POLU9PP: Understanding Public Policy

Module Co-ordinator: Professor Paul Cairney

Office Hours: Fridays 2.15-3.15 (on teaching weeks) or by appointment in Pathfoot A95

E-mail: p.a.cairney@stir.ac.uk

Seminars: Group 1 Fridays 9-11 (Cottrell C2B48)
                               Group 2 Fridays 12-2 (Cottrell C2X6)

First Meeting: Friday 22nd January

Coursework due: Thursday 24th March at noon

I.   Objectives and Learning Outcomes:

The course helps you investigate the dynamics of public policy. We ask, in seminars: what is policy, who makes it, why, and what are the effects? The literature on this topic is vast, and there is a lot of jargon to wade through. There are also some useful and fascinating concepts and theories that will help vastly improve your analytical skills if you take the time to understand them completely.

To that end, I offer you a 6-step programme to get there: (1) read my blog post, (2) listen to my podcast, (3) read the relevant chapter in my book, (4) read the original literature to which I refer, then (5) come to the seminars prepared to talk about them and share your understanding with me and your peers, and (6) produce your own theoretically-informed case study, in which you combine a policy options paper with your reflections on your recommendations, and a blog post in which you try to convince a wide audience about the need to solve the problem you raise. It's 7-steps if you include the exam.

You   can   find   the   list   of   blog   posts   and   podcasts   here   - https://paulcairney.wordpress.com/1000-words/. We discuss the nature of policy, power and the role of ideas. We explore theories on institutions, rational choice, policy networks, agenda setting and governance and compare them with descriptions of policy cycles and the 'rational actor'. We focus on some of the theories that I find most fascinating: multiple streams analysis, punctuated equilibrium, advocacy coalition framework, social construction of target populations, and complexity. We also apply concepts and theories to live issues, such as the extent to which governments engage in 'evidence based policymaking'. These concepts will help you think of the right questions to ask, and explanations to seek, but it is up to you to:
1. Bring your own empirical case study analysis to help you make sense of policy and policymaking.

2. Explain this stuff quickly and concisely to me and your peers. Imagine a policymaking world in which people are too busy to pay attention to you unless you make them pay attention, with: an eye-grabbing blog post title, one simple message, and a presentation that you can deliver in less than 5 minutes and 1000 words.

Subject specific skills

- Specific knowledge and understanding of current developments in the subject.
- an informed and critical understanding of theories of politics and policymaking
- an informed and critical understanding of current issues and debates
- an informed and critical understanding of the significance of policymaking.

Transferable/general skills

- produce very short and concise reports that people will want to read
- give quick and meaningful presentations that people will pay attention to and remember rather than sit through stoically because they have to be there
- identify, assess and utilise appropriate information sources, especially via the internet.
- understand and deploy complex sets of data, information and concepts.
- assimilate and disseminate, to defend and critically assess such data, information and concepts.
- make formal presentations on specific topics to an informed audience.
- work effectively (under guidance) in a peer relationship, exercising autonomy and initiative.
- develop interpretative and analytical skills.
- deploy critical awareness and creative thinking
- make informed judgements on the basis of relevant information.
- indicate an understanding of the relevant theoretical debates in the subject area.
- understand and employ the relevant range research methodologies

Expectations:

The Division of History & Politics encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning. We expect you to attend the seminars, do the required reading, hand in work on time, and to follow up on the feedback. In addition to work for seminar presentations and essays, we expect you to spend on average 6 hours per week on seminar preparation. For your weekly seminar, you should do the reading and listening, make notes, and prepare to make a meaningful weekly contribution to discussion.

Teaching and Learning

There will be one two-hour seminar per week. There will be no lectures. Instead, I will provide two blog posts and podcasts per week for you to read/ listen and take notes in advance and use as the basis for your weekly contribution. If the discussion flags a bit, I will tell you which of my posts I have managed to get to the front page of a google search and/ or one of the two jokes I can remember.

Blog topics and seminar dates:
Read this one first for some background: 12 things to know about studying public policy

1. [What is Policy?](#) and [Policy change and measurement](#) **22nd January**
2. [The Policy Cycle and its Stages](#) (see also [Success and Failure](#)) and [Bounded Rationality and Incrementalism](#) **29th January**
3. Joint session on ['Evidence Based Policymaking'](#) (see [EBPM resources](#)) with Peter Matthews' course in **Lecture Theatre W1 from 9-11 5th February**
4. [Power and Ideas](#) (see also [Framing](#)) and [Multiple Streams Analysis](#) **12th February**
5. [the Westminster Model and Multi-level Governance](#) and [Institutions and New Institutionalism](#) **19th February**

Reading Week

6. [Networks, sub-government and communities](#), [Punctuated Equilibrium Theory](#), and [The Advocacy Coalition Framework](#) **4th March**
7. [Context, Events, Structural and Socioeconomic Factors](#) and [Complex Systems](#) **11th March**
8. In the final pre-presentation week, we can choose our discussion from a list which includes: [Policy Transfer and Learning](#), [Rational Choice and the IAD](#), [Evolution](#), [The Psychology of Policymaking](#), [Critical Policy Studies and the Narrative Policy Framework](#), and the 'Social Construction of Target Populations' **18th March**

Easter Friday (coursework due the day before)

9. Your presentations **1st April**
10. Your presentations **8th April**

Coursework and assessment

This module is assessed with 50% coursework and 50% exam. For the coursework, the idea is that you specialise in a particular policy area or issue (such as health policy or, say, smoking regulation) and use the concepts/ theories from the course to inform your policy analysis, reflection, blog post, and presentation. You focus on the same issue each time, since the overall aim is to demonstrate that you can present an effective argument in different ways:

1. A spoken presentation to your peers in the seminar.
2. A short and punchy blog post which recognises the need to make an argument succinctly and grab attention with the title and first sentence/ paragraph (on the assumption that your audience will be reading it on their phone and will move on to something else quickly).
3. A policy analysis paper which has to make a substantive argument or recommendation in approximately two pages (on the assumption that busy policymakers won't read much else before deciding whether or not to pay attention to the problem and your solutions).
- You will also prepare a one-page reflection on the technical and political feasibility of your policy recommendations, to reflect your theoretical understanding of the policy process.

Summary of Assessment Components and Deadlines

Form	Weighting	Due Date	Employability Skill Sets
Policy Paper max. 1000 words plus bibliography	20%	All of the coursework is due on Thursday 24th March 2016 at noon.

This is partly for the sake of fairness. The presentations are spread across 2 seminar weeks in April but you all submit the work on the same date.

Your blog post is effectively the basis for your presentation. | Written communication Analysing and investigation Evaluating sources Construction of a reasoned case Planning and organising Discipline knowledge Concise argument |
| Reflection Max. 500 words plus bibliography | 10% | | Verbal communication Concise argument Planning and organising Construction of a reasoned case Discipline knowledge |
| **Blog post and presentation** – max. 500 words including links Max. 5 minutes (plus 5 minute Q&A) | 20% Note: you need to submit the post and make the presentation to receive a mark. | | Verbal communication Concise argument Planning and organising Construction of a reasoned case Discipline knowledge |
| **Note: you may not use the same topic that you addressed in POLU9SP**.

Note on referencing: (1) I recommend the Harvard style for the reflection and policy paper (but don't always use it in the course guide!); but (2) The blog post should have embedded weblinks rather than a bibliography.

Note on submission: for convenience, you should include all three assignments in the same Word (or equivalent) document (on separate pages). | | | |

Note: Further details on assessed elements are contained elsewhere in the module hand-out. Rules regarding assessment and attendance are to be found in the **Regulations and Procedures** online at http://www.stir.ac.uk/regulations/undergrad/ and http://www.stir.ac.uk/academicpolicy/handbook/ **Read these with care.**

The Division of History and Politics employs a range of assessment methods to enable students to develop a diverse set of subject-specific, cognitive and transferable skills. Essay-based assessment tests students' subject-specific knowledge and cognitive skills, and the practical skill of accessing relevant source material, whereas seminar-based assessment also tests other practical skills, such as verbal communication and the ability to defend one's arguments. Examinations primarily test students' subject-specific and cognitive skills, but in a context which also provides a rigorous test of the practical skill of editing one's material so that it is relevant to a given question.

POLICY PAPER

You receive 20% of your final grade by writing a policy brief. This should be a maximum of 1000 words (plus bibliography) and is generally subject to the same formal and stylistic requirements as the essay, but with a different format to reflect its aim.

Policy papers design and advocate a feasible measure (e.g., policy, strategy, plan, etc.) for a specific audience (e.g., individual, group, organisation, government) confronted with a significant problem or issue.

