Master of Social Policy Evaluation Proposal

Approved by the Faculty Senate October 23, 2019

RICE UNIVERSITY | SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PROPOSAL
MASTER OF SOCIAL POLICY EVALUATION
(MSPE)

I.   **INTRODUCTION**
The School of Social Sciences proposes a new Master of Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE) which will be a 13 month, 30-credit hour program. Students will learn to use frontier statistical methods to conduct independent policy evaluations. Students will learn the tools necessary to design and conduct policy evaluations best suited to the substantive context and availability of data, including the development and implementation of survey instruments. With extensive faculty expertise in these areas, the Master of Social Policy Evaluation is poised to meet these needs with an applied professional master's program that creates a new generation of skilled evaluators working within government or government-partner organizations to bring the best scientific evidence to bear on critical social policy issues. The MSPE program will provide a unique hands-on experience by drawing upon real-world policy evaluations conducted at the Texas Policy Lab and other research centers in the university. Policy areas include criminal justice, public health, early child development, education, and labor markets, among others.

II.   **RATIONALE**
The demand for evidence-based policy is steadily rising on national, state, and local levels. The U.S. Executive and Congressional Branches have begun to recognize evaluation as a critical component to understanding the nature and value of investments in social programs. The Office of Management and Budget recently began requiring that many discretionary domestic programs be subject to evaluation and certain pieces of legislation carry similar requirements.[1] States, cities, and other government entities are also increasingly seeking research to inform their decision making. In particular, the Texas state legislature, in recent sunset reports, is requiring state agencies to justify their program budget requests with data-driven evidence.

A growing and increasingly diverse population translates into a corresponding increase in the demands on social and economic programs at every level of government. As more resources are required to address societal needs, government expenditures on social programs must be efficiently targeted to address critical challenges in areas such as education, criminal justice, poverty, homelessness, healthcare, and many more. To have a palpable impact requires strategic, evidence-based approaches to developing overall policies and specific programs.

Policy evaluation is key. Rigorous evaluation provides an in-depth examination of program performance and context. Evaluation provides feedback to inform: 1) internal program improvement by answering questions about results and processes that managers directly control to achieve results; 2) external oversight and accountability by documenting efficiency, effectiveness, and "value added" (merit and worth) to society; and 3) knowledge development in a field. The successful practice of evaluation requires shared understanding, expectations, and resources among evaluators, public officials, and stakeholders. Above all, evaluation can contribute significantly to the understanding and success of public programs.

The MSPE and the Rice Graduate Education Experience

---

[1] http://coalition4evidence.org/

Rice University's School of Social Sciences is uniquely poised to be the leading educator of social policy evaluation practitioners. Similar to the Master of Global Affairs housed in the Dean's Office, the MSPE will draw upon the academic strengths of four departments: Economics, Political Science, Psychological Sciences and Sociology, with a rigorous curriculum that offers students the opportunity to develop rich analytical tools associated with different methodological and empirical approaches applicable to a variety of professional evaluation settings. Additionally, the program's partnership with the Texas Policy Lab will enable students to actively engage throughout their degree in ongoing applied case studies.

Furthermore, the MSPE underscores Rice's commitment to the data science initiative and will leverage the work conducted by our faculty in support of this endeavor. Faculty members actively involved in the Data Science Initiative such as Melissa Marschall with the Local Elections in America Project (LEAP) and Ruth Lopez-Turley with the Houston Education Research Consortium (HERC) bring a wealth of existing resources and avenues for applying the MSPE in everyday settings. Examples such as these show that big data and computational methods are not only useful for engineering, science and technology research; they are also an integral part of social scientific inquiry.

Benchmarking with existing programs (See Appendix A)
Existing programs in the area of social policy evaluation were consulted in the formulation of this degree program. Most such programs offer a Master of Public Policy (MPP) and require two years of full-time study. Each provided valuable insight into the field of evaluation and growing demand for this type of program. Our comparisons were drawn from: American University's Master of Public Policy, Arizona State University's Master of Public Policy, Georgetown University's Master of Public Policy, New York University's Master of Science in Public Policy, Oxford University, Pepperdine University's Master of Public Policy and the University of Houston's Hobby School of Public Affairs Master of Public Policy. The MSPE is closest in design to the NYU Wagner School MSPP program and the Oxford University Master of Evidence-Based Social Policy Intervention and Policy Evaluation. The Hobby School program is two years, graduated 9 students in the last reported year (from the National Association for Schools of Public Affairs and Administration) and conducts all classes in the evening.

Like ours, these programs aim for rigorous analytical training, with a strong focus on data analysis. What sets our program apart from others is the combination of formal modeling and data analysis tools with the applied state and local government partner projects of the Texas Policy Lab and other university research centers. No existing master's program includes the level of engagement with its community, research scientists, and academic faculty than proposed for the MSPE program.

Appendix A provides a detailed comparison of the MSPE with these other programs. Notably, the annual tuition cost of the MSPE is competitive with the two-year programs and considerably less than the similarly designed NYU 13-month program, though somewhat more than the one-year Oxford program and the two-year Hobby School program. The MSPE, along with ASU's MPP, Oxford's MSc-EBSPIPE and U of H's MPP, is the lowest cost on a per-credit basis.

Professional opportunities and career paths
Graduates of the MSPE will consider a variety of career opportunities in the public, nonprofit and private sectors. Although no specific accreditation or licensing bodies exist for this type of program, the MSPE will seek to join the following organizations as an institutional member to provide additional professional development and career support to students.

- American Evaluation Association (AEA)
- Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM)

Example career opportunities[2]
> Senior Manager of Research and Evaluations (Methodist Healthcare Ministries of South Texas)
> Program Evaluation Analyst (American Heart Association)
> Evaluation and Design Manager (Catholic Charities-Fort Worth)
> Research Specialist for Juvenile Justice Programs and Services (Texas Juvenile Justice Department)

III.   **CURRICULUM & DEGREE REQUIREMENTS[3]**
The MSPE program is a 13-month, 30 credit, non-thesis master's program. The coursework consists of 3 courses in the fall semester and four courses plus a lab in the spring semester, totaling 24 credits, and a 6 credit practicum completed over two six-week sessions in the summer. In addition, there is a non-credit bearing 3-week intensive statistics camp, before the start of the formal coursework, for those that do not have requisite prior coursework in statistics. All students, regardless of their pre-requisite status, will have to complete the homework assignments for the statistics camp. Students are admitted for full-time enrollment only and must remain in residence throughout the program. MSPE courses will not be open to Rice undergraduates. Although Rice undergraduates are encouraged to apply for admission into the MSPE degree program, there will not be a provision for early admission and enrollment into MSPE courses while the student is an undergraduate. (This is sometimes referred to as the "fifth-year master's degree option".)

Fall		Spring (Choice of 4 Courses from 502,504,506,508,510 offered every Spring)	
MSPE 501: Introduction to Public Policy (Bob Stein)	3	MSPE 502: Applications of Program Evaluation - Criminal Justice (Ekim Muyan)	3
MSPE 503: Quantitative Methods for Program Evaluation + Lab (Diego Amador)	5	MSPE 504: Applications of Program Evaluation - Labor Markets(Paul Treacy)	3
MSPE 505: Microeconomics for Policy Evaluation (TBD)	3	MSPE 506: Applications of Program Evaluation – Health (E Amirian)	3
		MSPE 508: Applications of Program Evaluation - Early Childhood Education (Erin Baumgartner)	3

---

[2] AEA American Evaluation Association Search Jobs." AEA - American Evaluation Association, 2 July 2018, www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=113.
http://evaluationjobs.org
[3] see Appendix D for course descriptions and draft syllabi

		MSPE 510: Developing Research-Practice Partnerships (Ruth Lopez Turley)	3
		MSPE 512: Laboratory – Coding, Software, Data Collection Methods (TBD)	1
Total Credits	11	Total Credits	13
Summer			
MSPE 513: Practicum I[1] (Ken Wolpin)	3		
MSPE 514: Practicum II (Flavio Cunha)	3		
Total Credits	6		

1. Practicum- The applied Social Policy Evaluation Practicum is offered in two summer sessions (MSPE 513 and MSPE 514). Students will be actively engaged in a current Texas Policy Lab or other university research center project to gain real-world, applied experience. The MSPE curriculum is specifically aligned with TPL major policy areas: criminal justice, health, early childhood and youth development, and labor markets. Students will summarize their experience in a final paper presented to practicum partners.

MSPE students must have a minimum GPA of 3.00 to be admitted to the program. At most, two courses (6 credit hours) may be transferred from other institutions.

Viability of the MSPE program
The expectation is that the MSPE will have an entering class in 2020/21 of 20 students, growing to 25 students in 2021/22 and to 30 in the steady state. Appendix B provides budget details under that scenario. The figures in the table are based on an assumption that tuition will grow by $2,000 per year. Costs are assumed to be constant throughout the period; an assumption that costs grow by 2% per year reduces net revenue by only about $25,000 in the fifth year. Upon reaching steady state enrollment in year 3 of the program, net revenues reach about $750,000 and then grow by about $50,000 per year.

These calculations assume that there will be sufficient demand for the program to reach the targeted levels of enrollment. We conducted three analyses to provide evidence on this issue. In the first analysis, using Texas state government job classifications and proposed MSPE curriculum content, we contrast the job and associated salary range that graduates of the MSPE program would be eligible for at entry into the program (with a Bachelor's degree) and upon graduation from the program. The second analysis computes rates of return for Texas residents with Master's degrees relative to residents with Bachelor's degrees over all occupations and over occupations aligned with the MSPE program. The third analysis provides the results of an internet survey designed to gauge demand.

Analysis I.
We expect that a significant portion of MSPE program graduates will be employed in the government sector, primarily either at the state or local level (in a National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) survey of 15 Master of Public Policy (MPP) programs, about one-half of graduates were employed in the government sector and an additional quarter in the non-profit sector). The analysis contrasts the kinds of jobs and associated salaries within the Texas state government that match the skills MSPE students will have acquired upon graduation (denoted by To: Job) as opposed to jobs that match the

skills they would have upon entering the program with a Bachelor's degree (denoted by From: Job).

All of the jobs presented below require a Bachelor's degree – none specifically requires a Master's degree. We base our judgment about contrasting jobs on a comparison of the work performed in those jobs with the MSPE curriculum. Work performance requirements and salary ranges can be found at http://www.hr.sao.texas.gov/CompensationSystem/JobDescriptions.

Example 1
From: Research Specialist I.
Work Performed: Collects, compiles, and analyzes research data; uses statistical methods and relational databases to analyze data sets; prepares or assists with preparing reports of research findings; assists with planning, developing, coordinating, and administering research projects; assists with formulating research objectives, programs, and priorities; assists with authoring or editing technical reports and summaries of findings; may assist in designing and creating computer programs for research applications; performs related work as assigned.
    Salary (Minimum, Average, Maximum): 33K, 40K, 49K
To: Research Specialist III.
Work Performed: Oversees, plans, develops, and monitors research projects; oversees the preparation of reports and research findings; evaluates and reviews the scope and methodologies of research projects and areas to be evaluated; develops and reviews policies and procedures used in conducting and administering research activities; develops quality assurance procedures, and conducts quality assurance reviews on research projects; provides consultation and technical advice on research methods and techniques; prepares and provides presentations for professional organizations, governmental entities, and the public; prepares research budget estimates, maintains cost accounting records of project expenditures, and prepares monthly budget reports; formulates and monitors long-range research objectives, programs, and priorities; reviews, analyzes, and evaluates the impact of legislation, regulations, and policies affecting current research; collects, compiles, and analyzes research data; designs and creates computer programs for research applications; may plan, assign, and/or supervise the work of others; performs related work as assigned.
    Salary (Minimum, Average, Maximum): 42K, 58K, 69K
And To: Research Specialist V.
Work Performed: Oversees, plans, develops, and monitors research projects; oversees the preparation of reports and research findings; evaluates and reviews the scope and methodologies of research projects and areas to be evaluated; develops and reviews policies and procedures used in conducting and administering research activities; develops quality assurance procedures, and conducts quality assurance reviews on research projects; provides consultation and technical advice on research methods and techniques; prepares and provides presentations for professional organizations, governmental entities, and the public; prepares research budget estimates, maintains cost accounting records of project expenditures, and prepares monthly budget reports; formulates and monitors long-range research objectives, programs, and priorities; reviews, analyzes, and evaluates the impact of legislation, regulations, and policies affecting current research; collects, compiles, and analyzes research data; designs and creates computer programs for research applications; may plan, assign, and/or supervise the work of others; performs related work as assigned.

