

POLICY CURRENTS

The University of New Mexico
Institute for Public Policy

NEWSLETTER OF THE PUBLIC POLICY SECTION
AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Designing Public Policy Programs

by Hank C. Jenkins-Smith

In an issue of *Policy Currents* primarily devoted to the upcoming APSA meetings, it seems appropriate to ask: What constitutes a good public policy program? Indeed, many of our colleagues still wonder what constitutes public policy as a field. If we cannot answer the latter question, we certainly can't answer the former.

My own informal query of a number of public policy scholars results in a range of quite distinct notions of the content of the policy field. At the risk of over-simplifying their answers, the following approaches appear to predominate:

- Public policy is the empirical study of theories of the process of policy formulation.
- Public policy is the study of the primary institutions in which policy formulation takes place, including (but not limited to) legislatures, executives and executive agencies, and electoral processes.
- Public policy is the normative and empirical study of how policies are and should be formulated, with an emphasis on the building of theories of democracy with the study of policy outcomes.
- Public policy is the study of substantive policy issue areas, such as those concerning social policies, the environment, or national security. This view emphasizes the need to integrate substantive policy knowledge with knowledge of the policy process.

- Public policy is the study of analytical methods - such as benefit/cost analysis or decision analysis techniques - that are tools to assist in the formulation of public policy.

Of course, other approaches are used, and any policy program will be a mix of some or all of these approaches. But programs vary greatly in emphasis, as reflected by specific course requirements.

The Public Policy Section Panels developed for the 1998 APSA meetings reflect all of these approaches. Furthermore, the short course on *Teaching Public Policy*, offered by the APSA Public Policy Section (see inside back cover), will focus on the very different kinds of courses that fill our public policy programs. We hope that these panels and the short course will stimulate thinking about how to design appropriate programs for teaching public policy.

To that end, *Policy Currents* invites articles and commentary on the appropriate design of public policy programs. We are particularly interested in short articles that focus on the thematic development of policy curricula and programs; examples of existing policy program designs; and contrasting views about the appropriate content and objectives of public policy programs. All submissions will be considered for publication in future issues of *Policy Currents*.

See Inside Back Cover for Registration Information for the Public Policy Section's Short Course on Teaching Public Policy.

The 1998 APSA Public Policy Program: An Annotated Version

In an effort to provide more useful advanced information about-and thereby encourage attendance at-the 1998 Public Policy Panels, the panel chairs were asked to provide brief overviews of the themes and content of their panels. These are included in this annotated listing of the 1998 APSA Public Policy Program.

Panel 25-1: LEARNING AND BELIEF CHANGE AMONG POLICY ELITES.

Friday, September 4 at 3:30pm

Chair: Paul Sabatier
University of California, Davis
Department of Environmental Science and Policy

Most studies of belief change and learning by political scientists have focused on the use of simple heuristics by the general public. Policy elites, on the other hand, have much more integrated and salient policy belief systems, and their learning processes may be quite different. Unfortunately, studies of elite beliefs have been addressed by three subdisciplines with very little cross-fertilization: international relations (Holsti, Haas, Keohane, Clark), public policy (Kingdon, Hall, Sabatier, Jenkins-Smith and May), and comparative politics (Putnam, Aberbach and Rockman). This panel seeks to encourage a dialogue among (junior and senior) scholars in IR and public policy concerning theoretical frameworks, methods and methods for examining belief change and the role that learning-versus other factors-plays in that process.

Papers:

Social Learning in the Management of Global Environmental Risks.

William Clark
Harvard University
Kennedy School of Government

Distinguishing Learning from Other Sources of Policy Change: The Case of Forestry in the Pacific Northwest.

George Hoberg
University of British Columbia

Cross-Societal Learning in Global Environmental Risk Management.

Miranda Schreurs
University of Maryland
Department of Government and Politics

Tactical Choice and Learning as an Evolu-

tionary Process.

Matthew Zafonte
University of California, Davis
Department of Environmental Science & Policy

and Stuart Hill
University of California, Davis

Discussant:

Peter May
University of Washington

Panel 25-2: THE POLITICS OF GAY RIGHTS.

Thursday, September 3 at 8:45am

Chair: Elaine Sharp
University of Kansas

This panel explores the political implications of sexual orientation in contemporary American politics. More particularly, the papers examine a number of important and often controversial political and policy issues including same-sex marriage, the protection of gay rights, gays in the military, and the distribution of AIDS health care services.

Papers:

The Determinants of Gay Rights Protection in American Communities.

James W. Button, Kenneth D. Wald and
Barbara A. Rienzo
University of Florida

Shopping for Favorable Venues in the States: Lessons from Same-Sex Marriage Legislation.

Donald P. Haider-Markel
University of Kansas

and Ronald La Due Lake

Perspectives on Evolving Policies on Integration of Lesbians and Gay Men into the United States Armed Forces: Future Directions and Potential Implications in our Post-Cold War Military.

Nicholas Nader
American University

HIV+ : Community Inequalities in AIDS Health Care Services.
Stella Theodoulou
California State University, Northridge

and Shelia M. Onnen
University of California, Santa Barbara

Discussant:

Elaine Sharp
University of Kansas

Panel 25-3: A ROUNDTABLE ON BALLOT MEASURES AND LOCAL ORDINANCES: THE GAY AND LESBIAN COMMUNITY VERSUS THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT.

Sunday, September 6 at 10:45am

Chair: Ellen Riggle
University of Kentucky

The political battle between the gay and lesbian community and the religious right has raged during the 1990s with heated conflicts at the state and local levels over the rights of gays and lesbians. The most widely publicized of these conflicts have centered around ballot measures aimed at denying, or more recently in Washington and Maine enacting, anti-discrimination protections on the basis of sexual orientation. There are also hundreds of local governments who have debated such ordinances at their level. This panel will include a screening of a documentary made about one such battle and a discussion of research related to similar public policy conflicts. The discussion will also focus on likely future actions and strategies by both sides in this on-going political struggle.

Presenters:

Marieka Klawitter
University of Washington
Graduate School of Public Affairs

Brian Hammer
University of Washington
Department of Geography

Jean Schroedel
Claremont Graduate University
Center for Politics and Economics

Steven K. Wisensale
University of Connecticut

Panel 25-4: A ROUNDTABLE ON THE TOOLS OF GOVERNMENT: REVISITING TAXONOMIES, TRENDS, AND THEORIES.

