

Summer 2008  
PA/POEC/PSCI 5303  
Public Policymaking and Institutions  
9:00 AM – 1:00 PM., Saturday  
GR3.606

Dr. Elliott  
GR3.104  
Phone: 972.883.2066  
Email: [elliott@utdallas.edu](mailto:elliott@utdallas.edu)  
Office hours: 8:00 – 9:00 am Saturday  
and by appointment

### **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course examines the literature in the area of political institutions and public policy. We will examine those institutions, both nongovernmental and governmental that are responsible for the formation of public policy. With regard to the former, political parties and interest groups, as well as public opinion and its influence upon parties and the formal structures of government will be explored. These formal structures include legislative, executive, bureaucratic and judicial institutions. Efforts will also be made to integrate the disparate findings. Institutional behavior and the policy process will also be examined from several important theoretical perspectives, including pluralism, rational choice theory and institutionalism, as well as explaining various approaches to decision-making.

### **LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

Objectives of the course are to understand the role that the institutions of government play in the policy process, the linkages between these institutions (Congress, Executive, Judiciary, Bureaucracy) and citizens (through discussions of role of public opinion, elections and interest groups), as well as a better understanding of the constitutional origins of the U.S. political system.

Learning objectives are measured by class discussion and presentations, a major literature review or policy analysis that addresses the core facet of U.S. political institutions in the policy context and a take-home final exam heavily weighted toward better understanding of the linkages between institutions.

### **COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

POEC 5303 (crosslisted with PA and PSCI 5303) is designed as part-seminar and part-lecture. Consequently, for this course to be successful, it will be the responsibility of each student to have prepared for each class by doing all necessary readings.

The course requirements are:

1. You have two options for your paper requirement; the expectations for both options are discussed in the Appendix.
  - a. Write an approximately 15-18 page literature review of a topic we have discussed, (or is related to a topic discussed) in class or covered in your readings. The topic should be related to the policy process or policymaking and incorporate reasonably representative elements of the literature. I expect to meet with each of you to discuss topics in further detail. Paper is due August 2. Style expectations are discussed in Appendix.

- b. Select a particular issue that has resulted in legislative activity at the federal or state levels, ultimately culminating in legislation that has been enacted into law as a statute. Using Anderson's framework of analysis as described in Public Policymaking, examine the evolution of the issue from the problem identification and definition stage to agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption. You may also discuss relevant policy design issues. The idea is to develop an in-depth analysis of the evolution of the issue, with a particular emphasis on key actors at various stages of the policy process and to integrate important concepts, theories, etc. into your analysis. The paper should be 15-18 pages. You should restrict your topics to legislation that has been adopted in the last 10 years or so.
2. Final take home exam, essay format; we will discuss in more detail the first class. Due August 9.
  3. Each student will participate in a group presentation (3-4 individuals per group) covering one of the main topics in the course. The instructor reserves the right to make adjustments regarding the nature of the topic and precise format, depending upon class enrollments. This assignment will be discussed in more detail at the first class meeting.
  4. Depending upon class size, each student will make at least one (possibly more) short individual presentations of articles or other readings required in the course.

**GRADING CRITERIA:**

1. Essay/Policy Analysis	40%
2. Final Exam	35%
3. Group Presentation	15%
4. Individual Presentation and Class Participation	<u>10%</u>
	100%

**TEXTS**

The following books will be used as texts for the course. They are listed alphabetically, and have been ordered by the bookstore and have been placed on reserve in the library.

James E. Anderson. 2001. Public Policymaking: An Introduction (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Charles O. Jones. 1999. Separate But Equal Branches: Congress and the Presidency 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York and London: Chatham House.

Kenneth J. Meier and John Bohte. 2006. Politics and the Bureaucracy (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/ Wordsworth.

James Stimson. 1999. Public Opinion in America. 2 ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Other required readings are indicated in the following course outline. All required texts may be purchased at the University of Texas at Dallas Bookstore, Off Campus Books, and Stanza Bookstore. A separate course packet containing other assigned readings not available through online databases is also available at all bookstores.