Salary (Minimum, Average, Maximum): 55K, 72K, 90K

Example 2.
From: Data Analyst I.
Work Performed: Consults with internal and external customers to identify user needs; compiles and queries data, analyzes data using standard statistical tools, methods, and techniques, and interprets results to identify significant differences in data; cleans and prunes data to discard irrelevant information; assists in developing methods for mitigating data issues and deploys those methods to correct issues; assists in preparing technical reports to present and interpret data, identify alternatives, and make and justify recommendations on data revisions; assists in identifying and interpreting data patterns and trends and assessing data quality; may assist with establishing and maintaining standard work procedures governing the appropriate use of data; performs related work as assigned.
    Salary (Minimum, Average, Maximum): 40K, 52K, 64K
To: Data Analyst III.
Work Performed: Consults with internal and external customers to identify user needs; compiles and queries data, analyzes data using standard statistical tools, methods, and techniques, and interprets results to identify significant differences in data; identifies and interprets data patterns and trends and assesses data quality; cleans and prunes data to discard irrelevant information; prepares concise, comprehensive technical reports to present and interpret data, identify alternatives, and make and justify recommendations on data revisions; assists in defining, developing, and implementing data standards; assists in developing data quality measures, analyzing data quality results, and implementing necessary changes to ensure data quality improvement; may develop and implement databases, data collection systems, data analytics, and other strategies that optimize statistical efficiency and quality;
performs related work as assigned.
    Salary (Minimum, Average, Maximum): 52K, 68K, 84K
And To; Data Analyst V.
Work Performed: Consults with internal and external customers to identify user needs; compiles and queries data; analyzes data using standard statistical tools, methods, and techniques; identifies data gaps, errors, anomalies, inconsistencies, and redundancies by analyzing the content, structure, and relationships within data; interprets results to identify significant differences in data; identifies and interprets data patterns and trends and assesses data quality; cleans and prunes data to discard irrelevant information; prepares concise, comprehensive technical reports to present and interpret data, identify alternatives, and make and justify recommendations on data revisions; drives the selection of data management tools, and the development of standards, usage guidelines, and procedures for those tools; defines, develops, and implements data standards; develops data quality measures, analyzing data quality results and implementing necessary changes to ensure data quality improvement; develops software applications or programming to use for statistical modeling and graphic analysis; may develop and implement databases, data collection systems, data analytics, and other strategies that optimize statistical efficiency and quality; may perform quality assurance and serves as a subject matter expert on data integrity, extraction, and compilation; may supervise the work of others; performs related work as assigned.
    Salary (Minimum, Average, Maximum): 69K, 93K, 117K

We believe that the rigor of our program, particularly with the inclusion of the practicum requirement, will enable our graduates to obtain employment in the higher paying job categories and advance more quickly within job categories. They will either have the skills required for these jobs upon graduation or, for the highest level jobs, the foundation necessary to acquire them through further learning.

Analysis II.

The salary differentials shown above are consistent with internal rates of return (or, return on investment) to obtaining a Master's degree relative to a Bachelor's degree presented in the table below. We base the calculations on data from the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is a nationally representative cross-sectional sample of about 300,000 individuals. The survey has been conducted annually since 2000 by the Bureau of the Census. We choose a sample consisting of only those individuals residing in Texas at the time of the survey. Since 2005, the Texas sample has included approximately 9,000 individuals in each year (and about 2,500 in each of the previous years). Over all the years, there are a total of 129,000 individuals. The sample is also restricted to individuals whose highest school attainment is either a Bachelor's degree or a Master's degree. The data do not report the type of master's degree.

Internal Rates of Return to Master's Degrees: Government Jobs in Texas (95 percent confidence interval in parentheses)				
	State Gov't Jobs	Local Gov't Jobs	Federal Gov't Jobs	All Gov't Jobs
All Occupations	12.4 (10.7, 14.0)	18.5 (17.0, 20.0)	16.8 (14.3, 19.4)	15.6 (14.6, 16.6)
Occupations most closely related to MSPE	na	na	na	26.9 (9.0, 44.9)

The first column shows the internal rate of return for individuals employed by the Texas state government, the second column those employed by a local government, the third column those employed by the federal government and the last column those employed at any government level. The two rows include individuals in all occupations (first row: 117, 230 observations across all government levels) and individuals employed in occupations whose tasks are most closely related to the master's program curriculum (second row: 463 observations). The restricted set of occupations includes "social science research assistant", "miscellaneous social scientist", "database administrator", and "statistical assistant". There are no occupational designations in the ACS that correspond more closely to the research specialist and data analyst positions previously described in the first analysis.

As seen in the table, the internal rate of return across all government levels (the last column) is 15.6%, considerably higher than one would expect to earn on any non-human capital investment. It is lowest for state jobs (12.4%) and highest for local government jobs (18.5%). Although these estimates are substantively large, the internal rate of return is even larger for the more relevant occupation sample, 26.9% (sample sizes are too small to break this down by governmental level). This analysis suggests, as did our previous analysis, that the MSPE degree would be a worthwhile investment in terms of its monetary return.

Although we do not envision having the resources to offer financial aid in the first few years of the program, we view that as a fundraising opportunity.

Analysis III. Internet Survey

We conducted a conjoint analysis to provide further evidence about demand for the program. The survey was completed by 1,000 individuals who satisfied the following conditions: age between 20 and 36, either lived in Texas or expressed a willingness to relocate to Texas, had a Bachelor's or Graduate degree, graduated with an undergraduate grade point average of 3.0 or higher, did not respond that they were "very unlikely" to enroll in an MPP program. A little more than two-thirds of those who met these conditions were female and about 90% were employed.

The survey considered three distinct contrasts (i) attend a one-year full-time 30-credit day MPP program vs. not attend the program, (ii) attend a two-year part-time 45-credit evening MPP program vs. not attend the program, and (iii) attend the one-year program, attend the two-year program or not attend either program. Within these three different choice sets, each respondent was randomly assigned 4 scenarios, with each scenario consisting of an annual tuition cost and a salary gain. The annual tuition cost was either 30, 40 or 50 thousand dollars for the one-year program and either 20, 30 or 40 thousand dollars for the two-year program (a total cost of 40, 60 or 80 thousand dollars over the two years). Consistent with the salary schedules in the first analysis, the salary gain was set at either 10, 15 or 20 thousand dollars per year.

It is useful to draw a comparison between the day and evening program in terms of their financial burden. To do so requires some assumptions. In particular, assume that attending the full-time day program would preclude working, while attending the part-time evening program would enable full-time work. For concreteness, consider the following example in which full-time work produces an annual income flow of $40,000. Thus, there is a financial cost in the form of foregone earnings of $40,000 incurred by attending the day program. If tuition for that program were $40,000, the total financial cost of the one-year program would therefore be $80,000. On the other hand, although there are no foregone earnings attached to the evening program, assuming that students continue their employment, the evening program incurs twice the annual tuition cost. Thus, if the evening program annual tuition cost is $40,000, the total cost of the program is $80.000. Thus, at least to a first-order approximation, in this example the financial burden of the two programs would be the same. A lower tuition rate for either program would make that program more attractive.

On the benefit side, the programs may differ in their financial reward. Indeed, employers might pay more for the completion of a 45-credit program than a 30-credit program. As noted, our conjoint analysis allows for different salary gains for the two programs. Higher salary gains should make a program more desirable.

The conjoint analysis does not explicitly capture other costs and benefits of either of the programs alone or in comparison. For example, there may be additional non-pecuniary costs to attending evening classes while also working full time. Or, depending on family circumstances, either program could entail significant childcare costs. Observed choices may reflect these and other considerations.

The table below presents the results from the conjoint analysis for the first two contrasts. A separate table presents the results for the third contrast. We highlight a subset of the tuition/ salary gain combinations. As seen in the first row of the table, 81.3 percent of the individuals offered the one-year program at a tuition cost of $40,000 and with an expectation that their salary gain would be $15,000 per year chose to attend the program. Given the same offer for the two-year program, 67.1 percent chose to attend. The 14.2 percentage point higher take-up rate, under the assumption that the financial cost is about the same for the two programs, reflects a preference for the one-year program based on factors other than the financial cost or the earnings gain (note that the *p*-value for the test that the take-up rates are the same is .002). The second row maintains the tuition cost but increases the salary gain to $20,000. As would be expected, both options increase, and by similar amounts (13.3 and 11.2 percentage points). The next two rows increase the tuition cost to $50,000 for the one-year program and the following two rows reduce the tuition to $30,000 for the two-year program. As expected, the take up rate is inversely related to the tuition change, although the extent of the change in the take-up rate is small, between 1 and 4 percentage points. The results are suggestive that there would be considerable demand for either a one- or two-year program. They also suggest that a one-year program is preferred. The next table explores this issue further.

Single Program Option		
Tuition, Salary Gain (in thousands of dollars)	One-Year Program vs. None Percent Choose Program	Two-year Program vs. None Percent Choose Program
40, 15	81.3	67.1
40, 20	94.6	78.3
50, 15	77.4	na
50, 20	91.1	na
30, 15	na	70.8
30, 20	na	77.7

The table below presents the results from the conjoint analysis for the third contrast, which allows for an explicit choice between the two programs. As seen in the first row, the one-year program is substantially more preferred (58.5%) than the two-year program (25.3%) given the same annual tuition ($40,000) even when the salary gain is twice as large for the two-year program. Reducing the salary gain differential by $5,000 increases the percentage choosing the one-year program (64.6%). Relative to the first row (baseline case), reducing the annual tuition cost of the two-year program by $10,000 (a $20,000 savings over the total cost of the program) while maintaining the $10,000 salary gain differential, leads to a reversal of preferences; 46.1 percent prefer the two-year program and 37.7 percent the one-year program. However, reducing the salary gain differential by $5,000 restores the baseline preference ordering.

Two Program Options			
T1, T2, S1,S2[1] Thousands of Dollars	Percent Choose One-Year Program	Percent Choose Two-Year Program	Percent Choose Neither program
40, 40, 10, 20	58.5	25.2	16.4
40, 40, 15, 20	64.6	24.5	10.9
40, 30, 10, 20	39.5	46.7	13.8
40, 30, 15, 20	48.7	36.9	14.4

1. T1 = Tuition for One-Year Program, T2 = Tuition for Two-Year Program, S1= Salary Gain for One-Year Program, S2= Salary Gain for Two-Year Program.

The conjoint analysis is consistent with there being considerable demand for a program like the MSPE. It is also consistent with a general preference for the one-year program with annual tuition of $40,000 over the comparably priced two-year program.

IV. **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES**
Proposed CIP Code: 30.0601 Systems Science and Theory (STEM-Designated)
Federal Definition: A program with a multidisciplinary approach to the analysis and solution of complex problems, requiring a combined approach using data and models from the natural, social, technological, behavioral and life sciences, and other specialized fields.

Students completing the Master of Social Policy Evaluation will demonstrate the ability to:

a. Acquire analytical skills that can be applied to a broad range of policy evaluation questions.
b. Design and conduct a program evaluation by constructing a logical model that uses appropriate data sources, data collection methods, and analytical techniques.
c. Assess the social responsibilities of government, non-government organizations, and corporate policies in the 21st century.
d. Communicate statistical findings in a clear and concise narrative that recognizes the positive and negative outcomes of potential policy solutions.

V. **BUDGET**
a. Five-Year Budget (see Appendix B and previous discussion)
b. The School of Social Sciences will provide sufficient funds to cover the initial start-up costs for marketing and operations in the year preceding matriculation of its first cohort.

VI. **INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES**
a. Faculty Resources
The MSPE will be administered by a faculty committee and led by one faculty director responsible for the academic oversight and advising of all MSPE students. The Faculty Director will meet with students regularly throughout the semester to assess progress and address concerns. The Faculty Director will be the official certifier for degree conferral.

The MSPE faculty committee will be determined in consultation with the Dean of Social Sciences. The committee will consist of no fewer than four tenured faculty members in the School of Social Sciences. Participating Social Sciences faculty will be compensated for their teaching through their department with course buyouts. Non-departmental faculty and adjuncts will be compensated according to the school's standard compensation rate.

Faculty Director:

| Margaret Beier, Ph. D. | Professor | Psychological Sciences |

Proposed Initial Faculty Committee:

Flavio Cunha, Ph.D.	Professor	Economics
Ruth Lopez-Turley, Ph.D.	Professor	Sociology
Fred Oswald, Ph. D.	Professor	Psychological Sciences
Bob Stein, Ph. D.	Professor	Political Science
Kenneth Wolpin, Ph.D.	Professor	Economics
Susan McIntosh	Dean	School of Social Sciences

Faculty Instructors:

Flavio Cunha, Ph.D.	Professor	Economics
Ruth Lopez-Turley, Ph.D.	Professor	Sociology
Bob Stein, Ph. D.	Professor	Political Science
Ken Wolpin, Ph.D.	Professor	Economics

Adjunct Instructors[4]:

Diego Amador, Ph.D.	Adjunct Faculty (NTT), Research Scientist	School of Social Sciences and Texas Policy Lab
E Susan Amirian, Ph.D.	Adjunct Faculty (NTT), Research Scientist	School of Social Sciences and Texas Policy Lab
Erin Baumgartner	Associate Director, HERC	Department of Sociology and HERC
Ekim Muyan, Ph.D.	Adjunct Faculty (NTT), Executive Director	School of Social Sciences and Texas Policy Lab
Paul Treacy Ph. D.	Lecturer (NTT)	School of Social Sciences

b. Staff Resources

Assistant Dean for Student Programs, Abbey Godley, along with her staff will oversee administrative tasks such as recruitment, orientation, academic logistics coordination with on campus stakeholders such as OISS, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, etc., and career counseling.

c. Institutional Resources
   - Classes will be offered during the day, although there may be some evening classes to accommodate other teaching responsibilities of faculty. All classes will be held in

---

[4] see Appendix E for summary c.v.'s

the Texas Policy Lab conference room in the Kraft Social Science Building and will not conflict with scheduled undergraduate or graduate classroom use.

- No additional library or information resources are anticipated to launch this program.

