Policy Seminar (UAP/PSCI 4644): Policy and Administration in a Democracy

Seminar participants will reflect on how the presentation of policy evidence shapes how policymakers and members of the public respond to problems of everyday governance. The seminar seeks to provide students the skills to recognize governance structures in organizations and how to use policy evidence to insert themselves into policy discussions. Coursework is reading and writing intensive. The seminar meetings and assignments are organized in four sections:

➔ Section 1 - Constructing Evidence in Policy Debate explores the process of creating, communicating, and consuming quantitative and visual evidence in policy debate.
➔ Section 2 - Organizing National Security Policy explores the development of the National Security Council (NSC) and the process of NSC policymaking.
➔ Section 3 - Urban Governance explores debate over a specific policy issue as a case study of governance, collaboration, and response to critical policy matters.
➔ Section 4 - Final Policy Briefings focuses on the development and delivery of a short briefing examining a policy problem, project, or proposal.

Course Reading

Other readings as assigned.

Grading

Evaluation of student coursework will be based on four course elements, each constituting 25 percent of the final course grade:

1. Memo #1 (500-750 words)
2. Memo #2 (500-750 words)

Written work will be evaluated using four equally weighted criteria:
➔ Assignment – Does it respond to the question or assignment?
➔ Analysis – Does it present a clear thesis or narrative? Are its conclusions supported?
➔ Grounding – Does it make effective use of course materials to establish firm theoretical and conceptual grounding?
➔ Readability – Is it concise and well-organized? Is the language clear? Is it free of egregious typos, grammatical errors, and other distractions?
3. **2 Policy Briefings**

Policy Briefings will be evaluated using four equally weighted criteria:

➔ **Assignment** - Does the presentation respond to the assignment?

➔ **Analysis** - Are elements of the presentation organized around a coherent thesis or narrative? Are problems and concepts clearly defined? Is the presentation informative? Is it interesting?

➔ **Grounding** - Does the presentation make effective use of available policy evidence? Is policy evidence accurately described, clearly cited, and critically analyzed?

➔ **Presentation** - Do oral and visual aspects of the presentation contribute to its clarity and effectiveness? Is the presentation free of common stylistic distractions?
**UAP/PSCI 4624, Seminar in Politics and Public Policy, “Field Study”**

The Field Study is intended to expand experiential learning beyond the internship. Specifically, the Field Study seeks to expose students to policy making at the executive, legislative and judicial levels by experiencing the environments in which policy is discussed, developed, and implemented, demonstrating the intersection of policy, governance, and collaboration. Students are encouraged to consider their internship work environment when visiting the field sites and to ask questions that help broaden their understanding and grasp of policy making in organizations and various policy impacts on communities, states, and the nation.

Sites are chosen based on their topical influence in policy, depth of expertise in a policy area, the relevance of the policy area, and whether the work supports the selected case study.

**Learning Objectives**

After completing this course, students will be able to:

1. Recognize and discuss the difference in policy-making processes at the executive, legislative, and judicial levels.
2. Compare and contrast the type of governance structures at work in focal organizations.
3. Explain why and how the presence and absence of collaboration in decision-making makes a difference to policies and programs affecting communities.

**Course Reading**


**Site Visits**

Capitol Hill, Congressman Don Beyer, Virginia 8th District
Department of State
United States District Court, Eastern District of Virginia
Others TBD based on case study

**Journal**

Students will keep a regular Journal reflecting on field study, professional development, and internship experiences. Formats are flexible but each week journals should include at least two questions that address observations regarding the effect of democracy and/or governance on policy making. As a broad
benchmark, the goal is to write about 250 words a week. Journal entries are due by 11 pm every Sunday.

Grading:

Memos, 50% (25% each)

1. Memo #1 (500-750 words)
2. Memo #2 (500-750 words)

Written work will be evaluated using four equally weighted criteria:
- Assignment – Does it respond to the question or assignment?
- Analysis – Does it present a clear thesis or narrative? Are its conclusions supported?
- Grounding – Does it make effective use of course materials to establish firm theoretical and conceptual grounding?
- Readability – Is it concise and well-organized? Is the language clear? Is it free of egregious typos, grammatical errors, and other distractions?

Final Project, 30%.

Requirements:
Paper
- Papers must be between 3-5 pages, double-spaced and proofread carefully. Use descriptive words and clear language, not jargon, to describe your experiences. Write to pull your reader into your story. Follow the criteria for all written work and use section headers as appropriate.

Presentations
- Presentations are a summary of the paper and should be 7-10 minutes in length. PRACTICE! Record and/or film yourself, paying attention to body movements, hand gestures and fillers such as “um” and “like”. Presentations may be in PowerPoint or Prezi.

Journal, 20%
- Weekly entry of at least 250 words.