
PPD 540

Public Administration and Society

Summer 2020

Instructor: **Matthew Wheeler**

Email: mwheeler@usc.edu

24/7 Technical Support

Student Help Portal:

<https://studentblackboardhelp.usc.edu/>

Phone: 213-740-5555 and choose option 2

Chat:

<https://help.edusupportcenter.com/shplite/usc/home>

Email: blackboard@usc.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Course Description](#)

[Course Objectives](#)

[Textbooks & Materials](#)

[Grading](#)

[Policies](#)

[Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems](#)

[Live Sessions](#)

[15 Weekly Activities](#)

[1](#) | [2](#) | [3](#) | [4](#) | [5](#) | [6](#) | [7](#) | [8](#) | [9](#) | [10](#) | [11](#) | [12](#) | [13](#) | [14](#) | [15](#)

Course Description

This course provides MPA students with an overview of contemporary public administration. We review important intellectual and constitutional foundations of the administrative state and construct a theoretical approach to the study and practice of public administration. A major objective of the course is to develop skills in critical analysis necessary for practice. In this way, the course builds a foundation for a variety of courses offered at Price School of Public Policy.

Course Objectives

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

- Identify the roles and responsibilities of the contemporary public administrator.
- Analyze a public administrator's approach to problem solving and decision making from a variety of perspectives.
- Make decisions based on the rule of law and the legal and ethical obligations that public administrators face on the job.
- Identify the role of competencies and boundaries in organizational structure.
- Identify the impact of organizational culture on a public administrator's choices and decisions.
- Identify the role of craft in inter-sectoral public management.
- Develop informed humility useful in expanding individual and societal capacities for human accomplishment.

Textbooks & Materials

Books:

- Hill, C.J., & Lynn, L.E. (2016). *Public management: Thinking and acting in three dimensions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.
- deBono, E. (1999). *Six thinking hats*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company.

Articles:

- There are additional readings and case studies that will be available in a Harvard Business School (HBS) digital course pack available for a one-time purchase. For access to the, click this link: [HBS course pack](#). If you have not used this system in the past, you may be requested to register for an

account. Once you have created an account and logged in, come back to this link to access the course pack.

- Many additional readings are available on ARES [e-reserve](#). Click “Search Courses” on the left menu, then under “Search by Course” enter PPD 540.
- Some additional readings are linked in the course space.
- The table at the end provides the readings assigned each week, as well as the indication for whether the article is available from HBS, ARES, or is linked in the course.

Grading

This course uses a percent based grading schema, as shown below.

| Evaluation Categories | Weighting |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Comprehensive Analytic Assignments | 40% |
| Group Case Study Assignments | 15% |
| Individual Case Study Assignments | 15% |
| Real-time Exercise | 15% |
| Discussions | 10% |
| Class Participation | 5% |
| TOTAL | 100% |

Grade Ranges

| Grade | Range |
|-------|-----------------|
| A | 93.0% or higher |
| A- | 90.0%-92.9% |
| B+ | 87.0%-89.9% |
| B | 83.0%-86.9% |

| | |
|----|----------------|
| B- | 80.0%-82.9% |
| C+ | 77.0%-79.9% |
| C | 73.0%-76.9% |
| C- | 70.0%-72.9% |
| D | 60.0%-69.9% |
| F | 59.9% or lower |

Methods of Assessment

Discussion Forums (10%)

Throughout the semester, you are asked to reflect and write about a variety of topics related to the study and practice of public administration. Even though these are often reflective in nature, they are still to be considered formal writing assignments. These posts are intended to stretch your thinking and understanding of the course material and to provide you with the opportunity to demonstrate your ability to critically and thoughtfully reflect and apply course concepts to practice, using the course materials to support your observations and arguments (including proper citations and references formatted in APA, MLA, or Chicago Manual of Style).

In each forum, you will submit an original response in the specified format to the questions and/or assignments posted. In addition, you are required to submit at least two thoughtful follow-up questions to posts from your classmates, and then respond to all questions posed to you by your peers and faculty. Please make sure to keep all of these posts on topic and related to the course material under consideration. Your follow-up posts should extend and move the conversation forward and demonstrate your ability to thoughtfully and critically engage with the material and issues being discussed (not just telling another student, “nice post” or “I agree”).

As indicated above, your overall discussion will be evaluated according to:

- 1) the quality of your analysis and comments/responses to the discussions and questions posed;
- 2) the extent to which your posts are thoughtful and demonstrate an understanding of the concepts addressed;
- 3) the extent to which you communicate your thoughts in well-constructed, grammatically-correct sentences.

All posts should be proofread for spelling and grammatical errors before being posted to the discussion board; and 4) the extent of your active and frequent involvement that demonstrates a commitment to learning about public administration.

Students must submit an initial response to the discussion forum prompt(s) or activity for the week by 11:55 p.m. Pacific Time on Day 4 (Saturday). Students will pose follow-up questions to two of their peers' initial posts by 11:55 p.m. Pacific Time on Day 5 (Sunday). So that we have an equitable distribution of follow-up questions, please look for classmates who have not yet received two follow-up questions and pose questions there. Finally, all students will respond to all follow-up questions they have received by 11:55 p.m. Pacific Time on Day 7 (Tuesday).

Initial posts: The initial post must be a **minimum of 250 words** and will be graded on how thoroughly it addresses the prompt(s); the depth of insight and analysis evident in the post; and how well it applies and incorporates concepts and ideas from the course material to offer a rational argument rather than a personal opinion.

Follow-up questions and responses: EACH response posts must be a **minimum of 150 words** (excluding phrases such as "great post" or "well done," etc.) and must either add to the argument or present an alternate point of view. Follow-ups will be graded on whether the required number was posted (questions and responses to questions); the substance of the response; and the depth of insight included in the response.

| Discussion Board Grading Criteria Rubric - 10 Points | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
| Relevance, Application, Originality, Length ___ / 4 points | Addresses the question, uses ideas from the text, unique perspective, clear focus, fluent, cohesive. Provides all posts in a timely manner. (4) | Addresses the question, uses ideas from the text, adds some content, usually has clear focus. Late or lacking posts in response to assignment (2) | Addresses the question, some relation to textual topic, nothing substantive added, inconsistencies in unity and / or coherence. (1) | Fails to address the question posed, non-serious and not contemplative response, lacks value added information, thought patterns difficult to follow (0) |
| Insight, Observation, Analysis ___ / 2 points | Posting offers significant concept or idea worth thinking about, ideas developed in depth, | Posting offers a concept worth thinking about, develops ideas, | Posting addresses concepts already highlighted, rudimentary development of ideas, | No clear concept addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, minimal understanding of the assignment (0) |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| | clear understanding of the assignment (2) | understanding of assignment (1) | some understanding of the assignment (1) | |
| Details/ Evidence __/2 point | Details including citations, core concept references are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course (2) | Details are elaborated and pertinent to the course (1) | Details lack elaboration or are repetitious (0) | Details lack elaboration or are repetitious (0) |
| Grammar, usage, mechanics __/2 points | Few, if any, errors are present (2) | Some errors are present (1) | Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (0) | Errors are frequent and severe (0) |

Comprehensive Analytic Assignment (40%)

Introduction

The Comprehensive Analytic Assignment is a series of six component exercises designed to give you experience in researching and analyzing a public administration situation. Known collectively as the “CAA,” these comprehensive analytic assignments constitute individual components of an academic paper. By completing these components individually, you receive faculty feedback that you should incorporate as you move through the project in order to improve your understanding of research and evidence and to develop your capacity to apply core concepts and theory to the analysis of public administration through argumentation and documentation. This series of assignments challenges you to employ your knowledge of the course literature, outside academic readings, and the analytic skills practiced through the completion of weekly assignments in critically analyzing a real public administration situation. You will link relevant core concepts and theories to the practice of public administration as you work through the process of analyzing a decision made by a public administrator. As such, the CAA is designed to help you develop and hone your capacity for critical analysis and the skills in research, writing, and analysis that are needed at the graduate level.