VII.   **QUALITY ASSURANCE**
   a. Program Assessment (see Appendix C)
   b. Admissions Criteria
      Students will be admitted to the MSPE annually for fall matriculation only. Applicants for the Master of Social Policy Evaluation must have:
      - Completed a BS or BA degree at the time of application (except students who will complete their degree by the time of matriculation)
      - Official transcripts from all universities attended in which a degree was awarded
      - Minimum 3.0 undergraduate GPA
      - GRE or GMAT scores
      - Three letters of recommendation
      - Statement of Purpose
      - Approved TOEFL scores for applicants whose native language is not English and who did not receive a degree from a university in which English is the official language of instruction. Students must meet Rice University's minimum standard of 90 on the TOEFL exam or 7 on IELTS.
      - $85 application fee

      Recommended student background
      - Students entering the Master of Social Policy Evaluation are encouraged to have advanced quantitative skills as evidenced by advanced undergraduate statistics or quantitatively-based elective courses beyond introductory level or core requirements. Significant work experience in program evaluation or data analysis beyond a baccalaureate degree can also fulfill the recommended background.
      - Additionally, degrees from a variety of undergraduate majors including liberal arts, business, education, criminal justice, public health, social works and public policy programs will be applicable to this program.
      - 1-2 years' work experience is suggested, but not required.

   c. Practicum Assessment
      Students will receive evaluations from their faculty supervisors in the practicum setting. In addition, those organizations that participate in the practicum will be surveyed to better understand the level of preparation needed of students in the specific organizations or evaluation projects. The survey of the practicum organizations will also seek comments on the nature of the project and results overall.

   d. Exit Interviews
      All students who complete the Master of Social Policy Evaluation will participate in an exit interview which includes both a questionnaire about the program and an in-depth interview to gauge student satisfaction with the program and building information to ascertain what is working well and what could be improved about the program. Results

from the exit interviews will be used to improve curriculum, instruction, and the practicum experience.

e. Graduate Council Assessment
   For assessment purposes, the Graduate Council will receive from the Dean of Social Sciences an evaluation of the program after three years of operation, to include information regarding staffing, faculty involvement, student admissions, student retention, quality of instruction, and budget overview.

f. Risk Assessment and Contingency
   The biggest risk to the Master of Social Policy Evaluation is the projected enrollment may not materialize. Although none of the analyses we conducted can be considered definitive, taken together they should provide a reasonable assurance that the MSPE program will be able to meet its target enrollment. Moreover, it is important to recognize that although there is some risk involved, the downside risk is small and the upside potential enormous. Given the cost of the program, the break-even enrollment level is only eight students. On the other hand, successful two-year Master in Public Policy (MPP) programs at other prestigious schools have enrollments that can exceed 100 students and tuition levels that exceed $100,000 over two years. For example, the Chicago Harris School of Public Policy enrolls about 150 students and has an annual tuition of $51,000 (about half of students receive financial aid). Although this program is mature and draws from a national and international pool, we believe that the MSPE program has the potential to gain similar stature.

   To reach our target enrollment, the MSPE Faculty Committee will continually analyze, evaluate, and target key recruitment markets.

VIII. LAUNCH
The MSPE will recruit for its first cohort during the 2019-2020 academic year and is set to admit students for matriculation in fall 2020.

IX.   APPENDIX
   a. Peer Program Comparison
   b. Program Five-Year Budget
   c. Program Assessment
   d. Course Descriptions/Selected Syllabi
   e. Letters of Support
   f. Proposed GA Text

Peer Program Comparison University	Degree	Affiliation	Credits Required	Total Tuition	Website
American University	MPP	School of Public Affairs	39 cr 2 yrs. + 1 Summer	$73,000	https://american.edu/spa/ma-ppol/
Arizona State University	MPP	School of Public Affairs	42 cr 2 yrs.	$53,000	https://spa.asu.edu/content/mpp-curriculum
Georgetown University	MPP	McCourt School of Public Policy	48 cr 2 yrs.	$112,000	https://mccourt.georgetown.edu/master-in-public-policy
New York University	MS – PP	Wagner School	42 cr 1 year + 1 summer	$75,000	https://wagner.nyu.edu/education/degrees/master-science-public-policy
Oxford University	MSc - EBSIPE[5]	Graduate Division	1 year	$31,000	https://www.ox.ac.uk/admissions/graduate/courses/msc-evidence-based-social-intervention-and-policy-evaluation
Pepperdine University	MPP	School of Public Policy	50 cr 2 yrs.	$80,000	https://publicpolicy.pepperdine.edu/master-public-policy
Univ. of Houston Hobby School	MPP	Hobby School of Public Affairs	39 credits 2 yrs+1summer	$14,450 in state $33,700 out of state	https://www.uh.edu/hobby/mpp/
Rice University	MS-MSPE	School of Social Sciences	30 cr 1 year + 1 summer	$40,000	

---

[5] Evidence-Based Social Intervention and Policy Evaluation

APPENDIX C
Assessment Plan for Master of Social Policy Evaluation

Learning Outcomes Published in the GA	PLO 1 Acquire analytical skills that can be applied to a broad range of policy evaluation questions.	PLO 2 Design and conduct a program evaluation by constructing a logical model that uses appropriate data sources, data collection methods, and analytical techniques.	PLO 3 Assess the social responsibilities of government, non-government organizations, and corporate policies in the 21st century.	PLO 4 Communicate statistical findings in a clear and concise narrative that recognizes the positive and negative outcomes of potential policy solutions.
Embedded location (Where?)	Practiced: MSPE 502,503, 504, 506, 507,508, labs Mastered: 509,510	Practiced: MSPE 502, 504, 506, 507,508, labs Mastered: MSPE 509, MSPE 510	Practiced: MSPE 501, MSPE 503 Mastered: MSPE 509, 510	Practiced: MSPE 502, 504, 506, 507,508, labs Mastered: MSPE 509, MSPE 510
Materials (What?)	Indirect: Course evaluation survey Direct: Final course examinations and practicum final paper and presentation	Indirect: Course evaluation survey Direct: Final course examinations and practicum final paper and presentation	Indirect: Course evaluation survey Direct: Final course examinations	Indirect: Course evaluation survey Direct: Final course examinations and practicum final paper and presentation
Measure (How?)	● Students will complete a variety of graded assignments including homework, quizzes, tests and final exams. ● Students will make an oral presentation to communicate the meaning of statistical analyses surrounding a policy evaluation on a selected topic. ● Instructors will provide a final assessment of the presentation using the oral presentation rubric.	● Students will complete a variety of graded assignments including homework, quizzes, tests and final exams. ● Students will make an oral presentation to communicate the meaning of statistical analyses surrounding a policy evaluation on a selected topic. ● Instructors will provide a final assessment of the presentation using the oral presentation rubric.	● Students will complete a variety of graded assignments including homework, quizzes, tests and final exams. ● Instructors will provide a final assessment of the student's mastery of this area using a common rubric.	● Students will complete a variety of graded assignments including homework, quizzes, tests and final exams. ● Students will make an oral presentation to communicate the meaning of statistical analyses surrounding a policy evaluation on a selected topic. ● Instructors will provide a final assessment of the presentation using the oral presentation rubric.
Standard (To What Extent?)	75% of MSPE students will earn a "Pass" (score of 2 or higher on a 1-3 point scale) rating on their practicum project using the writing and oral presentation rubrics.	75% of MSPE students will earn a "Pass" (score of 2 or higher on a 1-3 point scale) rating on their practicum project using the writing and oral presentation rubrics.	75% or more of the MSPE students will pass (B- or better) both the mid-term and final exams.	75% of MSPE students will earn a "Pass" (score of 2 or higher on a 1-3 point scale) rating on their practicum project using the writing and oral presentation rubrics.
Responsible (Who?)	Practicum advisor(s); faculty and administrative directors	Practicum advisor(s); faculty and administrative directors	Course instructors; Practicum advisor(s)	Practicum advisor(s); faculty and administrative directors
Timeline (When?)	Assessment: 2021, 2025 Follow Up: 2022, 2029	Assessment: 2022, 2026 Follow Up: 2023, 2027	Assessment: 2023, 2027 Follow Up: 2024, 2028	Assessment: 2024, 2028 Follow Up: 2025, 2029
Who receives results and who is responsible for follow-up?	Faculty Director, Dean of Social Sciences	Faculty Director, Dean of Social Sciences	Faculty Director, Dean of Social Sciences	Faculty Director, Dean of Social Sciences

APPENDIX D
Course Descriptions[6,7]

- **(NEW)** MSPE 501: Introduction to Public Policy (3 credits)*

    Public resources are limited, and decisions regarding how to use these scarce public resources must be informed by an understanding of how well public programs and policies produce their desired outcomes. This course will introduce students to concepts, research questions, and important readings in the study of public policy. The course will cover topics on the formation and implementation of public policy in the United States and in a cross national and comparative perspective. An introductory course such as this one typically aims to acquaint students with the breadth of work in the field at the expense of depth. The focus is on acquainting students with some of the classics in the field as well as highlighting current controversies in each area.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 502: Applications of Program Evaluation – Criminal Justice (3 credits)*

    This course introduces students to the program evaluation literature in the area of criminal justice. There are reform projects underway at every stage of the American criminal justice system. Understanding the impact of these reforms is crucial for the future of criminal justice in the United States. We will study policies and interventions at various stages of criminal justice, from policing to reintegration.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 503: Quantitative Methods for Program Evaluation (5 credits)*

    This course provides an in-depth introduction to the methods of program evaluation. The associated lab provides concrete examples for the students to gain practical experience in applying these methods. The methods presented will include: Randomized Controlled Trials, Instrumental Variables, Difference in Difference, Propensity Score Matching and Regression Discontinuity Design.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 504: Applications of Program Evaluation – Labor Markets (3 credits)*

    This course introduces students to the program evaluation literature in the area of labor markets. Students will critically read existing evaluations of labor market policies and evaluate for various types of validity and for generalizability, draw on methodological best practices and apply empirical tools to their own evaluations of labor market policies, identify and access important datasets commonly used in influential employment-related research, and discuss with policy professionals the salience, outcomes, workings, and broader context of a variety of public programs designed to improve labor markets.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 505: Microeconomics for Policy Analysis:

    This course will introduce students to economic principles and tools relevant for policy analysis. The course covers topics such as household decision-making, the economics of information, risk and uncertainty, markets and market structure, externalities and other

---

[6] A 3-week non-credit Summer Statistics camp will be held prior to the Fall semester. The purpose of the camp will be to provide all entering students the required statistics foundation for the coursework that follows, particularly for the Methods course, MSPE 503.

[7] A preliminary syllabus is provided for courses with an *.

types of market failure, behavioral economics, game theory, and welfare economics. Students will see how the application of economic theory to policy questions informs and guides social policy analysis.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 506: Applications of Program Evaluation – Health (3 credits)*
  Public health and healthcare service delivery play a crucial role in shaping population health and in influencing health systems at the federal, state, regional, and local levels. The ability to systematically and critically assess the health program evaluation literature is requisite for understanding how to identify and implement effective, evidence-based legislation, policies, and reforms. This course will provide a framework for analyzing the evidence base for public health programs and interventions, and will help students understand how such programs and interventions can impact health policy and affect the health of populations and individuals.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 508-:Applications of Program Evaluation – Early Childhood and Youth Development (3 credits)
  This course introduces students to the program evaluation literature in the area of early childhood education. In recent years, significant investments have been made in increasing and improving early learning opportunities for children. The course will provide students with an understanding of the evidence on the extent to which early childhood education program offerings have long term impacts on later success. It will examine the policy contexts of early childhood education and discuss the importance of using evidence in driving decision making at all policy levels, from school districts to the U.S. Department of Education. It will also examine the role of family in children's educational experiences.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 510- Developing Research-Practice Partnerships (3 credits)
  This course will prepare students to work in partnerships with policy makers and practitioners. The emphasis will be on partnerships within education, including significant participation from local school districts.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 512: Coding and Software (1 credit)
  This lab course introduces students to relevant programming languages and enhances their knowledge of statistical software packages.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 513- Social Policy Evaluation Practicum I (3 credits)
  The practicum project asks students to integrate and synthesize many components of the curriculum by undertaking a major policy evaluation project of value to an external client from the Texas Policy Lab, HERC or other university research center. During the project, students engage in the entire process of solving a real-world evaluation project. Students will produce IRB documents, write a literature review, clean data and propose an analysis.

- **(NEW)** MSPE 514- Social Policy Evaluation Practicum II (3 credits)
  A continuation of MSPE 519, the student will perform their proposed analysis and write a final report. The report must address both the strengths and weaknesses of the analysis and clearly state the conclusions that can be drawn.

Selected Syllabi:

MSPE 501: Introduction to Public Policy and Bureaucracy

Required Texts
1. David Weimer and Aidan Vining. Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice, fourth edition
2. Elinor Ostrom, Governing the Commons
3. Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones.1993 Agendas and Instability in American Politics.
4. James Q. Wilson. 1989. Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It.
5. Paul Peterson. 1981. City Limits.
6. Mancur Olson, 1965. The Theory of Collective Action
7. Gary Miller. 1992. Managerial Dilemmas: The Political Economy of Hierarchy
8. Douglas North. 1990. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance
9. David Mayhew. 1974. The Electoral Connection

Reading Assignments. In citing books, I have tried to list the date of the first edition, even though you might be purchasing a later edition.
*Additional reassignment
**Class reading assignment

COURSE PLAN

Week 1: Why public policy?
   ** Weimer and Vining, Chapter 4-9
   **Stein, Robert M.. 1993. "Arranging City Services." Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. 3 (1): 66-92.
   **Ostrom, Vincent, Charles M. Tiebout, and Robert Warren. 1961. "The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas." American Political Science Review. 55 (4): 831-842.
   ** Charles Tiebout. 1954. "A pure theory of local expenditures." Journal of Political Economy. 65:416-424.

Week 2: The demand for public policies
   ** Baumgartner and Jones, Agendas and Instability in American Politics
   ** Frank Baumgartner, Bryan Jones and John Wilkerson. 2011. "Comparative studies of policy dynamics." Comparative Political Studies. 13:2026.
   ** Frank Baumgartner, et al. 2009. "Punctuated equilibrium in comparative perspectives." American Journal of Political Science. 53:603-620.
   * Theodore Lowi. 1964. "American Business, Case Studies, and Political Theory." World Politics. 16: 677-715.
   ** Mancur Olson. 1965. The Logic of Collective Action. Chapters 1,2,5 and 6.
   * Jack Walker. 1983. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America." American Political Science Review. 77:390-406.
   *Theodore Lowi. 1969. The End of Liberalism
   **Toby Bolsen, James N. Druckman and Fay Lomax Cook. 2014. "The influence of partisan motivated reasoning on public opinion." Political Behavior. 36:235-262.
   **Lanny Martin. 2004. "The government agenda in parliamentary democracies." American Journal of Political Science 48:445-461.

