

WINTER 2018

POL 474H1S/2317H1S - POLITICS AND POLICY ANALYSIS
Department of Political Science
University of Toronto

Instructor: Dr. Jonathan Craft
Office: Sidney Smith 3048
Contact: jonathan.craft@utoronto.ca
Office Hours: Wednesday 1-2pm

Seminar: Tuesdays, 2pm - 4pm
Location: Sidney Smith 2120

COURSE OBJECTIVES

This course examines the work of policy analysts in modern liberal-democratic governments. It sets out the origins of the ‘policy analysis movement’ in the 1960s in the United States, and traces the diffusion and evolution of the idea of policy analysis over the next 50 years. The merits and demerits of the recent tendency for analysis to shift from ‘modern’ to ‘post-modern’ analytical techniques, along with those of the most recent ‘evidence-based’ policy movement, will be discussed. The course highlights the tensions that exist between politics and policy analysis as well as shifts from traditional policy analysis as ‘speaking truth to power’ and contemporary notions that understand it as “making sense together”. The course is organized around four main themes: (1) trends in policy analysis over time; (2) sources, and configurations of supply and demand in policy analysis; (3) forms and styles of policy analysis; and, (4) normative considerations. To illustrate these themes the course will draw on case studies and contemporary events in Canadian and international politics and public policy.

COURSE FORMAT

This course is an advanced, reading- and discussion-intensive seminar. Each week will begin with some introductory remarks from the instructor followed by student presentations, and extensive class discussion based on the readings and contemporary events.

REQUIRED READINGS

Students are required to access the course readings. These are primarily available through scholarly journals accessible through the U of T Libraries. Required readings not available in that manner have been posted on portal. Non-required readings are available on the open shelves of the various libraries. All students may, and graduate students are encouraged to read in addition to the required readings and bring insights from those readings to class discussions and to their written work.

* Students who have not previously completed a public policy course are encouraged to read an introductory text, such as: Pal, L.A. (2010). *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times*. 4th ed. Scarborough: Nelson.

COURSE EVALUATION

Short paper (Assignment 1)	30 %	Due in Class Week 6, February 13
Major paper (Assignment 2)	40 %	Due April 6 th
Seminar presentation & leadership	10 %	As assigned
Engagement	20 %	Ongoing

Seminar Engagement:

Engagement is measured by actions including but not limited to (a) consistent attendance (one cannot participate if one does not attend); (b) **being prepared for class (at a minimum, this means having completed the required readings)**; (c) being attentive to class discussion; (d) raising thoughtful comments and questions in class; (e) providing insight and analysis to the readings and discussions; (vi) bringing relevant news articles and other materials to the attention of the class. You will be required to participate regularly in this seminar and the instructor may cold call on students as required. Your participation grade in this class will be an aggregation of your weekly participation marks over the course of the term. Each week, I will assign you a participation grade using the following 3-point scale:

- 0 - Not present
- 1 - Present but did not participate
- 2 - Present and made some contribution
- 3 - Present and made purposeful, high quality contribution

Seminar leadership of article review/discussion

Student(s) will lead the seminar in a review and analysis of a selected article. The order will be determined during the first meeting. This assignment involves a 10-minute seminar presentation & leadership of approximately 15 minutes of subsequent group discussion. Students must provide a *concise* summary of the article but focus on a critical appraisal of the readings fit with course and weekly themes. *You should assume that everyone has read the materials* - the presentation should be thematic and analytical.

Presenter(s) are expected to prepare questions and will be in charge of leading and promoting discussion for their assigned article. Presenters, and all seminar participants, should reflect critically on the article and be prepared to discuss it. All students should consider:

- What is the main argument/thesis?
- What are the implications of the arguments in the reading for the weekly issue/topic?
- How does this reading 'fit' with others we've examined?
- What are the practical consequences for policy analysis or policy-making from the reading?
- What are there main strengths or weaknesses of the reading?
- What assumptions are being made in the reading, and are they warranted?
- What evidence does the author present? Dose it support the main argument?
- Where you persuaded by the argument? If so, why? If not, why not?
- What does the reading contribute to our understanding of politics and policy analysis?

