

# Methods for Environmental and Natural Resource Policy Analysis

## ESPM 4242/5242 (3 Credits)

Course Syllabus – Fall 2010

### Course Meeting Time and Location

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

### Course Instructors

Dennis Becker  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Forest Resources  
101D Green Hall  
(612) 624-7286  
[drbecker@umn.edu](mailto:drbecker@umn.edu)

Mike Kilgore  
Professor  
Department of Forest Resources  
301K Green Hall  
(612) 624-6298  
[mkilgore@umn.edu](mailto:mkilgore@umn.edu)

### Office Hours:

Dennis Becker: Mondays 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.; Thursdays 8:30 – 10:00 a.m.; or by appointment

Mike Kilgore: Tuesdays 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.; Thursdays 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.; or by appointment

### Course Prerequisites

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

### Required Readings

*A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, by Eugene Bardach (ISBN: 1-56802-923-3)

Additional readings and supplemental resources are available on the course website accessible via Moodle (<https://moodle.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 and ESPM 3261, or comparable course 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 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 written responses to discussion questions, written analysis exercises, and peer critiques of your fellow student's written material.

## Course Grading

Evaluation Tool	Points	Due Date
<b>Discussion Question Sets</b>		
Set 1: Policy Process & Participants	25	September 14
Set 2: Political Environment for Policy Analysis	25	September 16
Set 3: Role of the Policy Analyst	25	September 21
Set 4: Overview of Policy Analysis Process	25	September 30
<b>Writing Exercises</b>		
Writing Exercise #1: Policy Problem Definition ( <b>Draft</b> )	50	October 12
Writing Exercise #1: Policy Problem Definition ( <b>Revised</b> )	50	October 21
Peer Critique of Writing Exercise #1	50	October 28
Writing Exercise #2: Data Needs & Sources ( <b>Draft</b> ) <sup>1</sup>		October 21
Peer Critique of Writing Exercise #2	50	October 28
Writing Exercise #2: Data Needs & Sources ( <b>Revised</b> )	50	November 4
Writing Exercise #3: Data Collection and Analysis ( <b>Draft</b> ) <sup>1</sup>		November 16
Writing Exercise #3: Data Collection and Analysis ( <b>Revised</b> )	50	December 2
Writing Exercise #4: Evaluation Criteria & Alternatives ( <b>Draft</b> ) <sup>1</sup>		December 2
Peer Critique of Writing Exercise #4	50	December 9
Writing Exercise #4: Evaluation Criteria & Alternatives ( <b>Revised</b> )	50	December 17
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>500</b>

<sup>1</sup>Assignments must be turned in on time to prepare student peer critiques.

- 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. The “+” and “-” symbols will be used on the final course grade.

## Course Outline and Schedule<sup>1</sup>

Week	Date	Topic	Readings <sup>2</sup>
1	September 7	Course Orientation and “Doing” an Analysis – overview of syllabus, assignments, expectations of the semester, and preliminary project planning	Weimer & Vining 23-38
	September 9	Introduction to Policy Analysis – characterization of the policy process, types of policies, and key participants	Buck Chapter 3 Kilgore et al. (Jan. 1996)
2	September 14	Overview of the Policy Process and Participants (continued)  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Discussion Question Set #1	None
	September 16	Political Environment for Policy Analysis – politicization of scientific data, role of the analyst, and policy advocacy  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Discussion Question Set #2	Lackey National Academy of Sciences Spilisbury & Nasi 2006
3	September 21	Role of the Policy Analyst ( <i>Guest presentation</i> ) – discussion of political bias and advocacy as an analyst  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Discussion Question Set #3	Clark: Ch. 6
	September 23	Policy Analysis Overview – types of policy analysis and overview of analysis steps	Bardach (entire book)
4	September 28	Policy Analysis Overview (continued)	Bardach (entire book)
	September 30	Analysis Overview ( <i>guest presentation</i> ) – steps in the policy analysis process and use of the information  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Discussion Question Set #4	OLA Examples (see Moodle)
5	October 5	Problem Definition & Constructing Alternatives – framing a policy analysis and the use of alternatives to guide inquiry	Dunn: Ch 2; P&S: Ch 4 Kraft & Furlong: Ch 5
	October 7	Project Workday – group work on Writing Exercise #1: problem definition and constructing alternatives	None
6	October 12	Data Collection – data collection overview; review of focus groups and nominal group design to collect data  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Draft Writing Exercise #1	Gupta: Ch. 7 Leahy et al. 2008. Delbeccq et al. 1975
	October 14	Data Collection – review of survey design (mail, phone), and the Delphi technique to collect data	Clendenning et. al. 2004. Parker et. al. 1993.
7	October 19	Project Workday – group work on Writing Exercise #2: data needs and sources	Babbie: Ch 10
	October 21	Data Collection – review of qualitative data collection techniques (interviews and observations)  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Revised Writing Exercise 1; Draft Writing Exercise 2	None