Week 3: Alternative theories of policy formation
   **Suzanne Mettler. 2002. "Bringing the state back into civic engagement: Policy Feedback Effects of the G.I. Bill for World War II Veterans." American Political Science Review 95:351-365.
   ** Christopher Weible, Paul Sabatier and Kelly McQueen. 2009. "Themes and Variations: Taking Stock of the Advocacy Coalition Framework." Policy Studies Journal 37:121-140.

* Paul A. Sabatier. 2011. "The Advocacy coalition framework: Revisions and relevance for Europe." Journal of European Public Policy. 5:98-130

* Suzanne Mettler. 2011. The Submerged: How Invisible Government Policies Undermine American Democracy

* Keith Krehbiel. 1998. Pivotal Politics: A theory of U.S. Lawmaking

**Michael D. Jones and Mark K. McBeth. 2010. Á narrative policy framework: Clear enough to be wrong?" Policy Studies Journal 329:353

*John Kingdon. 1984. Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies.

**Charles Lindblom. 1959. "The Science of Muddling Through." Public Administration Review 19: 79-88.

Week 5: Institutional design and public policy

**Douglas North,. 1990. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance

*Elinor Ostrom, Governing the Commons

** Elinor Ostrom, 2011. "Background on the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework," Policy Studies Journal 39:1-27.

**Martin, Lanny W. and Georg Vanberg. 2013. "Multiparty Government, Fiscal Institutions, and Public Spending."Journal of Politics 75(4): 953-967.

New Martin and Vanberg paper

** Terry Moe. 1984. "The New Economics of Organization." American Journal of Political Science. 28: 739- 777.

* Mark Schneider, Paul Teske, Melissa Marschall, Michael Mintrom and Christine Roch. 1997. " Institutional Arrangements and the Creation of Social Capital: The Effects of Public School Choice." American Political Science Review. 91: 82-93. \

** Paul Peterson. 1981. "A Unitary Model of Taxation and Expenditure Policy in the United States," British Journal of Political Science, July, 1979, pp. 281 314.

**Malesky, Edmund, Cuong Nguyen AnnTran. 2014"The Impact of Recentralization on Public Services: A Difference-in-Differences Analysis of the Abolition of Elected Councils in Vietnam.: American Political Science Review. 108:144-168.

**Marcus Melo. When Institutions Matter: the politics of administrative, social security and tax reforms in Brazil.(Owlspace reading tab)

Week 6: Representation and public policy

**Alejandro Quiroz Flores and Alister Smith. 2013. "Leader Survival and Natural Disasters," British Journal of Political Science. 43:821-843.

Bernard Manin, Adam Przeworski and Susan C. Stokes. 1999. "Elections and Representation," in Democracy, Accountability and Representation ed. Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes and Bernard Manin.

* Gerald Wright, Robert Erikson and John McIver. 1993. Statehouse Democracy

** Peter Enns and Julianna Koch. 2013. "Public opinion in the U.S. States: 1956-2010." State Politics and Policy Quarterly 13:349-372.

** Carsey, Thomas M., and Jeffrey J. Harden. 2010. "New Measures of Partisanship, Ideology, and Policy Mood in the American States." State Politics & Policy Quarterly 10(2): 136–56.

*Jeffery R. Lax and Justin H.Phillips.2009. "How should we estimate public opinion in the states?" American Journal of Political Science. 53:107-121.

**Christopher Wlezien and Stuart N. Soroka. 2012. "Political Institutions and the Opinion-Policy Link," Western European Politics 35:1407-1435.

**Blais, Andre and Marc Andre Bodet. 2006. "Does Proportional Representation Foster Closer Congruence Between Citizens and Policymakers?" Comparative Political Studies 39:1243-1262.

**Stuart N. Soroka and Christopher Wlezien 2015. "The majoritarian and proportional visions and democratic responsiveness," Electoral Studies. forthcoming

**Burstein, Paul. 2003. "The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda." Political Research Quarterly 56(1): 29-40.

*Golder, Matthew and Jacek Stramski. 2010. "Ideological Congruence and Electoral Institutions." American Journal of Political Science 54:90-106.

**Hobolt, Sara Binzer and Robert Klemmensen. 2008. "Government Responsiveness and Political Competition in Comparative Perspective." Comparative Political Studies 41:309-337.

*Christopher Wlezien. 1995. "The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending." American Journal of Political Science 39:981-1000.

Week 7: Attribution of policy responsibility

**Raymond Duch, Wojtek Przepiorka and Randolph Stevenson. 2015. "Responsibility attribution for collection decision makers." American Journal of Political Science 59:372-389.

**Raymond Duch and Randolph Stevenson. 2013. "Vote perceptions of agenda power and attribution of responsibility for economic performance." Electoral Studies 32:5120516

*Shanto Iyengar. 1991. Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

*Christopher Anderson. 1995. Blaming the government: Citizens and the economy in five European democracies: Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe

**Kevin Arceneaux and Robert M. Stein. 2006. "Who is held responsible when disaster strikes? The attribution of responsibility of a natural disaster in an urban election." Journal of Urban Affairs. 28:43053.

*Arceneaux, Kevin. 2006. "The Federal Face of Voting: Are Elected Officials Held Accountable for the Functions Relevant to Their Office?" Political Psychology, 27 (5): 731-54.

**Sara Hobolt and James Tilley. 2013. "Who's in charge? How voters attribute responsibility in the European Union." Comparative Political Studies. Xx:1-25.

**Neal Malhotra and A.G. Kuo. 2008. "Attributing blame: The public's response to Hurricane Katrian." Journal of Politics. 70:1230-135.

**Robert Stein. 1990. "Economic voting for governor and U.S. Senator: The electoral consequences of federalism." Journal of Politics. 52:29-53.

**T.J. Rudolph. 2003. "Institutional context and the assignment of political responsibility." Journal of Politics65:190-215.

Lonna Atkeson and R.W. Partin. 1995. "Economic and referendum voting: A comparison of gubernatorial and senatorial eletions." American Political Science Review. 42:1003-1007.

Sean Gailmard and John W. Patty, 2019. "Preventing Prevention," American Journal of Political Science 63:342-352.

Week 9: The electoral connection and distributive policies I

**David Mayhew. 1974. The Electoral Connection

* R Douglas Arnold. Congress and the bureaucracy: A theory of influence. Yale University Press, 1980.

*Susan Stokes, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno and Valeria Brusco. 2013. Brokers, Voters and Clientelism. Cambridge University Press

* Diana Evans. Greasing the wheels: Using pork barrel projects to build majority coalitions in Congress. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

*John Ferejohn. 1974. Pork Barrel Politics. Stanford University Press

**Steven J Balla, Eric D Lawrence, Forrest Maltzman, and Lee Sigelman. Partisanship, blame avoidance, and the distribution of legislative pork. American Journal of Political Science, 515–525, 2002.

**Stephen Ansolabehere and James M Snyder Jr. .2007. "Party control of state government and the distribution of public expenditures". The Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 108(4):547–569, 2006.

**Brollo and Nannicini. Tying your Enemy's Hands in Close Races. the politics of federal transfers in Brazil. American Political Science Review. 2012. 106:4(742-761)

*Gibson, Edward L., and Ernesto Calvo. "Federalism and low-maintenance constituencies: Territorial dimensions of economic reform in Argentina." Studies in Comparative International Development 35.3 (2000): 32-55.

**Lancaster, Thomas D., and W. David Patterson. "Comparative Pork Barrel Politics Perceptions from the West German Bundestag." Comparative Political Studies 22.4 (1990): 458-477

Week 10: The electoral connection and distributive policies II

*Christopher R Berry, Barry C Burden, and William G Howell. After enactment: The lives and deaths of federal programs. American Journal of Political Science, 54(1):1–17, 2010.

**Christopher R Berry, Barry C Burden, and William G Howell. The president and the distribution of federal spending. American Political Science Review, 104(04):783–799, 2010.

**Anthony M Bertelli and Christian R Grose. Secretaries of pork? a new theory of distributive public policy. Journal of Politics, 71(3):926–945, 2009. c.

**Kenneth N Bickers and Robert M Stein. The congressional pork barrel in a republican era. Journal of Politics, 62(4):1070–1086, 2000.

**Robert M Stein and Kenneth N Bickers. 1994. Congressional elections and the pork barrel. Journal of Politics, 56(2):377–99,.

**John M Carey and Matthew Soberg Shugart. Incentives to cultivate a personal vote: A rank ordering of electoral formulas. Electoral studies, 14(4):417–439, 1995.

**Jowei Chen. The effect of electoral geography on pork barreling in bicameral legislatures. American Journal of Political Science, 54(2):301–322, 2010.

**Justin Grimmer, Solomon Messing and Sean Westwood. 2012. "How words and money cultivate a personal vote: The effect of legislator credit claiming on constituent credit allocation." American Political Science Review 106:703-719

**Butler, Daniel M., Christopher F. Karpowitz and Jeremy C. Pope. 2012. "A Field Experiment on Legislators' Home Styles: Service versus Policy. Journal of Politics. 74 (2): 474-486.

*Eric Kramon and Daniel Posner. 2013."Who benefits from distributive politics? How the outcome one studies affects the answer one gets." Political Perspectives 11:461-474.

**Remmer, Karen L. 2007. "The Political Economy of Patronage: Expenditure Patterns in the Argentine Provinces, 1983–2003." Journal of Politics 69(2):363–77.

Week 11: Policy diffusion and innovation

**Frederick Boehmke and Paul Skinner 2012. "State policy innovativeness revisited." State Politics and Policy Quarterly 12:1-27.

**Frances Stokes Berry and William Berry 1992. "Tax innovation and the states: Capitalizing on political opportunity." American Journal of Political Science 36:713-742.

**Craig Volden. 2006. "States as policy laboratories: Emulating success in the children's health insurance program." American Journal of Political Science 50:294-312.

*Charles Shipan and Craig Volden. 2006. "The mechanisms of policy diffusion." American Journal of Political Science. 52:840-857.

**Andrew Karch 2007. "Emerging Issues and future directions in state policy diffusion research." State Politics and Policy Quarterly 7:54-80.

*Sean Nicholson-Crotty.2009. "The politics of diffusion: Public policy in the American states." Journal of Politics 71:192-205.

**Brady Baybeck, William Berry, & David Siegel. 2011. "A strategic theory of policy diffusion via intergovernmental competition." Journal of Politics 73:232-247.

**Ellen Seljan and Nicholas Weller 2011. "Diffusion in direct Democracy: The effect of political information on proposals for tax expenditure limits in the U.S. states." State Politics and Policy Quarterly 11:348-368.

**Mintrom 1997. "Policy entrepreneurs and the diffusion of innovation." American Journal of Political Science. 41:738-770.

**Todd Makse and Craig Volden. 2011. "The role of policy attributes in the diffusion of innovations." Journal of Politics 73:108-124.

Week 12: Policy subsystems, networks and network theory

**Michael Mintrom and Sandra Vergari 1998. "Policy networks and innovation diffusion: The case of state education reforms." Journal of Politics 60:126-148.

**Keith Hamm. 1986. "The role of subgovernments in U.S. state policy making: An explanatory analysis." Legislative Studies Quarterly 11:321-351.

**Steven Balla 2001. "Interstate professional associations and the diffusion of policy innovations."American Politics Research 29:221-245.

*Virginia Gray and David Lowery. The population ecology of interest representation.

**Mark Lubell, John Scholz, Ramiro Berardo and Garry Robbins. 2012. "Testing policy theory with statistical models of networks." Policy Studies Journal 40:351-374.

*Mark Schneider, et al. 2003. "Building concensual institutions: Networks and the national estuary program." American Journal of Political Science. 47:143-158.

**Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, Gilbert K. St. Clair and Brian Woods. 1991, "Explaining change in policy subsystems: Analysis of coalition stability and defection over time," American Journal of Political Science. 35:851-880.

Week 13: Bureaucracy

**Mathew McCubbins and Thomas Schwartz. 1984. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols vs. Fire Alarms. American Journal of Political Science. 28: 165-179.

**Daniel Carpenter. 1996. "Adaptive Signal Processing, Hierarchy and Budgetary Control in Federal Regulation." American Political Science Review. 90: 283-302.

** Mathew McCubbins, Noll and Barry Weingast. 1987. "Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control." Journal of Law, Economics and Organization. 3: 243-277

** Kenneth Meier. "Representative Bureaucracy: An Empirical Analysis." American Political Science Review69:526-542.

*Huber & Shipan 2002. Deliberate Discretion: The institutional foundations of bureaucratic autonomy

**Charles Lindblom. 1959. "The Science of Muddling Through." Public Administration Review 19: 79-88.

**Jonathan Bendor. 1988. "Review Article: Formal Models of Bureaucracy." British Journal of Political Science. 18: 353-395.

* James Q. Wilson. 1989. Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It.

**Michael D. Cohen, James G. March and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." Administrative Studies Quarterly. 17:1-25.

**Jonathon Bendor, Terry Moe, and Kenneth Shotts. 2001. "Recycling the garbage can: An assessment of the research program." American Political Science Review95:169-190

**Johan Olsen. 2001. "Garbage cans, new institutionalism and the study of politics." American Political Science Review. 95:191-198

Week 15: Principal agency

**Gary Miller. 1992. Managerial Dilemmas: The Political Economy of Hierarchy

**Kenneth Shotts and Alan Wiseman .2010. "The politics of investigations and regulatory enforcement by independent agents and cabinet appointees. Journal of Politics72:209-226.
**John Huber, Charles Shipan and Madelaine Pfahler. 2001. "Legislatures and Statutory Control of Bureaucracy", American Journal of Political Science. 45: 330-345.
*Bendor, J. and Meirowitz, A. (2004) Spatial Models of Delegation. American Political Science Review, 98, 293-310.
**Bertelli, Anthony and Sven Feldman. 2007. "Strategic Appointments." Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. 17 (1): 19-38.
**David Epstein and Sharon O'Halloran. 1994. Administrative procedures, information, and agency discretion. American Journal of Political Science 38:697-722.
**McCubbins, Noll, and Weingast. 1989. Structure and process, politics and policy: Administrative Arrangements and the political control of policy." Virgina Law Review 75:431-82.
**John Huber, Nolan McCarty. Bureaucratic Capacity, Delegation, and Political Reform. American Political Science Review, v. 98, n. 3, 2004.