The style and content of policy analyses varies markedly, so you should search the web for some examples. In their various forms, policy papers are frequently used for advocacy within government and by NGOs. Policy papers appear to be:

- **Focused** (designed to achieve the goal of persuading the target audience)

- **Evidence-based** (based on a rational argument supported by evidence about the causes a particular problem and the consequences of potential solutions)

- **Succinct** (the targeted audience does not have the time to read an in-depth analysis)

- **Understandable** (using clear and simple language rather than too much jargon)

- **Accessible** (well-structured and subdivided by using clear descriptive titles)

- **Practical and feasible** (proposes one or more recommendations that seem realistic to the target audience)

The policy paper should be written with a policy-relevant actor/stakeholder in mind, such as a minister in a national or devolved or local government, the President of the European Commission, or a particular non-governmental organisation that is active in this issue-area. Parts of your analysis will be unaffected by this choice, but the policy options section will be written explicitly for this particular target audience.

The <u>problem definition</u> itself will also be shaped by the target audience. For instance, if you write about tobacco control, your policy problem could be about …

(a) how to extend tobacco control to new forms of social activity;

(b) how to criticise tobacco control and recommend effective forms of opposition;

(c) how to evaluate tobacco control and recommend how to learn lessons.

Before you start writing, declare your <u>policy question and target audience</u> on a **cover page** (which, like the bibliography, does not count towards the word limit):

- **Question**: ……………………………….

Examples:

  ➢ Who should take responsibility for tackling *a problem of your choice*?

  ➢ How should *an actor of your choice* respond to *a problem of your choice*?

  ➢ What role can *an actor of your choice* play in enhancing the status of *an organisation or governance mechanism of your choice*?)

<u>NB:</u> Steer away from *why* questions, as these are better suited for a fully-fledged research essay.

- **Target audience:** ……………………….

If you are uncertain about your chosen topic or policy question, please get in touch with me well before the submission deadline.

The policy paper could be organised into five sections:

(1) Executive Summary (~ 150 words)

- A very succinct summary of the main points, including …

    o A very brief description of the problem

    o A statement on why the current approach needs to be changed

    o Your recommendation

(2) Situation Brief

- Provides the background information and explains the significance of the problem

- Identifies the key actors, their interests and strategies (without this, your analysis and recommendations are likely to remain vague)

- Uses narrative analysis and description, but can also include tables with key data or diagrams

- Clear, precise and succinct

(3) Policy Options

- Outlines and evaluates policy alternatives, backed up by empirical evidence

- Concentrates on one particular actor whose (assumed or, ideally, ascertained) existing position/policy on the issue is briefly clarified

- Discussion of alternatives and recommendations must be either normatively or pragmatically acceptable to this actor

- Policy options must be credible and should include consideration of the existing policy trend and of alternatives

(4) Recommendations

- The preferred policy or course of action is explained and justified in an effort to persuade the reader of its validity

- This may not be the 'best' policy, but instead the most viable one. It must also be compatible with the preferences of your target audience

- Sometimes features a closing paragraph that re-emphasises the importance of action

(5) Key Sources

- An annotated bibliography lists 4-6 key readings (which should include academic articles/books) where vital and reliable information on the issue can be found

- Each reference is complemented by 1-3 sentences (e.g. in bullet points) which summarise the key points/arguments of this source

The assessment of the policy paper

In POLU9SP, I used the following questions to guide the marking on the policy paper:

- Tailored properly to a clearly defined audience?

- Punchy and concise summary?

- Clearly defined problem?

- Good evidence or argument behind the solution?

- Clear recommendations backed by a sense that the solution is feasible? (these two questions are similar, but they highlight different aspects of the value of solutions)

- Evidence of substantial reading, accompanied by well explained further reading?

From this list, the two most important contributions were from students who:

1. Gave a very clear and detailed account of the nature and size of the policy problem. The best reports used graphics and/ or statistics to describe the problem in several ways. Some identified a multi-faceted problem – such as in health outcomes, and health inequalities – without presenting confusing analysis (it is difficult to describe a problem in several ways, then come up with a specific solution). Some were able to present an image of urgency, to separate this problem from the many others that might grab policymaker attention.

2. Presented one or more solutions which seemed technically and/ or politically feasible. By technically feasible, I mean that there is a good chance that the policy will work as intended if implemented. For example, they provided evidence of its success in a comparable country (or in the past) or outlined models designed to predict the effects of specific policy instruments. By politically feasible, I mean that you consider how open your audience would be to the solution, and how likely the suggestion is to be acceptable to key policymakers. Some students added to a good discussion of feasibility by comparing the pros/ cons of different scenarios. In contrast, some relatively weak reports proposed solutions which were vague, untested, and/ or not likely to be acted upon.

Then, I gave credit to reports which summed up the problem and solution well in a short first paragraph (important for the busy policymaker), while some reports received a few extra marks for an excellent summary of their 4-6 key documents.

REFLECTION

You receive 10% of your final grade by writing a reflection on your policy brief. This should be a maximum of 500 words (plus bibliography) and the format of your discussion is up to you. Your aim is to show that you have done enough reading on policy concepts and theories before producing the policy paper. You do so by describing, in this short reflection, the factors that influence the nature of the problem you describe and the feasibility of your solutions. Kingdon talks about feasibility directly, but most concepts will be relevant. For example, you might reflect on your knowledge of agenda setting and framing to explain why you presented the problem in a particular way. It is up to you: the aim of this task is for you to be creative as you reflect on your reading. My only strong advice is to avoid trying to cram in a lot of buzzwords and referencing to give the impression that you know the material. It won't work.

BLOG POST and PRESENTATION

You receive 20% of your final grade by writing and presenting a policy-relevant blog post. The post should be 500 words maximum, including weblinks. There should not be a standard bibliography, but some of the links should be to academic sources (in Word, you can insert a weblink by selecting one or more words and right-clicking, selecting 'hyperlink' and adding the link in the main box; it should produce blue, underlined text).

The post should follow a similar structure to the policy analysis paper, but in this case your audience is different. You are trying to make an argument that will capture the attention of a more general audience (interested in politics and policy, but not a specialist) that might access your post from Twitter/ Facebook or via a search engine. This produces a new requirement, to: present a title which sums up the whole argument in under 100 characters, to leave room in the tweet for the web link (so, a statement is often better than a vague question); to summarise the whole argument in under 100 words in the first paragraph (what is the problem and solution?); and, to provide more information up to a maximum of 500 words. The reader can then be invited to read the whole policy analysis at the bottom of the post.

The style of blog posts varies markedly, so you should consult many examples before attempting your own (including Democratic Audit, the LSE, Nottingham's Ballots and Bullets, The Conversation and newspaper columns). When you read other posts, take note of their strengths and weaknesses. For example, many posts associated with newspapers introduce a personal or case study element to ground the discussion in an emotional appeal. Sometimes this works, but sometimes it causes the reader to scroll down quickly to find the main argument. Consider if it is as, or more, effective to make sure that your argument is direct and easy to find as soon as someone clicks the link on their phone. Many academic posts are too long (often beyond your 500 limit) and take too long to get to the point, so you should not merely emulate them. You should also not just chop down your policy paper – this is about a new kind of communication.

Presentation (without powerpoint)

To receive the grade, each student is required to give a – <u>maximum 5 minutes</u> - presentation based on their post.

We will hold the presentations in the final two weeks of semester (after the submission of the blog post on which your presentation is based). You are being assessed on a number of criteria. These are: (1) preparation, content and academic quality; (2) logical structure of presentation; (3) style and delivery (*including the ability to not just narrate your notes verbatim*); (4) performance in Q&A (including your participation as a presenter *and* part of the audience). There will be up to 5 minutes for you to answer questions from the seminar group and from the tutor.

- The presentation can be as creative as you wish, **but it should not rely on powerpoint in the room**. Imagine that none of the screens work or that you are making your pitch to a policymaker as you walk along the street: can you make this presentation engaging without any reference to someone else's technology? *Can you do it without just reading out your notes? Can you do it well in **under** 5 minutes?*
- Just like an essay, a verbal presentation should also have a clear structure, including a beginning, a main part, and a conclusion.

- If you fail to deliver your presentation to me in the workshops you are unable to receive a grade for your written work.

EXAM

You receive 50% of your final grade by answering questions in an exam. Here is a list of questions that I have asked in the past:

1. "Modern governance is - and, according to many, should be - dispersed across multiple centers of authority" (Hooghe and Marks, 2003). Discuss.
2. "To 'take ideas seriously' is to recognise the symbiotic relationship between power and the role of ideas" (Kettell and Cairney, 2010). Discuss.
3. Critically analyse the use of cycles and stages to describe the policy process.
4. What is the relevance of rational choice analysis to public policy?
5. What is the policy transfer continuum and what does it seek to describe?
6. Outline and compare the Advocacy Coalition Framework and punctuated equilibrium theory.
7. Define the term 'new institutionalism'. What value does a focus on 'institutions' add to the study of public policy?
8. Describe the limitations to 'comprehensive rationality' outlined in the public policy literature. What lessons can policymakers learn from these insights?

