



**Oregon State  
University**

**Course Name:** Public Policy Theory

**Course Number:** PPOL 512

**Term Offered:** Summer 2020

**Credits:** 4

**Instructor name:** Brent S. Steel

**Instructor email:** [bsteel@oregonstate.edu](mailto:bsteel@oregonstate.edu)

**Instructor phone:** 541-737-6133

**Link to instructor website:** <http://liberalarts.oregonstate.edu/spp/polisci/brent-s-steel>

### **COURSE CATALOG DESCRIPTION**

Theoretical approaches to the study of the policy process, policy elements, policy tools, (e.g., regulation), and policy typologies. **PREREQS:** Departmental approval required.

### **COURSE OVERVIEW**

Public policy can be studied in a variety of ways. In general, students tend to be most familiar with approaches that focus on the content of public policy: specific policy prescriptions, regulations, incentives, etc. A policy analysis or a policy evaluation course, for example, would likely spend a great deal of time on this content focused way of understanding public policy. This course takes a different approach.

The title of this course is *Public Policy Theory*. As such, this class will take a broader more general view of public policy than the content focus most students already understand or intuitively gravitate toward. This class focuses more so on understanding the *processes* of public policy as opposed to the specifics of any particular policy or context. In a way, any policy content we embrace is incidental or merely illustrative of the processes that are the focus of this class. As you can imagine, such a view of public policy is necessarily wide-angle, sweeping, and in need of both reliable assumptions and generalizations. The intent with this kind of approach is to better understand the how and why of policy. Why and how do some policies end up on the agenda and others do not? Why and how do some policies fail and others succeed? Who makes decisions? When does policy change or policy learning occur? These kinds of questions guide the content and course readings of this class. As we move through our exploration you will observe that different approaches have been applied to different questions to varying effect. Consequently, we have seen a proliferation of policy process approaches where no one approach works equally well for all questions or contexts. Our goal is to explore the major approaches.

### **COMMUNICATION**

Please post all course-related questions in the General Discussion Forum so that the whole class may benefit from our conversation. Please email your instructor for matters of a personal nature. I will reply to course-related questions and email within 24-48 hours. I will strive to return your assignments and grades for course activities to you within five days of the due date.

### **COURSE CREDITS**

This course combines approximately 120 hours of instruction, online activities, and assignments for 4 credits.

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

If you experience computer difficulties, need help downloading a browser or plug-in, assistance logging into the course, or if you experience any errors or problems while in your online course, contact the OSU Help Desk for assistance. You can call (541) 737-3474, email [osuhelpdesk@oregonstate.edu](mailto:osuhelpdesk@oregonstate.edu) or visit the [OSU Computer Helpdesk](#) online.

## LEARNING RESOURCES

All books are available through the OSU Beaver Store and other readings are available at the course Canvas site. You also can purchase books from Amazon, Barnes & Noble, etc. Readings are divided into three types: 1) core texts refer to texts which will provide the foundational material for the course; 2) auxiliary texts refers to books that are used as *alternatives to* or *critiques of* our foundational material; and, 3) Web Readings and External Links, which will supplement our other texts and guide critical discussions.

### *The core texts:*

1. Christopher Weible and Paul A. Sabatier (eds). 2017. *Theories of the Policy Process*, 4th edition. Boulder: Westview Press.

This book provides an excellent overview of the mainstream approaches to studying the policy process including but not limited to institutional rational choice, social construction, narrative policy framework, punctuated equilibrium and the advocacy coalition framework.

2. Smith, Kevin B., and Christopher W. Larimer, 2013. *The Public Policy Theory Primer*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Boulder: Westview Press, or 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 2016. **The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition is free online at the OSU Valley Library.**

This book approaches major questions posed by policy scholars (and practitioners) and makes some attempt to provide a broad sense of what answers have been produced, and then evaluate those answers.

### *Auxiliary texts:*

3. Domhoff, William G. 2014. *Who Rules America?* Boston: McGraw-Hill (earlier editions also work).

Provides an alternative class based sociological macro-framework for analyzing the policy process and power relationships in the U.S. context (although much of this framework could be applied to other countries as well).

