

PIA3309: COMPARATIVE PUBLIC POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Effective Term

Semester B 2022/23

Part I Course Overview

Course Title

Comparative Public Policy and Management

Subject Code

PIA - Public and International Affairs

Course Number

3309

Academic Unit

Public and International Affairs (PIA)

College/School

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CH)

Course Duration

One Semester

Credit Units

3

Level

B1, B2, B3, B4 - Bachelor's Degree

Medium of Instruction

English

Medium of Assessment

English

Prerequisites

Nil

Precursors

Nil

Equivalent Courses

SA3309 Issues in Public Management/POL3309 Issues in Public Management / POL3309 Comparative Public Policy and Management

Exclusive Courses

Nil

Part II Course Details

Abstract

This course aims to critically engage students with contemporary issues in public sector management. Adopting a combined multi-disciplinary and comparative approach students will be required to discover, analyse and contribute to providing creative solutions for specific public management issues via a variety of transformative individual and group learning assessment tasks. Topics examined on the course vary according to the particular public affairs of the day.

Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

CILOs		Weighting (if app.)	DEC-A1	DEC-A2	DEC-A3
1	Contribute to developing creative solutions for specific public management issues in Hong Kong	25	x	x	
2	Demonstrate international awareness of public management issues through comparison with Hong Kong	25	x		
3	Collaborate with peers to prepare, conduct and critique group research on a cutting-edge topic related to public management	25	x	x	x
4	Critically reflect on their own personal experience as a recipient of public services in Hong Kong	25	x		

A1: Attitude

Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.

A2: Ability

Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to real-life problems.

A3: Accomplishments

Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

TLAs	Brief Description	CILO No.	Hours/week (if applicable)
1	Lectures - presentation of theories, concepts and ideas based on academic literature (including course readings). Course lecturer responds to questions raised by students attending the lecture.	1, 2	
2	Canvas - PowerPoint slides to support lectures posted for students to download.	1, 2	

3	3	Reading - Readings assigned in the course. The readings improve student understanding of key concepts and give students an opportunity to apply ideas to the Hong Kong context.	4	
4	4	Individual term papers/ Group projects Students should work individually or in groups to complete projects that are related to learning goals.	1, 2, 3, 4	

Assessment Tasks / Activities (ATs)

	ATs	CILO No.	Weighting (%)	Remarks (e.g. Parameter for GenAI use)
1	Class Participation	4	10	
2	Group presentation	1, 3	20	
3	Individual paper	1, 2, 3, 4	30	1,000-1,500 words (references excluded)
4	Quizzes	1, 2, 3, 4	40	

Continuous Assessment (%)

100

Examination (%)

0

Assessment Rubrics (AR)**Assessment Task**

1. Class Participation

Criterion

Attendance

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Student attends all classes

Good (B+, B, B-)

Students attends most classes

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Students attends some classes

Marginal (D)

Student seldom attends class

Failure (F)

Student fails to attend class

Assessment Task

1. Class Participation

Criterion

Raising questions

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Student raises excellent questions

Good (B+, B, B-)

Student raises good questions

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Student raises adequate questions

Marginal (D)

Student raises marginal questions

Failure (F)

Student fails to raise questions

Assessment Task

2. Group presentation

Criterion

Content

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Presentation consists of excellently researched concepts supported by excellent and articulate details/illustrations

Good (B+, B, B-)

Presentation consists of well-researched concepts supported by good details/illustrations

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Presentation consists of adequately researched concepts supported by adequate details/illustrations

Marginal (D)

Presentation consists of barely researched concepts and is supported by barely adequate details/illustrations

Failure (F)

Presentation fails to produce concepts of adequate academic standard and provides substandard details/illustrations

Assessment Task

2. Group presentation

Criterion

Answering questions

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

The group effectively responds to audience questions demonstrating excellent understanding of the issues

Good (B+, B, B-)

The group effectively responds to audience questions demonstrating good understanding of the issues

Fair (C+, C, C-)

The group somewhat effectively responds to audience questions demonstrating adequate understanding of the issues

Marginal (D)

The group marginally responds to audience questions and demonstrates barely adequate understanding of the issues

Failure (F)

The group fails to adequately respond to audience questions and does not demonstrate adequate understanding of the issues