Written work:

Three written assignments form the majority of the course work and evaluation. Details for these are provided below, along with the essay question options for assignment 1 and 2. Further information will be provided in class on the nature and expectations of each assignment. Students should turn in assignments on time. **Exceptions will only be made in the case of an adequately documented emergency.**

To avoid problems in your assignments, please consult "How Not to Plagiarize," by Margaret Procter, Coordinator of Writing Support, U of T: <http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/how-not-to-plagiarize>

Assignment 1 (Short essay): Due: in class Week 6, February 13th

Length: 8 double-spaced pages (excluding references and foot/end notes), 12-point font, and one-inch margins.

***Essay question:** Select a real world policy issue (e.g. minimum wage, public transportation, taxes, housing/education policy etc.). Using course materials (weeks 1-6) and your own research, review and assess the main positions regarding the issue and how proponents use policy analysis to support their preferences. What does this suggest about the nature of your issue and the role of policy analysis in policymaking?*

Assignment 2 (Major paper): Due April 6th by 4:30pm at main political science office.

Select one policy issue you are interested in (e.g. international trade, climate change, agriculture, obesity) **which must be approved by the instructor**. Use your selected topic in response to **ONE** (1) of the following questions:

- a. A major dilemma of 21st century policy analysis is the need to incorporate participatory forms of citizen involvement in policy making, while at the same time encouraging rational decision-making based on the ‘best evidence’. How has this tension played out in your policy issue? Can evidence-based decision making and democratic decision making co-exist? Your answer must integrate course materials and your own research on your chosen policy issue.

OR

- b. Evaluate the success or failure your specific public policy. Your response should integrate course material as well as additional research on your policy issue to support your assessment.

OR

- c. In what ways does your policy issue help us understand the intersection of politics and policy analysis? How do our course material help us make sense of that intersection in your case?

Format:

- *The research paper should focus squarely on presenting an argument based on your chosen question, defending that argument and analyzing/refuting counter arguments.*
- Provide a cover page with the question, your name, and the word count;
- Use 12 point font, DOUBLE SPACED with normal margins;
- **Graduate papers:** ~ 6,000 words (not including notes & bibliography).
- **Undergraduate papers:** ~ 4,000 words (not including notes & bibliography).

GRADING APPEALS

Appeals of grades must be made in person and be accompanied by a 1-paragraph typed statement that outlines why you believe the grade is inappropriate. *Reconsiderations may result in increases or decreases to the marks originally allocated.*

ASSIGNMENT FORMATTING AND RECORD KEEPING

Unless otherwise stated, assignments must be typed, double-spaced, 12-point font with standard 1-inch margins. APA, MLA, or Chicago are acceptable citation styles. Students are also strongly advised to keep rough and draft work and hard copies of their assignments. These should be kept until the marked assignments have been returned. All graded assignments are to be kept by students until the grades have been posted on ROSI.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS AND PENALTIES

It is at my discretion whether or not to accept the late assignment and/or attach a lateness penalty (**which is 5% per day, weekends included**).

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship in a university, and to ensuring that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of each student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm>) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the processes for addressing academic offences. Potential offences include, but are not limited to:

In papers and assignments:

- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
- Making up sources or facts.
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.

In academic work:

- Falsifying institutional documents or grades.
- Falsifying or altering any documentation required by the University, including (but not limited to) doctor's notes.

All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following procedures outlined in the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. If you have questions or concerns about what constitutes appropriate academic behaviour or appropriate research and citation methods, you are expected to seek out additional information on academic integrity from your instructor or from other institutional resources (see <http://www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity/>).

ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcome in this course. In particular, if you have a disability or health consideration that may require accommodations, please feel free to approach me and/or the Accessibility Services Office as soon as possible. The Accessibility Services staff are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals and arrange appropriate accommodations. The sooner you let them and me know your needs, the quicker we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course. (From www.accessibility.utoronto.ca)

OFFICE HOURS, E-MAIL, AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES POLICY

Office hours are for you! If you have questions or concerns about assignments, the course, or want to talk about any course related materials please come by my office. If you are unable to make the scheduled office hours appointments may be possible. Please contact me to arrange a time.

