June 1999 Vol. 9, No. 2

POLICY CURRENTS

The University of New Mexico
Institute for Public Policy

NEWSLETTER OF THE PUBLIC POLICY SECTION
AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

The Once and Future Public Policy Program

by Peter deLeon and
Toddi A. Steelman
Graduate School of Public Affairs
The University of Colorado (Denver)

INTRODUCTION

As we close out the 20th century, it seems appropriate to reflect on the discipline and pedagogy of public affairs. The following essay poses the question, "how will public policy adapt to the changing conditions of our society?" To answer this question, it is necessary to track not only the changing conditions that are most salient to the practice of public affairs, but also how these changing conditions can be translated into meaningful curricula to train future policy practitioners.

Public policy as a field of study was forecast by Harold D. Lasswell as early as the late 1940s (Lasswell, 1949), and articulated explicitly in 1951 with the publication (with Daniel Lerner as his co-editor) of *The Policy Sciences*, and specifically with his seminal essay "The Policy Orientation" (Lasswell, 1951). Some twenty years later in the late 1970s, the first public policy programs[1] were established (see deLeon, 1988). However prescient Lasswell and his colleagues might have been, the United States and the world community in the 21st century will be a far different place than the 1950s or the 1970s (as Lasswell himself surely knew; see Lasswell, 1956). To wit: the American public trusted federal and usually state governments; devolution was not the phrase de jour; democracy and market-based economics were not a global consensus, either as a development medium or even an agreed-upon goal; technology was not as dominant nor as questioned; public, private, non-profit, and citizen sectors were more sharply defined and distinct in their mission and goals.

As if changes in political spheres and conducts were not enough, disciplinary changes have also been registered over the last twenty years. In many programs, public management as a field of inquiry has supplemented and in some cases supplanted public administration. Although many consider public management an outgrowth of policy implementation studies (Lynn, 1996), in recent years, it has assumed a significant life of its own, e.g., holding a bi-annual, invitational research conference (e.g., Kettl and Milward, 1996).

While admittedly some things have changed, others have remained the same. Lasswell's emphasis on a problem-oriented discipline that took into account the context of the situation and employed multiple methods of analysis is just as relevant today as it was decades ago. Turning inward and using Lasswell's advice to pay attention to contexts, it is necessary to take stock of the changing world around us and, more to the point, to speculate on how the public policy curricula will need to reflect these changes.[2] This essay, then, proposes a series of *observations* and *concerns* about the fundamental alternations in the American body politic. These are followed by a public policy curriculum, which, in both concept and practice, addresses these observations and conditions.[3] In conclusion, we will highlight ways in which policy studies can continue to evaluate its world and itself, thus adapting and, with luck, prospering.

OBSERVERATIONS AND CONCERNS

The thought exercise for this essay was that if we were to create a public policy program from whole cloth at the end of the 20th century, what trends should it reflect? It follows that these would be necessary to take into account for the training of the most effective and successful public policy professionals. To begin to answer that question, the trends catalogued below document two phenomena. On one hand, we point to six observations that we argue need to be factored into current and future public policy programs. On the other hand, we explore three concerns — current directions that to us are troublesome –- that should be addressed in the policy programs of the next century.

Observations:

Observation 1: Government is Perceived as Irrelevant

Today, Americans are widely seen to distrust government because it is "inefficient, wastes money and spends on the wrong things" (Nye, 1997:1). This lack of trust has given rise to an entire genre of policy prescriptions based upon "social capital" (see, for instance, Putnam, 1995, and Coleman, 1988).[4] Assuming for a moment that such observations have some credence, they should give us serious pause as a profession. As public servants and policy practitioners, we at some level have created the impression — real or perceived — of ineffectiveness. At times, policies have been proposed that are incompetent, problematic, and even unworkable; in these situations, they have eroded the trust of the public's faith in government.

This should be a clear call for us to figure out how to make ourselves, our students, and what we teach (and practice) more relevant to the public whom we allegedly serve. Such comments should provide the opportunity to rethink how we train students to be more relevant to the public's needs and to reconsider how policy practitioners can work more efficiently and target the "right things" and the right constituents (what Schneider and Ingram, 1997, refer to as the "target population"). Moreover, there must be a renewed emphasis on the proper justification for government intervention. At the very least, this means 1) providing defensible reasons for government action, and 2) prescribing action that is relevant for the public that will be served.

Observation 2: Decentralized and Interdependent Authority

Intergovernmental programs, such as welfare, health care and environmental protection, have grown markedly in recent decades. An intergovernmental perspective is crucial to understanding how our contemporary and future programs will perform (Conlan, 1998), especially in terms of policy implementation (Goggin et al., 1990). Devolution of authority to the states and localities means that scholars and students need to understand better the nature of the changing relationships between federal, state and local government. It is no longer functional to train students to understand how the federal, state or local governments operate as stand-alone entities. Thus, a greater emphasis should be placed on intergovernmental relations. Moreover, as the balance of power or legitimacy shifts, students also need to be made aware of the respective strengths and weaknesses that are affiliated with less or more centralized forms of government.

Observation 3: Democracy and Market Economy as the Dominant Paradigm

Democracy and market-based economic structures are now touted as the dominant ideals to have emerged from the end of the Cold War. However, as we have been reminded from the recent events in Russia, Southeast Asia and Latin America, free-markets are not without their pitfalls. Political and economic liberalism have their downsides. The two ideals are not necessarily complementary, perhaps even oppositional (see Dahl, 1999). In addition, there is an on-going debate as to whether the "new public management" somehow ignores democracy in its insistence on governmental efficiency (L. deLeon and P. deLeon, 1998; Lynn, 1998).

The implications from these observations are that we have a responsibility to train students in the advantages as well as the disadvantages of a democratic, market-based society. This means understanding not only markets, but also market failures. Likewise, democratic practices do not emerge overnight, and they are not always benign as nations as diverse as Singapore and the former Yugoslavia continue to remind us today. Democratic practices must be taught and cultivated, and different types of "democracy" are useful for different types of scenarios. Consequently, it is imperative for students to understand the benefits as well as the shortfalls that can come with a democratic form of governance.

Observation 4: Public, Private, Non-profit and Citizen Sectors

The traditional boundaries between the public, private, non-profit and citizen sectors have become increasingly blurred. In this world of decentralized and devolved policymaking (social welfare and public education are only two examples), there has been growing recognition for the need for all three sectors to work together to find potential solutions. It is unreasonable to expect that policy initiatives put forth by only one sector will increasingly be viewed with skepticism because there are too many vested interests residing in the other sectors demanding to be heard.

