

CWRU is an "organized interest" in the sense that it has in place a process to gather resources and information and participate in the policy process. It is organized to participate, through (mainly) its Office of Government Relations. It also participates in interest groups, such as the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and the Association of American Universities.

Second, interest representation therefore has at least two dimensions, which we might call policy advocacy and organizational advocacy. By policy advocacy, I mean efforts to change the actions of government mainly in order to achieve some desired change in the world. By organizational advocacy, I mean efforts to get some government to do something that helps an organization- or not do something that would hurt the organization. These two efforts can be much the same if the purpose of the organization is to change policy. There also are plenty of times when an interest seeks to change the world in ways that go far beyond its immediate self-interest but also serve that interest. CWRU's leadership, for example, would surely like the federal government to pay for much more medical research, and much – but not all! – of those extra funds would benefit other people and not CWRU. Yet a great deal of interest representation is focused on organizational concerns.

Third, for this course the best way to think about government action is to view it as a "policy process." The policy process includes not just choosing purposes (should the federal government expand access to health insurance?) but implementing them (will states set up health insurance exchanges and, regardless of who sets them up, how well will the online enrollment system work?). The process has many entry points or venues, and interests will choose at which points and how to participate. Different resources are more useful at different points in the process, so the relative "strength" or "weakness" of an interest will vary with those circumstances. And, while resources matter, so does opposition. An interest could get much of what it wants because hardly anyone objects and it is cheap for government decision-makers to be helpful. Conversely, an interest with huge resources could be blocked by powerful and persistent opponents.

Fourth, this "policy process," or government action in general, then should be seen as part of the environment for any organization or interest. By the environment, I mean those aspects of the outside world that shape an organization's ability to perform its intended tasks, survive, or thrive. For example, tax code provisions about deductibility of contributions, or laws about the rate of payout from endowments, are a significant aspect of Case Western Reserve University's environment.

In order to shape or defend against government actions, specific people associated with specific interests engage in a series of tasks. The best-known is advocacy, but part of the job of government relations professionals is also to inform the rest of their organization about what government might do to them, and how to cope with that. For both purposes, it is important to understand how governments decide – the policy process – as well as the tactics for advocacy. Different decisions are made in different ways, and so require different skills and tactics to represent interests.

This course can only begin to introduce you to the questions you would ask and factors to consider if you are ever involved in representing an interest or cause to governments. But my goal is to give you a good overview. That may give you a head start if you ever engage in advocacy, or better understanding when someone tells you the government is about to have some effect on your organization, or a sense of what to look for if, as a leader in a nonprofit organization, you have staff who work on government relations.

Along the way, you may also add to your understanding of how the American political system works. Textbooks talk about “democracy” and whether the U.S. system fits some ideal. That’s not an interesting question: of course it is far from the classic image of a democracy and far from ideal. The interesting questions involve who is served, how well, and why. *Who participates, to what effect?* What resources are needed to participate effectively, and do some interests have advantages because they have more of the most useful resources?

COURSE MATERIAL:

Common course readings include **two required texts**, available for purchase, and a collection of **articles that will be posted on the course Blackboard site**.

Jeffrey M. Berry with David F. Arons, *A Voice for Nonprofits*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press 2003.

Anthony J. Nownes, *Total Lobbying: What Lobbyists Want (and How They Try to Get It)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Each student will read **one other book**, for the review assignment described below. They will choose from among the following five:

Maureen H. Casamayou, *The Politics of Breast Cancer*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001.

Douglas R. Imig, *Poverty and Power: The Political Representation of Poor Americans*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

Richard Kirsch, *Fighting for Our Health: The Epic Battle to Make Health Care a Right in the United States*. Albany, NY: The Rockefeller Institute Press, 2011.

Michael D. Pertschuk, *Smoke in Their Eyes: Lessons in Movement Leadership from the Tobacco Wars*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2001.

