

DPP621
Public Policy and Analysis
Syllabus v.1

Clifford Frasier

Semester II, Academic Year 2024/2025

Time: Tuesday 9.00 – 12.00

Room: 2008/C3

Graduate School of Public Policy
Nazarbayev University

Teacher

Clifford Frasier

Email: clifford.frasier@nu.edu.kz

Office: 4.017

Office Hours: Wednesday 10.00 – 12.00

Email is generally the best way to communicate. For in-depth discussion please use my office hours, or by appointment using Teams or zoom.

This syllabus is available on Moodle, and it may be updated from time to time with notification. Students are responsible for obtaining any materials distributed in or outside of class.

Course Description

This module introduces doctoral students to major theoretical and analytical frameworks for the study of public policy. The module helps students appreciate substantive policy issues as well as theoretical issues across policy areas.

The module takes a research seminar format, where every week the teacher leads the discussion while students critically appraise various theories and frameworks given in the weekly readings. Each student is expected, on a particular week, to summarize scholarly readings in an insightful and critical fashion as well as to contribute a thoughtful question for the seminar's consideration

Course Aims

The goals of this course are to

- equip students with the ability to apply various theoretical frameworks to public policy problems and to policy analysis
- enable students to effectively communicate policy analysis and proposals to various stakeholders.
- facilitate acquisition of skills for policy analysis of practical public policy problems.

Learning Outcomes

As a result of studying this module, the student should

- possess a systematic understanding of public policy;
- be able to develop complex ideas based on a critical analysis of public policy research;
- be able to conceive, design, implement, and adapt a substantial process of research in the fields of public policy and policy analysis.

Assessment

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------|
| Class participation | 20% |
| Discussion: 15% | |
| Presentation of readings: 5% | |
| In-class essay 1 | 20% |
| In-class essay 2 | 20% |
| In-class policy analysis exercise | 20% |
| Policy research proposal outline and presentation | 20% |
| Presentation: 10% | |
| Final outline: 10% | |
| TOTAL | 100% |

Class participation: attendance and absence

PhD students are expected to attend all classes. Students who do not attend classes from the first day may be penalized or administratively withdrawn from the class.

Unexcused absences will be penalized by deducting 5% of the final grade for each unexcused week of absence.

Unexcused absence

An unexcused absence is when students miss classes for reasons not accepted by the School. Arriving late or leaving class early without appropriate documentation/ justification will be counted as an unexcused absence. Some reasons for an unexcused absence include:

- 1) missing bus;
- 2) working at a job;
- 3) sleeping too late;
- 4) going on a business trip.

Excused absence

If unforeseen circumstances prevent attendance, student must notify the module/course instructor in advance.

Some examples for an excused absence are: death of a family member; student's illness or injury.

If a student provides a medical certificate verified by University Health Center (UHC) then absence is counted as excused.

The time limit for submission of documentation for absences (including, but not limited to medical certificates) is 3 (three) working days after the condition preventing student from attending is over.

Medical certificates issued by a clinic other than University Health Center has to be verified by UHC.

In cases other than student's illness, it is the course instructor who makes the decision on granting excused absence after considering *documentation provided by a student*.

Class Participation and weekly assignments

Active class participation is a key to interactive learning. It reflects on our reading of the literature for a specific week. It helps us to formulate our arguments and critically engage with others on theoretical and substantive policy issues. It also includes: class attendance; active listening to other students' comments during the seminar; responding to what other students have said, not only to what the professor has said; timely submission of your presentation slides and oral presentation of the key points; timely preparation of other assignments; preparation and presentation of the policy research proposal outline.