Choosing a Topic

You will identify a decision made in the public domain by a *public administrator* that highlights an *administrative and/or management problem*. This decision should be documented by reliable sources, such as media reports, meeting minutes, organizational reports, and other published material. Pick something sufficient to hold your interest throughout the semester. You will need to develop three possible topics for discussion with student colleagues and faculty, so begin to look for ideas and start thinking about possible topics very early in the course. The instructor will provide feedback on topic choices and must approve a final proposal before you move on to completing the rest of the CAA assignments.

The primary “rule” for identifying and choosing a decision to study is that the decision **MUST** have been made or will be made by a **public administrator**. The decision you choose to study must center on the problems

and challenges of implementing public policy, not setting policy. You may NOT choose a decision made by an elected official, an appointed or elected board or commission, an appointed or elected commissioner, or any other individual whose task it is to set, rather than carry out, public policy. You should look for decisions made by individuals such as city or county managers, school superintendents, police or fire chiefs, top-level managers in public agencies, and so forth. Be sure you understand the difference before you begin looking for a topic.

Consider choosing a decision maker about whom you know, or for which you can access appropriate information, in order to ease your research efforts. Focus on a narrow, specific decision that was made at a specific time so that your analysis can focus on the context surrounding a single, tangible action and alternatives, not on a complex action that has innumerable alternatives and intricacies. Go “small,” exploring “bounded” decisions. There are no bonus points for selecting a “big” issue, a decision that is made far away from you, or for a grand organization (such as a federal agency) or one that received massive media or public attention. Look for the “everyday” decisions made by public administrators that have immediate impacts on the day-to-day lives of Americans, especially those citizens, neighbors, and individuals living in local communities.

Mechanics of the Assignments

These assignments are not intended to be merely classic encyclopedia or Wikipedia descriptions nor should they simply be a report or summary of the information you gather. Instead, the focus should be on analyzing the decision you chose in the context of the concepts and theories we study in the course. It is important that you read each instruction prompt carefully and think about ways to demonstrate your understanding of core course concepts and teachings by linking specific details from the public decision example you settled on to relevant ideas and concepts from the literature.

Each assignment is a unique paper and *will require both an introduction and conclusion statement*. Do not repeat the details of your case or example in each assignment introduction. Rather, you may assume that your reader knows your material well and therefore you should write an introductory statement representing just the new information you are presenting in each assignment. Keep your papers focused on the analytic components of the weekly assignment as you present a well-organized and thoroughly conceptualized discussion of a segment of the case example.

Citations and references: Your papers must include properly formatted citations and reference list. APA style is preferred. If you are well-grounded in another academic style (such as MLA or Chicago Manual of Style), please talk with your instructor for permission to use that style. Citations should include textbook and course readings as conceptual evidence as well as the articles, interviews, and other academic sources you develop through your own research for factual and conceptual evidence and discussion of your case.

Time frames: Several of these components require time to conduct research and develop your analysis and writings. The time between CAA exercises (denoted in the Course Logic Model graphic clearly) is a guideline to emphasize the research and drafting time available between submissions. There are a few weeks before

the first discussion of a topic selection so that you have the time required to review these assignments and research potential decision makers and decisions. There is extra time before the Week 10 and Week 13 analytic submissions so that you can receive and incorporate faculty feedback and conduct additional research. Because you are encouraged to work ahead in this course, there will be no credit for late submissions in accordance with the policy set forth in the syllabus. Turn your work in on time with complete citations included. You'll find specific deadlines along with the instructions provided in the weekly online course assignment pages.

Formats: Details of each assignment are provided in the weekly online course assignment pages. Each component requires a specific format, such as a memo, annotated bibliography, literature review, analytic essay, and Executive Summary. The formats are selected to emphasize the information you are to present in a concise, polished and “user friendly” professional manner. By following the directions carefully, you will master both the form and the function of each analytic assignment.

The Comprehensive Analytic Assignments described below are merely an introduction and NOT specific directions or assignment prompts for final submission. For detailed information on each requirement, please see the weekly online course assignment pages.

Individual Assignments

1. Identify a Decision

Drawing from the ideas you generated using the course discussion board in Week 4, choose a decision made in the public domain by a *public administrator* that highlights an *administrative and/or management* problem. The primary “rule” for identifying and choosing a decision to study is that the decision MUST have been made or will be made by a **public administrator**. The decision you choose to study must center on the problems and challenges of implementing public policy, not setting policy. You may NOT choose a decision made by an elected official, an appointed or elected board or commission, an appointed or elected commissioner, or any other individual whose task it is to set, rather than carry out, public policy. You should look for decisions made by individuals such as city or county managers, school superintendents, police or fire chiefs, top-level managers in public agencies, and so forth.

You should identify a situation that is not dependent upon criminal, unethical, or immoral behavior. Consider choosing a decision maker about whom you know, or for which you can access appropriate information, in order to ease your research efforts. Focus on a narrow, specific decision that was made at a specific time so that your analysis can focus on the context surrounding a single, tangible action and alternatives, not on a complex action that has innumerable alternatives and intricacies. Look for the “everyday” decisions made by public administrators that have immediate impacts on the day-to-day lives of Americans, especially those citizens, neighbors, and individuals living in local communities.

This decision should be documented by reliable sources, such as media reports, meeting minutes, organizational reports, and other published material.

See the assignment in the weekly online course assignment page for length and format requirements.

2. Annotated Bibliography

This assignment includes two objectives. The first objective is to create a beginning reference list to support your writing assignments. The second objective is to practice presenting a style of documentation of research often used often in academics and by senior policy makers that succinctly incorporates analysis in an organized collection of research that is easily reviewed by others.

You will submit (in APA format) a list and brief analysis of biographic materials, news and media clips, course readings, outside academic readings, news magazines, and academic journals related to your chosen topic, including the problem or situation, key public figures, related actors, and relevant academic concepts and theories. The references included can be edited, revised, and expanded as you work through your CAA project but you will need to submit these as an annotated bibliography only once. At all other times, your sources will be cited within your narrative and included as an APA-style reference list at the end of each document.

Annotated bibliographies include a brief summary statement of the findings of your article(s), or original interview notes, in addition to -- and following -- each alphabetical citation. This assignment demonstrates a documentation of your knowledge or understanding of the decision context and will previews citations of evidence you will use in upcoming assignments. Be sure to include a well-rounded effort incorporating information from a number of mediums and sources and from multiple viewpoints. It is expected that you will refine your research processes after receiving feedback from faculty and while developing further CAA assignments, so you are not limited in future efforts to just the information provided in the Annotated Bibliography. You should, however, demonstrate mastery of your topic in this assignment.

See the assignment in the course Moodle page for length and format requirements.

3. Problem Definition

The objective of this assignment is to define and create a statement of the problem, which forms the fundamental building block for your analysis of the decision. It should identify the core issue(s) facing the decision maker, and contain necessary background on the organization and the problem, opportunity, or issue it faces. All claims should be backed up with evidence from legitimate sources.

Specifically, your problem statement should answer the following questions: Who is the key decision maker? What is the primary decision? Where (e.g., agency, time frame, limitations) was the decision made? How is the key decision maker distinct from other important actors in this scenario? What are the backgrounds of these individuals and why are these factors relevant to the analytic dimensions of the decision? You will answer these questions in a narrative form.

This paper should be structured as a policy memo, crafted and formatted according to the directions and examples you will find in the weekly online course assignment page. Direct your memo to a senior official

outside of the organization you are studying but one who would have an interest in this decision, such as a public administrator faced with a similar dilemma or an elected official connected to the agency in which the decision was/is to be made. Identify yourself as author and list a fictitious title/role, such as a consultant, that would be appropriate in “the real world.”