READING

I provide some general reading and reading specific to each teaching week below. However, I have kept this list deliberately short to: (1) encourage us all to use the same key reading to discuss in seminars; and (2) encourage you to find relevant reading, using resources such as Google Scholar, as part of your training towards independent study (for some of you, in preparation for your 4th year dissertation). I also provide some extra further reading (including

web links) in the blog posts, and give you the option to chase up the topics that you find most interesting.

I am a shameless self-publicist, so will generally recommend that you read my blog posts, book(s) or articles before those of other scholars – partly because these texts provide you with further reading in the context of the discussion (which is far more useful, I think, than a stand-alone list).

The other reason I do it like this is that I can tell you what I know. You can then talk to me about what you find out when you look at the wider literature. What do you know that I don't? Let's find out. I don't do it so that you can regurgitate what I tell you (that would be disgusting).

So, for each week, start with:

1. The blog posts and podcasts for each week.
2. The relevant chapter in my book *Understanding Public Policy.*
3. The key reading in this guide.
4. Then finish by chasing up the topics/ readings suggested in those texts.

Some good databases for finding academic articles, books, book chapters, reports, and working papers are:

- StirGate (searches the library catalogue and several other online databases): http://www.stir.ac.uk/is/
- Google Scholar (easy to use, especially for tracking who else has cited a specific article/chapter): http://scholar.google.co.uk/
- ISI Web of Science: http://bit.ly/1igiZ4s
- Scopus: http://bit.ly/1e7nJCo
- Social Sciences Citation Index: http://bit.ly/1akr6ul

Please note that while Wikipedia is good for when you can't remember what films you've seen Tom Cruise in, it does not provide a good enough system for producing and confirming information that is respected by scholars. Also, try to get used to using Google *Scholar* as your first point of search, rather than Google 'what's the weather today?' UK. I explain this argument in more depth in this post: https://paulcairney.wordpress.com/2013/04/29/using-the-internet-for-political-research-pol9rm-30-4-13/

I won't go as far as requesting that you fill in a form each week, to show seminar preparation, but please come prepared with several points to make. This will benefit everyone. The alternative is for me to bore everyone about seminars representing a classic 'collective action' problem every time there is a lull in conversation. Or staring at you and saying 'I can wait'. Or telling the same jokes about the strawberry or magic dog. More seriously, if you want a reference from me in the future, you should speak in tutorials long enough for me to remember who you are.

Core and General Texts

Cairney, P. (2012) *Understanding Public Policy: Theories and Issues* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)
Cairney, P. (2016) The Politics of Evidence-based Policymaking (or here to go straight to the PDF).

See also:

Sabatier, P. and Weible, C. (2014) *Theories of the Policy Process* 3rd ed. (Chicago: Westview Press)

Selected books (a fuller list is in the *Understanding Public Policy* bibliography):

Birkland, T. (2005) *An Introduction to the Policy Process* 2nd Edition (London: M.E. Sharpe)
Dodds, A. (2013) *Comparative Public Policy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)
Hay, C. (2002) *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)
Hill, M. (2005) *The Public Policy Process* 4th Edition (Essex: Pearson Education)
John, P. (2012) *Analysing Public Policy* (London: Routledge)
Knill, C. and Tosun, J. (2012) Public Policy (Basingstoke: Palgrave)
McConnell, A. (2010) *Understanding Policy Success* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)
Parsons, W. (1995) *Public Policy* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar)
Smith, K. and Larimer, C. (2009) *The Public Policy Theory Primer* (Boulder, Co: Westview Press)
Miller, K. and McTavish, D. (2013) *Making and Managing Public Policy* (London: Routledge)
Wu, X, Ramesh, M., Howlett, M., and Fritzen, S. (2010) *The Public Policy Primer* (London; Routledge)

READING BY TOPIC

1. What is Policy?

Questions/ issues to consider: *How can we find it, describe it, measure it, and know if it has changed? How do we describe policy change?*

Covered in the core and general texts listed above

See also:
Cairney, P. (2008) 'Has Devolution Changed the British Policy Style?, *British Politics*, 3, 3, 350-72
Colebatch, H. (1998) *Policy* (Buckingham: Open University Press)
Colebatch, H. (2006b) *Beyond the Policy Cycle: The policy process in Australia* (Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin)
Dorey, P. (2014) *Policy Making in Britain: An Introduction* 2nd ed. (London: Sage)
Greer, S. and Jarman, H. (2008) 'Devolution and Policy Styles', in A. Trench (ed.) *The State of the Nations 2008* (Exeter: Imprint Academic)
Hogwood, B. (1987) *From Crisis to Complacency* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
Hogwood, B. and Gunn, L. (1984) *Policy Analysis for the Real World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
John, P. (2011) *Making Policy Work* (London: Routledge)
Marsh, D. and McConnell, A. (2010) 'Towards a Framework for Establishing Policy Success', *Public Administration*, 88, 2, 564–83
McConnell, A. (2010) *Understanding Policy Success: Rethinking Public Policy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)
Richards, D. and Smith, M. (2002) *Governance and Public Policy in the UK* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

2. The Policy Cycle and comprehensive rationality

Questions/issues to consider – *have scholars shifted their focus from policy cycles and ordered stages towards theories that recognise the messy and unpredictable nature of politics and policymaking? If so, why? What are the implications of 'bounded rationality' for policymaking and theories of policymaking?*

Reading

Althaus, C., Bridgman, P. and Davis, G. (2007) *The Australian Policy Handbook* 4th Ed. (Sydney: Allen and Unwin)

Brewer, G. and deLeon, P. (1983) *The Foundations of Policy Analysis* (Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press).

Bridgman, P. and Davis, G. (2003) 'What Use is a Policy Cycle? Plenty, if the Aim is Clear', *Australian Journal of Public Administration,* 62, 3, 98–102

Cairney, P. (2014) 'How can policy theory have an impact on policymaking?' Teaching Public Administration, advance access DOI: 10.1177/0144739414532284, 1-18

Colebatch, H. (2005) 'Policy analysis, policy practice and political science', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 64, 3, 14-23

Colebatch, H. (2006) *Beyond the Policy Cycle: The policy process in Australia* (Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin)

deLeon, P. (1999) 'The Missing Link Revisited', *Review of Policy Research*, 16, 3-4, 311-38

Everett, S. (2003) 'The Policy Cycle: Democratic Process or Rational Paradigm revisited?', *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 62, 2, 65–70

Hogwood, B. and Gunn, L. (1984) *Policy analysis for the Real World* (Oxford; Oxford University Press)

Hogwood, B. and Peters, B.G. (1983) *Policy Dynamics* (New York: St. Martin's Press)

Hood, C. (1976) *The Limits of Administration* (London: Wiley)

Howard, C. (2005) 'Policy Cycle: A Model of Post-Machiavellian Policy Making?' *Australian Journal of Public Administration,* 3, 3-13

Jordan, A.G. and J.J. Richardson (1987) *British Politics and the Policy Process* (London: Allen & Unwin)

Lindblom, C. (1959) 'The Science of Muddling Through', *Public Administration Review*, 19, 79-88

Lindblom, C. (1979) "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through", *Public Administration Review*, 39, 517-525

Pressman, J. and Wildavsky, A. (1979) *Implementation* (2nd ed.) (California: University of California Press)

Radin, B. (2000) *Beyond Machiavelli: Policy Analysis Comes of Age* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press)

Sabatier, P. (1986) "Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: a Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis", *Journal of Public Policy*, 6, 1, 21-48

Simon, H. (1976) *Administrative Behavior* 3rd Edition (London: MacMillan)

See also the reading for the ACF, since Sabatier was one of the policy cycle's biggest critics

3. 'Evidence Based Policymaking'

Questions/issues to consider: *what is it? Is policy-based evidence a better description of the use of evidence in policy?*

Cairney, P. (2016) The Politics of Evidence-based Policymaking (or here to go straight to the PDF).

