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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Spring 2015 | Preston Hall 210 | Wed 6:00-8:50 pm |

### Office Hours and Contact Information

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Day: | Tuesday  | Wednesday | and by appointment |
| Time: | 3:00 to 5:00 | 3:00 to 5:00 |
| Instructor: Dr. Alejandro RodríguezOffice: University Hall 551—Campus Mailbox: 19588Phone: (817) 272-3357E-mail: aro@uta.edu |

REQUIRED TEXTS

☺ Electronic resource through [UTA library](http://www.uta.edu/library/)

 **±**  In Shafritz, Hyde, and Parkes. (7th edition, 2012). Classics of Public Administration.

**(R)** Placed on library reserve

1. Frederick Taylor. (1911, 1947). Scientific Management: Comprising Shop Management, The Principles of Scientific Management and Testimony Before the Special House Committee. ☺
2. Herbert Simon. (1947, 1997). Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations.
3. Dwight Waldo. (1948, 2006). The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration.
4. Vincent Ostrom. (1973, 3rd edition, 2007). The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration.
5. Charles Goodsell. (1983, 2003). The Case for Bureaucracy.☺
6. Richard J. Stillman II. (1991, 1998). Preface to Public Administration **(R)**
7. Charles J. Fox and Hugh T. Miller. (1996). Postmodern Public Administration **(R)**
8. O.C. McSwite. (1997). Legitimacy in Public Administration: A Discourse Analysis. **(R)**
9. H. George Frederickson, Kevin B. Smith, and Christopher W. Larimer. (2011, 2nd edition). The Public Administration Theory Primer.
10. Woodrow Wilson. (1887). “The Study of Administration.” *Political Science Quarterly* 2(2): 197-222. ☺**±**
11. Max Weber. (1946). “Bureaucracy.” From From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology edited and translated by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. **±**
12. Herbert Simon. (1946). “The Proverbs of Administration.” *Public Administration Review* 6(Winter):53-67. ☺**±**
13. Robert K. Merton. (1952). “Bureaucratic Structure and Personality.” **±**
14. Dwight Waldo. (1952). “Development of Theory of Democratic Administration,” *American Political Science Review* 46(1):81-103.☺
15. Herbert Simon. (1952). “Development of Theory of Democratic Administration: Replies and Comments” *American Political Science Review* 46(2): 494-496 (Reply to Waldo).☺
16. Dwight Waldo. (1952). “Development of Theory of Democratic Administration: Replies and Comments.” *American Political Science Review* 46(2):501-503 (Reply to Simon).☺
17. Charles Tiebout. (1956). “A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 64(5):416-424. ☺
18. Douglas McGregor. (1957). “The Human Side of Enterprise.” **±**
19. Graham Allison. (1969). “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis.” *American Political Science Review*, 63: 689-718.☺
20. Charles Lindbloom. (1979). “Still Muddling, Not Yet Through,” *Public Administration Review* 39(6):517-526. ☺
21. Michael M. Harmon. (1989). “The Simon-Waldo Debate: A Review and Update.” *Public Administration Quarterly* (Winter):437-451.
22. Louis C. Gawthrop and Jeffrey S. Luke. (1989). Minnowbrook: The Search for a New Reality.” *Public Administration Review*. 49(2); Special Issue: Minnowbrook II. Changing Epochs of Public Administration:194-196. ☺
23. Frank P. Sherwood. (1990). “The Half-Century’s ‘Great Books’ in Public Administration,” *Public Administration Review*, 50(2): 249-264. ☺
24. H. George Frederickson. (1996). “Comparing the Reinventing Government Movement with the New Public Administration.” *Public Administration Review* 56(3):263-270. ☺
25. Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. (1998). “A Critical Analysis of the New Public Management.” *International Public Management Journal*, 1(1): 107-123. ☺
26. Robert D. Behn. (1998). “The New Public Management Paradigm and the Search for Democratic Accountability.” *The International Public Management Journal* 1(2):131-164. ☺
27. Linda Kaboolian. (1998). “The New Public Management,” *Public Administration Review* 58(3):189-193. ☺
28. H. George Frederickson. (1999). “The Repositioning of American Public Administration,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 32:701-711. ☺
29. Hal Rainey and Paula Steinbauer. (1999). “Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Organizations.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 1:1-32. ☺
30. Donald F. Kettl. (2000). “Public Administration at the Millennium: The State of the Field*.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(1):7-34. ☺
31. Laurence E. Lynn Jr. (2001). “The Myth of the Bureaucratic Paradigm: What Traditional Public Administration Really Stood For.” *Public Administration Review*, 61:144-157. ☺
32. Charles T. Goodsell. (2004). “American Public Administration’s Maturity: A Profile.” *International Journal of Public Administration* 27(7):471-480. ☺
33. Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde. (2012). Classics of Public Administration (7th edition).