See the assignment in the weekly online course assignment page for length and format requirements.

4. Literature Review

In this assignment, you will practice presenting a different, and very useful, style of research documentation and synthesis of your key findings, which is known as a literature review. This also helps form the basis for your analysis of the decision.

Your literature review should draw on what you've learned about the decision you are studying and your current understanding of core concepts at work in the public policy arena and the process for administrative decision making. Review your annotated bibliography and seek out new research about either the case example (topic) or about key public management concepts (structure, culture, craft, decision making, etc.) in the academic literature to fill in any gaps in knowledge you may have.

The literature review section may include (but is not limited to):

- A timeline or chronology of the facts of your case
- A discussion of the structural and cultural elements at work in the case
- A description of any conceptual framework or theory that would help analyze and explain the challenges and opportunities presented in the case

This paper should be crafted as a literature review, formatted according to the directions and examples you will find in the Week 09 Instructional Materials Page.

See the assignment in the weekly online course assignment page for length and format requirements.

5. Case Analysis

In this portion of the CAA, you will apply the concepts and theories we have been exploring in this course to the facts of your case. The facts you have learned through your research are specific examples of the practice of public administration demonstrated by the actions of the decision maker in your case. To demonstrate your understanding of the core elements of public administration theory as discussed in the course textbook and assigned readings, you must link these concepts to your “real life” decision example. Your essay should make sense of the decision maker’s dilemma to the reader by linking your description of the decision to concepts and theories that explain why the decision was made and evaluate the impact of the decision. This is what constitutes an analysis.

You should consider the full variety of constraints and enabling circumstances that are discussed in the course readings, including factual limitations (known or unknown information); context considerations (issues

affecting the decision maker and her/his course of action); legal, structural, and operational constraints; and elements of managerial craft and culture that also might be in play during the decision making process. You do not need to address each of these types case constraints or enabling circumstances. Use only those most appropriate to your example and the decision details. Provide reasoning and evidence from the course reading to support your claims about these constraints.

This assignment also provides you the opportunity to build an argument for how the key decision maker should have made (or should make) the primary decision and why. Again, you need to use all three analytic dimensions we have studied - structure, culture, and craft - to provide an understanding of the context of the decision that is grounded in both theory and practice. This assignment requires you to apply reasoning, argumentation, and evidence and documentation to support your assertions about how and why a particular decision should have been or be made in your case.

This assignment should do the following:

1. Discuss the most important facts that the decision maker must consider, and describe the decision context faced by this individual.
2. Provide an analysis of the key legal, structural, cultural, and/or craft constraints and enabling circumstances operating on the primary decision maker that affected or will affect the decision. What are they and why are they important in this case? How did/would these key elements impact the decision maker and drive his/her actions in the case? How did/do they shape the nature of or set the context for the primary decision that was made or needs to be made? Include pertinent points from both the theoretical and factual research you have collected to provide support for your arguments.
3. Provide an analysis of the relationship among the analytic dimensions of structure, culture, and craft at play in this decision, explaining the dynamics among these elements. Did one appear to impact others? If so, then explain how.
4. If the primary decision already has been made, draw your theoretical and factual research to assess whether this was or was not the right decision to make. If the primary decision has not yet been made, provide a recommendation, supported by your theoretical and factual research, for the decision that you (as the analyst) believe *should* be made.

While you may draw from prior assignments submitted, keep in mind that this Case Analysis assignment is a unique and should offer different perspective than earlier assignments. Focus on the complexity of your case to present a cogent and well-supported analysis rather than merely restating a listing or report of the factual and conceptual elements.

The format for this submission is an essay, which must be properly formatted with an introduction to the case, a well-defined and supported argument, and a concluding statement. In other words, write a beginning,

middle, and end. Proper citations and a reference list formatted in APA style are required in this submission, which should include citations from conceptual and theory sources (including textbook, course readings, your annotated bibliography, and any other relevant academic decision making theory sources) and from case facts and details (news clips, articles, organization documents, or personal interviews).

See the assignment in the weekly online course assignment page for length and format requirements.

6. Executive Summary

The final CAA assignment, the Executive Summary, has three objectives. The first is to create a summary that ties together all the components of your analyses and work product. The second objective is to incorporate the extensive feedback you've received from faculty on your writing and research efforts into crafting a precise and useful summary. The Executive Summary should reflect your most advanced understanding of the decision maker, the primary decision to be made, and all of the previous analytic components as you craft a synthesized summary document.

The third objective is to give you experience in crafting a comprehensive and succinct memorandum formatted in a specific and polished style that is both academic and professional and that mirrors senior staff- and executive-level communications. The function of an executive summary is to give the reader essential content from a main document or set of documents. Executive Summaries are used by advanced decision makers or an alternative decision making authority who seeks to understand opportunities of the present, actions of the past, or the importance of pending actions still to be undertaken.

Be explicit about the purpose for your document and highlight only salient points from prior assignment submissions. Clarity and organization of purpose, along with accuracy, are essential in these documents, as future decisions will be made based upon your presentation by those who have not read the original research or your analyses.

An executive summary makes a recommendation. In this case, you will argue for the support of or against the primary decision made or for your recommendation about the primary decision to be made. Provide rationales that can be logically followed by linking concepts and theories to the details practiced in your case. Include a concise statement of your findings, make a specific recommendation for action, and offer a justification for the proposed action or the action already undertaken to be supported.

In two pages, your Executive Summary should:

1. Be crafted with a specific audience (person/group) in mind (you don't need to identify this person or group but think about what person or group would need or want this information)
2. Include a concise statement of the findings drawn from your prior analyses
3. Provide a specific recommendation for action or for support
4. Offer justification and rationales for your recommendation
5. For extra credit, include potential next steps or actions for consideration

CAA Grading Rubrics

Please review the Comprehensive Analytic Assignments Grading Criteria Rubrics for information about expectations and evaluation of these assignments: *Identify a Decision, Annotated Bibliography, Problem Definition, Literature Review, Case Analysis and the final Executive Summary*. The rubrics are noted below and will be the basis for evaluating your effort and the assignment of value and grades.

| CAA: Identify a Decision Grading Criteria Rubric - 25 Points | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
| Identification of the Main Issues/ Problems ___ / 10 points | Identifies and understands all of the main issues to be presented in the case study; provides clear focus, fluent, cohesive discussion of a single decision point and related concerns. (10) | Identifies and understands most of the main issues in the example; usually has clear focus on the decision to be made but may not support all issues with data and facts. (8) | Identifies and understands some of the issues in the example presenting inconsistencies or incoherence in decision related facts and data; focus not on point. (6) | Serious lack of understanding and identification of issues in the decision example, errors in factual dimensions, lack of thought patterns or difficult to follow. (3) |
| Analysis of the Issues and Individuals Involved ___ / 5 points | Insightful and thorough analysis of all of the issues using frameworks from the readings, clearly identified individuals, purpose, ideas developed in depth, clear understanding of the assignment (5) | Thorough analysis of most of the issues using frameworks from the readings but some depth is lacking or logical gaps are evident in presentation of people and purpose. (3) | Attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of assignment and issues in the case (2) | Incomplete analysis of the issues and individuals that only partially addresses assignment (1) |
| Citations and links to research ___ / 5 points | Excellent research into the issue with clearly documented links to outside readings (5) | Good research and documented links (4) | Limited research and/or lacks documented links to any facts (3) | Incomplete research and lacking links to any facts (1) |
| Grammar, usage, mechanics _ / 5 points | Few, if any, errors are present (5) | Some errors are present (3) | Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (2) | Errors are frequent and severe (1) |