George C. Wilson, *This War Really Matters: Inside the Fight for Defense Dollars*. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2000.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS:

In addition to the weekly readings, your assignments will include two in-class exams, a book review, and a project in which you study one interest's engagement with the policy process.

1) Exams

Each will require you to show understanding of the preceding course material. It will take the form either of an essay question or a set of short-answer questions about core concepts. In either case I will provide a study guide during the previous class, and the question or questions will be taken from that study guide. The first exam will be on **October 9**. The second will be on **November 23**. *Each exam will count for 18% of your grade.*

2) Outside Reading Reports

Each student will read one book from the list of five above (Casamayou, Imig, Kirsch, Pertschuk, Wilson). *All students should choose their book no later than by the beginning of class on Sept 18*. There are two reasons for this requirement: to make sure you have sufficient time to get the book, and to ensure you have time to read it. I would like to have roughly equal numbers of students doing each book. Therefore, choices will be approved on a first-come, first-serve basis. On September 18 I will assign a book to any student who has not chosen.

Your task is to explain what the book tells us about the role of interests in the policy process. You may find that, at that point in the class, the book is providing perspectives on issues that we have discussed. You might also find that it is raising issues we haven't discussed but that seem important. In the latter case it may be something we will be getting to, or may not. In either event, *you should think of your goal as to explain to the rest of the class what they would learn from the book*. I expect to make the best papers available to the entire class, on the blackboard site.

The reports should be prepared in two parts. The first will be an oral presentation to classmates, for class discussion. These presentations will be made on either October 21 or October 23. Students should send me, by 8 p.m. on October 20, an outline of the main points they expect to make in their oral presentation. I will try to provide some comments that evening. Both my feedback on your outline and the class discussion should alert you to matters you might consider for your final versions. The finished papers will be due to me by e-mail by **Noon on Sunday, October 25**. These papers should be between 1,800 and 2,200 words long. *These papers will count for 24% of your grade.*

3) Advocacy Memo Project

Your project will involve writing a memo in which you evaluate the advocacy or public policy concerns of an organization. This means, first, that you should understand the organization's interests: what public policies might affect it, or what public policies its leaders might, in pursuit of the organization's mission, want to affect. Second, you will

want to understand what resources the organization can use for advocacy. That includes understanding what an organization can do to attract its members or supporters to work for those advocacy goals. A third factor is what governments, or what parts of what governments, the organization might target for its efforts. A fourth is what allies or rivals the organization might face. A fifth is what stage of the policy-making or decision-making processes the organization would do best to target, and what that might accomplish.

This project then requires a series of steps.

1) Choose an organization. **You should send me a one-page memo about your choice by Monday, September 21.** In this memo briefly describe the organization you have chosen, why, and what you think its main advocacy concerns will be.

2) Gather basic facts about the organization (which will include things like its core tasks, its budget, who does its work, whether it has customers or members, and so on). Send me a memo that summarizes these facts by class time on **Friday, October 2.**

3) **Your final memo will be due by 10 a.m. on Monday, Dec 14, submitted by e-mail.**

I strongly encourage you to meet with me after you submit each of the first two stages. I will provide written feedback on them, but it might be more helpful if we talk. I am available during my office hours but should also be able to schedule meetings at other times.

I also am willing to review and comment on first drafts of the final papers. Of course I need sufficient time to read a draft and prepare comments. So I will promise that if I receive a draft by December 7, I will provide comments by December 10.

Your final report should be in memo format. We can discuss who would be the best addressee for a memo about your particular organization. It could be the organization's leadership, or a foundation to which you would be making a proposal for support, or some other party that you suggest. We will discuss possible sources and research methods when we talk about your projects. Different organizations will require different kinds of research.

Naturally I would not object to, and would in fact encourage you to do your project about an organization with which you already have experience or connections.