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2010) 'What Is Evidence Based Decision Making?' (Canberra: ABS) http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/lookup/1500.0chapter32010

Bambra, C. (2013) 'The primacy of politics: the rise and fall of evidence-based public health policy?' *Journal of Public Health*, 35, 4, 486-7

Boaz, A., Ashby, D., Denyer, D., Egan, M., Harden, A., Jones, D. R. and Tranfield, D. (2006) 'A multitude of syntheses: a comparison of five approaches from diverse policy fields' *Evidence & Policy* 2, 4, 479-502

Boswell, C. (2009) *The Political Uses of Expert Knowledge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Botterill, L. and Hindmoor, A. (2012) 'Turtles all the way down: bounded rationality in an evidence-based age', *Policy Studies*, 33 (5), 367-379

Cartwright, N. and Hardie, J. (2012) *Evidence-Based Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Downe, J., Martin, S. and Bovaird, T. (2012) 'Learning from complex policy evaluations' *Policy & Politics*, 40, 4, 505-23

Hammersley, M. (2005) 'Is the evidence-based practice movement doing more good than harm?', *Evidence & Policy*, 1, 1, 85-100

Haynes, L., Service, O., Goldacre, B. and Torgerson, D. (2012) *Test, Learn, Adapt: Developing Public Policy with Randomised Controlled Trials* (London: Cabinet Office Behavioural Insights Team) https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/62529/TLA-1906126.pdf

Head, B. (2008) 'Three Lenses of Evidence-Based Policy', *The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 67, 1, 1–11

Head, B. (2010a) 'Reconsidering evidence-based policy: Key issues and challenges', *Policy and Society*, 29, 77-94

Head, B. (2010b) 'Water policy - Evidence, learning and the governance of uncertainty', *Policy and Society*, 29, 171-80

Head, B. (2013) 'Evidence-Based Policymaking – Speaking Truth to Power?' *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 72, 4, 397–403

Nutley, S., Walter, I. and Davies, H. (2007) *Using evidence: how research can inform public services* (Bristol: The Policy Press)

Nutley, S., Powell, A. and Davies, H. (2013) *What Counts as Good Evidence* (London: Alliance for Useful Evidence) http://www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/assets/What-Counts-as-Good-Evidence-WEB.pdf

Pawson, R. (2006) *Evidence-based Policy: A Realist Perspective* (London: Sage)

Petticrew, M. and Roberts, H. (2006) *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Sanderson, I. (2011) 'Evidence-based policy or policy-based evidence? Reflections on Scottish experience', *Evidence and Policy*, 7, 1, 59-76

Smith, K. (2013) *Beyond Evidence Based Policy in Public Health: The Interplay of Ideas* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

Stoker, G. (2013) 'Why Policymakers Ignore Evidence' (Southampton: University of Southampton) http://publicpolicy.southampton.ac.uk/why-policymakers-ignore-evidence/

Weiss, C. (1979) 'The Many Meanings of Research Utilization' *Public Administration Review* 39 (5): 426–431

Williams, I. and Glasby, J. (2010) 'Making 'what works' work: The use of knowledge in UK health and social care decision-making', *Policy and Society*, 29, 95–102

Power and Ideas
Chapters 3, 11 and 12 of *Understanding Public Policy* cover these topics

The literature on power and ideas is quite general, so you may want to go beyond this list.
Power
(*Key*) Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. (1962) 'Two Faces of Power', *The American Political Science Review*, 56, 4, 947-952
Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. (1963) 'Decisions and Nondecisions: An Analytical Framework', *The American Political Science Review*, 57, 3, 632-642
Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. (1970) *Power and Poverty* (New York: Oxford University Press)
Bock, G. and James, S. (1992) *Beyond Equality and Difference: Citizenship, Feminist Politics, and Female Subjectivity* (London: Routledge)
Crenson, M. (1971) *The Un-politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-decisionmaking in the Cities* (London: Johns Hopkins Press)
Dahl, R. (1957) 'The Concept of Power', *Behavioral Science*, 2, 3, 201-15
Dahl, R. (1958) 'A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model', *The American Political Science Review*, 52, 2, 463-9
Dahl, R. (1961) *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City* (New Haven: Yale University Press)
Hay, C. (2002) *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)
Heyward, C. (2007) 'Revisiting the Radical View: Power, Real Interests and the Difficulty of Separating Analysis from Critique', *Politics*, 27,1, 48-54
(*Key*) Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View* 2nd Edition (Basingstoke: Palgrave)
Ward, H. (1987) 'Structural Power - A Contradiction in Terms?' *Political Studies*, 35, 4, 593 - 610
Ideas
Axelrod, R. (1986) 'An Evolutionary Approach to Norms', *American Political Science Review*, 80, 4, 1095-1111
Baumgartner, F. and Jones, B. (1993) *Agendas and Instability in American Politics* (Chicago: Chicago University Press)
Béland, D. (2010) 'The Idea of Power and the Role of Ideas', *Political Studies Review*, 8, 2,145-54
Béland, D. and Cox, R. (2010) *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
Blyth, M. (2002) *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
Campbell, J. (2002) 'Ideas, Politics and Public Policy', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 21-38
Cohen, M., March, J. and Olsen, J. (1972) 'A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1, 1-25
Hall, P. (1993) 'Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain', *Comparative Politics*, 25, 3: 275–96
Hay, C. (2004b) '"Taking ideas seriously' in explanatory political analysis", *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 6, 142-9
Kettell, S. and Cairney, P. (2010) 'Taking the Power of Ideas Seriously: The Case of the 2008 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Bill', *Policy Studies*, 31, 3, 301-17
Radaelli, C. (1995) 'The role of knowledge in the policy process', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2, 2, 159 – 183
Walsh, J. (2000) 'When Do Ideas Matter? Explaining the Successes and Failures of Thatcherite Ideas' *Comparative Political Studies*, 33, 4, 483-516

Multiple Streams Analysis and 'Garbage Cans'

Questions/issues to consider – what is the point of focusing on three 'streams'? What does it take for an idea, or policy solution, to become accepted in a policymaking system?

Reading

Cairney, P. (2013) 'What is Evolutionary Theory and How Does it Inform Policy Studies?' *Policy and Politics*, 41, 2, 279-98

Cairney, P. (2009) 'The Role of Ideas in Policy Transfer: The Case of UK Smoking Bans since Devolution', *Journal of European Public Policy*

Campbell, J. (2002) 'Ideas, Politics and Public Policy', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 21-38

Cohen, M., March, J. and Olsen, J. (1972) 'A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1, 1-25

Durant, R. and Diehl, P. (1989) 'Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policy:
Lessons from the U.S. Foreign Policy Arena', *Journal of Public Policy*, 9, 2, 179-205

John, P. (2003) 'Is There Life After Policy Streams, Advocacy Coalitions, and Punctuations: Using Evolutionary Theory to Explain Policy Change?' The Policy Studies Journal, 31, 4, 481-98

Kettell, S. and Cairney, P. (2010) 'Taking the Power of Ideas Seriously: The Case of the 2008 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Bill', *Policy Studies*, 31, 3, 301-17

Kingdon, J. (1995) *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies Second Edition* (New York: Harper Collins). Note: the 2nd ed. contains one additional chapter at the end, so the 1st ed. is still OK

Lieberman, R.C. (2002) 'Ideas, Institutions and Political Order: Explaining Political Change', *American Political Science Review*, 90, 4, 691-712

Majone, G. (1989) *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Radaelli, C. (1995) 'The role of knowledge in the policy process', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2, 2, 159 – 183

Richardson, J.J. (2008) 'Policy-making in the EU: Interests, ideas and garbage cans of primeval soup' in (ed) J.J. Richardson *European Union: Power and Policymaking* 3rd edition (London: Routledge)

Zahariadis, N. (2003) *Ambiguity and Choice in Public Policy* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press)

See the Zahariadis chapters in the 3 editions of *Theories of the Policy Process*

There are also some journal special issues in production, in *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* and *Policy Studies Journal*.

Multilevel governance
Key reading: Chapter 8 of *Understanding Public Policy*
Examples of books covering at least one level of policymaking include:
Wallace, H., Pollack, M. and Young, A. (2010) *Policy-Making in the European Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Buonanno, L. and Nugent, N. (2013) *Policies and Policy Processes of the European Union* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Morphet, J. (2013) *How Europe Shapes British Public Policy* (Bristol: Policy Press)

Richardson, J. (2005) *European Union: Power and Policy-Making* (London: Routledge)

Cairney, P. and McGarvey, N. (2013) *Scottish Politics* 2nd ed. (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Birrell, D. (2012) *Comparing Devolved Governance* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Dorey, P. (2014) *Policy Making in Britain: An Introduction* 2nd ed. (London: Sage)
Richards, D. and Smith, M. (2002) *Governance and Public Policy in the UK* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

See also:
Durose, C. (2011) 'Revisiting Lipsky: Front-Line Work in UK Local Governance', *Political Studies*, 59, 4, 978-995
Flinders, M. (2008) *Delegated Governance and the British State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2003) 'Unravelling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-Level Governance', *American Political Science Review*, 97, 2: 233–43
Kjaer, A. (2004) Governance (Cambridge: Polity)
Kooiman, J. (2003) *Governing as Governance* (London: Sage)
Miller, V. (2010) *How much legislation comes from Europe?* (London: House of Commons Library)   http://www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/RP10-62/how-much-legislation-comes-from-europe

New Institutionalism

Questions/issues to consider – what are institutions? Identify the main ways in which institutions are described. How do they influence behaviour? Compare the ways in which a focus on different institutions maximises or minimises the 'policy styles' in different countries, from Lijphart's binary differences to Richardson's common styles.