4. Stone, Deborah. 2012. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. New York: Norton.

Stone's book can and should be read as a postmodern critique of dominant economic approaches to the study of public policy. Read for basic concepts, not details. She includes one or two tables in most chapters as excellent summaries after you have read the chapter.

### *Web Readings and External Links:*

There are numerous required articles, chapters and external web links required. All readings are located under "Modules" located at the course Canvas site.

**Note to prospective students:** Please check with the OSU Bookstore for up-to-date information for the term you enroll (<http://osubeaverstore.com/Academics> or 800-595-0357). If you purchase course materials from other sources, be very careful to obtain the correct ISBN.

## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

*The course seeks to develop in students...*

1. A sense of alternative approaches to the examination of public policy and of their respective strengths and limits.
2. Awareness of the role of interests, ideas, knowledge, uncertainties, and other factors in relation to the development and consideration of public policy.
3. Awareness of factors that affect whether and how topics become “problems” and get on the agendas of government for consideration.
4. A sense of approaches toward and tools of policy formulation and policy enactment, including the importance of language and other political elements that affect public and elite perceptions and actions.
5. Recognition of the importance of policy application (implementation, and its sub-component, budgeting) and awareness of factors that affect the relative success of implementation of policy decisions.
6. Awareness of the complexity of policy evaluation in terms of mixes of values, interests, competing orientations, and other factors, and of the ubiquity and effect of the evaluation of policies.
7. Conceptual clarity in evaluating overall policy development, drawing on various approaches that attempt to account for those developments.
8. The ability to synthesize all these to a specific area of public policy development.
9. Enhanced ability to explore policy issues and to present the results of those explorations clearly, concisely, and in compelling form in written and oral communication.

*Additional skill set outcomes:*

- A. Learn how to write a policy brief.
- B. Develop presentation skills.
- C. Ability to facilitate group discussion.
- D. Ability to work with groups.
- E. Ability to take on leadership roles.

## EVALUATION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

### **Weekly Canvas Discussion**

Participation in **NINE** weekly Canvas discussion groups is required beginning Week 2. Discussion topics should relate to the week’s assigned readings and other relevant observations. Each student must submit **ONE** original posting by Wednesday (11:00 pm). Then each student is responsible for **TWO** additional replies (minimum) to another student’s posting by Sunday (11:00 pm).

### **Policy Response Papers**

Each MPP student is responsible for submitting **FOUR** Policy Response (PR) papers. There are ten opportunities to submit these assignments. Each précis/reaction paper should be a succinct two-page paper (single-spaced, 11 point, times new roman font, with normal borders) that distills the essential elements of the assigned article and related elements of the core readings. PR Papers are due by 8:00 am Friday of the content selected (e.g., IAD PR is due Second week of class). For the purposes of this class, these essential elements are defined as:

1. **Theory:** Summarize the policy process framework. You should identify the core components and subcomponents, as well as core processes and relationships (you should supplement this section with core readings for that week).
2. **Method:** Briefly summarize the methods used in the study.

3. **Findings:** Briefly summarize the findings in the study.
4. **Compare and/or Strengths and Weaknesses:** Briefly compare/contrast this study with policy process frameworks that we have already covered in the course (e.g., you might note where another framework might be more useful; why “this” framework is especially useful for this case). If you do not feel comparison is appropriate, please speak to the strengths and weaknesses of the study (both theoretical and methodological).
5. **Practical Utility:** Speculate about how useful this process framework and this type of study would be to a practitioner. (If you were working as a policy analyst, when would you use this? When would you avoid it? Why?)
6. **Brilliant Insights or Thoughts:** Category six is the only reason you should go over two pages. As to what you write here, well....hard to say: it should be brilliant though! (And no more than one additional page).
7. **Be sure to cite appropriately and include a reference page (this page will not be counted against your page limit).**

The PR paper assignments are intended to accomplish two goals. The first goal is to help students distill the intricate and complex policy process approaches we cover in class into manageable and memorable core concepts. I want each of you to be able to return to these papers and quickly remember what it is about this or that framework that was important. Second, each of the papers will be written on actual academic research. This is important (and we will learn in this class) because policy people rarely use academic research to make policy. My hope is that when you go out into the policy world, you will be better equipped to bridge the aloof ivory tower and the messy political world of actual public policy making (including analysis, evaluation, and implementation). I want to emphasize, however, that students in my past courses have found these to be very difficult papers to write because of the required brevity and precision. Please budget an appropriate amount of time (i.e., likely more than your initial inclination) to complete these assignments.