Friday, September 4 at 8:45am

Chair: Michael Dukakis
Northeastern University

Important work in the 1980s documents the growing federal reliance on a variety of third parties to implement the expanded domestic policy agenda through such tools as grants, loans, tax expenditures, and regulations. Members of this roundtable, among others, took the lead in developing taxonomies and broad overviews of the tools of government and discussing their implications for federal goals and public management. Since this work was done, significant public debate on devolution, unfunded mandates and privatization has ensued focusing on the generic governance issues presented by third party government, as well as specific tools such as block grants and inter-governmental regulations. This debate has escalated the stakes as well as increased the need for timely research and reflection on the policy consequences of the design and management of these tools. This roundtable will examine the research and offer reflections.

Presenters:

Lester Salamon
Johns Hopkins University

B. Guy Peters
University of Pittsburgh

Paul Posner
U.S. General Accounting Office

B. Dan Wood
Texas A&M University

Panel 25-5: A ROUNDTABLE ON THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION REFORM.

Co-sponsored by Urban Politics. Public Policy is the primary sponsor.

Friday, September 4th at 10:45am

Chair: Abigail Thernstrom
Manhattan Institute

Schools are centers of community life, and they are also institutions that shape, in important respects, the community norms that young students will carry into their adult lives. No wonder there are great school wars: ongoing conflicts over who controls the mes-

sages that educators deliver, what they will be, and who will be forced to listen. Fundamental issues lurk behind conflicts involving vouchers, charter schools, the content of curricular materials, standardized tests, professional development, and the like. This panel is ideally suited to explore community and the politics of educational reform. The participants are at once reformers and nationally-known players in the political conflicts that efforts at change engender.

Presenters:

E. D. Hirsch
University of Virginia
University Professor of Education and
Humanities

Chester E. Finn, Jr.
Hudson Institute

Terry Moe
Stanford University
Hoover Institution

Eugene W. Hickok
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Roberta Schaefer
Worcester Municipal Research Bureau

**Panel 25-6: A ROUNDTABLE ON URBAN
EDUCATION RESEARCH: THE NEXT
GENERATION.**

*Co-sponsored by Urban Politics. Public Policy is the
co-sponsor.*

Saturday, September 5th at 3:30pm

**Panel 25-7: THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE POLICY
PARTNERSHIP.**

Thursday, September 3rd at 10:45am

Chair: Pauline Vaillancourt Rosenau
University of Texas-Houston

The papers on this panel assess i) the division of labor between government and the private sector across policy spheres and ii) efforts at collaboration between government and the private sector on particular policy projects. Participants explore the relationship between the public sector and the private with a goal of clarifying the advantages and disadvantages of public/private policy partnerships, and of specifying the conditions in which such partnerships work best and when they might be expected to fail. Most panelists will focus on an evaluation of past policy experience combined with

qualitative and quantitative evidence. We seek to indicate the policy arenas where government does the best job and identify those where the private sector has demonstrated superior results. At this critical historical juncture, where old understandings are being called into question and new relationships are being forged between the public and the private sectors, we aim for broad-based conclusions with concrete relevance that could have an impact for understanding and formulating policy in the future. At the same time it may well be that no single "best formula" is applicable to all policy fields, that there are policy arenas where government does a relatively better job than the private sector, and vice versa. Specific recommendations may range from a proposed form of balance to a conclusion that any collaboration at all is inappropriate in specific policy sectors.

Each author is already well known in his or her research specialty and each brings substantial experience to this endeavor. Most authors will, therefore, be reporting not only on their own research contribution but on the recognizable trends in their specific subfield.

Papers:

*Deconstructing the Public/Private Policy
Partnership.*

Stephen Linder
University of Texas-Houston

*Social Capital and Coproduction of Public
Order in the Criminal Justice Field.*

Nicholas Lovrich
Washington State University

*Private Policy in the Public Sphere: The
Case of Private Prisons.*

Anne Schneider
Arizona State University
College of Public Programs

*The Public/Private Partnership and Health
Care: What Can Be Learned from Medicaid.*

Michael Sparer
Columbia University
School of Public Health

Discussants:

Sheldon Kamieniecki,
University of Southern California

Robert Paehlke
Trent University
Political Studies

and Helen Ingram
University of California, Irvine
Department of Politics and Society

Panel 25-8: THE STATES AS POLICY LABORATORIES.

Co-sponsored with State Politics. Public Policy is the primary sponsor.
Saturday, September 5th at 10:45am

Chair: Scott P. Hays
Southern Illinois University

As greater responsibility for governing is devolved to the American states, there is a corresponding need to better understand how state policies are made, implemented, and impact on state residents. This panel examines the state policy process from a number of policy vantages – handgun regulation, abortion policy, and economic development. Besides informing us as to how the policy process proceeds in the American states, the papers should broaden our understanding of regulation, federalism, innovation, and interest group theory.

Papers:

The Civic Community, Interest Groups, and Economic Development in the States.

Edward T. Jennings, Jr.
University of Kentucky
Martin School of Public Policy and Admin.

and Meg Patrick Haist
University of Kentucky
Martin School of Public Policy and Admin.

Explaining Abortion Clinic Violence in the United States on a State by State Basis.
Dragan Stefanovic
Appalachian State University
Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice

and Ruth Ann Strickland
Appalachian State University
Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice

Handgun Safety and the Making of Controversial Public Policy: An Examination of Policy Formulation.
Emily Van Dunk
Public Policy Forum

Untangling the Role of the National Government in State International Economic Policy.
Renee J. Johnson
University of Florida

Policy Reinvention and Morality Policy: the Case of the Death Penalty.
Christopher Z. Mooney
West Virginia University

and Mei-Hsien Lee
National Chi Nan University

Discussants:

Scott P. Hays
Southern Illinois University

and Thomas R. Dye
Florida State University

Panels 25-9: NEW SCHOOLS, NEW COMMUNITIES, NEW QUESTIONS: ANALYZING THE CHARTER SCHOOLS MOVEMENT IN THE STATES.

