

**University of Wisconsin-Madison
La Follette School of Public Affairs**

**PA 869: LF Workshop in Public Affairs-Domestic Issues Spring 2014, Wed 1:20-3:15 pm;
Location: 594 Van Hise**

Instructors:

J. Michael Collins jmcollins@wisc.edu 4208 Nancy Nicholas Hall (or 7129 Soc Science Bldg)
Donald Moynihan dmoynihan@lafollette.wisc.edu, 212 La Follette School

General Course Information

The La Follette Workshop in Public Affairs-Domestic Issues is an opportunity for La Follette students, under the supervision of a faculty member, to work within teams for clients in the public, non-profit, or private sectors. Traditionally, clients approach the La Follette School with a particular policy-related issue or problem facing their organization. After some initial negotiations, the Workshop instructor assigns one of the student teams to investigate the issue, formulate a 50-page report, and present their findings in front of the client. The entire project—from inception to finalized report—is completed within a single semester. The main goal of these reports is to generate a useful and easy to understand piece of original research, which answers the specific policy-related question(s) of a “real client.”

The Instructor’s Role

As instructor for the Workshop Course, it is our responsibility to set-up the projects, provide structure for the course, provide targeted feedback, and evaluate the end products. Thus, while we provide general oversight for the projects, the students devise and implement them.

We will provide basic guidance on project management, the use of visual data, and presentations in a classroom settings. On weeks where there is not a meeting in a classroom, we expect that each group will have a standing meeting with their instructor. Please let us know if there are any unexpected and/or important developments during project implementation. We will be as supportive as possible and will work to resolve issues as they arise.

Be prepared to work: the workshop is demanding and fast-paced from the start. On January 28, students will be assigned to one of three teams to work together throughout the semester to produce an analytic policy report. Students are expected to meet in teams and/or with their consulting instructor regularly outside of assigned class times.

Reading

Required reading materials beyond those required for team projects will be posted at LEARN@UW.

There are two required texts

- *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*, by Eugene Bardach, 4th edition (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2012).
- *The Craft of Research*, Third Edition (Chicago Guides to Writing, Editing, and Publishing) by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb and Joseph M. Williams (Chicago Press 2008)

Ethics and Confidentiality

The La Follette School requires that the student teams maintain the highest level of ethics and integrity throughout the Workshop Course experience.

To participate in the Workshop Course, students must sign a “Confidentiality Agreement.” This agreement will be strictly enforced. This agreement states: “The ideas, concepts, data, and

recommendations generated within the Workshop Course are confidential and are to be used for the purposes of the client and for the educational experience provided within the Workshop Course only. Accordingly, they may not be passed on to any third party, either directly or indirectly, without the prior consent of the Workshop Instructor and the client. This includes any verbal discussions of the project, and any dissemination of draft or final documents.” Consequently, all project-related documents must be secured on password-protected computers or password-protected Internet-based websites, such as Google.Docs.

The La Follette School requires that students observe University research ethics, including meeting human subjects requirements for research. If you have not completed the human subjects module and test at the university’s IRB website, please do so.

A La Follette Student Experience

The Workshop Course will provide you with an opportunity to learn more about program and policy analysis by conducting a policy analysis for an actual client. Students will, in effect, put their policy analysis skills into practice and learn more about completing a policy analysis for a client. Although the term “policy analysis” covers a wide range of activities and perspectives, its essence involves the development, design, and assessment of existing or potential public policies. A good policy analyst should be able to function as a generalist, thus the objective of the course is to help prepare you to offer useful advice to policymakers on a wide range of issues regardless of your specific interest.

The course will use the theory and the methodological tools of economic, political, and statistical analysis that you have acquired in previous courses. Prerequisites assumed are PA 818, PA 874, PA 880, and PA 873. Please talk to us if you have not fulfilled all the course prerequisites. The vast majority of the class will be spent working in teams on projects, and we will meet separately with each team on a regular basis to ensure proper progress. In addition to the reports, students will be required to complete a number of other individual assignments and readings.

Tasks:

Student Reports. The primary product of the class is a student-led “report.” A team of students will produce each report. In almost all circumstances, each participating team member will receive the same grade on all group projects. Grading on the group project drafts will be based upon both process and outcome. The process component of the grade includes the meeting of deadlines, attendance at team meetings, attentiveness to draft requirements, responsiveness to our suggestions and to the suggestions of others, as well as the sheer effort put forward by the team to produce an excellent product. The outcome component of the grade focuses on the overall quality of the report, including whether or not the team was able to satisfy client expectations. As a result, the mere completion of a report does not guarantee a strong grade; teams must complete an excellent report to receive an excellent grade.