Please be sure to use your University of Toronto e-mail accounts for all course related correspondence. Please also note the course code (POL 474H1S/2317H1S) in the subject line of your messages. I will respond to e-mail within 48 hours of receiving messages, with longer response times for those received during weekends/holidays. **No assignments will be accepted by email.**

Electronic devices may only be used to access readings or for classroom activities specified by the instructor. At all other times, laptops, phones, and tablets should be closed, switched to silent mode, or turned off to avoid distractions. Exceptions will only be made for those with accommodations or for official note takers. Generally speaking, the negative impacts of electronic devices in the classroom (persistent distraction, low levels of engagement, poor knowledge retention, and lower grades) consistently outweigh the positives. Don't just take my word for it — see for yourself:

Holstead, Carol E. 2015. "The Benefits of No-Tech Note Taking," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 4.

Shirky, Clay. 2014. "Why I Just Asked My Students To Put Their Laptops Away," *Medium* (personal blog), September 8.

Hamilton, Jon. 2008. "Think You're Multitasking? Think Again," *NPR.org*, October 2.

PART I: Introduction: Policy Analysis and the Policy Sciences

WEEK 1 (January 9): Course Introduction

Overview of course themes, assignments, presentation scheduling

- Behn, R. (1981). Policy analysis and policy politics. *Policy Analysis*, 7(2): 199-226
- Wherry, A. The EI hiring credit: Joe Oliver will take the CFIB's word for it. Let us now consider how our policy gets made. *Macleans*, November 20, 2014. <http://www.macleans.ca/politics/the-ei-hiring-credit-joe-oliver-will-take-the-cfibs-word-for-it/>
- Shaffer, B. Why John Horgan deserves credit for going ahead with Site C Opinion: Analysis shows the answer to the Site C question is not so clear cut as polarized camps would have you believe. *Macleans*, December 11, 2017. <http://www.macleans.ca/news/canada/why-john-horgan-deserves-credit-for-going-ahead-with-site-c/>

WEEK 2 (January 16): Foundations and Evolutions

What are the foundations of policy analysis? How do we think of and practice it? How has it evolved over the years? What are the tensions between theory and practice? What are the leading ideal types of the policy process? Is policy analysis political, when and how do politics and policy analysis intersect?

Required Reading:

- Enserink, B., Koppenjan, J. and Mayer, I. (2013) A Policy Sciences View on Policy Analysis, pp.11-40, in W. A. H. Thissen & W. E. Walker (eds.), *Public Policy Analysis: New Developments*. New York: Springer. *Available as an electronic resource through UofT Library.
- Torgerson, D. 1986. "Between Knowledge and Politics: Three Faces of Policy Analysis. *Policy Sciences*, 19(1): 33-59.
- Lidman, R. and Sommers, P. (2005). The 'Complete' Policy Analyst: A Top Ten List. *Public Administration Review*, 65(5): 628-634 (**not available for seminar presentation by students**)

Suggested Readings:

- Weimer, D. and Vining, A. (2010). "What Is Policy Analysis?" in *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*. 5th ed. Longman.
- Wildavsky, A. (1979). *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Radin, B. (2013). Policy Analysis Reaches Midlife. *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 7(1): 8-27.

WEEK 3 (January 23): Rationality, Politics, and Policy Analysis

Many theorists assume that individuals are rational actors. What does that mean? What are the basic

assumptions of rational choice theory? How have rationality assumptions influenced the ways in which we understand individual choice, group choice, cooperation/collective action problems?

Required Reading:

- Becker, Gary S. 1976. Chp. 1 of *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*, pp. 3-14. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. *Posted on Portal
- Shepsle, Kenneth A., and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. "Rationality: The Model of Choice," in *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*, pp. 15-35. New York: Norton. *Posted on Portal
- Becker, Gary S. 1992. "The Economic Way of Looking at Life." Lecture, Nobel Prize in Economics. *Posted on Portal.