Co-sponsored with State Politics. Public Policy is the co-sponsor.
Saturday, September 5th at 8:45am

Panels 25-10: LOOKING AT THE POLICY PROCESS FROM BOTH ENDS

Friday, September 4 at 10:45am

Chair: Hank C. Jenkins-Smith
University of New Mexico
Institute for Public Policy

The scholarly debate over “bottom-up” versus “top-down” perspectives on the public policy process has not died. Rather, it has morphed into new and interesting forms, well represented by the papers on this panel. Included are the distinctive theoretical problems posed by policy processes involving intergovernmental and international interactions, on the one hand, and by nongovernmental, private, and nonprofit organizations, on the other hand. These papers will stimulate lively debate, and provide an overview of new developments in theories of the public policy process. Paul Sabatier is rumored to have promised to do a soft-shoe shuffle at the close of the session.

Papers:

Getting in on the Game: The Implementation of Title IX in College Athletics.
Shannon Jenkins
Loyola University Chicago

Problems and Prospects of Intergovernmental Management and Policy Development in the United States, Australia, and Japan: The Case of Disaster Relief.

Saundra K. Schneider
University of South Carolina
Department of Government and International Studies

The Politics of Air Bag Safety: A Competition among Problem Definitions.

David J. Houston
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

and Lilliard E. Richardson Jr
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Policy Problems, Design, and Implementation.

James P. Lester
Colorado State University

and Malcolm L. Goggin
Michigan State University

Business Crisis and Resistance to Policy Change: Organizational Factors.

Thomas A. Birkland
SUNY, Albany
Graduate School of Public Affairs

and Radhika Nath
SUNY, Albany
Graduate School of Public Affairs

Discussant:

Donald Haider-Markel
University of Kansas

Panel 25-11: POLICYMAKING: POLITICS AND ARENAS

Sunday, September 6 at 8:45am

Chair: Gary Mucciaroni
Temple University

The papers on this panel seek to explain congressional policy making in a variety of substantive policy arenas including child health care, telecommunications, and taxes. In doing that, the authors consider theoretical alternatives to the pluralist-incremental model of decision making that has dominated much of the discussion of policy making in America. Policies and changes in public policy are seen not so much as the result of the tugging and pulling of various groups but

as the product of other processes, including political learning and symbolic politics.

Papers:

Politics of Child Care Legislation: 1970-1998.

Sally S. Cohen
Yale University
School of Nursing

The Politics of Taxation: Who Pays What, When, How.

Sheldon D. Pollack
University of Delaware
College of Business and Economics

The Politics of 'Bad' Ideas: From the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.

David R. Beam
Illinois Institute of Technology

Social Learning and US Telecommunications Policy: From Monopoly to Competition 1934- 1990.

Michael Zarkin
University of Florida

Discussants:

Gary Mucciaroni,
Temple University

and Christopher McGrory Klyza
Middlebury College

Panel 25-12: REGULATORY POLICY IN AN ERA OF DEREGULATION

Saturday, September 5th at 3:30pm

Chair: Robert J. Duffy
Rider University

As the twentieth century draws to a close, regulatory programs and agencies are being challenged as never before. In calling for a reduction of government intervention in the private sector and for a devolution of authority to the states, advocates of deregulation are seeking to reverse almost five decades of regulatory growth. Our panel will assess regulatory policy, and regulatory change, in this new era. Papers will examine regulatory decision-making at both the federal and state level, and in a variety of policy areas: nuclear power, workplace safety, wilderness policy, and insurance.

Papers:

Regulatory Meltdown: Nuclear Enforcement in the Field.
Andy Whitford
Rice University

Kicking and Screaming: Policy Change in An Unlikely State Regulatory Body.
Carol S. Weissert
Michigan State University

and Susan Silberman
Michigan State University

The Political Economy of Regulation: A Move Away from Groups.
Brian J. Glenn
Brown University

Information, Targeting, and Enforcement: Exploring the Dynamics of Information on Decision-Making in a Regulatory Bureaucracy.
Gregory Huber
Princeton University

Analyzing Change in Wilderness Preservation Policies: Bureaucratic Politics or Venue Hopping?
Charles Davis
Colorado State University

Discussant:

Albert R. Matheny
University of Florida

Panel 25-13: THE FACE OF WELFARE

Thursday, September 3rd at 10:45am

Chair: Beryl A. Radin
SUNY-Albany

Few domestic policy issues have received as much attention in the general press as the 1996 enactment of welfare reform. But “ending welfare as we know it” struck more than a rhetorical chord. Analysts have found that the changes in welfare, particularly through the implementation of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, have exposed many other issues and impacts. The papers included in this panel examine several aspects of these shifts, including questions of residence, long term care, race as well as patterns of utilization of benefits.

Papers:

Proximity and Opportunity: How Residence, Race, and Community Resources Affect Welfare Reform.
Scott W. Allard
University of Michigan
Poverty Research and Training Center

and Sheldon Danziger
University of Michigan
Poverty Research and Training Center

Race, Poverty and Access to Long Term Care: City and Suburban Communities.
Susan C. Reed
De Paul University
School for New Learning

Steven Andes
De Paul University
School for New Learning

and Ruth Ann Tobias
De Paul University
School for New Learning

Welfare Attitudes and Patterns of Use: Evidence from the National Survey of America's Families.
Kevin H. Wang
The Urban Institute

Changing Patterns of Citizen Reliance on Public Program Benefits.
Bruce Jacobs
University of Rochester

Discussant:

David A. Rochefort
Northeastern University

Panel 25-14: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Thursday, September 3rd at 1:30pm

Chair: Jacqueline Vaughn Switzer
Northern Arizona University

Once considered a “niche” in the field of Environmental Policy, over the last ten years this area of inquiry has expanded significantly to include a broader range of researchers, regional studies, and state and local government initiatives. Once narrowly focused on the issues of hazardous waste siting and toxic pollutants, environmental justice research has moved on to the study of the decision making process, policy equity

and the roles of stock holders within and outside minority communities. This panel introduces those topics through a comprehensive update and presentations by experienced policy analysts.

Papers:

Efficiency Versus Equity in Environmental Protection: Trading SO₂ Emissions Under the 1990 Clean Air Act.

Evan J. Ringquist
Florida State University

Pollution in Minority Communities: Issue Definition, Agenda-Setting, and Policy-Making in the National Media.

Robert R. Higgins
Rutgers University

The Power of Information: Environmental Justice, Community Exposure, and the Efficacy of State Information Regulation Policy.

Marc D. Shapiro
University of Rochester

Mad About You: Community Activism and the Closing of Hazardous Waste Management Facilities.

