

# MC364 – Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation

Fall 2006 / M W 10:20-11:40 a.m. / Case Hall 340

Prof. Bryan Ritchie

302 Case Hall

Tel. 517 353-8614

Fax 517 432-1804

E-mail: [ritchieb@msu.edu](mailto:ritchieb@msu.edu)

Instructor web site: <http://www.msu.edu/~ritchieb/>

Office hours: M W 1-2:30, or by appointment

Course web site: <http://www.angel.msu.edu/>

## Course Overview and Objectives

This course has two objectives. The first is to provide you with an overview of public policy analysis and program evaluation—what it is, the tools used to do it, and how to critically assess studies others have done. Accordingly, the course is designed to encourage you to examine both quantitative and qualitative methods for analyzing public policies, explore various research strategies and designs, and learn how to appropriately interpret results. Illustrations will be drawn from major evaluation studies from a variety of policy areas and countries. Topics include domestic violence, education and training, health, crime control and neighborhood revitalization, homelessness, preschool education, forestry management, community and economic development, welfare reform, and comprehensive community building.

The second objective is to have you conduct policy analysis and evaluation using the methodological skills acquired in this and previous courses. Thus, not only will this course introduce you to the analytical skills needed for evaluating and choosing among policy options, but it will also require you to use these skills for yourself.

The course is divided into two parts, each part having several sections. The first part describes the role of public policy analysis and program evaluation in public policymaking, discusses the process of causal inference, and presents a variety of evaluation designs and tools to help the analyst control for alternative explanations and draw inferences about the causes and effects of public policies. The second part of the course concentrates on actual cases of policy evaluation and analysis and the problems and challenges that can occur. While the focus of this part of the course will be on your own evaluation research projects, we will also examine several cases that reveal challenges associated with comprehensive community initiatives and the politics of the utilization of evaluation research.

## Course Requirements

The primary requirement for this course is an original policy evaluation research project. This project will be broken down into steps; you will receive a grade for each step of the project as

well as for the entire finished project. Portions of the project will be done as a group while others will be done alone. Please retain all graded, returned copies of any of your work until two weeks after the term ends. ***Please note: all written assignments should be typed, double-spaced, 12-point font, 1-inch margins all around. Also, all paper assignments are due at the beginning of class on the specified day. Papers turned in after class on the same day are already one day late and, assuming late papers are accepted for that assignment, will be graded accordingly.***

### *Participation*

This course relies heavily on individual participation. Your grade, however, does not depend on how much you talk (neither I nor anyone else is interested in listening to anyone talk for the sake of talking). Instead, I am interested in thoughtful contributions that exhibit some insight, opinion, or clarification that comes only from “wrestling” a little with the readings.

Since participation is so important, it is clearly necessary that everyone attend class. I do not, however, keep a roll of who attends and who does not. Instead participation will be measured through class memos and discussion questions.

### **Class Memos and Discussion Questions**

You will be required to write a memo at least one page, but not longer than 2 pages long (see above for formatting) for each class session. **You must be in attendance to turn in a memo. Excuses will be provided for those with valid university conflicts or evidence from a doctor of illness.** These papers will be exchanged in class and read by a fellow student who will grade on the following criteria:

1. Up to one point for a summary of the readings. What are the big points or contributions of the readings? How is the reading structured? What are the arguments? And so forth. I would expect that you could do this in a paragraph, two at the most.
2. Up to two points for explaining the significance of the reading and linking it back to previous readings/discussions. How does the reading add to the debates on development? Does the reading agree or disagree with previous authors? How? This is the meat of the paper and may take several paragraphs.
3. Up to one point for contributing an insight, question, or comment on the readings. This question is not one meant to “stump the class,” but rather something you are wrestling with or wonder. Or, it might be an insight into how the reading is critical or makes a major contribution, etc. Finally, you might also offer a critique of the reading. This should only take a paragraph, although you might write more if you have to explain why a contribution is especially significant.

Although there are 21 class periods for which you might write, only 17 are necessary for full credit. If you write more than 17 papers, I shall drop the same number of papers with the lowest grade when figuring your final course grade.

## *Exams*

There will be a midterm exam that covers the first part of the course, but no final. Material for this exam will come from course readings, class lectures, and class discussions. **There will be no make-up examinations or incompletes** except in cases of medical or family emergency, for which appropriate documentation will be required.

