

School of Government

GOVT 534
PUBLIC INTEGRITY
(15 Points)

Trimester 1 / 2015

COURSE OUTLINE

Names and Contact Details

Course Coordinator: **Associate Professor Michael Macaulay**
Room RH 810, Level 8, Rutherford House, Pipitea Campus
Telephone: (04) 463 5307
Fax: (04) 463 5454
Email: michael.macaulay@vuw.ac.nz

Administrator: **Darren Morgan**
Room RH 821, Level 8, Rutherford House, Pipitea Campus
Telephone: (04) 463 5458
Fax: (04) 463 5454
Email: darren.morgan@vuw.ac.nz

School Office Hours: 8.30am to 5.00pm, Monday to Friday

Trimester Dates

Monday 23 February – Friday 19 June 2015

Withdrawal from Course

Formal notice of withdrawal must be in writing on a Course Add/Drop form (available from either of the Faculty's Student Customer Service Desks or from the course administrator). Not paying your fees, ceasing to attend lectures or verbally advising a member of staff will NOT be accepted as a formal notice of withdrawal.

1. Your fees will be refunded if you withdraw from this course on or before **Friday 6 March 2015**.

2. The standard last date for withdrawal from this course is **Friday 15 May 2015**. After this date, students forced to withdraw by circumstances beyond their control must apply for permission on an 'Application for Associate Dean's Permission to Withdraw Late' including supporting documentation. The application form is available from either of the Faculty's Student Customer Service Desks.

Class Times and Room Numbers

This course is delivered in a modular format.

Module One:	Tuesday 24 February 2015	9.00am – 5.00pm
Module Two:	Tuesday 14 April 2015	9.00am – 5.00pm
Module Three:	Tuesday 26 May 2015	9.00am – 5.00pm

Locations: Classes will be held on the Pipitea Campus of Victoria University in Wellington and you will be advised of your classroom one week prior to each module by email. The timetable is also available to view on the Victoria University website at www.victoria.ac.nz/students/study/timetables .

Attendance is required at all teaching days

Course Delivery

This course is delivered in a modular format over three days of 6 hours contact time each (18 hours total) between 9.00am and 5.00pm on the days indicated above, supplemented by 6 hours (online reading) between module meetings, as detailed in the course outline below. **Attendance is required at all teaching days. Participation in additional work sessions is mandatory.**

Expected Workload

The learning objectives set for each course are demanding and, to achieve them, candidates must make a significant commitment in time and effort to reading, studying, thinking, and completion of assessment items outside of contact time. Courses vary in design but all require preparation and learning before the first module. Regular learning is necessary between modules (students who leave everything to the last moment rarely achieve at a high level). Expressed in input terms, the time commitment required usually translates to 65-95 hours (excluding class contact time) per course.

Collective Learning

The course requires 6 hours of work between modules. This work is considered part of the class structure, but rather than being accommodated in a longer module day (i.e., 8.30am to 6.00pm), the equivalent of 2 hours per module can be flexibly scheduled by groups of students, with tasks undertaken and reported back as detailed below (see module outlines).

Prescription

This course examines integrity and ethics in the public sector from a systemic (national and international), organisational and individual viewpoint. It will investigate responsible leadership; identify signs of ethical collapse, demonstrate the concept of Integrity Management Systems (at local, national and organisational levels); and analyse international comparative cases on integrity management.

Course Learning Objectives

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

1. Distinguish between dispositional and situational approaches to integrity;
2. Understand the role of ethical climate and culture on leading organisations;
3. Identify key philosophical orientations (consequences; obligation; virtue; care; justice) in ethical dilemmas;
4. Critically evaluate methodologies used in measuring integrity and ethics;
5. Recognise and apply Integrity Management System models at organisational, local and national levels.

GOVT 534 Values

GOVT 534 is proud to promote New Zealand's public values of fairness; impartiality; responsibility; and trustworthiness. I hope that we all trust each other to give of our best and to share our knowledge and experiences. Conversations will always be fair and impartial – we will respect each other's opinions even, in fact especially, if we disagree with them. We will all take responsibility for our own thoughts and actions.

