PPPA 6001 Introduction to Public Administration & Public Service

Course Number: PPPA 6001.12  Semester: Fall 2015
Tuesdays 6:10-8:00,
Saturday, September 26, 8:30-2:00

Instructor: Dr. Lori Brainard
MPA Bldg. Room 601J
brainard@gwu.edu
Office Hours:
Mondays 4:00-6:00 p.m. by appointment
Tuesdays 4:00-6:00 p.m. by appointment
Please schedule appointments at:
https://brainard.youcanbook.me/

“...theory is best considered as a format for working out an understanding of a situation. Second, theory should function to provide a frame for viewing situations” (O.C. McSwite, 2001).

“Pioneer work is the work that thrills us all—it is more interesting to make the path than to walk in it” (Mary Follett, 1913).

Course Description
PPPA 6001 is the first MPA core course and provides a foundation for the program. This course connects to PPPA 6004 and Capstone, creating an integrating element throughout the MPA program. All three courses emphasize practical reasoning skills as they introduce particular frames (theory, history, and practice of public administration and management), applications, and a context for independent and collaborative learning.

We will examine the evolution of ideas and practice related to public administration and public service. Students will enhance their appreciation for what we may take for granted about “reality,” through critical thinking and a constant questioning of assumptions. As is often said, “We don’t know what we don’t know.” This course will provide frames of reference to help us seek out what we may not know, and to question what we think we know.
All of this is in the context of events currently unfolding in public administration practice.

This exploration will take place in a broader context that joins personal reflection with community building and the recognition that public administration is not an individual endeavor. Together, this intellectual exploration, personal reflection, and group experience create the foundation for the remainder of the MPA program and, we hope, for a lifetime of reflective action and effective practical reasoning as a public administrator.

Course Objectives
A public administrator is more than a technician. S/he must be skilled in holistic perception and responsive adaptation while continuously balancing competing interests and values. There is no blueprint for this behavior as each situation one encounters is uniquely comprised, in part, of one’s own cognitive biases (both conscious and unconscious), values, preferences, experience, aspirations, and associated skillset.

The aim of this course is to expand students’ explicit knowledge and skills related to public administration and at the same time reveal instinctual responses based on tacit knowledge and cognitive biases.

This course serves as a core socialization experience into our MPA program, into the discipline of public administration, and into the personal choice of living a public service life. It is both intellectual and personal. You are expected to develop a sense of American public administration’s history, traditions, controversies, and challenges; and to think seriously about how you situate yourself within that context—that is, about your choice of public administration, and your connection to public service. The course will develop your skills and capacities for practical reasoning, professional writing, and critical thinking.

Student Learning Outcomes
Through course discussions, readings, case applications, and independent reflection and shared deliberation, students will:

- Develop practical reasoning skills informed by history, theories, institutional contexts, and enduring debates in and inherent tensions of American public administration and management.
- Assess the meaning of public administration and public service as a professional field of study and practice.
- Identify their own preferences and personal styles and situate themselves within the identity of a public administrator.
• Understand and analyze major controversies and issues facing the field.
• Participate in and benefit from a supportive and developmental community of public administrators within the MPA program.
• Think critically about theory and contemporary practice.
• Write as a manager/leader, succinctly making and supporting arguments.
• Professionally provide and receive feedback.

Course Process
The course will be organized around a variety of learning formats. It will include lectures, discussions, case applications, a group presentation, and feedback and peer review. There is a large quantity of reading in this course; you should plan for approximately 50-150 pages of reading each week. There are also team-based and individual written assignments. You will need to budget your time carefully.

The Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration has a set of formal policies concerning attendance, written work, and incompletes. It is the responsibility of the student to make sure that he or she understands these and acts accordingly. Without prior approval, late work cannot be accepted for full credit. Grades will be discounted by one half grade (e.g., A becomes A-, A- becomes B+, etc.) for every three days (or portion thereof) that assignments are late. I do not change grades except in cases of mathematical error. If you wish to contest a grade a student must submit a brief, professional memo stating the grade they believe is merited and justifying the case for a changed grade with examples from her/his work and referencing professor feedback.

