TE WHARE WĀNANGA O TE ŪPOKO O TE IKA A MĀUI

VICTORIA
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

School of Government

PADM 510
APPROVED PERSONAL COURSE OF STUDY
(24 Points)

(Taught with GOVT 539
POLITICS, PHILOSOPHY AND PUBLIC POLICY)

Trimester 1 / 2016

COURSE OUTLINE

Names and Contact Details

Course Coordinator:	**Professor Jonathan Boston**
	Room RH 825, Level 8, Rutherford House, Pipitea Campus
	Telephone: (04) 463 5456
	Mobile: 027 563 5456
	Email: jonathan.boston@vuw.ac.nz
Lecturer:	**Dr David Bromell**
	(Christchurch-based – but in Germany from 29 April to 25 July 2016)
	Mobile: 021 140 2062
	Email: david.bromell@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

From Monday 22 February to Friday 17 June 2016.

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 4 March 2016**.

2. The standard last date for withdrawal from this course is **Friday 20 May 2016**. 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 or
    www.victoria.ac.nz/vbs/studenthelp/publications/Application-for-late-withdrawal-2010.doc .

Class Times and Room Numbers

Module One: Thursday 25 February 2016   9.00am – 5.00pm
Module Two: Thursday 28 April 2016   9.00am – 5.00pm
Module Three: Thursday 9 June 2016   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 <u>required</u> at all teaching days

Course Delivery and Attendance

This course is delivered in a modular format over three days, which includes a minimum of 24 hours contact. The 24 hours are broken up into:

- three separate days of six hours contact time each (a 'module'), taught between 9.00am and 5.00pm on the three teaching days (6.25 hours in the first module – hence a total of 18.25 hours);
- a minimum of 5.75 hours of online learning between teaching days (see Assessment, page 14 below).

Attendance is required at all three modular teaching days (9.00am – 5.00pm). Completing online learning tasks within the prescribed timeframes is also required in order to pass this course.

If, before enrolment for a course, you are aware that you will not be able to attend for part of a day, you must notify the Director of Master's Programmes when you enrol explaining why you will not be able to attend. The Director of Master's Programmes will consult with the relevant course coordinator. In such circumstances, you may be declined entry into a course.

If you become aware after a course starts that you will be unable to attend part or all of a day (i.e. more than two hours), or cannot complete the online learning requirements within the prescribed timeframes, you must advise the course coordinator explaining why you are unable to do so. The course coordinator may require you to complete compensatory work to ensure that you have successfully met the course requirements and fulfilled the learning objectives.

Expected Workload

The learning objectives set for this 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. School of Government courses vary in design but all require preparation and learning before the first day of the course and regular learning is also necessary (students who leave everything to the last moment rarely achieve at a high level).

Expressed in input terms, on average, the time commitment required usually translates to approximately 240 hours (including class contact time and online learning tasks) for a 24-point course. We recommend that you study for approximately 14-16 hours each week during the course.

Prescription

This course examines the contribution of political, social and moral philosophy to an understanding of the role of the state, and some of the issues surrounding the application of social science theories and methodologies to the conduct of policy analysis.

Course Learning Objectives (CLOs)

PADM candidates are expected to achieve these learning outcomes at a level that reflects the fact that this is a 24 point course. Moreover, in terms of learning outcomes, students are expected to engage at a level appropriate for senior managers in the NZ public sector (e.g. a strategic rather than operational focus; oriented towards whole-of-government rather than a single work unit or organisation; demonstrating synthesis, contextuality and multidisciplinarity in thinking), and will accordingly be assessed on that basis.

This course examines the contribution of political, social and moral philosophy to an understanding of the role of the state and the design of public policies. It considers several competing moral frameworks that influence ethical discourse on policy issues, and examines some of the key moral values and principles (e.g. liberty, justice, the public interest, the harm principle, the precautionary principle, etc.) that need to be taken into account when evaluating policy options. It does not provide a comprehensive course in political or social philosophy, but rather an introduction to a number of important theories, approaches and ideas that bear on 'hard questions' and dilemmas facing policy-makers. Various important contemporary policy issues are examined to illustrate the role of ethical considerations in governmental decision-making and the nature of the trade-offs that must often be confronted in policy making and public management.

This course develops skills in critical thinking, dealing with complexity, and clear communication.

By the end of the course, it is expected that students will be able to:

1. explain the strengths and weaknesses of a number of influential moral theories and identify their relevance to policy-making;
2. apply specific ethical values and principles to an analysis of particular policy issues;
3. engage with others in moral argument in a context of pluralism where some arguments are better than others, but no argument can win; and
4. think critically about 'the right thing to do' as citizens and as appointed or elected officials.

Course Content

The following outline indicates material covered in each module.