GOVT 534 Overall Philosophy

One of the great things about working in the fields of integrity and ethics is that the primary unit of analysis is **you**: your beliefs, your values, your judgements; your dilemmas; your working practices. In terms of skills and knowledge, therefore, you already have what it takes.

GOVT 534 wants to utilise your own knowledge and experience; as a result I have developed a few foundations for the course that I'd like to share:

1. The starting point for all our discussion is us: we will relate concepts to our experiences and not the other way around, which is why the collective learning element is so important as it gives us a collective grounding from which our own experiences can take off.
2. Learning about ethics is truly a collective experience and we rely on each other for open, constructive and respectful discussions. GOVT 534 is a community of scholars and our views (including mine) have equal weight.
3. Nothing on this course is designed to dissuade or judge people, it simply hopes open up new pathways with which to synthesize things you already know with some new concepts that may be helpful.
4. There is nothing in the course content that does not relate in some way to assessment. I would never waste your time nor create extra work for you although you are free to create as much for yourselves as you wish!

5. Having said that, new ideas, perspectives and views should and will emerge throughout the discussions so if something crops up that you wish to explore in an Assessment, that option will be available in each module.

In so doing we are not simply trying to learn new pieces of information about integrity and ethics but building on the skill set we have: our public service (and other) perspectives; our ability to communicate sensitive and complex ideas; and our ability to contribute to public management and policy more generally.

If there is one thing above all else GOVT 534 is looking to promote, however, it is the quality of your critical thinking skills. This does not mean your ability to criticise, of course, but your ability to take apart an idea and put it together again in different ways. There are lots of books written on critical thinking and if you would like I will share some of my favourites. For now, however, I just want to stress a few simple guidelines:

1. **Your opinion is only as valid as your evidence:** we are all entitled to think and say whatever we like but that does not mean we are entitled to be listened to. There is nothing as tyrannical as an unsubstantiated opinion so please use as much evidence as you can to always justify the assumptions and ideas presented in your arguments.
2. **Your experience is not the same as others':** no matter what has happened to us in the past, this does not mean we can use it as a generalisation for others. We can and should draw on our experiences but we must be careful how we translate those into broader messages.
3. **Question everything:** including this advice, and remember that the stronger the claim, the more evidence that is required.

Course Content and Readings

The course offers an inter-disciplinary approach to public integrity. It draws upon research from the fields of psychology; philosophy; organisational behaviour; leadership; sociology; religion; neuroscience; and others.

The course is divided into three modules, each investigating issues in public integrity at a different level: national; organisational; and individual. This structure is different to previous years and is a direct response to the really helpful feedback I received from students in 2014. Previously we have started with quite in-depth philosophical and psychological approaches to integrity and ethics. While these are essential, and will be covered in module 3, course feedback told me that this approach could be a little off putting. Which is why this year we are going to start with your own knowledge, and begin with broad based applications of ethics and integrity that everyone will hopefully feel comfortable with.

Each module will have guest speakers and interactive learning through case studies and other methods.

In terms of reading lists, there is no set text book for this course and appropriate readings will be found below. Where appropriate these will also be placed on Blackboard. I'd like to make some points specifically about our reading, which relates to the class philosophy above.

The official reading list has deliberately fewer items than on some other courses, and there are three specific reasons for this:

1. As stated above, the main bedrock of the course is you; it is helpful, therefore, to work from the inside out – i.e. be guided by your own perspectives and relate those to the reading. At this level we can afford to read less and think more.
2. As previously noted the course will rely on a discursive approach, and this is best inculcated through leaving intellectual spaces in which ideas can emerge and evolve. The reading is there to provide a framework and introduce these ideas but they will take space and substance in class.
3. As the course is inter-disciplinary it is highly likely that for each module you will encounter a new discipline (perhaps more than one). With this being the case and also due to the depth of the readings themselves, it is helpful to read less articles in greater depth than to skim a huge amount of material.