Course Requirements
There are many moving parts to this course. Please read the syllabus carefully (several times). Please note due dates on your calendar, and/or whichever workflow system you use.

In addition to weekly readings and class discussions, there are several other components, both team-based and individual and both written and oral.

Team Component—45% of grade
The Team Component consists of
• 3 team papers applying practical reasoning to case examples; 30% of final grade (10% each)
• 1 peer review of another team’s work; 7.5% of final grade
• Team presentation of reading 7.5%
• team process feedback and reflection; ungraded
• 2 feedback memos to your teammates; ungraded

Teams will compose three short papers applying course concepts to case examples. Each of these will be reviewed by the professor; one will be reviewed by a peer team (also in the bulleted list above). Students will be expected to revise the papers accordingly. Final versions are due as part of the team portfolio at the end of the semester.

The first team paper will be reviewed by the professor, applying the attached assessment matrix. Teams will be expected to use the feedback both to rewrite the first paper and to inform their writing of the subsequent team papers. The second team paper will be assessed through peer review using the assessment matrix. The reviews you provide your peers constitute part of the team grade. They will be assessed according to their timeliness and demonstrated care in applying the assessment matrix and providing helpful guidance.

The peer-review/feedback component is designed to reinforce good professional writing skills. All teams will be required to rewrite assignments at least once; many will rewrite twice before final submission.

A detailed description of the assignments (both the team papers and the peer review) follows at the end of the syllabus.

Please note: As with all writing, both old and new issues may emerge on new drafts of papers that were not evident in previous drafts. New versions often make apparent problems that existed in earlier drafts but may not have been apparent. The professor will identify these and students will be expected to correct accordingly.

Resources to support the teamwork are available on Blackboard. They include a narrated PowerPoint presentation and associated handouts on Teams and Team Building, guidance for crafting team agreements, and resources/guidance on providing feedback.

We will have one in-class team working session (October 13). This class is mandatory and reserved for: Feedback meetings and preparation for your team presentations.

Individual Component—45% of grade
The Individual component consists of:
• final analytical paper; 35% of final grade
• two reflective essays; 10% of final grade

For the analytical paper, you are required to read *Solution Revolution* by Eggers and MacMillan. Please deliberate on the changes described in the book and their implications for the future. All papers should encompass ideas from at least two sessions from the syllabus. The assignment is described in more detail at the end of the syllabus.

Reflective essays focus on self-awareness and self-assessment to inform effective practical reasoning, interpersonal relationships, and professional behavior as a public administrator. The first reflection is intended to reflect on the student's perceived Myers-Briggs Type and identify implications for the student as a public administrator. The final reflection addresses the overall course experience, including the content related to the public administration profession and where the student sees him/herself within this profession, the team experience, related feedback, and implications for professional growth.

The same writing style and structure is expected for the individual papers, and I will use the same assessment matrix for grading it.

**Class Participation**
Class participation is a prerequisite for several of our learning objectives, both for you to learn and for others to do so. You are expected to attend all class meetings, including our Saturday session and to engage in our discussions.

Class participation 10% of final grade

**Practitioner Speaker Series & Career Forum**
This is a series of guest speakers during class time. To introduce students to the variety of sectors operating in the public service, and to inform your thinking about your role and place in public administration, the course includes a practitioner speaker series. The series is integrated into the course schedule and does not require additional reading or time outside of class. To supplement this exposure and reflection on where you see yourself in public service, students are strongly encouraged to enroll in PPPA 6097 Career Forum. This is a no-credit, no additional cost course and meets Fridays, 3:30-6:00 p.m.

The purpose of the PPPA 6001 Practitioner Speaker Series is pedagogical and part of required class time. These are not recruitment talks, nor do they address any one specific organization (including the speakers' employers).
Rather, invited speakers are asked to talk about what careers in their sector look like generally. For each session, 20 minutes are reserved at the end of class. For those speakers and students who may be interested, once formal class time has ended, the conversation can continue and become more specific to a speaker's organization.