Presentation of reading (5%)

You will be responsible for presenting a succinct review of two *non-textbook* readings for one seminar meeting. This entails drafting two power-point slides for each reading – i.e. four slides total – that (1) identify the principal arguments, debates, or claims; (2) comment on the main empirical approaches; and (3) conclude by offering a relevant discussion question. For the session when you present, you will upload the four slides for the entire class by 5 pm the day before the seminar. Like other out-of-class assignments for this course, you may use AI in a narrow fashion within the constraints articulated below in this syllabus, however you shall NOT ask AI to compose the slides for your presentation. (Turnitin will be activated on this assignment, which also calculates an AI usage score. Slides that are AI-composed will lose half or all assignment points, depending on the discretion of the instructor). In class, you will give a no-more-than 10-minute presentation designed to initiate focused and critical discussion of the several readings. It is essential that you are able to articulate *in your own words* the arguments, debates, claims, and empirical approaches of the articles, because your oral presentation will elaborate on what is presented on the four slides. We will divvy up the weeks and will begin this component on Tuesday January 28.

In-class assignments (20% each – 60% total)

Principle requirements for this course are two essays plus one policy analysis that will be written in-class and are designed to help you construct an integrated understanding of the material. The essays will provide you with an opportunity to critically and systematically analyze course readings and theoretical debates. To help prepare for the essays, every session there will be posted a question for your reflection — the question will ask you to consider a connection between the session's readings and a topic from earlier sessions. The first essay will be written in-class on Tues Feb 4 (Week 4), and the second essay will be written on Tues March 11 (Week 8). Each essay will be written in-class. Respond to one out of two or three possible short questions that cover required readings. Each essay should total no more than 2 pages (double-spaced) in length. The policy analysis will be written in-class on Tues April 8 (Week 11). This analysis will require offering a multi-criteria decision table that compares various policy alternatives against various goals. Preparation guidelines for the policy analysis will be uploaded on Moodle.

Policy research proposal outline (10%) and presentation (10%) – 20% total

In the first few weeks, students will choose and refine a policy research question linked to a stage of the policy process, for instance problem definition (i.e. issue emergence), agenda setting, decision making, or implementation. You will then compose an outline of a research proposal

that explains how you will answer your research question. In this outline, you are not solving any policy problem but explaining why something is/was the way it is/was using descriptive information, theories of the policy process, as well as at least one other major theory or conceptual framework from our course. Guidelines will be uploaded on Moodle. Word limit (max 2000, no minimum limit).

During the last weeks of the course, you will offer an oral presentation of the outline of your research proposal. Your presentation will be limited to eight slides maximum and 10 minutes. While the logic of your presentation is ultimately yours to decide, guideline slides will be posted on Moodle. You may use feedback received in class as input to your final outline, due on Friday 2 May 2025.

Grading Scheme

| Letter | Percentage | GPA | Grade description (where applicable) |
|--------|------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A | 90-100 | 4 | Excellent, student meets the highest standards in completing the course assignments (demonstrates full grasp over the subject matter, engages literature critically, applies in research aptly) |
| A- | 85-89 | 3.67 | Very good, student meets most of the highest standards in completing the course assignments (demonstrates comprehension of the subject matter, knows the literature, applies in research aptly) |
| B+ | 80-84 | 3.33 | Good, student meets the high standards in completing the course assignments (demonstrates good understanding of the subject matter, does not fully know the literature, applies in research with guidance) |
| B | 75-79 | 3 | Fair, student meets most standards in completing the course assignments (demonstrates understanding of the subject matter, lacks knowledge of the literature, problems in applying) |
| B- | 70-74 | 2.67 | Adequate, student shows some reasonable command of the course material (barely meets the expectations, needs to work hard) |
| C+ | 67-69 | 2.33 | Acceptable, student meets basic standards in completing the course assignments |
| C | 64-66 | 2 | Acceptable, student meets some of the basic standards in completing the course assignments |
| C- | 61-63 | 1.67 | Acceptable, while failing short of meeting basic standards in several ways |
| F | 00-49 | 0 | Failing, very poor performance |

Other Seminar Policies:

Expectation to follow Kazakhstan news.

Over the course of the semester, it is expected that you will regularly follow the Kazakhstan news – including the Central Asian context.