## *Research Project*

Learning to conduct policy evaluation and analysis and then make recommendations for change is an important component of this course. Accordingly you will be required to submit a 25-30-page original policy evaluation and analysis paper. Portions of this project will be done in groups, although the final paper will be individually written and submitted. The project will be an evaluation of a substantive policy initiative (see attached sheet for project requirements). For every step done in a group, the group will have the opportunity assessing the work of the other team members.<sup>1</sup>

### **1. Formal project proposal (group)**

- a. See attached sheet for group assignment information and steps to choosing your policy area and countries.
- b. Meet with me as a group before September 11<sup>th</sup> to select your topic for analysis
- c. Turn in initial group project proposal on September 13<sup>th</sup>. Should be 4-6 pages and include a topic, main question, methodology, and preliminary bibliography. (See directions on proposal sheet for more info.)

### **2. Project presentation (group)**

- a. Make a 15-minute oral presentation of the group's project on September 18<sup>th</sup>. **DO NOT JUST READ THE PROPOSAL. READING THE PROPOSAL WILL RESULT IN THE LOSS OF ALL THE POINTS FOR THIS PHASE.** Be creative. You have Internet access, PowerPoint capability, etc. I expect this to be a professional presentation. The way you dress and the manner of your speech will affect the group's grade. I would recommend you practice this as a group before hand.
- b. This proposal and presentation is worth 5% of your grade.
- c. If done correctly, this proposal can form the introduction to your paper almost as written.
- d. Every day the proposal is late will result in a 1-percentage point drop. After five days there will be no points awarded.

### **3. Policy Review (Individual)**

- a. This section of the paper answers the following questions. What is the history of your policy area (broadly) in the countries you have chosen?
- b. What are the issues surrounding the policy? What was the motivation behind the initiative or program? Who stands to win and lose? What are the roadblocks to successful formation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation? **WHERE DOES YOUR STUDY FIT?**

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, if your group received 5 points for one step of the project, but your peers determine you participated only 50%, you would receive a 2.5.

- c. Should be 7-10 pages in length not including the bibliography.
  - d. Should be drawn from at least 20 sources, 10 of which must come from scholarly journals or books.
  - e. This phase will be incorporated into your paper as the policy review section
  - f. Due on October 11<sup>th</sup>. This phase is worth 10% of your grade.
  - g. Each day the literature review is late results in a 2-percentage point drop.
  - h. **IT IS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THIS AND ALL SUBSEQUENT PHASES IN ORDER TO PASS THE COURSE, EVEN IF NO POINTS ARE AWARDED.**
- 4. Oral Presentation (group)**
- a. Each group will give a 30-minute presentation on their project. The presentation must include the following:
    - i. The policy area and the countries involved.
    - ii. The major issues surrounding the policy initiative, the proposed or potential political, economic, and social ramifications from implementation, and the challenges associated with the project.
    - iii. An explanation of research strategy including chosen design and methodologies
    - iv. Then explain the findings. What can you conclude and with what level of confidence?
    - v. Finally, what are the recommendations for change of the policy or the environment in which it is implemented?
  - b. Clearly you will have to agree as a group on which items to present and which not to present.
  - c. The presentation will be worth 10% and will be graded for both content and style (my subtracting pen goes crazy whenever I hear the words “like” and “really”).
- 5. Presentation evaluations (Individual)**
- a. Each of you will be required to write a 1-2 page evaluation of every group presentation. This review can be focused on any aspect of the project: methodology, substance, findings, etc.
  - b. These are worth 5% of your grade. **I will accept no late evaluations. They are due at the beginning of the next class.**
- 6. Penultimate Draft (Group)**
- a. Turn in one group penultimate draft on November 15<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. Clearly, the earlier your group presents, the more time you will have to rework and modify the groups findings to come up with your individual final draft. I am happy to review earlier drafts **up to one week before the final draft is due.**
  - c. The draft is worth 5%. For every day the draft is late you lose 1 percentage point.
- 7. Final Paper (Individual)**
- a. Turn in a final draft before December 15<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m.
  - b. This draft should be 20-25 pages, **not** including bibliography.
  - c. I expect that although you presented as a group and turned in a group penultimate draft you will have individual views that differ from your other group members. This is the opportunity to modify your project to fit your exact conclusions, feelings, and understandings. Since there are no two individuals alike, no two papers can be alike either. Please write these yourself.

- d. The final paper is worth 25%. **I will not accept late papers.**
- e. Please see “Criteria for an A Paper,” at the end of the syllabus.

### *Summary of Course Deadlines*

One of the principal objectives of this course is to prepare students for life in the real world as policy analysts. Therefore, deadlines will be strictly enforced. Late papers will not be accepted. Due dates for course assignments are as follows:

Midterm	October 18
Project Proposal	September 13
Proposal Presentation	September 18
Policy Review Section	October 11
Penultimate Draft	November 15
Group Project Presentation	November 15, 20, 22, 27
Presentation Evaluations	November 29
Final Draft of Research Paper	December 15 <sup>th</sup> 10:00 a.m.