| CAA: Annotated Bibliography Grading Criteria Rubric - 25 Points | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|----------------------|------------|
| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Quality of evidence and research coherence</p> <p>___/ 10 points</p> | <p>Evidence is high quality and academic research from beginning to end, clear focus, fluent, cohesive; includes excellent use of framework or conceptual application in providing documentation relevant to chosen topic. (10)</p> | <p>Some academic research but may have minor lapses in evidence to support chosen topic, usually has clear focus by may not clearly support all aspects of topic selection. (8)</p> | <p>Minimally based upon research, lacking evidence and supporting documentation; presenting inconsistencies or incoherence in facts and data; framework not properly completed nor clearly communicated (6)</p> | <p>Serious lack of data, facts, information and research; lacking evidence to support argumentation, errors in factual dimensions, or lack of thought patterns difficult to follow (4)</p> |
| <p>Quality of analysis provided in annotations</p> <p>___/ 5 points</p> | <p>A very high quality of analysis using skills and frameworks learned in the course, establishes and maintains clear purpose, ideas developed in depth, clear understanding of the assignment (5)</p> | <p>Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose, but some depth of analysis or logical gaps are evident in presentation of research. (4)</p> | <p>Attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of the assignment (3)</p> | <p>Rudimentary application of skills and frameworks that partially address assignment. (2)</p> |
| <p>Sequencing of bibliography</p> <p>___/ 5 points</p> | <p>Appropriate sequencing of bibliographic entries and high quality information presented in annotations (5)</p> | <p>Appropriate sequencing of bibliographic entries and some information presented in annotations (3)</p> | <p>Inconsistencies, details lack elaboration or are repetitious (1)</p> | <p>Lacking appropriate sequencing, inconsistencies or random details, inappropriate or barely apparent facts are incomplete (0)</p> |
| <p>Writing mechanics and style</p> <p>___/ 5 points</p> | <p>Few, if any, errors are present (5)</p> | <p>Some errors are present (4)</p> | <p>Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (3)</p> | <p>Errors are frequent and severe (2)</p> |

CAA: Problem Definition Grading Criteria Rubric - 50 Points

| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Quality of evidence and research coherence</p> <p>___/ 20 points</p> | <p>Analysis identifies the primary decision to be made and the context faced by the decision maker. Management problem is clearly</p> | <p>Analysis identifies the primary decision to be made and the context faced by the decision maker. Management problem is substantially</p> | <p>Analysis lacks identification of the primary decision to be made and the context faced by the decision maker. Management problem is partially</p> | <p>Fails to clearly articulate the primary decision to be made and the decision context. Serious lack of data, facts, information and research; lacking evidence to support argumentation,</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | understood. Analysis is supported by high quality evidence and academic research from beginning to end, clear focus, fluent, cohesive. (20) | understood. Analysis is supported by some academic research but may have minor lapses in evidence to support arguments, usually has clear focus by may not clearly support all conclusions (15) | understood. Evidence and supporting documentation lacking; inconsistencies or incoherence in description. (10) | errors in factual dimensions, or lack of thought patterns difficult to follow (8) |
| Quality of analysis ___/ 15 points | A very high quality of analysis which distinguishes the primary decision maker from other important actors in the scenario. Establishes and maintains clear purpose, ideas developed in depth, clear understanding of the assignment (15) | Analysis distinguishes the primary decision maker but fails to discuss relevance of other important actors in the scenario. Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose, but some depth of analysis or logical gaps are evident. (13) | Analysis lacks clarity concerning key actors involved in the decision making example. Attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of the assignment (10) | Rudimentary application of analytic skills that partially address assignment. (5) |
| Sequencing or argument ___/ 10 points | Logic is organized to support conclusions, details are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the case (10) | Organized by may have minor lapses in logic, details are elaborated and pertinent to the case and framework (8) | Inconsistencies in coherence, details lack elaboration or are repetitious (6) | Lacking logic or argument, inconsistencies in coherence, details are random, inappropriate, or barely apparent; framework is incomplete (4) |
| Writing mechanics and style ___/ 5 points | Few, if any, errors are present (5) | Some errors are present (4) | Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (3) | Errors are frequent and severe (1) |

CAA: Literature Review Grading Criteria Rubric - 50 Points

| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Quality of evidence and research coherence ___/ 15 points | Literature review includes high quality evidence and academic research from a | Literature review includes evidence and academic research from multiple sources. Usually has clear | Literature review includes evidence and academic research from limited sources. Generally has clear | Literature review includes evidence from too few sources. Serious lack of data, facts, information and |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | comprehensive variety of sources. Has a clear focus; sources are related appropriately to the problem. It is fluent and cohesive. (15) | focus but may not clearly support all conclusions. Sources are primarily related to the problem. Is mostly cohesive. (12) | focus but may not clearly support all conclusions. Sources are somewhat related to the problem. Is somewhat cohesive. (10) | research; lacks focus and cohesiveness. (5) |
| Quality of analysis __/ 15 points | A very high quality of analysis using skills and frameworks learned in the course, establishes and maintains clear purpose, ideas developed in depth, clear understanding of the assignment (15) | Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose, but some depth of analysis or logical gaps are evident. (14) | Attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of the assignment (13) | Rudimentary application of skills and frameworks that partially address assignment. (11) |
| Sequencing __/ 15 points | Well organized; demonstrates logical sequence and structure; details are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the case.(15) | Organization may have minor lapses in logic; details are elaborated and pertinent to the case. (13) | Inconsistencies in organization and sequence; details lack elaboration or are repetitious and may not pertain to the case. (12) | Lacking organization and logic; details are random, inappropriate, or barely apparent. (8) |
| Writing mechanics and style __/ 5 points | Few, if any, errors are present (5) | Some errors are present (4) | Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (3) | Errors are frequent and severe (1) |

CAA: Case Analysis Grading Criteria Rubric - 100 Points

| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Quality of evidence and research coherence __/ 30 points | Analysis is supported by high quality evidence and academic research from beginning to end, clear focus, fluent, cohesive; includes excellent use of framework or conceptual application in | Analysis is supported by some academic research but may have minor lapses in evidence to support arguments, usually has clear focus by may not clearly support all conclusions and discussions of | Analysis is minimally based upon research, lacking evidence and supporting documentation; presenting inconsistencies or incoherence in facts and data; framework not properly completed | Serious lack of data, facts, information and research; lacking evidence to support argumentation, errors in factual dimensions, or lack of thought patterns difficult to follow (10) |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | providing evidence and documentation acknowledging and responding to alternative arguments. (30) | alternative arguments. (25) | nor clearly communicated (20) | |
| Quality of analysis __/ 40 points | A very high quality of analysis using skills and frameworks learned in the course, establishes and maintains clear purpose, ideas developed in depth, clear understanding of the assignment (40) | Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose, but some depth of analysis or logical gaps are evident. (36) | Attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of the assignment (32) | Rudimentary application of skills and frameworks that partially address assignment. (25) |
| Sequencing or argument __/ 20 points | Logic is organized to support conclusions, details are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the case (20) | Organized by may have minor lapses in logic, details are elaborated and pertinent to the case and framework (15) | Inconsistencies in coherence, details lack elaboration or are repetitious (10) | Lacking logic or argument, inconsistencies in coherence, details are random, inappropriate, or barely apparent; framework is incomplete (5) |
| Writing mechanics and style __/ 10 points | Few, if any, errors are present (10) | Some errors are present (6) | Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (4) | Errors are frequent and severe (1) |