In this new arrangement, the public sector should play a more dominant role as convenor and facilitator. Rather than dictating policy solutions from a hierarchical bureaucratic organization, policy practitioners will need to become more skilled at recognizing whom they need to bring to the table, how they can encourage cooperation, and how they can mediate workable outcomes. Consequently, policy programs need to train students in a series of consensus-building approaches — such as conflict resolution, mediation, and facilitation (e.g., Susskind and Cruikshank, 1987) — and to recognize and appreciate the different sectors for the benefits they can bring to the table, as well as their limitations.

Observation 5: Technology and Information Revolution

The communication's revolution has altered how we think about information, how we promote issues, and how we stay in contact. *The Economist* has referred to this as "the death of distance," in which events in Malaysia can be as immediate and pressing as events in Memphis (Cairncross, 1997; also Anonymous, 1997). Access to information and the ability to communicate rapidly has and will continue to transform how the public will interact with policy practitioners and affect policy.

The implications for policy are numerous. Greater access to information will not only transform politics and policy at the federal levels, but also at the city and county level. Policy practitioners will be able to disseminate information more quickly to constituents and at times without a great deal of thought. Witness the deluge of the Starr Report as an Internet phenomenon. By the same keyboard, administrators and policymakers will be accessible to citizens (Barber, 1984); whether they are beholding is, of course, another question.

Centralization of information will mean that government agencies and the public could be able to benefit from statistical profiling and data mining, thereby facilitating better targeting of services and service delivery, as well as abuse of privacy. Interest groups — some as minuscule as a single person — will be able to communicate with and inform each other more rapidly about policy developments, with only a minimal concern for credibility. The public as a whole will have to learn how to become involved effectively and how to discriminate good information from the all-too-frequently bad.

Because information has been the basis of power for many policy practitioners, these technological innovations mean that there is no longer a premium placed on merely possessing information. Rather, the ability to sort through the vast quantities of data and harness its potential will be a new currency of value. Clearly this means that there is a role in public policy curriculum for educating students about information technology, manipulation, and communication.

Finally, like most things, these communication innovations have their distinct downsides and we have an obligation to educate students about the potential for abuse and the consequences affiliated with such behavior. These technology and information-inspired developments also have the potential to widened the gap between those who have the skills (and resources) to participate in a highly technological society and those who are skill- and resource-deprived. If policy practitioners want to continue to be relevant to the people they serve and not just the people who are technically cognizant, they must learn to communicate in a variety of ways, using different media and not just the most sophisticated technology of the moment.

Observation 6: A Field Data Rich, Theory Poor, and Credibility Challenged

For some years now, policy scientists have observed that while policy studies have a universe of application, they are decidedly theory poor, with the dominant trend being oriented towards a predictive paradigm. Lasswell (1971:16) articulated a "maximization postulate" that "refers to act completions that are perceived by the actor as leaving him better off than he would otherwise be." It has served as the most general theoretic umbrella, but can scarcely served as a predictive theoretic touchstone upon which to build. Since then, predictive policy theory has largely been influenced by economists, complete with welfare economics, even if others have noted that they are surprising sterile for understanding social problems and solutions (Ascher, 1987; Etzioni, 1988). Alice Rivlin, in her 1986 Presidential address to the American Economics Association, warned, "If a golden age of economists' self-confidence ever occurred it is long since past" (Rivlin, 1987, p. 1). Even though there are a welter of contributing theoretic propositions, policy studies has nothing resembling a (let alone *the*) "grand unifying theory" (GUT).

While the lack of a GUT might be debilitating for many, it reflects the variegated nature of our inquiry; could any single theory imagine the complexity of the American health care or public education systems? Furthermore, this admission does have a positive effect on the study and teaching of policymaking, for it opens our analyses to a myriad of possibilities, none of which is automatically pre-empted by a preconceived theoretic dogma. It also facilitates our abilities to pursue a number of case analyses and peculiar networks that are central to the understanding of a number of episodes.

What is less positive is that while policy analysis offices have proliferated to virtually every nook and cranny of the federal government, to many state governments, and to a world of non-profit institutions, its products are rarely generic. With its demand for methodological (often quantitative or technological) rigor, it too-often is not accepted by policymakers, who consider it surely (at least politically) necessary, but seldom sufficient.

The ramifications for our policy programs are that we should focus on diagnostic frameworks that help us understand specific policy problems, instead of concentrating on the search for a GUT theory that fits all situations. We need to train our students and ourselves to be better diagnosticians of problems instead of providing ready-made, all-purpose solutions. Consequently, we should shift the emphasis in our curriculum to focus on enriching the conceptual toolboxes of our students rather than pursuing a predictive theoretic Holy Grail.

Concerns:

Concern 1: Telling Power What It Wants to Hear

Interest-based politics and an emphasis on self-interested maximizing behavior have overwhelmed the concept of the common good. Public policy was conceived as a profession that could advocate on behalf of the public good. Lasswell (1951) talked about "increasing the quality of information" available to policymakers, as well as a central concern for "human dignity." When the public good merely becomes nothing more than the temporarily prevailing voice from a cacophony of special interests, the profession is devalued. What happened to Wildavsky's *Speaking Truth to Power* (1979) and trying to figure out what is best for the nation, state and locality instead of the individuals or interests who would benefit from public action? We need a more directed and less self-serving mission for students and practitioners of public policy.

Concern 2: Focus on Acontextual Analysis

A web-based analysis of ten top public policy programs indicated that quantitative analysis and economics are requirements in nine programs. No other courses are mentioned with this degree of frequency. Quantitative analyses, with its focus on aggregate data sets and generalizable findings, can be reductionist in the methods used to assess the values and issues important to specific publics. The challenge in the future is to set aside "quantitative" and "economic" imperialism and let the unique characteristics of people and places inform our policy decisions. What may work in Topeka may not work in Savannah and certainly not in Johannesburg. This is not to say that the focus on economic and quantitative methods is not useful, but if students have *only* these tools in their toolboxes, they will use them in appropriate as well as inappropriate ways. Consequently, we need to enrich our toolkits to include more contextual methods of analysis, such as interviewing skills (Rubin and Rubin, 1995), cognitive mapping (Austin, 1998), ethnography and participant observation (Atkinson and Hammersby, 1998), participatory policy analysis (Durning 1993), content analysis (Lasswell and Pool, 1952; Berelson, 1952), narrative analysis (Atkinson 1992), q-methodology (Brown, 1980, McKeown and Thomas, 1988), and cluster analysis (Sneath and Sokal, 1973).

Concern 3: Neglect of Communication Skills

Given that today's public is generally better educated, has greater access to information, and in many ways a greater expectation of involvement in decision making, students of policy need to know how to communicate with the public and address their expectations *on an interactive basis*. Our review of public policy programs revealed that only one (the University of Georgia) required a course on communication skills. While some schools include a course on Public Speaking and Public Writing (and then only on a one-unit basis), the implicit message is that the policy practitioner is writing *for* or speaking *to* the public, not entering into a dialogue with the public. While one-way communication efforts are useful and appropriate in some settings, two-way communication is also an increasingly necessary tool, especially if we are to add more contextual methods to our methodological pantry.

