

Methods for Environmental and Natural Resource Policy Analysis

ESPM 4242/5242 (3 Credits)

Course Syllabus – Fall 2014

Course Meeting Time and Location

Tuesday/Thursday 10:15 – 11:30 a.m., Green Hall, Rm 203, St. Paul Campus

Course Instructors

Dennis Becker Associate Professor Department of Forest Resources 101D Green Hall (612) 624-7286 drbecker@umn.edu	Mike Kilgore Professor Department of Forest Resources 301K Green Hall (612) 624-6298 mkilgore@umn.edu
---	--

Office Hours:

Dennis Becker: Mondays 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. or by appointment

Mike Kilgore: Tuesdays 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.; Thursdays 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.; or by appointment

Course Prerequisites

Graduate student, or undergraduate with junior or senior standing; undergraduate students **MUST** have or are concurrently taking ESPM 3241W and ESPM 3261, or equivalent.

Required Readings

A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis, 4th Edition, by Eugene Bardach (ISBN: 9781608718429)

Additional readings and supplemental resources are available on the course website accessible via Moodle (<https://moodle2.umn.edu/>). Check the site frequently for updates.

Course Description and Focus

A fundamental skill for those involved in the management and use of natural resources is the ability to critically and systematically analyze and evaluate policies and programs. This course introduces students to the methods and processes used to analyze those policies and programs and distinguish among the different techniques used. Its emphasis is on the practical application of policy analysis principles and concepts to address contemporary natural resource and environmental problems recognizing the politically-charged environment within which decisions over the use, management, and protection of these resources occurs.

The basis for most of your grade will be a series of analyses of an important policy or program. Preparing the analyses will require you to conceptualize the problem, identify, gather and analyze actual data, and identify and evaluate a range of policy alternatives—essential steps in carrying out a prospective policy analysis. After completing this course, students will have developed the competency to conduct quantitative and qualitative analyses on a wide range of environmental and natural resource policy issues. Course prerequisites include familiarity with economic concepts and principles, as well as an understanding of the process by which policy is developed and implemented. Students who have taken ESPM 3214W/5261 and ESPM 3261/5261 or comparable courses will have sufficient background to be successful.

Student Performance Objectives

Upon completion of this course, you will be able to:

- Articulate the role and responsibilities of the policy scientist/ analyst in advancing knowledge and practice in environmental and natural resource decision-making.
- Differentiate among methods used to synthesize knowledge, forecast results, analyze programs, and evaluate outcomes of environmental and natural resource policies.
- Critically analyze various natural resource and environmental policy analyses.
- Identify and carry out key aspects of a policy analysis study including preparation and presentation of an analysis of a natural resource or environmental policy or program.

Course Format

A number of learning formats will use in the course including lectures, class discussion, and guest speakers. There will be several times during the semester when you will break into small groups for discussion and problem solving exercises. The primary instructional technique used is “learning by doing” accomplished through case analysis, experience sharing, brainstorming, and small group activities. Multiple cases will be presented with exercises to demonstrate the analysis process. Student-generated cases will also be used to learn strategies for problem framing and data collection.

Student Expectations and Policies

To meet the course requirements of a three credit class, you are expected to spend an additional six hours per week outside the classroom reading and reviewing course materials and preparing assignments. You should come to class having completed the assigned readings. Anyone with a documented disability condition who needs to arrange reasonable accommodations should bring this to our attention and the Disability Services Office (<http://ds.umn.edu>) at the beginning of the semester. To facilitate the rapid exchange of information and ideas, the following is emphasized:

- 1) The interactive style of learning used in this course makes it necessary for you to attend **ALL** classes. Much of the work and most of your knowledge will derive directly from in-class discussion and exercises.
- 2) Assignments are to be turned in at the beginning of class on the day they are due or will be considered late. Late assignments will receive a 10 percent deduction *for each class period* that elapses until turned in. Assignments will not be accepted after the designated final exam period.
- 3) Scholastic dishonesty in any portion of the academic work for the course shall be grounds for awarding a grade of F or N for the entire course. Scholastic dishonesty includes plagiarizing; cheating on assignments or examinations; engaging in unauthorized collaboration on academic work; taking, acquiring, or using test materials without faculty permission; submitting false or incomplete records of academic achievement; acting alone or in cooperation with another to falsify records or to obtain dishonestly grades, honors, awards, or professional endorsement; altering, forging, or misusing a University academic record; or fabricating or falsifying data, research procedures, or data analysis.
- 4) Sexual harassment by or toward a member of the University community is prohibited.
- 5) We will treat others with respect and dignity. You are encouraged to critique other’s ideas and arguments. However, it is inappropriate to attack a person or their values and beliefs.

Evaluation

Your course grade will be based on take-home quizzes, written analysis exercises, peer critique of a student's draft policy analysis report, and your comprehensive policy analysis report.