I would also like to stress that you are not under any obligation to read anything before the modules, other than the collective learning material. Sometimes readings are better understood after the contextualisation of lectures and class discussion and are useful to reflect upon.

However, we all work differently – some people like to read everything in advance, others like to select one or two items, and some are happy to look at reading afterwards. There is no right or wrong approach and I am happy for you to work within your natural learning instincts. The choice is entirely yours.

Module 1 National and International Integrity (Tuesday 24 February 2015)

This module will draw on a number of perspectives to look at integrity at community, regional and national levels. It will ask “what does it mean to be a nation with integrity”.

Collective learning material

For this module please read the executive summary and methodology sections of the Transparency International New Zealand (2013) *Integrity Plus: National Integrity System Assessment*. The entire report will be placed on Blackboard but you can also find it here <http://transparency.org.nz/2013/National-Integrity-System-Assessment-New-Zealand-2013> . Please think about the following questions:

1. What are the integrity issues that face New Zealand?
2. **If you are a New Zealand scholar** do you think the report is realistic, or does it over/under estimate the extent of the problem?
3. **If you are an overseas scholar** please also ask how these issues relate to your own jurisdiction and identify what other issues your country faces?
4. How useful is the NIS model as a comparable tool?

It is anticipated that the preparation for this task will be approximately 2 hours and that the class discussion will be followed by a number of interactive lectures that will highlight the following bodies of knowledge.

- Comparative approaches to anti-corruption and good governance;
- methodologies used to evaluate good governance;
- Syndromes of corruption;
- National Integrity Systems;
- Open Government Partnership;
- NZ and key corruption threats.

We will hopefully be able to introduce a guest speaker who will discuss either the NIS report or the OGP initiative. At the moment the speaker is to still be decided.

Suggested reading for this module:

- Robert Gregory (2013) ‘Assessing “Good Governance” and Corruption in New Zealand: “Scientific” Measurement, Political Discourse, and Historical Narrative’, *Working Paper 03/13*, Institute of Governance and Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Michael Johnson (2006) *Syndromes of Corruption: Wealth, Power and Democracy* (Cambridge: CUP)
- Macaulay, Newman, C, Hickey, G (2014) ‘Towards a Model of the Local Integrity System: learning the lessons from Great Britain’, *International Journal of Public Administration* 37, 2
- Chris Newman, & Michael Macaulay (2013) ‘Placebo or Panacea: Anglo-New Zealand Experiences of Legislative Approaches to combatting Bribery. *Journal of Criminal Law*, 77. 6
- OECD (2014) OECD Foreign Bribery *AN ANALYSIS OF THE CRIME OF BRIBERY OF FOREIGN PUBLIC OFFICIALS*
- State Services Commission (2014) Open Government Partnership website www.ssc.govt.nz/open-government-partnership
- Transparency International New Zealand (2013) *Integrity Plus: National Integrity System Assessment* (Wellington: TINZ)
- Transparency International UK (2011) *National Integrity System Assessment* (London: TI-UK)

Readings, that are not available via online databases will, along with other materials and case studies, be placed on Blackboard prior to the module.

Module 2 Organisational Integrity (Tuesday 14 April 2015)

This module will draw on a number of perspectives pertaining to how we embed and entrench integrity within our organisations. It will ask “what does it mean to be an organisation of integrity”?

Collective learning material

For this module you will need to read the official 2014 report into the failure of child services in Rotherham, UK. I must warn you that the report is harrowing but nevertheless is an exceptionally clear account of repeated ethical failures within and across organisations. The report will be on Blackboard and please think about the following questions:

1. Who should bear the greatest responsibility for this tragedy and why?
2. Who did act, who should have acted, and when should those actions have occurred?
3. Have you faced (or do you face) any organisational failures of integrity and how have you worked through them?

It is anticipated that the preparation for this task will be approximately 2.5 hours and that the class discussion will be followed by a number of interactive lectures that will highlight the following bodies of knowledge.