Concern 4: Neglect of Ethics and Values

Ethics deals with the notion of what constitutes appropriate service. Policy practitioners often shy away from dealing with ethical issues because it rapidly takes them into the domain of value-laden questions (Amy, 1984). For years, policy teachers and practitioners have argued that technical, value-free information could drive policy decisions. In retrospect, this has been widely conceived to be naive, perhaps even wrong (reflecting on the credibility concern raised above). Simply put, values matter. This is the crux of much of the post-positivist criticism of extant policy analysis (e.g., Danziger, 1995; Fischer, 1998).

Policy is inherently a normative practice, which is why ethics are central to the study of public policy. Only two of the top ten public policy programs reviewed (University of Georgia and Harvard) require an ethics course. We need to articulate and reinforce a basis of conduct for those who advocate on behalf of the public good. In doing so, we need to train our students to deal with the complexity of values and give them tools to assess and clarify values. For instance, value-focused thinking (Keeney, 1992), objective hierarchies (Clemen, 1996), and q-methodology (Brown, 1980; McKeown and Thomas, 1988) are all used to elicit and clarify perspectives, objectives and values. We also need to give them the normative training to begin to make judgments about whose values should prevail (Tang, 1986; Callahan and Jennings [eds], 1983).

A PROPOSED CURRICULUM DESIGN

Before offering our proposed curriculum design, we need to define a few "house rules." First, this is a graduate, professional curriculum, a Masters of Public Policy. While we have little argument with universities offering undergraduate policy curricula (see Brunner, 1997a), we propose a graduate curriculum with the understanding that a varied number of undergraduate majors will find public affairs an attractive graduate program. Second, it will welcome both pre-service and mid-service students; both have much to give and the exchange is valuable. Finally, and most contentious, our curriculum will have no choice; all students must take the same thirteen classes. To begin to offer choices (what some call "electives") would expand this proposal far beyond its conceptual boundaries. In s.ort, all of these courses are central to what we present as an "ideal" public policy curriculum, in which substantive (issue area) knowledge to be either gained "on the job" or through extra-curricular reading.

The over-view of the proposed curriculum would resemble the following table, supplemented with a concluding capstone course, the final course in the program. Itis specifically designed to increase the student's problem-solving skills, that is, the ability of the graduate to formulate a problem, bring a variety of analytic skills to bear, and present her or his findings with a professional competence.[5]

Concepts to Focus Inquiry	**Modes of Inquiry**	**Competencies**
Government and Government Failure	Inductive and Deductive Inquiry	Communications for a Policy Practitioner
Markets and Market Failures	Quantitative Techniques	Information Management
Organizations, Institutions, and Management	Qualitative Techniques	Alternative Conflict Resolution
The Policy Process	Field Research	Ethics and Values

Table 1: The Public Policy Curriculum

<u>*Concepts to Focus Inquiry*</u>

In this module of courses, the curriculum explicitly argues that policy problems emphasize diagnosis over predictive capabilities. Students are asked to take courses that will encourage the development of analytical skills to frame their inquiries about policy issues. Rather than propose courses from the traditional disciplinary dictionary (e.g., micro-economics), we prefer to design these courses to give students conceptual tools to think broadly about why government intervention is needed, which alternatives for action should be considered, and how change can be affected within the organizations and institutions where policy is crafted and implemented.

"Government and Government Failures" examines the very justification for government, including government interventions and their positive and negative consequences. Moreover, it explicitly includes the role and function of democratic processes and a civil society. Finally, it addresses the limitations of government (failures) and of democracy itself. The implication is clear: that there are many ways for governments to succeed or fail (or points in between) and markets are not the only potential culprit or alternative for action.

Analogously, our "economics" course, "Markets and Market Failures," talks to the strengths and shortcomings of market-based economies and the appropriate and inappropriate uses of applied economics and public finance for addressing such issues. Economics is too vital to the society and polity to consider exclusion, but the course is designed to emphasize practice over theory. The goal would be to illustrate on a workaday basis economic concepts such as marginal analysis, substitutions, trade offs, and opportunity costs. Thus, this course seeks to educate students to the variety of contexts in which markets can be expected to succeed or fail in the public sector, the conditions under which economics and public finance can be used most successfully, and the consequences of using these tools.

"Organizations, Institutions, and Management" is the Public Management component of the module. The special emphasis in this course deals with creating and managing change, i.e., to reflect the dynamic nature of management and its responsibilities. This course intends to familiarize students with the institutions and organizational structures affiliated with decision making and implementation in the public sector. It also focuses on the advantages, challenges and constraints in working, first, collaboratively with the public, private, citizen and non-profit sectors, and, second, inter-organizationally with federal, state and local entities.

Finally, the "Policy Process" course talks about "stages" in the policy process, from Formulation to Estimation to Selection to Implementation to Evaluation to Termination. While recently some have doubted Lasswell's original policy process model (see Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993), we suggest that one's understanding of a given policy would be incomplete without a realization of the various phases a policy must go through (for example, can anybody describe a policy without a vision of policy evaluation?) as well as the opportunities afforded by those phases.

Modes of Inquiry:

Modes of Inquiry represent the acknowledgment that analysis is composed of a tangible set of skills ("tools"). But it is equally important to realize the how and why and where for the application of these tools. Hence, the courses begin with an "Inductive and Deductive Inquiry" course that sets out the *approaches* to a problem set *prior* to the decision as to which set of tools to utilize. This course would lay a foundation for understanding the nature of empirical inquiry, conceptual frameworks for research, and sound research design. For instance, the first part of the course would cover the philosophy of science and methodology. The second part would address conceptual frameworks for research designs, including exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory models. The final segment would cover the pragmatic elements of research design. The emphasis would be on the problem context and what that context requires to examine the policy questions with some precision.

The "Quantitative Techniques" is analogous to similar quantitative research methods in public policy curricula throughout the country. We choose to emphasize a "Qualitative Techniques" class to expose students to more contextual methods of gathering information for analysis. Thus, public surveys, grounded theory, q-methodology, participatory policy analysis, focus groups, and interviewing (among others) are all essential pieces of the analyst's methodological tool kit.

Finally, "Field Research" is designed to give students the opportunity to combine the skills learned in the previous three courses to specific policy analytic exercises. The goal is to expose students to policy issues and problems and to have them craft an approach for inquiry. In-class and out-of-class projects would be used to give students experience in a variety of settings.