**Letter grading is based on a four point scale as follows:**

**3.7-4.0 A:** Excellent and exceptional work for a graduate student. Work at this level is unusually thorough, well-reasoned, creative, methodologically sophisticated, and well written. Work is of exceptional professional quality.

**3.6-3.7 A-:** Very Good: Very strong work for a graduate student. Shows signs of creativity and a strong understanding of appropriate analytical approaches, is thorough and well-reasoned, and meets professional standards.

**3.3-3.6 B+:** Good: Sound work for a graduate student; well-reasoned and thorough, without serious analytical shortcomings. This grade indicates the student has fully accomplished the basic objectives of this graduate course.

**3.0-3.3 B:** Adequate: Competent work for a graduate student with some evident weaknesses. Demonstrates competency in the key course objectives but the understanding or application of some important issues is less than complete.

**2.7-3.0 B-:** Borderline: Weak work for a graduate student but meets minimal expectations in the course. Understanding of key issues is incomplete. (A B- average in all courses is not sufficient to sustain graduate status in good standing.)

**2.3-2.6 C+:** Deficient: Inadequate work for a graduate student; rarely meets minimal expectations for the course. Work is poorly developed or flawed by numerous errors and misunderstandings of important issues.

**2.0-2.3 C:** Deficient – see above

**1.7-2.0 C-:** Deficient – see above

**Less than 1.7 F:** Unacceptable: Work fails to meet minimal expectations or course credit for a graduate student. Performance has consistently failed to meet minimum course requirements. Weaknesses and limitations are pervasive.

**Required Materials**

Shafritz, Jay M., and Albert C. Hyde, eds. *Classics of Public Administration*. Seventh Edition. Cengage Learning, 2011. (If you want to purchase an earlier edition, be sure to check it before purchasing to ensure it includes the required reading for the course.)

Additional required readings are available on Blackboard.

**Class Schedule**

**9/1: What We Think About When We Think About Public Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
<th>Reading/Viewing</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| * Q&A about class syllabus                      | Complete and score Myers-Briggs Type Inventory no later than today, 9/1. When completing the online assessment, be sure to correctly indicate which section you are in (e.g. Brainard, evening, 12) as there are 3 sections taking this inventory. To complete the assessment, go to [http://online.cpp.com](http://online.cpp.com) Username: tspppa Password: tspppa805 UserID: Leave this blank. You need to write down your ID number after you finish the assessment. | *Brinkerhoff, Derick W. and Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff. “Preparing for Public Service Careers: The Service Choice Spiral.” PA Times, Vol. 27, No. 6 (June 2004).  
*Complete first team meeting agenda. Due not later than 9/15. |
Please do not submit multiple assessments; only one will be scored for each of you.

### 9/8: Practical Reasoning & Thinking Critically about Public Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Writing Handouts/exercises: Will the real argument please stand up? What exactly is a “road map”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Shafritz &amp; Hyde, chapter by Lindblom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9/15: Context: Why We Have the Public Administration We Have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Homework:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
9/22: History of the Field: Accountability to Public Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Class discussion</td>
<td>* Team Paper #1 Babcock</td>
<td>*McSwite, O.C. “The Framing of the Issue,” Chapter 2. Legitimacy</td>
<td>Team Paper #2 on Rural Democracy, due by class time 10/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Shafritz &amp; Hyde, chapters by Wilson, Goodnow, Gulick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/26: SATURDAY: Self-Awareness and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator 8:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m., Funger 103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture and exercises on</td>
<td>MBTI Memo/Reflection Assignment: Please confirm and reflect on your MBTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the MBTI</td>
<td>results, according to your validation following our class discussion, exercises, and homework. Based on these results, what do you see as your primary strengths and potential weaknesses as a public servant? <strong>Due by 5pm, 10/9.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/29: History of the Field: An Alternative View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion of readings**

