

**POLS 6312 Survey of American Institutions and Public Policy  
Section: 18772**

Wednesday 5:30–8:30 PM, PGH 405  
University of Houston  
Department of Political Science  
Fall 2012

**Instructor**

Ling Zhu  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science  
Email: lzhu4@central.uh.edu  
Office: PGH 436  
Phone: 713-743-3890  
Office Hours: W/Th 2:00-4:00pm, or by appointment.

**Teaching Assistant**

Andrea Eckelman  
Email: akeckelman@gmail.com  
Office: PGH 426  
Office Hours: TBA.

**Course Description**

Public policy is a unique field in the political science discipline. On the one hand, the substantive topics of policy study overlap with those in many other fields of political science, such as American politics, international relations, political economy, etc. On the other hand, policy study has both scientific and applied aspects. It has generated numerous theories of its own and prescriptive knowledge about the policymaking process. One of the major challenges confronting political scientists is how to appropriately define the scope and nature of public policy research. Perhaps, the even more fundamental challenge is to develop an integrated view about what are the key research questions in the field of public policy. The purpose of this course is to introduce students to different and sometimes diffused theoretical ideas in the field of public policy. In particular, this course serves as an introductory course in public policy and policymaking in the United States. The course introduces you to political institutions and pivotal actors in the policymaking process. It also introduces you the meaning of public policy and political science approaches to it.

This course is designed for doctoral and MPA students in political science, although it may meet the needs of other students. The course proceeds in three sections, starting with

a brief introduction to the history and background of public policy study. Then, you will read intensively on various theories of the policymaking process. The third section primarily focuses on most recent and cutting-edge research pertaining various policy issues: education, social welfare, and health care, for example. This course is reading and writing intensive. In addition to keeping up with the readings, you will want to familiarize yourself with leading journals. In mainline political science, of course, they are the APSR, the JOP and the AJPS. SSQ is the leading interdisciplinary journal with a social policy bent. JPAM is perhaps the best policy analysis journal going and the Policy Studies Journal is another good policy journal.

### **Learning Objectives**

1. To become familiar with major theories in the field of public policy.
2. To become familiar with the existing literature on different policy issues.
3. To identify key research questions in the field of public policy.
4. To learn the frontiers in the scientific study of public policy.

### **Required Books and Additional Readings**

1. Bartels, Larry. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: the Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*, Russell Sage Foundation.
2. Baumgartner, Frank B. and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*, 2nd Edition, Longman.
3. Hero, Rodney E. 1998. *Faces of Inequality: Social Diversity in American Politics*, Oxford University Press.
4. Kingdon, John. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policy*, 2nd Edition, Longman.
5. Krause, George E. and Kenneth J. Meier eds. 2003. *Politics, Policy and Organizations: Frontiers in the Scientific Study of Bureaucracy*, University of Michigan Press.
6. Sabatier, Paul. 2007 "Theories of the Policy Process", 2nd Edition, Westview press.
7. Sabatier, Paul and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. eds. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: an Advocacy Coalition Approach*, Westview Press (optional).
8. Shafritz, Jay, Karen S. Layne and Christopher Borick eds. 2005. *Classics of Public Policy*, Pearson.
9. Smith, Kevin and Christopher Larimer. 2009. *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. Westview Press.

10. Stone, Deborah. 2011. *Policy Paradox: the Art of Political Decision Making*, 3rd Edition, W.W.Norton&Co.
11. There are additional weekly readings available on line (the Blackboard course reading folder).