Module One (Thursday 25 February 2016)

Six theories of justice:

1. **Introduction / Utilitarianism**
   - introduction to the course
   - consequentialism and utilitarianism
   - Jeremy Bentham

- deontological vs teleological ethics
- John Stuart Mill – and the English utilitarians in India
- cost-benefit analysis
- the trolley problem – and driverless cars

2. Justice as fairness
- Immanuel Kant's *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* (1780)
- John Rawls's theory of justice
- the 'original position' and 'veil of ignorance'
- principles of justice
- the difference/maxim in principle
- the politics of liberal equality

3. Entitlement and compensation
- Robert Nozick's *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*
- 'state of nature', 'natural rights' and the Lockean proviso
- the minimal state
- positive and negative rights
- liberty, equality, fraternity – and pre-conditions for the exercise of liberty

4. A capabilities approach
- Amartya Sen / Martha Nussbaum
- functionings, capabilities, agency, freedom
- measuring well-being and social progress
- basic capabilities?
- transcendental institutionalism and realisation-focused comparison
- public reason and open impartiality

5. Civic virtue and the common good
- Aristotle – justice as teleological and honorific
- Michael Sandel on the moral limits of markets, the purpose of politics and the formation of virtue
- Alasdair MacIntyre – 'narrative quest' and belonging in communities
- obligations of solidarity
- justice and the common good

6. Catholic social teaching
- Pope Leo XIII and Rerum Novarum (1891)
- key documents in an evolving tradition
- 'dignity', rights and the common good
- forms of justice: commutative, distributive, social
- labour, capital and a living wage
- just ownership and use of property
- prioritisation principles
- the preferential option for the poor
- Pope Francis – new directions

Module Two (Thursday 28 April 2016)

1. **Liberty and liberty-limiting principles**
   - the presumption in favour of liberty
   - the 'best judge' principle
   - grounds for coercion by the state (and others)
   - liberty-limiting principles
   - state paternalism
   - trade-offs and decision rules

2. **A case study and exercise**
   - physician-assisted suicide / active voluntary euthanasia

3. **Equality of what?**
   - Rawls re-visited
   - equality as end or means?
   - equality of what?
   - five kinds of equality
   - equality and other values
   - utility and equality
   - how equal do we want to be?

4. **Values pluralism and public policy**
   - evidence, emotion and values in public policy making
   - reasonable pluralism in liberal societies
   - philosophical responses to values pluralism
   - political responses to values pluralism
   - creating public value in the policy advice role

Module Three (Thursday 9 June 2016)

1. **Government and 'the good society'**
   - competing conceptions of the good society
   - state neutrality vs perfectionism
   - 'the common good' and 'the public interest'

2. **Governing for the long term**
   - intertemporal trade-offs – balancing current and future interests
   - the nature, causes and consequences of the 'presentist bias' in democratic politics
   - the problem of making and sustaining 'policy investments'
   - summary of proposed 'solutions'
   - the nature and effectiveness of 'commitment devices'

3. **Case study: the political and policy challenges of adapting to climate change**
   - the challenge of adaptation – complexity, risk, vulnerability, surprises
   - the specific adaptation issues facing New Zealand
   - policy issues – decision-making frameworks, adaptive management, liability, cost-sharing, compensation, etc.

4. **Public policy responses to child poverty in New Zealand**
   - poverty measurement
   - child poverty in New Zealand – trends and international comparisons
   - causes and consequences of child poverty
   - solutions – taking an investment perspective
   - current policy issues and options

<u>Readings</u>

There is no prescribed text; nor is there a set of course readings. Useful books and readings relevant to each module are set out below. A number of these have hyperlinks – you can access these free online. You can access many journal articles online through the VUW library home page (Journal finder), indicated with an *. As a VUW student, you have complete and free access to these materials. University copyright licenses allow you to download and print these materials, so long as you use them for educational purposes only. Please ask your course coordinator or a VUW librarian if you require help to access material, or if you run into any other problems. Some key documents (indicated below) can be accessed from the course resources on Blackboard.

The pre-reading for each module will be the basis for exercises and discussion in class. Following module 1, you will benefit from reading Michael Sandel's *Justice* (2009) – see below.

Additional reading is suggested following each module, so you can follow up on ideas of interest and to provide some starting points for your own research and preparation of assignments.

Useful Books

> If you buy only one book, make it this one:
> Sandel, M. (2009). *Justice: What's the right thing to do?* New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Boston, J., Bradstock, A., & Eng, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Public policy: Why ethics matters.* Canberra: ANU E-Press. Available free online: http://epress.anu.edu.au/titles/australia-and-new-zealand-school-of-government-anzsog-2/ethics_matters_citation

Boston, J., Bradstock, A., & Eng, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Ethics and public policy: Contemporary issues,* Wellington: Victoria University Press. Available for a modest cost online at http://mebooks.co.nz/index.php?route=product/product&product_id=355

Bromell, D. (2008) *Ethnicity, identity and public policy: Critical perspectives on multiculturalism,* Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, School of Government, Victoria University of Wellington. Available free online: http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/publications/show/247

Reading for Module 1

Pre-reading

Arvan, M. (2014). How do you read philosophy? *The Philosophers' Cocoon*. Retrieved from http://philosopherscocoon.typepad.com/blog/2014/03/how-do-you-read-philosophy.html

Arvan, M. (2014). How do you write? *The Philosophers' Cocoon*. Retrieved from http://philosopherscocoon.typepad.com/blog/2014/03/how-do-you-write.html

Bromell, D. (unpublished paper, 2016) *Why (not) political philosophy?* (**on Blackboard**).