- the role of organisational values;
- compliance versus integrity approaches to organisational integrity;

- the OECD integrity management system (IMS) model;
- ethical culture;
- ethical climate;
- administrative evil;
- the signs of ethical collapse;
- integrity audit tools;
- ethical leadership.

We will also hopefully be welcoming a guest speaker, Gordon Davis, Chief Legal officer for State Services Commission to give us a perspective on how the SSC looks after issues of integrity, including its new integrity strategy. I highly recommend that you look at their Code of Conduct here www.ssc.govt.nz/code and the results from the 2013 *Integrity and Conduct Survey* here www.ssc.govt.nz/integrity-and-conduct-survey-2013 . Both of these will be discussed in class.

Suggested reading for this module:

- James S. Bowman and Claire Connolly Knox (2008) ‘Ethics in Government: No Matter How Long and Dark the Night’ *Public Administration Review* 68, 627-639
- Herman Finer (1941) ‘Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government’ *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 335-350
- Mark Curtis Hoffman and Maria Gajewski (2012), ‘The Ten Masks of Administrative Evil’ *Administrative Theory & Praxis* Vol. 34, No. 1, 125–132.
- Marianne M Jennings (2004) ‘Preventing Organizational Ethical Collapse’ *The Journal of Government Financial Management*; 53, 1, 12-19
- Alan Lawton, and Michael Macaulay, (2009), ‘Ethics management and ethical management’, in *Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration: cases and concepts* eds. Cox III, R., (New York: M. E. Sharpe) 107-120
- Michael Macaulay, and David Norris, (2013) ‘The ethical minefield of endless innovation’ in *Handbook of Innovation in Public Sector Services* eds. by Osborne, S. P. & Brown, L (London: Elgar)
- Michael Macaulay (2011) ‘Measuring ethical performance’ *Risk and Reward: shared perspectives* (London: ACCA)
- Arthur Shacklock, Mark Manning and Linda Hort (2011) ‘Dimensions and Types of Ethical Climate within Public Sector Human Resource Management’, *Journal of New Business Ideas & Trends* 9, 1, 51-66.
- Finn Tschudi (2008) ‘A Comment on Adams and Balfour’, *Public Administration* 86, No. 4, 895–903
- Lisa Zanetti and Guy B Adams (2000), ‘In Service of the Leviathan: Democracy, Ethics and the Potential for Administrative Evil in the New Public Management’. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 22, 3, 534-554

Readings, that are not available via online databases will, along with other materials and case studies, be placed on Blackboard prior to the module commencing.

Module 3 Individual Integrity (Tuesday 26 May 2015)

This module will draw on a number of perspectives to look at the philosophical and psychological approaches to how we process morality and ethics. It will ask “what does it mean to be a person of integrity”.

Collective learning material

For this module I would like you to read a December 2014 article from the Los Angeles Times, which looks at the report on the CIA's use of torture but also what the management principles behind this were. The article is on Blackboard and please think about the following questions:

1. Why were "enhanced interrogation" techniques used?
2. Were they justified?
3. How did the CIA manage the interrogation process?
4. What were the ethical dilemmas that public managers faced here?
5. What are the ethical dilemmas that you face in your working lives?

It is anticipated that the preparation for this task will be approximately 1.5 hours and that the class discussion will be followed by a number of interactive lectures that will highlight the following bodies of knowledge.

- ethical dilemmas and integrity paradoxes;
- situational psychological views on ethics;
- dispositional psychological views on ethics;
- traditional philosophical views on ethics;
- moral emotions and affective psychology;
- workplace and organisational psychopathy.

As well as lectures, the learning materials will also include small-scale experiments and multi-media presentations including a film.