### Course Requirements

1. Class attendance and regular participation in class discussion.
2. Read the assigned readings prior to each class meeting.
3. Weekly discussion notes. Each student is required to submit ONE discussion note on each week's readings. Discussion notes are due by Tuesday at noon (via the Blackboard Vista assignment drop-box) each week that the class meets. All the discussion notes should be the most important questions or arguments that the student has identified based on the assigned readings. They will help to foster in-class discussion and will be shared at the beginning of each class meeting. The discussion notes should answer following questions: (1) what is the theoretical perspective or the hypotheses of the author? (2) what is the methodology here? (3) what are the conclusions? and (4) what would be your critique of the reading? DO NOT write more than 120 words in one discussion note.
4. Analytical Literature Review Essay. Each student is required to identify a research question in the field of public policy and write an analytical literature review essay on the research question. The literature review essay must be structured around theoretical approaches/arguments regarding state of the literature in this area. Length Limit: 3,000 words. The literature review essay is due on **Oct. 10** in class.
5. A Research Design Paper. Based on the research topic that you choose for the analytical literature review essay, you should prepare a research design paper about how to research your topic. This research design paper should build on your literature review essay. Based on the state of the literature, what is your proposed theoretical framework to address the specific research question that you choose? What, if any, sources of data are now available on your topic? Are there laws and regulations that are relevant? If so, how would you measure changes in relevant regulations and laws? The research design paper should not be preoccupied by methodology in the statistical sense. Instead, it should focus on what you propose to do to investigate the topic. Length limit: 6,000 words. The research design paper is due on **Nov.14** in class. All papers should follow the Chicago Manual of Style.
6. Final Written Exam. The written final will contain 3-5 questions and students will have some choice among questions. Questions will be distributed on Dec. 4 via Blackboard. Students will take it over a 48-hour period, using any materials they desire. The written exam is due on **Dec. 6 (noon)**. All exam reports should be uploaded to the Blackboard turn-it-in drop-box.

7. Mini-Conference and peer review. We will hold a mini-conference during our class meeting on **Dec.12**. Each student will have 15 minutes to present his or her research design paper to the class and to draw feedback from the audience. Students will be assigned a “buddy” and will review their buddies’ research design papers. In our mini-conference, students will serve as discussants to their buddies’ drafts. Written comments will be given to both the author and the instructor. These comments will be evaluated by the instructor for depth, clarity, and insight.

### **Attendance and Late Policy**

1. Attendance. Absence from the class will only be accepted in extenuating circumstances with a university-accepted excuse. If you know in prior that you cannot attend the class, please inform me before the scheduled class-meeting.
2. Late Policy. Late work will be penalized by one letter grade. E.g. an A-paper turned in one day late will become a B-paper. Late work would only be accepted with university-accepted excuses without penalty.

### **Grading**

1. Participation (discussion notes and in-class discussion), 20%
2. Literature Review Essay, 20%.
3. Research Design Paper, 20%
4. Written Exam, 20%
5. Mini-Conference Presentation, 10%
6. Peer Review, 10%
7. Final Grades
  - A = 100-95 (Excellent)
  - A- = 94-90
  - B+ = 89-87 (Good)
  - B = 86-84
  - B- = 83-80 (Poor)
  - C+ = 79-77
  - C = 76-74
  - C- = 73-70
  - D+ = 69-67
  - D = 66-64
  - D- = 63-60
  - F = 59-0 (Failing)

## **Academic Integrity**

As commonly defined, presenting the words or works of others' as your own is plagiarism. Plagiarism is one of the worst academic sins, for the plagiarist destroys the trust among colleagues, without which research cannot be safely communicated. Plagiarism is also a violation of the UH Academic Honesty Policy. If you are uncertain of what constitute academic dishonesty, you should contact me prior to submitting the assignment and/or check the UH Academic Honesty Policy from the university website: [www.uh.edu/provost/policies/uhhonestypolicy.html](http://www.uh.edu/provost/policies/uhhonestypolicy.html). Students are expected to adhere to the UH Academic Honesty Policy. Cheating or plagiarism in course assignments, exams, and the final paper will lead to a grade of F.

## **Americans with Disability Act (ADA)**

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you need special accommodations and assistance due to a disability, please contact the Center for Students with DisABILITIES (CSD Building 568, Room 110) and the Learning Support Services (LSS, 321 Social Work Building), or call 713-743-5411 to make appropriate arrangements.

## **Course Calendar**

### **Part I. Background and Overview**

*Week 1 (August 29 ): Course Overview*

- Overview of the syllabus and course requirements.

*Week 2 (September 5 ): Background, History, and the Study of Public Policy*

In this week, we will discuss public policy as a concept and a field of study. How do scholars define the core of policy study? What are the mainstream approaches to study public policy? How have policy sciences evolved in the past decades? These are important questions for us to get a first impression about the field of public policy.

