for each topic we will cover.

The course also requires completion of a short *policy tracking project* using government documents. As in previous years, the policy tracking assignment is designed to introduce students to the intricacies of federal public policy documents. John Shuler of the UIC documents library will give a lecture on federal documents in the library and on the web during our class meeting on January 28. The report will be due at the beginning of class the following week (on February 4).

In addition, each student will pick a theory, hypothesis, conjecture, or question that interests them and design a study to test it. This paper should be in the form of a normal social science convention paper (and maybe should become one, probably after more work, in the future). The paper should consist of a) an introduction saying what the paper is going to do; b) a statement of a problem in literature on policy making, implementation, and evaluation that you will address; c) a research question and/or major hypothesis to be examined; d) your research design; e) at least a preliminary attempt to implement your research design (and/or a detailed consideration of what pattern your findings would have to take in order to confirm/reject your hypothesis); f) a discussion of the findings in terms of the problem you initially identified; and g) a short conclusion saying what you studied and what you found out. A proposal for this paper is due at the beginning of the 10th class on March 10; a draft is due at the 13th class (April 7); and the final paper is due at the 14th class (April 14).

Course grades will be based on the following:

Tracking Exercise:	10%
Midterm Exam:	20%
Book/Article Reports	15% (7 1/2% each)
Final Exam	20%
Class Participation	10%
Term Paper	<u>25%</u>
	100%

Several books have been ordered as required books for this course and should be available in the UIC Bookstore. Several other books are ordered as recommended and/or may be purchased from Amazon.Com, Borders.Com or some where. Or they can be checked out from the library. These books will be reported on by one or two seminar members. The following books are required:

- 1) Bruce Cain, John Ferejohn. and Morris Fiorina, *The Personal Vote*, Harvard 1987. PB Used copies if available.
- 2) John Aldrich, *Why Parties?* Chicago, 1995. PB Used copies if available.
- 3) Frances E. Lee and Bruce Oppenheimer, *Sizing Up the Senate*, Chicago 1999. PB
- 4) Paul Peterson, *The Price of Federalism*, Brookings 1995. PB Used copies if available.
- 5) Barry Rundquist and Thomas Carsey, *Congress and Defense Spending: The Distributive Politics of Military Procurement* (Oklahoma: 2002). PB
- 6) Bryan Jones, *Reconceiving Decisionmaking in American Government*, Chicago, 1994.
- 7) Daniel Carpenter, *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Networks, Reputations and Policy Innovation in Executive Departments, 1862-1928* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001)

Recommended:

- 1) R. Douglas Arnold, *The Logic of Congressional Action*, Yale, 1990. PB
- 2) Stephen Skowronek, *Building a New American State*, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- 3) Charles Wolf, *Markets or Governments*, Second Edition, MIT Press, 1993. PB
- 5) Donald Wittman, *The Myth of Democratic Failure*, U. Of Chicago 1995. PB
- 6) Stephen Skowronek, *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill*

Clinton PB

7) James Q. Wilson, *What Government Agencies Do And Why They do It*, (Basic Books, 2000). PB 1989 edition Used copies if available.

8) Benjamin Page and James Simmons, *What Governments Can Do*, U. Of Chicago (2000) PB

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

I INTRODUCTION

Week 1. 1/14 Introductions and Viewing the Problem of Explaining Public Policy from a Political Science Perspective; Issues in understanding and research on public policy formation, implementation and evaluation. P=Preferences and Institutional Structure. Examples: Size of House; etc. Policy characteristics: the three “E’s,” (effective v. indffective problem solving, equality v inequality, and efficiency v inefficiency); stability/status quo maintenance v change; and fragmentation v. coherence. Are their other characteristics of public policies that we should be able to explain? Funnel. Reciprocal relationships.

II PROCESS THEORIES AND RESEARCH

Week 2. 1/21 **Three Approaches to Studying Policy Making: Rational Choice, Behavioral, APD.** Have read William Riker, APSR 1980; Donald Wittman ch. 5. “Homo Economicus vs. Homo Phychologicus,” in *The Myth of Democratic Failure*; and Benjamin Page and Robert Shapiro, *The Rational Public*, Chapter 10; and Milton Friedman, “The Methodology of Positive Economics,” Chapter 1 in Friedman’s *Essays in Positive Economics* (Chicago, 1953).