The memo project will count for 30% of your grade. Reports submitted for POSC 306 should be no less than 2500 words long. Reports submitted for POSC 406 should be no less than 3500 words long. In each case, if you have more to say, please go ahead and write more.

4) Class Participation

Many of the issues raised in this course call on you to form your own judgments – my job is to help you do so carefully and rigorously. So it would be great if you can help each other through discussion.

Participation will count for 10% of the overall grade. This is meant to reward contributions to discussion and encourage class attendance. Students who attend regularly but are not active in discussion will receive as a participation grade no less than the same grade they earn for the rest of their work. If students miss a quarter or more of class sessions, without a reason I have approved, the participation grade could be lower than their average for the rest of the class. Particularly good participation will receive an "A" for participation, regardless of the student's grades on the rest of the work.

In other words, good participation could raise your grade; steady but quiet participation can't hurt it; and skipping a lot of classes could hurt a little bit.

GRADING FORMULA

To summarize, grades will be calculated as follows:

- * First exam: 18%
- * Second exam: 18%
- * Book review: 24%
- * Memo project: 30%
- * Class Participation: 10%

Late or missing assignments:

If a student has quite a good reason to miss an assignment, I will consider exceptions to the following rules. But no exceptions will be made if a student does not notify me before missing an assignment, or cannot document the reason, or if the reason is not sufficient.

If a student misses an exam without a documented and acceptable reason, I will give a make-up before the next class, but deduct the equivalent of an entire grade (e.g. an A- becomes a B-). If a student does not make up the missing exam before the next class, there will be a further penalty. In either case, of course, I will be forced to write a different exam for that student.

A student who is absent from their book review presentation, without a documented and acceptable reason, will be docked the equivalent of one and one third of a grade (e.g. from A- to C+) for the project. That seems to me like a minimal sanction, given that they would not have completed one part of the project.

Lateness on the written book review report is subject to a reduction of half a grade for each day it is late.

Each stage of the memo project is due on the date and time stated. Lateness on any stage will result in a deduction from the final grade for the project. The final stage of the memo must be completed on time, unless the student has requested and I have approved an Incomplete for the course. That means Incompletes must be requested before the assignment is due.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

You must document all sources you use in writing your papers according to an accepted style guide. A good standard approach is in the Chicago Manual of Style (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), but any standard format will be fine for this class. Plagiarism of any form will be punished by referral to the appropriate university judicial proceedings, as well as by a failing grade in the assignment on which the plagiarism occurs. Plagiarism includes, according to the MLA Handbook (New York: MLA, 1988), two related activities: repeating “as your own someone else’s sentences, more or less verbatim,” and “paraphrasing another person’s argument as your own, and presenting another’s line of thinking as though it were your own.” Proper citation of sources will allow you to incorporate others’ analyses without committing plagiarism.

SCHEDULE OF READINGS AND CLASS ACTIVITIES:

Note: I have selected what I consider particularly useful articles from a variety of sources. In order to avoid repeating bibliographical material below, I refer to some sources by shorthand:

* The two assigned books are referred to as "Nownes" or "Berry."

* Various editions of Allan J. Cigler & Burdett A. Loomis, *Interest Group Politics*, all published by CQ Press, are referred to as Cigler & Loomis,” and the edition.

* Paul S. Herrnson, Ronald G. Shaiko, and Clyde Wilcox, *The Interest Group Connection: Electioneering, Lobbying, and Policymaking in Washington* 2nd ed., also from CQ Press in 2004, is referred to as “Herrnson et al.”

* Sandy Maisel and Jeffrey M. Berry eds., *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interest Groups*, Oxford U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2010 is referred to as "Oxford Handbook."

Week 1. The Policy Process

August 24: Introduction to class and each other.

