

ESP 160: The Policy Process
Lecture T TR | Sections W
Spring 2019

THE POLICY PROCESS

Instructor

Dr. Gwen Arnold
gbarnold@ucdavis.edu

Office hours

Fridays 12pm-1pm
Wickson 2144

Teaching assistants

Megan Foster
mlfoster@ucdavis.edu

Office hours

Thursdays 11am-12pm
Wickson 2135

Mackenzie Johnson
mrjohnson@ucdavis.edu

Wednesdays 10am-11am
Wickson 2135

Ellie Oldach
ejoldach@ucdavis.edu

Tuesdays 10:30-11:30am
Wickson 2135

OVERVIEW

This class introduces students to leading theories of the policy process used in political science and public administration. Students will use these theories to analyze case studies of real environmental policy issues.

Grading

You can earn up to 1,000 points in this course, divided as follows:

Graded element	Points
In-class group activities	100
Paper topic proposal	50
Two papers (150 points each)	300
Participation in two paper feedback sessions (25 points each)	50
Five quizzes (50 points each)	250
Five lecture attendance checks (10 points each)	50
Weekly discussion section attendance and participation (10 points per section)	100
One-time discussion section article presentation (50 points)	50
Weekly discussion section question posting (50 points)	50

Assignments

You will receive additional details about the assignments on the first day of class or at a reasonable interval before the assignment is due.

In-class group activities

At various intervals there will be in-class group activities designed to advance understanding of the material.

Papers

You will choose a policy dilemma to analyze during the quarter, explaining its key dimensions in a 1–2 page proposal due in hard copy in section on April 17. Instructions for the proposal will be provided and discussed in section. We will provide a list of dilemmas that align well with the theories being tackled in the course. Alternately, you can choose a different policy dilemma. The policy dilemma either should be completed or a significant portion of it should be completed; this is important so that you can find retrospective media and scholarly coverage.

Once your topic is approved,* you will write two 5–7 page double-spaced papers analyzing the topic through the lens of a policy theory and proposing a related research design. Each paper must apply a different policy theory.

In each paper, you will explain how the policy theory can help explain the dynamics of your policy dilemma. You then will propose and describe a research study that you could pursue using the policy theory. The study should either investigate how or the dimensions along which the policy theory helps explain the dilemma, or use evidence from the policy dilemma to investigate the theory itself. (We will discuss these options in the first two weeks of class.)

You should use your Wednesday sections to brainstorm and outline these papers, taking advantage of TA guidance and insights from other students. Two discussion sections will be specifically designated as paper workshops, and you will earn points for participating in these sessions.

Papers must be submitted in hard copy, not via email, to the box outside Dr. Arnold's office door in Wickson 2144 by 5 p.m. on the day they are due. The deadline for Paper 1 is Tuesday, May 14. Paper 2 is due Thursday, June 6. This timing means that you should use MSF, Democratic Policy Theory, or ACF in Paper 1. Paper 2 can use any policy theory except the one you used in the first.

You will receive Paper 1 back, graded and with comments, by May 29. This will give you time to incorporate the feedback into your second paper. Grades for the proposal and the papers will be assigned according to a rubric detailed in a separate document.

We strongly encourage you to come to office hours to discuss your papers with Dr. Arnold, Megan, Ellie, and/or Mackenzie. **Students who get feedback on their analysis and research design ideas consistently do better on their papers than those who do not.**

* If your proposal is not approved, your TA will work with you to set up a deadline for a second proposal.

Individual quizzes

Five short quizzes will take the place of exams in this course. They will cover lecture materials and assigned readings. Each will be worth 50 points and will contain short answer or multiple choice questions. They will take 15-20 minutes.

Lecture attendance check

Lecture attendance checks will occur in five lectures. They will not be announced in advance. You earn 10 points for being in class when an attendance check occurs.

Discussion section attendance and participation

There are 10 discussion section meetings. For each, you will earn a 3 points for attendance and 7 points for active participation in discussion. “Active participation” involves two things: (1) Verbal contribution to whole-class discussions or in small-group activities and (2) You post a discussion question to Canvas. Discussion section scores are awarded solely at the discretion of your TA.

Discussion section article presentation

During one of the section meetings, you will work in a group of students to give a 20-30 minute summary of one of the assigned articles and lead discussion about it. Your TA will coordinate presentation scheduling and group assignment.

Discussion section question posting

At least one hour before discussion section, you must post to Canvas a constructive question regarding one of the assigned readings. A constructive question facilitates discussion and critical inquiry. Examples of NON-constructive questions include “What page does the article start on?” and “When is the next quiz?”

You earn 5 points per question. Questions posted less than one hour before the start of your section meeting do not earn points. In the section where you present an article, you do not need to post a question as well. You automatically earn the 5 points in that section.