Competencies

Competencies refer to a set of more practical, often more "human" skills than the previous "Modes of Inquiry" classes. For instance, "Communication for a Policy Practitioner" recognizes that an analyst must, in some manner or another (i.e., written, oral, or graphic), skillfully communicate with either the client or the target audience (see Meltsner, 1980). While analysts have long concerned themselves with communicating with their particular client, these skills have too often been acquired as part of an on-the-job training exercise. This mode of learning has never proven especially effective (although of course necessary), but as new modes of analysis (e.g., participatory policy analysis) and technologies (electronic media) become prevalent, we can no longer leave communication skills to the vagaries of the work place. Furthermore, as Aronson (1993) has pointed out, there are times when good communications involve careful and sympathetic listening in addition to speaking skills.

"Information Management" is meant to ensure competency in information technologies, data manipulation and communication. Students will be trained to be proficient in a variety of low-tech to high-tech information media. Information identification, retrieval, manipulation, analysis and dissemination will be covered.

"Alternative Conflict Resolution" covers a set of skills including mediation, conflict resolution, negotiation, facilitation, leadership and followership. Schon and Rein (1994) refer specifically to mediation as a new venue for policy analysis and the work of scholars like Susskind and Curikshank (1987) as a way of "breaking" the frequent policy "impasses." Others, such as Fischer (1998), propose facilitation as an increasingly relevant policy skill when moving towards a more participatory policymaking protocol. The flattening of organizational hierarchies has placed a premium on working in groups and so the course will also address what it means to be a leader, follower and group member.

Lastly, drawing on a variety of policy scholars from Lasswell (1951) to Tang (1986) but also including a history of political philosophy, a formal course in "Ethics and Values" is required. The purpose is twofold. First, too often values are neglected or ignored for a variety of unacceptable reasons (see Amy, 1984). Values lie at the heart of the policy exercise and to overlook them does serious damage to the credibility of the policy analyst. Second, the course does not teach what is an "ethic" or "value"; rather, it proposes how one structures values and ethics into a policy salient argument, and how one presents moral reasoning as a practical professional skill.

The Capstone

The final class in the proposed public policy curriculum is a "capstone" that incorporates in an applied manner much of the materials presented earlier in the curriculum. To assure a wide range of applications, this "class" is divided into two semesters, the first being a simulated policy analytic exercise in an arena in which students can afford to experiment (that is, make the occasional mistake that has little consequence), and the second being a real-life policy exercise. The preferred mode would be for a team of students to work together (under the tutelage of an instructor) as a team of consultants. At the end of each semester, the team would present its findings to other student teams as well (in the second semester) to an actual client.

Although there is always the "free rider" problem that would enable the student/sloth to rely upon other students' efforts, we suggest that so much of good policy work is the result of several analysts working together. Thus to imply that analysis is a singular activity would be a disservice to the student. Moreover, employers actively seek graduates who have proven their ability to work in groups. Simply, analysts work together and we need to inculcate early the necessary skills (including, of course, how to deal with the "free rider").

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this exercise was not so much to define *the* public policy curriculum for the next generation of public affairs programs, but to present a number of present and emerging observations and concerns that should define and affect any public policy curriculum. We openly admit that this essay basically reflects our particular views, thus implying that others can propose alternative curricula, specific classes, and, most centrally, alternative observations and concerns. But we do argue that given the enumerated observations and concerns, the proposed curriculum is relevant on three criteria. First, it evolves the public policy curriculum in ways that are increasingly germane to the body politic; failing that desideratum would be to fail the basic philosophy of the policy sciences. Second, it moves public policy towards a methodological catholicity, one willing to include a variety of tools that appear to be salient to contextual problems. And, third, it stresses the normative underpinning of public policy, foundations that have been set aside for too many policy analytic exercises. In short, the proposed curriculum reaffirms in a contemporary manner the broad outlines of what Lasswell and others proposed a generation ago.

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to two very thoughtful anonymous reviewers who insisted the authors give at least a passing consideration to their particular parochialisms, as well as Prof. Andrew Willard of the Policy Sciences Center, whose recollections of Harold Lasswell are much fresher than ours.

Endnotes

1. As opposed to public administration programs begun in the late 1920s at Syracuse University and the University of Southern California.

2. We are hardly alone in this endeavor. Ronald Brunner (1997a, 1997b) has written extensively about the policy sciences in both the graduate and undergraduate curriculum.

3. Aaron Wildavsky, in the 1970s, mused how policy studies came to be in the academy: "after World War II, the United States, aware of other countries' difficulties, established numerous centers to study foreign areas; by the late sixties, people realized the United States had problems too; thus they started schools of public policy (Wildavsky 1979, p. 409).

4. Social capital in this context alludes to a variety of endeavors within the public, private, non-profit, and civic sectors that seek to build obligations, expectations, and trust into reciprocal relationships that ultimately contribute to a stronger, more viable civil society.

5. We readily admit that the scheduling of classes is a daunting exercise; we will momentarily leave this activity to the enthusiast.

References

Amy, Douglas J. 1984. "Why Policy Analysis and Ethics Are Incompatible." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol 3, No. 4 (Summer). Pp. 573-591.

Anonymous (Francis Cairncross). 1997. "Telecommunications: A Connected World." *The Economist.* (September 13). Special Telecommunications Survey. Pp. 1-27.

Aronson, Jane. 1993. "Giving Consumers a Say in Policy Development or Just Being Heard?" *Canadian Public Policy*. Vol. 19, No. 4. Pp. 367-378.

Ascher, William. 1987. "Policy Sciences and the Economics Approarch to a 'Post-Positivist' World." *Policy Sciences*. Vol. 20, No. 1 (April). Pp. 3-9.

Atkinson, P.A. 1992. *Understanding ethnographic texts*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Atkinson, P.A. and M. Hammersby. 1998. "Ethnography and Participant Observation" In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Austin, Diane E. 1998. "Cultural Knowledge and the Cognitive Map." *Practing Anthropology.* Vol. 20, No. 3 (Summer). Pp. 21-24.

Berelson, B. 1952. *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. Gencoe, Il: Free Press.

Brown, S. 1980. *Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brunner, Ronald D. 1997a. "Raising Standards: A Prototyping Strategy for Undergraduate Education." *Policy Sciences*. Vol. 30, No. 2. Pp. 167-189.

———. 1997b. "Teaching the Policy Sciences." *Policy Sciences*. Vol. 30, No. 2. Pp. 217-231.

Cairncross, Francis 1997. *The Death of Distance.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Callahan, Daniel, and Bruce Jennings (eds). 1983. *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. New York: Plenum.

Clemen, R.T. 1996. *Making Hard Decisions: An Introduction to Decision Analysis*. Albany, NY: Duxbury Press.

Conlan, Timothy. 1998. *From New Federalism to Devolution: Twenty five years of Intergovernmental Reform*. Brookings Institutions: Washington, D.C.