Suggested Readings:

- Simon, H.A. 1995. Rationality in Political Behavior. *Political Psychology*, 16(1): 45-61.
- DeLeon, P. 1994. Reinventing the Policy Sciences: Three Steps Back into the Future. *Policy Sciences*, 27(1): 77-95.
- Tsebelis, G. (1990). *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics*. Berkeley: U of California Press.

Week 4 (January 30): Limited Rationality and Post-Positivist Policy Analysis

What is "bounded rationality" and how does it affect preference formation? Are individuals always motivated by self-interest? How do post-positivists understand policy analysis? What do they and positivists theorists agree/disagree on? What are the implications for policy analysis?

Required Reading:

- Pal, L. (2011). Assessing incrementalism: Formative assumptions, contemporary realities. *Policy and Society*, 30(1): 29–39.
- Forester, John. (1984). "Bounded Rationality and the Politics of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review* 44(1): 23-31.
- Johnson, G.F. (2005). "The Normative Foundations of Positivist and Non-Positivist Policy Analysis and the Ethical Implications of the Emergent Risk Society." *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 7(2): 137–153.

Suggested Readings:

- Yanow, D. (2007). Interpretation in policy analysis: on methods and practice. *Critical Policy Analysis*, 1(1): 109–121.
- Hoppe, R. (1999). Policy Analysis, Science and Politics: From 'Speaking Truth to Power' to 'Making Sense Together'. *Science and Public Policy*, 26(3): 201-210.
- Danziger, M. (1995) "Policy Analysis Postmodernized: Some Political and Pedagogical Ramifications" *Policy Studies Journal* 23:3 435-450

Part II – Policy Analysis: Supply & Demand Dynamics

WEEK 5 (February 6): Shifting Landscapes and Component Reconfiguration

Why does Prince contend we have moved from 'speaking truth to power' to 'sharing truth with many actors of influence'? How have notions of 'truth' and 'power' changed? What do changes in the contexts within which politics and policy analysis unfold suggest for policy-making? How can we make sense of the various supplies of policy advice, and evolving practices, and their interaction??

Required Reading:

- Hajer, M. (2003). Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy Sciences*, 36(2): 175-195.
- Prince, M.J. (2007). Soft Craft, Hard Choices, Altered Context: Reflections on Twenty-Five Years of Policy Advice in Canada, pp. 163-185 in Laurent Dobuzinskis, Michael Howlett, and David Laycock, eds., *Policy Analysis in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007). *Posted on portal
- Craft, J., Halligan, J. (2017). “Assessing 30 Years of Westminster Policy Advisory System Experience”. *Policy Sciences*, 50(1): 47-62.

Suggested Readings:

- Craft, J., and Howlett, M. (2012). Policy Formulation, Governance Shifts and Policy Influence: Location and Content in Policy Advisory Systems. *Journal of Public Policy*, (32) 2:79-98.
- Halligan, J. (1995). Policy Advice and the Public Sector. In *Governance in a Changing Environment*, pp. 138–172. B. Guy Peters and Donald J. Savoie (Eds.). Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Lindquist, E. (1996). New Agendas for Research on Policy Communities: Policy Analysis, Management and Governance. In Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M., & Laycock, D. (Eds). *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art*, pp. 219–241. Toronto: IPAC/University of Toronto Press.

Week 6 (February 13): ** Assignment 1 due in Class

Public Service Policy Analysis

Does the practice of public service policy analysis match theory? What do public service policy workers actually do? Can (and should) public servants be neutrally competent, or more ‘responsive’ to the elected officials? Is public service policy analysis ‘political’?

Required Reading:

- Howlett, M. and Wellstead, A. (2011). Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy Revisited: The Nature of Professional Policy Work in Contemporary Government. *Politics & Policy*, 39(4): 613–633.
- Page, E. (2010). Bureaucrats and expertise: elucidating a problematic relationship in three tableaux and six jurisdictions. *Sociologie du travail*, 52(2): 255-273.
- Montpetit, E. (2011). Between Detachment and Responsiveness: Civil Servants in Europe and North America. *West European Politics*, 34(6): 1250–1271.