Mark Atlas
Carnegie Mellon University

Discussant:

Alka Sapat
Florida Atlantic University

Panel 25-15: DELIVERING THE GOODS IN COMMUNITIES

Saturday, September 5th at 10:45am

Chair: Alan J. Abramson
The Aspen Institute

Devolution assumes, at the very least, a certain degree of confidence in local governments. The on-rushing train of devolution has overlooked one notable fact: on average, local governments are the least powerful units of government in U.S. federal system. How can they respond to the challenges being laid at their door?

Papers:

Policy Provision in American Communities: The Role of Nonprofit Organizations in Good Times and Bad.

Kenneth Bickers
Indiana University

Institutional Reform, Citizen Involvement, and Social Capital: The Effects of Coproduction on Inner-City Schools and Communities.

Melissa Marschall
University of South Carolina
Department of Government and International Studies

Church Based Organizations and Urban Revitalization.

Fran Scott
Wayne State University

An Assessment of the Latest Trend in Healthcare Reform: Community Impact Studies and Collaborative Networks.

Joan L. Exline
University of Southern Mississippi
Center for Community Health

Discussant:

Lyke Thompson
Wayne State University

Panel 25-16: COURTS AND POLICY PROCESS

Sunday, September 6th at 8:45am

Chair: Paul Kramer
Moorhead State University

This panel will present four papers loosely organized around the theme of how courts of various types and in various countries impact the public policy process. Two of the papers will focus on U.S. courts and two will focus on the courts of Switzerland and Canada respectively. Jeremy Lewis of Huntingdon College will present a paper on the U.S. Supreme Court's Role in Access Policy discussing recent decisions and trends in administrative law. Albert Methany of the University of Florida will review recent Supreme Court decisions in the environmental law arena in the era of divided government in the United States. Christopher Manfredi and Antonia Maioni of McGill University, Montreal, will present on the subject of courts and health policy in Canada. Christine Rothmayr of the University of Zurich, Switzerland will discuss interest groups and their interaction with the Supreme Court of Switzerland in developing reactions to policy feedback at both the state and federal level. The discussant for the panel is Gary Coglianese of Harvard University. The panel should provide some interesting cross cultural insights into the role of courts in the policy process across a variety of substantive contexts and institutional arrangements in the output/feedback stage of the policy process.

Papers:

The Supreme Court's Role in Access Policy.
Jeremy R. T. Lewis
Huntingdon College
History and Political Science Department

Courts and Health Policy: Judicial Decision Making and Publicly Funded Health Care.
Christopher P. Manfredi
McGill University

and Antonia Maioni
McGill University

Interest Groups, Courts and Public Policy in Switzerland: Supreme Court Decisions and their Impact on the Reformulation of Policies on the State and Federal Level.
Christine Rothmayr
University of Zurich, Switzerland

The Same, Only Different: The Supreme Court, Divided Government, and Precedent in Environmental Law.
Albert R. Matheny
University of Florida

Discussant:

Cary Coglianese
Harvard University

Panel 25-17: PUBLIC OPINION AND PUBLIC POLICY.

Saturday, September 5th at 8:45am

Chair: C. Blease Graham, Jr.
University of South Carolina
College of Criminal Justice

In a given policy area, what kind of an impact does public opinion have? In what ways does public opinion influence the formulation, adoption, and implementation of public policy? How strong are the linkages between citizen preference and government action? The papers on this panel use empirical data to provide answers to these questions. Three particularly compelling substantive policies are examined: environmental protection, health care, and social welfare. The authors employ a range of methodologies and a mix of data bases to challenge some of the standard assumptions of impact and linkage.

Papers:

Implications of Public Opinion for Environmental Policy: Risk Perceptions, Policy Preferences, and Management Options for Climate Change.
Robert E. O'Connor
Pennsylvania State University

Wanting it all: Citizens, Trade-Offs, and the Failure of Health Care Reform.
James Kuklinski, Paul Quirk, Jennifer Jerit and Robert Rich
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Public Opinion and Social Welfare Policy: A Comparison of the Role of Structural Determinants of Attitudes toward Social Inequality in Sweden and the United States.
Pamela D. Alesky
Syracuse University

Symbolic Racism, Self-Interest and Health Care Reform: A Study of Public Opinion.
Madelaine Pfahler
University of Michigan
Center for Political Studies

Discussants:

Gregory Hager
University of Kentucky

and Jeffrey Talbot
University of Kentucky

Panel 25-18: THE IMPACT OF WELFARE REFORM

Saturday, September 5th at 8:45am

Chair: Marie Gottschalk
University of Pennsylvania

The controversial welfare reform act of 1996 sought, among other things, to devolve responsibility for public assistance to the states. The panelists assess the impact of this landmark legislation at the state and local level in a variety of settings, ranging from a single-county study in northern Virginia to state-level experiments in Wisconsin, Oregon, and Arizona to a macro-level, 50-state comparison.

The papers focus on several key questions, including: What specifically are states doing with their newfound authority in the area of public assistance? How much flexibility do states have to tailor their welfare reform programs? What variation has there been between states

in the implementation of this legislation and why? Do states have the resource capacity to meet the new state and federal goals for welfare reform and public assistance? What effect have state-level reform efforts had on the quality of life of welfare recipients? And finally, what contribution does this new evidence from the states make to the wider public policy debate about devolution and the alleviation of poverty in the United States?

Papers:

Devolution, Year One: How is Decentralization Changing Welfare in America?

Charles Noble
California State University, Long Beach

Impact of Virginia Welfare Reform Policies on Former Beneficiaries of AFDC/TANF.

Carole Kuhns
Virginia Tech

and Danielle Hollar
Virginia Tech

Implementing Welfare Reform in Two States: An Analysis of State Flexibility and Resource Capacity.

Mary Ann E. Steger
Northern Arizona University

Statecraft: Welfare Reform in Wisconsin.

Lawrence M. Mead
New York University

Discussant:

Edward Lascher
California State University, Sacramento
Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration

Panel 25-19: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.

Friday, September 4th at 8:45am

Chair: Robert Bartlett
Purdue University

Over the past two decades officials in the United States and elsewhere have sought market- and community-based alternatives to traditional command-and-control regulation of the environment. While the particulars vary, those alternatives attempt to shift the emphasis from coercion and confrontation to incentives and cooperation. Drawing upon the experiences of both the United States and Denmark, the papers on this panel look at the adoption, implementation, and

impact of alternative approaches to environmental regulation including emissions trading, devolution, and community-based environmental protection.