### Policy Theory Paper

The major project in the course is a policy theory paper in which you apply course materials and review extant scholarship and research to better understand a policy area or policy problem of your own choosing. This assignment usually works best if the topic is relevant to your own interests and/or degree track (e.g., ocean policy, forest policy, water policy, health policy, rural policy, etc.). The paper should be 15-20 pages (double-spaced, normal font, standard margins, numbered, etc.) and is worth a maximum of 300 points. Papers should use a consistent citation format, have proper grammar and spelling, and presents a proper introduction. If there are multiple spelling errors, bad grammar, or a failure to communicate the thrust of your paper in the introduction, I will not read the rest of the paper. ***An Initial Policy Theory Paper statement due (1-2 pages plus outline) is due January 27. This statement should include the topic, paper outline, and at least 5 references on the topic. Failure to submit the statement will result in a lower final score.*** The final paper is due March 20 by 6:00 pm.

Your analysis should include the components below. In each case it is essential that you draw on and cite relevant course and other materials:

1. **Introduction:** This section introduces your chosen policy area or problem. In this section you want to briefly establish why your policy area is important, how your paper addresses the policy area or problem, and tell us where your paper is going and how it plans to get there.
2. **Literature Review of Your Policy Area/Problem:** In this section you want to have an extended discussion of what was introduced in the introduction about your policy area/problem (a rule of thumb here is that a sentence in the intro usually equals a paragraph in the body of the paper, but this is only a rule of thumb). In this section will overview your policy area by detailing what has happened (e.g., on the agenda, passed, being implemented; or put on agenda but failed to pass), the emergence of key issues/concerns/etc., and the current status

of your policy area or problem. Most importantly, however, your literature review will tell us what we already know in terms of extant research (when it comes to sources academic presses and peer-reviewed journals are best. Focus on these where possible—but other sources can and should be consulted, such as government agency reports, trade books from trustworthy sources, etc.)

3. **Theories of the Policy Process and Your Policy Area/Problem:** In this section you will need to determine what the various theories, policy sub-fields, and policy process frameworks have to say about your policy area or problem (e.g., ACF, IAD, Multiple Streams, policy evaluation studies, policy analysis reports, etc.). You do not need to cover every single theory, sub-field, or framework that we covered in class. In most cases what you pay attention to will be dictated by what has been done; in some cases however, (such as if you picked the broad area of environmental policy), you might find you have too many sources. In those cases pick the best of what you find.
4. **Assess the Theories of the Policy Process and your area:** What aspects of your policy or problem have been addressed extensively? To what end? Where is work needed? Are there similar findings produced by different frameworks? Ultimately, how this section is structured will depend on what you found in the previous section. The important part here is that you need to think synthetically (synthesize what you found), comparatively (compare findings, approaches, etc.), and analytically (argue and write well).
5. **Moving Forward:** In this final section, you have the opportunity to map where you would like to see policy theory to better understand your policy area/problem. You can focus on whatever you like here: solutions, gaps in our knowledge, a specific research design that you would like to employ, etc.