Dahl, Robert A. 1999. *On Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Danziger, Marie. 1995. "Policy Analysis Postmodermized: Some Political and Pedagogical Ramifications." *Policy Studies Journal*. Vol. 23, No. 3 (Winter). Pp. 435-450.

deLeon, Linda, and Peter deLeon. 1997. "Public Management and the Democratic Ethos." Delivered at the 4th National Public Management Research Conference, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

deLeon, Peter. 1988. *Advice and Consent: The Development of Policy Sciences.* New York: The Russell Sage Foundation.

Durning, Dan. 1993. "Participatory Policy Analysis in a Social Agency: A Case Study." *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*. Vol. 12, No. 2 (Spring). Pp. 231-257.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1988. *The Moral Dimension*. New York: The Free Press.

Fischer, Frank. 1998. "Beyond Empiricism: Policy Inquiry in a Postpositivist Perspective." *Policy Studies Journal.* Vol. 26, No. 1 (Spring). Pp. 129-146.

Goggin, Malcolm, Ann O'M. Bowman, James P. Lester, and Lawrence J. O'Toole. 1990. *Implementation Theory and Practice: Towards a Third Generation.* NY: Harper Collins

Keeney, R.L. 1992. *Value Focused Thinking*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kettl, Donald F. and H. Brinton Milward. 1996. *The State of Public Management.* Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Lasswell, Harold D. 1949. "The Democratic Character," in his, *The Political Writings of Harold D. Lasswell*. Glencoe, IL. Pp. 465-525.

———. 1951 "The Policy Orientation." *The Policy Sciences*. In Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell (Eds.). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press. Pp. 3-15.

———. 1956. "The Political Science of Science." *American Political Science Review.* Vol. 50, No. 4 (December). Pp. 961-979.

———. 1971 *A Preview of the Policy Sciences*. New York: American Elsevier.

Lasswell, H.D. and I. deS. Pool. 1952. "Political Symbols" in *The Comparative Study of Political Symbols: An Introduction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lynn, Laurence E., Jr. 1996. *Public Management as Art, Science, and Profession.* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers.

———. 1998. "A Critical Analysis of the New Public Management." *International Public Management Journal.* Vol. 1, No. 1. Pp. 107-123.

McKeown, B. and D. Thomas. 1988. *Q Methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Meltsner, Arnold J. 1980. "Don't Slight Communication: Some Problems in Analytic Practice." In Giandomencio Majone and Edward S. Quade (eds.). 1980. *Pitfalls of Analysis*. New York: John Wiley.

Nye, Joseph S., Jr. 1997. "Introduction", in Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Phillip. D. Zelikow, and David C. King (eds.), *Why Americans Don't Trust Government.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy.* Vol. 6, No. 1. Pp. 65-78.

Rivlin, Alice M. 1987. "Economics and the Political Process." *American Economics Review*. Vol. 77, No. 1 (March). Pp. 1-10.

Rubin, H.J. and I.S. Rubin. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: TheArt of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sabatier, Paul A. and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, (eds.). 1993. *Policy Change and Learning*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Schon, Donald A. and Martin Rein. 1994. *Frame Reflection*. NY: BasicBooks.

Schneider, Anne L. and Helen Ingram. 1997. *Policy Design for Democracy.* Lawrence, KS: The University of Kansas Press.

Sneath, P.H.A. and R.R. Sokal. 1973. *Numerical Taxonomy: The Principles and Practice of Numerical Classification*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Susskind, Lawence, and Jeffrey Curikshank. 1987. *Breaking the Impasse*. New York: BasicBooks.

Tang, Rosemary. 1986. *Ethics in Policy Analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wildavsky, Aaron. 1979. *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Division 25: Public Policy
Final Program
1999 APSA Meeting, Atlanta, GA

Section Chair:
Peter Eisinger
Wayne State University

Panel #1.
Title: PARTICIPATORY POLICY ANALYSIS: ADVANCES IN PRACTICE AND THEORY

Chair: Dan Durning
Univ. of Georgia, Vinson Inst. of Govt.

Papers:

Gaming/Simulation as Participatory Policy Analysis
Richard Duke
Univ. of Michigan, College of Arch. & Planning
and Jac Geurts
Tilburg University(Netherlands)
Work and Org. Research Ctr.
Research Unit on Policy Studies

Experimental Evaluation of Participatory Policy Analysis
Ronald Batenburg
Univ. of Michigan and Tilburg University, Netherlands
Work and Org. Research Unit
Research Unit on Policy Studies
and Franks J. Bongers
Tilburg University

Using Social-Environmental Perception Methodology to Enhance Participation Methods
Lyn Kathlene
Univ. of Nebraska, Dept. of Political Science
and Thomas Horan
Claremont Graduate University

Changes in Values and Beliefs about the Food System as a Result of a Participatory Planning Process: Results of a Q Study in Six Rural Counties
David Pelletier
Cornell University, Div. of Nutritional Sciences

Discussants:
Sally Selden
Syracuse, Maxwell School

Milton Lopes
Univ. of Georgia, Inst. of Community and Area Development

Panel #2. A Roundtable
Title: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION 2020: PRESENT PERCEPTIONS, FUTURE TRENDS
Co-sponsored with Race and Ethnicity; Public Policy is the primary co-sponsor

Chair: Frederick Lynch
Claremont McKenna College, Dept. of Government

Participants:
Stephan Thernstrom
Harvard, Dept. of History

R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr.
American Inst. for Managing Diversity

George LaNoue
Univ. of Maryland, Baltimore
Dept. of Political Science

Carol Swain
Princeton, Woodrow Wilson School

Michael Rothschild
Princeton, Woodrow Wilson School

John David Skrentny
Univ. of Pennsylvania
Dept. of Sociology

Panel #3.
Title: DOING BETTER THAN EXPECTED? THE POLITICS OF HEALTH CARE EXPANTION IN THE 1990s

Chair: Colleen Grogan, Yale University
Inst. for Social and Policy Studies

Papers:

The Stunning Transformation of the Medicaid Program
Eric Patashnik and Colleen Grogan
Yale University, Dept. of Political Science

The Politics of Enrollment for Child Health Insurance Programs
Glenn Beamer
Yale University, RWJF Scholar in Health Policy, School of Public Health

State Competition for Medicaid and AFDC
Mark Rom *and* Michael Bailey
Georgetown University
Georgetown Public Policy Institute

The Social Roles of Medicare
Michael Gusmano *and* Mark Schlesinger
Yale University, Dept. of Epidemiology & Public Health

Discussant:
Mark Peterson
UCLA, Dept of Policy Studies

Panel #4.
Title: ACCOUNTABILITY AND CHARTER SCHOOLS

Chair: David Paris
Hamilton College, Dean of Faculty Office

Papers:

