Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis
Fall 2018

Course: PUBL 603
Time: Tuesday, 7:10 p.m.
Location: Room 438
Instructor: Nancy A. Miller
              Room 415 Public Policy Building
              nanmille@umbc.edu
              410-455-3889
Office hours: By appointment

Should you need services or accommodations due to a disability to fully participate in the class, please speak with us or contact the Office of Student Support Services, Phone No.: (410) 455 – 2459; TTY: (410) 455 – 3233.

OVERVIEW

This course focuses on the basic principles and techniques of policy analysis. Most of the course attends to activities involved in policy analysis. In addition, the relationship between policy analysis and policy making, along with emerging professional and ethical issues, will be addressed.

The themes that run through the course center around the following questions:

- What is the function and purpose of policy analysis?
- What do policy analysts do?
- How do they conduct policy analysis?
- What contributions does policy analysis make to the policy making process? To society?
- What are the limitations to policy analysis?

REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT

A high level of student participation in class sessions is expected. Thus, completing and thinking about assigned readings prior to class is essential.

In addition to required readings and class participation, course requirements include:

- Completion of written assignment, *Finding and Evaluating Data in Support of a Baltimore Issue*

1

- Completion of an article critique and discussion in class.
- Completion of a policy analysis of a specific policy issue, demonstrating skills learned throughout the course. Sections of the paper will be presented in class and submitted for review over the semester. The final paper will be due at the end of the semester. The final policy analysis will also be presented in class. This will be a small (2-4 individuals) group analysis. It will focus on an issue specific to Baltimore and build from the data assignment.
- Preparation of a letter to the Mayor or another relevant "client" (e.g., Director of Department of Housing) related to your policy analysis and recommendation.

GRADING

Written assignment (data and evidence)	30 points
Written assignment ('critique')	20
Part I of analysis (problem); oral presentation	
and written submission	20
Part II of analysis (alternatives/criteria); oral presentation	
and written submission	20
Policy Analysis paper and presentation	50
5 peer evaluation	
5 stakeholder involvement	
Policy letter	20
Class participation	20

A	162-180
B	144-161
C	126-160

READINGS

The following books will be used and are available for purchase at the UMBC Bookstore:

Bardach, A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis, 5th Ed.

Weimer and Vining, Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice, 5th Ed.

Additional assigned readings are available electronically on Blackboard.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDENTS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY

By enrolling in this course at UMBC, each student assumes the responsibilities of an active participant in UMBC's scholarly community in which everyone's academic work and behavior are held to the highest standards of honesty. Cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, and helping others to commit these acts are all forms of academic dishonesty, and they are wrong. Academic misconduct could result in disciplinary action that may include, but is not limited to, a failing grade for the assignment, a failing grade for the course, suspension or dismissal. The Policy and Procedures for Graduate Student Academic Misconduct is available at http://www.umbc.edu/gradschool/procedures/misconduct.html.

Of particular concern is plagiarism. Plagiarism is defined as "taking and passing off as one's own the ideas, writings, etc., of another" (Webster, 1983). In other words, plagiarism is theft of another's words and ideas. It constitutes serious academic dishonesty. Plagiarism can result from a student's failure to cite a source (e.g., of the ideas, writings, etc., of another that the student uses in his or her paper) or failure to appropriately block or use quotation marks (and an appropriate source citation) around directly quoted material.

This policy does not distinguish between intentional and inadvertent plagiarism. Nor does it distinguish between "drafts" and final submissions. Clearly, intentional plagiarism is a serious offense. Some students may feel, however, that inadvertent plagiarism is not a serious offense. It is for at least two reasons. First, it is difficult (some might say impossible) to distinguish between intentional and inadvertent plagiarism. Second, inadvertent plagiarism suggests that students either have not paid attention to this policy or are willing to submit work that is carelessly and sloppily completed. In either event, plagiarism will be appropriately punished if it is found in any work for this course.

All students in the Department of Public Policy are required to read and be familiar with the following:

UMBC Policies and Procedures
·   Statement of Values for Student Academic Integrity at UMBC
http://www.umbc.edu/provost/integrity/Honorcode.htm
·   Policy and Procedures for Student Academic Misconduct
http:/www.umbc.edu/gradschool/procedures/misconduct.html

What Is Plagiarism and How to Avoid It
·   A.O. Kuhn Library, "Avoid Plagiarism: Give Credit To Those Who Deserve It, Including Yourself" (http://aok.lib.umbc.edu/reference/plagiarism.php3)
·   The Writing Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, "Quoting and Paraphrasing Sources" (http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/QuotingSources.html)
·   The Writing Place at Northwestern University, "Avoiding Plagiarism" (http://www.writing.northwestern.edu/tips/plag.html)

We encourage you to bring any questions you might have regarding the meaning and importance of academic integrity, what plagiarism is and how to avoid it, and citation styles to faculty members in the department.