Reading
Barzelay, M. and Gallego, R. (2010) 'The Comparative Historical Analysis of Public Management Policy Cycles in France, Italy, and Spain: Symposium Conclusion', *Governance*, 23, 2, 297-307
Blyth, M. (2002) *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
Bovens, M., 't Hart, P. Peters, Albaek, E., Busch, A., Dudley, G., Moran, M. and Richardson, J. (2001) 'Patterns of governance: sectoral and national comparisons' in M. Bovens, P. 'tHart and B.G. Peters (eds.) *Success and Failure in Public Governance* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar)
Capoccia, G. and Kelemen, D. 'The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism', *World Politics*, 59, 3, 341-369
DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983) 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields', *American Sociological Review*, 48, 2, 147-160
Dowding, K. and King, A. (1995) 'Introduction' in (eds) K. Dowding and A. King *Preferences, Institutions and Rational Choice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
Freeman, G. (1985) 'National Styles and Policy Sectors: Explaining Structured Variation', *Journal of Public Policy*, 5, 4, 467-496
Hall, P. (1993) 'Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain', *Comparative Politics*, 25, 3, 275-296
Hall, P. and Taylor, R. (1996) 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms', *Political Studies*, XLIV, 936-57
Kriesi, H., Adam, S. and Jochum, M. (2006) 'Comparative analysis of policy networks in Western Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy* 13, 3, 341–361
Larsen, T., Taylor-Gooby, P. and Kananen, J. (2006) 'New Labour's Policy Style: A Mix of Policy Approaches', *Journal of Social Policy*, 35, 4, 629-49

Lijphart, A. (1999) *Patterns of Democracy* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Lowndes, V. (2010) 'The Institutional Approach' in (eds.) D. Marsh and G. Stoker *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Kay, A. (2006) *The Dynamics of Public Policy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar)

Kratochwil, F. (2008) 'Constructivism' in (eds.) D. Della Porta and M. Keating *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

March, J. and Olsen, J. (1984) 'The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life', *The American Political Science Review*, 78, 3, 734-749.

Ostrom, E. (2007) 'Institutional Rational Choice' in (ed) P. Sabatier *Theories of the Policy Process 2* (Cambridge MA: Westview)

Peters, B. (2011) *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The New Institutionalism* (London: Continuum)

Pierson, P. (2000) 'Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics', *The American Political Science Review*, 94, 2, 251-267

Poteete, A., Janssen, M. And Ostrom, O. (2010) *Working Together: Collective Action, the Commons and Multiple Methods in Practice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Rhodes, R., Binder, S. and Rockman, B. (2006) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Richardson, J. J. (ed.) (1982) *Policy Styles in Western Europe* (London: Allen and Unwin)

Rosamond, B. (2000) *Theories of European Integration* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Schmidt, V. (2006) 'Institutionalism' in (eds.) C. Hay, M. Lister and D. Marsh *The State: Theories and Issues* (Basingstoke; Palgrave)

Schmidt, V. (2008) 'Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 303-26

Steinmo, S. (2008) 'Historical Institutionalism' in (eds.) D. Della Porta and M. Keating *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Streek, W. and Thelen, K. (2005) 'Introduction: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies' in (eds.) W. Streek and K. Thelen *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Thelen, K. and Steinmo, S. (1992) 'Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics' in (eds) Steinmo, S., Thelen, K. and Longstreth, F. *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Tsebelis, G. (2002) *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

Policy networks and governance
Questions/issues to consider – what is a policy network and why do they exist/ What kinds can you describe, and how do they differ from each other? What is the 'logic of consultation'?

Key reading: the section on networks in chapter 9 of *Understanding Public Policy*
See also:
Dowding, K. (1995b) 'Model or Metaphor? A Critical Review of the Policy
Network Approach', Political Studies, 43, 2: 136–58
Heclo, H. (1978) 'Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment', in A. King (ed.) *The New American Political System* (Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute)
Jordan, G. (1981) 'Iron Triangles, Woolly Corporatism and Elastic Nets: Images of the Policy Process', *Journal of Public Policy* 1, 1, 95-123
Jordan, G. and Cairney, P. (2013) 'What is the 'dominant model' of British policymaking?
Comparing majoritarian and policy community ideas', British Politics, 8, 3, 233–259

Jordan, A.G. and Maloney, W.A. (1997) "Accounting for Subgovernments: Explaining the Persistence of Policy Communities", *Administration and Society*, vol.29, 5, 557-583

Jordan, A.G. and Richardson, J.J. (1982) 'The British Policy Style or the Logic of Negotiation?' in (ed) Richardson, J.J. *Policy Styles in Western Europe* (London: Allen and Unwin)

Jordan, A.G. and Richardson, J.J. (1987) *British Politics and the Policy Process* (London: Allen & Unwin)

Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (1992b) 'Policy Communities and Issue Networks:
Beyond Typology' in D. Marsh and R.A.W. Rhodes (eds) Policy Networks in
British Government (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997) *Understanding Governance* (Open University Press)

Richardson, J. and Jordan, G. (1979) *Governing Under Pressure: The Policy Process in a Post Parliamentary Democracy* (Oxford: Robertson)#

Punctuated equilibrium

Questions/issues to consider – why can policymaking appear to be stable for long periods, only to be destabilised profoundly? Why do many policies stay the same for long periods while a small number change quickly and dramatically? Compare the main ways in which we can study, identify and explain these processes.

Reading

Baumgartner, F. and Jones, B. (1993; 2009) *Agendas and Instability in American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press) – the 2nd edition just has an update chapter at the end (so the 1st edition is still OK)

Baumgartner, F. and Jones, B. (eds, 2002) *Policy Dynamics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Baumgartner, F., Green-Pedersen, C. and Jones, B. (eds.) (2006) 'Comparative Studies of Policy Agendas', special issue of the *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13, 7

Cairney, P. (2013) 'What is Evolutionary Theory and How Does it Inform Policy Studies?' *Policy and Politics*, 41, 2, 279-98

John, P. (2006) 'The policy agendas project: a review', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13, 7, 975-86

Jones, B. (1994) *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Jones, B. and Baumgartner, F. (2005) *The Politics of Attention* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Jordan, A.G. and Maloney, W.A. (1997) "Accounting for Subgovernments: Explaining the Persistence of Policy Communities", *Administration and Society*, vol.29, 5, 557-583

True, J.L., Jones, B.D. and Baumgartner, F.R. (2007) Punctuated Equilibrium Theory' in (ed.) P. Sabatier *Theories of the Policy Process 2nd Edition* (Cambridge MA: Westview Press)

The Advocacy Coalition Framework

Questions/issues to consider – *do people enter politics to turn their beliefs into policy? What kinds of beliefs are conducive to coalition formation and advocacy? How do coalitions 'learn' and change? What factors influence subsystem stability and policy change?*

Reading

Majone, G. (1980) 'Policies as theories', *Omega* 8, 2, 151-62

Princen, S. (2007) 'Advocacy Coalitions and the Internationalization of Public Health Policies', *Journal of Public Policy*, 27, 1, 13-33

Sabatier, P. and Jenkins-Smith, H. (eds.) (1993) *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach* (Boulder: Westview Press)

Jenkins-Smith, H. and Sabatier, P. (1994) 'Evaluating the Advocacy Coalition Framework', *Journal of Public Policy*, 14, 2, 175-203

John, P. (2003) 'Is There Life After Policy Streams, Advocacy Coalitions, and Punctuations: Using Evolutionary Theory to Explain Policy Change?' *The Policy Studies Journal*, 31, 4, 481-98

Sabatier, P. (1986) "Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: a Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis", *Journal of Public Policy*, 6, 1, 21-48

Sabatier, P. (1988) 'An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy-oriented learning therein', *Policy Sciences*, 21, 1, 129-68

Sabatier, P. (1998) 'The advocacy coalition framework: revisions and relevance for Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5, 1, 98-130

Weible, C., Sabatier, P. and McQueen, K. (2009) 'Themes and Variations: Taking Stock of the Advocacy Coalition Framework', *Policy Studies Journal*, 37, 1, 121-41

Weible, C.(2007) 'An advocacy coalition framework approach to stakeholder analysis: Understanding the political context of California marine protected area policy', *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 17, 1, 95-117

Special *Policy Studies Journal* issue on the ACF: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2011.00412.x/abstract

See also the 3 editions of *Theories of the Policy Process* and my draft chapter on the ACF: https://paulcairney.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/cairney-on-acf-oxford-classics-11-4-13.pdf

Socioeconomic factors and the role of 'events'
Key reading: Chapter 6 of *Understanding Public Policy*

See also:
Hay, C. (2002) *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Hay, C. (2006b) 'Globalization and Public Policy' in M. Moran, M. Rein and R. Goodin (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Hogwood, B. (1992) *Trends in British Public Policy* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

Quiggin, J. (2006) 'Economic Constraints on Public Policy' in M. Moran, M. Rein and R. Goodin (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Rose, R. (1990) 'Inheritance Before Choice in Public policy', *Journal of Theoretical Politics,* 2, 3, 263-91

Rose, R. and Davies, P. (1994) *Inheritance in Public Policy: Change Without Choice in Britain* (Yale University Press)

Complexity theory

Questions/issues to consider – what is a complex policymaking system? What are some of complexity theory's key tenets, and what are their theoretical and practical implications?