Further reading related to Module 1
Cohen, G. (2011). How to do political philosophy. In M. Otsuka, (Ed.). *On the currency of egalitarian justice, and other essays in political philosophy* (pp. 225-235). Princeton: Princeton University Press (**on Blackboard**).
Kymlicka, W. (1990) *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An introduction,* Oxford: Clarendon.

Utilitarianism and cost-benefit analysis
Argyrous, G. (2013). A review of government cost-benefit analysis guidelines: How do they differ? *Occasional paper, Australia and New Zealand School of Government*. Retrieved from www.anzsog.edu.au/media/upload/publication/112_SSC-Occpaper-6-Argyrous-G-1.3.13.pdf
Bentham, J. (1789/1996). *Introduction to the principles of morals and legislation.* J. Burns & H. Hart, (Eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Gray, J. (1991). Introduction. *John Stuart Mill: On liberty and other essays* (pp. vii–xxx). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Greene, J. (2013). *Moral tribes: Emotion, reason, and the gap between us and them.* London: Atlantic Books.
Mill, J.S. (1871). *Utilitarianism.* Available as a print or electronic resource in VUW library.
New Zealand Treasury (2015). *Guide to social cost benefit analysis*. Wellington, New Zealand Treasury. www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/guidance/planning/costbenefitanalysis/guide
Sandel, M. (2009). *Justice: What's the right thing to do?* (chapter 2). New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
* Sen, A. (2000). The discipline of cost-benefit analysis. *Journal of Legal Studies, 29*(S2), 931–952. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/468100

John Rawls: Justice as fairness
Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice.* London: Oxford University Press.
Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A restatement.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Wenar, L. (2008). John Rawls. *The Stanford encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2008 Edition). E. N. Zalta (Ed.). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/rawls/

Robert Nozick
Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state and utopia.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Uzgalis, W. (2012). John Locke. *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Fall 2012 Edition). E. N. Zalta (Ed.). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2012/entries/locke/

A capabilities approach
Nussbaum, M. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
Sen, A. (2009). Introduction. In R. Hanley (Ed.). *Adam Smith: The theory of moral sentiments* (pp. vii–xxvi). New York: Penguin (**on Blackboard**).

Civic virtue and the common good
Aristotle (1953). *The ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*. J. A. K. Thomson, (Trans.). Harmondsworth. Middlesex: Penguin. (e-book available).
Kraut, R. (2012). Aristotle's ethics. *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. E. N. Zalta (Ed.). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2012/entries/aristotle-ethics/
MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory.* London: Duckworth.
MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Miller, F. (2012). Aristotle's political theory. *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. E. N. Zalta (Ed.). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2012/entries/aristotle-politics/

Sandel, M. (1982). *Liberalism and the limits of justice.* Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sandel, M. (1996). *Democracy's discontent: America in search of a public philosophy.* Cambridge: MA: Belknap Press.

Sandel, M. (2009). *Justice: What's the right thing to do?* New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Sandel, M. (2012). *What money can't buy: The moral limits of markets.* New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

* Sandel, M. (2013). Market reasoning as moral reasoning: Why economists should re-engage with political philosophy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 27*(4), 121–140.

Catholic social teaching

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2010). Social action. *Catholic Church in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Retrieved from www.catholic.org.nz/social-action/dsp-default.cfm?loadref=11

Hollenbach, D. (1988). *Justice, peace, and human rights: American catholic social ethics in a pluralistic world.* New York: Crossroad.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops (1986). *Economic justice for all: Pastoral letter on catholic social teaching and the U.S. economy.* Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Reading on active voluntary euthanasia for online learning tasks and pre-reading for Module 2

Read as widely as you can on active voluntary euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide:
- *to support your achievement of the online learning tasks due by 14 and 19 April 2016*
- *to prepare you for an exercise in class on 28 April 2016*
- *because it's a fascinating topic!*

Adams, G. (2014, Jan). Voluntary euthanasia: Too hot to handle? *North & South*, pp. 62-71 (**on Blackboard**).

Beauchamp, T., & Childress, J. (1994). *Principles of biomedical ethics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, A., Guillett, G., & Jones, G. (1992). *Practical medical ethics* (pp. 1-16). Auckland: Oxford University Press (**on Blackboard**).

Campbell, A., Guillett, G., & Jones, G. (1992). *Practical medical ethics* (pp. 108-119). Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Economist Intelligence Unit (2015) *2015 Quality of Death Index: Ranking palliative care across the world.* Retrieved from www.economistinsights.com/healthcare/analysis/quality-death-index-2015

Geddis, A. (2015) Aid in dying in the High Court: Seales v Attorney General. *Policy Quarterly*, 11(3), pp. 27-29. Retrieved from http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/files/94fe16795f0.pdf

George, K. (2007). A woman's choice? The gendered risks of voluntary euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide. *Medical Law Review*, *15* (Spring), pp. 1-33 (**on Blackboard**).