COURSE SCHEDULE AND READINGS

Sept. 4   Introduction and Overview

Sept. 11   An Introduction to Policy Analysis

                 Weimer and Vining, Chapter 1

                 Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (2018). Moving beyond the Merit-Based Incentive Payment System. Report to Congress on Medicare Payment Policy, Chapter 15, March 2018, Washington D.C.

                 Organize groups

Sept. 18   Data and Evidence

                 Weimer and Vining, Chapter 14

.
                 Bardach, pgs. 79-107

                 Some Baltimore data sites:

                 Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance. http://www.bniajfi.org/

                 Annie E. Casey Foundation. Kids Count Data Book. http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data#MD/5/0/char/0

                 Baltimore City Neighborhood Health Profile 2011. http://health.baltimorecity.gov/sites/default/files/2011%20Summary%20Baltimore%20City%20NHP.pdf

                 2018 Maryland Report Card. http://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/

                 Group work on data paper

Sept. 25   Data and Evidence (continued)

                 Discussion of Baltimore Policy Issues

Data paper due

Peterson, M.A. (2018). In the shadow of politics: The pathways of research evidence and health policy making. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 43(3):342-376.

Problem Recognition and Definition

Hedegaard, H., Warner, M. & Minino, A.M. (2017). Drug overdose deaths in the United States. 1999-2016. NCHS Data Brief no. 294, December 2017.

Acs, G., Pendall, R., Tuckson, M. & Khare, A, (2017). The cost of segregation. National trends and the case of Chicago, 1990-2010. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C. Executive Summary and pgs. 1-49.

Bardach, pp 1-16

Oct. 2   Problem Recognition and Definition (continued)

Mitchell, J. (2013). Who are the long-term unemployed? Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Nichols, A., Mitchell, J. & Lindner, S. (2013). Consequences of long-term unemployment. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Tuochy, C.H. (2018). Welfare state eras, policy narratives, and the role of expertise: The case of the Affordable Care Act in historical and comparative perspective. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 43(3):427-453.

Rationale for Public Intervention

Weimer and Vining, Chapters 5 & 6

Peer evaluation criteria due

Oct. 9   Modeling the Problem with a Focus on Policy Variables

Acs, G. (2013). Assessing the factors underlying long-term unemployment during and after the Great Recession. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Babitsch, B., Gohl, D., & von Lengerke, T. (2012). Re-revisiting Andersen's Behavioral Model of Health Services Use: A systematic review of studies from 1998–2011. GMS Psycho-Social-Medicine, 9, Doc11.

http://doi.org/10.3205/psm000089 **Article critique.**

Elder, K., Xiransagar, S., Miller, N.A., Bowen, S.A., Glover, S. and Piper, C. (2007). African Americans' decisions not to evacuate New Orleans before Hurricane Katrina: A qualitative study, *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(S1):S124-S129, 2007.

Oct. 16   **Group presentations of Part I**

                 Part I of paper due

                 Interim peer evaluation

Oct. 23   <u>Identifying Alternative Policies</u>

Sawicki, (1983).   On the virtues of doing nothing. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 2 (1983).

Weimer and Vining, Ch. 10

Bardach, pgs. 16-31

Acs, G. (2013). Responding to long-term unemployment. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Wheaton, L. & Sorensen, E. (2010). Extending the EITC to noncustodial parents: Potential impacts and design considerations. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29(4):749-768. **Article critique.**

Maag, E. (2015). Earned income tax credit in the United States. *Journal of Social Security Law*, 22:20-30.

Ellwood, D.T., et al. (2016). Creating mobility from poverty: An overview of strategies. Urban Institute, August 2016.

Oct. 30   <u>Criteria Development, Selection, Measurement</u>

Bardach, 31-47

Weimer and Vining, Ch. 7

Massey, D.S. (2012). Reflections on the dimensions of segregation. *Social Forces*, 91(1):39-43.

Acs, G., et al. (2018). The cost of segregation. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C. Appendix B, pgs. 50-54.

Acs, G., et al. (2018). Measuring mobility from poverty. Urban Institute. Washington, D.C., April 19, 2018.