CAA: Executive Summary Grading Criteria Rubric - 50 Points

| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient |
|--|--|--|---|
| Quality of research and evidence __/15 points | Excellent in integrating and applying high quality topical research as documentation and evidence to support thesis (15) | There is reasoned application of quality research to the topic thesis; some sources may be unreliable or irrelevant (12) | There is partial success in applying research; may be biased or over-reliant on sources such as popular news or advocacy sources (10) |
| Quality of analysis and application of key framework | A very high quality analysis that uses skills and frameworks learned in the | Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose, but some depth | Rudimentary application of skills and analytic frameworks that partially addresses the assignment (10) |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| ___/15 points | course to address the purpose of the assignment (15) | of analysis or logical gaps are evident. (12) | |
| Writing mechanics and style ___/10 points | A clean product with no errors and a highly professional, neutral writing style (10) | Some errors are present or style or syntax is faulty; professional style needs polish (8) | Multiple errors or patterns of error; too rhetorical or conversational a style (6) |
| Sequencing of argument ___/10 points | Organized within paragraphs and across sections to support argument. An excellent executive summary (10) | Organized but may have minor lapses, transitions evident, usually has clear focus; poor or no executive summary (8) | Poor transitions, inconsistencies in coherence; may lack executive summary (6) |

Group Case Study Assignments (15%)

There are three group case studies scheduled during the semester. Each assignment involves reading the case, engaging in a live discussion with your team via Zoom, Skype, Google Hangouts, or another medium of your choice, and production of an analytic response (including appropriate links to the reading) to the questions posed in the case. These responses take the form of written and graphic (visual) pieces. See the group assignment descriptions in the online course for deadlines and details. Also, as part of these assignments, **each student** is required to complete and submit a Group Assignment Reflection. Instructions for these can be found in the online course.

| Group Case Study Assignments Grading Criteria Rubric - 50 Points | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
| Identification of the main issues/ problems ___/ 9 points | Identifies and understands all of the main issues in the case study; provides clear focus, fluent, cohesive and uses conceptual application from course readings. (9) | Identifies and understands most of the main issues in the case study; usually has clear focus but may not support all issues with conceptual ideas applied from the course readings. (7) | Identifies and understands some of the issues in the case study presenting inconsistencies or incoherence in facts and data; focus and conceptual ideas not presented. (5) | Serious lack of understanding and identification of issues in the case study, errors in factual dimensions, lack of thought patterns or difficult to follow. (2) |
| Analysis of the Issues ___/ 13 points | Insightful and thorough analysis of all of the issues using frameworks from the | Thorough analysis of most of the issues using frameworks from the readings but | Attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of | Incomplete analysis of the issues that partially addresses assignment (3) |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | readings, clear purpose, ideas developed in depth, clear understanding of the assignment (13) | some depth is lacking or logical gaps are evident. (11) | assignment and issues in the case (8) | |
| Effective solutions/ Strategies __ / 10 points | Well documented, reasoned and appropriate comments on solutions, or proposals for solutions, to all issues in the case study (10) | Appropriate, well thought out comments about solutions, or proposals for solutions, to most of the issues in the case study (9) | Superficial and/or inappropriate solutions to some of the issues in the case study (7) | Little or no action suggested, and/or inappropriate solutions to all of the issues in the case study (1) |
| Citations and links to course readings; additional research __ / 9 points | Excellent research into the issues with clearly documented links to class and/or outside readings (10) | Good research and documented links to the material assigned (8) | Limited research and/or lacks documented links to any readings (6) | Incomplete research and lacking links to any readings (2) |
| Grammar, usage, mechanics _ / 5 points | Few, if any, errors are present (5) | Some errors are present (3) | Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (2) | Errors are frequent and severe (1) |
| Group assignment reflection ___ / 3 points | Comprehensive reflection on the process of creating a collective presentation is submitted (3) | Reflection on the process of creating a collective presentation is submitted but lacks thoroughness (2) | Basic report on the process of creating a collective presentation is submitted (1) | Comprehensive reflection on the process of creating a collective presentation is submitted (0) |

Individual Case Study Assignments (15%)

There are three individual writing assignments included in the course, each of which involves a case study that you will analyze on your own. These will involve a written analysis and response to real-world situations in which public administrators needed to make critical decisions. Formats will vary with each assignment (briefing paper, memorandum, literature review, and comparative essay). Each assignment involves reading the details of the case and producing an analytic response (including appropriate links to the reading) to the questions posed in the case. See the assignment descriptions in the online course for deadlines and details.

Individual Case Study Assignments Grading Criteria Rubric - 50 Points

| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Identification of the Main Issues/ Problems __ / 10 points | Identifies and understands all of the main issues in the case study; provides clear focus, fluent, cohesive and uses conceptual application from course readings. (10) | Identifies and understands most of the main issues in the case study; usually has clear focus but may not support all issues with conceptual ideas applied from the course readings. (8) | Identifies and understands some of the issues in the case study presenting inconsistencies or incoherence in facts and data; focus and conceptual ideas not presented. (6) | Serious lack of understanding and identification of issues in the case study, errors in factual dimensions, lack of thought patterns or difficult to follow. (3) |
| Analysis of the Issues __ / 15 points | Insightful and thorough analysis of all of the issues using frameworks from the readings, clear purpose, ideas developed in depth, clear understanding of the assignment (15) | Thorough analysis of most of the issues using frameworks from the readings but some depth is lacking or logical gaps are evident. (13) | Attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of assignment and issues in the case (10) | Incomplete analysis of the issues that partially addresses assignment (5) |
| Effective solutions/ Strategies __ / 10 points | Well documented, reasoned and appropriate comments on solutions, or proposals for solutions, to all issues in the case study (10) | Appropriate, well thought out comments about solutions, or proposals for solutions, to most of the issues in the case study (9) | Superficial and/or inappropriate solutions to some of the issues in the case study (7) | Little or no action suggested, and/or inappropriate solutions to all of the issues in the case study (1) |
| Citations and links to course readings; additional research __ / 10 points | Excellent research into the issues with clearly documented links to class and/or outside readings (10) | Good research and documented links to the material assigned (8) | Limited research and/or lacks documented links to any readings (6) | Incomplete research and lacking links to any readings (2) |
| Grammar, usage, mechanics _ / 5 points | Few, if any, errors are present (5) | Some errors are present (3) | Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident (2) | Errors are frequent and severe (1) |

Real-time Exercise (15%)

The Real-time Exercise (RTE) is an activity aimed at developing and honing your capacity for critical analysis and communicating complex concepts in a succinct and focused way. The intent is to move you from simply

reporting facts to analyzing the meaning and impact of real-life events, decisions, issues, controversies, and opportunities faced by public administrators every day. In short, rather than report the facts, this is designed to push you into answering the “so what?” question – what can we, as public administrators, learn by reading about and thinking about what’s happening in society?

Using both verbal and visual skills, you’ll provide commentary on topics of the day as they relate to the practice of public administration. This commentary, expressed through “Twitter-like” taglines and old-fashioned drawings, will link what you’re learning about public administration concepts and theories to current events in the public realm. This exercise also will help you improve your research techniques and develop an understanding of how to link theory to practice in any situation.

What to do

First Step: Find a recent news article that focuses on an event, incident, or issue in the public realm. Determine how it is relevant to public administrators in the context of the classroom lessons of the week. Capture the hotlink to post.

Second Step: Draw a picture that represents the critical point of your news clip. Do *not* draw a storyboard. You will attach an image of your original drawing to your blog post.

Third Step: Using the message window, write your commentary in no more than two sentences (or 140 characters) to highlight the key point. Make it pithy and to the point.

Fourth Step: In the message window, mark your Real-time Exercise post about anything from #accountability to #publicmanager.