Gillett, G. (1989). *Reasonable care.* Bristol: Bristol Press.

Havill, J. (2015) Physician-assisted dying. *Policy Quarterly*, 11(3), pp. 30-33. Retrieved from http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/files/4f0f8b496a2.pdf

HM Government (2014, Jan). *An evidence review of the drivers of child poverty for families in poverty now and for poor children growing up to be poor adults.* Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, London (**on Blackboard**).

Kleinsman, J. (2015) Euthanasia and assisted suicide: good or bad public policy? *Policy Quarterly*, 11(3), 34-37. Retrieved from http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/files/23377b51a6d.pdf

Lord Falconer. (2012). *Report of commission on assisted dying*. London: Demos. Retrieved from www.commissiononassisteddying.co.uk/

Parliamentary Library (2003). Voluntary euthanasia and New Zealand. *Background note 2003/07*. Retrieved from www.parliament.nz/resource/0000000219

Wicks, W. (2015) The consequences of euthanasia legislation for disabled people, *Policy Quarterly*, 11(3), pp. 38-40. Retrieved from http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/files/888df78d193.pdf

Further reading related to Module 2
Liberty, coercion, harm and precaution

Dworkin, R. (1985). *A matter of principle* (chapter 11). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Feinberg, J. (1973). *Social philosophy* (chapters 2-3). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Feinberg, J. (1980). *Rights, justice and the bounds of liberty: Essays in social philosophy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

* Goodin, R. (1990). Liberalism and the best-judge principle. *Political Studies*, 38, 181-195.

Goodin, R. and Reeve, A. (eds.) (1989). *Liberal Neutrality.* London: Routledge.

John, P., Cotterill, S., Moseley, A., Richardson, L., Smith, G., Stoker, G. & Wales, C. (2011). *Nudge, nudge, think, think: Experimenting with ways to change civic behaviour.* London: Bloomsbury.

* MacLeod, C. (1997). Liberal neutrality or liberal tolerance? *Law and Philosophy*, 16, pp. 529-559.

Mill, J. S. (1956 edition). *On liberty.* New York: Liberal Arts Press.

Sartorius, R. (Ed.). (1983). *Paternalism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, esp. chapters 1, 2, 3 and 13.

Thaler, R., & Sunstein, C. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth and happiness.* London: Penguin.

Equality and inequality

* Anderson, E. (1999). What is the point of equality? *Ethics, 109*(2), 287–337 **(on Blackboard)**.

Barry, B. (2001). *Culture and equality: An egalitarian critique of multiculturalism.* Cambridge: Polity Press and Blackwell Publishers.

Boston, J. (2013). What kinds of inequality matter? In M. Rashbrooke, (Ed.). *Inequality: A New Zealand crisis and what we can do about it* (pp. 70–86). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books. **(on Blackboard)**.

Boston, J. (2011). Comment: Reflections on equality and citizenship. In C. Charters & D. Knight (Eds.). *We the People(s): Participation in governance* (pp. 208–221). Wellington: Victoria University Press **(on Blackboard)**.

Bromell, D. (2014). 'A fair go' in public policy. *Policy Quarterly,* 10(2), pp. 12-21. Retrieved from http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/files/4597c9519ba.pdf

Bromell, D. (2010). Inequality and the economy of ideas. *Policy Quarterly,* 6(3), 40–44. Retrieved from http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/files/15007e065e6.pdf

Duclos, J.-Y. (2006). *Equity and equality.* IZA Discussion paper No. 2284, Retrieved from www.iza.org/en/webcontent/publications/papers/viewAbstract?dp_id=2284

* Dworkin, R. (1981). What is equality? Part I: Equality of welfare. *Philosophy and Public Affairs, 10*(3), 185–246.

* Dworkin, R. (1981). What is equality? Part II: Equality of resources. *Philosophy and Public Affairs, 10*(4), 283–345.

Dworkin, R. (2000). *Sovereign virtue: The theory and practice of equality.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gosepath, S. (2011). Equality. *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. E. N. Zalta (Ed.). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/equality/

Marquez, X. (2011). Is income inequality unjust? Perspectives from political philosophy. *Policy Quarterly,* 7(2), 61–67. Retrieved from:
http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/files/28ca3580530.pdf

Miller, D. (1999). *Principles of social justice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pikkety, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press. (e-book available).

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A restatement* (esp. §§7.3, 39). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rashbrooke, M., (Ed.). (2013). *Inequality: A New Zealand crisis and what we can do about it.* Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Sen, A. (1979). *Equality of what?* The Tanner Lecture on Human Values, Stanford University, 22 May 1979. Retrieved from http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/s/sen80.pdf

Sen, A. (2002). Freedom and social choice: The Arrow Lectures. [1991], Pt VI of *Rationality and Freedom* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice* (pp. 286–90 and chapters 11 and 14).Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press,

Stiglitz, J. (2012). *The price of inequality.* London: Allen Lane.

Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice: A defense of pluralism and equality.* Oxford: Robertson.

Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, K. (2010). *The spirit level: Why equality is better for everyone.* London: Penguin.

Wilson, M. (2011). The disconcerting reality of constitutional theory informed by practice. In C. Charters & D. Knight (Eds.). *We the people(s): Participation in governance* (pp. 182–207). Wellington: Victoria University Press **(on Blackboard)**.

Values pluralism and public policy

Bromell, D. (2008) *Ethnicity, Identity and Public Policy: Critical perspectives on multiculturalism,* Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, School of Government, Victoria University of Wellington, http://ips.ac.nz/publications/publications/show/247

Bromell, D. (2012) *Evidence, Values and Public Policy*, Occasional Paper, Australia and New Zealand School of Government. Retrieved from:
www.anzsog.edu.au/media/upload/publication/84_Bromell-Evidence-values-and-public-policy-for-ANZSoG-FINAL.pdf

Flynn, J. (2000) *How to Defend Humane Ideals: Substitutes for objectivity,* Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press.

Gluckman, P. (2011) *Towards Better Use of Evidence in Policy Formation: A discussion document* Wellington. Retrieved from: www.pmcsa.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/Towards-better-use-of-evidence-in-policy-formation.pdf

Gluckman, P. (2013) 'Communicating and using evidence in policy formation: The use and misuse of science', speech to IPANZ 21 February 2013. Retrieved from: www.pmcsa.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/13-02-21-Communicating-and-using-evidence-in-policy-formation.pdf

Gluckman, P. (2013) *Interpreting Science: Implications for public understanding, advocacy and policy formation*. Auckland: Office of the Prime Minister's Science Advisory Committee. Retrieved from www.pmcsa.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/Interpreting-Science-April-2013.pdf

Gluckman, P. (2013) *The Role of Evidence in Policy Formation and Implementation: A report from the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor*, Auckland: Office of the Prime Minister's Science Advisory Committee. Retrieved from: www.pmcsa.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/The-role-of-evidence-in-policy-formation-and-implementation-report.pdf

Haidt, J. (2012) *The Righteous Mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion,* New York: Pantheon Books.

Nussbaum, M. (1992) 'Human functioning and social justice: In defense of Aristotelian essentialism', *Political Theory* 20 (2), pp. 202–246.

Nussbaum, M. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The capabilities approach,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pielke, R. (2007). *The Honest Broker: Making sense of science in policy and politics,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

* Rawls, J. (1987) 'The idea of an overlapping consensus', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 7 (1), pp. 1–25.

Rawls, J. (2001) *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (2005) *Political Liberalism* (expanded edition), New York: Columbia University Press.

van Zwanenberg, P. and Millstone, E. (2005) 'Analysing the role of science in public policy-making', in van Zwanenberg and Millstone (eds.), *BSE: Risk, science, and governance,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 10-38.

Winston, K. (2010) *Moral Competence in Public Life*, Occasional Paper, Australia and New Zealand School of Government. Retrieved from:
www.anzsog.edu.au/media/upload/publication/18_occpaper_04_winston.pdf

Reading for Module 3

Pre-reading

IPCC (2014). Summary for policymakers. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Retrieved from:
http://ipcc-wg2.gov/AR5/images/uploads/IPCC_WG2AR5_SPM_Approved.pdf

Further reading related to Module 3
Government and 'the good society'

Barry, B. (1965). *Political argument* (Chapters X-XV). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

* Benditt, T. (1973). The public interest. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, *2*(3), 291-311.

Boston, J. (2013. July). The quest for the good society: Economics, ethics and public policy. Paper prepared for a Treasury seminar. Retrieved from http://apo.org.au/research/quest-good-society-economics-ethics-and-public-policy **(on Blackboard)**

* Caney, S. (1991). Consequentialist defences of liberal neutrality. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, *41* (165), 457-477.

* Caney, S. (1995). Anti-perfectionism and Rawlsian liberalism. *Political Studies*, *43*, 248-264.

* Cochran, C. (1974). Political science and "the public interest. *Journal of Politics*, *36*(2), 327-355.

Dahl, R (1989). *Democracy and its critics* (Chapters 20-21). New Haven: Yale University Press.

* Douglass, B. (1980). The common good and the public interest. *Political Theory*, *8*(1), 103-117.

* Dupré, L. (1993). The common good and the open society. *The Review of Politics*, *55*(4), 687–712.

Francis, M., & Tully, J. (Eds.). (2009). *In the public interest: Essays in honour of Professor Keith Jackson* (chapter 1). Christchurch: Canterbury University Press. **(on Blackboard)**.

James, C., with Argyle, E. (2014). *A way of thinking about vested interests*. Wellington: Institute for Governance and Policy Studies, School of Government, Victoria University of Wellington, Working Paper 14/02. Retrieved from
http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/publications/show/356 **(on Blackboard)**

* Smith, T. (1999). Aristotle on the conditions for and limits of the common good. *American Political Science Review*, *93*(3), 625–636.