- Shafritz, Layne, and Borick, Ch.1 (Easton), Ch.2 (Linddblom, Lipsky)
- Stone, entire book.
- Smith and Larimer, Introduction, Ch.1, 2, and 3.

### **Part II: Theories of Public Policy**

*Week 3 (September 12): Theories of the Policy Process (Overview)*

In this week, we will discuss major theories of the policy process. Finishing this week's

readings, you should know what are key stages of a policy process (cycle). You should also understand how scholars theoretically describe and research the policy process. In addition, we will discuss the role of rationality in the policy process and large-N comparative studies.

- Sabatier, Ch.1, 2, 3, 4, and 8.
- Smith and Larimer, Ch.4, 5, and 6.
- Shafritz, Layne, and Borick, Ch.5 and Ch.11 (Meltsner and Wildavsky.)
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1991. "Rational Choice Theory and Institutional Analysis: Toward Complementarity." *American Political Science Review*, 85(1): 237-243.

*Week 4 (September 19): Comparing Different Policy Theories*

In this week, we will expand last week's overview into more specific discussions on different policy theories. Sabatier (2009) provides a synopsis of main theoretical frameworks and theories in the field of public policy, including the punctuated equilibrium theory, the advocacy coalition framework, the diffusion models, etc. We will revisit some of these frameworks in the subsequent weeks. For this week, our focus is to grasp similarities and dissimilarities of these theoretical frameworks.

- Sabatier, Ch. 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10.
- Schlager, Edlla and William Blomquist. 1996. "A Comparison of Three Emerging Theories of the Policy Process." *Political Research Quarterly*, 49(3):651-672.
- Pierson, Paul.2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review*, 94(2): 251-67.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 2009. "Policy Theory, Policy Theory Everywhere: Ravings of a Deranged Policy Scholar." *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1):5-11.
- Nowlin, Matthew. 2011. "Theories of the Policy Process: State of the Research and Emerging Trends." *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(s1):41-60.
- Gupta, Kuhika. 2012. "Comparative Public Policy: Using the Comparative Method to Advance Our Understanding of the Policy Process." *Policy Studies Journal* 40(s1): 11-26.

*Week 5 (September 26) Policy Problems, Agenda-Setting and Policy Change*

There must be something of an agenda in American politics—someone must have it. Who does? How would we explain it—even describe it? One possible argument is simple: we live in a relative democratic government and popular majorities rule. This is the view of Stimson and colleagues. They have a more empirical view of our agenda setting process and, behold, it is democratic to a tee. Kingdon is the founder of agenda-setting literature, providing many testable propositions about the agenda cycle. Baumgartner and Jones extended Kingdon's multiple-stream framework and provided alternative explanations to both stability and instability of the American Politics.

Moreover, you need to understand the classic Bachrach and Baratz article in terms of the famous “community power structure” debate, but their question is: why are some very important things not on the agenda in the first place?

- Shafritz, Layne and Borick, Chapter 4 (skim through the three essays).
- Kindon, entire book, but focus more on ch. 4-8.
- Baumgartner and Jones, Ch.1-8.
- Bachrach, Peter and Morton Baratz. 1962. “The Two Faces of Power, *American Political Science Review*, 56(4): 947-952.
- Stimson, James, Michael B. MacKuen and Robert S. Erikson. 1995. “Dynamic Representation,” *American Political Science Review*, 89(3): 643-665.
- John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Moore. 2001. “Policy Preferences and American Politics: What the People Want Government to Be, *American Political Science Review*, 95(1): 145-153.

*Week 6 (October 3) Inside the Policymaking “Black-Box”: Bureaucrats and Interests*

Once a problem moves itself on a political agenda, who proposes policy alternatives for decision-makers? Who executes policy decisions? Who delivers services to citizens? This week’s collection focuses on the “fourth branch of the government” – bureaucracy. The idea here is that policymaking is not just about presidents and congress, but about a complex interaction of elected officials, plus bureaucracies (who may have their own logic) and interest groups. Today, it’s more, much more, than the classic study of Weberian bureaucracies. Bureaucratic research is largely the terra incognita of American political science.