## COURSE OUTLINE

<b>I. The Policy Process</b>	
<b>May 24</b>	<p><b>REVIEW OF SYLLABUS</b>            Jeffrey W. Knopf. 2006. Doing a Literature Review. <u>PS Online</u>: 123-132 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p>Iain McMenamin. 2006. Process and Text: Teaching Students to Review the Literature. <u>PS Online</u>: 133-135 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION AND THE CONTEXT OF THE POLICY PROCESS</b>            The Articles of Confederation and The Constitution of the U.S., from Benjamin Ginsburg, Theodore J. Lowi and Margaret Weir. 2003. <u>We The People</u>. NY and London: W W Norton, pp. A6-A20 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p>The Federalist Papers, from Ginsburg et al. A21-A25 (<i>packet</i>).</p>
<b>May 31 -June 7</b>	<p><b>STAGES IN THE POLICY PROCESS</b></p> <p>Anderson, <u>Public Policymaking</u> (entire)</p> <p>Jeffery Worsham. 2006. Up in Smoke: Mapping Subsystem Dynamics in Tobacco Policy. <u>Policy Studies Journal</u>. 34:437-451.</p> <p>B. Dan Wood and Jeffrey S. Peake. 1998. The Dynamics of Foreign Policy Agenda Setting. <u>American Political Science Review</u>. 92: 173-184.</p>
<b>June 7-14*</b>	<p><b>THEORIES OF POLICYMAKING AND INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR</b></p> <p>A. Pluralism            David Truman, "Group Politics and Representative Democracy" in Stella Z. Theodoulou and Matthew A. Cahn, eds. <u>Public Policy: The Essential Readings</u>, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. pp. 66-71 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p>B. Rational Choice            Bryan D. Jones. 2001. <u>Politics and the Architecture of Choice: Bounded Rationality and Governance</u>, Chicago; University of Chicago Press, pp. 24-83; 108-130 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p>C. Institutionalism            Robert Scott. 1995. <u>Institutions and Organizations</u>. Thousand Oaks and London: Sage Publications, 1-62 (<i>packet</i>).</p>
<b>June 21</b>	<p><b>INCREMENTALISM, NONINCREMENTALISM AND PUNCTUATED EQUILIBRIUM</b>            Charles E. Lindblom. 1959. "The 'Science' of Muddling Through." <u>Public</u></p>

\* A library research presentation designed to familiarize students with research databases that may be useful to the research paper project is tentatively scheduled for either June 7 or 14.

	<p><u>Administration Review</u>, 19: 79-88.</p> <p>Paul R. Schulman. 1975. "Nonincremental Policymaking" in <u>American Political Science Review</u>, 69: 1354-1370.</p> <p>Bryan D. Jones and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2004. A Model of Choice for Public Policy. <u>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</u>. IS: 325-351.</p>
<b>II. Policy Institutions</b>	
<b>June 28</b>	<p><b>POLITICAL PARTIES AND PUBLIC OPINION</b></p> <p>James Stimson. 1999. <u>Public Opinion in America: Moods, Cycles and Swings</u>. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.</p> <p>David W. Brady. 1978. "Critical Elections, Congressional Parties and Clusters of Policy Changes." <u>British Journal of Political Science</u>, 8: 79-99.</p>
<b>July 5</b>	<p><b>INTEREST GROUPS AND INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS</b></p> <p>Ronald G. Shaiko, "Making the Connection: Organized Interests, Political Representation, and the Changing Rules of the Game in Washington Politics." In <u>The Interest Group Connection</u> (henceforth, IGC), 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Washington DC: CQ Press, pp. 1-24 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p>Scott R. Furlong, "Exploring Interest Group Participation in Executive Policymaking." In <u>IGC</u>, pp. 282-297 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p>Brunell, Thomas. 2005. The Relationship Between Political Parties and Interest Groups. <u>Political Research Quarterly</u>. 58: 681-689.</p>
<b>July 12-19</b>	<p><b>LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE INTERACTION</b></p> <p>Jones, <u>Separate But Equal Branches: The Presidency and Congress</u>.</p> <p>Ian Budge and Richard Hofferbert. 1990. Mandates and Policy Outputs: US Party Platforms and Federal Expenditures. <u>American Political Science Review</u>. 84: 111-131.</p> <p>David Austen-Smith and John R. Wright. 1994. Counteractive Lobbying. <u>American Journal of Political Science</u>. 38: 25-45.</p>
<b>July 26</b>	<p><b>BUREAUCRACIES AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE</b></p> <p>Kenneth J. Meier and John Buhte. 2006. <i>Politics and the Bureaucracy</i> (5<sup>th</sup> ed.).</p> <p>Warshaw, Shirley Ann. 1995. "White House Control of Domestic Policymaking: The Reagan Years." <u>Public Administration Review</u>, 55: 247-253.</p> <p>James Q. Wilson. "The Rise of the Bureaucratic State." In <u>Theodoulou and Cahn</u>, pp. 251-258 (<i>packet</i>).</p> <p>B. Dan Wood and Richard W. Waterman. 1991. "The Dynamics of Political</p>