Recommended:

Benjamin Page and Robert Shapiro, *The Rational Public* (Chicago, 1992), chapters 2, 7, 8, and 9.

Lupia, McCubbins, and Popkin, Eds., *Elements of Reason* (Cambridge, 2000), Chapters 1, 3, and 8.

Gregory Marcus, W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen, *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgement*, Chicago 2000.

Report on APD

Maybe Report on other approaches.

Week 3 1/28 Documents lecture in library. Hand out legislative tracking questions.

Week 4 2/4 Elections and Policy Making. Have read: Cain, Ferejohn, and Fiorina, *The Personal Vote*, and Wittman, *The Myth of Democratic Failure*, Chs. 2 and 3.

Submit Legislative Tracking Assignment.

Recommended:

R. Douglas Arnold, *The Logic of Congressional Action*, Yale, 1990.

Report on Arnold.

Week 5 2/6 Political Parties and Policy Making. Have read John Aldrich, *Why Parties?* Chicago, Parts I, III, and IV. David Brady, *Critical Elections and Congressional Policy Making* (Stanford, 1988), Chapters 5 to 7.

Recommended:

G. Bingham Powell, Jr., *Elections as Instruments of Democracy* (Yale, 2000), Chapter 10.

Ansolabehere, Snyder, and Stewart, "Candidate Positioning in U.S. House Elections," in *AJPS*, Jan. 2001.

Cox and McCubbins, *Legislative Leviathan* (California, 1993).

Week 6 2/11 Legislating and Policy Making. Have read Frances E. Lee and Bruce Oppenheimer, *Sizing Up the Senate* and Barry Rundquist and Thomas Carsey, *Congress and Defense Spending: The Distributive Politics of Military Procurement*

Recommended:

Tim Groseclose and David King, "Committee Theories Reconsidered," in Dodd and Oppenheimer, *Congress Reconsidered*, 7th Edition (CQ Press, 2001).

Nelson W. Polsby, *How Congress Evolves*, Oxford 2003.

Report on Polsby

Report on Grossclose and King.

Week 7 2/18 Agendas and Policy Making. Have read Bryan Jones, *Reconceiving Decision Making in Democracies*, (Chicago, 1994), Chapter 10.

Recommended:

John Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*.

Report on Kingdon.

Report on the rest of Jones.

Week 8 2/25 Executives and Bureaucrats and Policy Making. Have read James Q. Wilson, *What Government Agencies Do And Why They do It* (a behavioral approach), Daniel Carpenter, *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Networks, Reputations and Policy Innovation in Executive Departments, 1862-1928* (an APD Approach), and Epstein and O'Halloran, *Delegating Powers* (a rational choice approach), 1999.

Recommended:

Stephen Skowronek, *Building a New American State*, Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Stephen Skowronek, *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill Clinton*

Aaron Wildavsky, *Politics of the Budgetary Process*, Second Edition.

Hand Out Take-Home Midterm Exam.

Week 9: 3/3 Executives and Bureaucrats and Policy Making: Continued.

Week 10 3/10 Overview of Interest Group Theories of Policy Making.

Reports on Olson, *Logic of Collective Action* and Lowi, *End of Liberalism*.

Submit Midterm Exam.

Submit proposal for term paper.

Week 11 3/17 Spring Break.

Week 12 3/24 Federalism and Policy Making. Have read Peterson, *The Price of Federalism*.

Submit and present legislative tracking memo.

Recommended:

III PUBLIC POLICY

Week 12 3/31 Policy Efficiency. Have read Wolf, *Markets or Governments*.

Recommended:

Amihai Glazer and Lawrence Rothenberg, *Why Government Succeeds* (Harvard 2001).

Week 13 4/7 Policy and Equality: Redistribution. Have read Page and Simmons, *What Governments Can Do*, Chicago 2000, Chapter 3 and 9.

Report on Gillens, *Why Americans Hate Welfare* (Chicago, 1999).

Submit draft of term paper.

Week 14 4/14 Reports on Sam Peltzman's articles "Voters as Fiscal Conservatives" and "The Growth of Government." Report on Trubowitz.

Submit Term Paper.

Pass out take home final exam.

Week 15 4/21 Concluding Lecture on Why Public Policies Take the Form they Do. In class discussion of Legislative Tracking Projects.