### **Grading**

- Midterm 20%
- Papers 20%
- Project proposal and presentation 5%
- Policy review 10%
- Oral presentation 10%
- Presentation evaluations 5%
- Penultimate draft 5%
- Final paper 25%

### **Readings**

The following books are required reading and are available for purchase at the various bookstores around campus. Assigned readings from these texts are marked with a “T” in the course schedule.

- Schutt, Russell K. 2006. Investigating the social world. Pine Forge Press. ISBN: 141292734X
- Munger, Michael C. 2000. Analyzing Policy: Choices, Conflicts, and Practices. New York: W.W. Norton. ISBN: 0-393-97399-9

- Course Pack at Student Book Stores

Additional required readings are either on reserve in the main library and are indicated with a UR in the course schedule or are available electronically from two sources. Those that can be accessed through the library site ([www.lib.msu.edu](http://www.lib.msu.edu)) to ProQuest, JSTOR, etc., are marked with a “W”. Those on the course website are marked with “A.”

### *Supplementary Readings*

Recommended readings are listed in the Course Outline for those students wishing to explore a specific topic further. In addition, articles on policy analysis and program evaluation can be found in a variety of journals and periodicals. Listed below are a few journals that frequently feature articles on evaluation research: *Evaluation Review*, *Evaluation Practice*, *American Journal of Evaluation*, *Journal of Human Resources*, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *Social Service Review*, and *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.

In addition, two other publication series deserve special mention—*Evaluation Studies Review Annual* (Call no.: [H62 .E9](#); vol. 1-12, 1976-1987) and *Policy Studies Review Annual* ([H1 .P73](#); vol. 1-10, 1977-1992). Each is a compilation of articles about policy analysis and program evaluation methodology as well as findings from actual evaluation studies. Each volume tends to be organized around a specific theme and also contains articles of general interest. In addition, the American Evaluation Association publishes an annual series *New Directions in Evaluation* that features symposia on timely topics of interest in the field of evaluation research and program evaluation.

### *Course Web Site*

The URL for the course web site is <http://www.angel.msu.edu/>. Plan on visiting this site often for messages, important links, grades, assignments, etc.

### *Electronic Readings*

You are expected to access some of the readings online through the MSU Library’s website using your pilot account while on campus, or the MSU proxy server if you are off campus (clearly you can also go to the library and look up paper version). Here is the library web page you should access:

<http://magic.lib.msu.edu/screens/opacmenu.html>

Many of the electronic readings are from a database called Proquest Direct. To get to Proquest from the MAGIC webpage listed above, Click on “Electronic Resources” and from there select “Proquest.” Usually, the easiest way to get the articles is to click on “new search by word” and type in the title of the article. For articles earlier than 1997, remember to check the “back issues” box before initiating the search. Any exceptions will be noted in the course outline below. From time to time I will send you readings via e-mail or include a link to them from the course web site.

*Newspaper Reading*

In addition to other assignments, you should keep up with major policy issues in the news. Good sources include the *New York Times* (current issues available free on the web at [www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com)), *Financial Times* (available free on the web at [www.ft.com](http://www.ft.com)), *Economist* (a few selected free articles are available at [www.economist.com](http://www.economist.com)), *Wall Street Journal* (Dow Jones News Retrieval available free only through MSU Library site in the electronic resources section, only to computers located on campus). Please see me if you are interested in discounted hard copy subscriptions. We will discuss relevant topics in class, and questions about high profile stories may appear on the quiz or exams.

**Course Outline**

Date      Class  
            No.

T=Textbook  
W=WWW  
MR = Madison Reserve  
UR = MSU Library Reserve  
A = Angel Class Web Site

**PART I: INTRODUCTION, OVERVIEW, DEFINING PROBLEMS, CAUSAL INFERENCE**

8-28      1

Introduction

- Course description and syllabus
- New Concepts and objective
- Working in Groups
- Examples of past work

*Recommended Activities:*

- Have dinner with your group
- Visit the web site of The Electronic Policy Network for an overview of selected organizations engaged in policy analysis and program evaluation: <http://epn.org>
- Visit the web site of the American Evaluation Association (<http://www.aea.org>) and the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (<http://qsilver.queensu.ca/~appamwww/>)
- Browse the Federal Staff Directory (Call No.: REF DESK JK723 .E9 F44) and see where policy planning, analysis, and evaluation functions are located in various federal agencies.