The Impact of Charter Competition on School Accountability
Frederick Hess
Univ. of Virginia, Curry School of Education

"Charter School Accountability: Problems and Prospects"
Bruno Manno, Annie E. Casey Foundation

"Assessing Variations in the Oversight of Charter Schools"
Sandra Vergari, SUNY-Albany
Dept of Edu. Administration & Policy Studies

Discussant:
Paul Peterson, Harvard
Dept of Government

Panel #5.
Title: PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH: BRINGING POLICY ANALYSIS BACK IN (A THEME PANEL)

Chair: Lawrence Mead, New York University
Dept of Politics

Papers:

Welfare Reform: Policy and Politics Since the Family Support Act
Lawrence Mead, New York University
see above

Environmental Policy: The Civic Dimension
Marc Lundy, Boston College
Dept of Political Science

Immigration Reform
Peter Skerry, Claremont McKenna College
Dept of Government

Public Pension Reform in the U.S. and U.K.
Steven Teles, Boston University
Inst. on Race and Social Division

Discussant:
Peter de Leon, Univ. of Colorado at Denver
Graduate School of Public Affairs

Panel #6.
Title: ALTERNATIVES TO TOP-DOWN ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

Chair: Edella Schlager, University of Arizona
School of Public Administration and Policy

Papers:

Watershed Management from the Ground Up: Political Science and the Explanation of Regional Governance Arrangements
Edella Schlager, University of Arizona
and William Blomquist
Indiana Univ., Indianapolis, Political Science

Can the State Create Community-Based Natural Resource Management?
Cassandra Moseley
Yale, Dept. of Political Science

'Conservative Environmentalists'? Political Environmentalism and Policy Preferences
Christopher Jan Carman
Rice University, Dept of Political Science

Discussant:
Craig Thomas
Univ. of Mass., Amherst, Political Science

Panel #7.
Title: ISSUES IN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

Chair: Christopher Thorn
University of Wisconsin
Wisconsin Center for Education Research

Papers:

Governance and Education Reform
John Portz
Northeastern University, Political Science

Winds of Change: Teachers, School Governance, and School Choice
Robert Maranto
Federal Executive Institute
Scott Milliman
James Madison University
and Frederick Hess
University of Virginia

Diversity, Segregation, and Comprehensive School Choice
April Gresham
none
Scott Milliman
James Madison University

Discussant:
Michael Mintrom
Michigan State University
Political Science Dept. schram

Panel #8.
Title: EXPANDING THE SCOPE OF URBAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Peter Eisinger
Wayne State University

Papers:

Changing Patterns in Environmental Policy: Urban Brownfield Reuse and Economic Development
Richard Hula
Michigan State University, Political Science

Orange Crush: Mobilization of Bias, Ballot Initiatives, and the Politics of Professional Sports Stadia
Daniel Smith
University of Denver, Political Science

Sure Log, University of Denver
see above

Creative Community: Art As Community Development
Mark Mattern, Chapman University
Dept. of Political Science

Shari Mitchell, Chapman University
see above

Discussant:
Oren Levin-Waldman
Bard College, Jerome Levy Institute

Panel #9.
Title: POLITICIS IN CYBERSPACE

Chair: Lyke Thompson
Wayne State University

Papers:

Wiring the Future: The Politics of the Information Highway
Michael Hawthorne, Univ. of N.C, Pembroke
Dept. of Political Science

Governance, Policy, and Place in an Age of Technologically Mediated Interaction
Paul Baker, George Mason University
Inst. of Public Policy

Blurring Boundaries and Lowering Thresh olds: How the Internet is Changing Policy Subsystems

Jennifer Mathews-Lucas, Univ. of N.M.
Dept of Political Science

Discussants:
Ellen Grigsby
University of New Mexico, Dept of Political Science

Priscilla Regan, George Mason University
Dept of Public and International Affairs

Panel #10.

Title: METROPOLITAN INEQUALITIES

Chair:
Richard Elling, Wayne State University
Dept of Political Science

Papers:
Measuring Metropolitan Governance Structure and Its Impact on Income Distribution in Metropolitan Areas
Anja Kurki, Univ. of Maryland
Dept. of Government and Politics

The Politics of Discontent: Assessing the Impacts of urban Secession on Representation and Empowerment in Los Angeles
Matthew Cahn, Cal State Univ, Northridge
Center for California Studies

Discussant:
Joe Ohren, Eastern Michigan University
Dept of Political Science

Panel #11.

Title: EXPLORATIONS IN POST-POSITIVIST POLICY ANALYSIS

Chair:
Sanford Schram, Bryn Mawr College
Graduate School of Social Work

Papers:
Narrative Policy Analysis in Practice
Scott Peters, Illinois Institute of Technology
Social Science Dept.

Putnam, Quine and Policy Analysis: Constructing a Post-Positive Policy Analysis on the Remnants of Realism
Robert Bailey, Rutgers University at Camden
Graduate Dept. of Public Policy and Admin.

The Analysis of 'Real World' Policy Arguments
William Ball, College of New Jersey

Discussant:
Maarten Hajer, University of Amsterdam
Adeling Politicologie

Panel #12

Title: POLICY LEARNING: BRITISH CASES

Chair:
Colin Hay, University of Birmingham
POLSIS

Papers:
Politics, Insititutions, and Government Learning: Hypotheses and Evidence from the Thatcher Years
James Walsh, Univ. of N.C. at Charlotte
Dept. of Political Science

'Reform' of the British National Health Service After the Election of a Labour Government: Evidence and Consequences
Tim Strawderman, Univ. of Texas-Houston
Health Policy Institute
School of Public Health

Connecting Policy Transfer with Ideology: A Study of Great Britain's Failed Emulation of the Americans with Disabilities Act
Elizabeth Lightfoot, University of Minnesota
School of Social Work

Discussant:
Colin Hay, University of Birmingham
see above

Panel #13

Title: STATES AT THE CUTTING EDGE: DOES STATE POLICY MAKE A DIFFERENCE? (Co-sponsored with the State Politics Section #29; Public Policy is the primary co-sponsor)

Chair:
Robert Lowry, Michigan State University
Dept. of Political Science

Papers:
Children in Poverty: Do State Policies

Matter?
David Morgan, Univ. of Oklahoma
Department of Political Science

Kenneth Kickham, University of Oklahoma
see above

State Policy Innovation and the Course of the AIDS Epidemic
Steven Peterson, Penn State Univ at Harrisburg
School of Public Affairs

James Schubert, Northern Illinois University
Department of Political Science

Exploring the Impact of Welfare Reform: A Comparison of Pre- and Post-Reform Effects on the Duration of ADFC?TANF Receipt
Tami Swenson, Texas A&M University
Center for Demographic and Socioeconomic Research