Policy on late/missed submission of assignments

- Re the in-class essays and policy analysis, students are permitted to take a make-up only if they have a *prior* arrangement with me (a prior arrangement is defined as at least 24 hours in advance) or supply UHC-verified documentation or Dean's permission excusing their absence due to serious illness or another family problem. Travel, conflict with another activity or job, and other nonmedical reasons are not acceptable excuses for missing the deadlines printed in this syllabus.
- Turning in an assignment beyond the deadline leads to an automatic grade reduction of 10% of the assignment for each calendar day (including the day of lateness and each subsequent day).
- Technical difficulties uploading assignments to Moodle will not excuse late assignments. If Moodle is frozen and will not upload, then please email a copy directly to me with a timestamp before the deadline.

Policy on browsers

This course honors a *no browser policy* during class time. Browsers are only allowed when the internet is required during in-class exercises. If students wish to check readings posted on Moodle, they should download such readings either before class or during the break. There will be no internet browsing during the seminar. To build collective support for this policy, students will be asked to sign a No Browser Policy Agreement at the beginning of the semester. Part of the student's participation grade depends on active listening to the lectures and to other students during the class, so students who violate the *no browser policy* risk forfeiting class participation points at the instructor's discretion.

Academic integrity and plagiarism

The students and faculty at Nazarbayev University are very concerned about academic integrity. Each student should have the assurance that the rules of the game are understood by everyone and enforced equally. Students are expected to adhere to the University's academic integrity policy, which may be found posted at: <https://nu.edu.kz/media/prospective-students/NU-Student-Code-of-Conduct.pdf> Every student is expected to maintain academic integrity and is expected to report violations to me.

The NU Academic Code of Conduct lists academic integrity as one of six important values. According to this Code, we have agreed to 'make every effort to understand what counts as plagiarism and why this is wrong.' To avoid giving the impression that you are passing off other people's work as your own, you will need to acknowledge conscientiously the sources of information, ideas, and arguments used in your assignments. For this purpose, you will use the intext citation style according to the American Psychological Association:

<https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/citations/basic-principles>
<https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/citations/basic-principles/author-date>

Students should review carefully the definitions of: plagiarism, cheating, and falsification of documents. All written work that students submit must abide strictly by the University's academic integrity policy. Plagiarism penalties will follow the below guide:

Homework, paper (Turnitin):

- 20%+ similarity = automatic 20% grade reduction
- 25%+ similarity = automatic 25% reduction
- 30%+ similarity = Instructor's discretion

The best way to avoid the above problem is to adhere to the policy of **never ever copy pasting** anything anywhere in your assignments. All work submitted will be checked by university software to detect AI usage and plagiarism.

AI policy:

In the course, we appropriate a recent analogy comparing the introduction of AI to the introduction of plastics into the industrial economy decades ago, in

Lobe, A. (2025, January 8). AI is the new plastic – how the web suffers from digital waste. *NZZ*. <https://www.nzz.ch/feuilleton/ki-ist-das-neue-plastik-wie-das-web-unter-digitalem-muell-leidet-ld.1864889>).

The introduction of plastic and later AI both increase productivity and the possibility of creating useful products, while simultaneously increasing garbage and increasing the demand for authentic, higher quality work. The uses of AI tools (Grammarly and ChatGPT) in this course is therefore limited. It is improper to use these tools: to generate output and present it as your own work or idea; or to generate an output, paraphrase it and then present it as your own work or idea. Keep in mind that it is wrong to represent yourself as having produced something when you didn't produce it.

1. For this course, the only acceptable AI tools to use are: Grammarly and ChatGPT ('Open AI').
2. Below are the limited but acceptable uses of the above tools:
 - Grammarly: assistance with grammar, spelling, and punctuation.
 - ChatGPT can be used:
 - to find and retrieve information, but not to verify information.
 - as a search engine (similar to Google Scholar) to identify sources for literature review.
 - as a 'research assistant' to locate information. Keep in mind that information retrieved by ChatGPT cannot be considered as "true" and therefore must be verified by other other sources.
 - as an agent to propose ideas for your consideration – ideas such as (a) draft problem statements based on reviews of literature, (b) draft research questions that respond to problem statements, (c) methodological choices for how to analyze data and for how to present findings (keep in mind that ChatGPT cannot

adjudicate between methodological options and cannot adequately explain why the methodology is appropriate to your study).