8-30      2

Overview: Programs, Policies, and Evaluations

- Schutt, Chap. 1, pp 1-30
- Munger, Analyzing Policy, Chap. 1

*Recommended:*

- Edward Suchman, Evaluative Research (New York: Russell Sage, 1967)
- Charles Schultze, The Politics and Economics of Public Spending (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1968)
- Alice Rivlin, Systematic Thinking for Social Action (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1971)
- Richard Nelson, The Moon and the Ghetto (New York: Norton, 1977)
- Edith Stokey and Richard Zeckhauser, A Primer for Policy Analysis (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978)
- Henry Aaron, Politics and the Professors (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1978)

T  
T

- Aaron Wildavsky, Speaking Truth to Power (Boston: Little, Brown, 1979)
  - Lee Cronbach and Associates, Toward Reform of Program Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980)
  - Daniel L. Stufflebeam and Anthony J. Shinkfield, Systematic Evaluation (Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 1985)
  - William R. Shadish, Jr., Thomas D. Cook, and Laura Leviton, Foundations of Program Evaluation: Theories of Practice (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1991)
  - Carol Weiss, Evaluation Research, 2d ed (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1998)
- 9-4     **3**     University Holiday, no School
- 9-6     **4**     Theories, Philosophies, Processes and Problems of Social Research
- Schutt Chaps. 2-3, pp. 31-90. T
- Recommended:*
- Eugene Bardach, “Problems of Problem Definition in Policy Analysis,” pp. 161-171 in John P. Crecine, ed., Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management, Vol. 1 (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1981)
  - Deborah Stone, Policy Paradox and Political Reason (Boston: Scott, Foresman, 1988)
  - David A. Rochefort and Roger W. Cobb, The Politics of Problem Definition (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1994)
- 9-11    **5**     Causal Inference
- Schutt, Chapt 6, pp 171-199 T
  - Michael Scriven, “Maximizing the Power of Causal Investigations: The Modus Operandi Method,” Evaluation Studies Review Annual, Vol. 1 (1976): 101-118 CP
  - Gary King, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba, Designing Social Inquiry (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) pp. 75-109. CP
- 9-13    **6**

**Group Project Proposals Due**
- Validity Issues in Evaluation Research
- Cook and Campbell, Quasi-Experimentation (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1979), Chap. 2 CP
  - Munger, Analyzing Policy, Chaps. 2-3 T
- Recommended:*
- Campbell and Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966)
  - Melvin M. Mark and Thomas D. Cook, “Design of Randomized Experiments and Quasi-Experiments,” pp. 65-82 in Leonard Rutman, ed., Evaluation Research Methods, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1984)
- 9-18    **7**

**Group Project Proposal Presentations**
- 9-20    **8**     Measurement and Reliability
- Jim Nunnally and Robert Durham, “Validity, Reliability, and Special Problems of Measurement in Evaluation Research,” pp. 289-352 in E. Struening and M. Guttentag, Handbook of Evaluation Research, Vol. 1 (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1975) CP
  - Schutt, chapt. 4 pp. 91-131. T
- Recommended:*
- Nancy Cochran, “Grandma Moses and the ‘Corruption’ of Data,” Evaluation Quarterly 2 (August 1978): 363-373
  - Richard Zeller and Edward Carmines, Measurement in the Social Sciences (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980)
  - Hubert Blalock, Conceptualization and Measurement in the Social Sciences (Beverly