Steve White, Texas A&M
see above

Steve Murdock, Texas A&M
see above

Variability in State Policy Priorities: An Empirical Analysis
Saundra Schneider, Univ of South Carolina
Dept of Government and International Studies

Discussant:
Richard Fording, University of Kentucky
Department of Political Science

Panel #14

Title: POSTWAR TRANSORMATION OF THE NATIONAL POLITY

Chair:
Guy Peters, University of Pittsburgh
Dept of Political Science

Papers:
The Evolution of American Government, 1947-1999
Frank Baumgartner, Penn State University and Caltech
Division of Humanities and Social Sciences

Bryan Jones, University of Washington
Dept of Political Science

Budgeting for Science and Technology: Exploring Committee Competition and Issue Salience
T. Jens Feeley, University of Washington
Center for American Politics and Public Policy

Home Field Advantage: Jurisdictional Change and Legislative Outputs
Jeff Worsham, West Virginia University
Dept of Political Science

Discussant:
Gary Mucciaroni, Temple University
Dept of Political Science

Panel #15

Title: PUBLIC FUNCTIONS, PRIVATE INTERESTS

Chair:
Donald Kettl, University of Wisconsin

Papers:
Assessing NASA as a Reinventing Government Initiative or Saving the Space Station
Roger Handberg, Univ. of Central Florida
Dept of Political Science

Privatization and the Twenty-First Century City: Political Rhetoric and Reality in the Indianapolis Experiment
Sheila Suess Kennedy, Indiana University
School of Public and Environmental Affairs
IUPUI

The Administrative Experience of Germany's Treuhandanstalt and the United States' Resolution Trust Corporation: Lessons for Asia?
Mark Cassell, Kent State University
Dept of Political Science

Discussant:
Frank Thompson, SUNY-Albany
Rockefeller College

Panel #16

Title: GLOBALIZATION AND DEMESTIC POLICY

Chair:
Allan Rosenbaum, Florida International University

Papers:
Dolphins and Tuna, Shrimp and Turtles: An American Tale or a Policy Community Goes Global?
Graham Wilson, Univ of Wisconsin-Madison
Dept of Political Science

Procedures, Politics, Trade and Tomatoes
Benjamin Allen, George Mason University

Globalization, Environmental Policy and International Cooperation
Brenda Holzinger, Princeton University

Discussant:
Harvey Feigenbaum, George Washington University
Dept of Political Science

Panel #17

Title: PROVERTY ON OUR MIND: IMAGES OF THE POOR AND WELFARE

Chair:
Ester Fuchs, Barnard College
Center for Urban Policy

Papers:
Inventing Poverty: Popular Images of the Poor and U.S. Welfare Policy, 1929-1996
Jill Edy, University of Michigan
Dept of Communication Studies

Common Perceptions? How Administrators, Clients, and Charitable Providers Look at Welfare Reform
Andrew Glassberg, Univ of Missouri-St. Louis
Public Policy and Administration

George McCall, Univ of Missouri-St. Louis
see above

Julie Middleton, Univ of Missouri
Outreach/Extension

The Social Construction of Target Popula tions and Its Effect on State Welfare Policy
Wendy Simmons, Emory University
Dept of Political Science

Discussant:
Ester Fuchs, Barnard College
Center for Urban Policy

Panel #18

Title: TERM LIMITS: IMPACTS ON STATE LEGISLATURES
(The Public Policy Section is the secondary co-sponsor of this panel, along with State Politics, the primary co-sponsor)

Panel #19

Title: RACE AND PUBLIC POLICY
(The Public Policy Section is the secondary co-sponsor of this panel, along with Race and Ethnicity, the primary co-sponsor)

Note: Arthur Swenson withdrew

Posters:
Regulatory Negotiation Versus Conventional Rulemaking: Claims, Counterclaism, and Empirical Evidence
Laura Langbein and Cornelius Kerwin, American University
Dept of Public Administration
School of Public Affairs

The President, Congress and Policy Out comes: Influences on U.S. Social Welfare Recipients
Virginia Marie Haysley, Univ of New Orleans

Three Strikes and You're Out: Game-winning Play or Unnecessary Roughness?
Elsa Chen, UCLA and RAND Corporation

Righteous Anger: The Religious Right's Response to Changes in the Content of American Public Education
Robert Stacey, University of Richmond
Dept of Political Science

Political Ping-Pong: HUD's Response to Multiple Principals in the EZ/EC Program
Marc Wallace, American University
Dept of Government

Gender-Neutral Family Leave Policy looks Good on Paper: But Does It Promote Equal

Opportunity in the Real World Too?
April Boutillette Brinkman, Cornell Univ.

Sexual Harassment in the Military: A Failure of Enforcement
Lauren Holland, University of Utah
Dept of Political Science

Christina Batjer
same as above

The Political Determinants of Energy Taxes
Svetlana Morozova, Claremont Graduate University
Center for Politics and Economics

Practical Uses of Systems Theory for Policy Design
Jenny Stuart, University of Canberra

**The Policy Agendas Project:
A Public Resource for the Systematic Study of Public Policy**

by Frank R. Baumgartner, Penn State University and Bryan D. Jones, University of Washington

Over the past six years, since the publication of *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*, we have been busy supervising the creation of a series of extremely large and, we hope, useful datasets covering a range of indicators of interest to students of public policy. Our datasets include a sample of stories in the *New York Times*, all congressional hearings, all public laws, all stories in the Congressional Quarterly *Almanac*, and the entire federal budget. Each of these five datasets covers the period of 1947 to 1994 or later (efforts continue to bring the datasets up to date). A large number of scholars have already used these datasets for their own purposes, but here we want to make their availability more widely known. The datasets are free; they have not been fully exploited already by us or by anyone else; and they may be useful to a great number of scholars. Some are already aware of the databases by reading our web site or seeing our conference papers, but many scholars probably are not aware of the availability and the potential usefulness of what we have collected.

In contrast to many scholarly activities where the original collectors of some useful data want to "quarantine" the information until they have exploited it fully themselves, we want to encourage the broadest use of these datasets. There are many reasons for this attitude, the most important of which is that the discipline as a whole will benefit from greater sharing of resources rather than from a continual and repetitive reinvention of the wheel. Our project, supported by the National Science Foundation, Texas A&M University (up to 1998), the University of Washington, and Pennsylvania State University, will serve to answer a number of our own conceptual questions about the policy process. More importantly, perhaps, it can serve as an additional tool to a great number of policy scholars as they investigate whatever issues may be of interest to them.