Reading
Alter, K. and Meunier, S. (2009) 'The Politics of International Regime Complexity', *Perspectives on Politics*, 7, 1, 13-24

Blackman, T. (2001) 'Complexity theory and the new public management', *Social Issues*, 2, 1, http://www.whb.co.uk/socialissues/tb.htm

Bovaird, T. (2008) 'Emergent Strategic Management and Planning Mechanisms in Complex Adaptive Systems', *Public Management Review*, 10, 3, 319-40

Cairney, P. (2012) 'Complexity Theory in Political Science and Public Policy', *Political Studies Review*, 10, 3, 346-58 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1478-9302.2012.00270.x/abstract

Geyer, R. (2012) 'Can Complexity Move UK Policy beyond 'Evidence-Based Policy Making' and the 'Audit Culture'? Applying a 'Complexity Cascade' to Education and Health Policy', *Political Studies*, 60, 1, 20-43

Geyer, R. and Rihani, S. (2010) *Complexity and Public Policy* (London: Routledge)

Hallsworth, M. and Rutter, J. (2011) *Making Policy Better* (London: Institute for Government)

Geyer, R. and Cairney, P. (2015) *Handbook of Complexity and Public Policy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar)

Haynes, P. (2008) 'Complexity Theory and Evaluation in Public Management', *Public Management Review*, 10, 3,401-19

Haynes, P. (2014) *Managing Complexity in the Public Services* (2nd Edition)

Haynes, P. (2012) *Public Policy Beyond the Financial Crisis: An International Comparative Study*

Kernick, D. (2006) 'Wanted - new methodologies for health service research. Is complexity theory the answer?' *Family Practice* 23, 385–390

Mitchell, M. (2009) *Complexity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Mitleton-Kelly, E. (2003) 'Ten Principles of Complexity and Enabling Infrastructures' in E. Mitleton-Kelly (ed.) *Complex Systems and Evolutionary Perspectives of Organisations* (Amsterdam: Elsevier)

Morcol, G. (2012) *A Complexity Theory For Public Policy* (Routledge)

Paley, J (2010), 'The appropriation of complexity theory in health care', *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 15 (1), 59-61

Room, G. (2011) *Complexity, Institutions and Public Policy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar)

Sanderson, I. (2006) 'Complexity, 'practical rationality' and evidence-based policy making' *Policy and Politics*, 34 (1), 115-132.

Sanderson, I. (2009) 'Intelligent Policy Making for a Complex World: Pragmatism, Evidence and Learning', *Political Studies*, 57, 699-719

Policy Transfer, Learning and the Use of Ideas

Questions/issues to consider – what is the difference between policy transfer and learning? What types of transfer and learning are there? How do, and should, governments learn from each other?

Reading

Armstrong, A. (1998) 'A Comparative Analysis: New Public Management - The Way Ahead?', Australian Journal of Public Administration, 57, 2, 12-24

Bennett, C. (1991) "What is Policy Convergence and What Causes It?", *British Journal of Political Science*, 21, 2, 215-33

Bennett, C. (1991b) 'How States Utilize Foreign Evidence", *Journal of Public Policy*, 11, 1, 31-54

Bennett, C. and Howlett, M (1992) 'The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change', *Policy Sciences*, 25, 275-94

Benson, A. and Jordan, A. (2011) 'What Have We Learned from Policy Transfer Research? Dolowitz and Marsh Revisited', *Political Studies Review*, 9, 3, 366-78

See the chapters by Berry, F. and Berry in the three editions of *Theories of the Policy Process*

Busch, P. and Jörgens, H. (2005) 'The International Sources Of Policy Convergence: Explaining The Spread Of Environmental Policy Innovations', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12, 5, 860-84

Dolowitz, D. (2003) "A Policy-maker's Guide to Policy Transfer", *The Political Quarterly*, 101-8

Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (1996) "Who Learns What from Whom: a Review of the Policy Transfer Literature", *Political Studies*, XLIV, 343-57

Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D (2000) "Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making", *Governance*, 13, 1, 5-24

Evans, M. and Davies, J. (1999) 'Understanding Policy Transfer: A Multi-Level, Multi-Disciplinary Perspective", *Public Administration*, 77, 2, 361-85

Heichel, S., Pape, J. and Sommerer, T. (2005) 'Is there convergence in convergence research? An overview of empirical studies on policy convergence', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12, 5, 817–40

Hoberg, G. (1991) 'Sleeping with an Elephant: The American Influence on Canadian Environmental Regulation' *Journal of Public Policy*, 11, 1, 107-131

Hoberg, George (2001) "Globalization and Policy Convergence: Symposium Overview", *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 3, 127-32

Holzinger, K. and Knill, C. (2005) 'Causes and conditions of cross-national policy convergence', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12, 5, 775–796

James, O. and Lodge, M. (2003) "The Limitations of 'Policy Transfer' and 'Lesson Drawing' for Public Policy Research", *Political Studies Review*, 1, 179-93

Keating, M. & Cairney, P. (2012). 'Policy Transfer and Learning'. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 22, 3.

Rose, R. (1991) 'What Is Lesson-Drawing?' *Journal of Public Policy*, 11, 1, 3-30

Rose, R. (1993) *Lesson-Drawing in Public Policy* (New Jersey: Chatham House)

S Rose, R. (2005) *Learning From Comparative Public Policy: A Practical Guide* (London: Routledge)

tone, D (1999) "Learning Lessons and Transferring Policy across Time, Space and Disciplines", *Politics*, 19, 1, 51-9

Walker, J.L. (1969) "The Diffusion of Innovations among the American States", *American Political Science Review*, 63, 880-99

Questions/issues to consider – what issues do rational choice theory raise for public policy problems and the solutions designed to solve them? We will also explore the links between 'axiomatic' forms of rational choice and behavioural science (to inform the separate session).

Reading

Axelrod, R. (1986) 'An Evolutionary Approach to Norms', *American Political Science Review*, 80, 4, 1095-1111

Baumol, W. (1987) 'Microeconomics: A Comment on the Realism of Assumptions', *Journal of Economic Education*, 18, 2, 155

Buchanan, J. (2005) 'Public Choice: The Origins and Development of a Research Program', paper to Public Choice Society http://sb.cofc.edu/pv_obj_cache/pv_obj_id_4ECD266F12BDD0CFDC97260213CA09AA2CE10700/filename/Public%20Choice%20Origins%20Buchanan.pdf

Chwaszcza, C. (2008) 'Game Theory' in D. Della Porta and M. Keating (eds.) *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences; A Pluralist Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Dewan, T., Dowding, K., and Shepsle, K. (2009) 'Editors' introduction: Rational Choice Classics in Political Science' in (eds.) K. Dowding, T. Dewan and K. Shepsle *Rational Choice Politics Volume 1* (London: Sage)

Dunleavy, P. (1991) *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf)

Elster, J. (1986) 'Introduction' in (ed) J. Elster *Rational Choice* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Hindmoor, A. (2006) *Rational Choice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Ward, H. (2002) 'Rational Choice' in (eds) D. Marsh and G. Stoker *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (Basingstoke: Palgrave) (there is a chapter on rational choice on each version of this text)

Dowding, K. and King, A. (1995) 'Introduction' in (eds) K. Dowding and A. King *Preferences, Institutions and Rational Choice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Dowding, K. (1991) *Rational Choice and Political Power* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar)

Dowding, K. (2010) 'Rational Choice Theory' in (ed.) ed. M. Bevir *Sage Handbook of Governance* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).