Assignments	Points	Due Date
Take Home Quizzes		
Quiz 1: Policy Analysis Critique	25	September 30
Quiz 2: Policy Analysis Construction	25	October 2
Writing Exercises		
Preliminary Problem Selection	--	October 7
Writing Exercise 1: Policy Problem Definition and Data Needs	50	October 14
Writing Exercise 2: Policy Alternatives and Evaluation Criteria	50	October 28
Writing Exercise 3: Collecting Data and Assessing Alternatives	50	November 18
Draft Policy Analysis & Peer Critique		
Draft Report for Peer Critique	50	December 2
Student Peer Critique	50	December 9
Final Policy Analysis Report		
Revised Policy Analysis Report	200	December 17
TOTAL:		500

The “+” and “-” symbols will be used on the final course grade for the following categories:

- A** Demonstrated achievement is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet the course requirements (100 – 90 percent).
- B** Demonstrated achievement is significantly above the level necessary to meet the course requirements (89 – 80 percent).
- C** Demonstrated achievement meets the course requirements (79 – 70 percent).
- D** Demonstrated achievement is worthy of credit even though it fails to fully meet the course requirements (69 – 60 percent).
- F** Represents failure (no credit) and signifies that the work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit, or (2) not completed and no agreement between the instructor and student that the student would be awarded an “I” (< 60 percent).
- I** (Incomplete) Assigned at the discretion of the instructor when, due to extraordinary circumstances (e.g., hospitalization), a student is prevented from completing the work of the course on time. An “Incomplete” requires a written agreement between the instructor and student specifying dates and conditions for completion of the make-up work.

Note: The above numeric standards for assigning grades may be adjusted downward (only downward) at the discretion of the instructor, depending on overall class performance.

Course Outline and Schedule^{1,2}

Week	Date	Topic	Readings ²
1	September 2	Course Orientation, “Doing” an Analysis – overview of syllabus, assignments, expectations, and project planning	
	September 4	Introduction to Policy Analysis – characterization of the policy process, types of policies, and key participants	Buck: Ch. 3; Kilgore et al. 1996 Weimer & Vining 23-38
2	September 9	Policy Analysis Overview – types of policy analyses and overview of analysis steps	Bardach (entire book)
	September 11	Policy Analysis Overview (continued)	
3	September 16	Role of the Policy Analyst (<i>guest presentations</i>) (Greg Knopff and Bob Meyer)	Clark: Ch. 6 O’Laughlin 2004
	September 18	Analysis Overview (<i>guest presentation</i>) – steps in the policy analysis process and use of information (D. Kirchner)	OLA Case Examples
4	September 23	Policy Analysis Theory & Systems Approaches	Arts 2012 Rametsteiner & Weiss 2006
	September 25	Economic Analysis ASSIGN: Quiz 1	Farrow and Toman 1998 Hahn and Dudley 2007
5	September 30	Policy Analysis Examples DUE: Take home Quiz 1 ASSIGN: Quiz 2	Turner et al. 2010 Grafton et al. 2011
	October 2	Policy Analysis Examples (continued) DUE: Take home Quiz 2 (peer critique)	OLA Briefing Sheets: DNR Forest Management; Recycling/ Waste Reduction
6	October 7	Policy Problem Definition DUE: Preliminary Problem Selection	Dunn: Ch. 3 Patton & Sawicki: Ch. 4
	October 9	Project Workday – Writing Exercise 1 (Problem Definition)	
7	October 14	Constructing Policy Alternatives DUE: Writing Exercise 1	Bardach (App B); Böcher 2012; Kraft & Furlong: Ch 5
	October 16	Evaluation Criteria	Jaakko Poyry Consulting 1992 Kraft & Furlong: Ch. 6
8	October 21	Operationalizing Your Criteria	Grafton et al. 2011
	October 23	Project Workday – Writing Exercise 2 (Policy Alternatives & Evaluation Criteria)	
9	October 28	Data Collection – focus groups, nominal groups and Delphi DUE: Writing Exercise 2	Delbeccq et al. 1975; Leahy et al. 2008; Parker et. al. 1993

¹ Dates are approximate and may change as the semester progresses.

² Additional readings may be assigned during the course of the semester; check the course Moodle site for the latest.

	October 30	Data Collection – Survey design (mail, phone, web surveys)	Clendenning et. al. 2004 Dillman: Ch. 5; Gupta: Ch. 7
10	November 4	Data Collection – interviews and observations	Babbie: Ch. 10
	November 6	Data Collection – Other secondary data (benefit transfer)	Benefit Transfer websites Brouwer 2000
11	November 11	Assessing Alternatives – Select among competing policies	Patton & Sawicki: Ch. 8
	November 13	Project Workday – Writing Exercise 3 (Collecting Data & Assessing Alternatives)	
12	November 18	Political Environment for Policy Analysis DUE: Writing Exercise 3	Lackey 2006; Breining 2012; Spilsbury & Nasi 2006
	November 20	Putting It All Together	
13	November 25	Putting It All Together	
	November 27	THANKSGIVING – NO CLASS	
14	December 2	Professional Panel: TBD DUE: Draft Report for Peer Critique	
	December 4	Professional Panel Discussion	
15	December 9	Debriefing – panel debriefing, peer critique debrief, course wrap-up and evaluation DUE: Peer Critique of Draft Report	
16	December 17	DUE: Revised-Final Policy Analysis Report	