See the link titled “Real-time Exercise Instructions” in the online course home page for detailed instructions on completing this exercise.

| Real-time Exercise Grading Criteria Rubric - 10 Points | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Incomplete |
| Report on self learning, recap the most valuable lessons of the week __ / 3 points | Identifies the issue(s) and topics germane to the course for this specific week and/or the study unit currently being studied. Offers new venues for study, additional case materials or unique application of course learning. (3) | Clearly states the focus of issues and provides relevance to the weekly study unit currently or previously under discussion. Offers expanded models from case studies suggested in course reading materials. (2) | Reflects topics covered in the course up to the date but does not expand upon the lessons taught to capture new examples or applied learning. (1) |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Demonstrates critical thinking skills __ / 3 points | Frames a news story or opinion piece relevant to answering the question “so what?” (3) | Summarizes a salient topic or concern without addressing the critical if unstated point. (2) | States the issue of concern, provides evidence of summary perspectives. (1) |
| Shares timely links and resources with others __ / 2 points | Selects a news clip from current media published within 72 hours, and is uniquely authored by an original source—not a reprinted or repurposed piece circulated by a news aggregator or wire service. (2) | Selects a news clip from current media published within 72 hours and provided by a reputable media outlet. (1) | Selects reprinted materials which are out of date, from another original source, not unique to class holdings or come packaged in an aggregated or summarized format. (0) |
| Grammar, usage, mechanics as appropriate to social media __ / 2 points | Uses recognizable social media shorthand and code appropriate for maximizing meaning. Few, if any, errors are present. (2) | Fails to maximize impact statement or content in abbreviated formats. Some errors are present. (1) | Commentary does not increase understanding. Errors are frequent and severe. (0) |

Participation (5%)

Your participation grade will be based on your attendance and engagement in the Live Sessions (10 points each), with the remainder on faculty interaction and group contribution and participation. See the Live Session Policy and Schedule section below for details about Live Session attendance policies.

Participation in written and oral discussions and group engagements is a key part of our learning process. Communications that enable students to think over what you have read, apply the material and concepts addressed in the course, and compare your ideas with others must be practiced in a professional setting. Contributing to the course learning opportunities in both a respectful and appropriate manner will help confirm student inputs adhere to academic standards.

You will receive a score based on the rubric below indicating the quality of your interactions.

| Participation Grading Criteria Rubric - 100 Points | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Objective/Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Incomplete |
| Commitment to course __ /10 points | High level of activity and proactive involvement in course tasks and activities; constructive engagement in class interactions; always | Reasonable level of activity and involvement in course tasks and activities; engages in team interactions and class live | Misses meetings or does not engage fully in project tasks and activities; does not participate fully in live sessions or meet all deadlines; reactive rather than proactive (15) |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | meets deadlines; live session attendance (50) | sessions; meets deadlines (30) | |
| Intellectual contributions on point for this course ___/10 points | Provides particularly useful citations, research and original ideas that make particularly insightful contributions to the understanding of fellow students and offers instructive contributions during the course (20) | Regularly contributes conceptual ideas that advance the goals and tasks of fellow students and advances the end objectives of the course (12) | Provides some contributions that advance the understanding of class members and addresses the objectives of the course (5) |
| Professional team work and positive relationships ___/20 points | Displays leadership in keeping teams cohesive and on task during group work. Communications and interactions in all meetings, live time, email and other interactions are consistently constructive and highly professional (30) | Communications and team interactions are mostly constructive and professional; listening skills are present; communications are always professional (17) | Communications in team meetings; live time; and other interactions absent or sometimes lacking professionalism or do not help keep class cohesive and working constructively (8) |
| Live Session participation ___/60 points (10 points per Live Session) | Actively participates in the Live Session by providing comments and asking questions OR submits a comprehensive and complete after-the-fact reflection on the recorded Live Session for a missed session (10 per Live Session). | Attends the Live Session but does not actively participate in the session by providing comments and asking questions OR submits a basic after-the-fact response to the recorded Live Session for a missed session (5 per Live Session). | Fails to attend the Live Session OR fails to submit an after-the-fact response to the recorded Live Session for a missed session (0 per session). |

Policies

Weekly Structure

Each day of the week is numbered (please see below). Day 1 is Wednesday, the first day of the beginning of each weekly session.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Day 1 | Day 2 | Day 3 | Day 4 | Day 5 | Day 6 | Day 7 |
| Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Monday | Tuesday |

Due dates for all assignments are stated in day numbers. Assignments are due no later than 11:55 p.m. in the Pacific Time zone on the day that is stated within the assignment page and the weekly activity table.

Late Assignments

Because the asynchronous online framework allows considerable flexibility for completing the work required in this course, and all syllabus requirements and assignments are available at the beginning of this course for students who wish to work ahead of schedule. **NO assignments are accepted after their due dates.** If an assignment is not completed, the student receives zero points for it. There can be no exceptions to this policy except with written permission granted by faculty PRIOR to the original due date.

Please make sure to allocate sufficient time to complete all of your assignments in your schedule. If you have questions about the readings, how to locate resources you need to complete an assignment or have an inquiry about the assignment prompt, you are encouraged to reach out to your faculty member as early as possible to get information and help well in advance of any deadline.

Guidelines for all written work

- Each submission should be proofread and written for clarity. It should be organized in a helpful way and should begin with a brief overview, a clear focus on your analysis (not a recitation of research) and argumentation; then conclude with a summary of the paper and its claims. Support assertions of fact, argue your position and provide insightful analysis supported in all cases with research and evidence useful for documentation. Use an appropriate academic citation format (e.g. APA Styleguide) in a consistent manner to document your sources. Citation expectations are very high so make sure to include both footnotes, endnotes, or an inclusive bibliography depending upon the format of the assignment submission. These criteria will all be considered in determining your grade.
- All papers should be single-spaced in 12 point font with one inch margins and submitted in a Word document format and not as a .pdf file format to allow for feedback and faculty annotations unless otherwise noted in the assignment instructions.

Grade of Incomplete

Only when work is not completed because of documented illness or other "emergency" occurring after the twelfth week of the semester (or 12th week equivalent for any course scheduled for less than 15 weeks), may the professor assign a grade of incomplete, INC. An "emergency" constitutes a situation or event which could not be foreseen and which is beyond the student's control and which prevents the student from taking any final paper, exam or completing other work during the final weeks of class. A student may not request an INC before the end of the twelfth week (or 12th week equivalent for any course scheduled for less than 15 weeks).

Course work which is not completed on time does not meet the eligibility requirements for being considered “incomplete work” and will instead receive zero credits in the grade book. Please review the assignment late policy if you have questions about late versus incomplete coursework.

Group Work

This course has three group assignments. You will be placed into each group by your professor in the week prior to the assignment. (There will be an instructor announcement directing you where to go in the online course to obtain your group information.)

- You will work with your Week 03 Action Team (1-8) for Week 03 Group Assignment 01.
- You will work with your Week 08 Action Teams (1-8) for Week 08 Group Assignment 01.
- You will work with your Week 14 Action Teams (1-8) for Week 14 Group Assignment 01.

Library Access

As a USC student, you have access to all the [USC library resources](#).

Additionally, USC Library tutorials provide examples of ways to avoid plagiarism and academic dishonesty (<https://libraries.usc.edu/research/reference-tutorials>). Find additional tutorials teaching ways to organize your research to avoid plagiarism (and more useful information) here (<http://libguides.usc.edu/tutorials>).

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Academic Conduct

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards”

<policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b>. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, <policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct>.

Support Systems

Student Health Counseling Services (SCS) - (213) 740-7711 – 24/7 on call

<engemannshc.usc.edu/counseling>

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1-800-273-8255

suicidepreventionlifeline.org

Free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Relationship & Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) – (213) 740-4900 - 24/7 on call

<https://studenthealth.usc.edu/sexual-assault/>

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm.

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED)/Title IX compliance – (213) 740-5086

equity.usc.edu, titleix.usc.edu

Information about how to get help or help a survivor of harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and additional resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants. The university prohibits discrimination or harassment based on the following protected characteristics: race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, physical disability, medical condition, mental disability, marital status, pregnancy, veteran status, genetic information, and any other characteristic which may be specified in applicable laws and governmental regulations.