* Tullock, G. (1984). A (partial) rehabilitation of the public interest theory. *Public Choice*, *42*, 89-99.

Governing for the long term

Boston, J. and T. Stuart (2015). Protecting the Rights of Future Generations: Are Constitutional Mechanisms an Answer. *Policy Quarterly*, 11, 2, 60-71.

Cullen, M. (2013). The Political Economy of Long-Term Fiscal Planning from a Social Democratic Perspective. *Policy Quarterly*, 9, 4, 15-20.

Jacobs, A. (2008). The Politics of When: Redistribution, Investment and Policy Making for the Long Term. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38, 2, 193–220.

Jacobs, A. and J. Matthews (2012). Why Do Citizens Discount the Future? Public Opinion and the Timing of Policy Consequences. *British Journal of Political Science*, 42, 903-935.

James, C. (2013). Making Big Decisions for the Future. *Policy Quarterly*, 9, 4, 21-28.

Milkman, K., T. Rogers and M. Bazerman (2008). Harnessing Our Inner Angels and Demons: What we have learned about want/should conflicts and how that knowledge can help us reduce short-sighted decision-making. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 4, 324-338.

Oxford Martin Commission (2013). *Now for the Long Term* Oxford, Report of the Oxford Martin Commission for Future Generations.

Reeves, R. (2015). Ulysses goes to Washington: Political myopia and policy commitment devices. Centre for Effective Public Management, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Rennie, I. (2013). 'Speech of Head of State Services and State Services Commissioner at the Institute of Public Administration New Zealand (IPANZ) State sector legislation launch', Wellington, 30 July.

Upton, S. (2013). Fiscal and Other Risks over the Long Term. *Policy Quarterly*, 9, 4, 9-14.

Climate change (especially adaptation)

Adger, N. et al. (Eds.) (2009). *Adapting to Climate Change: Thresholds, Values, Governance,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boston, J., J. Wanna, V. Lipski and J. Pritchard (Eds.). (2014). *Future-Proofing the State: Managing Risks, Responding to Crises and Building Resilience,* Canberra: ANU Press.

Eriksen, S., Nightingale, A., and Eakin, H. (2015). Reframing adaptation: the political nature of climate change adaptation, *Global Environmental Change*, 35, 523-533 (**on Blackboard**).

Evans, L., Milfont, T. and Lawrence, J. (2014). Considering local adaptation increases willingness to mitigate, *Global Environmental Change*, 25, 69-75.

Gardiner, S. (2011). *A perfect moral storm: The ethical tragedy of climate change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

IPCC. (2014). Summary for policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis report*. Available at http://ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/

Lawrence, J. et al. (2015). Adapting to changing climate risk by local government in New Zealand: institutional practice barriers and enablers, *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability,* 20, 3, 298-320 (**on Blackboard**).

Lewanddowsky, S. et al. (2015.) Uncertainty as knowledge, *Philosophical Transactions A*, 373, 20140462.

Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (2015). *Preparing New Zealand for Rising Seas: Certainty and uncertainty*. Retrieved from www.pce.parliament.nz/publications/preparing-new-zealand-for-rising-seas-certainty-and-uncertainty

Rosenzweig, C. et al. (2011). Developing coastal adaptation to climate change in the New York City infrastructure-shed: process, approach, tools, and strategies, *Climatic Change*, 106, 93-127.

SOLGM (2015). *Climate Change: Local government can make a difference*. Wellington: Society of Local Government Managers. Retrieved from: www.solgm.org.nz/Category?Action=View&Category_id=1186

Stewart, R. (2002). Environmental regulatory decision making under uncertainty. *An Introduction to the Law and Economics of Environmental Policy: Issues in Institutional Design* (pp. 71-126) (Vol. 20) (**on Blackboard**).

Weijers, D., Eng, D. & Das, R. (2010). Sharing the responsibility of dealing with climate change: Interpreting the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. In J. Boston, A. Bradstock, & D. Eng, (Eds.). *Public policy: Why ethics matters.* Canberra: ANU E-Press. http://press.anu.edu.au/apps/bookworm/view/Public+Policy%3A+Why+ethics+matters/5251/ch08.xhtml#toc-anchor **(on Blackboard)**

Public policy responses to child poverty in New Zealand

Articles on child hardship in *Policy Quarterly*, 11, 3, August 2015, pp. 3-26: http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/publications/publications/show/364

Boston, J., & Chapple, S. (2014). *Child poverty in New Zealand.* Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

HM Government. (2014). *An evidence review of the drivers of child poverty for families in poverty now and for poor children growing up to be poor adults.* Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, London, January (**on Blackboard**).