Papers:

Sticks, Carrots or Cymbals? The Role of Institutions, Interests, and Shadow Communities in the Adoption and Diffusion of State Environmental Policy Innovations.

Alka Sapat
Florida Atlantic University

The Challenge to New Governance in the Twenty-First Century: Achieving Effective Central-Local Relations.

Gary Bryner
Brigham Young University

The Influence of Nongovernmental Actors on the Sulfur Dioxide Allowance Market.

Christopher Jan Carman
University of Houston

Cooperation, Transaction Costs, and Community-Based Environmental Protection.

Mark Lubell, Mihriye Mete, Mark Schneider and John T. Scholz
SUNY at Stony Brook

Regulatory Styles and Policy Implementation: Examining Enforcement of Danish Agro-Environmental Policy.

Peter J. May
University of Washington

and Soeren Winter
Aarhus University

Discussants:

Robert Bartlett
Purdue University

and Craig Thomas
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Panel 25-20: POLICY ANALYSIS: OLD AND NEW.

Saturday, September 5th at 1:30pm

Chair: John Hinder
Texas Tech University

This panel reflects the state of contemporary policy analysis. Frederick Wirt employs longitudinal analysis with multiple cohort groups to study the indi-

vidual and institutional consequences of the GI Bill. Keith Mueller demonstrates how Medicare policy data gathered and analyzed for various purposes influenced the development of the legislation. Andrew Rich explores the determinants and impacts of think tanks in American society using both survey data and secondary organizational measures. Gormley and Weimer present comparative case studies that examine "Schattschneider mobilization" in both education and health policies.

Papers:

Long-Range Consequences from Higher Education for Veterans and Non-Veterans: The GI Bill a Half-Century Later.
Frederick M. Wirt
University of Illinois- Urbana

The Proliferation of Think Tanks and the Devaluation of Expertise in Contemporary American Politics.
Andrew Rich
Yale University

Importance of Payment by County in New Medicare Policies.
Keith J. Mueller
University of Nebraska Medical Center
Department of Preventive and Societal Medicine

The Politics of Organizational Report Cards.
William T. Gormley, Jr.
Georgetown University
Public Policy Institute

David L. Weimer
University of Rochester
Public Policy Analysis Program

Discussant:

Mack C. Shelley II
Iowa State University

Panel 25-21: CONNECTING CITIZENS TO GOVERNMENT

Saturday, September 5th at 1:30pm

Chair: Martin Gruberg
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh

In a sense, what links the papers on this panel is their focus on the connection between citizens and government. What separates them is the specific vehicle used to examine that connection. For example, one paper looks at what might be called igood

government organizations in two metropolitan areas and another focuses on black churches and sacred nonprofits in New York. In both cases, the fundamental issue is the influence these organizations have on public policy. Two other papers take more of an administrative or management view of the citizen-government connection. One examines the governing boards of community health centers, the other addresses the performance of ombudsmen. Again, the key issue is the effect of these citizen-empowering structures on public policy.

Papers:

Citizen Leagues and Metropolitan Policy Making: The Kansas City and St. Louis Cases.
E. Terrence Jones
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Redeveloping the Hood: Black Churches, Sacred Nonprofits, and Public Policy
Michael Leo Owens
State University of New York at Albany

Dispute Resolution and Bureaucratic Reform: The Hawaii Ombudsman.
Larry B. Hill
University of Oklahoma

Community Governance of Health Centers in the 1990s: Rhetoric and Reality.
Anne Dievler
Johns Hopkins University
School of Hygiene and Public Health

Discussants:

Matthew J. Lindstrom
Siena College

and Ester Fuchs
Barnard College

Panel 25-22: COMMUNITIES AND POLICY CHOICES

Saturday, September 5th at 3:30pm

Chair: Ramona Burton
University of South Carolina
Dept. of Government and International Studies

It is at the local level that government is closest to the people. Thus one might expect to find democracy in its fullest bloom in America's communities. But, do the policy choices made by local communities reflect public sentiment? The papers on this panel explore four controversial policy choices: community policing,

minority set-asides, gated communities, and strip club regulation. Each of the choices puts government in a difficult position on issues of fairness and equity. The underlying theme is that “community” is not all sweetness and light.

Papers:

*The ‘Community’ in ‘Community Policing’:
The Role of Neighborhood and City Contexts
in Program Implementation.*

Heather C. Hill
University of Michigan

Gated Communities: A New Kind of Community.

Steven Puro
Saint Louis University

*Regulating Strip Clubs: An Empirical Study
of the Legislation of Morality.*

Dana J. Patton
University of Kentucky

*Set-Aside Policies: Sources of Support in
Two Florida Cities.*

Russell Benjamin
Northeastern Illinois University

Discussant:

Michelle Hoyman
University of Missouri, St. Louis

Panel 25-23: NEW EVIDENCE ON THE EFFECTS OF SCHOOL CHOICE

Friday, September 4th at 1:30pm

Chair: James Q. Wilson
UCLA

School choice is a reform gaining greater attention from scholars and officials concerned about the condition of education, particularly in central cities. Currently, two publicly funded choice experiments are underway in Milwaukee and Cleveland and privately funded programs are starting in New York and several other cities. The papers on this panel present the latest evidence from the experiments in Milwaukee, Cleveland, and New York. The papers examine the effects of school choice on academic achievement, parental satisfaction, racial integration, and political tolerance.

Papers:

*The New York Voucher Program after Its
First Year.*

David Myers
Mathmatica Policy Research

and Paul E. Peterson
Harvard University
Department of Government

The Effects of School Choice in Cleveland.

William Howell
Stanford University

*Integration and Values in Public and Private
Schools.*

Jay P. Green
University of Texas at Austin

*The Multiple Imputation of Missing Data in
the Milwaukee Choice Experiment.*

Donald Rubin
Harvard University
Department of Statistics

Discussant:

Jeffrey Henig
George Washington University

Business Meeting:

Friday, September 4th at 5:30pm

Reception*:

Friday, September 4th at 10:00pm

*Note: The 6:30pm time listed in *PS* and at the APSA website is incorrect.

Please attend the panels listed. The section’s allocation of panels is based on attendance, and more panels means more chances for participation!