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED TEXTS

1. Chester Barnard. (1938). The Functions of the Executive.
2. Thomas Kuhn. (1962, 1970). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.
3. Harold Seidman. (1970, 1980, 1998). Politics, Position, and Power.
4. Graham Allison. (1971). Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.
5. Dwight Waldo. (1985). The Enterprise of Public Administration: A Summary View.
6. John Rohr. (1986). To Run a Constitution
7. James Q. Wilson. (1989). Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It.
8. Brian R. Fry. (1989). Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo. ☺
9. Gary L. Wamsley et. al. (1990). Refounding Public Administration
10. David Osborne and Ted Gaebler. (1992). Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.
11. Camilla Stivers. (1990). “Toward a Feminist Theory of Public Administration,” *Women and Politics*, 10(4):49-65. **±**
12. Gary L. Wamsley et. al. (1996, 2004). Refounding Democratic Public Administration
13. H. George Frederickson. (1997). The Spirit of Public Administration
14. O. C. McSwite. (2002). Invitation to Public Administration
15. George Boyne. (2002). Public and Private Management: What’s the Difference?” *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1): 97-122. ☺
16. Julie Dolan and David H. Rosenbloom, eds. (2003). Representative Bureaucracy: Classic Readings and Continuing Controversies.

OTHER RECOMMENDED TEXTS

See SUPA’s Public Administration Ph.D. Reading List.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to critically examine public administration theory through the lenses of the various governance models that have been proposed—albeit, in most cases, implicitly—by public administration scholars beginning with the traditional bureaucratic model through a market-based model to a postmodern discourse-based model. The course begins by examining each governance model’s stated or implied assumptions (about man, government, state, and so on). Second, the course considers the political philosophy and conceptual pillars on which the models are theoretically founded. Finally, the course examines whether there is any credibility and theoretical basis to the claim of an emerging paradigm in public administration. The principal readings will focus on authors who have addressed public administration theory and the question of what is Public Administration.

**Course Aim:**

The purpose of the course is to strengthen the students’ critical thinking and integrative skills through the deconstruction of theory. Students will be expected to produce a paper of near publishable quality. The topic of the paper will focus on issues and concepts relevant to public administration.

**Learning outcomes—upon completion of this course, students should be able to:**

1. Concisely describe the core issues of contemporary public administration as presented in the assigned reading materials and discussed in class;
2. Demonstrate the ability to analyze and critique public administration topics within the ideological framework of democracy, federalism, capitalism, bureaucratic politics, and institutional dynamics as detailed in the assigned reading materials and discussed in class;
3. Concisely explain the various concepts and theories informing public administration as presented in the assigned reading materials and discussed in class; and
4. Demonstrate the ability to integrate core issues, topics, and theories relevant to public administration discussed during this seminar by writing a research-based essay of near publishable quality.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND COMPETENCIES

This course is a graduate seminar. As opposed to a lecture-based class, this seminar is designed to stimulate a discussion of issues and topics relevant to public administration theory. The discussion will be mostly shifted away from the instructor and focused on students’ input, intellectual stimuli, questions, and collegial search for answers. The instructor will provide a framework for the discussion, synthesize information, and promote self-aware questioning of public administration as a field of inquiry. Conversely, unreflective, uncritical, and redundant discussions will be discouraged. In sum, students are encouraged to debate key issues and to discover information with the instructor acting more as a facilitator of learning than a provider of information. The seminar requirements are as follows:

**Readings**

To contribute effectively to this seminar, students are expected to complete assigned readings before class meetings and be prepared to discuss the content of the readings assigned for each class. Students must guide their reading of the material by considering the following questions: How does this relate to public administration theory? How does this theory reflect practice? Where does this fit in the intellectual evolution of public administration?

The assigned readings might seem extensive for some class sessions or as a whole; however, these are only the essential readings and very introductory in nature. Students are strongly encouraged to supplement the assigned readings with materials from the SUPA Ph.D. reading list and other materials that students should seek on their own.

**Class Participation (100 points = 20 percent of your final grade)**

The success of the seminar as a learning experience depends, to a large extent, on the level and quality of participation by students. Class participation by everyone in the class is therefore required. Participation quality is enhanced by the students’ willingness to challenge the readings, established concepts and theories, and each other. This could only be accomplished by prior preparation and attendance to all class sessions.