- Shafritz, Layne and Borick, Ch.3.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1997. “Bureaucracy and Democracy: The Case for More Bureaucracy and Less Democracy, *Public Administration Review*, 57(3):193-199.
- Krause and Meier, Part I (skip the Spence chapter) and Part III (Skip the Keiser Chapter and the Smith Chapter).
- Hicklin, Alisa and Erik Godwin. 2009. “Agents of Change: the Role of Public Managers in Public Policy.” *Policy Studies Journal* 37(1):13-20.
- Carpenter, Daniel. et al. 2012. “The Complications of Controlling Agency Time Discretion: Deadlines and FDA Drug Review.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1): 98-114.

*Week 7 (October 10) Policy Design, Implementation, and Evaluation*

The idea that policy should be “designed” seems to be a pretty good one. Design, if there is any, presumably happens before a policy gets enacted. Implementation happens after. The Pressman&Wildavsky volume singlehandedly created the field of policy implementation. We use tools to accomplish a policy objective. Here is a fair

question: What is a “good” public policy or a “bad” public policy? Is the secret in the design or the implementation? Do we judge the quality of a policy based on the output (i.e. the design of a policy) or the outcome (i.e. the implementation results)?

- Pressman, Jeffrey and Aaron Wildavsky. 1973. *Implementation*, Preface, Ch. 1, 5, 6, and 10.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1990. “Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools.” *Journal of Politics* 52(2): 510-27.
- Matland, Richard E. 1995. “Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: the Ambiguity Conflict Model of Policy Implementation.” *Journal of Public Administration Review and Theory*, 5(2):145-147.
- Shafritz, Layne, and Borick, Ch.7
- Ringquist, Evan J. 1993. “Does Regulation Matter? Evaluating the Effects of State Air Pollution Control Programs.” *Journal of Politics*, 55(4):1022-1045.
- Smith, Kevin B. 1997. “Explaining Variation in State Level Homicide Rates: Does Crime Policy Pay?” *Journal of Politics*, 59(2): 350-367.
- Gilmour, John B. and David E. Lewis. 2006. “Assessing Performance Budgeting at OMB: the Influence of Politics, Performance, and Program Size.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(2): 169-186.

### **PART III: Critical Policy Issues and Diverse Research Agendas**

#### *Week 8 (October 17) Government Spending and Distribution*

Anthony Downs, William Riker, and the average person on the street believe that politicians reward their supporters and punish their opponents by distributing benefits or burdens of public policy. Or do they? Machiavelli actually advised against this strategy. How do benefits and burdens in the political system get distributed? When you control a fifth of the GDP and have all sorts of regulations and laws, you get to have a big say in “who gets what when and how” - Lasswell’s classic definition of “politics.” Part of the point here is that government makes all sorts of decisions which distribute and redistribute almost entirely without our having those questions explicitly on the policy agenda. Rules make distributive allocations. Many are intentional; many are not. Who gets health benefits? Who gets to go to the coveted public school?

- William Jacoby. 2000. “Issue Framing and Public Opinion on Government Spending, *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(4):750-767.
- Arthur Sanders. 1988. “Rationality, Self-interest, and Public Attitudes on Public Spending,” *Social Science Quarterly*, 69(3):311-324.
- Rehm, Philipp, Jacob S. Hacker, and Mark Schlesinger. 2012. “Insecure Alliances: Risk, Inequality, and Support for the Welfare State.” *American Political Science Review*, 106(2): 386-406.

- Meier, Kenneth J. Joseph Stewart and Robert England. 1991. “The Politics of Bureaucratic Discretion: Educational Access as an Urban Service,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 35(1):155-177.
- Balla, Steven J. et al., “Partisanship, Blame Avoidance, and the Distribution of Legislative Pork,” *American Journal of Political Science* 46(3):515-525.

*Week 9 (October 24) Social Policy and Redistribution*

Social policy is symbolic, expensive, and controversial. Most of our focus here is on income and income support policies. Anti-poverty policies were once very controversial, and still are, despite the “welfare reforms” of 1996. Social Security policy has rarely been controversial until now. Income policy in general, though, is the great hidden iceberg of American politics or as Bachrach and Baratz might put it, America’s biggest “non-decision.” Our biggest social policy decision (or non-decision) concerns income.