A Response to Paul Sabatier's "The Status and Development of Policy Theory: A Reply to Hill"
by Frederick C. Thayer, *Southern University*

Let's Not Overlook Deeper Questions: A Suggestion

Paul Sabatier (1997, 1-10) praises some developments in the "theory of policy studies," criticizes others. Long discussions of "rules of theory-building," "theories," "frameworks" and "models," however, hide big **policy issues** that contemporary theories cannot solve. Sabatier and others use theories that blind them to the Garrett Hardins of the world, and even seem unfamiliar with the microeconomic approaches they believe they support.

Ostrom and Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD)

In Sabatier's view, Elinor Ostrom's research program applies her IAD (a combined "framework" and "theory") to "the management of common pool resources." It is "one of the most important theoretical developments in political science over the last 10-15 years," "has attracted a half-million dollars in funding annually from NSF [National Science Foundation] and other agencies" and "will probably gain her election to the National Academy of Sciences" (Sabatier, 1997: 4). According to Sabatier (1997), Ostrom (1990) reacted this way to Hardin's "tragedy of the commons" (1968):

[Hardin] implicitly assumed a given set of institutional rules-particularly, that local herders could not communicate with each other and *themselves* reach a set of agreements to regulate access to the common pool resource-and thus that intervention by external agents was necessary to regulate and enforce access restrictions.

Hardin's target was not herders and their cattle, but **human** "overpopulation" in a world of finite resources. "The population problem" was the hard-to-miss subtitle of the article. Hardin borrowed from an 1833 pamphlet by William Forster Lloyd about an endlessly increasing number of herders bringing their cattle to graze in an open pasture of fixed size ("commons") (1968, 1244). Individually or collectively, the herders have no property rights and no legal authority to exclude other herders. The pasture is destroyed when the cattle eat the grass faster than it can regrow. Hardin was implicitly describing any free market and, most especially, how a free market in child production must work. Hardin attacked Adam Smith, the "invisible hand," and the "dominant tendency . . . to assume that decisions reached individually will, in fact, be the best decisions for an entire society" (1968, 1244). He attacked the United Nations for declaring that "any . . . decision with regard to the size of the family must irrevocably rest with the family itself, and cannot be made

by anyone else" (1968, 1246). He devoted an entire section to "Mutual Coercion Mutually Agreed Upon" (1968, 1247), doubtless on a global scale, as a concept for managing the "commons." "Freedom to breed," he asserted, "bring[s] ruin to all" (1968, 1248). He noted that as with nuclear arms races, the natural sciences cannot solve a problem of overpopulation in ways compatible with free markets, individualism and the family unit as population manager (1968, 1243). Can the National Science Foundation do the job?

The traditional operation of free markets, and anti-trust laws based upon that tradition, assume that individuals are "free" to "exploit" and "develop" whatever natural resources they can find. Gold rushes and oil wells are memorable parts of history. For centuries, international law was based upon the notion that the seas were available to all, and that it was impossible to take too many fish from the sea. The dominant view today is that anyone may enter an industry at any time because resources are always available. But when competitive producers form a scheme, this is known as "collusion," "conspiracy in restraint of trade," "anti-competitive behavior" and "cartels" that lead to anti-trust indictments. Hardin used rational choice economics to show how free marketing and finite resources can produce only tragedy (1968, 1244). Why, then, depend upon microeconomics and its derivative "public choice" theory that both depend upon individual decisions?

What Should Be Done?

Policy theorists should ask if they really can use microeconomics as a base for managing "common resources" or, if you will, finite resources. The words "finite" and "limited," applied to global resource availability, have nothing to do with the economic "scarcity" applicable only to individuals. If an individual is hugely rich and can buy virtually anything s/he chooses to buy, that person's "scarce" resource is **the time** needed to consume or use.

Policy theorists who accept the need for cooperative management forms have already abandoned the microeconomics they cherish. Indeed, if a free market were to be described in political language, the only appropriate label would be "anarchy," hardly what "commons" managers have in mind. As Hardin noted, the problem was not new, only getting worse; new management schemes had been used to overcome the "commons" problem:

First we abandoned the commons in food gathering, enclosing farm land and restricting pastures and hunting and fishing areas. . . . [L]ater we saw that the commons as a place for waste disposal would also have to be abandoned. . . . [W]e are still struggling to close the commons to pollution by

automobiles, factories, insecticide sprayers, fertilizing operations, and atomic energy installations. . . . Every new enclosure of the commons involves the infringement of somebody's personal liberty. . . . [W]hat does "freedom" mean? When men mutually agreed to pass laws against robbing, mankind became more free, not less so. . . . The most important aspect of necessity that we must now recognize, is the necessity of abandoning the commons in breeding (1968, 1248).

Multi-state compacts are anything but new. The ocean of air through which airplanes fly domestically and around the world has been regulated for a very long time, international mail even longer. Every management design for a "commons" need not be wholly governmental, but governments use antitrust exemptions to legitimize nongovernment schemes. Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal authorized producers in the 1930s to jointly restrict production and regulate wages and prices in trying to end Great Depression. Effectively, this authorized cartels, but the Supreme Court declared the arrangements an unconstitutional antitrust violation.

The fear of overpopulation has influenced important decisions, but in ways that obscure the deeper issues. Nation-states restrict immigration to stabilize population. Many countries, including this one, have from time to time sterilized "substandard" people to prevent them from multiplying. Even recent debates on "welfare reform" included the occasional assertion that welfare encouraged unintelligent women to have too many babies. "Normal" citizens, however, get tax deductions if they have children, an incentive to procreate. The fact that other animal species produce surplus populations is widely accepted, and hunting seasons are scheduled to "cull the surpluses." Can humans forever insist that the rule does not apply to us? Even as this is written, a prominent magazine features an article that asks if "each of us" in the Western world might "consider . . . having only one child" (McKibben 1998, 55). The question appears startling but relies on individual choice. As Hardin asserted, only "mutual coercion" lets individuals "become free to pursue other goals" (1968, 1248).

Because all great religions preach the gospel of increasing population, some who might wish to study global population questions are frightened off by religion-based opponents who fight to prevent U.S. money from supporting family planning programs all over the world. They insist that there can never be a human overpopulation problem, and that neither time nor money should be spent studying the question. It may not be the abstract "value of human life" that is at stake, but the survival of the human species.