OTHER COURSE DETAILS

Academic integrity

It is your responsibility to understand and comply with the University of California, Davis Code of Academic Conduct, as well as any other documented policies of the department, college, and university related to academic integrity. The code can be reviewed online: <http://sja.ucdavis.edu/cac.html>.

Classroom civility

I expect you to respect your fellow students and myself and to behave in a professional manner. Failure to meet these standards will be considered classroom disruption and treated as such pursuant to the University of California, Davis Code of Academic Conduct.

Disclaimer

This syllabus is subject to change at the instructor's discretion.

Grading

Rubrics that indicate how grades will be assigned to papers will be available on Canvas. Answer keys for quizzes will be posted on Canvas. Your individual papers will be returned, graded, 2 weeks following submission. Graded quizzes will be returned to you in the next week's discussion section.

Communication

I am always happy to talk with you about course materials, as are the TAs. You can visit us during our office hours or you can set up an appointment. Email is also a good way to reach us, with some important caveats:

- We will respond to your email within 48 hours unless there is a holiday or we are traveling.
- Put the course title and number in the subject line of your email (ESP 160) or after your name at the bottom of the email.
- Use a personal salutation in your email: "Dear Dr. Arnold," "Dear Megan," or "Dear Erica."
- Use a capital letter to start the first word of each sentence and every proper noun.
- Use complete sentences, correct spelling, and correct punctuation.
- At the end of the email, use an appropriate sign-off, such as "Sincerely" or "Best." Below the sign-off, write your first and last name.

If you do not follow these instructions, your email may not be answered.

Late assignments

Late papers will be accepted within 24 hours of the deadline, but will receive a 50% penalty on the grade you would have received otherwise. Papers must be submitted in hard copy, not via email, to the box outside of Dr. Arnold's office.

If you miss class in which a quiz, group activity, or lecture attendance check occurs, you will miss the associated points. Exceptions can be granted, and a make-up assignment provided, in two situations:

- You were sick or otherwise unable to attend class due to a family or personal emergency.
- You had a religious or cultural obligation that directly conflicted with class attendance.

For each situation you may be asked to provide authoritative documentation, such as a doctor's note. If you miss section for an exception-worthy reason, contact your TA to discuss a potential make-up activity. If you miss lecture, contact Dr. Arnold.

The make-up assignment for a legitimate absence generally will involve you writing a critical summary of one of the course readings and submitting it within a week of your absence.

Required text

Weible, C., and P. A. Sabatier. 2017. *Theories of the Policy Process*, 4th ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

You will usually be assigned 2–3 additional articles that will be posted on Canvas. These articles offer examples of how the policy theory being discussed can be applied to a real-life policy situation. You should read these materials before the first class in the week in which they are assigned.

Canvas

Some course readings are posted on Canvas. Course updates and announcements may also be

posted on Canvas. It is your responsibility to check Canvas regularly. Failure to do so is not an excuse for being unaware of material posted there.

Special needs

If you have a disability which may affect your performance in the course, please let Dr. Arnold know when the course begins (or as soon as possible if the disability begins during the quarter) so that appropriate accommodations can be made. Some accommodations may require prior approval from the UC Davis Student Disability Center (<http://sdc.ucdavis.edu/>).

If unexpected events that may require special accommodations arise during the quarter (e.g., personal or family emergencies), please notify Dr. Arnold as soon as possible. You may be required to provide authoritative documentation.

Technical issues

It is your responsibility to resolve technical difficulties. Technical difficulties are not an excuse for late work.

TOPICS AND READINGS

The schedule below notes the topic and readings associated with each week of the course. (C) indicates a PDF available from Canvas.

Week 1 (April 2 – April 4)

T: Syllabus and course overview; why study the policy process?

TR: Research design in policy studies I

Required Readings

Weible and Sabatier 2017 Introduction and Chapter 10 (C)

Truman State University Political Science Research Design Handbook (C)

Week 2 (April 9–11)

T: Research design in policy studies II

TR: Research design in policy studies III

Required Readings:

Pollack Chapters 1–2 (C)

Shively Chapters 1–2 (C)

Week 3 (April 16–18)

T: Multiple streams framework (MSF)

W: Paper proposal due in section

TR: MSF

Required Readings:

Weible and Sabatier 2017 Chapter 1

Kammerman, P. 2018. Factors driving the promotion of hydroelectricity: A qualitative comparative analysis. *Review of Policy Research* 35 (2): 213-237. (C)

Sistrom, M. G. 2010. Oregon's Senate Bill 560: Practical policy lessons for nurse advocates. *Policy, Politics, and Nursing Practice* 11 (1): 29-35. (C)