<b>8</b>	October 26	Data Collection – review of benefit transfer methods, content analysis, and other forms of secondary data	Benefit Transfer model
	October 28	Data Collection – sampling and data quality techniques  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Peer Critique of Writing Exercise #1 & #2	Dillman Ch 5
<b>9</b>	November 2	Data Analysis – overview of techniques of analyzing primary and secondary data	FR Staff Paper # 193
	November 4	Project Workday – group work on Writing Exercise #3: data collection and analysis  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Revised Writing Exercise #2	None
<b>10</b>	November 9	Evaluation Criteria – choosing criteria to guide selection of alternatives in a policy analysis	Kraft & Furlong: Ch 6 GEIS – Criteria Develop. Doc. Clawson: Ch 3
	November 11	Comparing Alternatives – employing the evaluation criteria to select among competing policies	P&S: Ch 8 Kraft & Furlong: Ch 6
<b>11</b>	November 16	Panel Presentation: National Policy Topic (pending)  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Draft Writing Exercise #3	TBD
	November 18	Framing an Analysis (in-class discussion of Panel Presentations; in-class exercises)	None
<b>12</b>	November 23	Policy Case Study	OLA Report: Natural Resource Lands
	November 25	<b>THANKSGIVING – NO CLASS</b>	
<b>13</b>	November 30	Project Workday – group work on Writing Exercise #4: evaluation criteria and alternative selection	None
	December 2	Policy Case Study (continued)  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Revised Writing Exercise 3; Draft Writing Exercise 4	OLA Report: Natural Resource Lands
<b>14</b>	December 7	Policy Case Study (continued)	OLA Report: Natural Resource Lands
	December 9	Policy Case Study (continued)  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Peer Critique of Writing Exercise #4	
<b>15</b>	December 14	Course Wrap-Up – assistance with writing exercises; review of learning objectives; course evaluations	None
	December 17	FINAL EXAM  <b><u>DUE:</u></b> Revised Writing Exercise #4	

<sup>1</sup> Dates are approximate and may change as the semester progresses.

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

## Bibliography

- Babbie, E. 1995. *The practice of social research*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. 476 p. **(Chapter 10, p. 255-278)**
- Bardach, E. 2009. *A practical guide for policy analysis: The eightfold path to more effective problem solving*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 162 p.
- Buck, S.J. 1996. *Understanding environmental administration and law*. 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Wisconsin's 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)**
- Clawson, M. 1975. *Forests for whom and for what?* Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press. **(Chapter 3, p. 17-25)**
- Delbecq, A.L., A.H. Van de Van, and D.H. Gustafson. *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*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. **(Chapter 5, p. 194-213)**
- Dunn, W.N. 2004. *Public policy analysis: An introduction*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Upper River Saddle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. 528 p. **(Chapter 2, p. 33-70)**
- Gupta, D.K. 2001. *Analyzing public policy: Concepts, tools and techniques*. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 408 p. **(Chapter 3, p. 46-69)**
- 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. and A.R. Ek. 2007. *Cumulative forestry impact assessment: Lessons learned and planning for states*. University of Minnesota, Department of Forest Resources, Staff Paper # 193. 35 p.
- Kilgore, M.A., P.V. Ellefson, and G.A. Rose. 1996. *Innovative forestry initiatives: Minnesota prepares for the future*. *Journal of Forestry*, 21-25.
- Kraft, M.E. and S.R. Furlong. 2007. *Public policy: Politics, analysis, and alternatives*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 459 p. **(Chapter 6, p. 147-178)**
- 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.
- 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*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. 482 p. **(Chapter 4, p. 147-185)**
- 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.
- Weimer, D.L. and A.R. Vinining. 2005. *Policy analysis: Concepts and practice*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Upper River Saddle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. 501 p. **(Chapter 2, p. 23-38)**