References

- Hardin, Garrett. 1968. "The Tragedy of the Commons: The population problem has no technical solution: it requires a fundamental extension in morality." *Science*. 162: 1243-1248.
- Hardin, Garrett. 1968. "The Tragedy of the Commons: The population problem has no technical solution: it requires a fundamental extension in morality." *Science*. 162: 1246. Quoting U. Thant. *Int.Planned Parenthood News*. No. 168 (February 1968): 3.
- McKibben, Bill. 1998. "A Special Moment in History: The fate of the planet will be determined in the next few decades, through our technological, lifestyle, and population choices." *Atlantic Monthly*. 281, 5: 55-78.
- Sabatier, Paul A. 1997. "The Status and Development of Policy Theory: A Reply to Hill." *Policy Currents*. 7, 4 (December): 1-10.

Daniel McCool, "The Subsystem Family of Concepts: A Critique and a Proposal." *Political Research Quarterly*, (June 1998).

The subsystem concept has been widely utilized by political scientists for many decades. The various concepts that fall under this rubric have been greatly modified and improved in recent years. However, a number of problems persist. This essay explains why the subsystem concept has been so popular and enduring, and then discusses three problems in the application and use of subsystem concepts. It then proposes that a different approach, which emphasizes function rather than structure, be utilized, and develops the idea of a "hierarchy of conflict" to help improve the utility of the subsystem model. This permits the development of a typology of subsystem strategies, and the formulation of basic hypotheses.

Carole Chaney, R. Michael Alvarez, and Jonathan Nagler. "Explaining the Gender Gap in U.S. Presidential Elections, 1980-1992." *Political Research Quarterly*, (June 1998).

The article compares the voting behavior of women and men in presidential elections since 1980. We test whether the different levels of salience which men and women attribute to different issues or the different preferences men and women have on issues best accounts for the gender gap. Utilizing theories of different issue emphasis between men and women, we use a multivariate model to demonstrate that a combination of respondent views on the economy, social programs, military action, abortion, and ideology can consistently explain at least three-fourths of the gender gap in the 1984, 1988, and 1992 elections. We show that, consistent with prior research on individual elections, women placed more emphasis on the national economy than men, and men placed more emphasis on pocketbook voting than women. We add evidence showing that women have consistently more negative assessments of the economy than do men, suggesting that a part of what has been considered a Republican-Democratic gender gap is really an anti-incumbent bias on the part of women. We also clarify the interpretation of partisan identification in explaining the gender gap.

Marie Hojnacki. "Organized Interests' Advocacy Behavior in Alliances." *Political Research Quarterly*, (June 1998).

In this article I examine how the characteristics of a coalition can affect the incentives an organization has to contribute to a collective advocacy effort. Although groups working in coalition have opportunities to free-

ride on the efforts of their allies, the opportunity to develop a reputation as an advocate may provide a selective incentive to contribute. Reputations are important because of the information they convey to potential allies about how groups are likely to behave in an alliance. But for reputations to serve as a selective incentive, a group's advocacy contribution must be easy for its allies to observe. Thus, only in coalitions that are designed to make groups' advocacy contributions conspicuous will a decision to free-ride be a costly strategy to employ. Based on data I collected about organizations' coalition advocacy activity on five issues, I show that groups in a coalition are less likely to free-ride when their advocacy activities are coordinated and when they interact often with their alliance partners.

Jerel A. Rosati, Michael W. Link, and John Creed. "A New Perspective on the Foreign Policy Views of American Opinion Leaders in the Cold War and Post-Cold War Eras." *Political Research Quarterly*, (June 1998).

This article breaks new ground in the study of the foreign policy views of American opinion leaders by using a systematic content analysis of writings published in leading foreign policy journals. It is in such journals that the debate on the nature and direction of American foreign policy is often played out. Such an approach allows us to examine the level of diversity in the foreign policy thought of opinion leaders and to provide an initial assessment of the level of continuity and change in this thought since the end of the Cold War. The findings do not suggest the formation of a new consensus over the direction of American foreign policy anytime soon. Rather, between the Cold War eighties and the post-Cold War nineties foreign policy attitudes have been marked by both persistence and change, resulting in a greater diversity and complexity of thought, as well as greater optimism for the future of U.S. foreign policy. The study highlights the importance of developing alternative research strategies and data sources which both supplement and complement more traditional survey research approaches in order to more fully capture and understand the foreign policy thought of American opinion leaders.

Stephen S. Meinhold and Steven A Shull. "Policy Congruency Between the President and the Solicitor General." *Political Research Quarterly*, (June 1998).

This article examines the policy attention and ideological congruence between solicitors general and their appointing presidents. It builds on previous research by presenting an alternative way of measuring

presidential policy preferences that varies within administrations and offers an empirical test of the congruence between presidents and their appointees.

Presidential attention to four policy areas and the ideological direction of that attention through their public statements is examined to see whether chief executives' rhetoric corresponds to the filing of discretionary amicus curiae briefs by solicitors general. We find that presidential statements are an important predictor of discretionary solicitor general behavior. Thus, solicitors general are responsive to the policy attentiveness and the ideological preferences of the executives who appoint them.

Kevin T. McGuire. "Explaining Executive Success in the U.S. Supreme Court." *Political Research Quarterly*, (June 1998).

The solicitor general is widely believed to occupy a special status among the parties appearing in the U.S. Supreme Court. A broad array of theoretical advantages are thought to contribute to the federal government's influence, but scholars have no direct evidence of their impact. More importantly, virtually all existing research has failed to measure directly the influence of those advantages across other parties, as well. Estimating a series of probit models of executive success in the Court under both Democratic and Republican administrations, I test the impact of one such advantage, litigation experience, measured for all parties across all cases. The results suggest that, notwithstanding the conventional wisdom, there is nothing distinctive about the solicitor general's influence. Thus, existing explanations regarding the solicitor general's institutional prestige appear to overstate the importance of the executive's role in the Court.

Jeff Yates and Andrew Whitford. "Presidential Power and the United States Supreme Court." *Political Research Quarterly*, (June 1998).

In the study we build upon the work of Ducat and Dudley's 1989 examination of presidential power and the federal judiciary. Whereas they focused upon presidential fortunes before the federal district courts in cases involving the formal constitutional and statutory powers of the president, we apply a similar model to the voting records of United States Supreme Court Justice in such presidential power cases. Additionally, we offer an extended model of justice voting on presidential power cases that we believe affords a better explanation of the decision-making process. We find that presidents receive more voting support in cases involving foreign policy and military affairs than in domestic/nonmilitary cases, thus lending support to the "two presidencies" thesis.