MSPE 502: Applications of Program Evaluation – Criminal Justice

Course overview: There are reform projects underway at every stage of the American criminal justice system. Understanding the impact of these reforms is crucial for the future of criminal justice in the United States. Policies scaled up without evidence may have detrimental consequences for both those involved in the criminal justice system and the taxpayers. This course will apply the quantitative evaluation methods in criminal justice. We will study policies and interventions at various stages of criminal justice, from policing to reintegration.

Course Outline and Readings:

Week 1: Introduction to the course, the economic theory of crime and punishment

(1) How to write a literature review for MSPE 502?
Choosing a topic
Sources
Structuring your review
Critiquing a paper

(2) Process of Criminal and Juvenile Justice in the United States
Bureau of Justice Statistics, "What is the sequence of events in the criminal justice system?" (Available at https://www.bjs.gov/content/justsys.cfm)
National Juvenile Defense Center, "Flowchart of the Juvenile Court Process." (Available at https://njdc.info/flow-chart-of-the-juvenile-court-process/)

(3) History of Criminal Justice in the United States
[Read Chapters 2, 3 and 4] J. Travis, B. Western, and S. Redburn, 2014. "The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences," Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. (available at http://johnjay.jjay.cuny.edu/nrc/nas_report_on_incarceration.pdf)

Week 2:

A Rational Theory of Crime
Gary S. Becker, 1968. "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach," Journal of Political Economy, University of Chicago Press, vol. 76, pages 169-169.
Olivier Marie, Lessons from the economics of crime," Centerpiece, Winter 2013/14, pages 7-9

Mahmoud Bahrani, "The economics of crime with Gary Becker," The Chicago Maroon, May 25, 2012. (available at https://www.chicagomaroon.com/2012/05/25/the-economics-of-crime-with-gary-becker/)

Ronald L. Akers, "Rational Choice, Deterrence, and Social Learning Theory in Criminology: The Path Not Taken," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, vol. 81, pages 653-676.

Impact of laws on crime: The case of decriminalizing marijuana

Dragone, Davide & Prarolo, Giovanni & Vanin, Paolo & Zanella, Giulio, 2019. "Crime and the legalization of recreational marijuana," Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, Elsevier, vol. 159(C), pages 488-501.

Jérôme Adda & Brendon McConnell & Imran Rasul, 2014. "Crime and the Depenalization of Cannabis Possession: Evidence from a Policing Experiment," Journal of Political Economy, University of Chicago Press, vol. 122(5), pages 1130-1202.

Brinkman, Jeffrey & Mok-Lamme, David, 2017. "Not in My Backyard? Not So Fast. The Effect of Marijuana Legalization on Neighborhood Crime," Working Papers 17-19, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

Week 3: Policing: Does more police reduce crime?

Rafael Di Tella and Ernesto Schargrodsky. 2004. "Do Police Reduce Crime? Estimates Using the Allocation of Police Forces After a Terrorist Attack." American Economic Review, 94(1): 115-133.

William N. Evans and Emily G. Owens. 2007. "COPS and crime." Journal of Public Economics, 91: 181-201

Steven Mello, 2019. "More COPS, less crime." Journal of Public Economics, 172: 174-200.

Paul Heaton & Priscillia Hunt & John MacDonald & Jessica Saunders, 2016. "The Short- and Long-Run Effects of Private Law Enforcement: Evidence from University Police," Journal of Law and Economics, University of Chicago Press, vol. 59(4), pages 889-912.

Week 4: Predictive Policing: Can data help prevent crime?

Giovanni Mastrobuoni. 2017. "Crime is terribly revealing: Information technology and police productivity." Working paper.

Jessica Saunders, Priscillia Hunt, and John S. Hollywood. 2016. "Predictions put into practice: a quasi-experimental evaluation of Chicago's predictive policing pilot." Journal of Experimental Criminology, 12: 347-371.

National Institute of Justice, 2016. "Evaluation of the Shreveport Predictive Policing Experiment," from NIJ.gov: https://nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/strategies/predictive-policing/Pages/evaluation-of-the-shreveport-predictive-policing-experiment.aspx

Braga, A. A., & Bond, B. J. 2008. "Policing crime and disorder hot spots: A randomized controlled trial." *Criminology*, 46 (3), 577-607.

Braga, A. A., Hureau, D. M., & Papachristos, A. V. 2012. "An ex post facto evaluation framework for place-based police interventions," *Evaluation review*, *35*(6), 592-626.

Caeti, T. J. (1999). "*Houston's targeted beat program: A quasi-experimental test of police patrol strategies"* (Doctoral dissertation, Sam Houston State University).

Week 5: Policing Technology: Body Cameras and other technology

Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., Drover, P., Sykes, J, Henderson, R.,2016. "Wearing body cameras increases assaults against officers and does not reduce police use of force: Results from a global multi-site experiment," European Journal of Criminology, 13(6), 744–755.

David Yokum, Anita Ravishankar, Alexander Coppock, 2017. "Evaluating the Effects of Body-Worn Cameras: A Randomized Controlled Trial," working paper, Lab@DC.

Ready, J.T. & Young, J.T.N., 2015. "The impact of on-officer video cameras on police–citizen contacts: findings from a controlled experiment in Mesa, AZ." Journal of Experimental Criminology, 11: 445.

Koper, C., Taylor, B. G., & Woods, D. (2013). A Randomized Test of Initial and Residual Deterrence from Directed Patrols and Use of License Plate Readers at Crime Hot Spots. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 9*(2), 213-244.Taylor, B. G., Koper, C., & Woods, D. (2012). Combating Vehicle Theft in Arizona: A Randomized Experiment with License Plate Recognition Technology. *Criminal Justice Review, 37*(1)*,* 24-50.

La Vigne, N. G., Lowry, S.S., Markman, J. A., & Dwyer, A. M. (2011). *Evaluating the use of public surveillance cameras for crime control and prevention*. Baltimore case study. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

La Vigne, N. G., Lowry, S.S., Markman, J. A., & Dwyer, A. M. (2011). *Evaluating the use of public surveillance cameras for crime control and prevention*. Chicago case study. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Lum, C., Hibdon, J., Cave, B., Koper, C. & Merola, L. (2011). License plate reader (LPR) police patrols in crime hot spots: an experimental evaluation in two adjacent jurisdictions. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7(4): 321-345.

Week 6: Pretrial Detention and Diversion

Will Dobbie & Jacob Goldin & Crystal S. Yang, 2018. "The Effects of Pretrial Detention on Conviction, Future Crime, and Employment: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges," American Economic Review, American Economic Association, vol. 108(2), pages 201-240, February.

Gupta & Christopher Hansman & Ethan Frenchman, 2016. "The Heavy Costs of High Bail: Evidence from Judge Randomization," The Journal of Legal Studies, University of Chicago Press, vol. 45(2), pages 471-505.

Megan Stevenson, Forthcoming. "Distortion of Justice: How the Inability to Pay Bail Affects Case Outcomes" Journal of Law, Economics & Organization.

Week 7: Diversion Courts

Shelli B. Rossman, John K. Roman, Janine M. Zweig, Christine H. Lindquist, Michael Rempel, Janeen Buck Willison, P. Mitchell Downey, Kristine Fahrney, 2018. "NIJ's Multisite Evaluation of Prosecutor-Led Diversion Programs: Strategies, Impacts, and Cost-Effectiveness." RAND, Center for Court Innovation, Assciation of Prosecuting Attorneys and Police Foundation Research Paper. (available at https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251665.pdf)

Michael Rempel, Melissa Marie Labriola, Priscillia Hunt, Robert C. Davis, Warren A. Reich, Samantha Cherney, 2018. "NIJ's Multisite Evaluation of Prosecutor-Led Diversion Programs," RAND Research Paper. (available at https://www.rand.org/pubs/external_publications/EP67598.html)

Shelli B. Rossman, John K. Roman, Janine M. Zweig, Christine H. Lindquist, Michael Rempel, Janeen Buck Willison, P. Mitchell Downey, Kristine Fahrney, 2011. " The Multi-Site Drug Court Evaluation: The Impact of Drug Courts," Urban Institute Report. (available at https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237112.pdf)

Julian M. Somers, Lauren Currie, Akm Moniruzzaman, Faith Eiboff, Michelle Patterson, 2012. "Drug treatment court of Vancouver: An empirical evaluation of recidivism," International Journal of Drug Policy.

Cissner, A.B., Rempel, M., Franklin, A.W., Roman, J.K., Bieler, S., Cohen, R. and Cadoret, C.R.,2013. "A Statewide Evaluation of New York's Adult Drug Courts.", Urban Institute.

Week 8: Courts: How to prevent failure to appear at the court?

Brice Cooke, Binta Zahra Diop, Alissa Fishbane, Jonathan Hayes, Aurelie Ouss, Anuj Shah, 2018. "Using Behavioral Science to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes Preventing Failures to Appear in Court," Working Paper.

Bornstein, B.H., Tomkins, A.J., & Neeley, E.M, 2011. "Reducing courts' failure to appear rate: A procedural justice approach: Final report"

Rosenbaum, D.I., Hutsell, N., Tomkins, A.J., Bornstein, B.H., Herian, M.N., & Neeley, E.M. (2012). Using court date reminder postcards to reduce courts' failure to appear rates: A benefit-cost analysis. Judicature, 95, 177-187.

Week 9: Courts: Impact of sentencing decisions

Michael Mueller-Smith. 2015. "The Criminal and Labor Market Impacts of Incarceration." Working paper.

Steven D. Levitt, 1996. "The effect of prison population size on crime rates: Evidence from prison overcrowding litigation." Quarterly Journal of Economics, 111(2): 319-351.

Magnus Lofstrom, Steven Raphael, and Ryken Grattet, 2014. "Is Public Safety Realignment Reducing Recidivism in California?" Public Policy Institute of California.

Rucker Johnson, Steven Raphael. 2012. "How Much Crime Reduction Does the Marginal Prisoner Buy?" Journal of Law and Economics, Vol. 55, No. 2 (May 2012), pp. 275-310

Rafael Di Tella and Ernesto Schargrodsky. 2013. "Criminal Recidivism after Prison and Electronic Monitoring." Journal of Political Economy, 121(1): 28-73.

Week 10: Re-entry: How to reduce recidivism?

Philip J. Cook, Songman Kang, Anthony A. Braga, Jens Ludwig, and Mallory E. O'Brien. 2014. "An Experimental Evaluation of a Comprehensive Employment-Oriented Prisoner Re-entry Program." Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 31(3): 355-382.

Ronald D'Amico, Hui Kim, 2018. "Evaluation of Seven Second Chance Act Adult Demonstration Programs: Impact Findings at 30 Months." Social Policy Research Associates Report.

Lattimore PK, Visher CA. The impact of prison reentry services on short-term outcomes: evidence from a multisite evaluation. Evaluation Review. 2013;37(3-4):274–313.

Duwe, G. (2015). The benefits of keeping idle hands busy: An outcome evaluation of a prisoner reentry employment program. Crime & Delinquency, 61(4), 559-586.

Week 11: Juvenile Justice

(1) Introduction

[Read Chapter 2, 3 and 4] Richard J. Bonnie, Robert L. Johnson, Betty M. Chemers, and Julie A. Schuck, 2013. "Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach," Committee on Assessing Juvenile Justice Reform, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Justice Reform.

(2) Interventions to reduce juvenile delinquency

Sara B. Heller. 2014. "Summer jobs reduce youth violence among disadvantaged youth." Science, 346(6214): 1219-1223.

Alexander Gelber, Adam Isen, and Judd B. Kessler. 2016. "The Effects of Youth Employment: Evidence from New York City Summer Youth Employment Program Lotteries." Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131(1): 423-460.

Sara B. Heller & Anuj K. Shah & Jonathan Guryan & Jens Ludwig & Sendhil Mullainathan & Harold A. Pollack, 2017. "Thinking, Fast and Slow? Some Field Experiments to Reduce Crime and Dropout in Chicago," The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Oxford University Press, vol. 132(1), pages 1-54.

Jeffrey R. Kling, Jens Ludwig, and Lawrence F. Katz. 2005. "Neighborhood Effects on Crime for Female and Male Youth: Evidence from a Randomized Housing Voucher Experiment." Quarterly Journal of Economics, 120(1): 87-130.

Week 12: Rehabilitative interventions for delinquent youth:

Cahill, M., Coggeshall, M., Hayeslip D., Wolff, A., Lagerson, E., Scott, M., Davies, E., Roland, K., and S. Decker. (2008). Los Angeles, California. In *Community Collaboratives Addressing Youth Gangs: Interim Findings From the Gang Reduction Program.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.

Spergel, I. A., Wa, K. M., & Sosa, R. V. (2002). *Evaluation of the Mesa Gang Intervention Program (MGIP). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Worrall, J. L. & Gaines, L. K. (2006). The effect of police-probation partnerships on juvenile arrests. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(6), 579-589.

Week 13: Juvenile Adjudication and its Consequences

Anna Aizer & Joseph J. Doyle, 2015. "Juvenile Incarceration, Human Capital, and Future Crime: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges," The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Oxford University Press, vol. 130(2), pages 759-803.

Klein, M. W., 1986. "Labeling theory and delinquency policy: An experimental test." *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13,* 47-79.

Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., & Woods, D. J. 2000. "Recidivism Patterns in the Canberra Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (Rise)." Canberra, Australia: Centre for Restorative Justice, Australian National University.

Week 14: Conclusion

Introduction to the practicum.

Students will select two papers that were not selected for presentation to be covered.

MSPE 503: Quantitative Methods for Program Evaluation

Course Overview and Objectives:

Government agencies, multilateral institutions, NGOs, and many other institutions implement, manage, and monitor a wide array of social programs. The goal of this course is to introduce students to the basic methods for assessing and quantifying the causal impact of these programs. The course will provide students with the necessary theoretical and applied skills to use these methods, understand their limitations, and choose among them. Furthermore, it will allow students to critically read and analyze impact evaluation studies and establish their reliability. The course will combine lectures that will discuss the theory and implementation of a series of methodologies, hands-on work to apply these methods using existing data, and group discussions of studies that use the different methods. At the end of the course, students will be able to interpret the results of impact evaluation studies, whether their own or someone else's, to provide measured public policy recommendations that are grounded on rigorously produced evidence.

Course Texts

The following main texts will be used throughout the course.

- Khandker, S.R., Koolwal, G.B., Samad, H.A. (2009). Handbook on impact evaluation: quantitative methods and practices*.* Washington, DC: World Bank [KKS]
- Hernán M.A., Robins J.M. (2019). Causal Inference. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC, forthcoming. [HR]

- Dufflo E., Glennersterzand R. and M Kremer (2006) Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit. Working Paper. [DGK]

KKS will be the main text and the course will follow it closely. The practical applications of the methods will be based on Part 2 of KKS.

HR is a more advanced text. Some chapters in it will complement KKS. Students who want to delve deeper into the methods are encouraged to go beyond these selected chapters.

DGK focus on experimental methods (Part II of the course) and will complement KKS in that section.

Readings from these texts are denoted using initials and chapter numbers in the course outline below.

Course Outline [Required readings in brackets] {Applications in braces}
- I.   A General Framework for Impact Evaluation (2 weeks).
    1. The problem of causal inference [KKS-2, DGK-2.1]
    2. Establishing a theory of change
    3. The model of potential outcomes
    4. Parameters of interest [HR-1]
    5. Internal and external validity
- II.   Experimental methods (2 weeks) [KKS-3, HR-2, DGK] {KKS-12}
    6. Randomized Control Trials
    7. Research design
    8. Ethics of randomized experiments
- III. Quasi-experimental methods (8 weeks)
    9. Introduction [HR-11.1]
    10. Differences in Differences [KKS-5] {KKS-14}
    11. Instrumental Variables [KKS-6, HR-16] {KKS-15}
    12. Matching [KKS-4, HR-15]{KKS-13}
    13. Regression Discontinuity [KKS-7, HR-11.5]{KKS-17}
- IV.   Conclusion (3 weeks)
    14. Beyond average effects: an overview [KKS-8, HR Ch. 4]
    15. Comparing and choosing among methods [KKS-9]
    16. Drawing inference from impact evaluations

MSPE 504: Applications of Program Evaluation – Labor Markets (3 credits)

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:
- Critically read existing evaluations of labor market policies and evaluate for various types of validity and for generalizability.
- Draw on methodological best practices and apply empirical tools to their own evaluations of labor market policies.
- Identify and access important datasets commonly used in influential employment-related research.
- Discuss with policy professionals the salience, outcomes, workings, and broader context of a variety of public programs designed to improve labor markets.

Course Schedule

Week 1

Course overview. Introduction to labor market policies (minimum wage laws; workforce development programs, discrimination, immigration, work requirements of public assistance,

right-to-work laws; earned income tax credit); concepts (labor supply; labor demand; life cycle model; human capital); and evaluation challenges (endogeneity, selection bias, generalizability of experiments).

Week 2

Data sources (survey and administrative). Data cleaning. Missing data (including attrition, survey non-response, question non-response). Survey design (simple random sampling, clustering, convenience). Weighting.

Cameron, A.C., & Trivedi, P. (2005). Chapter 24: Stratified and Clustered Samples. In Microeconometrics: Methods and Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamermesh, D. S. (2000). The craft of labormetrics. ILR Review, 53(3), 363-380.

https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/

https://enforcedata.dol.gov/views/data_catalogs.php

https://usa.ipums.org/usa/

https://www.bls.gov/nls/nlsy97.htm

https://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/

Week 3

Identification in Research Designs. Sources of endogeneity. Potential pitfalls.

Angrist, J. D., & Krueger, A. B. (1999). Empirical strategies in labor economics. In Handbook of labor economics (Vol. 3, pp. 1277-1366). Elsevier. (Selected passages.)

DiNardo, J., & Lee, D. S. (2010). Program evaluation and research designs (No. w16016). National Bureau of Economic Research.

List, J. & Rasul, I. (2010). Field Experiments in Labor Economics. NBER WP No. 16062. (Selected passages.)

Week 4

Labor Supply, Background:

Borjas, G.J. Labor Economics (p 21-54). Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin. (On reserve.)

Dickert, S., Houser, S., & Scholz, J. K. (1995). The earned income tax credit and transfer programs: a study of labor market and program participation. Tax policy and the economy, 9, (only pages 7-9, from the subsection 2.1: Empirical Models of Men's and Women's Hours of Work).

Hausman, J. & Ruud, P. (1984). Family Labor Supply with Taxes. The American Economic Review, 74(2), 242-248.

Mincer, J. (1981). The economics of wage floors. (No. w804). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Week 5

Labor Supply, evaluations

Camerer, C., Babcock, L., Lowenstein, G., & Thaler, R. (1997). Labor Supply of New York City Cab Drivers: One Day at at Time. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112(2), 407-441.

Eissa, N. (1995). Taxation and labor supply of married women: The Tax Reform Act of 1986 as a Natural Experiment (No. w5023). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Fehr, E., & Goette, L. (2007). Do workers work more if wages are high? Evidence from a randomized field experiment. American Economic Review, 97(1), 298-317.

Week 6

Educational Achievement and Human Capital

Background

Borjas, G.J. Chapter 6 (selected passages). Labor Economics. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin. (On reserve.)

Evaluations

Card, D. (1993). Using geographic variation in college proximity to estimate the returns to schooling. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Lang, K., & Kropp, D. (1986). Human capital versus sorting: the effects of compulsory attendance laws. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 101.

Week 7

Earned Income Tax Credit

Background:

https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-tax/policy-basics-the-earned-income-tax-credit
https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/briefing-book/what-earned-income-tax-credit

Evaluations:

Eissa, N., & Hoynes, H. W. (2006). Behavioral responses to taxes: Lessons from the EITC and labor supply. Tax policy and the economy, 20, 73-110.

Eissa, N. & Leibman, J. (1996). Labor Supply Response to the Earned Income Tax Credit. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 111(2), 605-637.

Moulton, J. G., Graddy-Reed, A., & Lanahan, L. (2016). Beyond the EITC: the effect of reducing the earned income tax credit on labor force participation. National Tax Journal, 69(2), 261-284.

Week 8 No Class, Mid-term break

Week 8

Workforce Development Training Programs

Marcal, L. E. (2001). Does Trade Adjustment Assistance Help Trade-Displaced Workers? Contemporary Economic Policy, 19(1), 59-72.

Friedlander, D., Greenberg, D. H., & Robins, P. K. (1997). Evaluating government training programs for the economically disadvantaged. Journal of Economic Literature, 35(4), 1809-1855.

LaLonde, R. J. (1986). Evaluating the econometric evaluations of training programs with experimental data. The American economic review, 604-620.

Week 9

Minimum wages

Background:

Wolfers, J. (2017). What Do We Really Know About the Employment Effects of Minimum Wages.

Evaluations:

Card, D., & Krueger, A. B. (1993). Minimum wages and employment: A case study of the fast food industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania (No. w4509). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Neumark, D., & Wascher, W. (1992). Employment Effects of Minimum and Subminimum Wages: Panel Data on State Minimum Wage Laws. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 46(1), 55-81.

Dube, A., Lester, T. W., & Reich, M. (2010). Minimum wage effects across state borders: Estimates using contiguous counties. The review of economics and statistics, 92(4), 945-964.

Unintended consequences:

Chakrabarti, S., Devaraj, S., & Patel, P. (2017). Minimum Wage and Restaurant Hygiene Violation: Evidence from Food Establishments in Seattle. Available at SSRN 2992783.

Week 10

Inequality

Background:

Autor, D.H. (2014). Skills, education, and the rise of earnings inequality among the "other 99 percent". Science, 344, 843-851.

Stewart, M. (2018). The 9.9 Percent Is the New American Aristocracy. The Atlantic, June.

Evaluations:

Autor, D.H., Levy, F., & Murnane, R.J. (2003). The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118(4), 1279-1333.

Kalleberg, A. L. (2012). Job quality and precarious work: Clarifications, controversies, and challenges. Work and Occupations, 39(4), 427-448.

Weil, D. (2014). The fissured workplace. Harvard University Press. Chapter 1.

Week 11

Employment Discrimination

Background

Darity, W. A., & Mason, P. L. (1998). Evidence on discrimination in employment: Codes of color, codes of gender. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12(2), 63-90.

Evaluation:

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. American economic review, 94(4), 991-1013.

Neal, D., & Johnson, W. (1996). The Role of Premarket Factors in Black-White Wage Differences. Journal of Political Economy, 104(5), 869-895. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.rice.edu/stable/2138945

(See critique of Neal & Johnson (1996) on p 73-74 of Darity & Mason (2004).)

Boraas, S., & Rodgers III, W. M. (2003). How does gender play a role in the earnings gap? An update. Monthly Labor Review, 126, 9-15.

Week 12

Employment regulation and enforcement

Galvin, D. J. (2016). Deterring wage theft: alt-Labor, state politics, and the policy determinants of minimum wage compliance. Perspectives on Politics, 14(2), 324-350.

Johnson, M. S. (2016). Regulation by shaming: Deterrence effects of publicizing violations of workplace safety and health laws. Unpublished manuscript.

Cappelli, P., & Hamori, M. (2008). Are Franchises Bad Employers? ILR Review, 61(2), 147–162.

Week 13

Other Miscellaneous Topics

Right-to-Work Laws

Bono-Lunn, D. (2018). The Right to Work or the Right to Free Ride? The Impacts of Right to Work Laws on Union Wages and State Unionization Rates. Unpublished Manuscript.

Job lock

Bailey, J. & Chorniy, A. (2016). Employer-Provided Health Insurance and Job Mobility: Did the Affordable Care Act Reduce Job Lock? Contemporary Economic Policy, 34(1), 173-183.

Veteran's Employment

Bound, J., & Turner, S. (2002). Going to war and going to college: Did World War II and the GI Bill increase educational attainment for returning veterans? Journal of Labor Economics, 20(4), 784-815.

Week 14

Wrap Up, Paper Presentations, or Final Exam

MSPE 505: Microeconomics for Policy Analysis

Course Schedule
Weeks 1 to 3

Introduction and basic concepts

Constrained utility maximization
Competitive equilibrium, including conditions and classic assumptions
Income and substitution effects
Welfare maximization, including consumer and producer surpluses

Weeks 4 to 6
Market Failures
Public goods (free riders, tragedy of the commons)
Externalities and Coase's Theorem
Information asymmetry
Moral hazard and adverse selection

Weeks 7 & 8
Government expenditures
Equity and income distribution
Health care and retirement programs and spending

Weeks 9 & 10
Taxation
Inefficiencies, incidence

Week 11 & 12
Game Theory
Games of Complete Information
Games of Incomplete Information

Week 12 & 13
Behavioral Economics and Bounded Rationality
Relaxation of the classic microeconomic assumptions

Week 14 – Wrap Up, Paper Presentations, or Final Exam

MSPE 506: Applications of Program Evaluation – Health

Required Text: Critical Appraisal of Epidemiological Studies and Clinical Trials (Oxford Medical Publications) 3rd Edition, Mark Elwood
Recommended Texts & Other Readings:
The Practice of Health Program Evaluation – 1st Edition, David Grembowski
Epidemiology - 5th Edition, Leon Gordis
Introduction to Health Policy – 2nd Edition, Leiyu Shi
Health Policy Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Approach – Edition 3, Curtis P McLaughlin
Other readings will be made available in the course packet/Web forum
Learning Objectives
Understand how to critically assess the literature on program evaluation in health
Synthesize evidence from multiple studies to develop a robust understanding of evidence to date on various programs and interventions
Understand the impact of study design on weight and quality of evidence
Learn how to appropriately use existing evidence to make effective decisions on interventions or programs that may be implemented to improve the health of individuals and populations
Identify how evidence-based policy recommendations can be implemented
.

Appendix E
Curricula Vitae

Diego Amador

Texas Policy Lab
Rice University
diego.amador@rice.edu
diego.amador.o@gmail.com
https://sites.google.com/site/diegoamadorecon

Education

2015	Ph.D. in Economics, University of Pennsylvania.
2008	M.A. in Economics, Universidad de los Andes.
2005	B.A. in Anthropology, Universidad de los Andes.

Appointments

2019 -	Research Scientist, Texas Policy Lab, Rice University
2015 - 2018	Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Universidad de los Andes

Working Papers

- "The Consequences of Abortion and Contraception Policies on Young Women's Reproductive Choices, Schooling and Labor Supply"
- "Telling schools apart: the role of preferences, restrictions, and the ability to differentiate in school choices", with Nicolás Grau (Universidad de Chile) and Juan-Andrés Castro (Universidad de Chile)
- "The Effect of Child Disability on Parents' Labor Supply: Evidence from Colombia", with Mónica Pinilla-Roncancio (Universidad de los Andes)

Teaching Experience

Advanced Econometrics (Universidad de los Andes),
Methods for Impact Evaluation (Universidad de los Andes),
Introduction to Microeconomics (Universidad de los Andes, University of Pennsylvania),
Introduction to Econometrics (Universidad de los Andes).