	Control of the Bureaucracy.” <u>American Political Science Review</u> , 85:801-828.
<b>August 2</b>  <b>PAPERS DUE</b>	<b>ADJUDICATORY INSTITUTIONS AND POLICYMAKING</b> David Adamany. 1995. “The Supreme Court.” In John B. Gates and Charles A. Johnson, eds. <u>The American Courts: A Critical Assessment</u> , Washington DC: CQ Press, pp 1-34 ( <i>packet</i> ).  Donald R. Songer. “The Circuit Courts of Appeal.” In Gates and Johnson, pp. 35-60 ( <i>packet</i> ).  Laurence Baum. “Courts and Policy Innovation.” In Gates and Johnson, pp. 413-434 ( <i>packet</i> ).  Karen O’Connor, “Lobbying the Justices or Lobbying for Justice? The Role of Organized Interests in the Judicial Process.” In <u>IGC</u> , pp. 319-340 ( <i>packet</i> ).
<b>August 9</b>	<b>Final Exam Due</b>

### **STUDENT CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINE**

The University of Texas System and The University of Texas at Dallas have rules and regulations for the orderly and efficient conduct of their business. It is the responsibility of each student and each student organization to be knowledgeable about the rules and regulations which govern student conduct and activities. General information on student conduct and discipline is contained in the UTD publication, *A to Z Guide*, which is provided to all registered students each academic year.

The University of Texas at Dallas administers student discipline within the procedures of recognized and established due process. Procedures are defined and described in the *Rules and Regulations, Board of Regents, The University of Texas System, Part 1, Chapter VI, Section 3*, and in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities of the university’s *Handbook of Operating Procedures*. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations (SU 1.602, 972/883-6391).

A student at the university neither loses the rights nor escapes the responsibilities of citizenship. He or she is expected to obey federal, state, and local laws as well as the Regents’ Rules, university regulations, and administrative rules. Students are subject to discipline for violating the standards of conduct whether such conduct takes place on or off campus, or whether civil or criminal penalties are also imposed for such conduct.

### **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

The faculty expects from its students a high level of responsibility and academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends upon the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student demonstrate a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

Scholastic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, statements, acts or omissions related to applications for enrollment or the award of a degree, and/or the submission as one's own work or material that is not one's own. As a general rule, scholastic dishonesty involves one of the following acts: cheating, plagiarism, collusion and/or falsifying academic records. Students suspected of academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary proceedings.

Plagiarism, especially from the web, from portions of papers for other classes, and from any other source is unacceptable and will be dealt with under the university's policy on plagiarism (see general catalog for details). This course will use the resources of turnitin.com, which searches the web for possible plagiarism and is over 90% effective.

### **EMAIL USE**

The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the value and efficiency of communication between faculty/staff and students through electronic mail. At the same time, email raises some issues concerning security and the identity of each individual in an email exchange. The university encourages all official student email correspondence be sent only to a student's U.T. Dallas email address and that faculty and staff consider email from students official only if it originates from a UTD student account. This allows the university to maintain a high degree of confidence in the identity of all individual corresponding and the security of the transmitted information. UTD furnishes each student with a free email account that is to be used in all communication with university personnel. The Department of Information Resources at U.T. Dallas provides a method for students to have their U.T. Dallas mail forwarded to other accounts.

### **WITHDRAWAL FROM CLASS**

The administration of this institution has set deadlines for withdrawal of any college-level courses. These dates and times are published in that semester's course catalog. Administration procedures must be followed. It is the student's responsibility to handle withdrawal requirements from any class. In other words, I cannot drop or withdraw any student. You must do the proper paperwork to ensure that you will not receive a final grade of "F" in a course if you choose not to attend the class once you are enrolled.

### **STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES**

Procedures for student grievances are found in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities, of the university's *Handbook of Operating Procedures*.