By promoting the broader use of systematic information, we hope to encourage broader studies of the policy process and to encourage the longitudinal analysis of policy issues. The subfield as a whole should benefit from the use of these data, though, of course, they will not be useful for all purposes. Still, we suspect that a large number of subscribers to this newsletter will find something of use. Several dissertations have used our datasets as a starting point for a more in-depth look at the development of a particular policy, for example. We expect that our five datasets may best serve as the starting point rather than as a complete source of information for most projects, but this will only happen if a broad range of policy scholars are aware of what we have to provide.

The policy agendas project consists of five large datasets, as laid out in the following table:

Dataset/ Period Covered	Source/ Unit of Analysis	No. of Cases/ No. of Variables
Congressional Hearings 1964 to 1994	CIS Abstracts Hearing	~70,000 20
Public Laws 1948 to 1994	CQ Almanac Appendix listing all public laws Public Law	~16,000 17
CQ Stories 1948 to 1994	CQ *Almanac* Story or major section of story	~12,500 37
Federal Budget 1947 to 1995	*Budget of the US* OMB Subfunction	51 years 72 Subfunctions
New York Times Stories (sample) 1947 to 1994	*New York Times Index* Story abstracts	~45,000 20

For each of the five datasets, we provide a complete set of identification variables so that the user can go back to the original documents to look at the source in greater detail. So for example the hearings dataset includes the date and CIS identification number of each hearing; the CQ Stories database includes the section in CQ where the story appeared, etc. In addition, there are a number of analytic variables of use to a variety of scholars: For hearings, we list the committee(s) and subcommittee(s) that held the hearing, whether it was a bill referral, an administration proposal, an appropriations discussion, etc. Complete codebooks for each dataset are available on our web site.

Perhaps the most important element that determines the usefulness of our datasets to a range of users is the extensive set of topic codes that we have devised. In contrast to most sources of longitudinal data, including the federal government's own reports of the budget, we have worked hard to guarantee temporal consistency for our topic categories. That is, we don't change the rules as we go. A hearing that is coded #301, health care availability, would be coded the same way if it appeared in 1952 or in 1992. Typically, keyword searches, published indices, and other sources of publicly available data over time suffer from a tendency to "improve" or "revise" the categorization scheme over time. Our topic categories are consistent over time. This includes our version of the OMB budget authority; we spent over two years simply reading through the footnotes to the annual federal *Budget* noting how OMB had altered their spending classifications over time, and we adjusted the figures so that they are consistent. In the case of the budget dataset, we use the OMB classification of 72 categories of spending (though we adjust it for changing definitions over time and for inflation). For each of the other datasets, we use the following major topics:

Major Topic Categories

1. Macroeconomics
2. Civil Rights
3. Health
4. Agriculture
5. Labor, Immigration, and Employment
6. Education
7. Environment
8. Energy
10. Transportation
12. Law, Crime, and Family Issues
13. Social welfare
14. Community Development and Housing
15. Banking, Finance and Domestic Commerce
16. Defense
17. Space, Science, Technology, and Communications
18. Foreign Trade
19. International Affairs
20. Federal Government Operations
21. Public Lands and Water Management

Additional Major Topics Used for *NY Times* Only
24. State and Local Government Administration
26. Weather and Natural Disasters
27. Fires
28. Arts and Entertainment
29. Sports and Recreation
30. Death Notices
31. Churches and Religion
99. Other, Miscellaneous, and Human Interest

New York Times stories are coded only by the major topics indicated (and, since there are many topics, such as book reviews, sports results, or home improvement ideas, on which Congress is rarely called to legislate, there are no corresponding major topics in the congressional databases for a few categories that exist in the NYT database, as indicated above). Each of the congressional databases is broken down further by subtopic. For example, the major topic of Health is broken down into the following subtopics:

Health Care Subtopics

300 General (includes combinations of multiple subtopics)
301 Health Care Reform, Health Care Costs, Insurance Costs and Availability
303 Medicare and Medicaid
306 Regulation of Prescription Drugs, Medical Devices, and Medical Procedures
307 Health Facilities Construction and Regulation, Public Health Service Issues
309 Mental Illness and Mental Retardation
310 Medical Fraud, Malpractice, and Physician Licensing Requirements
311 Elderly Health Issues
312 Infants, Children, and Immunization
313 Health Manpower Needs and Training Programs
315 Military Health Care
332 Alcohol Abuse and Treatment
333 Tobacco Abuse, Treatment, and Education
334 Illegal Drug Abuse, Treatment, and Education
349 Specific Diseases
398 Research and Development
399 Other

All in all, there are approximately 225 subtopics in our coding system. Users can locate all hearings, CQ stories, and public laws on a given subtopic or broad topic area with ease. For most categories, one of the OMB budget subfunctions or major OMB functional categories of spending also may correspond. Thus, those who want to trace policy actions in a given policy area can use these datasets as a useful starting point. Each dataset except the budget also includes a summary field with a textual description of the item. Therefore, one can cull out of the dataset cases that do not correspond to exactly what one is looking for, or one can re-combine or re-code the data to match another coding system. All in all, the extensive topic and subtopic coding is the key to making these linked datasets useful to a broad audience in public policy.

Downloading instructions, codebooks, and complete documentation are available at our web site: <weber.u.washington.edu/~ampol/agendasproject.html>

Skewered

(A Column Dedicated to The Preservation Of Rotisserie Political Science)[1]

by Joseph Stewart, Jr.

[1]See Meier, Kenneth J. and Joseph Stewart, Jr. 1992. "Rotisserie Political Science." *PS* 25(3).

Send comments or submissions to:
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

Public Policy Section Officers

President
Peter Eisinger
Wayne State University

President-elect
Paul Quirk
University of Illinois

Secretary/Treasurer
Mark Schneider
State University of New York-Stony Brook

Council Members
Frank Baumgartner
Pennsylvania State University

Christopher Bosso
Northeastern University

John Hird
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

Rosemary O'Leary
Indiana University

Evan Ringquist
Florida State University

Elaine Sharp
University of Kansas

David Leo Weimer
University of Rochester

Susan Welch
Pennsylvania State University

Pietro Nivola
Brookings Institution

Paul Peterson
Harvard

Gary Bryner
Brigham Young University

Mary Ann Steger
Northern Arizona University

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

Personals:

Policy Currents is continuing to accept personal ads for our 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

Send address changes to:

Director, Member Services
c/o American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Please include information that the address change applies to the Public Policy section.

Editor
Hank C. Jenkins-Smith
hjsmith@unm.edu

Managing Editor
Kristin E. Kenyon
kkenyon@unm.edu

Assistant Managing Editor
Leopoldo V. Jaramillo
leoj@unm.edu

Abstracts, announcements, and other information to be printed in the next issue of Policy Currents should be sent on 3.5" diskette to:
Editor, Policy Currents
University of New Mexico
Institute for Public Policy
1805 Sigma Chi NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121

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