In order to help facilitate a quality paper, your policy theory paper will be “turned in” for assessment at several critical points throughout the semester. The rubric used to evaluate this paper is available

#### Policy Theory Paper

Assignment	Description	Date	Points
Statement	A one paragraph statement about which policy area or problem you intend to examine; and 5 references.	July 5	10 Points.
Annotated Bibliography	An annotated list of references you will be consulting for your paper. I would guess you would need 20 minimum, but this list should be large as it will provide the basis for your paper and it is likely you will not use all the references.	July 19	25 Points
Outline	A full outline of your paper, including subheadings, and transition sentences between subheadings.	July 26	15 Points
Rough Draft	This is your first cut at the manuscript. Usually these are longer than the page limit (the delete key is your best friend for rewrites).	August 16	25 Points
Final Draft	A final, polished, insightful 15-20 page paper.	Sept.4	250 Points
<b>Total:</b>			<b>325 Points</b>

### Course Assignments and Points

Assignment	Possible Points	Learning Outcomes	Skill Set Outcomes
Weekly Canvas Discussion	135 (15 points each)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9	B, C, E
Policy Response Papers	100 (25 points each)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	A
Policy Theory Paper	325	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	A
<b>Total=</b>	<b>560</b>		

### GRADING SCALE

Course Letter Grade	Percent of points possible*
A	[95-100%]
A-	[90-94%]
B+	[87-89%]
B	[83-86%]
B-	[80-82%]
C+	[77-79%]
C	[73-76%]
C-	[70-72%]
D+	[67-69%]
D	[63-66%]
D-	[60-62%]
F	[0-59%]