E. Susan Amirian, PhD, MSPH

Higher Education	PhD in Epidemiology (Minors: Biostatistics & Biological Sciences) University of Texas School of Public Health, Houston, TX	2009
	Masters of Sciences in Public Health University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, Denver, CO	2006
Primary Professional Appointments	**Research Scientist** Texas Policy Lab Rice University	2018 - present
	Assistant Professor *(After 2016, PTE/symbolic)* Dan L Duncan Cancer Center Department of Pediatrics (Hematology-Oncology Section) Baylor College of Medicine	2013 - 2019
	Outcomes Researcher (Project Lead) Health Economics and Outcome Research McKesson Specialty Health	2016 - 2018
	Research Director Houston Food Bank	2016
	Instructor Dan L Duncan Cancer Center Department of Pediatrics (Hematology-Oncology Division) Baylor College of Medicine	2012 - 2013
	Post-Doctoral Associate Dan L Duncan Cancer Center Baylor College of Medicine	2010 - 2012
	Senior Scientist NASA's Longitudinal Study of Astronaut Health MEI Technologies	2009 - 2010

Selected Publications

Selected from 43 total; 3 under review

Rifkin RM, Medhekar R, **Amirian ES**, Aguilar KM, et al. A real-world comparative analysis of carfilzomib and other systemic multiple myeloma chemotherapies in a US community oncology setting. Ther Adv Hematol, 2019, 10:2040620718816699.

Amirian ES, Ostrom QT, Armstrong GN, Lai RK, et al. Aspirin, Non- Steroid Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs), and Glioma Risk: Original Data from the Gliogene International Case Control Study and a Meta-Analysis. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention, 2019, 28(3):555-562.

Royse KE, El Chaer F, **Amirian ES**, Hartman C, Krown SE, Uldrick TS, Lee JY, Shepard Z, Chiao EY. Disparities in Kaposi sarcoma incidence and survival in the United States: 2000-2013. PLoS One, 2017, 12(8):e0182750.

Amirian ES, Armstrong GN, Zhou R, Lau CC, Claus EB, et al. The Gliogene Consortium: A report from the Glioma International Case-Control Study (GICC). Am J Epidemiol, 2016, 183(2):85-91. PMID: 26656478

Amirian ES, Fickey P, Scheurer ME, Chiao EY. Anal Cancer Incidence and Survival: Comparing the Greater San-Francisco Bay Area to Other SEER Cancer Registries. PLOS One, 2013, 8(3):e58919. PMID: 23484057

Textbook Chapters

Jacobs DI, **Amirian ES**, Claus EB, Jenkins RB, Bondy ML, Wrensch MR. Etiological and epidemiological aspects. In Oncology of CNS Tumors, Third Edition, edited by M Westphal & D Reardon. Springer, 2019.

Amirian ES, Ostrom QT, Liu Y, Barnholtz-Sloan J, Bondy ML. Nervous System Tumors. In Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention, Fourth Edition, edited by D Schottenfeld & JF Fraumeni, Jr. Oxford University Press, 2017.

Erin Marie (Powell) Baumgartner
Rice University
Houston Education Research Consortium   Phone: 708.846.7897
6100 Main Street, MS-258   E-mail: erinmariebaum@gmail.com
Houston, TX 77005   *Updated 8/2019*

EDUCATION	*Pennsylvania State University*, University Park, PA **Ph.D.,** *Dual-degree program in Sociology and Demography*	2015
	University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL **M.Ed.**, *Measurement, Evaluation, Statistics, and Assessment*	2010
	University of Chicago, Chicago, IL **M.A. Program in the Social Sciences**, *Sociology*	2008
	University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN **B.B.A.,** *Marketing, second major in Sociology, cum laude*	2004

PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS	*Associate Director for HISD Research & Relations* Houston Education Research Consortium, Rice University	March 2019 – present
	Postdoctoral Fellow Houston Education Research Consortium, Rice University	August 2015 – February 2019

PUBLICATIONS

Frisco, Michelle, **Erin Baumgartner**, and Jennifer Van Hook. (2019) "The Weight of School Entry: Weight Gain Among Hispanic Children of Immigrants During the Elementary School Years." *Demographic Research* 40: 95-120.

Alwin, Duane, **Erin Baumgartner**, & Brett Beattie. (2018). "Number of Response Categories and Reliability in Attitude Measurement." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 6(2), 212-239.

Baumgartner, Erin. (2016). "Making Gains or Falling Behind? Changes and Stability in School Readiness". *Social Science Research* 64: 277-298.

RESEARCH BRIEFS

Baumgartner, Erin. (2017). "The Benefits of HISD Pre-Kindergarten: The Relationship between Years of Exposure and School Readiness". Available at: https://kinder.rice.edu/uploadedFiles/Kinder_Institute_for_Urban_Research/Programs/HERC/HERC%20School%20readiness.pdf.

Baumgartner, Erin. (2017). "Equality of Pre-Kindergarten Educational Opportunities: Examining Student Differences in Access to High Quality Pre-Kindergarten (Part 1)". Available at: https://kinder.rice.edu/uploadedFiles/Kinder_Institute_for_Urban_Research/Programs/HERC/2017V5I5.BAUMGARTNER_PREKQUAL1.pdf.

Baumgartner, Erin. (2017). "Equality of Pre-Kindergarten Educational Opportunities: Examining the Association between Quality Pre-K and Student Outcomes (Part 2)". Available at: https://kinder.rice.edu/uploadedFiles/Kinder_Institute_for_Urban_Research/Programs/HERC/2017V5I6.BAUMGARTNER_PREKQUAL2.pdf

MEMBERSHIPS

American Educational Research Association, American Sociological Association, Population Association of America, Sociology of Education Association

EKIM CEM MUYAN

Texas Policy Lab

Rice University

5620 Greenbriar Drive, Suite 110 | Houston, TX 77005

713.348.2420 | ekimcmuyan@rice.edu

ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

2010 – 2016	**University of Pennsylvania**	Philadelphia, PA
	Ph.D., Economics	
	Fields: *Political Economics, Public Economics, and Development Economics*	

2008 – 2010	**Universita di Bologna**	Bologna, Italy
	Laurea Magistralis, Economics	

2004 – 2008	**Sabanci University**	Istanbul, Turkey
	BA, Economics, Minor, Mathematics	

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2018 – Present	**Texas Policy Lab, Rice University**	Houston, TX
	Executive Director	

2016 – 2018	**Cornerstone Research**	Washington, D.C.
	Associate	

2015 – 2016	**Rice University**	Houston, TX
	Visiting Lecturer	

2014 – 2015	**University of Pennsylvania**	Philadelphia, PA
	Teaching Mentor	

RESEARCH PAPERS

"Public Investment and Preference Aggregation under Alternative Decentralization Institutions," Working Paper, August 2016.

"The Network Economics of Foreign Aid," with Camilo Garcia-Jimeno, June 2016.

"How many votes does a dollar buy: Campaign Spending and Strategy in U.S. Congressional Elections," with Devin Reilly, December 2015.

"Why do PACs donate: Ideology or Favors?" with Devin Reilly, November 2015.

HONORS

University Fellowship, University of Pennsylvania	2010-2016
Fellow of Collegio Superiore	2008-2010
Visiting Scholar at the Ecole Normale Paris	2010

Paul C. Treacy
treacy@rice.edu

EDUCATION
Ph.D., Public Policy   May 2019
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Royster Society of Fellows, 2014-2019
Current Population Survey Data Workshop, Summer 2018
Best Teaching Assistant 2017 (as voted by students)
- *Dissertation:* Three Essays on the Effects of Employment Policy on Discrimination, Labor Force Participation, and Job Growth
- *Fields of interest:* Applied labor economics, Public finance, Employment policy and regulations

Master of Public Policy   May 2008
McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University, Washington DC

Dean's Fellowship Recipient
Research Assistant, Harry Holzer, Professor and Labor Economist
Research Assistant, B. Lindsay Lowell, Professor and Demographer
- *Master's Thesis:* Selection Issues in Temporary Work Programs: Are Those Who Overstay Their Visas Different Than Those Who Return?

Master of Industrial and Labor Relations   May 1992
School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca NY
Citicorp Fellowship Recipient

B.A., Economics and English Literature   May 1989
Rice University, Houston TX

REFEREED JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Publications
- **Treacy, P.C.**, Jagger, P., Song, C., Zhang, Q., & Bilsborrow, R.E. (2018). Impacts of China's Grain for Green Program on Migration and Household Income. *Environmental Management.*
- **Treacy, P.C.**, & MacKay, D. (2017). Weighing obligations to home care workers and Medicaid recipients. *Nursing Ethics.*

Presentations and Posters
- Southern Economic Association 2019 Annual Meeting. Minimum Wages and Willingness to Work: A New Method of Measuring Labor Supply Elasticity. (Presentation)
- Southern Economic Association 2018 Annual Meeting. Do Employers Discriminate More When Minimum Wages Increase? (Presentation)
- Association for Public Policy Analysis & Management 2018 Annual Meeting. (Poster)

Working papers
- Minimum Wages and Willingness to Work: A New Method of Measuring Labor Supply Elasticity
- Do Employers Discriminate More When Minimum Wages Increase?
- Does Expanding Medicaid Expand Health Care Employment? The Job Growth Effects of 17 Million New Consumers

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Teaching Faculty and Research Associate, Rice University, *Houston TX*   August 2019 to present
Workers' Rights Division, North Carolina Justice Center, *Raliegh NC*   Summer 2017
Wage and Hour Division, U.S. Department of Labor, *Washington DC*   June 2008 – August 2014
Institute for the Study of International Migration, *Washington DC*   January 2008 to June 2008
Hallmark Cards, Inc., *Kansas City MO and Dradford England*   July 1992 – August 2006

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS
Member, Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management
Member, Southern Economic Association

APPENDIX F
Letters of Support

Susan Keech McIntosh, Ph.D.
Dean of the School of Social Sciences (Interim)
Herbert S. Autrey Professor of Anthropology

September 27, 2019

Letter of support for the proposed Master of Social Policy Evaluation

This proposal for a new Master of Social Policy Evaluation program is substantially revised and expanded from the original proposal submitted by former Dean Merlo in spring, 2019. It is now a 13 month, 30 credit program, rather than a 24 month, 39 credit hour program. The curriculum is now tighter, and more coherent, and the teaching faculty are clearly identified. A number of these are adjunct faculty in the Texas Policy Lab; their thumbnail c.v.'s are included in an appendix. Requests by the VP for Finance last spring for clarity regarding a break-even enrollment scenario, tuition rate, and teaching buyouts for MSPE courses have been explicitly addressed in the revised proposal. Syllabi now accompany the descriptions of required new courses. It is now a very strong proposal, in my view.

The objectives of the MSPE degree align with the increasing emphasis on evidence-based policy formulation at both the national level (e.g., the Evidence-Based Policymaking Act signed into law in January 2019) and in Texas. As this movement attracts the interest of more government agencies, the demand for the skills to evaluate policies and assess whether they are effective in meeting their intended goals is growing. The MSPE curriculum is designed to provide the skills to do this work. Integral to the curriculum is the experience of working with Texas Policy Lab (TPL) researchers who have access to data sets from state and local government agencies to assess the efficacy of particular policies and programs. Rice faculty, including Ken Wolpin and Flavio Cunha (Economics) and Margaret Beier (Psychological Sciences) are involved in designing and conducting some of the research projects at the TPL that students will work on during a required summer practicum. We foresee that additional faculty from various Social Science departments will find opportunities to help design TPL projects in their areas of research interest. The School of Social Sciences, in conjunction with the TPL, is expanding their outreach efforts to communicate these opportunities to faculty as they arise.

The link between the MSPE and the TPL is a particularly exciting aspect of the program, providing students with an important experiential learning component. The School of Social Sciences has invested substantially in the creation of the TPL with major funding from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation. Through the required work on a TPL project, MSPE students will gain experience in consulting with government partner organizations, and acquire the tools needed to make an impact on policy decisions. The MSPE training will prepare future leaders to be critical policy evaluators who aim for efficient stewardship of funds through identification of effective policy solutions. Net revenue from the MSPE program is specified in the Arnold Foundation grant to be a source of ongoing funding for the TPL.

The MSPE promises to be an excellent program. The proposal notes that there is a risk that it will not meet enrollment projections of 30 per year by FY2023. However, the break-even point is 10 students, leading me to agree that "the downside risk is small and the upside potential enormous". I am committed to supporting the MSPE program if approved and will do my best to ensure a successful recruitment of the first student cohort and the stability of the program going forward.

Email skmci@rice.edu • Office 713-348-4824 • Rice University School of Social Sciences—MS 27
Sewall Hall • Suite 360 • P. O. Box 1892 • Houston, TX 77251-1892 • socialsciences.rice.edu

Seiichi P. T. Matsuda
Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
E. Dell Butcher Professor of Chemistry
Professor of BioSciences

October 9, 2019

Dr. April DeConick
Isla Carroll and Percy E. Turner Professor of Biblical Studies
Chair, Graduate Council

Dear April,

I support establishing the Master of Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE) degree program at Rice. It has gone through substantial revision and I am convinced that it is an academically sound program that would be useful to a number of students. It is hard to know exactly what the market for this program will be. I think that the projections may be optimistic. If significantly smaller than hoped for, the program should have academic value and be financially viable (although would of course provide less income).

I will state here for the record that the income from this program is not indefinitely committed to support TPL. The grant proposal stated that the degree program proposal would commit funds to TPL, and the degree program proposal states "Net revenue from the MSPE program is specified in the Arnold Foundation grant to be a source of ongoing funding for the TPL." Neither of these statements establishes a long-term commitment of any funds. These statements cannot can preempt the authority of the university to make decisions on any income going forward. In our current approach, the Dean of Social Sciences would govern most of any net income.