SKEWERED

Edited by Joseph Stewart, Jr.

Anyone who has ever edited a book or a journal has dealt with "screw-ups in manuscript preparation." Paul Sabatier is especially experienced in this activity because he is constantly asking scholars to test his Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) while he is at the same time changing it, thereby requiring another volume. Paul offers the following addition to "Rotisserie Political Science."

- +5 perfectly put together paper (sure, it rewards people for what should be the norm, but it isn't)
- +7 perfectly put together plus color graphics
- +10 perfectly put together plus color graphics plus photo of author(s) [Editor's note: if the author is Ken Meier, including a picture reverses the sign. There are limits to what can be included in respectable journals that might fall into the hands of children.]
- 1 penalty for each page out of order or "forgotten," but pages numbered so easy to correct. Penalty is doubled for each page over 30 in the manuscript, because you're trying to say too much. [Editor's note: Manuscripts dealing with the Advocacy Coalition Framework are allowed to go over 30 pages, because the author has to explain Sabatier's latest version.]
- 2 penalty for each page out of order or "forgotten" when one has "forgotten" to number pages
- 5 "forget" to include tables and figures for data that exist
- 5 combine two completely different papers but forget to collate the page numbering (so easy to detect problem)
- 20 combine two completely different papers but collate the page numbering so that it appears to be a continuous paper—thereby unfairly requiring that the paper actually be read for content to detect the error. [Editor's note: the editor agrees to buy a six-pack of Lone Star to anyone who can identify the first person sufficiently diabolical to win -20 points on this game.]

Create your own Rotisserie Political Science division, or improve on this one.

Joseph Stewart, Jr., Professor
Department of Political Science
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
phone: 505-277-7390, fax: 505-277-2821
e-mail: joestew@unm.edu

Policy Section Members

Remember to renew your section membership when you pay your APSA dues.

Public Policy Section Officers

President and 1998 Public Policy Program Co-Chair

Ann Bowman, University of South Carolina

1998 Public Policy Program Co-Chair

David Hedge, University of Florida

Secretary/Treasurer

Mark Schneider, State University of New York at Stony Brook

Council Members

James Lester, Colorado State University

Barry Rabe, University of Michigan

Howard Silver, Consortium of Social Science Assoc.

Margaret Weir, Brookings Institution

Rosemary O'Leary, Indiana University

Christopher Bosso, Northeastern University

Evan Ringquist, Florida State University

David Weimer, Rochester University

John Hird, University of Massachusetts

Susan Welch, Penn State University

Elaine Sharp, University of Kansas

Personals:

Policy Currents is now accepting personal ads for our new Personals column. If you would like more information on the column or would like to submit a personal ad, please contact:

Leo Jaramillo
PC Personals
Institute for Public Policy
1805 Sigma Chi, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
(505) 277-1099
leoj@unm.edu

Visit the APSA Policy Section www home page!
The URL is: <http://www.fsu.edu/~spap/orgs/apsa.html>

Editor

Hank C. Jenkins-Smith

Managing Editor

Kristin E. Kenyon

Assistant Managing Editor

Leopoldo V. Jaramillo

Senior Art/Publication

Production Specialist

Carol Brown

Abstracts, announcements, and other information to be printed in the next issue of *Policy Currents* should be sent on 3-1/4" diskette to:

Editor, *Policy Currents*
University of New Mexico
Institute for Public Policy
1805 Sigma Chi NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121

YOU ARE INVITED....

to attend the APSA Public Policy Section's first-ever short course
TEACHING PUBLIC POLICY: NEW WINE IN NEW BOTTLES
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1998 at NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY in BOSTON.
(That's the day before the APSA meeting officially begins.)

Lunch at noon, followed by a series of panels from 1:00 - 5:00 that offer new models, different approaches, re-designed courses. Maybe you're like us...you've been teaching a policy course for awhile, you modify it a bit each time you teach it, but you're wondering, isn't there a better way? What should I be covering that I'm not? How can I make this course more interesting? What do other instructors do? Or maybe you're new to teaching policy and wonder how to develop an effective course that will win you teaching awards (and maybe inform a few students) within a few short years. Whether you are interested in brushing up, re-creating, or inventing, the short course should work for you.

Our first session will focus on undergraduate policy courses and features an award-winning group of instructors including Sue Crawford of Creighton who will talk about her course on public policy analysis, Larry Mead of New York University who will discuss his course on poverty and welfare policy, Wayne Parsons of the University of London who will present his comparative public policy course, and David Robertson of the University of Missouri-St. Louis who will talk about his course on environmental policy. Attendees will have an opportunity to ask questions and engage the presenters.

In the second session, the focus shifts to policy courses taught at the graduate level and it also includes a stellar cast of policy scholars. David Hart from the Kennedy School at Harvard will talk about his course Mobilizing for Political Action, Sally Kenney of the University of Minnesota will present her course, Women and Public Policy, Bryan Jones of the University of Washington will discuss his course on public policy theories, and Barry Rabe of the University of Michigan will talk about his health policy course. As with the preceding session, attendees will be encouraged to pursue points of interest with the panelists.

We will wrap up the short course with what promises to be a lively discussion of what a public policy curriculum might look like in the next century. In it, we will consider some of the issues involved in creating and maintaining public policy programs and concentrations. What kind of an emphasis should a policy program have? How about teaching public policy with a point of view? What role should research, economics, political philosophy, political science, computing, etc. play in undergraduate and graduate programs? Is an interdisciplinary approach still viable? How (and should) graduate programs in public policy fit into the more traditional mix of graduate courses and training? Where should public policy programs be housed?

OK, how much will this cost you? Lunch and three panels for only 20 smackeros.

What do you need to do? Complete the registration form below (or the one in PS) and send it to David Hedge, Department of Political Science, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611. Telephone: 352-392-0262, ext. 287. E-mail: dhedge@polisci.ufl.edu Please enclose your check for \$20.00 made out to the Organized Section on Public Policy.

ALERT: In the unlikely event that we do not get a critical mass of participants, we will need to cancel the event. So register early (and often). See you in Boston.

REGISTRATION FORM

Name: _____

Affiliation: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ E-mail: _____

Fax: _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
Institute for Public Policy
1805 Sigma Chi Rd., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
(505) 277-1099

NON PROFIT - ORG.
US POSTAGE
PAID
Albuquerque, NM
PERMIT NO. 39