The final report [and all draft versions] shall be no more than 50-pages [single spaced] in length, excluding the required front materials and works cited pages. Approximately 25-pages shall be allocated to the report itself, while about 25-pages shall be allocated to report appendices. Appendix information should be of as high of quality as the main report, and contain information that substantially supports and enhances the main report. All reports must be formatted as indicated by the La Follette Publication Directors, Karen FASTER. Reports of insufficient quality or content, as assessed by the instructors, will not be distributed to clients. Projects that do not conform to the La Follette School’s high standard of ethics or the class’s confidentiality agreement will not be distributed to the clients. Some group projects may be posted on the La Follette School webpage, while others may not. These reports, and the specific knowledge generated within, within may not be used or disseminated beyond the Workshop Course. The report must follow formatting guidelines of Chicago author-date. For more details see:

<http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/publications/resources.html>

Self and Peer Evaluations

It is the responsibility of each group member to encourage and maintain strong group membership and participation throughout the semester. At the end of the course, each team member will also be asked to submit a confidential evaluation of the individual contributions of each of his or her fellow team members. These evaluations, as interpreted by us, will constitute 20% of your final grade.

When evaluating contributions, consider the following:

- Involvement: attending and participating in meetings,
- Contributions: planning the project, specifying work, ideas, research, analysis, writing,
- Reliability: meeting deadlines, completing work, and
- Collegiality and respect for others.

If we observe team consensus about significant differences in contributions, we will raise or lower the relevant individual's grades. We will also not serve as a positive reference for any student whose peer evaluation indicates poor performance. We may request peer reviews prior to the end of the semester in order to help guide the group and diagnose potential problems.

Grading Allocation

Review of Last Year's Projects	5%
Evaluation of Professional Reports	10%
Peer and Self Evaluation	20%
Final Project Report	65%

Grading Standard

93-100 A	78-82 BC	63-68 D
88-92 AB	73-77 C	59-62 DF
83-87 B	69-72 CD	<59

Other Information:

Working with Clients. Working with "real" clients is often a rewarding experience. In some cases, it can also be a frustrating experience. When frustration occurs, it is usually caused by mistaken or unclear expectations. As part of the Workshop Course, it is your job to understand and appreciate your client's expectations, and to correct any mistaken expectations early in the semester.

We require frequent communications between you and your client. For instance, we have required your team to communicate with your client seven times during the semester: (1) our initial meeting, (2) the early memo, (3) in the first draft, (4) in the second draft, (5) in the "near final" document, (6) final document, and (7) at the final presentation. Your team should have many other conversations with your clients outside of these events, as well. Your client will be providing you feedback during these communications. It is your team's responsibility to integrate this feedback into your reports, when possible, while still retaining the integrity of the policy analysis process. When it is not possible to integrate client feedback, it is necessary to communicate with the client to ensure appropriate expectations. All interactions must be completed in a professional and timely manner. Clear communication and coordination within the team and with the client will be crucial.

Late Assignments. Assignments not provided to when requested, as per the syllabus, will be reduced by 20% automatically. All work should be turned in via LEARN@UW, not via email or hardcopy unless otherwise indicated.

Expectations for Academic Integrity. We expect a full adherence to UW's code of academic integrity. We also expect that you will acknowledge all ideas that are not your own through proper citation. Please put all direct quotes in quotations. This issue is very important. [Please see Karen FASTER for details.]

Plagiarism or any other form of falsification is cheating and will not be tolerated. Students who do not adhere to the highest levels of integrity may receive no credit on assignment, fail the course, or suffer the more extreme consequences.

Consult http://writing.wisc.edu/Handbook/QPA_plagiarism.html, the UW Writing Center website, for subtleties about plagiarism. Ask us if you are uncertain in any instance.

Disabilities. People with disabilities will be fully included in this course. Please inform us if you need any special accommodations in the curriculum, instruction, or assessments of this course to enable you to participate fully. Confidentiality of the shared information will be strictly maintained. Certain accommodations may require the assistance of the UW's McBurney Center mcburney.wisc.edu/

Collaborative Team Work. The teams are encouraged to use Google.Docs to manage their collaborative team work. The team members [and only the team members] and we may have access to the Google.Docs document. The Google.docs document must be password protected and must abide by the class confidentiality agreement. There will be an in-class training session for the program. The teams may be asked for periodic feedback and formal evaluation regarding the use of Google.Docs in their projects.