We will also hopefully be welcoming a guest speaker, Dr Gary Hickey, who has worked extensively in the fields of public ethics in health and local government. He currently works for a number of organisations, including the United Nations, and his biography can be found here: www.iaca.int/about-us/agreement-and-external-resolutions/15-faculty/visiting-lecturers-and-speakers/faculty-of-business-compliance/436-gary-hickey

Suggested reading for this module:

- Yana R. Avramova and Yoel Inbar (2013) 'Emotion and moral judgment', *Cognitive Science* 4:169–178.
- Paul Babiak and Ellen O' Toole (2012) 'The Corporate Psychopath' *FBI Enforcement Bulletin*, November, 7-11
- Clive R. P. Boddy (2010) 'Corporate Psychopaths and organizational type', *Journal of Public Affairs* 10: 300–312
- Clive R. P. Boddy (2012) 'Corporate Psychopaths and Marketing', *The Marketing Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 79-89
- Jonathan Haidt (2001) 'The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment', *Psychological Review*, 108. No. 4, 814-834
- Michael Haynes (2009) 'Rationality, morality and Joel Bakan's *The Corporation*', *Int. J. Management Concepts and Philosophy*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1-18
- Michael Macaulay, (2009) 'Adapted morality: the challenge of evolutionary psychology for administrative ethics', *Public Integrity* 11, 1, 35-44
- Michael Macaulay, (2009) 'The I that is We: recognition and administrative ethics' in *Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration: cases and concepts* eds. Cox III, R., (New York: M. E. Sharpe) 26-40

- Michael Macaulay and Alan Lawton, (2006) ‘From virtue to competence – changing the principles of public service?’ *Public Administration Review*, September/October, 66, (5) 1-9
- Herbert D. Saltzstein and Tziporah Kasachkoff (2004) ‘Haidt’s Moral Intuitionist Theory: A Psychological and Philosophical Critique’, *Review of General Psychology*, Vol. 8, No. 4, 273–282
- Thalia Wheatley and Jonathan Haidt, (2005), ‘Hypnotic Disgust Makes Moral Judgments More Severe’, *Psychological Science*, Vol. 16, No. 10. 780-784

Readings, that are not available via online databases will, along with other materials and case studies, be placed on Blackboard prior to the module.

Assessment

Students will be assessed by three completed Assessments.

The purpose of assessment is three-fold: 1) to ensure students have met the standard of work required of the course; 2) to give feedback on a student’s performance to assist with future study; and 3) to provide the teaching staff with feedback on the progress of the class. Students will be assessed on the basis of their individual work.

Summary of Assessment Requirements				
Assessment	Type	Indicative length	Due Date	Percentage of Overall Mark
Essay One	Written	1,500 words	Friday 20 March 2015	30%
Essay Two	Written	1,500 words	Friday 15 May 2015	30%
Essay Three	Written	2,500 words	Friday 19 June 2015	40%

Please submit ALL Assessments VIA BLACKBOARD in the Assessments section.

Essay One

Basing this essay on your own country, please choose ONE from the following options:

1. What do you consider to be the key corruption risks – internal and external – facing your country today? Which syndrome of corruption does your country most closely align? Please use as many empirical examples as you can.
2. Is corruption in your country accurately measured? Can corruption ever be accurately measured or even defined? Discuss in reference to Gregory’s critique.
3. Do international responses to national integrity issues ever make sense? Discuss in reference to a global initiative or the work of NGOs.

Alternatively, if none of the above appeal, we can arrange a negotiated question that emerges from the themes of the module (to be discussed between us).

Course Learning Objectives being tested:

- CLO 4: Critically evaluate methodologies used in measuring integrity and ethics

- CLO 5: Recognise and apply Integrity Management System models at organisational, local and national levels.

What's the aim of this assessment?

Assessment one allows you to be expansive and look at big-picture problems. What is really crucial here is to use as much evidence as you can – from the literature, from official statistics, etc. – and to really test the whole ethos of integrity and corruption studies. What exactly is going on when we say X or Y is a corrupt nation – what are the assumptions behind it and are these ideological?

What I am looking for here is a balance and a synthesis between actual examples and theoretical perspectives.