### CLASS SCHEDULE

	General Class Readings
<b>Week 1</b>	<p><b>Introducing Public Policy Theory: The Field of Public Policy, Early Frameworks, and Practical Importance</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Smith and Larimer, Chapters 1 and 2</b>, pp. 1-45.</li> <li>2. <b>Weible and Sabatier, pp. 1-16</b>; Weible's "Introduction: the Scope and Focus of Policy Process Research and Theory"</li> <li>3. <b>Stone, Chapter 1</b>, pp. 1-37: Introduction and Politics</li> <li>4. <b>Domhoff, Introduction and Chapter 1</b>: pp. xi-21</li> </ol> <p><b>Policy Response Article</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Weible et al. 2012. "Understanding and Influencing the Policy Process," <i>Policy Sciences</i>, 45: pp. 1-21.</li> </ol>
<b>Week 2</b>	<b>Institutional Analysis and Development Framework</b>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Smith &amp; Larimer, Chapter 3:</b> “Who Makes Decisions? How do they Make Decisions? Actors and Institutions.” pp 47-72</li> <li>2. <b>Sabatier 2007, Chapter 6</b>, pp. 215-252: Schlager and Cox, “The IAD Framework and the SES Framework: An Introduction and Assessment of the Ostrom Workshop Frameworks”</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Imperial Mark. T. 1999. “Institutional Analysis and Eco-System-Based Management: the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework.” <i>Environmental Management</i>, 24(4): 449-65.</li> <li>4. Basurto, Xavier. 2005. “How Locally Designed Access and Use Controls Can Prevent the Tragedy of the Commons in a Mexican Small-Sale Fishing Community.” <i>Society and Natural Resources</i>, 18: 643-659.</li> <li>5. <b>Stone Chapters 2-6</b>, pp. 39-154: Goals</li> </ol>
<b>Week 3</b>	<p><b>The Multiple Streams Approach</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Smith &amp; Larimer, Chapter 4 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) or Chapter 5 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed):</b> “Where does Policy Come From? The Policy Process.”</li> <li>2. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 1</b>, pp. 17-54: Herweg, Zahariadis and Zohlnhofer, “The Multiple Streams Framework: Foundations, Refinements, and Empirical Applications”</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Blankenau. 2001. “The Fate of National Health Insurance Coverage in Canada and the United States: A Multiple Streams Explanation,” <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 20 (1): 38-55.</li> <li>4. <b>Stone, Chapters 7-11</b>, pp. 157-268: Problems.</li> <li>5. Jones et al. 2015. “A River runs through it: A Multiple Streams Meta-Review,” <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> (June).</li> </ol>
<b>Week 4</b>	<p><b>Punctuated Equilibrium Theory</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 2, pp. 55-102:</b> Jones, and Mortensen. “Punctuated Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in Public Policymaking.”</li> <li>2. Prindle, David F. 2012. “Importing Concepts from Biology into Political Science: The Case of Punctuated Equilibrium.” <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 40 (1): 21-44.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Schrad. 2009. “Constitutional Blemishes: American Alcohol Prohibition and Repeal as Policy Punctuation.” <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 35 (3): 437-463.</li> <li>4. Worsham, Jeff and Chaun Stores. 2012. Pet Sounds: Subsystems, Regimes, Policy Punctuations, and the Neglect of African American Farmers, 1935-2006. <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 40 (1): 169-190.</li> <li>5. Givel, Michael. 2006. “Punctuated Equilibrium in Limbo: The Tobacco Lobby and U.S. State Policymaking from 1990 to 2003. <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 34 (3): 405-418.</li> </ol>
<b>Week 5</b>	<p><b>The Advocacy Coalition Framework</b></p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 4, pp. 135-172:</b> Jenkins-Smith et al. "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Overview of the Research Program."</li> <li>2. Weible, Christopher M., Paul A. Sabatier, and Kelly McQueen. 2009. "Themes and Variations: Taking Stock of the Advocacy Coalition Framework." <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 37 (1): 121-140.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Stich &amp; Miller. 2008. "Using the Advocacy Coalition Framework to Understand Freight Transportation Policy Change." <i>Public Works Management Policy</i> 13, 62-74.</li> <li>4. Nohrstedt, Daniel. 2008. The Politics of Crisis Policymaking: Chernobyl and Swedish Nuclear Energy Policy." <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 36 (2): 257-278.</li> <li>5. Jorgensen, Paul. D. 2017. "The Politics of Policy Formulation: Overcoming Subsystem Dynamics." In Michael Howlett and Ishani Mukherjee (eds.), <i>Handbook of Policy Formulation</i>. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, p. 449-462.</li> </ol>
<b>Week 6</b>	<p><b>Innovation and Diffusion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 7, pp. 253-300.</b> "Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research"</li> <li>2. Shipan, Charles R., and Craig Volden. "The mechanisms of policy diffusion." <i>American journal of political science</i> 52, no. 4 (2008): 840-857.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Wiener, Joshua G., and Tomas M. Koontz. "Shifting Winds: Explaining Variation in State Policies to Promote Small-Scale Wind Energy." <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> 38, no. 4 (2010): 629-651.</li> <li>4. Krause, Rachel M. "Policy innovation, intergovernmental relations, and the adoption of climate protection initiatives by US cities." <i>Journal of Urban Affairs</i> 33, no. 1 (2011): 45-60.</li> <li>5. Daley, Dorothy M., and James C. Garand. "Horizontal diffusion, vertical diffusion, and internal pressure in state environmental policymaking, 1989-1998." <i>American Politics Research</i> 33, no. 5 (2005): 615-644.</li> </ol>
<b>Week 7</b>	<p><b>Policy Design and Social Construction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Smith and Larimer, Chapter 8 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) or Chapter 4 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed):</b> "Whose Values? Policy Design."</li> <li>2. <b>Sabatier and Weible, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Chapter 4,</b> pp. 105-150: Ingram, Schneider, and DeLeon. "Democratic Policy Design: Social Construction of Target Populations."</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Sidney, M. 2001. "Images of Race, Class, and Markets: Rethinking the Origin of U.S. Fair Housing Policy." <i>Journal of Policy History</i>, 13 (2): 181-214.</li> <li>4. Pierce, Jonathan J., Saba Siddiki, Michael D. Jones, Kristin Schumacher, Andrew Pattison, &amp; Holly Peterson. 2014. "Understanding what is Inside the Box: Analysis of the Policy Design and Social Construction Literature." <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 42 (1): 1-29.</li> <li>5. <b>Stone, Chapters 12-16, pp. 271-378:</b> Solutions.</li> </ol>