- Hills, CA: Sage, 1982)
- Duncan MacRae, Jr., Policy Indicators (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1985)
  - Susan E. Mayer and Christopher Jencks, “Poverty and the Distribution of Material Hardship,” Journal of Human Resources 24 (Winter 1989): 88-114
  - Patricia Ruggles, Drawing the Line: Alternative Poverty Measures and their Implications for Public Policy (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1990)
  - Constance F. Citro and Robert T. Michael, eds., Measuring Poverty: A New Approach (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1995)
- 9-25     9     Data Collection
- Leigh Burstein, Howard E. Freeman, Kenneth A. Sirotnik, Ginette Delandshere, and Michael Hollis, “Data Collection: The Achilles Heel of Evaluation Research,” Sociological Methods and Research, Vol. 14, No. 1 (August 1985): 65-80
- Recommended:*
- David C. Hoaglin, Richard J. Light, Buckman McPeck, Frederick Mosteller, and Michael A. Stoto, Data for Decisions: Information Strategies for Policymakers (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1982)
  - Berk and Sherman, “Data Collection Strategies in the Minneapolis Domestic Assault Experiment,” pp. 35-48 in Leigh Burstein, Howard E. Freeman, and Peter H. Rossi, eds., Collecting Evaluation Data (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985)
  - Herbert Jacob, Using Published Data (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1984)
  - William Alonso and Paul Starr, eds., The Politics of Numbers (New York: Russell Sage, 1987)
- 9-27     10     Experimental Designs
- Schutt, chapt 7, pp 200-232
- Recommended:*
- Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966)
  - Donald Campbell, “Reforms as Experiments,” pp. 71-100 in E. Struening and M. Guttentag, Handbook of Evaluation Research, Vol. 1 (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1975)
  - Henry Riecken and Robert Boruch, Social Experimentation (New York: Academic Press, 1976)
  - Cook and Campbell, Quasi-Experimentation (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1979)
  - Jerry Hausman and David Wise, eds., Social Experimentation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985)
  - S. Fienberg, B. Singer, and J. Tanur, “Large-Scale Social Experimentation in the United States,” Chap. 12 in A. Atkinson and S. Fienberg, eds., A Celebration of Statistics (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1985)
  - David H. Greenberg and Philip K. Robins, “The Changing Role of Social Experiments in Policy Analysis,” Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 5 (1986): 340-362 [R]
  - David H. Greenberg, Mark Shroder, and Matthew Onstott, The Digest of Social Experiments (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1997)
- 10-2     11     Experimental Designs: Case—The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment
- Lawrence W. Sherman and Richard A. Berk, “The Specific Deterrent Effects of Arrest for Domestic Assault,” American Sociological Review 49 (1984): 261-272
  - Binder and J.W. Meeker, “Experiments as Reforms,” Journal of Criminal Justice 16 (1988): 347-358 [R]
  - R.C. Davis and B. Smith, “Domestic Violence Reforms: Empty Promises or Fulfilled Expectations,” Crime and Delinquency 41 (1995): 541-552
- Recommended:*

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nancy Egan, “The Police Response to Spouse Abuse: An Annotated Bibliography,” (New York: City University of New York, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, nd) <a href="http://www.lib.jjay.cuny.edu/research/spouse.html">http://www.lib.jjay.cuny.edu/research/spouse.html</a></li> <li>• Lawrence W. Sherman, <u>Domestic Violence</u> (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1988)</li> <li>• E.S. Buzawa and C.G. Buzawa, <u>Domestic Violence: The Criminal Justice Response</u> (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990)</li> <li>• Lawrence W. Sherman, “The Influence of Criminology on Criminal Law: Evaluating Arrests for Misdemeanor Domestic Violence,” <u>Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology</u> 83 (1992): 1-45</li> <li>• C.G. Bowman, “The Arrest Experiments: A Feminist Critique,” <u>Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology</u> 83 (1992): 201-208</li> <li>• J. McCord, “Deterrence of Domestic Violence: A Critical View of Research,” <u>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency</u> 29 (1992): 229-239</li> </ul>	
10-4	12	<p><u>Quasi-Experimental Designs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schutt, chapt 5 pp 132-170.</li> </ul> <p><i>Recommended:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campbell and Stanley, <u>Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research</u> (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966)</li> <li>• Cook and Campbell, <u>Quasi-Experimentation</u> (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1979)</li> <li>• Charles M. Judd and David A. Kenny, <u>Estimating the Effects of Social Interventions</u> (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981)</li> <li>• Christopher Achen, <u>The Statistical Analysis of Quasi-Experiments</u> (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986)</li> </ul>	T
10-9	13	<p><u>Quasi-Experimental Designs: Case—National Evaluation of the Healthy Start Initiative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barbara Devaney, Embry Howell, Marie McCormick, and Lorenzo Moreno, <u>Reducing Infant Mortality: Lessons Learned from Healthy Start. Final Report.</u> (Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., July 2000) Class Web Site</li> </ul> <p><i>Recommended:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embry M. Howell, Barbara Devaney, Barbara Foot, Mary Harrington, Melissa Schettini, Marie McCormick, Ian Hill, Renee Schwalberg, and Beth Zimmerman, <u>The Implementation of Healthy Start: Lessons for the Future</u> (Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., November 1997)</li> </ul>	A
10-11	14	<b>Policy Review Section Due</b>	
		<p><u>Quantitative Data Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schutt, Chapt 14, pp. 441-488</li> <li>• Munger Chapt 9 and 10, pp. 280-345 (skim)</li> </ul>	T T
10-16	15	<p><u>Qualitative Methods</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schutt, chapt 9 pp. 286-324</li> <li>• Munger, <u>Analyzing Policy</u>, Chap. 4</li> </ul> <p><i>Recommended:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jack McKillip, <u>Need Analysis: Tools for the Human Services and Education</u> (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1987)</li> <li>• Belle Ruth Witkin, “Needs Assessment Since 1981: The State of the Practice,” <u>Evaluation Practice</u> 15 (1994): 17-27</li> <li>• Fernando I. Soriano, <u>Conducting Needs Assessments: A Multidisciplinary Approach</u> (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995)</li> </ul>	T T
10-18	16	<b>Midterm Examination</b>	