**Leading of Class Discussion (100 points = 20 percent of your final grade)**

Depending on enrollment, students will each lead the class on a discussion of one or more assigned topics. Students leading the class discussion are expected to read beyond what is assigned for that specific class session. Discussants should be prepared to cover the background of the central themes or issues, their history, intellectual evolution, and the different views on themes or issues.

**Discussion Materials (100 points = 20 percent of your final grade)**

Students leading the class discussion will prepare a discussion guide addressing the following:

Integrative Review

This is a short critical and cogent review of the assigned readings. In five to seven pages assess the intellectual contribution of the readings. This is also an integrative assignment. That is, you are expected to connect the most influential and significant ideas of the readings to one another and to the broad literature of public administration. How are the ideas on one assigned reading connected to the other readings? How are the ideas discussed in the assigned readings relevant to current ideas in the field? What are the implications of these ideas for the field?

This assignment is due at noon one day before the class discussion. Please email your Integrative Review to all your classmates and to the instructor by the due date. Your grade will be based on your writing skills and content. I will penalize late Integrative Reviews by one full letter grade and will not accept them after class discussion.

**Journal Manuscript (100 = 40 percent of your final grade)**

The purpose behind this course requirement is to compel students to reflect on an area of research relevant to public administration theory. This team assignment is designed to further reinforce the knowledge that students are expected to acquire through the other learning components of the course.

The instructor will lead each team in drafting a [peer reviewed](http://libraries.uta.edu/video/instruction/pr/intro.htm) journal manuscript on a timely, theory-based, and relevant public administration topic. The instructor and students will collaboratively decide on the topics of the manuscript.

#### Format

Draft the manuscript according to the [**APA** style manual](http://www.uta.edu/library/help/files/cite-apa.pdf) Suggested length of paper is between 20 and 25 double-spaced pages (not counting cover page or Table of Contents). Use a 12-point font and one-inch margins all around. List (following APA style) the 20 or more academic references used to write the manuscript.

#### Grading Criteria

I will grade the manuscript based on content, written clarity, and research sources’ relevance and appropriateness. This assignment is graded on a 0-100 scale, where 100 points equals 40 percent of final grade.

Content (60 points): Grade based on the team’s ability to demonstrate an understanding of a selected topic of public administration and, just as important, how various concepts relate to one another and to work settings. That is, the authors should have discussed all appropriate material and should have excluded all tangential material while at the same time connecting the various relevant concepts to one another. More is not necessarily better. Think more write less.

Written clarity (20 points):Grade based on organization, grammar, spelling, and punctuation. A well-organized paper uses interconnected paragraphs to develop the main argument of the essay. Connecting paragraphs requires that the writer use transitional sentences between paragraphs. Written clarity is negatively affected by grammatical errors, repeated use of sentence fragments, unclear sentences, misspelled words, and faulty punctuation.

Relevance of research references (20 points)**:** Grade based on the authors’ ability to recognize relevant research references as demonstrated by the number of appropriate peer-reviewed references used to develop the argument of the essay. Newspaper articles, editorials, and other non-referee materials either printed or posted online are not considered academic references.

 LATE PAPERS WILL BE PENALIZED BY A FULL LETTER GRADE.

I will grade your performance according to the following criteria:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignments** | **Points** | **Cumulative Points** | **Percentage Points** | **Due Dates** |
| Class participation | 100 | 100 | 20 | Ongoing |
| Integrative Review | 100 | 200 | 20 | By noon the day before class discussion |
| Leading of class discussion | 100 | 300 | 20 | As assigned |
| Journal Manuscript | 100 | 400 | 40 | See the course calendar |

Grades are calculated as follows:

A = 90% and above | B = 80 – 89% | C = 70 – 79% | D = 60 – 69% | F = 59% and below