Green, D. and Shapiro, I. (1994) *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Green, D. and Shapiro, I. (2005) 'Revisiting the Pathologies of Rational Choice' in (ed) I. Shapiro *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

Griggs, S. (2007) 'Rational Choice Theory in Public Policy: The Theory in Critical Perspective' in (eds) F. Fischer, G. Miller and M. Sidney *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis* (London: CRC Press)

Hampsher-Monk, I. and Hindmoor, A. (2010) 'Rational Choice and Interpretive Evidence: Caught Between a Rock and a Hard Place?', *Political Studies*, 58, 1, 47-65

Hardin, G. (1968) 'The Tragedy of the Commons', *Science*, 162, December, 1243-8

Hay, C. (2002) *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Hay, C. (2004) 'Theory, Stylized Heuristic or Self-fulfilling Prophecy? The Status of Rational Choice Theory in Public Administration', *Public Administration*, 82, 1, 39-62

Hindess, B. (1988) *Choice, Rationality and Social Theory* (London: Unwin Hyman)

Hindmoor, A. (2006b) 'Public Choice' in C. Hay, M. Lister and D. Marsh (eds.) *The State: Theories and Issues* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Keohane, R. and Ostrom, E. (1995) *Local Commons and Global Independence* (London: Sage)

Laver, M. (1997) *Private Desires, Political Action* (London: Sage)

Le Grand, J. (2003) *Motivation, Agency and Public Policy: Of Knights and Knaves, Pawns and Queens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

MacDonald, P. (2003) 'Useful Fiction or Miracle Maker: The Competing Epistemological Foundations of Rational Choice Theory', *American Political Science Review*, 97, 4, 551-65

McLean, I. (1987) *Public Choice* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Mueller, D. (2003) *Public Choice III* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Olson, M. (1971) *The Logic of Collective Action* (2nd Printing) (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press)

Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Parsons, S. (2005) *Rational Choice and Politics: A Critical Introduction* (London: Continuum)

Shepsle, K. and Bonchek, M. (1997) *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions* (London: Norton)

Tullock, G. (1967) 'The Welfare Costs of Tariffs, Monopolies and Theft', *Western Economic Journal*, 5, 3, 224-32

Ward, H. (2002) 'Rational Choice' in (eds) D. Marsh and G. Stoker *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Evolution
Cairney, P. (2013) 'What is Evolutionary Theory and How Does it Inform Policy Studies?' *Policy and Politics*, 41, 2, 279-98

The Psychology of Policymaking
Alter, A. and Oppenheimer, D. (2009) 'Uniting the tribes of fluency to form a metacognitive nation' *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13 (3), 219-235
Alter, A. () *Drunk Tank Pink*
Chabris, C. and Simons, D. () *The Invisible Gorilla*
Frank, R. (1988) *Passions within reason: the strategic role of the emotions* (NewYork: Norton)
Haidt, J. (2001) "The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment," *Psychological Review* 108, 4, 814-834
Haidt, J. (2007) 'The New Synthesis in Moral Psychology', *Science*, 316: 998-100
Haidt, J. (2012) *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion* (New York: Pantheon)
Kahneman, D. (2012) *Thinking Fast and Slow* (UK edition) (London: Penguin)
Lewis, P. (2013) 'Policy Thinking, Fast and Slow: A Social Intuitionist Perspective on Public Policy Processes', American Political Science Association 2013 Annual Meeting Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2300479
Quattrone, G. and Tversky, A. (1988) 'Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analysis of Political Choice', *American Political Science Review* 82:719-736
Slovic, P. (2010) 'Introduction' in (ed.) Slovic, P. *The Feeling of Risk* (Oxford: Earthscan)
Sunstein, C. (2002) *Risk and reason: safety, law, and the environment* (New York: Cambridge University Press)
Thaler, R. and Sunstein, C. (2008) *Nudge* (London: Penguin) – this is the book associated with behavioural science, economic and policy
Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1973) 'Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability', *Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 207-32

The Role of Ideas, Critical Policy Analysis, Interpretive approaches and the NPF

Questions/issues to consider – what is the distinctive role of critical and interpretive approaches to policy analysis? Compare critical texts which challenge 'positivist' accounts with others (such as the NPF) introducing the role of narrative but using traditional means. This topic brings up, yet again, the role of 'ideas', but does it do so in a distinctive way? Also note the links between the NPF and our later focus on psychology.

Reading
Bevir and Rhodes
Fischer, F. (2003) *Reframing Public Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
Fischer, F. and Forester, J. (eds) (1993) *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis* (London: UCL Press)
That Discourse analysis thing
Genieys, W. and Smyrl, M. (eds.) (2008) *Elites, Ideas and the Evolution of Public Policy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Goodin, R. and Tilly, C. (2006) *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Hay, C. (2004b) "'Taking ideas seriously' in explanatory political analysis", *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 6, 142-9

Majone, G. (1989) *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press)

McBeth, M., Jones, M. and Shanahan, E. (2014) 'The Narrative Policy Framework' in Sabatier, P. and Weible, C. (eds.) *Theories of the Policy Process 3rd edition* (Chicago: Westview Press)

Rhodes

Stolfi, F. (2010) 'Testing Structuralist and Interpretative Explanations of Policy Change: The Case of Italy's Budget Reform', *Governance*, 23, 1, 109-32

The social construction of target populations

Ingram, H.., Schneider, A.and deLeon, P. (2007) 'Social Construction and Policy Design' in (ed) Sabatier, P. *Theories of the Policy Process* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press), 169–89

Pierce, J., Siddiki, S., Jones, M., Schumacher, K., Pattison, A. and Peterson, H. (2014) 'Social Construction and Policy Design: A Review of Past Applications', *Policy Studies Journal*, 42, 1, 1-29

Schneider, A. and Ingram, H. (1993) 'Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy', *The American Political Science Review*, 87, 2, 334-47

Schneider, A. and Ingram, H. (1997) *Policy Design for Democracy* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas)

Schneider, A. and Ingram, H. (2005) "A Response to Peter deLeon." *Public Administration Review* 65 (5), 638-640

Schneider, A., Ingram, H. and deLeon, P. (2014) 'Democratic Policy Design: Social Construction of Target Populations' in Sabatier, P. and Weible, C. (eds.) *Theories of the Policy Process 3rd edition*

REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES - HISTORY AND POLITICS 2015/16

MODULE COMPLETION

All assessed elements of modules must be completed as they, in line with University definitions, have specific learning outcomes which cannot be achieved without completion. This includes all class tests, online journals, oral presentations, exams or other forms of assessment as itemised in the Assessment: Components and Deadlines section to be found in all module handouts. It is the responsibility of students to make themselves aware of all assessed elements.

ATTENDANCE

Students in History and Politics are expected to attend all lectures. **Attendance at tutorials/seminars is prescribed since students are assessed for their oral performance.** These classes, together with coursework submission and examinations, are defined as academic contact points. To have participated fully in the module, to acquire important transferable skills, and to have achieved the required learning outcomes students will have needed to attend their classes regularly. Students who are absent for more than a third of prescribed classes will have their mark capped at a maximum of 40 for that module.

In the case of tutorials/seminars students are expected to attend their assigned groups. Exceptionally, and for good reason, you may be granted permission to attend a different

tutorial group once, but only if one is available and only by arrangement with your tutor. If you do not obtain agreement, you will be marked absent. If a student is unable to attend a particular tutorial, the tutor should be notified of the circumstances without delay.

ESSAYS
Essay Deadlines
History and Politics take these deadlines seriously. When there are good grounds such as illness or bereavement for seeking an extension, an application should be submitted on a form obtainable from the Divisional Office (or on Succeed under History and Politics Undergraduate Information (1516)) as early as possible, but no later than the essay deadline. It must be signed by the module coordinator to indicate approval. All students, including those with an Agreed Record of University Adjustments (ARUA), must carry out this procedure for each essay.

Essay Submission
All essays, including late essays and those for which extensions have been agreed, should be submitted through the essay box outside A63 by 12 noon on the due date. They should not be handed to tutors or handed in personally at the office. Please note that the essay box is emptied daily at or shortly after 12 noon, and all essays are date-stamped at that time. Essays must be submitted with a completed cover sheet and these are available outside A63.

Turnitin
To protect the integrity of the degrees, the Divisions make use of the plagiarism detection software Turnitin which is available through Succeed. Accordingly **History and Politics REQUIRE students to upload an electronic copy of their essays by the relevant deadline. Please note that the penalties for late and non submission of essays also apply to the electronic versions of essays**. Guidance on Turnitin is available at http://www.stir.ac.uk/media/schools/is/documents/succeeddocuments/turnitinuk-student.pdf. Essays will not be marked unless the electronic copy is uploaded, and delay in uploading will result in minimal comments on the hard copy. Please note that all the regulations about submission of the paper copy of your essays and assignments still apply. The electronic copy is an additional requirement, not a substitute; that is to say, an essay or assignment submitted electronically on time but not submitted in hard copy by the set deadline will still be counted as late. Needless to say, the electronic version and the paper version must be identical, and checks are carried out to ensure that this is so.
All students are entitled to monitor their Turnitin scores and, if they wish, to resubmit their essays before final submission, though subject to the required deadlines. If students choose to use Turnitin for monitoring purposes they need to be aware that there will be a delay before a new version of their essays can be submitted: 24 hours in the case of a first resubmission, and 48 hours for a second. If done too close to the essay submission date, students run the risk of missing the deadline and incurring penalties.
Turnitin is only one of a variety of tools used to assess plagiarism (see below). Regardless of the Turnitin score, in matters of plagiarism academic judgement is decisive and final.

Late Submission of Essays
If a student fails to submit a piece of coursework on time, work will be accepted up to seven calendar days after the submission date (or expiry of any agreed extension) but the mark will be lowered by three marks per day or part thereof. After seven calendar days, the piece of work will be deemed a non-submission and will be given a mark of 0 (zero). **For the**

avoidance of doubt, Saturday and Sunday count as two calendar days. These penalties apply when a request for an extension is not approved by the module coordinator.