3. Below are the unacceptable uses of the AI tools:

- To compose your assignments. ChatGPT should not compose the slides of your presentations and should not compose the outline for your research proposal.
- To verify information.

4. Anything generated by AI needs to be followed by an intext citation, as well as a citation in the reference section, as per the APA guidelines articulated in the following link:

<https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt>

5. Out-of-class assignments (slides for the reading summary, slides for the final presentation, the draft proposal outline, and the final proposal outline) must include a slide or a page dedicated to one of the below acknowledgments:

- **“No content generated by AI technologies has been used in this assignment.”**
- **(1) “I acknowledge the use of –** [*specify Grammarly (<https://www.grammarly.com/>) or ChatGPT (<https://chatgpt.com/>)*] **– (2) to** [*specify what the tool was used for, e.g. (a) to generate materials for background research in the drafting of this assignment, (b) to improve the spelling and grammar of the document, (c) to refine the academic tone and accuracy of my work, including grammatical structures, punctuation, and vocabulary, (d) to refine the logic of paragraphs in the following sections or subsections (list the sections), (e) to generate problem statements based on the literature review, which informed the final problem statement drafted by the author for inclusion in the Introduction and Methods sections of the assignment, (f) other usage specified*]. **(3) I entered the following prompts on** [*specify the date, such as 5 April, 2025*] : [*specify exactly the prompt, such as “Write a 50-word summary about the Mabo native title case. Write it in an academic style. Add references and quotations from Eddie Koiki Mabo.”*] **(4) The output from the AI was then** [*specify how it was used, such as (a) included in parts in modified form in the final assignment, (b) further modified to better represent my own tone and style of writing; and in all cases was acknowledged by intext citations/s.*]

6. All students must sign our course AI agreement policy.

European Association for Public Administration Accreditation (EAPAA) standards

This course implements the following EAPAA Ph.D. Student Learning Outcomes:

1. A systematic understanding of Public Policy/Public Administration
3. Ability to conceive, design, implement and adapt a substantial process of research
4. Ability to respect principles of scholarly integrity in research
6. Ability to develop complex new ideas based on a critical analysis of existing knowledge.

Provisions on Students with Disabilities

Nazarbayev University is committed to creating an equitable and inclusive education environment for all students, with and without special learning needs (this includes conditions

that may be physical, cognitive, socio-emotional, and psychological). If you have or suspect a special learning need, please contact the Special Learning Needs Committee (SLNC). This committee exists to provide academic support to students with qualified special learning needs. Please contact the SLNC as early as possible, ideally at the commencement of the semester, to ensure you receive the fullest support available.

If you have approved SLNC accommodations, please share them with your teaching faculty to enable their implementation in the course. Accommodations will only be active once your teaching faculty has received them and cannot be applied retroactively. Email contact: SLNC@nu.edu.kz

Required Textbooks

Weimer, D. L., & Vining, A. R. (2016). *Policy analysis: Concepts and practice*. Routledge. Referred to in the syllabus as “Weimer & Vining”

Course Outline & Readings

Week 1 – January 14. **Introduction and Syllabus Discussion**

Weimer & Vining: Chapters 2 and 3

Week 2 – January 21. **Background concepts and theories: normative theories of public policy**

De Mesquita, E. B. (2016). Normative Frameworks. In *Political economy for public policy*. (pp. 13-46) Princeton University Press.

| |
|----------|
| Exercise |
|----------|

Week 3 – January 28: **Background concepts and theories: rational actor theory and public opinion**

Meltzer, A. H., & Richard, S. F. (1981). A rational theory of the size of government. *Journal of political Economy*, 89(5), 914-927.