- Smeeding, Timothy M. 2005. “Public Policy, Economic Inequality and Poverty: The United States in Comparative Perspective,” *Social Science Quarterly* 86:955-983.
- Lupu, Noam and Jonas Pontusson, “The Structure of Inequality and the Politics of Redistribution,” *American Political Science Review*, 105(2):316-336.
- Kelly, Nathan. 2005. “Political Choice, Public Policy and Distributional Outcomes,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(4):865-880.
- Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson, *Winner-Take-All Politics*, Ch. 2.
- Carpenter, Daniel. 2012. “Is Health Policy Different?” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1): 287-311.
- Campbell, Andrea L. 2012. “Policy Makes Mass Public.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1): 333-351.

*Week 10 (October 31) Interests and Institutions: the Political Economy Perspective*

Political economists have offered rich theoretical resources to explain how the economic and institutional forces intertwine with each other and how the two forces together affect the policymaking process. However, only a few scholars in mainstream scholarship on American politics use a political economy framework. Recently, there has been a rising interest in researching the politics of inequality, much of which focuses on the American political economy, the connection between market and political forces, and the consequence of privatizing government responsibilities. Here is one of the key issues – if not the key issue – of both real world politics and the social sciences today. How much should we rely on the market as conservatives would want versus how much should we use “rule of law” mechanisms, or what Schultze calls command and control policies? Almost nothing splits conservatives and liberals more than this issue in this country and abroad. On the world stage, “globalization” is accompanied by demands for “privatization.”

- Savas, E.S. 2000. *Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships*, Introduction (skim through this).
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Joe Soss. 2010. “The Politics of Inequality in America: A Political Economy Framework.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 13:341-364.
- Bartels, entire book.
- Hacker, Jacob. 2004. “Privatization Risk without Privatizing the Welfare State: the Hidden Politics of Social Policy Retrenchment in the United States.” *American Political Science Review*, 98(2):243-260.
- Chubb, John E. and Terry M. Moe. 1998. “Politics, Markets and the Organization of Schools,” *American Political Science Review*, 82(4):1065-1087.
- Weiher, Gregory and Kent L. Tedin, 2002. “Does Choice Lead to Racially Distinctive Schools? Charter Schools and Household Preferences” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 21(1):79-92.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1999. “Sex, Drugs, Rock and Roll: A Theory of Morality Politics.” *Policy Studies Journal*, 17(4):681-695.

*Week 11 (November 7) Federalism, State Governments, and Public Policy*

American policymaking takes place in a federal system. Almost everyone agrees that the states are where the action is in American policy-making. Whether it is California's efforts in environmental policy, Wisconsin's union-busting, New York's gay marriage law, or Massachusetts' effort to provide near-universal health care, the states are the American innovators, as the classic Jack Walker paper showed. To a large degree the federal government is no more than a vast check writing machine, providing only a smattering of services. State and local governments deliver public services and spend more money if we take out the three or four big ticket federal items such as Social Security, defense, interest on the debt, and Medicare. Burdened by debt, riven by gridlock, and consumed by foreign issues, the federal government's role in social policy innovation is nearly moribund. Obama's signature national health care reform is under attack by half the states. Here we focus on federalism and the role of state governments in the policymaking process.

- Joseph Zimmerman, *Contemporary American Federalism: Growth of National Power*, Ch. 9.
- Walker, Jack L. 1963. “The Diffusion of Innovation among the American States,” *American Political Science Review*, 63(3):880-899.
- Krause and Meier, the Keiser Chapter.
- Lax, Jeffery R. and Justin H. Philips. 2012. “The Democratic Deficit in the States.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1):148-165.
- Gray, Virginia H. et al. 2010. “Incrementing toward Nowhere: Universal Health Care Coverage in the States.” *Publius*, 40(1):82-113.

- Cummins, Jeff. 2009. "Party Control, Policy Reforms, and the Impact on Health Insurance Coverage in the U.S. States." *Social Science Quarterly*, 92(1):246-267.
- Kelly, Nathan and Christopher Witko. 2012. "Federalism and American Inequality." *Journal of Politics*, 74(2):414-426.
- Whitford, Andrew B. 2002. "Decentralization and Political Control of the Bureaucracy." *Journal of the Theoretical Politics*." 14(2): 167-193.