Week 16 4/28 Submit Final exam

QUESTIONS TO ANSWER FOR PPA/POLS 541 TRACKING LEGISLATION BACKWARDS EXERCISE

The purpose here is to give students an opportunity to become familiar with public documents on public policy making, primarily at the national level. This lesson is best conveyed in the context of a policy problem *in which one is particularly interested*.

Among the documents one might consult are **Congressional Quarterly**--start with the most recent multi-year volume entitled **Congress and the Nation**. Then look at **CQ Annual** for the particular year(s) of interest. Finally, look at **Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report** for detailed things that happen each week. Other good hard copy sources are **National Journal**, the **Congressional Clearing House**, the **National Register**, and the **Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance** (it lists the more than 1000 federal domestic programs and the laws that authorize them).

The **Congressional Information Service (CIS) Index** provides a map of the **Congressional Record**, committee hearings and reports, and conference reports. The **CIS Index** itself gives dates when hearings and floor debates occurred and information on identical bills with different identification numbers, companion bills in the other chamber, etc.

Basic political information on each Congress and all of the members of Congress and their constituencies is available from the **Almanac of American Politics** (published every Congress since 1970) and **Politics in America** (published by CQ press every two years since the 1980s). Subcommittee assignments are available in the special issue of **CQ Weekly Report** published early in the first year of every Congress.

Many of these sources and others are available on-line and our documents library talk should give us a list of sites like **Thomas**. The Political Science department's home page (www.uic.edu/depts/pols/) lists a bunch of government document sites.

Using sources like the foregoing, not secondary sources like journalistic accounts or scholarly monographs of particular bills, prepare a memorandum answering as many of the following questions as you can:

Part I

1) What is the general policy problem involved here?

- 2) What federal programs address this problem?
- 3) For one of the programs you have listed, what does this program do? Who does it affect? Does it have more impact in some regions or states than others?
- 4) For the program identified in (3), identify the public law that authorized it.
- 5) What federal regulations and other rules were created to implement the public law?
- 6) Have there been any judicial ruling that have affected the implementation of the program?
- 7) At this point in time, is the program that is being delivered more consistent with the public law (3), the administrative rulings (4), or the legal rulings (5)?
- 8) What political party controlled the Congress and the executive branch when the public law (3) was enacted? When the administrative rulings (4) were created?
- 9) 4) Into which chamber was the bill first introduced? Who introduced it (name, party, state, district, and biggest city)? Were there co-sponsors? How many co-sponsors were Democrats? Republicans? Had the same bill been introduced in previous Congresses? Which party controlled the chamber when it was introduced? Which party controlled the White House and the other chamber?
- 10) To which committee or committees was the bill referred in each chamber? Which subcommittees? Did the committee(s) and or subcommittee(s) hold hearings on the bill? How many? When?
- 11) If there were hearings, who participated (check through the hearing and see how many times each member is recorded as having said something)--name, party, state.? Who were the witnesses (names and titles)? Who chaired the hearing? How many participated? How many did not participate?

12) Was there a vote on the bill in committee and/or subcommittee? What was it? Was there a recorded mark-up session? If so, what happened to the bill during the mark-up session? Did the committee report the bill?

13) Was the bill debated on the floor of either or both chambers?

Who participated in these debates? (name, party, state)

14) Was the bill amended in either chamber? What was the vote on each amendment? What were the amendments? What was the vote on the whole bill? Number Democrats for? Number Republicans for?

15) Was there a conference committee on the bill? Who were the House and Senate conferees? (name, party, state, what committee in their chamber were they from?)

16) Is there any legislation pending on this subject in the current Congress?

Part II

Based on your research in Part I,

1) Which legislators, interest groups, or other entities (e.g., Iraq's government) appear to have won the most of what they wanted from the legislative process that produced your program? Who lost? On what evidence do you base these judgements?

2) Who won and lost from the implementation phase of the process of producing our program? On what evidence to you base this judgement?

3) Who won and lost from the legal rulings on your program? (Identify your evidence).

4) With which one or several of the various theories of why policy takes the form with which you are familiar, including those you have encountered in this course, would you say the process you have studied is most consistent? Why do you think it is this (these) theory and not others?

5) If you wanted to evaluate how effectively the law that was enacted deals with the problem you listed in 1), what kind of data would you want to look at? Do you think the law would appear effective by this evidence?

John Aldrich, *Why Parties?* Chicago, Parts I, III, and IV.