Harper, S., King, N.B., Meersman, S.C., Reichman, M.E., Breen, N. & Lynch, J. (2010). Implicit value judgments in the measurement of health inequalities. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 88(1):4-29.

Nov. 6   **Present Part II of paper**

             Part II of paper due

Nov. 13   APHA Annual Meeting – no class

Nov. 20   Comparing Alternatives

             Chettry, R. & Hendren, N. (2015). The impacts of neighborhoods on intergenerational mobility. Childhood exposure effects and county-level estimates. Introduction. Harvard University and NBER, May 2015.

             Tach, L. & Wimer, C. (2017). Evaluating policies to transform distressed urban neighborhoods. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., October 24, 20170.

             Seroczynski, A.D., Evans, W.N., Jobst, A.D., Horvath, L. & Carozza, G. (2016). Reading for Life and adolescent re-arrest: Evaluating a unique juvenile diversion program. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 35(3):662-682. **Article critique.**

             Weimer and Vining, Chapter 15

Nov. 27   Policy adoption

             Weimer & Vining, Chapter 11

             Role of evidence in policy making

             Jones, D.K. & Louis, C.J. (2018). Using evidence to inform state health policy making: Lessons from four states comparing Obamacare and infant mortality. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 43(3):377-399. **Article critique**.

Dec. 4   Policy Implementation

Weimer and Vining, Chapter 12

Heinrich, C.J., Burch, P., Good, A., Acosta, R., Cheng, H., Dillender, M., et al. (2014). Improving the implementation and effectiveness of out-of-school-time tutoring. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(2):471-494. **Article critique.**

Draft Policy Analysis due (optional; for feedback)

Dec. 11 **Student presentations of final Policy Analysis**

Dec. 18 **Policy analysis paper due; second peer evaluation due**

Policy letter to the Mayor due

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS

Identifying a Baltimore Issue and Locating Credible Evidence to Support the Issue

For your group policy issue, craft a one sentence problem statement (e.g., The Baltimore City unemployment rate is too high. The Baltimore City homicide rate is too high). Identify six sources of data/information related to your problem (e.g., Census Bureau, peer reviewed article, Urban Institute, Annie E. Casey Foundation, Maryland Department of Education, Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance, among others). Describe the steps you took to identify the sources. With your group members, develop at least three measures of credibility (e.g., subject to external review, qualifications/reputation of author(s)). Evaluate the credibility of the data related to your problem obtained from each of your six sources. Use the evidence to justify your choice of the problem.

Beginning with the problem statement, every part of a policy analysis includes data. Evaluating accuracy and credibility are essential. The paper is 5-6 pages, double spaced, exclusive of references and tables. You will develop and discuss the problem statement and credibility measures with group members (2-4 members) but write the paper individually.

Article Critique

For your selected article,

a)   Begin with a description of the problem being addressed.
b)   Discuss the type(s) of data and evidence used in the article.
c)   Identify one to two conclusions in the article. Briefly summarize these
     conclusions. Then evaluate how well these conclusions are substantiated by the

evidence presented.

(4-5 pages, double spaced)

Policy Analysis

Please prepare a policy analysis related to a Baltimore City problem identified for your group. Please include the following:

Problem statement and supporting evidence (Part 1)

➢ Problem statement and support
➢ Trends, comparative evidence
➢ Impacts (individual, social)

Rationale for government intervention (Part 1)
Model of the problem, including identification of "policy variables" (Part 1)
Identification and discussion of the status quo and at least two policy alternatives (Part 2)
Identification and discussion of at least three criteria for evaluation, including specific
    measurement; effectiveness and costs should be two of the criteria (Part 2)
Comparison of the status quo and alternatives by the evaluation criteria (Part 3)
Recommendation with justification (Part 3)
Discussion of issues related to adoption and implementation (Part 3)

This is a small group (2-4) exercise. The presentation will be made by the group. Each group will develop peer evaluation criteria for purposes of identifying group "ground rules" for accomplishing the work of the group. Policy analysis papers are 15-20 pages, double spaced, appropriately referenced, APA style. The final paper must include a paragraph describing each participant's contribution. Stakeholder involvement should also be evident in the final paper (e.g., acknowledgement; appendix; in-text reference; among others).

Policy Letter to the Mayor

Please prepare a letter to the Mayor or another appropriate client on your policy analysis, with a recommendation for a specific policy proposal. Explain the problem, why you think your proposal is important, what issues it raises, and why you think it should be supported.

The Mayor may not read your full analysis; what does she need to know? How can you motivate her to read more? (250-500 words; no longer than 500 words!! letter format).