

I've developed an approach to teaching public policy that combines policy analysis with political analysis. I've used this successfully in both graduate and undergraduate courses, but here I will concentrate on my graduate seminar, called simply Public Policy. This course serves mainly Ph.D. students from NYU's Wagner School, which is our policy unit, and Masters students from the Politics Department.

The course grew out of my frustration at the bifurcated nature of the public policy field. Largely, it consists of studies of policy problems by economists and studies of the politics of these issues by political scientists. The economics studies discuss what government *should* do about an issue, but usually without serious discussion of the political and bureaucratic constraints. Conversely, the political science studies address what government has *actually done* and the politics of that, but usually without serious discussion of what it ought to do. Ironically, the economists tell government what to do without discussing government; political scientists do discuss government, but without telling it what to do.

Of course, in government policymakers must address both policy and politics. They constantly struggle to reconcile the two. Statecraft is all about squaring that circle. So policy research should do the same. One should first make an argument on-the-merits about how best to treat some issue. One then *goes on* to consider the political or bureaucratic constraints on doing so. Each viewpoint offers perspective on the other. In light of one's preferred policy, one may advocate changes in the policy process so that government can "do the right thing." But in light of the constraints, one might shift one's goal to something closer to what government can do. So policy analysis is expanded to include an institutional dimension, and political analysis is expanded to include a normative dimension. This, I believe, is what the ancients meant by the master science.

In the course, I first discuss this combined conception and the reasons why policy studies have been bifurcated. The next two sessions review the theory behind classic economic policy analysis—the "market failure" approach to the goals of government and approaches to the optimization of policy, including cost-benefit analysis. We also consider criticisms of the economics approach. Then follow several sessions on political analysis—the policy process, the politics of policy, policy advocacy, and the bureaucracy. The treatment of all these subjects is fairly advanced and presumes some prior study or work experience with the subjects. The midterm exam follows.

I then have several sessions on research that illustrates the concept—of which there is not much! Recent topics and the associated authors have included federal budgeting (Allan Schick), education policy (Kevin Kosar), welfare reform in Pennsylvania (Stephen Camp-Landis), charter schools (David Whitman), compensatory programs for disadvantaged youth (Hugh Price), and the Harlem Children's Zone (Paul Tough). I bring in some of the authors to discuss their work. I also have featured my own research on welfare reform in Wisconsin and work programs for men.

Meanwhile, students write papers on topics of their choosing that combine policy with political analysis in the recommended way. In the last two class sessions, as many as we have time for summarize their arguments and receive feedback. The course ends with a final exam, at which the students also submit their papers.

Wagner students use the seminar to review the theoretical material for their comprehensive exams, and several have derived their dissertation topics from the papers they wrote for this course. I attach the current syllabus and an article (one of several I've written) about the combined conception of policy research.