

PUBLIC POLICY COMPREHENSIVE EXAMS

Requirements

Prior to taking a comprehensive exam in public policy, all students must have taken and passed at least two courses:

- PS 625: Graduate Seminar in Public Policy (required), and
- At least one of the classes in the following list, when offered by a faculty member in the department's Public Policy subfield (consult the list at polisci.uoregon.edu/fields/public-policy)
 - PS 566: Legalizing Civil Rights in Post-Warren Era
 - PS 567: US Presidency
 - PS 571: Intergenerational Justice
 - PS 577: International Environmental Politics
 - PS 584: US Supreme Court
 - PS 595: US Political Economy
 - PS 630: States and Regimes

In the event that these courses are not offered before the student takes the exam – or if the student was otherwise unable to take one of these courses – the student should contact the chair of the policy field to explore other options to fulfill the course requirements. These alternate options must be approved through an exception process; consult the Director of Graduate Studies.

The public policy subfield will organize an annual roundtable on preparation for the policy exam. All prospective public policy students should attend. Consult the public policy subfield chair for details.

Students taking a comprehensive exam in public policy are expected to have read the public policy literature as defined by the Public Policy Core Reading List. All students must demonstrate their mastery of that Core Reading List as well as additions to that list that reflect the student's particular interests, developed in consultation with the full Public Policy field committee. Students should begin this consultation well in advance of the anticipated term of examination.

Those taking a MAJOR exam must master additional readings covering BOTH a key theoretical subfield within Public Policy AND a substantive area of expertise. Students taking a major exam will answer three (3) questions.

Those taking a MINOR exam must master additional readings covering EITHER a key theoretical subfield within Public Policy OR a substantive area of expertise. Students taking a minor exam will answer two (2) questions.

The Public Policy Committee offers a reading list for the “pre-specified” subtheme of “Law and Public Policy.” The reading list for this subtheme can serve as either a theoretical subfield OR a substantive area of expertise.

The Core Reading List will be posted on the Department of Political Science website. This list is intended to serve as a *starting point* for student preparation for the core theme. In addition, an archive of reading lists for theoretical subfields and substantive areas will be maintained as students who take the comp exam develop them in consultation with the committee. Again, these lists are intended to serve as *starting points* for student preparation for the corresponding theme.

For all comprehensive exams, *questions* will be solicited from all current faculty on the Public Policy Field Committee. Students taking a major comprehensive exam will have the option to contribute a question focused on a substantive area of expertise. The question will be placed on the exam if approved by the committee. That question must be submitted at the time the comprehensive exam contract is written, and under no circumstances after the Friday of week 1 of the term in which the exam will be taken. This option is designed to foster a focused dialogue within the committee and between faculty and student prior to the exam. The completed examination will be *evaluated* by three Field Committee members to be determined by the Field Committee chair in consultation with all members of the Field Committee.

As part of writing a contract with their committee, the student will develop a list of readings for either a theoretical subfield or a substantive area, or both. That list or those lists should reflect both the field committee's and the student's assessment of important new works in the field covered by the theme. The committee expects students to make reference to all appropriate and relevant work in the field, whether or not those works were included in the student's contracted reading list. Good comprehensive exam answers demonstrate empirical knowledge of important cases as well as the student's ability to explore and understand the application of a theory to a particular empirical context.

Structure of the Exam

Those taking a MAJOR exam must do (a), (b), and (c) below.

Those taking a MINOR exam must do (a) and either (b) or (c) below.

(a) Core: answer 1 of 2 (or more) questions provided by the committee, which will cover the full breadth of the Core Reading List.

(b) Theoretical subfield: answer 1 of 2 (or more) questions provided by the committee that may cover the full breadth of the Theoretical Subfield Additional Readings. The list of additional readings will be developed through a consultation between the student and the committee chair and members. This list will include no less than 20 readings (books, articles, chapters) designed to help the student develop a theoretically-informed mastery of a key theoretical field within public policy (e.g., agenda setting, bureaucracy, regulation, political economy, implementation, decision making, and policy evaluation).

(c) Substantive area: answer 1 of 2 (or more) questions provided by the committee that may cover the full breadth of the Substantive Area Additional Readings. The list of additional readings will be developed through a consultation between the student and the committee chair and members. This list will include no less than 20 readings (books, articles, chapters) designed to help the student develop a theoretically-informed and sophisticated knowledge of a particular substantive area of expertise (e.g., health care, poverty, environment, business regulation, immigration, science and technology policy).

PUBLIC POLICY COMPREHENSIVE EXAMS

Public Policy Core Reading List

Allison, G. T. 1971. *Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Ansell, Chris, and Alison Gash. "Collaborative governance in theory and practice." *Journal of public administration research and theory* 18.4 (2008): 543-571.

Baumgartner, F. R. and B. D. Jones. 2009. *Agendas and instability in American politics* (2nd edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beck, U. 1992. *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Breyer, S. G. 1982. *Regulation and its reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brinkerhoff, D. W. and B. L. Crosby. 2002. *Managing policy reform: concepts and tools for decision-makers in developing and transitioning countries*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Cohen, M. D., et al. 1972. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17(1): 1-25.

Dryzek, J. S. 1990. *Discursive democracy: politics, policy, and political science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dorf, M. and C. F. Sabel. 1998. *A constitution of democratic experimentalism*. *Harvard Law Review*.

Fischer, F. and J. Forester. 1993. *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fung, A., et al. 2007. Full disclosure: the perils and promise of transparency. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapter 3.

Fung, A. and E. O. Wright. 2003. Deepening democracy: institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance. London: Verso.

Haas, P. M. 1992. Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization* 46(1): 1-35.