- *J. Addams, “Problems of Municipal Administration (1904) in Classics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Instruction for feedback memos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Brenée Brown: <a href="http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/exhaustion-is-not-a-status-symbol/2012/10/02/19d27aa8-0cba-11e2-bb5e-492c0d30bff6_story.html">http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/exhaustion-is-not-a-status-symbol/2012/10/02/19d27aa8-0cba-11e2-bb5e-492c0d30bff6_story.html</a></em></td>
<td>Midterm feedback memos to teammates due 10/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10/6: Communicating: Peer Review, Feedback and Presentations**

**Handouts**


**Guidance on Feedback Memos available on Blackboard**

**Comment [LB1]:** Additional Resources:

- Center for Nonviolent Communication webpage on Nonviolent Communication Language: [http://www.cnvc.org/nvc.htm](http://www.cnvc.org/nvc.htm)
October 7 PEER REVIEW DUE TO PEER TEAM by 5:00 PM.

October 9 Reflection #1 on MBTI DUE by 5:00 PM

October 11 Mid-term Feedback Memos to teammates due by 5pm.

10/13: Mandatory Team Working Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Feedback meetings</td>
<td>Team Paper #2 on Rural Democracy Revised according to peer feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Preparation of Team Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10/20: The Nature of the Public Interest

Practitioner Speaker Series Tonight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Class exercise: Following the 2013 Supreme Court decision invalidating section 4, should Congress amend the Voting Rights Act?</td>
<td>Read pages 1029-1033, 1040-1041 (General Discussion).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shafritz &amp; Hyde, chapters by Simon and Waldo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [AP2]: For Further Reading If Interested:
- Peruse the website: http://www.civilpolitics.org/
## 10/27: Thinking Critically about Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Discussion of reading</td>
<td>Team Paper #3</td>
<td>Shafritz &amp; Hyde, chapters by Weber, Follett, and Barnard</td>
<td>Prepare class lecture/presentation on assigned reading for 11/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*In-class team exercise:</td>
<td>Voting Rights Act or Sexual Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming the Bureau of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [LB3]:** For Further Reading on This Topic:
- Watch "Taylorism on ABC World Report": [Link](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sfP31lvAe9I)

## 11/3: Thinking Critically about Human Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Handout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Discussion of reading and</td>
<td>Lecture/Presentation on Assigned Readings</td>
<td>Shafritz &amp; Hyde, chapters by Maslow, and McGregor—Groups 1 and 2</td>
<td>*Handout: Pfeffer’s Five Models of Social Behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>models of social behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Apply ideas from readings to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Perry, James L., Trent A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay, Empirical Research, and the Perils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Persistence.&quot; Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boardman, Craig, Barry Bozeman,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Branco Ponomariov. &quot;Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


11/10: Ethics and Administrative Responsibility

Practitioner Speaker Series: Government Sector

Comment [LB4]: For Further Reading On This Topic:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
*Shafritz & Hyde, chapters by Frederickson and Stivers* | Final Feedback Memos to teammates due 11/17 |

**11/17: Public Administration and Democracy**

**Practitioner Speaker Series: Private Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11/24: Into the Future-- The Solution Revolution: Opportunities and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Feedback forms</td>
<td>Final Reflection: What does public service mean to you? What role do you see yourself playing in public service? How will you measure your success? What did you learn from your team experience and feedback and what might you do differently in other courses in this program and as a public servant? This final assignment should be approximately five pages. Due by 5pm.</td>
<td>Eggers and MacMillan, Solution Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Analytical Essay. Due today. However, you may wish to revise your paper after you hear the guest speaker tonight. If you wish to do so the paper is due December 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guest Speaker:**

**Brooks Rainwater (MPA)**

Director, City Solutions and Applied Research

Responsible for leading NLC's research efforts and strengthening the capacity of municipal leaders to create strong local economies, safe and vibrant neighborhoods, world-class infrastructure and a sustainable environment.