Bias Assessment Response and Support – (213) 740-2421

[Incidents of bias, hate crimes and microaggressions need to be reported allowing for appropriate investigation and response.](#)

Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions for appropriate investigation and response.

The Office of Disability Services and Programs – (213) 740-0776

dsp.usc.edu

Support and accommodations for students with disabilities. Services include assistance in providing readers/notetakers/interpreters, special accommodations for test taking needs, assistance with architectural barriers, assistive technology, and support for individual needs.

USC Support & Advocacy – (213) 821-4710

studentaffairs.usc.edu/ssa

Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

Diversity at USC – (213) 740-2101

diversity.usc.edu

Information on events, programs and training, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

USC Emergency – UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu, emergency.usc.edu

Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

USC Department of Public Safety – UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-120 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu

Non-emergency assistance or information.

Live Session Policy and Schedule

This course has six Live Sessions, which will be held via Zoom. Faculty conducts these Live Sessions to share insights into the topics we are covering, to offer opportunities to ask questions about the course, and to discuss any assignment challenges or ideas you may have. These opportunities are scheduled to coincide with major assignments and projects. Live Sessions offer you the opportunity to speak directly with faculty and to explore advanced tips and techniques for successfully completing this course. Students are encouraged to be actively involved in these sessions.

Participation in these Live Sessions is **required** and will be graded as part of your overall class participation grade. You may fulfill this requirement in one of two ways:

Option A: Attend the live session in real time and actively participate by asking questions, engaging in the discussion, and contributing thoughtful and constructive comments and observations. Simply logging in to the session and attending is *not* considered active participation and will count *against* your overall grade.

Option B: If you cannot attend a session, it will be recorded and archived for you to view later. In order to receive participation credit for the week, you will need to watch the live session recording and then post a 300-to 500-word response that includes your own answers to the questions posed during the live session (as if you were attending the session and those questions were posed to you), an analysis of what you find to be the key insights or lessons learned from the session, and any follow-up questions you may have. This should NOT just be a summary of the slides and materials presented. You should integrate course materials as appropriate. *To receive credit, you must submit your response to the discussion board in the Live Session Information & Missed Live Session Submittals section no more than 10 days following the session.*

PLEASE NOTE: A 10-point deduction will be taken for any missed Live Session.

Live sessions occur on **Wednesday** of designated weeks from **6:00-7:30 P.M. Pacific Time (Trojan Time)**. The live sessions will occur in the following weeks

- **Week 01**
- **Week 03**
- **Week 06**
- **Week 09**
- **Week 12**
- **Week 14**

Access the Live Session via the “Meetings” icon in the online course.

To join the audio portion of this meeting, you may listen and speak through your computer's headphone and microphone configuration or dial in using a touch tone phone. Please be sure that if you are using your computer's microphone that you also use earbuds or headphones to listen in order to eliminate reverberation of the audio. Don't use your computer's speaker.

If you cannot attend a session, the link for the recorded session will be available in the “Meetings” section of the online course for later viewing. **If you are reviewing a session after the fact to earn credit, please post your review as a reply to the appropriate Live Session in the Live Session Information & Missed Live Session Submittals section of the online course.**

Weekly Activities

| Week 01: Introduction: What is Public Administration? | | |
|---|----------|-------------|
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| <p>Reading</p> <p>Hill & Lynn, pages 1-4 and Chapter 1</p> <p>Allison, G. T. (1988). <i>Public and private management: Are they fundamentally alike in all unimportant aspects?</i> In Stillman, R. (Ed.), <i>Public administration: Concepts and cases</i> (283-298). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. (Located in e-reserves)</p> | Day 3 | Ungraded |

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration, <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> Vol. 2, No. 2, 197-222. (Located in e-reserves) | | |
| Week 01 Live Session | Day 1, 6:00 PM PT | 10 |
| Week 01 Discussion 01: Introductions | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Comments: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 01 Discussion 02: Public vs. Private Organizations - Are They Fundamentally Different? | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 01 Assignment 01: Introduction Survey | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 01 Assignment 02: Real-Time Exercise | Day 4 | Ungraded |
| Week 01 Checkpoint 01: Comprehensive Analytic Assignment Preview | Components due in various weeks | No points this week |
| Week 02: Introduction: The Context of Public Administration | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Cayer, N.J., Baker, D.L., & Weschler, L. F. (2010). <i>Public administration: Social change and adaptive management</i> (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Birkdale Publishers. Chapter 2. (Located in e-reserves) Kettl, D.F. (2007). The transformation of governance: Who governs and how? In J.M. Shafritz & A.C. Hyde (Eds.), <i>Classics of public administration</i> (6th ed.) (577-587). Boston, MA: Thomson Wadsworth. (Located in e-reserves) Moynihan, D.P., & Ingraham, P.W. (2010). The suspect handmaiden: The evolution of politics and administration in the American state. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 70(supplement), S229-S237. (Located in e-reserves). | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 02 Discussion 01: Life in the Swamp | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> | 10 |

| | <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | |
|---|---|-------------|
| Week 02 Assignment 01: Real-time Exercise | Day 4 | 10 |
| Week 03: Structure: The Constitutional Foundations of Public Administration | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| <p>Reading</p> <p>Hill & Lynn, pages 99-104 and Chapter 4</p> <p>Madison, J. (1787). Federalist #10: The same subject continued: The union as a safeguard against domestic faction and insurrection. <i>New York Daily Advertiser</i>, November 22. http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/the-federalist-10.php</p> <p>Madison, J. (1788). Federalist #47: The particular structure of the new government and the distribution of power among its different parts. <i>New York Packet</i>, February 1. http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/the-federalist-47.php</p> <p>Hamilton, A., or Madison, J. (1788). Federalist #51: The structure of the government must furnish the proper checks and balances between the different departments. <i>New York Packet</i>, February 8. http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/the-federalist-51.php</p> <p>Rosenbloom, D.H. (1983). Public administrative theory and the separation of powers. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 43(3), 219-227. (Located in e-reserves)</p> | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 03 Live Session | Day 1, 6:00 PM PT | 10 |
| Week 03 Discussion 01: Constitutional Governance | <i>Initial Post: Day 4 Follow-up Questions: Day 5 Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 03 Group Assignment 01: The Logic of Governance Case Study | Day 7 | 47 |

| Week 03 Group Assignment 02: Reflection | Day 7 | 3 |
|---|---|-------------|
| Week 04: Structure: The Administrative State | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Hill & Lynn, Chapter 5 Merton, R.K. (2012). Bureaucratic structure and personality. In J.M. Shafritz & A.C. Hyde (Eds.), <i>Classics of public administration</i> (7th ed.) (100-108). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. (Located in e-reserves) Simon, H.A. (1946). The proverbs of administration. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 6(1), 53-67. (Located in e-reserves) | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 04 Discussion 01: The Bureaucracy as an Instrument of Control | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 04 Discussion 02: Comprehensive Analytic Assignment Topic Proposals | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Response: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 04 Assignment 01: Real-time Exercise | Day 4 | 10 |
| Week 05: Structure: Tools for Public Administrators | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Hill & Lynn, Chapter 6 Hurricane Katrina (A): Preparing for "The Big One" in New Orleans (Located in HBS coursepack) Hurricane Katrina (B): Responding to an "Ultra-Catastrophe" in New Orleans (Located in HBS coursepack) | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 05 Discussion 01: The Influence of Structure | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions:</i> | 10 |

