

PA5490: Topics in Social Policy: Identity and Public Policy

Spring 2013

TTh 4 – 5:15 p.m.

Room 60 Humphrey Center

Debra Fitzpatrick

257 Humphrey Center

612-625-7176

Email: dfitzpatrick@umn.edu

Office Hours: Wednesdays 3-4 p.m.

Course Description:

Multiple and intersecting identity categories (gender and gender expression, race/ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, immigration status and many others) continue to play an important role in public policy. This course will examine: (1) how a policymaker's own identity can be both a resource and a barrier in the policymaking process; (2) how policymakers (and the policies they create) are an important component in the ongoing, negotiated construction of identity categories; (3) how assigned, assumed, performed identity results in differential participation in policymaking processes; and (4) how an intersectional analysis of identity reveals disparate treatment and outcomes for subgroups of people in various policy arenas. These areas of inquiry will be examined using feminist legal and economic theory and queer theory frameworks. Thirteen faculty members from the Humphrey School, as well as Political Science, Education and Human Development, Law, Psychology and other disciplines, participate in the course with each teaching a section on the intersecting identity dimensions of their scholarship.

Course Objectives:

After completing the course, students should be able to:

- summarize the role of identity in a wide range of public policy contexts;
- understand the role policymakers play in identity construction;
- compare and contrast the framing of problems and solutions across contexts using gender, intersectional, and poststructural or discourse analysis;
- investigate, construct and generate a gender, intersectional or post-structural/discourse analysis of a specific area of policy;
- make connections with faculty that bring an intersectional or post-structural/discourse analysis to their substantive areas of expertise.

Course structure:

Most weeks, the Tuesday and Thursday sessions will be taught by the same faculty member. Visiting faculty members will leave for the last 15 minutes of our Thursday sessions when we will consolidate our learning for the week and connect to prior sessions.

Students are expected to attend class regularly.

To encourage timely reading of the articles and to ensure that you think about what you are reading, a very short **reaction paper** for each set of readings will be due by Monday at 5 p.m. You will post reaction papers on the class Moodle website. You are expected to read the reactions posted by your classmates *before* class on Tuesday. Reaction papers will be required for Weeks 2-7 and 10-13, except that each student may choose two other weeks in which she/he will not turn in reaction papers. Thus, you will write 8 reaction papers

One **longer paper, a intersectional or critical discourse analysis** will be due: a topic proposal is due in the 3rd week of class (class discussion February 14); a rough draft is due to peer reviewers by Monday, March 26; and the final paper is due Friday, April 26th by 5 p.m. Your paper must be fairly concise: no more than 15 pages of text plus a one-page executive summary. The bibliography and tables, graphs and figures will not be counted as part of the 15 pages. You are encouraged to include graphs and figures that clarify your points. The paper must be double-spaced type or at least space-and-a-half type and the font size should be a minimum of 12 point. It should have page numbers.

Lateness at any of the deadlines will be penalized. Content, structure, grammar, and spelling are taken into account in the paper's grading. Any final paper with a substantial number of grammatical problems will receive a grade no higher than a B, no matter how good the content. If in doubt, ask a friend to proof-read your paper. Your paper should end up being good enough to show to a potential employer or, for HHH students, to use as part of a Professional Paper.

A process of peer reviewing will be used to improve your final papers and facilitate the paper-writing process. Students will comment on other students' proposed paper topics and drafts. Timely participation in this process is expected and will be graded. A hand-out will describe expectations for the peer review process.

Each student will **present a brief summary of their analysis** to the class during the last week of the course.

A **final test** will cover the foundational texts *and* applications from faculty member topic area.

Grading:

Reactions should be posted to the Web before class time on the due date. Reaction papers not turned in will be given zeros. These will be graded with a check or check plus.

The test, the paper and peer reviews will receive letter grades based on the following scale:

A 4.00 94-100 Represents achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements.

A- 3.67 90-93

B+ 3.33 87-89

B 3.00 84-86 Represents achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements.