OECD (2009). *Doing better for children.* Paris: OECD. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/els/family/doingbetterforchildren.htm

Office of the Children's Commissioner. (2012). *Solutions to child poverty in New Zealand: Evidence for action.* Final report of the Expert Advisory Group on Solutions to Child Poverty, Wellington: Office of the Children's Commissioner. Retrieved from www.occ.org.nz/assets/Uploads/EAG/Final-report/Final-report-Solutions-to-child-poverty-evidence-for-action.pdf

Office of the Children's Commissioner. (2013). *Child poverty in New Zealand: Building on the progress to date.* Expert Advisory Group on Solutions to Child Poverty, Wellington: Office of the Children's Commissioner. Retrieved from www.occ.org.nz/assets/Publications/EAG-Child-Poverty-Progress-29Oct13.pdf

Perry, B. (2015). *Household incomes in New Zealand: Trends in indicators of inequality and hardship, 1982 to 2014.* Wellington: Ministry of Social Development. Retrieved from www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/monitoring/household-incomes/index.html

Assessment

The information in this section may be modified for PADM students. The course coordinator will confirm the assessment requirements.

The Assessment Handbook will apply to all VUW courses: see www.victoria.ac.nz/documents/policy/staff-policy/assessment-handbook.pdf .

The purpose of assessment is three-fold: to ensure that you have met the standard of work required of the course; to give you feedback on your performance to assist you with your future study; and to provide the teaching staff with feedback on the progress of the class. You will be assessed on the basis of your individual work.

Your grade in this course will be based on your performance in the following:

1. A book report of no more than 1,200 words (20%)
2. Completion and quality of online learning tasks (15%)
3. A short essay of no more than 1,500 words (25%)
4. A long essay of no more than 3,000 words (40%).

For a copy of assessment sheet used to mark assignments for this course, see page 23 of this Course Outline.

Submit all items through the assignments section of Blackboard. DO NOT SUBMIT PDFs.

You should keep a copy of all submitted work.

Book Report (due Tuesday 22 March 2016): 1,200 words, 20%

This assignment is an opportunity to engage with a significant text, to locate it in the history of ideas, assess its strengths and weaknesses and reflect on its relevance to public policy making (see course learning objectives CLO 1, p. 4 above). To do well in this assignment, you will have to look at some of the secondary literature about your chosen author.

Write a book report on ONE of the following:
- Bentham, J. (1789) *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (multiple editions/copies are in the VUW library).
- MacIntyre, A. (1981) *After Virtue: A study in moral theory,* London: Duckworth.
- Mill, J.S. (1861) *Utilitarianism*, available as a print or electronic resource in VUW library (various editions).
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops (1986) *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral letter on Catholic social teaching and the U.S. economy,* Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops.
- Nozick, R. (1974) *Anarchy, State and Utopia,* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nussbaum, M. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The capabilities approach,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rawls, J. (2001) *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sandel, M. (1982) *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice,* Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999) *Development as Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (2009) *The Idea of Justice,* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Structure your report as follows:
1. Summarise the key message of this author (150 words).
2. Locate the author's thought in the history of ideas. Whose work were they building on, or reacting against? (150 words).
3. Assess its strengths and weaknesses, and relevance to public policy making (750 words).
4. Bring your report to a conclusion, with your single, most significant 'take away' from engaging with this author (150 words).

Online Learning Tasks (due Thursday 14 April and Tuesday 19 April 2016): 15%

These tasks require a total time commitment of at least 5.75 hours. They relate particularly to the course learning objective to engage with others in moral argument (CLO 3, p. 4 above). There are three tasks to complete:
1. Read at least the four articles in the August 2015 issue of *Policy Quarterly* by Geddis, Havill, Kleinsman and Wicks (p. 9-10 above). Further reading will improve your contributions (and grade!) for the remaining tasks.

2. Write a blog entry of around 350 words as follows, **no later than 10.00pm on Thursday 14 April 2016**.
    a. If your family name begins with letter A to M, you are to develop an ethical argument AGAINST the legalisation of physician-assisted suicide and/or active voluntary euthanasia.
    b. If your family name begins with letter N to Z, you are to develop an ethical argument FOR the legalisation of physician-assisted suicide and/or active voluntary euthanasia.
3. Read and respond (around 150 words) to others' blog posts – **no later than 10.00pm on Tuesday 19 April 2016.**
    a. If you argued AGAINST legalisation, respond to at least one post that argues FOR.
    b. If you argued FOR legalisation, respond to at least one post that argues AGAINST.

The course coordinator is able to monitor your completion of these tasks in Blackboard by the due date/time. Blogs will be assessed as follows: 10% of your final grade for the initial post; 5% for your response(s) to others' posts.

Short Essay (due Tuesday 17 May 2016): 1,500 words, 25%

This assignment requires you to apply specific ethical values and principles to public policy (see course learning objectives CLO 2, p. 4 above).

EITHER

> In what circumstances, and for which reasons, is state paternalism justifiable? Draw on at least two current policy issues to illustrate your answer.

OR

> 'A decent society should guarantee to every citizen fair equality of opportunity, but this does not necessarily mean they will enjoy equal outcomes.' Discuss, with particular reference to John Rawls's theory of justice as fairness.