August 26: Joseph White, "Models of Policy" ms.2015. (21 pages)

- August 28: Roger L. Conner, "RADIO: The Life Cycle of a Public Policy Problem," ms. 2008. (8 pages)
 Roger L. Conner, "Strategy and Stance: A Framework to Understand How (Most) Public Advocates Think." Ms. 2008 (14 pages)
- Week 2. Lobbyists and Lobbying, or Advocates and Advocacy*
- August 31: I will not be present, but there may be a guest speaker.
- Sept 2: Nownes, Chapters 1-2, "Studying Lobbyists and Lobbying," and "Lobbying and Lobbyists in the United States: A Primer." (1-36).
- Sept 4: I will not be present, but there may be a guest speaker.
 Alan Rosenthal, "Introduction" and, "The People Who Lobby," Chapters 1-2 in Rosenthal, *The Third House: Lobbyists and Lobbying in the States 2nd ed.* Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2001 (1-40).
- Week 3. Lobbyists and Lobbying (continued)*
- Sept 7: Labor Day, No Class
- Sept 9: Alan Rosenthal, "State Government Relations," "The Interests at Stake," and "The Rules of the Game," Chapters 3-5 in *The Third House: Lobbyists and Lobbying in the States 2nd ed.* (41-107).
- Sept 11: Nownes, Chapter 3, "Public Policy Lobbying, Part One," (37-56).
- Week 4. Perspectives*
- Sept 14 **Class will not meet due to Rosh HaShanah**
 Frances E. Lee, "Interests, Constituencies, and Policy Making." Chapter 10 in Paul J. Quirk and Sarah A. Binder eds., *The Legislative Branch.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005 (281-313).
- Sept 16 Discussion of Frances Lee chapter
- Sept 18 **Book for review assignment should be chosen by today.**
 Berry Chapters 1-2, "The Age of Nonprofits," and "Nonprofits As Interest Groups" (1-46).

- Week 5. Perspectives Continued*
- Sept 21 Berry Chapters 3-4, "The Regulation of Lobbying," and "Chilling the Liberals" (47-92).
One-page memo about organization you intend to study is due today
- Sept 23 **Class will not meet due to Yom Kippur**
Berry Chapters 5-6, "Different Standard, Different Behavior," and "Politically Effective Nonprofits" (93 – 145).
- Sept 25 Berry Chapter 7, "The Rules Are Never Neutral" (146-166).
- Week 6. The Partial Puzzle of Participation*
- Sept 28: Robert Salisbury, "Interest Representation: The Dominance of Institutions," *American Political Science Review* 78 (1984): 64-76.
Robert H. Salisbury and Loretta Conklin, "Instrumental Versus Expressive Group Politics: The National Endowment for the Arts", in Cigler & Loomis 5th ed. (283-302).
- Sept 30: Paul E. Johnson, "Interest Group Recruiting: Finding Members and Keeping Them," in Cigler & Loomis 5th ed. (35-62).
- Oct 2: William P. Browne, "Exchange Theory and the Institutional Impetus for Interest Group Formation," in Cigler & Loomis 6th ed. (313-329).
Submit second stage of advocacy memo project
- Week 7. Participation Continued*
- Oct 5: Frank R. Baumgartner, "Interest Groups and Agendas," Chapter 27 in *Oxford Handbook* (519-533).
- Oct 7: Daniel Okrent, Prologue and Chapters 1-3 of *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*, New York: Scribner, 2010 (1-52).
- Oct 9: First Exam**
- Week 8. Information and Persuasion*
- Oct 12: John Tierney and William Frasure, "Culture Wars on the Frontier: Interests, Values, and Policy Narratives in Public Lands Politics." Cigler & Loomis 5th ed., (303-325).

Roy T. Meyers, "Strategies for Spending Advocates," in Roy T. Meyers ed., *Handbook of Government Budgeting*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999 (548-66).

Oct 14: R. Kent Weaver, "The Role of Policy Research." In Weaver, *Ending Welfare as We Know It*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2000. (135-68).
Deborah Stone, "Numbers," Chapter 8 in *Policy Paradox 2nd ed.* (163-187).