Assessment Task

2.Group presentation

Criterion

Creativity

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Presentation fully able to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Good (B+, B, B-)

Presentation mostly able to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Presentation partially able to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Marginal (D)

Presentation hardly able to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Failure (F)

Presentation unable to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Assessment Task

2.Group presentation

Criterion

Collaboration

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Students demonstrate excellent team work collaboration

Good (B+, B, B-)

Students demonstrate good team work collaboration

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Students demonstrate adequate team work collaboration

Marginal (D)

Students demonstrate barely adequate team work collaboration

Failure (F)

Students unable to demonstrate barely adequate team work collaboration

Assessment Task

3. Individual/Group paper1

Criterion

Thesis

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Thesis very clearly stated & topic is excellently defined.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Thesis clearly stated and topic is defined well.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Thesis adequately stated and topic is defined adequately.

Marginal (D)

Thesis unclearly stated and topic marginally defined.

Failure (F)

Thesis unstated and topic not defined.

Assessment Task

3. Individual/Group paper1

Criterion

Analysis

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Entirely demonstrates rigorous ability to analyze and evaluate issues and concepts

Good (B+, B, B-)

Generally, demonstrates rigorous ability to analyze and evaluate issues and concepts in the field

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Adequately demonstrates ability to analyze and evaluate issues and concepts in the field

Marginal (D)

Marginally demonstrates ability to analyze and evaluate issues and concepts in the field

Failure (F)

Overall, does not demonstrate the ability to analyze and evaluate issues and concepts in the field

Assessment Task

3. Individual/Group paper1

Criterion

Theoretical support

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Thesis supported by an excellent variety of relevant facts, examples and illustrations from experience.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Thesis supported by a good variety of relevant facts, examples and illustrations from experience.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Thesis supported by an adequate variety of relevant facts, examples and illustrations from experience.

Marginal (D)

Thesis somewhat supported by an adequate variety of relevant facts, examples and illustrations from experience.

Failure (F)

Thesis is not supported by facts, examples, details and illustrations.

Assessment Task

3. Individual/Group paper1

Criterion

Organization and Structure

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Organization & structure excellent Introduction & conclusion very effectively related to the whole.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Organization & structure clear. Introduction & conclusion effectively related to the whole.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Organization & structure mostly clear. Introduction & conclusion are somewhat effectively related to the whole.

Marginal (D)

Organization & structure adequate. Introduction & conclusion are adequately related to the whole.

Failure (F)

Organization & structure lacking. Introduction & conclusion not adequately related to the whole.

Assessment Task

3. Individual/Group paper1

Criterion

Source material

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Source material is incorporated logically & insightfully. Sources are documented accurately.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Good incorporation of source material. Good use of source documentation.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Adequate incorporation of source material. Adequate use of source documentation.

Marginal (D)

Marginal incorporation of source material. Barely adequate use of source documentation.

Failure (F)

Source material not incorporated. Documentation is inaccurate

Assessment Task

3. Individual/Group paper1

Criterion

Creative contribution

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Paper fully able to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Good (B+, B, B-)

Paper mostly able to create somewhat credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Paper partially able to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Marginal (D)

Paper hardly able to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Failure (F)

Paper unable to create credible solutions for a specific public management issue in Hong Kong

Assessment Task

4. Quiz assignment

Criterion

Responding to questions

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Response very clearly stated & answer is excellently argued.

Good (B+, B, B-)

Response clearly stated and answer is argued well.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Response adequately stated and answer is adequately argued.

Marginal (D)

Response unclearly stated and answer is marginally argued.

Failure (F)

Response unstated and answer not argued.

Assessment Task

4. Quiz assignment

Criterion

Organization and Structure of response

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Excellent Organization & structure evident

Good (B+, B, B-)

Organization & structure clear.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Organization & structure mostly clear.

Marginal (D)

Organization & structure adequate.

Failure (F)

Organization & structure lacking.