OR

> Out of concern that some 16 and 17 year olds may be undergoing forced marriage, there is a proposed Member's Bill (Joanne Hayes) awaiting the Ballot: the Marriage (Court Consent to Marriage of Minors) Amendment Bill (www.parliament.nz/resource/en-nz/51HOH_MEMBILL107_1/773390b1fdecf6e48554d8ab0918e543ea2cbb8b). The Bill proposes that 16 and 17 year olds who wish to marry must apply to the court, and sets out how the court is to consider the application.
> Outline arguments **for and against** this proposed legislation.

Long Essay (due Friday 17 June 2016): 3,000 words, 40%

The long essay is an opportunity to:
* address a specific instance of conflicting claims in a context of values pluralism, drawing on the course content (lectures, class discussion and your own reading); and
* think critically about 'the right thing to do' in public policy.

The questions invite you (see course learning objectives CLO 3 and 4, p. 4 above) to:
- engage with others in moral argument in a context of pluralism where some arguments are better than others, but no argument is likely to be compelling to all citizens; and
- think critically about 'the right thing to do' as citizens and as appointed or elected officials.

EITHER

'The problem with fiscal discipline is not the intention to minimize fiscal risks and protect future interests but the fact that it precludes many desirable public investments which would deliver significant net benefits'. Discuss in relation to the on-going debates internationally over the merits of fiscal austerity following the global financial crisis.

OR

'Much of the climate change debate has used science as a proxy when the real debate, which is valid, is over responsibility between nations and between generations' (Prof. Sir Peter Gluckman). Describe what you think are the respective roles of science and ethics in public policy making.

OR

How, if at all, can the notion of the 'common good' be articulated and applied in a pluralistic society with 'deep diversity'? Discuss in relation to the integration of migrants into New Zealand society and a planned increase in the refugee quota. You may also wish to touch on the refugee situation in Europe.

OR

'Child poverty in New Zealand does not occur because of inadequate social assistance, but because of incompetent or irresponsible parenting. Child poverty is first and foremost a family problem, and a family responsibility.' Discuss views for and against this statement, with implications for public policy making.

Expectations of Assignments in this Course

The expected workload for this course is around 150 hours, with a significant commitment to reading, studying and thinking, as well as completing assignments. We will look for evidence of this in your assignments, as these are the sole basis for assessment in this course.

Three criteria that are relevant to both university and public sector writing are:
- *client focus* – the essay is structured, written and presented in a way that makes it easy to read and understand
- *relevance/content* – the essay gets to the point quickly and clearly and answers the question succinctly and well
- *attention to detail* – accurate description of others' views; correct spelling, grammar and referencing; accurate presentation of numbers, data, tables and figures.

It is always a delight to read assignments that are:
- laid out with generous white space (left and right margins of at least 2.54 cm, double-spaced)
- printed in a font/size that is easy to read (e.g. Arial 11 pt, or Times Roman 12 pt)
- clearly structured, with headings that outline your argument
- written in plain English, in the active voice, with relatively short (rather than long and complex) sentences and paragraphs.

Proof read your assignments carefully before submitting them, and/or ask a colleague or friend to do this for you.

Note to Students

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.

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-servicedesk@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.

Computation of Grades

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

Pass/Fail	Grade	Normal range	Indicative characterisation
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
	C-	50% - 54%	Adequate evidence of learning
Fail	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)	

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 <u>all</u> 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.

If you believe that exceptional circumstances may prevent you from meeting the mandatory course requirements, contact the Course Coordinator for advice as soon as possible.

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

If additional information needs to be communicated, this will occur in class and/or via notices on Blackboard.

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

You will be invited to complete formal evaluation questionnaires at the end of the course, but feedback is very welcome at any time, as this can shape preparation for the next module. Student feedback on University courses may be found at
www.cad.vuw.ac.nz/feedback/feedback_display.php (enter GOVT 539).

Link to General Information

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

Assignment Assessment Sheet

Student Name …………………………………………………………… **Mark** ……………….

Please also see the written comments on your manuscript. Note that there is no formula that connects these ticks with your mark.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	
Content						
Question effectively defined						No attempt to define the question
Answers the question						Does not answer the question
Uses evidence/sources to support arguments						Arguments inadequately supported
Sources properly acknowledged and accurately described						Sources inadequately acknowledged or inaccurately described
Demonstrates understanding of topic						Lack of apparent understanding
Shows independent thought and critical judgement						Lacks critical judgement
Structure						
Clear, relevant introduction						Weak introduction
Essay clearly and logically structured						Poor structure
Points made in well-organised paragraphs						Poor paragraphing
Effective conclusion						Weak conclusion
Language						
Ideas clearly expressed						Ideas unclear
Succinct						Verbose, repetitive and/or obtuse
Correct sentence structure						Poor sentence structure
Correct spelling and punctuation						Poor spelling and punctuation
Other						
Correct referencing	Yes			No		
Reasonable length	Yes			No		
Effective use of figures and tables	Yes			No		

Comments:

****