Essay Presentation

It is a requirement that written assignments for all modules must be word-processed, contain a bibliography and give an indication of word length. Anonymous marking of History and Politics essays is standard practice. Therefore, your name should not appear on the essay. Instead you should give your University student registration number. Students must make and retain a copy of each essay submitted, since they may be required to produce this copy.

The required length of essays is advised in the module assessment section of the module handout. There are different subject rules in History and Politics concerning penalties for excessive length.

In History: no student will be penalised for exceeding the recommended length by up to 20% where the length requested is less than 2,000 words, or up to 500 words where the length requested is 2,000 words or over.

In Politics: no student will be penalised for exceeding the recommended length by up to 10% whatever the length of the assignment.

In either subject, if the essay goes beyond the stated maximum it will be penalised by 3% on the University's common marking scheme. If a second essay in the same module is similarly overlong it will be penalised by 6%. The intention of these guidelines is to encourage you to be concise and exclude material that is not relevant to your argument. Students also risk being penalised if they submit essays significantly shorter than the required length. Word counts must be indicated on the essay cover sheet and must be accurate.

Students should read the Student Handbooks for History and Politics and the Academic Skills Booklet for History for details of style as well as for assessment guidelines, expected standards and assessment criteria. They are available on-line in History and Politics Undergraduate Information (1516) under Teaching Materials.

Student Learning Services offer Personal Development Modules on Learning Strategies and Information Technology Skills. These courses are particularly useful in the early stages of a degree programme. Fuller details are available at http://www.stir.ac.uk/campus-life/learning-support/personal-development-modules/.

Those requiring information and advice on computing facilities on campus (e.g. location and hours of computer labs; information on word processing workshops, information on obtaining an internet password) should consult https://www.stir.ac.uk/is/student/help/.

Plagiarism

It is generally understood why cheating in examinations is wrong: it is an attempt to gain undeserved credit by presenting the work of another as one's own. For the University not to treat cheating as an extremely serious offence, would be unfair to its students and would jeopardise the standard of its awards. Exactly the same is true of coursework submitted for assessment. Plagiarism in coursework is the equivalent of cheating in an examination because it involves the reproduction of another's work, whether ideas, data or expressions, without due acknowledgement. This is plagiarism, whether the source is printed, electronic or

handwritten, whether it is reproduced verbatim or paraphrased, or drawn on extensively or in brief. Do not share your work with another student.

The University has an agreed policy setting out procedures and penalties for dealing with plagiarism. This policy can be found under Academic Misconduct in the University's on-line Quality Handbook at http://www.stir.ac.uk/academicpolicy/handbook/assessment/#q-8.
Plagiarism will normally result in an essay being given a fail grade and there are likely to be additional penalties. If students are in any doubt at all about the nature of plagiarism, or the means by which to avoid it, they are strongly advised to consult their tutor. Students should clearly understand that it is their responsibility to be sure they understand these matters. Ignorance is not accepted as a defence for plagiarism. See the Student Handbooks for History and Politics for further information and 'The Little Book of Plagiarism', available online at https://www.stir.ac.uk/media/services/registry/quality/BookofPlagiarism.pdf.

Appealing an essay grade
Your essay grades are the result of careful academic judgement. If you nonetheless feel that the mark of your essay does not reflect your efforts and achievement, contact your tutor in the first instance. You should raise your concerns within one week of receiving the grade. If this does not resolve the matter, please request the tutor to refer the matter to the module co-ordinator. Where the module coordinator is the tutor, the matter should be referred to the Learning and Teaching Officer (LTO). In case the tutor is the LTO, the matter should be referred to the Programme Director. The LTO (or Programme Director) will then appoint a colleague who will mark the piece of work in question anonymously. This assessment will be final. Please be aware that marks can go up as well as down! Please also take note of the University's appeals and complaints procedures:
https://www.stir.ac.uk/academicpolicy/handbook/student-academic-appeals-and-complaints/**.**

TUTORIAL/SEMINAR ASSESSMENT
Informal Oral Contributions
It is fully appreciated that speaking in front of others is a skill that comes more easily to some than others, but it is an important attribute in terms of securing employment and so is something that all should strive to acquire. The most significant issues are to attend and to participate. Students will be assessed on the relevance of their comments, analytical skills, knowledge and understanding of the subject. Students should be aware that it is the quality rather than the quantity of contributions which is being assessed. **Unexplained absences will result in reduced tutorial participation and so be given a lower oral grade.**

Formal Oral Contributions
Formal contributions may include pre-arranged presentations, debates or role playing exercises. They will be assessed on content, clarity and delivery. Where appropriate, students are encouraged to make use of PowerPoint, whiteboards or blackboards to illustrate their presentations. Formal presentations should remain within the time limit stipulated by the tutor.

Formally Assessed Presentations
Where a formal presentation is a specified element in the assessment of a module, the following regulations apply:

a. Students who fail to deliver their presentation must within 5 calendar days provide their tutor with an alternative, written presentation. The grade awarded for this written presentation will be 50% of what would have been awarded had the presentation been made in the normal

way. Written versions handed in more than 5 calendar days late will incur the same penalties as late essays (see above).

b. Students who for good reason cannot deliver their presentation must inform their tutor as soon as possible and, if at all practical, prior to the seminar. In such cases the tutor will attempt to re-arrange the presentation for another date or give the student an alternative presentation topic. Should that not be possible, the student will be asked to submit a write-up in lieu of the presentation. Write-ups submitted after the agreed hand-in date will be subject to the University policy regarding the late submission of essay work (see above).

FEEDBACK PROCEDURES
The Division operates the University's policy on feedback http://www.stir.ac.uk/feedback/ (i.e. appraisal of assessed work) and feedforward (i.e. recommendations for improvement).

Feedback and Guidance Sessions
All teaching staff and tutors have Feedback and Guidance Sessions when they are available to provide advice on course work, reading and other module issues. If students would like general feedforward, they are welcome to consult their tutors in these sessions. These times are posted on the doors of each tutor and those for module coordinators are also indicated at the front of module handouts. Note that these times apply only during the teaching period and if advice is required outside these times students must email the tutor concerned to make arrangements.

Coursework
Tutors will advise their students about how they intend to return essays (and equivalent coursework) after grading. Whatever system is employed - individual pick-up face-to-face or distribution in class/seminar or electronic return - all students are entitled to one-to-one feedback. If this cannot be accommodated during a tutor's normal Feedback and Guidance Sessions, students should email their tutor to make appropriate arrangements. Unless there are special circumstances notified to students, coursework will be returned within three weeks. Module coordinators will retain uncollected essays for six months after the due date of return. Specific feedforward will be indicated on each essay return matrix under 'Action points'. Students are expected to respond to feedback and feedforward by following the guidelines provided in the on-line Student Guide at:
https://www.stir.ac.uk/media/services/registry/documents/A%20student%20guide%20to%20feedback%20and%20feedforward.pdf.

At the end of each module, and once grades are validated by the Chief Examiner, anonymised grade sheets will be posted on Succeed providing a breakdown of assessed elements.

EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES
Where students feel that extenuating circumstances have contributed to a reduction in performance in examinations or other assessed work, they may refer to the university's Quality Handbook for guidance:
https://www.stir.ac.uk/academicpolicy/handbook/student-academic-appeals-and-complaints/.
There the requirements for documentary evidence and the role of the subject Board of Examiners are explained.

MODULE EVALUATION
It is University policy to evaluate each module and a standard questionnaire will be issued. It is important that you complete this thoughtfully so that we can monitor modules effectively.

The procedure is anonymous and tutors will ensure that privacy is afforded to each group of students for a process which takes only about 5 minutes.

ADVISERS OF STUDIES
Full- and part-time History and Politics undergraduate students who wish to discuss **changing their degree programme or changing module choices** once registered should contact the Advisor of Studies for History or Politics. For session 2015-16 these are:

History   Dr Jacqueline Jenkinson   P.A54, Tel. ext. 7582, j.l.m.jenkinson@stir.ac.uk
Politics   Dr Andrea Baumeister   P.A89, Tel. ext. 7572, a.t.baumeister@stir.ac.uk

Study Abroad and Erasmus students and **students with disability issues** wishing to discuss any question should consult the Adviser of Studies.

For details of the role of the Advisers of Studies, please see
https://www.stir.ac.uk/tse/advisers/.

BECOMING A COURSE REPRESENTATIVE
Being a course rep is a great opportunity to help shape your course and your learning experience. Course representatives are elected from all students on a module and are invited to attend student-staff consultative committees to discuss what is working well and what could be improved within the module. Reps also actively engage with their fellow students seeking out issues and presenting these to the union and the division for solutions. For more information go to: http://www.stirlingstudentsunion.com/aboutus/courserepresentation/.

CHANGES IN ACADEMIC REGULATIONS
Academic regulations are subject to constant review and so students are advised in any case of doubt to consult the on-line Quality Handbook at
https://www.stir.ac.uk/academicpolicy/handbook/. Please note that University policy as set out there may supersede what is outlined here.