**PART II: POLICY AND PROGRAM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS**

- 10-23 17 Needs Assessment: Case—Who Are the Homeless?
- Munger, Analyzing Policy, Chap. 7 T
  - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Report to the Secretary on the Homeless and Emergency Shelters (Washington, HUD, 1984) CP
  - Martha Burt et al, Homelessness: Programs and the People They Serve (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, August 1999), Highlights. CP
  - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Report on the 1988 National Survey of Shelters for the Homeless (Washington, HUD, March 1989). CP
- Recommended:*
- HUD Report on Homelessness. Joint Hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and the Subcommittee on Manpower and Housing of the House Committee on Government Operations, 98<sup>th</sup> Cong. 2 sess. (GPO, 1984)
  - HUD Report on Homelessness-II. Joint Hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and the Subcommittee on Manpower and Housing of the House Committee on Government Operations, 99<sup>th</sup> Cong. 1 sess. (GPO, 1985)
  - R. Bruce Wiegard, “Counting the Homeless,” American Demographics 7 (December 1985): 34-37
  - M. Audrey Burnam and Paul Koegel, “Methodology for Obtaining a Representative Sample of Homeless Persons: The Los Angeles Skid Row Study,” Evaluation Review, Vol. 12, No. 2 (April 1988): 117-152
  - Charles D. Cowan, William R. Breakey, and Pamela J. Fischer, “The Methodology of Counting the Homeless,” pp. 169-182 in Committee on Health Care for Homeless People, Homelessness, Health, and Human Needs (Washington: National Academy Press, 1988)
  - Peter Rossi, Down and Out in America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989)
  - Interagency Council on the Homeless and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Practical Methods for Counting Homeless People: A Manual for States and Local Jurisdictions (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, March 1992)
  - Martha R. Burt, Over the Edge: The Growth of Homelessness in the 1980s (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1992)
- 10-25 18 Cost-Benefit Analysis
- Schutt. Chap. 11, pp 357-384. T
  - Michael Munger, Analyzing Policy. Chapter 11. T
- Recommended:*
- Jerome Rothenberg, “Cost-Benefit Analysis: A Methodological Exposition,” pp. 55-88 in M. Guttentag and E. Struening, eds., Handbook of Evaluation Research, Vol. 2 (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1975)
  - Mark Thompson, Benefit-Cost Analysis for Program Evaluation (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980)
  - Edward Gramlich, Benefit-Cost Analysis of Government Programs (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981)
  - E.J. Mishan, Benefit-Cost Analysis, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Winchester, MA: Allen and Unwin, 1982)
- 10-30 19 Cost-Benefit Analysis: Case—The Perry Preschool Program
- Steven W. Barnett, “Benefit-Cost Analysis of the Perry Preschool Program and Its Policy Implications,” Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 7 (Winter 1985): 333-342 CP
  - [Benefit-cost analysis of preschool education: Findings from a 25-year follow-up;](#) W