**Course Calendar**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Topic** | **Assignment/Readings** |
| **1. Jan 21** | Introduction to the course |  |
| **2. Jan 28** | Why theory?  | Frederickson et. al. (2011), Chap 1;Stillman (1991/98), Chap 1 |
| **3. Feb 4** | Bureaucracy  | **Weber** (1946); Merton (1952); **Goodsell** (1983/2003)  |
| **4. Feb 11** | The politics-administration dichotomy | **Wilson (1887)**; Stillman (1991/98) Chap 2-3; the **three-essay** Waldo vs. Simon debate of 1952; **Harmon (1989)** |
| **5. Feb 18** | Principles of a science of administration* **The bureaucratic model**
 | **Taylor** (1911, 47); Stillman (1991/98), Chap 4 |
| **6. Feb 25** | Theories of Political Control of the BureaucracyWho controls the bureaucracy? | **Frederickson et. al.** (2011), Chap 2; Stillman (1991/98), Chap 5 |
| **7. Mar 4** | Administration ***is*** politics | **Waldo (1948, 2007)**; Simon (1946, Proverbs) |
| **Mar 9-14** | Spring Vacation |  |
| **8. Mar 18** | Theories of Bureaucratic Politics | Lynn (2001); Allison (1969);**Frederickson e. al.** (2011), Chap 3 |
| **9. Mar 25** | Beyond the politics administration dichotomy | Sherwood (1990); **Kettl (2000)**; **Goodsell (2004)** |
| **10. Apr 1** | Theories of Public Management * **A market-based government model**
 | **Frederickson et. al.** (2011), Chap 5; McGregor (1957); **Lynn (1998)**; Behn (1998); Kaboolian (1998); Rainey & Steinbauer (1999)  |
| **11. Apr 8** | New Public Administration | **Frederickson**. (1996); Gawthrop & Luke (1989) |
| **12. Apr 15** | Postmodern Theory * **Discourse-based government model**
 | **Fox** (1996); **O.C. McSwite** (1997); Frederickson et. al (2011), Chap 6 |
| **13. Apr 22** | Decision Theory | **Simon (1947, 1997)**; Frederickson et. al. (2011), Chap 7; Lindbloom (1979) |
| **14. Apr 29** | Rational Choice Theory * **The Tiebout model**
 | Frederickson et. al. (2011), Chap 8; **Ostrom (1973, 2007); Tiebout (1956)** |
| **15. May 6** | Theories of Governance | **Frederickson et. al.** (2011), Chap 9; Frederickson (1999) |
| **16. May 13** |  | **Research paper due by noon May 13** |

**See next page for team assignmentsAssigned Topics by Teams**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Topic** | **Integration** |
| **2. Jan 23** | Why theory? | **Team 1**: Adame, Caesar, Flake |
| **3. Jan 30** | Bureaucracy | **Team 2**: Albano, Killingsworth, Heath |
| **4. Feb 6** | The politics-administration dichotomy | **Team 3**: Green, Parks, Dunlap |
| **5. Feb 13** | Principles of a science of administration* **The bureaucratic model**
 | **Team 4**: Horn, Hatley, Hooper |
| **6. Feb 20** | Theories of Political Control of the BureaucracyWho controls the bureaucracy? | **Team 5**: Johnson, Brown, Phillips |
| **7. Feb 27** | Administration ***is*** politics | **Team 6**: Macon, Portillo, Williams |
| **8. Mar 6** | Theories of Bureaucratic Politics | **Team 7**: Sloan, Taylor, Njenga, Vela |
| **Mar 9-14** | Spring Vacation |  |
| **9. Mar 20** | Beyond the politics-administration dichotomy | **Team 1**: Adame, Caesar, Flake |
| **10. Mar 27** | Theories of Public Management * **A market-based government model**
 | **Team 2**: Albano, Killingsworth, Heath |
| **11. Apr 3** | New Public Administration | **Team 3**: Green, Parks, Dunlap |
| **12. Apr 10** | Postmodern Theory * **Discourse-based government model**
 | **Team 4**: Horn, Hatley, Hooper |
| **13. Apr 17** | Decision Theory | **Team 5**: Johnson, Brown, Phillips |
| **14. Apr 24** | Rational Choice Theory * The self-maximizing bureaucrat
* The Tiebout model
 | **Team 6**: Macon, Portillo, Williams |
| **15. May 1** | Theories of Governance | **Team 7**: Sloan, Taylor, Njenga, Vela |
| **16. May 8** |  | Research paper due by noon May 13 |

Revised: 1/16/15 ***Policies and Student Resources:***

**Drop Policy:** Students may drop or swap (adding and dropping a class concurrently) classes through self-service in MyMav from the beginning of the registration period through the late registration period. After the late registration period, students must see their academic advisor to drop a class or withdraw. Undeclared students must see an advisor in the University Advising Center. Drops can continue through a point two-thirds of the way through the term or session. It is the student's responsibility to officially withdraw if they do not plan to attend after registering. **Students will not be automatically dropped for non-attendance**. Repayment of certain types of financial aid administered through the University may be required as the result of dropping classes or withdrawing. For more information, contact the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships (<http://wweb.uta.edu/aao/fao/>).