Brooks Rainwater previously served as the director of public policy at the American Institute of Architects, where he developed the organization's research and public policy agenda focused on design-centered policy at the intersection of cities, sustainability and health. He also led the American Institute of Architects/Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for Advanced Urbanism’s Health and Urbanism initiative promoting public health in the built environment.
12/1: TBD
Due to our Saturday session, our last class meeting can be on November 24, subject to discretion of the professor.
Policies in Public Administration and Public Policy Courses

1. Incompletes: A student must consult with the instructor to obtain a grade of I (incomplete) no later than the last day of classes in a semester. At that time, the student and instructor will both sign the CCAS contract for incompletes and submit a copy to the School Director. Please consult the SPPPA Student Handbook or visit home.gwu.edu/~moses/Incompletes.doc for the complete CCAS policy on incompletes.

2. Submission of Written Work Products Outside of the Classroom: It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that an instructor receives each written assignment. Students can submit written work electronically only with the express permission of the instructor.

3. Submission of Written Work Products after Due Date: Policy on Late Work: All work must be turned in by the assigned due date in order to receive full credit for that assignment, unless an exception is expressly made by the instructor. [Note: Professor Brainard's policy is that without prior approval, late work is reduced by one-half grade for every three days (or parts thereof) that it is late].

4. Academic Honesty: Please consult the "policies" section of the GW student handbook for the university code of academic integrity. Note especially the definition of plagiarism: "intentionally representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise; failure to attribute any of the following: quotations, paraphrases, or borrowed information." All examinations, papers, and other graded work products and assignments are to be completed in conformance with the George Washington University Code of Academic Integrity. IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KNOW THE CODE AND TO FOLLOW IT.

5. Changing Grades After Completion of Course: No changes can be made in grades after the conclusion of the semester, other than in cases of clerical error.

6. The Syllabus: This syllabus is a guide to the course for the student. Sound educational practice requires flexibility and the instructor may therefore, at her/his discretion, change content and requirements during the semester.

7. Accommodation for Students with Disabilities: In order to receive accommodations on the basis of disability, a student must give notice and provide proper documentation to the Office of Disability Support Services, Marvin Center 436, 202-994-8250. Accommodations will be made based upon the recommendations of the DSS Office.

8. Professor Brainard’s Policy on Grade Contestation: Students wishing to contest a grade are required to write a professional memo stating the grade they believe is merited and outlining and justifying their case for a changed grade. Student must use examples from her/his work, referencing professor feedback.
Team Component

3 Case Analyses

This is a writing assignment, with a peer-review, designed to reinforce good professional writing skills. Professional (workplace) writing is significantly different from the kind of academic or descriptive writing you may be accustomed to. Please refer to the handout on Blackboard on Workplace Writing.

All teams will be expected to rewrite team papers at least once in response to feedback from the professor and from their peers. You should expect to need to write multiple drafts no matter how good a writer you have considered yourself to be in the past. Rewriting is both a practice and a skill common to all seasoned professionals. Particularly with this assignment, initial feedback may not reflect your general writing skills as much as it reflects the process of learning a style that may be new to you.

Note: Revising a paper almost always creates new issues that must be addressed in yet another revision. Similarly, when reading a revised paper, one almost always identifies either (a) problems that existed in an earlier version but were obscured by others and/or (b) new issues that the revision created. Students are responsible for revising all. The idea is to produce the best paper possible, not merely to meet identified issues in a previous version.

The professor will assess the first team paper using the attached matrix. The second paper will be assessed through peer review using the assessment matrix. In addition to benefitting from the feedback you receive, the peer review will also enable you to become familiar and work with the assessment matrix. The matrix recognizes that there are many elements to your writing. You should note, however, that in the grading process not all elements of the matrix are weighted equally. Like riding a bicycle, writing (and applying this matrix) cannot be learned solely from reading about them.

These are professional papers and are expected to be critical, analytic, and succinct. I expect you to make your own argument. I assume that you are in an MPA program because you want to be leaders. Leaders have opinions, make arguments, and seek to persuade others to follow them. This assignment is not intended as an academic/intellectual exercise, but as a writing exercise wherein you make and logically support an argument within the parameters described below. Clearly making and supporting an argument in a way that is easily accessible to a reader is an essential skill for any professional.