B- 2.67 80-83

C+ 2.33 77-79

C 2.00 74-76 Represents achievement that meets course requirements.

C- 1.67 70-73

D+ 1.33 67-69

D 1.00 64-66 Represents achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails to meet fully the course requirements.

Class participation— being there, being on-time, and being an alert participant in class—will be rewarded.

These weights in percentages are approximate:

1. Posted reactions on weekly readings (15%)
2. Peer Review of Gender Analysis (15%)
3. Paper and Presentation (30%)
4. Participation (15%)
5. Final Exam (25%)

Required Text Books/Materials

Covering

Black Feminist Politics from Kennedy to Obama

Gender Theory Queer Theory

Urban Black Women and the Politics of Resistance (The Politics of Intersectionality)

Diversity and Class Norms

In this class we will be discussing a number of controversial and sensitive topics. The purpose of the discussions is to examine and evaluate a wide range of viewpoints. In order to maintain a positive learning environment both the students and the instructor are expected to adhere to the following norms:

- Respectful dialogue. You will be encouraged to enter into debates that challenge facts, ideas and underlying assumptions in a respectful manner, without engaging in personal criticism.
- Everyone is expected to participate in class discussions; it is the instructor's role to insure that everyone's voice is heard. Please assist me by encouraging your quieter

classmates to participate, and helping to avoid domination of the conversation by a few.

- Please do not assume that a student's race, ethnicity, gender or gender expression, sexual orientation or other aspects of identity defines his or her position on topics explored in the class, or requires that he or she automatically serve as a spokesperson. Matters of identity can be deeply personal. Decisions to voice personal comments and experiences regarding the topics that we discuss should be the result of personal choice, not obligation.
- Some of the readings and a/v materials that we will be discussing may include offensive statements or assumptions about people within identity categories. It is important for students to recognize that these materials are included because they form an important part of contemporary political discourse about identity. It is our role as public policy professionals to examine the underlying assumptions and other elements of social/identity category construction within the public policy arena.

Electronics in class

You may use your laptop computer in class for note-taking or (rarely) looking up answers to questions that come up in class. You may not use it for checking email or Facebook or anything else. It's very tempting – and also very rude, not to mention detrimental to your education. First offenders are asked to turn off the computer for the class. Second offenders are required to keep computers put away for the rest of the semester. Similarly, **cell phones and Blackberries** and the like may be kept on and visible by people with small children or similar responsibilities (but tell the instructor); everyone else is expected to keep their electronics out of sight and out of hearing.

Incompletes:

Incompletes are rarely given. I have designed the course so that you can complete the work during the semester. Documented family crises or medical emergencies may result in you needing to negotiate an incomplete. In that case, the Humphrey Institute's policy on incompletes will be followed. First, I only grant incompletes or make-up exams if you have requested them in advance. Second, by finals week you must have submitted in writing a description of what work remains to be done and the date by which you will have completed the work — use the HHH form for incompletes. Failure to submit the work in that time will result in a 0 for that assignment, and may lead to a failing grade for the course. I do not allow students to submit additional work for extra credit.

Mental Health:

As a student you may experience a range of issues that can cause barriers to learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may lead to diminished academic performance or reduce a student's ability to participate in daily activities. University of Minnesota services are available to assist you with addressing these and

other concerns you may be experiencing. You can learn more about the broad range of confidential mental health services available on campus via the Student Mental Health Website at <http://www.mentalhealth.umn.edu>

Disabilities:

It is University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities that may affect their ability to participate in course activities or to meet course requirements. Students with disabilities are encouraged to contact the instructor early in the semester to discuss their individual needs for accommodations.

Other Resources for Success:

Center for Writing's Student Writing Support.

Student Writing Support provides free writing instruction for all University of Minnesota students - graduate and undergraduate - at all stages of the writing process. They help students develop productive writing habits and revision strategies via in-person consultations. See <http://writing.umn.edu/sws/index.htm> .