Essay Two

Outline what you think are the main components of the Integrity Management System in your organisation, even if it missing several key features. The please choose **ONE** from the following questions:

1. Explain what is missing (if anything) and analyse how successfully its components work together *as a system*. What gaps are needed to be filled? What obstacles exist to fully developing an IMS? How does your IMS fit in with those of other agencies that you may come into contact with?
2. Has your IMS ever failed? If so does that failure correspond to any of the seven signs of ethical collapse? Were these failures of the system of leadership?
3. Has your IMS suffered from sustained failure, or has a lack of a successful IMS ever led to an example of *administrative evil*? How has this appeared, who was affected and how was the situation resolved (if indeed it was resolved)? Do you think the concept of administrative failure is useful to looking at organisational integrity?

Alternatively, if none of the above appeal, we can arrange a negotiated question that emerges from the themes of the module (to be discussed between us).

Course Learning Objectives being tested:

- CLO 2: Understand the role of ethical climate and culture on leading organisations
- CLO 5: Recognise and apply Integrity Management System models at organisational, local and national levels.

What's the aim and expectations of this assessment?

Assessment two also enables you to start with a real-life experience but to use your judgement of your organisation to assess how successfully it manages ethics and integrity failures. You can use a number of perspectives, which tie in with module one as well, to explore an issue from a range of angles.

Again I am not looking for anything too descriptive (in fact please feel free to use diagrams to save on words for this piece of work) and more importantly I am not looking for an argument that simply outlines a series of problems and how people were badly affected. This assessment looks at where the weak points in an organisation lie and the extent to which this can lead to serious consequences for a range of stakeholders, and perhaps for the organisation itself.

Essay Three

To begin, outline (in one or two paragraphs) an ethical dilemma that you have faced at work. Then please choose **ONE** from the following options:

1. What did you do to resolve the dilemma (if you managed to resolve it at all)? Explain how your actions fitted within the classic frameworks outlined in the module (deontological, consequentialist, virtue ethics or care ethics) and say whether or not you would use any of these frameworks to do things differently in the future.
2. What were the competing emotional and rational responses by you and others to the issue? How were these managed and dealt with? To what extent did you use reason or emotion to solve any differences?
3. Were the main issues environmental or personal, and to what extent did these interact? Discuss with reference to psychological and dispositional views of integrity.

Alternatively, if none of the above appeal, we can arrange a negotiated question that emerges from the themes of the module (to be discussed between us).

Course Learning Objectives being tested:

- CLO 1 Distinguish between dispositional and situational approaches to integrity
- CLO 3 Identify key philosophical orientations (consequences; obligation; virtue; care; justice) in ethical dilemmas

What's the aim and expectations of this assessment?

In previous years, and in previous incarnations of this module, assessment three has been almost entirely theoretical and that hasn't necessarily allowed scholars to fully explore what these concepts mean to them. Therefore this assessment allows you to be self-reflective and apply the theories and concepts we have looked at in a real-life situation.

I will not be looking for a very long description of the problem, nor am I too worried about very detailed outlines of your key theoretical points. Feel free to assume prior knowledge on the reader's behalf. Instead I am looking for the synthesis of conceptual and empirical: how do the ideas we have looked at inform your experience? That is what the main purpose is – not just to see what your thoughts are but to see how you actually think by applying them.

Students should keep a copy of all submitted work.

Note on Quality Assurance

Your assessed work may also be used for quality assurance purposes, such as to assess the level of achievement of learning objectives as required for accreditation and academic audit. The findings may be used to inform changes aimed at improving the quality of VBS programmes. All material used for such processes will be treated as confidential, and the outcome will not affect your grade for the course.

Penalties

The ability to plan for and meet deadlines is a core competency of both advanced study and public management. Failure to meet deadlines disrupts course planning and is unfair on students who do submit their work on time. It is expected therefore that you will complete and hand in assignments by the due date. Marks will be deducted at the rate of five per cent for every day by which the assignment is late and no assignments will be accepted after five working days beyond the date they are due. For example, if you get 65% for an assignment, but you handed it in on Monday when it was due the previous Friday, you will get a mark of 50%.