*Week 12 (November 14) Racial Diversity, Multiple Identities and Public Policy*

V.O.Key, Rodney Hero, and many others believe that race and ethnicity continues to be an important political force in the American system. Here, we firstly focus on the so-called "two-tier pluralism", and discuss how race and ethnicity affect both the procedural/formal democracy and substantive representation. Hero's book provides a new lens, through which to view policies and their implications to distributive justice. It also opens new questions— if race/ethnicity can be used to study how the American democracy is compartmentalized by its diverse constituents, what about other social identities (e.g. gender, immigration background, age, the disadvantaged, etc.)? As questions of social identity continuously arise in contemporary political/policy debates, taking race and other social identities as a key political variable promises us a better understanding of important political concepts: representation, social equity, governance, for example.

- Hero, Ch.1 and 5. Skim through other chapters.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Construction of Targeted Population." *American Political Science Review*, 87(2):334-347.
- Tesler, Michael. 2012. "The Spillover of Racialization into Health Care: How President Obama Polarized Public Opinion by Racial Attitudes and Race." *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(3):609-704.
- Bratton, Kathleen and Kerry Haynie.1999. "Agenda Setting and Legislative Success in State Legislatures: the Effects of Gender and Race." *Journal of Politics*, 61(3): 658-679.
- van Oorschot, Wim and Wilfred Uunk. 2007. "Welfare Spending and the Public Concerns for Immigrants." *Comparative Politics*40(1):63-82.
- Abdelal, Rawi et al. 2009. *Measuring Identity*, Introduction.

*Week 13 (November 21)*. Thanksgiving break, no class meeting.

*Week 14 (November 28) Norms, Ideas, and Policy Learning.*

What is the role of norms, beliefs, and ideas in the policymaking process? Perhaps, Sabatier and Smith will both advocate a research framework that incorporates knowledge, ideas, and values. Mainstream policy scholars who accept the policy-stages model all take the assumption that policy changes take place in centralized locations.

Sabatier and Smith, however, contend that the policymaking process can be rather fluid, and the momentum of change can be advanced by policy entrepreneurs as well as epistemic communities. This weeks' readings all center on the concept of policy learning, an issue that has not received enough attention in the literature. How do we know when learning happens and induces future policy changes? What are the core learning mechanisms? Who are the agents of change? Is learning driven by beliefs or rational considerations? These are all important questions to uncover the premises of ACF, a theoretical framework for linking politics and policy decisions to ideas.

- Sabatier, Paul A. and Hank Jenkin-Smith. 1988. "Symposium Editor's Introduction," *Policy Science*, 21(2-4):123-127.
- Sabatier, Paul A. 1988. "An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein." *Policy Science*, 21(2-4):129-168.
- Jenkin-Smith, Hank C. 1988. "Analytical Debates and Policy Learning: Analysis and Change in the Federal Bureaucracy." *Policy Science*, 21(2-4):1169-211.
- Heintz Jr., H. Theodore. 1988. "Advocacy Coalitions and the OCS Leasing Debate." *Policy Science*, 21(2-4): 213-238.
- Bennett, Colin J. and Michael Howlett. 1992. "The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and Policy Change." *Policy Science*, 25(3):275-294.
- Weible, Christopher M., Paul A. Sabatier, and Kelly McQueen. 2009. "Themes and Variations: Taking Stock of the Advocacy Coalition Framework." *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1):121-140.
- Carpenter, R. Charli. 2007. "Setting the Advocacy Agenda: Theorizing Issue Emergence and Nonemergence in Transnational Advocacy Networks." *International Studies Quarterly*, 51:99-120.
- Sabatier, Paul A., John Loomis, Catherine McCarthy. 2005. "Hierarchical Controls, Professional Norms, Local Constituencies, and Budget Maximization: An Analysis of U.S. Forest Service Planning Decisions." *American Journal of Political Science*, 39(1): 204-242.

*Week 15 (Dec.5)* Written Exam

*Week 16 (Dec.12)* Mini-Conference and Wrap-Up.

## **Caveat**

The aforementioned weekly schedule and assignments in this course may be subjective to change.