In attempting to resolve any student grievance regarding grades, evaluations, or other fulfillments of academic responsibility, it is the obligation of the student first to make a serious effort to resolve the matter with the instructor, supervisor, administrator, or committee with whom the grievance originates (hereafter called "the respondent"). Individual faculty members retain primary responsibility for assigning grades and evaluations. If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the grievance must be submitted in writing to the respondent with a copy of the respondent's School Dean. If the matter is not resolved by the written response provided by the respondent, the student may submit a written appeal to the School Dean. If the grievance is not resolved by the School Dean's decision, the student may make a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate or Undergraduate Education, and the dean will appoint and convene an Academic Appeals Panel. The decision of the Academic Appeals Panel is final. The results of the academic appeals process will be distributed to all involved parties.

Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations.

### **INCOMPLETE GRADE POLICY**

As per university policy, incomplete grades will be granted only for work unavoidably missed at the semester's end and only if 70% of the course work has been completed. An incomplete grade must be resolved within eight (8) weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester. If the required work to complete the course and to remove the incomplete grade is not submitted by the specified deadline, the incomplete grade is changed automatically to a grade of **F**.

### **DISABILITY SERVICES**

The goal of Disability Services is to provide students with disabilities educational opportunities equal to those of their non-disabled peers. Disability Services is located in room 1.610 in the Student Union. Office hours are Monday and Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.; Tuesday and Wednesday, 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.; and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

The contact information for the Office of Disability Services is:

The University of Texas at Dallas, SU 22

PO Box 830688

Richardson, Texas 75083-0688

(972) 883-2098 (voice or TTY)

Essentially, the law requires that colleges and universities make those reasonable adjustments necessary to eliminate discrimination on the basis of disability. For example, it may be necessary to remove classroom prohibitions against tape recorders or animals (in the case of dog guides) for students who are blind. Occasionally an assignment requirement may be substituted (for example, a research paper versus an oral presentation for a student who is hearing impaired). Classes enrolled students with mobility impairments may have to be rescheduled in accessible facilities. The college or university may need to provide special services such as registration, note-taking, or mobility assistance.

It is the student's responsibility to notify his or her professors of the need for such an accommodation. Disability Services provides students with letters to present to faculty members to verify that the student has a disability and needs accommodations. Individuals requiring special accommodation should contact the professor after class or during office hours.

### **RELIGIOUS HOLY DAYS**

The University of Texas at Dallas will excuse a student from class or other required activities for the travel to and observance of a religious holy day for a religion whose places of worship are exempt from property tax under Section 11.20, Tax Code, Texas Code Annotated.

The student is encouraged to notify the instructor or activity sponsor as soon as possible regarding the absence, preferably in advance of the assignment. The student, so excused, will be

allowed to take the exam or complete the assignment within a reasonable time after the absence: a period equal to the length of the absence, up to a maximum of one week. A student who notifies the instructor and completes any missed exam or assignment may not be penalized for the absence. A student who fails to complete the exam or assignment within the prescribed period may receive a failing grade for that exam or assignment.

If a student or an instructor disagrees about the nature of the absence [i.e., for the purpose of observing a religious holy day] or if there is similar disagreement about whether the student has been given a reasonable time to complete any missed assignments or examinations, either the student or the instructor may request a ruling from the chief executive officer of the institution, or his or her designee. The chief executive officer or designee must take into account the legislative intent of TEC 51.911(b), and the student and instructor will abide by the decision of the chief executive officer or designee.

## Appendix

Both option one [the literature review] and option two [policy analysis of a selected issue] must meet certain basic standards:

- a. Each must be 15-18 pages in length, discounting the bibliography or citation page.
- b. Margins must be one inch and font size should be no larger than 12.
- c. Students are expected to draw upon the relevant literature. Regarding *option one*, this means a primary focus on the peer reviewed journal literature, although books and manuscripts may be used on a limited basis. With regards to *option two*, students should consider a somewhat broader range of sources. This can include peer reviewed journal articles, journals of opinion and other policy relevant literature. As a rule of thumb, 13-18 sources for each option are expected.
- d. Regarding citation mechanics, consult any APSA publication, including the APSR. References are embedded in the text, within parentheses: (last name, date) or, as necessary (last name, date: page number). Direct quotes are always referenced. The complete reference should be included on a separate bibliography page. Again, consult the APSR for details on what a full citation on the bibliography page would look like.
- e. If you find it necessary to make comments or observations that are not a part of the body of the text [such comments may be used to provide details that, while relevant, are ancillary to the main thrust of the narrative] use endnotes rather than footnotes. Use a separate page, titled "Endnotes".

If you have questions concerning style, refer to the APSR, or see the instructor.