If ill-health, family bereavement or other personal circumstances beyond your control prevent you from meeting the deadline for submitting a piece of written work or from attending class to make a presentation, you can apply for and may be granted an extension to the due date. You should let your course coordinator know as soon as possible in advance of the deadline (if circumstances permit) if you are seeking an extension. Where an extension is sought, evidence, by way of a medical certificate or similar, may be required by the course coordinator.

Computation of Grades

The translation from numerical marks to letter grades is set by the following grade ranges.

<i>Pass/Fail</i>	<i>Grade</i>	<i>Normal range</i>	<i>Indicative characterisation</i>
Pass	A+	90% - 100%	Outstanding performance
	A	85% - 89%	Excellent performance
	A-	80% - 84%	Excellent performance in most respects
	B+	75% - 79%	Very good performance
	B	70% - 74%	Good performance
	B-	65% - 69%	Good performance overall, but some weaknesses
	C+	60% - 64%	Satisfactory to good performance
	C	55% - 59%	Satisfactory performance
Fail	C-	50% - 54%	Adequate evidence of learning
	D	40% - 49%	Poor performance overall; some evidence of learning
	E	0 - 39%	Well below the standard required
	K	Fail due to not satisfying mandatory course requirements, even though the student's numerical course mark reached the level specified for a pass, usually 50%. A student whose course mark is below 50 should be given a D (40-49) or E (0-39), regardless of whether they met the mandatory course requirements	
Pass	P	Overall Pass (for a course classified as Pass/Fail)	
Fail	F	Fail (for a Pass/Fail course)	

Access to Blackboard

Blackboard is Victoria University's online environment that supports teaching and learning by making course information, materials and other learning activities available via the internet through the myVictoria student web portal. Ensure that you can access Blackboard before the course begins.

To access the Blackboard site for this course:

1. Open a web browser and go to www.myvictoria.ac.nz .
2. Log into myVictoria using your ITS Username (on your Confirmation of Study) and password (if you've never used the Victoria University computer facilities before, your initial password is your student ID number, on your Confirmation of Study, Fees Assessment or student ID card – you may be asked to change it when you log in for the first time).
3. Once you've logged into myVictoria, select Blackboard (from the options along the top of the page) to go to your Blackboard homepage.
4. The "My Courses" section displays the courses you have access to – select the appropriate link to access the course-specific Blackboard site. Please note that only courses that are actually using Blackboard and have been made available to students by their respective course coordinator will be displayed.

If you have any problems gaining access to Victoria University's computer facilities, such as myVictoria and Blackboard, you should contact the ITS Service Desk on (04) 463 5050 or its-service@vuw.ac.nz . See www.victoria.ac.nz/its/student-services/ for more information.

Power-point slides and other lecture materials that are posted on Blackboard may differ from the presentations used in class, as the copyright rules for archived presentations differ somewhat from those for live presentation.

Academic Integrity, Plagiarism, and the Use of Turnitin

Plagiarism is presenting someone else's work as if it were your own, whether you mean to or not. 'Someone else's work' means anything that is not your own idea. Even if it is presented in your own style, you must still acknowledge your sources fully and appropriately. This includes:

- material from books, journals or any other printed source
- the work of other students or staff
- information from the Internet
- software programs and other electronic material
- designs and ideas
- the organisation or structuring of any such material.

Acknowledgement is required for *all* material in any work submitted for assessment unless it is a 'fact' that is well-known in the context (such as "Wellington is the capital of New Zealand") or your own ideas in your own words. Everything else that derives from one of the sources above and ends up in your work – whether it is directly quoted, paraphrased, or put into a table or figure, needs to be acknowledged with a reference that is sufficient for your reader to locate the original source.

Plagiarism undermines academic integrity simply because it is a form of lying, stealing and mistreating others. Plagiarism involves stealing other people's intellectual property and lying about whose work it is. This is why plagiarism is prohibited at Victoria.

If you are found guilty of plagiarism, you may be penalised under the Statute on Student Conduct. You should be aware of your obligations under the Statute, which can be downloaded from the policy website (www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/policy/students.aspx). You could fail your course or even be suspended from the University. Plagiarism is easy to detect. The University has systems in place to identify it.

Student work provided for assessment in this course may be checked for academic integrity by the electronic search engine www.turnitin.com. Turnitin is an on-line plagiarism prevention tool which compares submitted work with a very large database of existing material. At the discretion of the Head of School, handwritten work may be copy-typed by the School and subject to checking by Turnitin. Turnitin will retain a copy of submitted materials on behalf of the University for detection of future plagiarism, but access to the full text of submissions will not be made available to any other party.

There is guidance available to students on how to avoid plagiarism by way of sound study skills and the proper and consistent use of a recognised referencing system. This guidance may be found at the following website www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/plagiarism.aspx. If in doubt, seek the advice of your course coordinator. **Plagiarism is simply not worth the risk.**

School of Government Service Standards

Good learning and teaching outcomes for students in School of Government courses depend on many factors, including open, transparent and accountable relationships between teaching and support staff, and students in their various activities. The following service standards indicate some of the key expectations that teaching staff and students can have of each other. In all cases, they represent what the School believes should be 'normal' practice; exceptional circumstances can and will be negotiated as required.

Please note that there are University-wide policies relating to assessment – including rights of review and appeal. Details may be found in the Assessment Handbook (which is reviewed and updated from time to time – www.victoria.ac.nz/about/governance/dvc-academic/publications).

In general terms, any concerns that a student or students may have should be raised with the course coordinator in the first instance. If that course of action is not appropriate, the School's programme support staff will direct you to the relevant Programme Director/Coordinator.

Standards relating to staff timeliness of responses to email and phone queries:

- Email or phone queries from students will be responded to in 48 hours

Standards relating to availability of course materials:

- Students on modular or intensive courses will usually have course materials at least 4 weeks before the course starts
- Students on weekly courses will usually have course materials available on the first day of the course

Standards relating to attendance:

- It is expected that students will attend all contact teaching sessions for a course. If a student is aware that they will be unable to attend part of a course prior to it commencing, they are required to advise the course coordinator. In such a situation, the student may be declined entry into the course.
- Where a course coordinator approves some non-attendance before the class commences, the course coordinator may set additional item(s) of assessment of learning and teaching objectives for the course for students unable to attend. Advice relating to the submission and assessment of any such additional assessment will be provided by the course coordinator.

Variations to the assessment details provided in the course outline:

- Any variation to the assessment details in the course outline will be formally agreed between the course coordinator and students at the earliest possible time, preferably at the beginning of the course.

Standards relating to assignments – turnaround and feedback:

- Unless otherwise agreed between students and the course coordinator, items of assessment will be marked within 15 working days of submission.
- Comments on pieces of assessment will allow students to understand the reasons for the mark awarded, relative to the teaching and learning objectives specified in the course outline, and will usually include advice on how the student can improve their grades in future assignments.

Mandatory Course Requirements

In addition to obtaining an overall course mark of 50 or better, students must submit or participate in all pieces of assessment required for this course.

Participation in additional work sessions is mandatory.

If you cannot complete an assignment or sit a test or examination, refer to www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/exams-and-assessments/aegrotat .

Communication of Additional Information

Information will be communicated via Blackboard. It is essential, therefore, that you activate your @myvuw.ac.nz email account (the free email account created for you when you enrol and accessed via the myVictoria student web portal) before the start of the course. Once you have activated your @myvuw.ac.nz email account, if you want to receive these emails at your preferred email address (e.g. your home or work email address), you must modify the settings so all emails sent to it are automatically forwarded to your preferred email address. For more information, please go to www.victoria.ac.nz/its/student-services/FAQs.aspx#Email Forward .

Student Feedback

Student feedback on University courses may be found at www.cad.vuw.ac.nz/feedback/feedback_display.php .

Link to General Information

For general information about course-related matters, go to www.victoria.ac.nz/vbs/studenthelp/general-course-information .