- Barnett, W Steven; American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Albany; Oct 1993; Vol. 63, Iss. 4; pg. 500
- [Perry Preschool graduates show dramatic new social gains at 27](#); *Cohen, Deborah L*; *Education Week*, Washington; Apr 21, 1993; Vol. 12, Iss. 30; pg. 1
- Recommended:*
- Deborah J. Stipek, Jeanette Valentine, and Edward Zigler, "Project Head Start: A Critique of Theory and Practice, pp. 477-494 in Edward Zigler and Jeanette Valentine, eds., Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty (New York: Free Press, 1979)
  - J. Berrueta-Clement, L.J. Schweinhart, W.S. Barnett, A.S. Epstein, and D.P. Weikart, Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 19 (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1984)
  - Edward Gramlich, "Evaluation of Education Projects: The Case of the Perry Preschool Program," *Economics of Education Review* 5 (1986): 17-24
  - Edward Zigler and Susan Muenchow, Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment (New York: Basic Books, 1992)
  - L.J. Schweinhart, H.V. Barnes, and D.P. Weikart, Significant Benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 27 (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1993)
  - Paul M. Wortman, "An Exemplary Evaluation of a Program that Worked: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project," *Evaluation Practice* 16 (1995): 257-265
  - Advisory Committee on Head Start Research and Evaluation, Evaluating Head Start: A Recommended Framework for Studying the Impact of the Head Start Program (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, October 1999)
- 11-1    20    Historical and Comparative Research
- Schutt, chapt 12, pp. 385-410. T
  - Munger, Analyzing Policy, Chap. 6 T
  - Kaplan and Rodrik Malaysia Capital Controls
- Recommended:*
- Angela Browne and Aaron Wildavsky, "What Should Evaluation Mean to Implementation?," pp. 181-205 in Jeffrey Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky, Implementation, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984)
  - Angela Browne and Aaron Wildavsky, "Implementation as Mutual Adaptation," pp. 206-231 in, Implementation, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.
  - John Stuart Hall and Susan A. MacManus, "Tracking Decisions and Consequences: The Field Network Evaluation Approach," pp. 100-118 in Walter Williams, ed., Studying Implementation (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1982)
  - Richard Nathan, "The Methodology for Field Network Evaluation Studies," pp. 73-99 in Walter Williams, ed., Studying Implementation (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1982)
  - Robert K. Yin, "Studying the Implementation of Public Programs," pp. 36-72 in Walter Williams, ed., Studying Implementation (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1982)
  - Irene Lurie, "Field Network Studies," Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, State University of New York at Albany, February 2000
- 11-6    21    Monitoring and Implementation Assessment: Case—Singapore Skills Development Fund
- Read <http://www.mom.gov.sg/MOM/CDA/0.1858.2226-----00.html> W
  - Sarosh Kuruvilla Linkages between Industrialization Strategies and Industrial Relations/Human Resource Policies: Singapore, Malaysia, the Philippines, and India *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 49, No. 4. (Jul., 1996), pp. 635-657. W
- 11-8    22    Case Study Designs
- Robert K. Yin. 1994. Case Study Research : Design and Methods. Thousand Oaks: CP

Sage Publications. Chapter 2.

- U.S. General Accounting Office, Case Study Evaluations (Washington, D.C.: GAO/PEMD-91-10.1.9, November 1990), pp. 32-62, 74-86, Glossary 130-132 CP

*Recommended:*

- Robert K. Yin and Karen A. Heald, “Using the Case-Survey Method to Analyze Policy Studies,” Administrative Science Quarterly 20 (September 1975): 371-381
- Jerome Murphy, Getting the Facts: A Fieldwork Guide for Evaluators and Policy Analysts (Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear, 1980)
- Michael Patton, Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods, 2d ed. (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1990)
- Charles C. Ragin and Howard S. Becker, eds., What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Robert E. Stake, The Art of Case Study Research (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995)

11-13 23 Case Study Designs: Case—National Evaluation of Weed & Seed

- Terence Dunworth and Gregory Mills, “National Evaluation of Weed and Seed,” National Institute of Justice Research in Brief (June 1999): 1-7 [R\*] A
- Terence Dunworth, Gregory Mills, Gary Cordner and Jack Greene, National Evaluation of Weed & Seed: Cross-Site Analysis (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, July 1999) [R\*] A
- Timothy Bynum, Gregory Mills, and Kristen Jacoby, National Evaluation of Weed and Seed: Pittsburgh Case Study (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, June 1999) [R\*] A

*Recommended:*

- Wesley Skogan, Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990)
- Dennis P. Rosenbaum, ed., The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promise (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994)
- George L. Kelling and Catherine M. Coles, Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in Our Neighborhoods (New York: Martin Kessler Books, 1996)
- William A. Geller, “As a Blade of Grass Cuts through Stone: Helping Rebuild Urban Neighborhoods through Unconventional Police-Community Partnerships,” Crime & Delinquency 44 (January 1998): 154-177

11-15 24 **Penultimate Draft Due**

Presentations

11-20 25 Presentations

11-22 26 Presentations

11-27 27 Presentations

11-29 28 **Presentation Evaluations Due**

Reporting Research

- Schutt, chapt. 15, pp.489-515. T
- Munger, Analyzing Policy, Chap. 5,12 T

*Recommended:*

- Carol Weiss, “Research for Policy’s Sake: The Enlightenment Function of Social Research,” Policy Analysis 3 (1977): 531-545
- Carol Weiss and Michael Bucuvalas, Social Science Research and Decision-Making (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980)
- Charles Lindblom and Cohen, Usable Knowledge (New Haven: Yale University

Press, 1981)

- Thomas D. Cook, Judith Levinson-Rose, and William E. Pollard, “The Misutilization of Evaluation Research,” pp. 727-748 in H. Freeman and M. Solomon, eds., Evaluation Studies Review Annual, Vol. 6 (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981)
- Robert Rich, ed., The Knowledge Cycle (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981)
- James M. Verdier, “Advising Congressional Decision-Makers: Guidelines for Economists,” Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 3 (1984): 421-438
- Carol Weiss, “Congressional Committee Staffs (do, do not) Use Analysis,” pp. 94-112 in M. Blumer, ed., Social Science Research and Government (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- Carol Weiss and Eleanor Singer, Reporting of Social Science in the National Media (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988)
- Erik Albaek, “Between Knowledge and Power: Utilization of Social Science in Public Policy Making,” Policy Sciences 28 (1995): 79-100