Guidelines and suggestions for reaction papers:

- _ Refer to readings by the last name of the first author.
- _ For full credit, mention each reading.
- _ Be brief! Three sentences per reading should be plenty. In this case, longer does not necessarily mean better.
- _ Comments on the different readings do not need to be separated into different paragraphs; if you want to make a comparison that is fine.
- _ DO NOT SUMMARIZE the readings. I've read them too!
- _ It is acceptable (but not necessary) to discuss current events or personal experiences to illustrate a point.
- _ Part of your reaction may be a response to previously posted reactions of your classmates, as long as what you write also reflects your own perspective on the readings.

Suggestions for the paper:

- _ A variety of analytical frameworks are used in this course to advance our understanding of identity in the public policy arena. You may compare two approaches, but it may be easier to focus your paper if you structure your paper around one framework.
- _ Pick a topic in which you are really interested.
- _ If the topic is big, focus on a very small part of it. I can help you narrow it down.
- _ The deadlines are for your benefit, not mine. The more opportunities you have to get input on your paper and to revise it, the better it will be.

WEEKLY TOPICS AND ASSIGNMENTS

WEEK ONE – Introduction to each other, the course and to Feminist Legal Theory, Queer Theory and Allied Movements with Debra Fitzpatrick

Tuesday, January 22 and Thursday, January 24

Readings:

Chamallas, Martha (2003). *Introduction to Feminist Legal Theory*. Chapters 1 (Thinking Like a Feminist), 2 (Three Stages of Feminist Legal Theory), 5 (The Diversity Stage – 1990's and Beyond) and 6 (Allied Intellectual Movements – Critical Race Theory and Gay and Lesbian Studies)

(Skim for common framings if you have a background in feminist theory)

Kenney, Sally J. (2012) *gender & JUSTICE: Why Women in the Judiciary Really Matter*. Chapter 1 (Gender as a Social Process)

Wilchins, Riki. (2004) *Queer Theory Gender Theory*. Chapters 4 (Derrida and the Politics of Meaning), 6 (Foucault and the Disciplinary Society) and 9 (Postmodernism and Its Discontents), 10 (Race-Critical Thought and Postmodernism's "Second Wave") and 11 (Butler and the Problem of Identity).

Allan, Elizabeth, Iverson, Susan, & Ropers-Huilman, Rebecca. (Eds.) (2010). Chapter 2: "Feminist Poststructuralism Meets Policy Analysis," *Reconstructing Policy in Higher Education: Feminist Poststructural Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Schneider, Anne & Ingram, Helen (1993). "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (June 1993), 334-347

WEEK TWO – Covering and Sexual Orientation: Debra Fitzpatrick

Tuesday, January 29 and Thursday, January 31

In Class Viewing: Interview with Kenji Yoshino

Required Readings:

Covering, Yoshino, Kenji, 2007. Random House. (Pages 74-196: Gay Covering, Racial Covering, Sex-based Covering, The End of Civil Rights, The New Civil Rights)

"Silence of the Lambs," Onwuachi-Willig, Angela in *Presumed Incompetent: Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. 2011

WEEK THREE – Black Feminist Theory and Politics: Duchess Harris (Macalester College)

Tuesday, February 5 and Thursday, February 7

Readings:

Black Feminist Politics from Kennedy to Obama by Duchess Harris

WEEK FOUR – Intersectionality: Dara Strolovitch

Tuesday, February 12

Readings:

Strolovitch, Dara Z. (2007). *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*. Chapters 1, 2, 4 & 7

Thursday, February 14

Assignment: brainstorm five possible paper topics

WEEK FIVE – Feminist Economics and Data Collection: Deborah Levison

Tuesday, February 19 and Thursday, February 21

Readings:

If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics by Marilyn Waring. Prologue, Chapter 1 (A Woman's Reckoning: An Introduction to the International Economic System); Chapter 3 (Boundary of Conception: How the UNSNA Makes Women Invisible); Chapter 4 selected pages (Nothing Sexist Here: Statisticians in Action); and Chapter 5 selected pages (The Statistical Conspiracy: Sources for the National Accounts)

WEEK SIX – Hip Hop and Queer Black Politics: Zenzele Isoke

Tuesday, February 26 and Thursday, February 28

Readings:

Isoke, Zenzele. 2013 *Urban Black Women and the Politics of Resistance (The Politics of Intersectionality)*, Palgrave Macmillan.