Sincerely,

Seiichi P. T. Matsuda
Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

MEMORANDUM

To: Susan Keech McIntosh, Dean of the School of Social Sciences (Interim) and Autrey Professor of Anthropology

FROM: George R. Zodrow, Chair of Economics and Cline Professor of Economics

SUBJECT: Support for Proposal for new Masters in Social Policy Evaluation

DATE: September 2, 2019

To confirm our earlier discussions, I believe the proposed new Masters in Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE) would be an excellent program and would significantly enhance both the division and the university; I support it enthusiastically. Although we have not discussed this program formally at a department meeting, I polled all of the members of the department's Executive Committee and most of our senior faculty and found unanimous support for moving forward expeditiously with the MSPE. In addition, I confirm that the department is willing to provide the resources required to support the program on an on-going basis.

The need for rigorous and systematic evaluation of the relative efficacy of alternative social policies and programs cannot be denied (at least so one would hope). The proposed MSPE would provide its students with both the requisite knowledge and the essential quantitative tools needed to effectively engage in such evidence-based policy evaluation. The existence of similar and successful programs at other top universities indicates that the need for such educational programs has been recognized and demand is strong, while the unique features of the MSPE proposals suggest that it will be highly successful in its own right and thus fulfill the need to sustainably finance the operations of our new Texas Policy Lab.

In particular, I believe that making the MSPE a 13-month program will greatly enhance its appeal to prospective students without sacrificing its intellectual substance; indeed, the outstanding Rice faculty from four different departments who are participating in, and fully committed to, this interdisciplinary enterprise virtually guarantees an academically rigorous yet practically applicable program of the highest quality. As you know, our Masters in Energy Economics is similarly structured and has been quite successful thus far, both in terms of attracting good students and placing them successfully upon graduation. In addition, the explicit link between the MSPE program and the Texas Policy Lab, which includes two of our most prominent researchers, Professors Ken Wolpin and Flávio Cunha, as well as links with other university departments and research centers with equally qualified faculty, will provide prospective students with a unique "in-house" opportunity to apply the program evaluation skills they have attained within the context of the program. These opportunities will similarly enhance the attractiveness of the program and clearly provide it with an important experiential learning component

---

that will encompass a wide variety of "real world" issues in critical areas such as early education policy, health care, labor markets, the criminal justice system, and many others. I am confident that the MSPE will be highly successful in enabling its students to "do well by doing good."

In my view, the curriculum for the MSPE is carefully developed and well-structured. In particular, an essential key to the success of the program is that the quantitative methods course (as well as the applications courses) be sufficiently rigorous and this certainly appears to be the case. The criteria for admission seem reasonable and should result in a high quality pool of potential students. The budget projections and the projected demand analyses are of course subject to uncertainty but seem quite plausible. In particular, the fact that the steady-state break-even point for the program is only ten students suggests that the downside financial risk from the program is limited while the upside potential may well be huge. In addition, I cannot emphasize too strongly how critical it is to put the Texas Policy Lab on a sound financial footing, as I believe it will be one of the most successful innovations at Rice in many years.

To summarize, I enthusiastically support the MSPE proposal and hope that it will be adopted soon. Please feel free to contact me if I you need any additional information.

Eduardo Salas, Ph.D.
Allyn R. & Gladys M. Cline Professor of Psychological Sciences
Chair, Department of Psychological Sciences

September 11, 2019

TO: Graduate Council

FROM: Eduardo Salas, Chair, Department of Psychological Sciences

RE: Letter of Support for the Master of Social Policy Evaluation Program

I am writing to express my full and enthusiastic support for the Master of Social Policy Evaluation proposal. This applied professional master's program promises to equip students with the skills and experience necessary to focus both on quantitative and qualitative analysis in the area of social policy evaluation.

The program has been benchmarked against similar programs at American University's Master of Public Policy, Arizona State University's Master of Public Policy, Georgetown University's Master of Public Policy, New York University's Master of Science in Public Policy, Oxford University and Pepperdine University's Master of Public Policy. Rice's program will go beyond these existing programs to offer students the opportunity to engage with formal modeling, big data, and applied client projects in the Houston Area and in greater Texas (through the Texas Policy Lab). This project-based learning approach will enhance the educational experience at Rice and promises to produce engaged and active professionals in social policy. I have every confidence it will attract top talent in the field of social policy evaluation.

Margaret Beier, Professor in our department, will be the faculty director of the Master of Social Policy Evaluation Program but will not be teaching in the program. After consultation with Margaret, I am in agreement that her participation in this program will put no undue burden on the Department of Psychological Sciences.

In sum, I fully support the proposal to develop this Master of Social Policy Evaluation for advanced students interested in this area. I believe it will be a great success for Rice University and through the students we will train, has the potential to have a great impact on the world around us.

Email: Eduardo.Salas@rice.edu • Office: 713-348-3917 • Fax: 713-348-5221 • http://psychology.rice.edu
Rice University Department of Psychological Sciences - MS 25 | 6100 Main St. | Sewall Hall 429B | Houston, TX 77005

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

August 30, 2019

Graduate Council
Rice University

School of Social Sciences Master of Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE)

To Whom It May Concern:

The Sociology Department supports the creation of a Master's of Social Policy Evaluation in spirit. It promotes engaged, usable research of the sort that our faculty and graduate training embrace and encourage. In isolation, the proposal circulated offers a thoughtful step in that direction, and we appreciate the effort that has gone into drafting its various components. For the foreseeable future, however, we will not be able to offer much in the way of faculty support beyond the one course a year taught by Professor Ruth Lopez Turley. This is true not only for the Master's curriculum but also for related work in the Texas Policy Lab and capstone courses for the new undergraduate major in Social Policy Analysis (SoPA).

The reason is not the program itself, which again we support in spirit, but how it is structured to draw on tenure-track faculty from existing departments in return for piece-rate resources (e.g. for patch lecturers). In larger departments, this strategy is unlikely to present problems because they have more faculty and thus more degrees of freedom to cover essential posts (e.g., Chair, Associate Chair, Graduate Director, and Undergraduate Director) in addition to maintaining a robust set of classes for graduate and undergraduate training. In Sociology, we have a different situation. Compared with the three other primary departments listed in the proposal – Economics, Political Science and Psychological Sciences – Sociology has a tenure-track faculty size of just 52%, 60% and 67%, respectively. That deficit means that we cannot offer the same faculty support without undermining the core functioning of the department, including a relatively new PhD program that is now reaching its full size.

In other words and in short, the proposal works better for other departments than it does for us. This discrepancy is further amplified by two recent and related developments. First, the replacement hire that we had been promised and expected to make this year was denied. Second, administrative approval for future hiring sounds like it may be attached to joint hires supporting other new initiatives on campus. If that proves to be the case, then supporting those commitments would likely take precedent.

Yours sincerely,

James R. Elliott
Chair and Professor of Sociology

RICE

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Ashley Leeds, Chair, Political Science
TO: Susan McIntosh, Dean of Social Sciences
DATE: September 27, 2019
RE: Masters in Social Policy Evaluation

The faculty from the department of political science have had an opportunity to review the proposal for a Masters of Social Policy Evaluation to be offered by the School of Social Sciences. We understand that the proposal provides for Professor Bob Stein to teach one course per year in the program, and that the proposed budget provides for our department to receive $20,000 for each MSPE course that Bob teaches. Professor Stein is excited to teach in the program, and we are happy to support him doing so.

We note that Professor Stein has also been teaching in the undergraduate SOPA program, along with Professor Marschall. We are happy to continue supporting this as well, to our best ability. Of course some years it will be important for Professor Stein to teach graduate courses in political science, so we cannot commit all of his teaching to SOPA and MSPE.

While it is always possible that strategic plans will change over time, our current departmental hiring plan does not involve building in public policy. Were Professor Stein to leave Rice, we cannot guarantee that our department would be able to provide an alternative faculty member to take over the core introductory MSPE course.

Master of Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE) Degree

<mark>Outcomes</mark> | <u>Requirements</u> | <u>Policies</u> | <u>Opportunities</u>

Program Learning Outcomes for the MSPE Degree

Upon completing the MSPE degree students will be able to:
1. Acquire analytical skills that can be applied to a broad range of policy evaluation questions.
2. Design and conduct a program evaluation by constructing a logical model that uses appropriate data sources, data collection methods, and analytical techniques.
3. Assess the social responsibilities of government, non-government organizations, and corporate policies in the 21st century.
4. Communicate statistical findings in a clear and concise narrative that recognizes the positive and negative outcomes of potential policy solutions.

Master of Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE) Degree

<u>Outcomes</u> | **<mark>Requirements</mark>** | <u>Policies</u> | <u>Opportunities</u>

Requirements for the MSPE Degree

The MSPE degree is a non-thesis master's degree. For general university requirements, please see <u>Non-Thesis Master's Degrees</u>. For additional requirements, regulations, and procedures for all graduate programs, please see <u>All Graduate Students</u>. Students pursuing the MSPE degree must complete:

- A minimum of 10 courses (30 credit hours) to satisfy degree requirements.
- A minimum of 30 credit hours of graduate-level study (coursework at the 500-level or above).
- A minimum of 30 credit hours must be taken at Rice University.
- Residency enrollment of full-time graduate study.
- A practicum.
- A minimum overall GPA of 2.67.

The courses listed below satisfy the requirements for this degree program. In certain instances, courses not on this official list may be substituted upon approval of the program's academic advisor, or where applicable, the department or program's Director of Graduate Studies. (Course substitutions must be formally applied and entered into Degree Works by the department or program's <u>Official Certifier</u>.) Students and their academic advisors should identify and clearly document the courses to be taken.

Summary

Total Credit Hours Required for the MSPE Degree	30

Degree Requirements

Core Requirements	
MSPE 501 **(NEW)** Introduction to Public Policy	3
MSPE 502 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Criminal Justice	3
MSPE 503 **(NEW)** Quantitative Methods + Laboratory	5
MSPE 504 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Labor Markets	3
MSPE 505 **(NEW)** Microeconomics for Policy Analysis	3
MSPE 506 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Health	3
MSPE 508 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Early Childhood and Youth Development	3
MSPE 510 **(NEW)** Developing Research-Practice Partnerships	3
MSPE 512 **(NEW)** Laboratory – Coding and Software	1
Practicum	
MSPE 513 **(NEW)** Social Policy Evaluation Practicum I	*3*
MSPE 514 **(NEW)** Social Policy Evaluation Practicum II	*3*
Total Credit Hours	**30**

Students will select four of the Applications courses. Practicum experience is offered in a two-course summer-long intense consulting evaluation (MSPE 509 and MSPE 510, Policy Evaluation Practicum I and II) with the Texas Policy Lab, HERC or other Rice research center clients. Students will be actively engaged in projects to gain real-world, applied experience in areas such as education, health, criminal justice and others. Students summarize their experience in a final paper presented to practicum partners.

Proposed Plan-of-Study

The following plan-of-study represents the current two-semester + Summer sequence in which students pursuing the MSPE degree complete the required coursework. Substitution of courses may be made on a rare, exceptional basis with permission of the program director.

First Semester (Fall)	
MSPE 501 **(NEW)** Introduction to Public Policy	3
MSPE 503 **(NEW)** Quantitative Methods + Laboratory	5
MSPE 505 **(NEW)** Microeconomics for Policy Analysis	3
Credit Hours	***11***
Second Semester (Spring)	
MSPE 502 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Criminal Justice	3
MSPE 504 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Labor Markets	3
MSPE 506 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Health	3
MSPE 508 **(NEW)** Applications of Program Evaluation – Early Childhood and Youth Development	3
MSPE 510 **(NEW)** Developing Research-Practice Partnerships	3
MSPE 512 **(NEW)** Laboratory – Coding and Software	1
Credit Hours	***13***

Third Semester (Summer)	
MSPE 513 **(NEW)** Social Policy Evaluation Practicum I	3
MSPE 514 **(NEW)** Social Policy Evaluation Practicum II	3
Credit Hours	*6*

Students will select four of the Applications courses. Practicum experience is offered in a two-course summer-long intense consulting evaluation (MSPE 513 and MSPE 514), Policy Evaluation Practicum I and II) with the Texas Policy Lab, HERC or other Rice research center clients. Students will be actively engaged in projects to gain real-world, applied experience in areas such as education, health, criminal justice and others. Students summarize their experience in a final paper presented to practicum partners.

Master of Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE) Degree

Outcomes **|** Requirements **|** **Policies** **|** Opportunities

Policies for the MSPE Degree

Department of Social Policy Evaluation Graduate Program Handbook

The General Announcements (GA) is the official Rice curriculum. As an additional resource for students, Social Policy Evaluation publishes a graduate program handbook, which can be found here: {graduate handbook link here}

Enrollment Status Requirements

Students may enroll for the Master of Social Policy Evaluation for full-time enrollment only. University graduation requirements (including the minimum residency requirement for students in graduate degree programs) still apply.

Transfer Credit

For Rice University's policy regarding transfer credit, see Transfer Credit. Some departments and programs have additional restrictions on transfer credit. Students are encouraged to meet with their academic program's advisor when considering transfer credit possibilities.

Departmental Transfer Credit Guidelines

Students pursuing the MSPE degree in the field of Social Policy Evaluation should be aware of the following departmental transfer credit guidelines:

- No more than 2 courses (6 credit hours) of transfer credit from U.S. or international universities of similar standing as Rice may apply towards the degree.
- Requests for transfer credit will be considered by the program director (and/or the program's official transfer credit advisor) on an individual case-by-case basis.

Additional Information

For additional information, please see the Social Policy Evaluation website: {MSPE link here}

Master of Social Policy Evaluation (MSPE) Degree
Outcomes **|** Requirements **|** Policies **|** Opportunities

Opportunities for the MSPE Degree

Additional Information

For additional information, please see the Social Policy Evaluation website: {MSPE link here}