The papers should be no more than three pages double-spaced. It should be clearly structured with:

1. An introduction that
   a. states a clear argument (not a statement that will “explore” or “discuss” the issues), and
b. presents a road map for the paper (introduces the structure of the paper).
   Another way of thinking about the “roadmap” is as a table of contents in sentence form.
2. A brief summary of the main arguments/ideas you will apply to the case, as relevant to the team’s argument. You can think of this as akin to a literature review.
3. An analysis of these that builds support for your argument, presenting your own ideas about the issue. For a good example of how to structure your ideas to bridge from theory to practice, see Etzioni, Amitai. “The Elements of a Good Society,” Chapter 1. The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society. New York: Basic Books, 1996: 3-33.), especially his section on “Implications for Practice and Society.”
4. A concluding paragraph. Summarize the paper and highlight why the argument matters.

An “A” paper must include each of these components, present a well-supported argument, and reflect the basic mechanics of good writing (correct grammar, punctuation, etc.). More specific guidelines are indicated in the assessment matrix.

Develop a clear and comprehensive answer to the case and question, being careful to respond to every part of the question. You need to demonstrate original thinking on the issue of how to bridge theory to practice in your analysis section. There is no single correct answer for any of the questions. Your answers will be evaluated in part on how clearly and imaginatively you develop and present your position.

The paper should be no more than 3 pages double-spaced (no exceptions) and use parenthetical citation (author, year). Do not use footnotes or endnotes.

PEER-REVIEW EXERCISE

Purpose
The purpose of this exercise is to enable you to become more familiar with the expectations of workplace writing (and the particular criteria summarized in the assessment matrix) by applying these not only to your own writing, but to the review of another’s writing, for which you may be able to see the application more objectively. The exercise provides practice for developing skills to critically analyze your own and others’ writing. In addition to providing additional feedback on your writing, importantly, peer review models the nature of workplace writing. Workplace writing is characterized as interpersonal and interactive, and emphasizes group problem-solving. As managers you will frequently be expected to review, comment on, and edit others’ writing as well as mentor them in developing writing skills, just as you will be on the receiving end of such writing review and coaching. This exercise provides experience for you both to receive and provide such feedback as professionals.
Instructions

You should expect to read the paper at least twice. The first reading is to get an overview of the paper; the second reading is for generating constructive criticism for the other team to use when revising their paper.

Feedback should be provided in the form of the assessment matrix attached, with additional comments in a separate cover sheet as needed or preferred (not required). Using the matrix is a requirement of this exercise. Under “Comments,” for each category indicate the assessment ranking (marginal-outstanding), as well as detailed comments to support your selection of this assessment ranking. Be as helpful as you can to identify specific things the author can do to move up (to the right) along the assessment scale.

Put yourself in your peers’ shoes as professionals and writers, not as social acquaintances. The point is to do your best to help your colleagues succeed in this assignment. While diplomacy is a prerequisite for good management, vague, gratuitous, or even disingenuous comments and compliments are not.

Your assessment should be provided directly to your peers.

When you submit your own second draft paper, you are to attach the feedback/assessments you received and comment, as needed, on how you responded to that feedback.

Team Presentation

During the week of 11/3, each group will be responsible for reading and learning and presenting to the class one of our reading materials. Presentations will be assessed based on the information provided in the lecture on Feedback and Presentations.

Feedback and Reflection

The team assignment includes two feedback memos to your teammates, which will not be graded. We will discuss these in class.

Team members are to write a one-paragraph feedback memorandum to each of their team members.

For the first feedback memo you are required to hold a team feedback meeting. Please follow the agenda provided.

You will be required to attach and reflect upon the feedback you receive from your teammates for your final reflection assignment.
INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT

REFLECTIONs

Students are required to complete two reflective assignments.