Assessment Task

4.Quiz assignment

Criterion

International awareness

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Answer clearly demonstrates student' s international awareness of a public management issue through comparison with Hong Kong

Good (B+, B, B-)

Answer mostly demonstrates student' s international awareness of a public management issue through comparison with Hong Kong

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Answer adequately demonstrates student' s international awareness of a public management issue through comparison with Hong Kong

Marginal (D)

Answer marginally demonstrates student' s international awareness of a public management issue through comparison with Hong Kong

Failure (F)

Answer fails demonstrates student' s international awareness of a public management issue through comparison with Hong Kong

Assessment Task

4.Quiz assignment

Criterion

Ability to reflect

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

Responses clearly demonstrate ability to reflect on their own experience of public services in Hong Kong

Good (B+, B, B-)

Responses mostly demonstrate ability to reflect on their own experience of public services in Hong Kong

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Responses adequately demonstrate ability to reflect on their own experience of public services in Hong Kong

Marginal (D)

Responses marginally demonstrate ability to reflect on their own experience of public services in Hong Kong

Failure (F)

Responses fail to demonstrate ability to reflect on their own experience of public services in Hong Kong

Part III Other Information

Keyword Syllabus

Public sector management, private-sector, public sector, outsourcing, quality of Life, customer-orientated bureaucracy, performance measurement, quality, comparative public management, civil service reform

Reading List

Compulsory Readings

	Title
1	Hague, Rod, Martin Harrop, and John McCormick. 2019. <i>Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction</i> . 11th edition. <i>Comparative Government and Politics Series</i> . London: Red Globe Press.
2	Khan, Haroon A. 2018. <i>Globalization and the Challenges of Public Administration</i> . Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69587-7 .
3	Hildreth, W. Bartley, Gerald Miller, and Evert A. Lindquist, eds. 2021. <i>Handbook of Public Administration</i> . 4th edition. <i>Public Administration and Public Policy</i> . New York, NY: Routledge.
4	Mller, Frederik S. 2020. <i>Public Administration: Perspectives, Management and Challenges</i> .
5	Sardaryan, Henry T. 2021. <i>International Perspectives on Public Administration</i> . 1st ed. Abingdon, Oxon#; New York, NY#: Routledge, 2021.
6	Zang, Xiaowei, and Hon Chan. 2020. <i>Handbook of Public Policy and Public Administration in China</i> . Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789909951 .
7	Shafritz, Jay M. 2017. <i>Introducing Public Administration</i> . Ninth edition. New York: Routledge.

Additional Readings

	Title
1	Akranavi?i?t?, D. and Ru#evi?ius, J. (2007) Quality of life and its components' measurement, <i>Engineering Economics</i> 2 (52): 44-49
2	Brown, E., Derudder, B., Parnreiter, C. et al. (2010). World city networks and global commodity chains: towards a world-systems' integration. <i>Global Networks</i> , 10, 12-34.
3	Cutler, T. and Waine, B. (1997) <i>Managing the Welfare State: Text and Sourcebook</i> , Oxford: Berg
4	Chaston, I. (2011) <i>Public sector management : mission impossible?</i> Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
5	DiMaggio, P. and Powell W. (1983) The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. <i>American Sociological Review</i> , 48, 2 pp. 147-160

6	Ferlie, E, Lynn L Jr and Pollitt, C (eds.) The Oxford Handbook of Public Management, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
7	Flynn, N. (2012) Public sector management London : SAGE
8	Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2001) Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction, 6th edition, New York: Palgrave
9	Higgins, P. (2012) Irrationality, Bricolage, Quality and Performance Measurement: Unpacking the conundrum in a comparative East-West context in Building Service-Oriented Government,
10	Korczynski (2002) Human resource Management in service work, London: Routledge
11	Lynn, L. E. Jr., Public Management: Old and New, New York; London: Routledge, 2006.
12	Mastracci, S. Newman, M and Guy, M. (2010) Emotional Labour: Why and how to teach it, Journal of public affairs education, 16, 2, 123-141
13	Rose, R. (2005) Learning from Comparative Public Policy: A guide to lesson drawing, London: Routledge, chapters as necessary
14	Shek, D. and Lee, B. 2007 A Comprehensive Review of Quality of Life (QOL) Research in Hong Kong, The Scientific World Journal, 7, 1222-1229.
15	Walsh, K. (1995) Quality through markets: the New Public Service Management in Wilkinson A. and Wilmott H. (Eds) (1994) Making Quality Critical, London: Routledge
16	Wu Wei, Yu Wenxuan, Goh Nguen Wah, Hao Xiaoming, Lan Zhiyong (eds), World Scientific Publishing Company.