Suggested Readings:

- Meltsner, A.J. (1976). *Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dror, Y. (1967). Policy Analysts: A New Professional Role in Government Service. *Public Administration Review*, 27(3): 197-203.
- Hollander, M., and Prince, M. (1993). Analytical units in federal and provincial governments: Origins, functions and suggestions for effectiveness. *Canadian Public Administration*, 36 (2): 190–224.

WEEK 7 (February 20): * reading week, no class *****

Week 8 (February 27): Non-Public Service Policy Analysis

Does non-public service policy analysis differ than that of public servants? What function does it serve in contemporary policy-making? Is the growth in non-public service policy analysis ‘good’ for policy-making or hamper optimal policy-making? What do think tanks and ministerial political staffs do as analysts?

Required Reading:

- Howlett, M., Tan, S. Migone, A., Wellstead, A. and B. Evans. (2014). Policy Formulation and the Tools of Policy Appraisal: The Distribution of Analytical Techniques in Policy Advisory Systems. *Public Policy and Administration*, 29(4) 271–291
- Stone, D. (2007). Recycling Bins, Garbage Cans or Think Tanks? Three Myths Regarding Policy Analysis Institutes. *Public Administration*, 85(2): 259-78.
- Eichbaum, C., and Shaw, R. (2008). Revisiting Politicization: Political Advisers and Public Servants in Westminster Systems. *Governance*, 21(3) 337-363.

Suggested Readings:

- Perl, A. and White, D.J. (2002). The Changing Role of Consultants in Canadian Policy Analysis. *Policy & Society* 21(1): 49-73.
- McBride, S and Merolli, J. (2013). “Alternatives to austerity? Post-crisis policy advice from global institutions” *Global Social Policy*, vol. 13(3): 299-320
- Bakvis, H. (1997). Advising the executive: Think tanks, consultants, political staff and kitchen cabinets. pp. 84–125 In *The Hollow Crown: Countervailing Trends in Core Executives*, P. Weller, H. Bakvis and R.A.W. Rhodes (Eds). New York: St. Martin’s Press.

Part III – Modes and Styles of Policy Analysis

Week 9 (March 6): Evidence and Argumentation in Policy Analysis

What is evidence? How do various theorists use it in the policy analysis literature? Does it have limits or can it be misused? How do argumentation, discourse, and persuasion play out in policy analysis?

Required Reading:

- Head, B.W. (2010). Reconsidering Evidence-based Policy: Key Issues and Challenges. *Policy and Society*, 29(2): 77-94.
- Majone, G. (1989). Analysis as Argument, pp. 21-41 in Majone. *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. ***posted on portal**
- Parkhurst, J. (2017). Bias and the politics of evidence (chapter 3) in *The Politics of Evidence*. New York: Routledge (Open Access) <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781317380870>

Recommended

- MacRae, D. (1991). Policy Analysis & Knowledge Use. *Knowledge and Policy*, 4(3): 27-40.
- Laforest, R. and Orsini, M. (2005). Evidence-based Engagement in the Voluntary Sector: Lessons from Canada. *Social Policy & Administration*, 39(5): 481- 497.
- Fisher, F., and Gottweis, H. (2012). *The Argumentative Turn Revisited: Public Policy as Communicative Practice*. Duke University Press.

Week 10 (March 13): Styles of Policy Analysis

Many have postulated the existence of different ‘styles’ of policy analysis. What are they, and what do they contribute to our understanding of policy analysis and politics? When are certain styles predominant? Can multiple styles exist concurrently? How are policy styles linked to broader patterns and types of ‘governance’ and politics?

Required Reading:

- Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (1982). Professional roles for policy analysts: A critical assessment. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 2(1): 88-100.
- Mayer, I.S., Bots P.G., van Daalen, C.E. 2013. Policy Analytical Styles, pp.255-270 in Araral, Fritzen, Howlett, Ramesh, Wu (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Public Policy*. New York: Routledge. ***posted on portal**

- Howlett, M., and Lindquist, E. (2004). Policy analysis and governance: Analytical and policy styles in Canada. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 6(3): 225–249.