These papers and any additions/amendments you make will be one of the important foundations for reflecting on your learnings and evolved career plans at the end of the MPA program, a component of the Capstone course (PPPA 6009). Please try to respond to all components of each assignment within the allotted page limit. The first paper (MBTI reflection) should be approximately two pages. The final paper should be approximately five pages and will be weighted more heavily in the grade for the reflective assignments. The papers will be graded according to whether the student addresses each component of the questions, and submits the paper on time. Please see grading policies on late work.

1. Please reflect on your MBTI results. Use the class exercises, temperaments, type development theory, and feedback from those who know you well (as per the validation exercise instructions). (Your discussion should demonstrate/confirm that you drew upon all of these sources to reflect on your type). Based on these results, what do you see as your primary strengths and potential weaknesses as a public servant? This blog entry should be between 700-1000 words.

2. What does public service mean to you? What role do you see yourself playing in public service? How will you measure your success? What did you learn from your team experience and feedback and what might you do differently in other courses in this program and as a public servant? Attach the feedback memos you received at the mid-term, your mid-term action plan, and the final feedback memos you received. This final log assignment should be between 1400-1800 words, excluding the feedback attached.

ANALYTICAL PAPER

Each student will read Eggers and MacMillan, Solution Revolution. Eggers and MacMillan identify the future of governance as problem solving across sectors and across government-citizen boundaries. Using ideas from at least two sessions of this course, identify what they see as the major components of this future public administration. What do you see as the pros and cons of that? And what are some of the challenges to achieving that? All papers should encompass ideas from at least two sessions from the syllabus. Papers are to be no more than five pages (excluding title and bibliography) and double-spaced.
| Category                                      | Unacceptable                                                                 | Marginal                                                                 | Acceptable                                                                                     | Good                                                                                     | Outstanding                                                                                     | Comments                                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Demonstrated Understanding of the Issues    | No apparent understanding of the issue(s)                                    | Limited understanding of the issue(s) displayed by vague, unclear language | Developing some understanding of the issue(s) and responding to the question posed             | Suggests an understanding of the issue(s) and responds to the question, but language and ideas are not fully developed | Clear understanding of the issue(s) displayed by clear, concrete language and complex ideas that directly address the question posed |
| Argument Statement                          | Addresses the topic but does not include an argument statement               | Focused on the topic and implies but does not specifically state an argument and/or the argument does not reflect course content | States an argument but with vague language and/or weak evidence of insight (oversimplified or obvious argument) | Clearly stated argument demonstrating creative application of course concepts/author ideas | Clearly articulated argument that demonstrates innovative thinking, reflects clear insight and thoughtful synthesis of ideas, and connects clearly to author ideas/course content |
| Analysis                                     | Few to no solid supporting ideas or evidence for the analysis               | Some supporting ideas and/or evidence for the analysis                    | Analysis is adequate but lacks specificity and is not well synthesized                       | Analysis is logically developed and adequately synthesized.                               | Specific, developed details and superior support and evidence in the analysis                   |
| Structure and Organization                  | Lacks logical progression of ideas                                           | Brief skeleton (introduction, body, conclusion) but content does not reflect and/or mixes heading content | Includes logical progression of ideas but minimal overlap between sections and transitions are lacking. Includes at least an implicit roadmap. | Includes logical presentation of ideas, argument builds through distinct sections, supported by clear transitions. Clearly stated roadmap. Author and student ideas are clearly identifiable. | Argument logically builds with mutually supporting sections and clear implications identified in the conclusion. Clearly stated road map and literature review is distinct from student's own analysis. |
| Mechanics                                   | Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation; run-on and/or incomplete sentences and paragraphs | Errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation; but few run-on and/or incomplete sentences and paragraphs | Some grammatical errors or questionable word choice; almost all sentences and paragraphs are well-structured | Few grammatical errors or questionable word choice; all sentences and paragraphs are well-structured | Nearly error-free, reflecting a clear understanding and thorough proofreading; each paragraph fully develops one main idea representing a logical progression of the argument |