WEEK SEVEN – Migration: Kathy Fennelly

Tuesday, March 5 and Thursday, March 7

Readings:

Mireya Navarro, "The Most Private of Makeovers."

"'What about Female Genital Mutilation' and Why Understanding Culture in the First Place Matters" in "Engaging Cultural Differences: The Multicultural Challenge in Liberal Democracies." R. Schweder, M. Minow, & H. Markus, Eds (2002). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press

"Do They Hear You When You Cry" Part 1, 2 and 3, Fauziya Kassindja

View in class:

Chasing Freedom

WEEK EIGHT – Pay Equity and Mid-course Review: Debra Fitzpatrick

Tuesday, March 12

Readings:

Chamallas; Chapter 7 "Applied Feminist Legal Scholarship – Economic Subordination of Women"

Lo Sasso A.T, et. al. "The \$16,819 Pay Gap for Newly Trained Physicians: The Unexplained Trend of Men Earning More Than Women," *Health Affairs* 30. No 2 (2011) 193-201

Mass-Racusin, Corrine A., et al. "Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, October 9, 2012, vol. 109, no. 41 .

Barres, B. "Does Gender Matter," *Nature* 442: 133-136 (2006)

Carter, Nancy M. and Christine Silva THE MYTH OF THE IDEAL WORKER: DOES DOING ALL THE RIGHT THINGS REALLY GET WOMEN AHEAD? *Catalyst*, 2011.

Thursday, March 14

Mid-course review and discussion

SPRING BREAK

WEEK NINE – Peer Review of Papers

Monday, March 25 Paper draft due to reviewers

Tuesday, March 26 and Thursday, March 28

Paper Peer Review Sessions in Small Groups

WEEK TEN-- Gender in Education: National and International Issues: Fran Vavrus and Rebecca Ropers-Huilman

Tuesday, April 2 and Thursday, April 4

Readings:

Ropers-Huilman, Rebecca, & Winters, Kelly. (2011). "Feminist methodology in higher education." *Journal of Higher Education*, 82 (6): 667-690.

Dancy, T.E (2011). "Colleges in the Making of Manhood and Masculinity: Gendered Perspectives on African American Males." *Gender and Education*, 23 (4), July 2011, 477-495.

Vavrus, Frances & Seghers, Maud (2010). "Critical Discourse Analysis in Comparative Education: A Discursive Study of "Partnership" in Tanzania's Poverty Reduction Policies," *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 54, no. 1.

Vavrus, Frances (2005). "Adjusting Inequality: Education and Structural Adjustment Policies in Tanzania." *Harvard Educational Review*; Summer 2005; 75, 2; Research Library pg. 174

WEEK ELEVEN – Domestic and International Care-giving: Greta Friedemann-Sanchez

Tuesday, April 9

Readings:

Benería, Lourdes (2008) "The crisis of care, international migration, and public policy." *Feminist Economics*, 14(3), 1-21.

View in class:

Movie *Chain of Love*

Thursday, April 11

Readings:

The 10/66 Dementia Research Group. 2004. "Care Arrangements for People with Dementia in Developing Countries." *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 19: 170–177.

Vo, Phoung H., Kate Penrose, and Jody Heymann. 2007. "Working to Exit Poverty while Caring for Children's Health and Development in Vietnam." *Community, Work and Family* 10(2): 179–199.