Bibliography

- Arts, B. 2012. Forest policy analysis and theory use: Overview and trends. *Forest Policy & Economics* 16:7-13.
- Babbie, E. 1995. *The practice of social research*. 7th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. 476 p. **(Chapter 10, p. 255-278)**
- Bardach, E. 2012. *A practical guide for policy analysis: The eightfold path to more effective problem solving*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 180 p.
- Böcher, M. 2012. A theoretical framework for explaining the choice of instruments in environmental policy. *Forest Policy & Economics* 16:14-22.
- Brouwer, R. 2000. Environmental value transfer: state of the art and future prospects. *Ecological Economics* 32(2000):137-152.
- Buck, S.J. 1996. *Understanding environmental administration and law*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: Island Press. 225 p. **(Chapter 3, p. 34-60)**
- Clendenning, G., D.R. Field, and D. Jensen. 2004. A survey of seasonal and permanent landowners in WI Northwoods: Following Dillman and then some. *Society and Natural Resources*, 17: 431-442.
- Clark, T.W. 2002. *The policy process: A practical guide for natural resource professionals*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 215 p. **(Chapter 6, p. 111-126)**

- Delbecq, A.L., A.H. Van de Van, D.H. Gustafson. 1975. *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company. **(Chapter 2, p. 15-39)**
- Dillman, D.A. 2000. *Internet surveys: The tailored design method*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. **(Chapter 5, p. 194-213)**
- Dunn, W.N. 2004. *Public policy analysis: An introduction*. 3rd ed. Upper River Sadle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. 528 p. **(Chapter 3, p. 71-128)**
- Farrow, S. and M. Toman. 1998. Using environmental benefit-cost analysis to improve government performance. Discussion Paper 99-11. Resources For the Future. Washington, DC. 16 p.
- Hahn, R.W., and P.M. Dudley. 2007. How well does the U.S. government do benefit-cost analysis? *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 1(2): 192-211.
- Grafton, R.Q., G. Libecap, S. McGlennon, C. Landry, and B. O'Brien. 2011. An integrated assessment of water markets: A cross-country comparison. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 5(2): 219-239.
- Gupta, D.K. 2001. *Analyzing public policy: Concepts, tools and techniques*. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 408 p. **(Chapter 3, p. 46-69; Chapter 7, p. 149-174)**
- Jaakko Poyry Consulting. 1992. *Final criteria for identifying significant impacts, developing mitigation alternatives, and recommending preferred mitigation action for a Generic Environmental Impact Statement: Timber harvesting and management in Minnesota*. Report prepared for the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board, St Paul, MN.
- Kilgore, M.A., P.V. Ellefson, and G.A. Rose. 1996. Innovative forestry initiatives: Minnesota prepares for the future. *Journal of Forestry* 94(1): 21-25.
- Kraft, M.E. and S.R. Furlong. 2007. *Public policy: Politics, analysis, and alternatives*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 459 p. **(Chapter 5, p. 120-144; Chapter 6, p. 146-178)**
- Lackey, R.T. 2006. Axioms of ecological policy. *Fisheries*, 31(6): 286-290.
- Leahy, J.E., M.A. Kilgore, C.M. Hibbard, and J.S. Donnay. 2008. Family forest landowners' interest in and perceptions of forest certification: Focus group findings from Minnesota. *Northern Journal of Applied Forestry*, 25(2): 73-81.
- Minnesota Office of the Legislative Auditor. 2014. DNR forest management evaluation description, January 2014. Program Evaluation Division. St. Paul, MN 1 p.
- Minnesota Office of the Legislative Auditor. 2014. Recycling and waste reduction evaluation description, January 2014. Program Evaluation Division. St. Paul, MN 1 p.
- O'Laughlin, J. 2004. Policy analysis framework for sustainable forestry: national forest case study. *Journal of Forestry* 102(2): 34-41.
- Parker, R.J., L. McAvoy, D.W. Lime, and J.L. Thompson. 1993. *An employee Delphi study to aid in developing a social science research agenda in the Midwest Region: Detailed analysis of natural resource/visitor management and human use issues*. National Park Service, Cooperative Park Studies Unit. Report prepared by the College of Natural Resources, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN.
- Patton, C.V. and D.S. Sawicki. 1993. *Basic methods of policy analysis and planning*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. 482 p. **(Chapter 4, p. 147-185; Chapter 8, p. 332-361)**
- Rametsteiner E., G. Weiss. 2006. Assessing policies from a systems perspective: experiences with applied innovation systems analysis and implications for policy evaluation. *Forest Policy Economics* 8:564-576.
- Spilsbury, M.J and R. Nasi. 2006. The interface of policy research and the policy development process: Challenges posed to the forestry community. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8: 193-205.
- Turner, C.; Becker, D.R.; Taff, S.J.; Domke, G.M.; Gauto, V. 2010. Assessing forestation opportunities for carbon sequestration in Minnesota. Report for the Minnesota Forest Resources Council, St. Paul, MN.
- Weimer, D.L. and A.R. Vinining. 2005. *Policy analysis: Concepts and practice*. 4th ed. Upper River Sadle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. 501 p. **(Chapter 2, p. 23-38)**