<b>Week 8</b>	<p><b>The Narrative Policy Framework</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 5</b>, pp. 173-214: Jones, McBeth and Radaelli, "The Narrative Policy Framework."</li> <li>2. Weible, Christopher and Edella Schlager. 2014. "Narrative Policy Framework: Contributions, Limitations, and Recommendations." in <i>The Science of Stories: Applications of the Narrative Policy Framework in Public Policy Analysis</i>, (ed.) Michael D. Jones, Elizabeth A. Shanahan, and Mark K. McBeth. New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 235-246.</li> </ol> <hr/> <p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Shanahan, Elizabeth, Michael D. Jones, Mark K. McBeth, and Ross Lane. 2013. "An Angel on the Wind: How Heroic Policy Narratives Shape Policy Realities." <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 41 (3): 453-483.</li> <li>4. Jones, Michael D. 2013. "Cultural Characters and Climate Change: How Heroes Shape our Perceptions of Climate Science." <i>Social Science Quarterly</i>, 95 (1): 1-39.</li> <li>5. Ney, Steven. 2014. "The Governance of Social Innovation: Connecting Meso and Macro Levels of Analysis." In <i>The Science of Stories: Applications of the Narrative Policy Framework in Public Policy Analysis</i>, (ed.) Michael D. Jones, Elizabeth Shanahan, and Mark K. McBeth. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.</li> </ol>
<b>Week 9</b>	<p><b>Policy Feedback Theory</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Sabatier and Weible, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Chapter 5</b>, pp. 151-182: Mettler and SoRelle "Policy Feedback Theory."</li> </ol> <hr/> <p><b>Policy Response Articles</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Jordan, Jason. 2013. "Policy Feedback and Support for the Welfare State," <i>Journal of European Social Policy</i> 23: 134-148.</li> <li>3. Kline, David. 2001. "Positive Feedback, Lock-In, and Environmental Policy," <i>Policy Sciences</i> 34: 95-107.</li> </ol>
<b>Week 10</b>	<p><b>Surveying and Critiquing the Field</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Smith &amp; Larimer, Chapter 9 &amp; 10 (both 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> ed).</b></li> <li>2. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 8</b>, pp. 301-328: Heikkila and Cairney, "A Comparison of Theories of the Policy Process."</li> <li>3. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 9</b>, pp.329-362: Tosun and Workman, "Struggle and Triumph in Fusing Policy Process and Comparative Research."</li> <li>4. <b>Weible and Sabatier, Chapter 10</b>, pp. 363-378: Weible, "Moving Forward and Climbing Upward: Advancing Policy Process Research."</li> <li>5. <b>Stone Conclusion, pp. 379-386</b>: Policy Analysis and Political Argument.</li> </ol> <hr/> <p><b>Policy Response Book</b></p> <p>Domhoff, (All)</p>
<b>Finals Week</b>	<b>Policy Theory Paper Due</b>

## **COURSE POLICIES**

### **Discussion Participation**

Students are expected to participate in all graded discussions. While there is great flexibility in online courses, this is not a self-paced course. You will need to participate in our discussions on at least two different days each week, with your first post due no later than Wednesday evening, and your second and third posts due by the end of each week.

### **Incompletes**

Incomplete (I) grades will be granted only in emergency cases (usually only for a death in the family, major illness or injury, or birth of your child), and if the student has turned in 80% of the points possible (in other words, usually everything but the final paper). If you are having any difficulty that might prevent you completing the coursework, please don't wait until the end of the term; let me know right away.

### **Statement Regarding Students with Disabilities**

Accommodations for students with disabilities are determined and approved by Disability Access Services (DAS). If you, as a student, believe you are eligible for accommodations but have not obtained approval please contact DAS immediately at 541-737-4098 or at <http://ds.oregonstate.edu>. DAS notifies students and faculty members of approved academic accommodations and coordinates implementation of those accommodations. While not required, students and faculty members are encouraged to discuss details of the implementation of individual accommodations.

### **Accessibility of Course Materials**

All materials used in this course are accessible at the Canvas wwebsite (excluding required textbooks). If you require accommodations please contact [Disability Access Services \(DAS\)](#).

Additionally, Canvas, the learning management system through which this course is offered, provides a [vendor statement](#) certifying how the platform is accessible to students with disabilities.

### **Expectations for Student Conduct**

Student conduct is governed by the university's policies, as explained in the OSU Code of Student Conduct:

[http://studentlife.oregonstate.edu/sites/studentlife.oregonstate.edu/files/code\\_of\\_student\\_conduct.pdf](http://studentlife.oregonstate.edu/sites/studentlife.oregonstate.edu/files/code_of_student_conduct.pdf)

### **Academic Integrity**

Students are expected to comply with all regulations pertaining to academic honesty. For further information, visit [Student Conduct and Community Standards](#), or contact the office of Student Conduct and Mediation at 541-737-3656.