Folbre, Nancy 1994. *Who Pays for the Kids?* London: Routledge. Chapter 7

WEEK TWELVE – Social Cognition and Implicit Bias: Eugene Borgida

Tuesday, April 16 and Thursday, April 18

Assignment:

Take the Harvard Implicit Association Tests for Gender-Science, Sexuality, and Gender-Career at <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/demo/>

Print out or write down your results and bring them to class (for reference, no one will be required to share).

Required Readings:

David Faigman, Nilanjan Daguja and Cecilia Ridgeway. "A Matter of Fit: The Law of Discrimination and the Science of Implicit Bias," *Hastings Law Journal*. Vol. 59: 1389-1434)

Susan T. Fiske and Eugene Borgida. "Providing Expert Knowledge in an Adversarial Context: Social Cognitive Science in Employment Discrimination Cases," *Annu. Rev. Law Soc. Sci.* 2008: 4:123-148

Eden King, et. al. "Discrimination in the 21st Century: Are Science and the Law Aligned?" *Psychology, Public Policy and Law* 2011, Vol 17, No 1, 54-75

Williams, J.C., & Bornstein, S. (2008). The evolution of "FRED": Family responsibilities discrimination and developments in the law of stereotyping and implicit bias. *Hastings Law Journal*, 59, 1311-1358.

Recommended Readings:

Kristin A Lane, Jerry Kang and Mahzarin Banaji. "Implicit Social Cognition and Law," *Ann. Rev. Law. Soc. Sci.* 2007 3:427-451.

Anthony Greenwald and Linda Hamilton Krieger. "Implicit Bias: Scientific Foundations," *California Law Review*, July 2006, Vol 94, No 4: 945-967.

WEEK THIRTEEN – Neighborhood Development and Sex Trading: Lauren Martin

Tuesday April 23 and Thursday, April 25

Required Readings:

Martin, Lauren. "The Prostitution Project: Community-Based Research on Sex Trading in North Minneapolis," *CURA REPORTER*, Fall/Winter 2010.

Penfold, C., G. Hunter, et al. (2004). "Tackling Client Violence in Female Street Prostitution: Inter-agency Working between Outreach Agencies and the Police." *Policing & Society* 14(4): 365-379.

Romero-Daza, N., M. Weeks, et al. (2003). "'Nobody Gives a Damn if I Live or Die': Violence, Drugs, AND Street-Level Prostitution in Inner-City Hartford, Connecticut." *Medical Anthropology* 22(3): 233 - 259.

Rosen, E. and S. A. Venkatesh (2008). "A "perversion" of choice - Sex work offers just enough in Chicago's urban ghetto." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 37(4): 417-441.

Weitzer, R. (2009). "Sociology of Sex Work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35(1): 213-234.

WEEK FOURTEEN – Political Leadership

Tuesday, April 30

Readings:

Lawless, Jennifer L., and Richard L. Fox. 2008. "Why Are Women Still Not Running for Public Office?" *Issues in Governance Studies*, Number 16, May 2008

Gerrity, Jessica C., Tracy Osborn, and Jeanette Morehouse Mendez. 2007. "Women and Representation: A Different View of the District?" *Politics & Gender* 3: 179–200.

Carroll, Susan, Ed. 2001. *The Impact of Women in Public Office*. Indiana University Press. Intro, Chapter 1 "Representing Women" and Chapter 4 "Local Elected Women and Policymaking."

Lien, Pei-te, et. al. "Expanding Categorization at the Intersection of Race and Gender: "Women of Color: as a Political Category for African American, Latina, Asian American and American Indian Women." Paper presentation at the Annual American Political Science Association meeting, 2008.

Pinderhughes, Diane. et. al. "How Do We Get Along? Linked Fate, Political Allies, and Issue Coalitions." Paper presentation at the Annual American Political Science Association meeting, 2009.

Wednesday, May 1 5 p.m. final paper due

Thursday, May 2

Student Presentations

WEEK FIFTEEN – Student Presentations

Tuesday, May 7 and Thursday, May 9

Student Presentations