Oct 16: No Class, professor will not be present

Week 9. Book Discussions

Oct 19: No Class, Fall Break

Oct 20: Please send outline of book presentation to Professor White by e-mail by 8:00 p.m.

Oct 21: Book Discussions, schedule to be determined.

Oct 23: Book Discussions, schedule to be determined.

Papers due by e-mail to Professor White by Noon on Sunday, Oct 25

Week 10. Influencing Legislatures: The Inside and Outside Games

Oct 26: Nownes, Chapter 2, "Public Policy Lobbying, Part Two," (57-102)

Oct 28: Joe White, "What Legislators Want" ms. (12 pages).

Oct 30: Richard L. Hall and Richard Anderson, "Issue Advertising and Legislative Advocacy in Health Politics," chapter 10 in Cigler & Loomis 8th ed. (221-242).

Week 11. Influencing Legislatures, Continued

Nov 2: Kelly D. Patterson and Matthew M. Singer, "Targeting Success: The Enduring Power of the NRA," chapter 2 in Cigler & Loomis, 7th ed. (37-64)

Nov 4: John C. Green and Nathan S. Bigelow, "The Christian Right Goes to Washington: Social Movement Resources and the Legislative Process," in Herrnson et al. (189-211)

Nov 6: Paul Herrnson, excerpts from *Congressional Elections 7th ed.* (Book is in press, selections will be posted when available)
Special Guest Speaker! Professor Herrnson

Week 12. Advocating for Resources

Nov 9: Nownes, Chapter 6, "Procurement Lobbying" (148-196).

Nov 11: Richard G. Sheridan, "The Politics of Budgeting," from Sheridan, *Follow the Money: Ohio State Budgeting*. Cleveland: Federation for Community Planning, 2000 (Vii-Viii, 143-167).

Nov 13: Nownes, Chapter 5, "Land Use Lobbying," (103-147).

Week 13. Executives and Courts

Nov 16: Suzanne J. Piotrowski and David H. Rosenbloom, "The Legal-Institutional Framework for Interest-Group Participation in Federal Administrative Policymaking," in Herrnson et al. (258-81).

Scott R. Furlong, "Exploring Interest Group Participation in Executive Policymaking," in Herrnson et al. (282-97).

Nov 18: Frank N. Laird, "Learning Contested Lessons: Participation Equity and Electric Utility Regulation," *Review of Policy Research* 25 (5), 2008 (429-48).

Nov 20: Wayne V. McIntosh and Cynthia L. Cates, "Cigarettes, Firearms, and the New Litigation Wars: Smoking Guns Behind the Headlines," in Herrnson et al. (341-364).

Hans J. Hacker, "Defending the Faithful: Conservative Christian Litigation in American Politics," in Herrnson et al. (365-384).

Week 14. Almost Wrapping Up

Nov 23: Second Exam

Nov 25: Voluntary class, review discussion

Nov 27: No Class, Thanksgiving Break

Week 15. Alliances, Polarization and Bias

- Nov 30: Christopher M. Weible and Paul A. Sabatier, "A Guide to the Advocacy Coalition Framework," in Frank Fischer, Gerald J. Miller, and Mara S. Sydney eds., *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis*, Boca Raton FL: CRC Press, 2006 (123-137).
Roger L. Conner and Patricia Jordan, excerpts from "Attitudes, Advocacy, and Polarization: The New Iron Triangle of American Public Policy" ms., March 2010, (1-8, 24-43).
- Dec 2: Michael T. Heaney, "Linking Parties and Interest Groups," chapter 30 in *Oxford Handbook* (568-587)
- Dec 4: Kay L. Schlozman, "Who Sings in the Heavenly Chorus? The Shape of the Organized Interest System," chapter 22 in *Oxford Handbook* (425-450).
Nownes, Chapter 7, "Recap and Final Thoughts" (197-218)

December 14: Memo Project Due by 10:00 a.m.