**Attendance:** At The University of Texas at Arlington, taking attendance is not required. Rather, each faculty member is free to develop his or her own methods of evaluating students’ academic performance, which includes establishing course-specific policies on attendance. As the instructor of this section, I have decided that attendance at class meetings is not required but strongly encouraged.

**Americans with Disabilities Act:** The University of Texas at Arlington is on record as being committed to both the spirit and letter of all federal equal opportunity legislation, including the *Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)*. All instructors at UT Arlington are required by law to provide "reasonable accommodations" to students with disabilities, so as not to discriminate on the basis of that disability. Any student requiring an accommodation for this course must provide the instructor with official documentation in the form of a letter certified by the staff in the Office for Students with Disabilities, University Hall 102. Only those students who have officially documented a need for an accommodation will have their request honored. Information regarding diagnostic criteria and policies for obtaining disability-based academic accommodations can be found at [www.uta.edu/disability](http://www.uta.edu/disability) or by calling the Office for Students with Disabilities at (817) 272-3364.

**Title IX:** The University of Texas at Arlington is committed to upholding U.S. Federal Law “Title IX” such that no member of the UT Arlington community shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity. For more information, visit [www.uta.edu/titleIX](http://www.uta.edu/titleIX).

**Academic Integrity:** Students enrolled in this course are expected to adhere to the UT Arlington Honor Code:

*I pledge, on my honor, to uphold UT Arlington’s tradition of academic integrity, a tradition that values hard work and honest effort in the pursuit of academic excellence.*

*I promise that I will submit only work that I personally create or contribute to group collaborations, and I will appropriately reference any work from other sources. I will follow the highest standards of integrity and uphold the spirit of the Honor Code.*

UT Arlington faculty members may employ the Honor Code as they see fit in their courses, including (but not limited to) having students acknowledge the honor code as part of an examination or requiring students to incorporate the honor code into any work submitted. Per UT System *Regents’ Rule* 50101, §2.2, suspected violations of university’s standards for academic integrity (including the Honor Code) will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. Violators will be disciplined in accordance with University policy, which may result in the student’s suspension or expulsion from the University.

**Student Support Services**:UT Arlington provides a variety of resources and programs designed to help students develop academic skills, deal with personal situations, and better understand concepts and information related to their courses. Resources include tutoring, major-based learning centers, developmental education, advising and mentoring, personal counseling, and federally funded programs. For individualized referrals, students may visit the reception desk at University College (Ransom Hall), call the Maverick Resource Hotline at 817-272-6107, send a message to resources@uta.edu, or view the information at [www.uta.edu/resources](http://www.uta.edu/resources).

**Electronic Communication:** UT Arlington has adopted MavMail as its official means to communicate with students about important deadlines and events, as well as to transact university-related business regarding financial aid, tuition, grades, graduation, etc. All students are assigned a MavMail account and are responsible for checking the inbox regularly. There is no additional charge to students for using this account, which remains active even after graduation. Information about activating and using MavMail is available at <http://www.uta.edu/oit/cs/email/mavmail.php>.

**Student Feedback Survey:** At the end of each term, students enrolled in classes categorized as “lecture,” “seminar,” or “laboratory” shall be directed to complete an online Student Feedback Survey (SFS). Instructions on how to access the SFS for this course will be sent directly to each student through MavMail approximately 10 days before the end of the term. Each student’s feedback enters the SFS database anonymously and is aggregated with that of other students enrolled in the course. UT Arlington’s effort to solicit, gather, tabulate, and publish student feedback is required by state law; students are strongly urged to participate. For more information, visit <http://www.uta.edu/sfs>.

**Emergency Exit Procedures:** Should we experience an emergency event that requires us to vacate the building, students should exit the room and move toward the nearest exit, which is located **left** as you exit the classroom. When exiting the building during an emergency, one should never take an elevator but should use the stairwells. Faculty members and instructional staff will assist students in selecting the safest route for evacuation and will make arrangements to assist individuals with disabilities.

**Final Review Week:** A period of five class days prior to the first day of final examinations in the long sessions shall be designated as Final Review Week. The purpose of this week is to allow students sufficient time to prepare for final examinations. During this week, there shall be no scheduled activities such as required field trips or performances; and no instructor shall assign any themes, research problems or exercises of similar scope that have a completion date during or following this week *unless specified in the class syllabus*. During Final Review Week, an instructor shall not give any examinations constituting 10% or more of the final grade, except makeup tests and laboratory examinations. In addition, no instructor shall give any portion of the final examination during Final Review Week. During this week, classes are held as scheduled. In addition, instructors are not required to limit content to topics that have been previously covered; they may introduce new concepts as appropriate.