Hacker, J. S. 2002. The divided welfare state : the battle over public and private social benefits in the United States. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hajer, M. A. and H. Wagenaar. 2003. Deliberative policy analysis : understanding governance in the network society. *Theories of institutional design*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heclo, H. 1978. Issue networks and the executive establishment. *The New American Political System*, edited by S. H. Beer and A. S. King: 87-124. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Hirschman, A. O. 1970. Exit, voice and loyalty. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jasanoff, S. 1990. The fifth branch: science advisers as policymakers. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kingdon, J. W. 2003. Agendas, alternatives, and public policies. New York: Longman.

Lieberman, R. C. 1995. Social construction continued (with response from Schneider and Ingram). *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 437-446.

Lindblom, C. E. 1959. The science of "muddling through". *Public Administration Review* 19: 79-88.

Lindblom, C. E. 1990. Inquiry and change: the troubled attempt to understand and shape society. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lowi, T. J. 1972. Four systems of policy, politics, and choice. *Public Administration Review* 32(4): 298-310.

McCubbins, M. D., et al. 1989. Structure and process, politics and policy: administrative arrangements and the political control of agencies in the US. *Virginia Law Review* 75: 431-482.

Melnick, R. S. 1994. Between the lines : interpreting welfare rights. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Mettler, S. 2005. Soldiers to citizens : the G.I. bill and the making of the greatest generation. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, R. B. 2009. International politics and the environment. London: Sage Publications.

Moss, D. A. 2002. When all else fails : government as the ultimate risk manager. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Perrow, C. 1999. Normal accidents : living with high-risk technologies. *Princeton paperbacks*: x, 451 p. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Pressman, J. L. and A. Wildavsky. 1973. Implementation: how great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sabatier, P. A. 2007. Theories of the policy process (2nd ed.). *Theoretical lenses on public policy*. Boulder: Westview.

Sabel, C. F. 1997. Design, deliberation and democracy: on the new pragmatism of public and private institutions. *Liberal institutions, economic constitutional rights, and the role of organizations*, edited by K.-H. Ladeur. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

- Sarnoff, S. K. 2001. Sanctified snake oil: the effect of junk science on public policy. Westport: Praeger.
- Schneider, A. L. and H. M. Ingram. 1997. Policy design for democracy. *Studies in government and public policy*: xii, 241 p. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Schneider, A. and H. Ingram. 1993. Social construction of target populations: implications for politics and policy. *American Political Science Review* 87(2): 334-347.
- Schön, D. A. and M. Rein. 1994. Frame reflection: toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies. New York: BasicBooks.
- Schram, S. 1995. Words of welfare : the poverty of social science and the social science of poverty. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schneiberg, M. and T. Bartley. 2008. Organizations, regulation and economic behavior: regulatory dynamics and forms from the 19th to the 21st century. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 4: 31-61.
- Skocpol, T. 1992. Protecting soldiers and mothers : the political origins of social policy in the United States. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Stone, D. A. 2002. Policy paradox : the art of political decision making. New York: Norton.
- Thaler, R. H. and C. R. Sunstein. 2008. Nudge: improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Viscusi, W. K., et al. 2005. Economics of regulation and antitrust (4th edition). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, particularly chapters 1 and 2.

Law and Public Policy

Aiyah and Summers. Form and Substance in Anglo-American Law

Baum, The Supreme Court in American Politics Burke, Lawyers Lawsuits and Litigants

Benesh, Sara C. 2006. "Understanding Public Confidence in American Courts," Journal of Politics, 68: 697-707

Ely, Democracy and Distrust

Epp, The Rights Revolution

Feeley and Rubin, Judicial Policy Making and the Modern State

Flemming, Roy B., Dan Wood, and John Bohte. 1999. "Attention to Issues in a System of Separated Powers: The Macrodynamics of American Policy Agendas." The Journal of Politics 61, 1: 76-108.

Friedman, American Law in the 20th Century

Galanter "Why the 'Haves' Come Out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change," Law and Society Review 9 (1974)

Gibson and Caldeira 1992. "The Etiology of Public Support for the Supreme Court," American Journal of Political Science 36: 635-664.

Ginsburg, Judicial Review in New Democracies

Glendon, Rights Talk: The Impoverishment of Political Discourse.

Graber, Mark A. 1993. "The Nonmajoritarian Difficulty: Legislative Deference to the Judiciary," Studies in American Political Development 7.

Horowitz, The Courts and Social Policy.

Kagan, Adversarial Legalism: The American Way of Law. Harvard Univ. Press.

Keck, Beyond Backlash: Assessing the Impact of Judicial Decisions on LGBT Rights

Klarman, Michael. 1994. "How Brown Changed Race Relations: The Backlash Thesis." *The Journal of American History*. Vol. 81, No. 1, p. 81-118.

Klarman. 2005 "Brown and Lawrence (and Goodridge)," *104 Michigan Law Rev.* 431–89.

McCann, *Rights at Work*

McCann, Michael. 1992. "Reform Litigation on Trial." *Law & Social Inquiry*, Vol. 17, No. 4, 715-743.

McCloskey and Levinson, *American Supreme Court*

Melnick, *Between the Lines*

Miller and Barnes, *Making Policy, Making Law*

Persily, Citrin and Egan, eds. *Public Opinion and Constitutional Controversy*.

Post, Robert and Reva Siegel. 2007. "Roe Rage: Democratic Constitutionalism and Backlash." *42 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev.* 373-434.

Reed, *On Equal Terms: The Constitutional Politics of Educational Opportunity*.

Rosenberg, *The Hollow Hope*

Scheingold, Stuart, *The Politics of Rights*,

Shapiro, *Courts*

Silverstein, *Law's Allure: How Law Shapes, Constrains, Saves and Kills Politics*

Skrentny, *Minority Rights Revolution*

Teles, *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement*