PA 6300 Quality and Productivity Improvement in Government
Summer Semester 2016

Instructor:	Dr. James R. Harrington
Time:	Wed 6:00pm to 10:00pm
Class Location:	GR 3.606
Phone:	972-883-3513
E-mail:	james.harrington@utdallas.edu
Office:	GR 2.820
Office Hours:	Wednesday 10 to 12 or by appointment

Course Description:

This course examines the major tools, techniques, and principles aimed at improving quality and productivity in the public sector. To provide students with practical methods for improving public organizations, this course will cover accountability systems, performance measurement, pay for performance reward systems, contracting out, and organizational assessment. Furthermore, this course will also cover other organizational and managerial factors that are essential for sustaining productive, high-quality organizations.

The concepts covered in this course are applicable to managers in the public, private, or non-profit sectors. The main goal of this course is to provide students with an understanding of current and practical management tools and strategies. Furthermore, students will gain a deeper understanding of the implications and challenges of improving public sector quality and productivity.

Learning Objectives

- Develop an understanding of the tools for measuring and managing performance in public organizations
- Critically evaluate the tools and strategies related to public productivity
- The ability to apply management and policy tools to improve government processes
- The ability to maintain and promote a culture of innovation in your public or private organization
- Understand the major empirical findings on the different types of performance management techniques
- Learn to think critically and know how to access resources to keep current on management best practices

Format:

The course will meet from 6:00-10:00 P.M. in GR 3.606 on Wednesday from May 25 through August 3. Class sessions will consist of small group activities, exercises, workshops, seminar-style discussions, and lectures.

Required Texts:

Moynihan, D. P. (2008). *The dynamics of performance management: Constructing information and reform*. Georgetown University Press. ISBN: 1589011945

Radin, B. (2006). *Challenging the performance movement: Accountability, complexity, and democratic values*. Georgetown University Press. ISBN: 1589010914

Other required readings will be available electronically via our eLearning course page and/or available for reserve at the Eugene McDermott Library.

Citation Style

For your papers, you should use either APA or Chicago style. Also, feel free to use the vast amount of resources on the Internet. Mainly, I expect students to be consistent in regards to formatting, citations, and references. For more information, please refer to one of these style manuals.

Turabian, Kate L. 2007. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations.* 7th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

American Psychological Association. (2009). Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Edition.

Grading Policy and Written Assignments

First Examination	35%
Second Examination	35%
Case Study Presentation	20%
Class Preparation and Participation	10%
Total	100%

Grading for this course shall be structured as follows:
93-100=A, 90-92=A-, 87-89=B+, 83-86=B, 80-82=B-, 77-79=C+, 73-77=C, Below 73=F.

Course Requirements

1) *Class Preparation and Participation (10%)*
   Students are expected to do all required readings prior to class and must be able to demonstrate comprehension and adequate reflection. Please note, you are expected to go beyond summarizing the articles in classroom discussion. Students are encouraged to discuss current issues and their own real-world experience as it relates to the course discussion. Course discussion should be an interactive dialogue with the instructor and students that help contextualize the major themes and issues presented in the reading.

2) *Case Study Presentation (20%)*
   To link the concepts presented in class to real-world examples, students will present a case study by providing an overview of the case and an analysis. Presentations will be 10 to 15 minutes. After the presentations, we will have a class discussion on the cases. In this discussion, students are expected to discuss the implications and challenges faced in each case.

3) *Examinations (Exam 1 -35%; Exam 2 – 35%)*

There will be two examinations (in-class, short answer and essay) covering selected topics. The examinations are designed to test the student's ability to understand and critically evaluate the reading, lecture, and discussion materials covered during the semester.

Additional Requirement for PhD Students: PhD students will be required to select a topic from among the class scheduled discussions and present an analysis (review/interpretation/critique) of some portion of the literature that the field has generated on the topic under consideration. The analysis will include consideration of at least five articles (or articles and books) drawn from literature outside of the pieces considered in the syllabus readings. This 5 to 7 page paper is due on the last day of class.

Course & Instructor Policies

Attendance Policy

Regular and punctual class attendance is expected. Students who fail to attend class regularly are inviting scholastic difficulty. Because of the importance of attendance and active participation in the design of the course, more than two absences mean that your academic credit for the course is in jeopardy. If for some reason, you must miss a class, please phone or e-mail faculty in advance. It is especially important not to miss class if possible given the course only meets once per week.

Late work

No late papers will be read (any exceptions owing to special circumstances must be arranged in advance of the due date).

Electronic Device

You will be allowed to take notes and access articles on your laptop or tablet. You are expected to use electronic devices for coursework-related activities. Please be respectful to your colleagues and resist the urge to surf the internet. Please remember to keep your cell phone ringer off during class time.

Disability Services

It is the policy and practice of The University of Texas at Dallas to make reasonable accommodations for students with properly documented disabilities. However, written notification from the Office of Student Access Ability (OSA) is required. If you are eligible to receive an accommodation and would like to request it for a course, please discuss it with an OSA staff member and allow at least one Session's advanced notice. Students who have questions about receiving accommodations, or those who have, or think they may have, a disability (mobility, sensory, health, psychological, learning, etc.) are invited to contact the Office of Student Access Ability for a confidential discussion.

Academic Integrity

The faculty expects from its students a high level of responsibility and academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends upon the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student demonstrate a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

Scholastic Dishonesty: Any student who commits an act of scholastic dishonesty is subject to discipline. Scholastic dishonesty includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, collusion, submitting for credit any work or materials that are attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another person, or any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts.

Religious Holy Days

The University of Texas at Dallas will excuse a student from class or other required activities for the travel to and observance of a religious holy day for a religion whose places of worship are exempt from property tax under Section 11.20, Tax Code, *Texas Code Annotated*.

The student is encouraged to notify the instructor or activity sponsor as soon as possible regarding the absence, preferably in advance of the assignment. The student, so excused, will be allowed to take the exam or complete the assignment within a reasonable time after the absence: a period equal to the length of the absence, up to a maximum of one session. A student who notifies the instructor and completes any missed exam or assignment may not be penalized for the absence. A student who fails to complete the exam or assignment within the prescribed period may receive a failing grade for that exam or assignment.

If a student or an instructor disagrees about the nature of the absence [i.e., for the purpose of observing a religious holy day] or if there is similar disagreement about whether the student has been given a reasonable time to complete any missed assignments or examinations, either the student or the instructor may request a ruling from the chief executive officer of the institution, or his or her designee. The chief executive officer or designee must take into account the legislative intent of *TEC 51.911(b)*, and the student and instructor will abide by the decision of the chief executive officer or designee.

UT Dallas Syllabus Policies and Procedures

The information contained in the following link constitutes the University's policies and procedures segment of the course syllabus.

Please go to http://go.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies for these policies.

The descriptions and timelines contained in this syllabus are subject to change at the discretion of the Professor.

Course Outline

Date	Topic
Session 1: May 25	Overview
Session 2: June 1	-Elements of the Productivity and Quality Paradigm -Core Values, Mission Statements, and Vision Statements
Session 3: June 8	-Measuring Quality
Session 4: June 15	-Use of Technology
Session 5: June 22	-Contracting Out as a Productivity Strategy -Accountability Systems and Performance Measurement
Session 6: June 29	**First Examination**
Session 7: July 6	-Motivation and Reward Systems/Pay for Performance
Session 8: July 13	-Dynamics of Performance Management
Session 9: July 20	-Organizational Culture & High Performance in Core Public Administration Functions -Management, Capacity, and Performance
Session 10: July 27	-Organizational Assessments: Analyzing and Improving Processes -Perspectives on The New Public Service
Session 11: August 3	**Second Examination**

Session 1: Overview
    Review the syllabus
    Provide objectives and overview of the course

    Exercise:
        Sign-up for Case Study Presentations

Session 2:

Elements of the Productivity and Quality Paradigm
    Readings:
        Van Ryzin, G. G. (2007). Pieces of a puzzle: Linking government performance, citizen satisfaction, and trust. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *30*(4), 521-535.

        Light, P. C. (2006). The tides of reform revisited: Patterns in making government work, 1945–2002. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(1), 6-19.

        GAO. (2004). High-Performing Organizations: Metrics, Means, and Mechanisms for Achieving High Performance in the 21st Century Public Management Environment

  Core Values, Mission Statements, and Vision Statements
    Readings:
        Kim, S. E., & Lee, J. W. (2007). Is mission attachment an effective management tool for employee retention? An empirical analysis of a nonprofit human services agency. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *27*(3), 227-248

        Robertson, P. J., Wang, F., & Trivisvavet, S. (2007). Self-and collective interests in public organizations: An empirical investigation. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *31*(1), 54-84

        Wright, B. E. (2007). Public service and motivation: does mission matter? *Public Administration Review*, *67*(1), 54-64.

        Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2011). Public Organizations and Mission Valence When Does Mission Matter? *Administration & Society*, *43*(1), 22-44.

        Weiss, J. A., & Piderit, S. K. (1999). The value of mission statements in public agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *9*(2), 193-224.

    Exercise:
        Discuss UTD Realize the Vision: The Campaign for Tier One & Beyond

----

Session 3:

Measuring Quality
Readings:
Radin, B. (2006). *Challenging the performance movement: Accountability, complexity, and democratic values*. Georgetown University Press.

Dalehite, E. G. (2008). Determinants of performance measurement: An investigation into the decision to conduct citizen surveys. *Public Administration Review*, *68*(5), 891-907.

Matthes, M. (2008). The Des Moines experience with citizen-informed performance measurement and reporting. *National Civic Review*, *97*(1), 13-20.

Ho, A. T. K. (2011). PBB in American local governments: it's more than a management tool. *Public Administration Review*, *71*(3), 391-401.

Ho, A. T. K. (2006). Accounting for the value of performance measurement from the perspective of Midwestern mayors. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *16*(2), 217-237.

Exercise:
Case Study Presentation and Discussion

Session 4:

Use of Technology in Government
Watch TED talks on this subject matter

Session 5:

Contracting Out as a Productivity Strategy
Readings:
Brown, T. L., Potoski, M., & Van Slyke, D. M. (2006). Managing public service contracts: Aligning values, institutions, and markets. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(3), 323-331.

Gazley, B. (2008). Beyond the contract: The scope and nature of informal government–nonprofit partnerships. *Public Administration Review*, *68*(1), 141-154.

Fernandez, S. (2009). Understanding contracting performance an empirical analysis. *Administration & Society*, *41*(1), 67-100.

Chen, Y. C., & Perry, J. (2003). Outsourcing for e-government: Managing for success. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 404-421.

Clary, B., Ebersten, S., & Harlor, S. (2000). Organizational change issues in performance government: The case of contracting. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 282-296.

Performance Management Systems

Heinrich, C. J., & Marschke, G. (2010). Incentives and their dynamics in public sector performance management systems. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *29*(1), 183-208.

Julnes, G. (2007). Promoting Evidence-Informed Governance: Lessons from Evaluation. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *30*(4), 550-573.

Yang, K., & Hsieh, J. Y. (2007). Managerial Effectiveness of Government Performance Measurement: Testing a Middle-Range Model. *Public Administration Review*, *67*(5), 861-879.

Session 6: First Examination

Session 7:

Motivation and Reward Systems

Readings:

Perry, J. L., Hondeghem, A., & Wise, L. R. (2010). Revisiting the motivational bases of public service: Twenty years of research and an agenda for the future. *Public Administration Review*, *70*(5), 681-690.

Kim, J. (2010). Strategic human resource practices: Introducing alternatives for organizational performance improvement in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, *70*(1), 38-49.

Podgursky, M. J., & Springer, M. G. (2007). Teacher performance pay: A review. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *26*(4), 909-950.

Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). The role of organizations in fostering public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, *67*(1), 40-53.

Exercise:

Case Study Presentation and Discussion

Group Activity: Dallas ISD Pay for Performance for Teachers

Session 8:
Dynamics of Performance Management
    Readings:
        Moynihan, D. P. (2008). *The dynamics of performance management: Constructing information and reform*. Georgetown University Press.

    Exercise:
        Case Study Presentation and Discussion
        Group Activity: No Child Left Behind Act

Session 9:
Organizational Culture & High Performance in Core Public Administration Functions
    Readings:
        Hartmann, J., & Khademian, A. M. (2010). Culture Change Refined and Revitalized: The Road Show and Guides for Pragmatic Action. *Public Administration Review*, *70*(6), 845-856.

        Garnett, J. L., Marlowe, J., & Pandey, S. K. (2008). Penetrating the performance predicament: communication as a mediator or moderator of organizational culture's impact on public organizational performance. *Public Administration Review*, *68*(2), 266-281.

        Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2000). Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: empirical evidence from UK companies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *11*(4), 766-788.

Management, Capacity, and Performance
    Readings:
        Meier, K. J., & O'Toole, L. J. (2002). Public management and organizational performance: The effect of managerial quality. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *21*(4), 629-643.

    Exercise:
        Case Study Presentation and Discussion

Session 10:
Organizational Assessments: Analyzing and Improving Processes
    Readings:
        Van Wart, M. (1995). The first step in the reinvention process: assessment. *Public Administration Review*, 429-438.

        McLaughlin, J. A., & Jordan, G. B. (1999). Logic models: a tool for telling your programs performance story. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *22*(1), 65-72.

Kaplan, S. A., & Garrett, K. E. (2005). The use of logic models by community-based initiatives. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *28*(2), 167-172.

Perspectives on the New Public Service
Readings:

Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2006). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(2), 168-176.

Ingraham, P. W. (2005). Performance: Promises to keep and miles to go. *Public Administration Review*, *65*(4), 390-395.

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The new public service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, *60*(6), 549-559.

Exercise:

Case Study Presentation and Discussion
Construct Logic Models

Session 11: Second Examination

The instructor reserves the right to make reasonable alterations to the syllabus.

Email Use

The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the value and efficiency of communication between faculty/staff and students through electronic mail. At the same time, email raises some issues concerning security and the identity of each individual in an email exchange. The university encourages all official student email correspondence be sent only to a student's U.T. Dallas email address and that faculty and staff consider email from students official only if it originates from a UTD student account. This allows the university to maintain a high degree of confidence in the identity of all individual corresponding and the security of the transmitted information. UTD furnishes each student with a free email account that is to be used in all communication with university personnel. The Department of Information Resources at U.T. Dallas provides a method for students to have their U.T. Dallas mail forwarded to other accounts.

These descriptions and timelines are subject to change at the discretion of the Professor.