Suggested Reading:

- Richardson, J.J., A.G. Jordan, and R.H. Kimber. (1978). Lobbying, Administrative Reform and Policy Styles: The Case of Land Drainage. *Political Studies*, 26(1), 47-64.
- Geneva-May, I. (2002). From Theory to Practice: Policy Analysis, Cultural Bias and Organizational Arrangements. *Public Management Review*, 4(4), 581-591.
- Richardson, J., Gustafsson, G. and Jordan, G. (1982). The Concept of Policy Style, pp. 1-16 in J.J. Richardson (eds). *Policy Styles in Western Europe*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

PART IV – Normative Considerations

Week 11 (March 20): Principles, Ethics, and Policy Analysis

- Anderson, C. (1979). The Place of Principles in Policy Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 73(3): 711-23.
- Shue, H. (2006). Ethical Dimensions of Public Policy, pp. 709-728 in Michael Moran, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press. *available as e-book through U of T libraries.
- Amy, DJ. (1984). Why Policy Analysis and Ethics Are Incompatible *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 3(4): 573-591.

Recommended Readings:

- Scott, C., & Bahler, K. (2010). *Adding Value to Policy Analysis and Advice*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.
- Montgomery, D.J. (1987). Rational Policy Analysis: Normative Foundations. *Public Productivity Review*, 10(4):47-54:

Week 12 (March 27): Policy Analysis and Democracy

Policy analysis has faced harsh criticism for being overly technical and undemocratic. Many have called for more participatory forms of analysis and a ‘democratization’ of the policy sciences. How democratic should policy analysis be? Does greater participation improve or hamper policy-making?

Required Reading:

- Pierre, Jon. (1998). “Public Consultation and Citizen Participation: Dilemmas of Policy Advice”, pp. 137-63 in *Taking Stock: Assessing Public Sector Reforms*. B. Guy Peters and Donald J. Savoie (Eds.). Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press. Online: <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/63493>.
- Ingram, H. and Schneider, A.L. (2006). Policy Analysis for Democracy, pp. 169-190 in Michael Moran, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.*available as e-book through U of T libraries.
- Walters, L., Aydelotte, J., Miller, J. (2000). Putting More Public in Policy Analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4): 349-359.

Suggested Readings:

- deLeon, P. (1992). The Democratization of the Policy Sciences. *Public Administration Review*, 52(2): 125-129.
- Johnson, G.F. (2011). “The Limits of Deliberative Democracy: Elite Motivation in Three Canadian Cases.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44(1). 137–159.

- Durning, D. (1993). Participatory policy analysis in a social service agency: A case study. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 12(2): 297–322.

Week 13 (April 3): So How “Good” Was It? Politics, Policy Analysis, and Policy Evaluation

How can we analyze policy performance? How do we determine if policy has been ‘successful’ or a ‘failure’? Can we escape relativism, or is it an entirely subjective enterprise? How is policy evaluation political and what does policy analysis offer in terms of policy learning improving policy outcomes?

Required Reading:

- McConnell, A. (2010). Policy success, policy failure and grey areas in-between. *Journal of Public Policy* 30(3): 345–362.
- Howlett, M. (2012). The lessons of failure: learning and blame avoidance in public policy-making. *International Political Science Review*, 33(5): 539–555.
- Craft, J. (2017). Partisan Advisers and Political Policy Failure Avoidance. *Public Administration*, 95(2): 327–341.

Recommended Readings:

- Bovens, Mark; Paul ‘t Hart and B. Guy Peters. (2001). Analyzing governance success and failure in six European states, in *Success and Failure in Public Governance. A Comparative Analysis*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Turnpenny, J., Radaelli, C.M., Jordan, A., Jacob, K. (2009). The Policy and Politics of Policy Appraisal. Emerging Trends and New Directions. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16:4, 640-653.
- McConnell, A. (2010). *Understanding Policy Success: Rethinking Public Policy*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Snow, Dave. (2015). “Explaining a Policy Failure: Policy Framing, Federalism, and Assisted Reproductive Technologies in Canada.” *Canadian Public Policy* 41 (2): 124-136

**** April 6th - Essay #2 due in hardcopy at political science main office by 4:30pm ** remember the late penalty will be 10% for submissions received on the following Monday (hardcopy required). Please do not slide essays under my office door.**