12-4	<b>29</b>	<u>Utilization of Evaluation Research: Illustrations</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sherman and Cohn, “The Impact of Research on Legal Policy: The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment,” <u>Law and Society Review</u> 23 (1989): 117-144</li> <li>• David H. Greenberg and Marvin B. Mandell, “Research Utilization in Policymaking: A Tale of Two Series (of Social Experiments),” <u>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</u> 10 (Fall 1991): 633-656</li> <li>• Bernard Brown, “Head Start: How Research Changed Public Policy,” <u>Young Children</u> 40 (July 1984): 9-13</li> <li>• Poffenberger, Mark. 1997. Rethinking Indonesian Forest Policy: Beyond Timber Barons. <i>Asian Survey</i>. Vol. 37, no.5, (May). pp 453-469.</li> <li>• Trends in Indonesian Forest Policy</li> </ul>	<p>CP</p> <p>CP</p> <p>CP</p> <p>W</p> <p>A</p>
12-6	<b>30</b>	Course Review and Wrap Up	

**Final Paper Due Friday December 15, 10:00 a.m.**

## Criteria for an “A” Paper

(Adapted from Rick Doner and Joanne Brzinski, Emory University, 1999)

*What is written without effort is in general read without pleasure* – Samuel Johnson.

**Topic/Argument:** A strong paper is one that goes beyond describing a phenomenon and poses a puzzle for explanation. Why did the United States play such a major role in the creation of the post-war international trade and monetary systems? What has been the role of the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry in helping declining industries? What have been the consequences of the changes in Japan’s electoral system? In posing a puzzle, it is useful to keep a few things in mind. One is the utility of identifying competing explanations and positioning yourself within the debate. The second is the importance of asking a question where you can find evidence to build an argument. The third is that you will probably not be able to make an airtight case for one side or the other. That is fine. Just be clear as to where your evidence is weak and what kind of information you would need to make a stronger argument.

**Structure:** The introduction 1) identifies the basic question, puzzle, objective of the paper; 2) tells the reader why the topic is important in terms of policy, theory, and/or class themes; 3) briefly presents the paper’s basic argument; 4) lays out how the author intends to proceed (i.e., identifies the paper’s overall structure). A long paper should have clear sections and headings (and maybe subheadings). For both short and long papers, there should be a clear set of points that relate to the puzzle you have identified. Transitions between sections are clear. The conclusion should summarize basic arguments and evidence, relate the paper to the course, and offer something that is new or different relative to the existing literature.

**Evidence:** Your arguments must be backed up by empirical evidence. The paper should acknowledge situations where evidence is not available. You will need to look at both scholarly literature on an issue and empirical information about it. Your evidence must be fully referenced throughout the paper.

**Sources:** You should use at least 10 sources and not rely on class texts. Your sources should be varied. You should use scholarly journal articles and books. Use the various research databases (e.g. ABCPoliSci, ABIInform, Nexis, JSTOR) to find relevant journal articles. Newspapers, magazines, and journals are useful sources of information as well. On-line resources are very useful, but use them primarily to supplement rather than replace more traditional sources. Official sources (e.g., government, international organization web pages, government documents) are appropriate to use. However, there are some instances where student work or personal comments are posted on the web. These sorts of sources should be avoided.

**Bibliography:** Bibliographic and end/foot/internal note citations must be correct and consistent, not only for books and articles, but for web-based evidence as well. The following volumes, available at both the Madison and MSU libraries, can help:

The Chicago Manual of Style: The Essential Guide for Writers, Editors, and Publishers. 14<sup>th</sup> edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Gibaldi, Joseph. 1999. MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: The Modern Library Association of America.

Turabian, Kate. 1996. *Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

For citing materials from the World Wide Web, please refer to

[URL: http://www.ipl.org/ref/QUE/FARQ/netciteFARQ.html](http://www.ipl.org/ref/QUE/FARQ/netciteFARQ.html)

**Grammar/Spelling:** Close to perfect. A few isolated errors are OK, but any patterns of error are not. These might include subject-predicate disagreement; confusing their/there, its/it’s etc.; non-sequiturs; run-on sentences. Paragraphs and sentences should be relatively short. Try to avoid repeating mistakes in later papers that have been identified in earlier ones.

**Relevance to the Course:** Papers should apply appropriately the ideas from the readings and class discussions.