| | | |
|--|---|--------------------|
| | Day 5 <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | |
| Week 05 Assignment 01: Katrina Case Study | Day 7 | 50 |
| Week 05 Assignment 02: CAA Decision | Day 7 | 25 |
| Week 06: Culture: Ethics, Values, and Motives | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Hill & Lynn: pages 267-270 and Chapter 8 Cooper, T.L. (2004). Big questions in administrative ethics: A need for focused, collaborative effort. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 64(41), 395-407. (Located in e-reserves) Svara, J.H. (2007). <i>The ethics primer for public administrators in government and nonprofit organizations</i> . Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers. Chapter 4. (Located in e-reserves) | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 06 Live Session | Day 1, 6:00 PM PT | 10 |
| Week 06 Discussion 01: To Obey or Not to Obey | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 06 Assignment 01: Real-time Exercise | Day 4 | 10 |
| Week 07: Culture: Institutionalized Values | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Hill & Lynn, Chapter 9 Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (2008). <i>Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership</i> (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Chapter 19. (Located in e-reserves) | Day 3 | Ungraded |

| | | |
|---|--|--------------------|
| <p>Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H.G. (2006). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 66(2), 168-176. (Located in e-reserves)</p> | | |
| <p>Week 07 Discussion 01: The Impact of Organizational Culture</p> | <p><i>Initial Post:</i> Day 4 <i>Follow-up Questions:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies to Questions:</i> Day 7</p> | 10 |
| <p>Week 07 Assignment 01: CAA Annotated Bib</p> | Day 7 | 25 |
| Week 08: Culture: Diversity | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| <p>Reading</p> <p>deBono, E (1999). <i>Six thinking hats</i>. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.</p> <p>Ewoh, A.I.E. (2013). Managing and valuing diversity challenges to public management in the 21st century. <i>Public Personnel Management</i> (42)2, 107-122. (Located in e-reserves)</p> <p>Thomas, K.M., & Plaut, V.C. (2012). The many faces of diversity resistance in the workplace. In K.M. Thomas (Ed.) <i>Diversity resistance in organizations</i> (1-23). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (Located in e-reserves)</p> <p>Bond, M. A., & Haynes, M.C. (2014). Workplace diversity: A social-ecological framework and policy implications. <i>Social Issues and Policy Review</i>, 8(1), 167-201. (Located in e-reserves)</p> <p>"Civil Rights Reform: CRAT, CRIT and Implementing Change"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part 1 ○ Part 2 | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| <p>Week 08 Discussion 01: Valuing and Managing Diversity</p> | <p><i>Initial Post:</i> Day 4 <i>Follow-up Questions:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies to</i></p> | 10 |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| | Questions: Day 7 | |
| Week 08 Group Assignment 01: Civil Rights Reform Case Study | Day 7 | 47 |
| Week 08 Group Assignment 02: Reflection | Day 7 | 3 |
| Week 09: Craft: Managerial Styles | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Hill & Lynn, pages 335-340 and Chapter 10 Denhardt, J.V., & Campbell, K. B. (2005). Leadership education in public administration: Finding the fit between purpose and approach. <i>Journal of Public Affairs Education</i> , 11(3), 169-179. Read pages 171-176 only, which offers a summary of various theories about leadership (Located in e-reserves) Nahavandi, A. (2009). <i>The art and science of leadership</i> (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. Chapter 1 (Located in e-reserves) | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 09 Live Session | Day 1, 6:00 PM PT | 10 |
| Week 09 Discussion 01: Does Leadership Make a Difference? | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 09 Assignment 01: Real-Time Exercise | Day 4 | 10 |
| Week 09 Assignment 02: CAA Problem Def | Day 7 | 50 |
| Week 10: Craft: Managerial Heuristics | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Hill & Lynn, Chapter 11 Overman, E. S., & Boyd, K. J. (1994). Best practice research and postbureaucratic reform. <i>Reform Journal Public Administration Research</i> | Day 3 | Ungraded |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| <p><i>Theory</i>, 4(1), 67-84. (Located in e-reserves)</p> <p>Myers, S., Smith, H.P., & Martin, L.L. (2004). <i>Conducting best practices research in public affairs</i>. Orlando, FL: Center for Community Partnerships, College of Health & Public Affairs, University of Central Florida (Located in e-reserves)</p> | | |
| Week 10 Discussion 01: Learning to Think and Act Strategically | <p><i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i></p> | 10 |
| Week 10 Assignment 01: CAA Lit Review | Day 7 | 50 |
| Week 11: Craft: Craftsmanship | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| <p>Reading</p> <p>Harvard Kennedy School Case: <i>Winning Hearts and Minds: Reforming the Providence School District</i> (Parts A & B). (Located in HBS coursepack)</p> <p>Leithwood, K., Anderson, S.E., Mascall, B., & Strauss, T. (in press). School leaders' influences on student learning: The four paths. In T. Bush, L. Bell, & D. Middlewood (Eds.), <i>The principles of educational leadership and management</i> (1-13). London: Sage Publishers. (Located in e-reserves)</p> <p>Nahavandi, A. (2009). <i>The art and science of leadership</i> (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. Chapter 9 (Located in e-reserves)</p> | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 11 Discussion 01: Leading Change | <p><i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i></p> | 10 |
| Week 11 Assignment 01: Skills and Styles | Day 7 | 50 |
| Week 12: Accountability: First Principals and The Rule of Law | | |

| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
|--|---|-------------|
| Reading Hill & Lynn, Chapter 2 Dobel, J.P. (1990). Integrity in the public service. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 50(3), 354-366. (Located in e-reserves) Dunne, D.D., & Legge, J.S. Jr. (2001). U.S. local government managers and the complexity of responsibility and accountability in democratic governance. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> , 73-88. (Located in e-reserves) | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 12 Live Session | Day 1, 6:00 PM PT | 10 |
| Week 12 Discussion 01: Managerial Accountability | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 12 Assignment 01: Real-Time Exercise | Day 4 | 10 |
| Week 12 Assignment 02: Admin Discretion | Day 7 | 50 |
| Week 13: Accountability: Rules and Regulations | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Hill & Lynn, Chapter 7 | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 13 Discussion 01: Enforcing the Rules of the Game | <i>Initial Post: Day 4</i> <i>Follow-up Questions: Day 5</i> <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | 10 |
| Week 13 Assignment 01: CAA Case Analysis | Day 7 | 100 |
| Week 14: Accountability: Managing in Three Dimensions | | |

| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
|--|--|-------------|
| Reading Hill & Lynn, pages 413-415 and Chapter 12 | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 14 Live Session | Day 1, 6:00 PM PT | 10 |
| Week 14 Assignment 01: CAA Exec Summary | Day 7 | 50 |
| Week 14 Group Assignment 01: The Columbia Accident Case Study | Day 7 | 47 |
| Week 14 Group Assignment 02: Reflection | Day 7 | 3 |
| Week 15: The Public Administration of the Future | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Point Value |
| Reading Crosby, B.C. (2010). Leading in the shared-power world. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 70(supplement), S69-S77. (Located in e-reserves) Fiorino, D.J. (2010). Sustainability as a conceptual force for public administration. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 70(supplement), S78-S88. (Located in e-reserves) Koppell, J.G.S. (2010). Administration without borders. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 70(supplement), S46-S55. (Located in e-reserves) Moore, M.H. (2012). Creating public value: Strategic management in government.. In J.M. Shafritz & A.C. Hyde (Eds.), <i>Classics of public administration</i> (7th ed.) (549-561). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. (Located in e-reserves) Perry, J.L., & Buckwalter, N.D. (2010). The public service of the future. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 70(supplement), S238-S245. (Located in e-reserves) | Day 3 | Ungraded |
| Week 15 Discussion 01: Looking Down the Road - the 3D Approach | <i>Initial Post:</i> Day 4 <i>Follow-up Questions:</i> Day 5 | 10 |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <i>Replies to Questions: Day 7</i> | |
|--|--|--|