Optional Reading:

Brunner, S. 2008. Understanding policy change: Multiple streams and emissions trading in Germany. *Global Environmental Change* 18 (3): 501-507. (C)

Week 4 (April 23-25)

T: MSF, Quiz 1

W: Paper proposal returned in section

TR: Democratic policy design

Required Readings:

Sabatier and Weible 2014 Chapter 4 (C—note that this is NOT in the 2017 book)

Buckhoy, N. 2015. Environmental justice for whom? A social construction framework analysis of Executive Order 12898. *Environmental Justice* 8 (5): 157-164. (C)

Henstra, D. 2010. Explaining local policy choices: A multiple streams analysis of municipal emergency management. *Canadian Public Administration* 53 (2): 241-258. (C)

Week 5 (April 30-May 2)

T: Democratic policy design

TR: Democratic policy design, Quiz 2

Required Readings:

Al-Kohlani, S., and H. R. Campbell. 2016. Rank-order implications of social construction theory: Does air quality depend on social constructions? *Policy Sciences* 49: 467-488. (C)

Czech, B., P. R. Krausman, and R. Borkhataria. 1998. Social construction, political power, and the allocation of benefits to endangered species. *Conservation Biology* 12 (5): 1103-1112. (C)

Optional Reading:

Reese, E. 2005. Policy threats and social movement coalitions: California's campaign to restore legal immigrants' rights to welfare. In *Routing the opposition: Social movements, public policy, and democracy*, eds. D. S. Meyer, V. Jenness, and H. M. Ingram, 259-287. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (C)

Week 6 (May 7-9)

T: Advocacy coalition framework (ACF)

W: Paper workshop 1

TR: ACF

Required Readings:

Weible and Sabatier 2017 Chapter 4

Ellison, B. A. 1998. The advocacy coalition framework and implementation of the Endangered

Species Act: A case study in western water politics. *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 11–29. (C)
Heinmiller, B. Timothy, and Kevin Pirak. 2016. Advocacy coalitions in Ontario land use policy development. *Review of Policy Research* 34 (2): 168–185. (C)

Optional Reading:

Elliott, C., and R. Schlaepfer. 2001. Understanding forestry certification using the Advocacy Coalition Framework. *Forest Policy and Economics* 2 (3–4): 257–266. (C)

Week 7 (May 14–16)

T: ACF, PAPER 1 DEADLINE

TR: Narrative policy framework, Quiz 3

Required Reading:

Weible and Sabatier 2017 Chapter 5

Week 8 (May 21–23)

T: Narrative policy framework

TR: Narrative policy framework, Quiz 4

Required Readings:

Gupta, K., J. Ripberger, and W. Wehde. 2018. Advocacy group messaging on social media: Using the Narrative Policy Framework to study Twitter messages about nuclear energy in the United States. *Policy Studies Journal* 46 (1): 119–136. (C)

Shanahan, E., M. D. Jones, M. McBeth, and R. R. Lane. 2013. An angel on the wind: How heroic policy narratives shape policy realities. *Policy Studies Journal* 41 (3): 453–483. (C)

Optional Readings:

McBeth, M., E. Shanahan, P. Hathaway, L. Tigert, and L. Sampson. 2010. Buffalo tales: Interest group policy stories in Greater Yellowstone. *Policy Sciences* 43: 391–409. (C)

Weible, C. M., K. L. Olofsson, D. P. Costie, J. M. Katz, and T. Heikkila. 2016. Enhancing precision and clarity in the study of policy narratives: An analysis of climate and air issues in Delhi, India. *Review of Policy Research* 33 (4): 420–441.

Week 9 (May 28–30)

T: Institutional Analysis and Design (IAD)

W: Paper workshop 2

TR: IAD

Required Readings:

Imperial, M. T., and T. Yandle. 2005. Taking institutions seriously: Using the IAD framework to analyze fisheries policy. *Society and Natural Resources* 18 (6): 493–509. (C)

Ostrom, E. 2007. Institutional rational choice: An assessment of the institutional analysis and development framework. In *Theories of the Policy Process*, 2nd ed, ed. P. Sabatier, 35–72. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. (C)

Optional Reading:

Mollenkamp, S., M. Lamers, and E. Ebenhoh. 2008. Institutional elements for adaptive water management regimes: Comparing two regional water management regimes in the Rhine basin. In *Adaptive and integrated water management*, eds. C. Pahl-Wostl, P. Kabat, and J. Moltgen, 148–166. Springer: Berlin. (C)

Week 10 (June 4–6)

T: IAD

TR: Comparing and contrasting leading policy theories, Quiz 5, PAPER 2 DEADLINE

Readings:

Weible and Sabatier 2017 Chapter 8