Kollman, K. (1998). *Outside lobbying: Public opinion and interest group strategies*. Princeton University Press. *Selections*.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| Begin reading synopsis presentations. |
|---------------------------------------|

| |
|----------|
| Exercise |
|----------|

| |
|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Release of preparation material for in-class Essay 1. |
|-------------------------------------------------------|

Week 4 – February 4. **Background concepts and theories: types of goods and collective action; institutionalism; policy subsystem**

Lowery, D. (2015). Mancur Olson, the Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. In *The Oxford Handbook of Classics in Public Policy and Administration*.

North, D. C. (1990). Chapters 1, 2, 4, 6, & 7. In *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Weible, C. M., Sabatier, P. A., & McQueen, K. (2009). Themes and variations: Taking stock of the advocacy coalition framework. *Policy studies journal*, 37(1), 121-140.

For further reading:

Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political studies*, 44(5), 936-957.

McCool, D. (1998). The subsystem family of concepts: a critique and a proposal. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51(2), 551-570.

Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1991). Agenda dynamics and policy subsystems. *The journal of Politics*, 53(4), 1044-1074.

| |
|-------------------------|
| Essay 1: in-class essay |
|-------------------------|

Week 5 – February 11. Background concepts and theories: Incrementalism and multiple streams theory.

Lindblom, C. E. (1979). Still muddling, not yet through. *Public administration review*, 39(6), 517-526.

Chapters 4 & 9 in: Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. 2nd Ed. New York: Longman.

For further reading:

Lindblom, C. (2018). The science of “muddling through”. In *Classic readings in urban planning* (pp. 31-40). Routledge.

Capano, G. (2009). Understanding policy change as an epistemological and theoretical problem. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 11(1), 7-31.

To review major approaches to understanding the policy process, see: Weimer & Vining, Chapter 11

“An Alternative Perspective,” pp, 900 – 915 in: Cobb, R. W., & Elder, C. D. (1971). The politics of agenda-building: An alternative perspective for modern democratic theory. *The journal of politics*, 33(4), 892-915.

Downs, A. (1972). Up and down with ecology: The issue-attention cycle. *The public*, 28, 38-50.

Stone, D. A. (1989). Causal stories and the formation of policy agendas. *Political science quarterly*, 104(2), 281-300.

Howlett, M. (2018). The criteria for effective policy design: Character and context in policy instrument choice. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 11(3), 245-266.

Weimer, D. L. (1992). Claiming races, broiler contracts, heresthetics, and habits: Ten concepts for policy design. *Policy Sciences*, 25(2), 135-159.

Weimer & Vining, Chapter 12

In P. Love and J. Stockdale-Otarola (Eds.), Debate the Issues: Complexity and policy making. Paris: OECD Insights. Retrieved from:

https://www.oecd.org/naec/complexity_and_policymaking.pdf

“Navigating Wicked Problems” (pp. 28 – 30)

“Out of Complexity a Third Way” (pp. 31-35)

Week 6 – February 18. Background concepts and theories: Elaborating the roles of government.

Milward, H. B., & Provan, K. G. (2000). Governing the hollow state. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 10(2), 359-380.

McCubbins, M. D., Noll, R. G., & Weingast, B. R. (1987). Administrative procedures as instruments of political control. *JL Econ. & Org.*, 3, 243. *Selections*.

For further reading:

On the principal-agent problem, Chapter 2 in: Bertelli, A. M. (2012). *The political economy of public sector governance*. Cambridge University Press.

Weimer & Vining, Chapter 8, section entitled “Agency Loss”

Chapters 1 & 2 in: Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public service*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Week 7 – February 25. Background concepts and theories: Social policy and welfare policies

Lee, Cheol-Sung and In-Hoe Koo. 2016. "The Welfare States and Poverty." in *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Poverty*.

Adema and Whiteford. 2010. "Public and Private Social Welfare" in *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*.

Smeeding, Timothy. 2016. "Poverty Measurement" in *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Poverty*.