OAR 576-015-0020 (2) Academic or Scholarly Dishonesty:

a) Academic or Scholarly Dishonesty is defined as an act of deception in which a Student seeks to claim credit for the work or effort of another person, or uses unauthorized materials or fabricated information in any academic work or research, either through the Student's own efforts or the efforts of another.

b) It includes:

(i) CHEATING - use or attempted use of unauthorized materials, information or study aids, or an act of deceit by which a Student attempts to misrepresent mastery of academic effort or information. This includes but is not limited to unauthorized copying or collaboration on a test or assignment, using prohibited materials and texts, any misuse of an electronic device, or using any deceptive means to gain academic credit.

(ii) FABRICATION - falsification or invention of any information including but not limited to falsifying research, inventing or exaggerating data, or listing incorrect or fictitious references.

(iii) ASSISTING - helping another commit an act of academic dishonesty. This includes but is not limited to paying or bribing someone to acquire a test or assignment, changing someone's grades or academic records, taking a test/doing an assignment for someone else by any means, including misuse of an electronic device. It is a violation of Oregon state law to create and offer to sell part or all of an educational assignment to another person (ORS 165.114).

(iv) TAMPERING - altering or interfering with evaluation instruments or documents.

(v) PLAGIARISM - representing the words or ideas of another person or presenting someone else's words, ideas, artistry or data as one's own, or using one's own previously submitted work. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to copying another person's work (including unpublished material) without appropriate referencing, presenting someone else's opinions and theories as one's own, or working jointly on a project and then submitting it as one's own.

c) Academic Dishonesty cases are handled initially by the academic units, following the process outlined in the University's Academic Dishonesty Report Form, and will also be referred to SCCS for action under these rules.

### **Conduct in this Online Classroom**

Students are expected to conduct themselves in the course (e.g., on discussion boards, email postings) in compliance with the [university's regulations regarding civility](#).

### **Tutoring**

[NetTutor](#) is a leading provider of online tutoring and learner support services fully staffed by experienced, trained and monitored tutors. Students connect to live tutors from any computer that has Internet access. NetTutor provides a virtual whiteboard that allows tutors and students to work on problems in a real time environment. They also have an online writing lab where tutors critique and return essays within 24 to 48 hours. Access NetTutor from within your Canvas class by clicking on the NetTutor button in your course menu.

### **OSU Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Course evaluation results are extremely important and are used to help me improve this course and the learning experience of future students. Results from the 19 multiple choice questions are tabulated anonymously and go directly to instructors and department heads. Student comments on the open-ended questions are compiled and confidentially forwarded to each instructor, per OSU procedures. The online Student Evaluation of Teaching form will be available toward the end of each term, and you will be sent instructions via ONID by the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation. You will log in to "Student Online Services" to respond to the online questionnaire. The results on the form are anonymous and are not tabulated until after grades are posted.

**Basic Needs**

Any student who has difficulty affording groceries or accessing sufficient food to eat every day, or who lacks a safe and stable place to live, and believes this may affect their performance in the course, is urged to contact the Human Services Resource Center (HSRC) for support ([hsrc@oregonstate.edu](mailto:hsrc@oregonstate.edu), 541-737-3747). The HSRC has a [food pantry](#), a [textbook lending program](#) and other resources to help. Furthermore, please notify the professor if you are comfortable in doing so. This will enable them to provide any resources that they may possess.

**Getting Help**

We all go through times in life when we need help. Learn about counseling and psychological resources for Ecampus students. If you are in immediate crisis, please contact the Crisis Text Line by texting OREGON to 741-741 or call the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline at 1-800-273-TALK (8255). There are additional resources if you are located near campus: Access counseling through [OSU Counseling and Psychological Services \(CAPS\)](#), where you can get group counseling, individual therapy, or relational counseling. Website: <https://studentlife.oregonstate.edu/hsrc>