For further reading:

Brady, David and Markus Jäntti. 2016. "Economic Performance, Poverty, and Inequality in Rich Countries. " in *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Poverty*

Release of preparation material for in-class Essay 2.

March 4. SPRING BREAK

Week 8 – March 11. Policy Analysis

Weimer & Vining, Chapter 15: skim sections "Problem Analysis" through "Presenting Recommendations"

Morestin, F., National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (2012). A Framework for Analyzing Public Policies: Practical Guide. National Collaborating Center for Public Health, Public Health Agency of Canada.

Bardach & Patashnik, Part I, pp. 33 – 47

McConnell, A. (2010). Policy success, policy failure and grey areas in-between. *Journal of public policy*, 30(3), 345-362.

Case: Kidney Transplant Shortage

For further reading:

Bovens, M., & 't Hart, P. (2016). Revisiting the study of policy failures. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(5), 653-666.

Essay 2: In-class essay

Week 9 – March 18. Policy analysis (continued)

Bertelli, A. M., & Richardson Jr, L. E. (2008). The behavioral impact of drinking and driving laws. *Policy Studies Journal*, 36(4), 545-569.

Lyles, W., Berke, P., & Smith, G. (2014). A comparison of local hazard mitigation plan quality in six states, USA. *Landscape and urban planning*, 122, 89-99.

For further reading:

Case: Appendix A, “Mandatory Minimum Drug Sentences” in: Bardach. 2012. A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis, The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving. Sage CQ Press. Pp. 125 – 139.

Howlett, M., McConnell, A., & Perl, A. (2017). Moving policy theory forward: Connecting multiple stream and advocacy coalition frameworks to policy cycle models of analysis. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 76(1), 65-79.

March 25. Nauryz Holiday

Week 10 – April 1. Structuring policy problems and research questions

Newman, I., & Covrig, D. M. (2013). Building consistency between title, problem statement, purpose, & research questions to improve the quality of research plans and reports.

Baron & Kenny (1986). Mediator – Moderator Distinction

For further reading:

Kerr, N. L. (1998). HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and social psychology review*, 2(3), 196-217.

Release of preparation material for in-class Policy Analysis.

Week 11 – April 8. More policy concepts – diffusion and information models

Shipan, C. R., & Volden, C. (2012). Policy diffusion: Seven lessons for scholars and practitioners. *Public Administration Review*, 72(6), 788-796.

Betz & Neff. (2017). Social Policy Diffusion in South Asia.

Workman, S., Jones, B. D., & Jochim, A. E. (2009). Information processing and policy dynamics. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1), 75-92.

For further reading:

Lohmann, S. (1994). The dynamics of informational cascades: The Monday demonstrations in Leipzig, East Germany, 1989–91. *World politics*, 47(1), 42-101.

Policy Analysis essay – in-class Policy Analysis

Week 12 – April 15. Public policy, globalization, and global governance

Keohane, R. O. (2012). Twenty years of institutional liberalism. *International relations*, 26(2), 125-138.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1995). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*, 19(3), 5-49.

For further reading:

Prakash, A., & Potoski, M. (2016). Dysfunctional institutions? Toward a new agenda in governance studies. *Regulation & Governance*, 10(2), 115-125.

Week 13 – April 22. Comparative public policy

Knill, C. (2005). Introduction: Cross-national policy convergence: concepts, approaches and explanatory factors. *Journal of European public policy*, 12(5), 764-774.

Knack, Stephen and Philip Keefer. 1995. "Institutions and Economic Performance: Cross-Country Tests Using Alternative Institutional Measures," *Economics and Politics* 7 (3): 207-27.

Cronert, A. (2018). Accommodation or extraction? Employers, the state, and the joint production of active labor market policy. *Politics & Society*, 46(4), 539-569.

Begin presentations

Week 14 – April 29. Presentations.

| |
|---------------|
| Presentations |
|---------------|

Final policy proposal paper outline due on Friday 2 May 2025