Graduate School Human Research Protection Program (HRPP)

All students must complete human subjects training:

For an overview see: "Instructions for Completing CITI Human Subjects Research Training"

<https://kb.wisc.edu/gsadminkb/page.php?id=32559>

"UW-Madison Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) Portal"

<https://my.gradsch.wisc.edu/citi/index.php> See Course: "Human Subjects Protection for Education, Social & Behavioral Science Researchers"

Tentative Schedule of Activities

* = date for assignment or team meeting with instructor, not class session

Wednesday January 22 Class Meeting: Introduction, Discuss syllabus, Discussion of Projects

Assignments:

- Review Confidentiality Agreement, Sign and Turn-in to instructor
- Complete Student Preference Form and Turn-in

*** Friday January 24 Assignment to Project. (not a class meeting)**

- We will email and post at LEARN@UW group assignments on Friday (or over the weekend).
- Note: Some students may need to move their formal registration to the other section based on the consulting instructor assigned to the project .

*** Jan 24-Jan 31:**

- First group meeting
- Meeting with consulting instructor (TBD)
- Prior to this meeting, email your instructor a short (less than 1 page) memo with your initial

questions regarding group project. What is unclear? What do you need to know to get started? We will share these with your clients in an effort to structure your first meeting.

*** Jan 24-Feb 7:**

- First client meeting (after first instructor consultation)
- Within the first two weeks of class each group will meet with their client.

Wednesday January 29 Topic: Project Management

- Discuss project management, Google.Docs; works cited, citations, and paper formation; exchange contact info and teams establish email listserves; highlight human subjects reviews; and review past student reports.

Assignments:

- Report Critiques: Read two reports written last year for PA 869 (Domestic): a) Narrowing the Achieving Gap, and b) Strategies for Reducing in Rem Foreclosures in the City of Milwaukee. The reports can be found on the LFS webpage. Prepare ½ page written critique of each report.
- Listening Assignment: Listen to the “Prologue” [or first ~14 minutes...but not Acts 1-3] of This American Life episode. These first 14 minutes of the show deal with new research regarding group dynamics. The full show aired on 12/19/08, and is called “Ruining it for the Rest of Us.” You should be able to stream the audio for free:
http://www.thislife.org/Radio_Episode.aspx?sched=1275

Reading Assignments:

- Bardach - Part 1(Eightfold Path)
- Booth – Chapters 1-6: (Research Approach)
- Dan Bednarz and Donna J. Wood, “Policy Analysis and Teams: People, Tasks, and Trust,” in Research in Teams: A Practical Guide to Group Policy Analysis, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1991), 3-15. (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- JPAM 2002 Articles – Educating the Client (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Frances Cole Jones, *How to Wow*, Ch 3 Maximizing Meetings (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Design Thinking, *Fast Company* 2010 (Posted at LEARN@UW)

*** Wednesday February 5 Meet instructor at prearranged times**

Assignments:

- *Individual assignment:* Complete student version of working with human subjects course online. Go to <https://my.gradsch.wisc.edu/citi>. Login with your UW netid. Identify the human subjects course (in the social and behavioral sciences) – this can be a little tricky. You want to complete the on-line “Students in Research Module” (only), which should take about 30 minutes. There will be quiz at the end of the module. Upload a PDF copy of the completion page as evidence of your completing the course into the DROPBOX at LEARN@UW.
- *Team assignment:* A memo (2 pages or less) to detail the research question(s) and planned data collection strategy. This memo will also contain a “Schedule of Work Activities” with target dates and people assigned to action steps. The purpose of this memo is to update the client on student research activities and facilitate any necessary redirection of and feedback on the project. Bring a hard copy to our meeting for feedback.

After feedback from instructor email a revised copy of this document to your client and cc your instructor. This must be sent by **5 pm CT Friday February 7**. Remind the client of the feedback deadline (COB Friday February 24).

Wednesday February 12

Class Meeting: Karen FASTER and Terry Shelton
Writing and formatting. Meet at 594 Van Hise.

Individual assignment:

- Critiques. Review policy reports provided by the instructors. Complete an analysis of the relative strengths and weaknesses of each report (2 pages or less). Give particular attention to the executive summaries and how well these capture the focus of the report.

Reading Assignments

- Review <http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/publications/resources.html>
- Bardach - Part II (Assembling Evidence)
- Booth Ch 7-14 (Supporting Claims)
- Musso, JPAM 2000 – Writing as Problem Solving (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Shirley Gatenio Gabel and Sheila B. Kamerman " Getting Policy Messages Across" in The Columbia Guide to Social Work Writing, Warren Green, Barbara Levy Simon (Eds) 2012.(Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Recommended: Howard Becker, *Tricks of the Trade*, Ch 5, Logic. (Posted at LEARN@UW)

* **[Friday February 14]** Deadline for client feedback on memo

* **Wednesday February 19** No class meeting. Individual meetings as needed.
Note: Teams should be writing up introduction materials.

Wednesday February 26 **Class Meeting** in class: Presenting Data

Reading Assignments

- “Making Data Talk: A Workbook” U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Booth – Chapter 15 (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Edward Tufte, *Beautiful Evidence* Mistakes in Presentations (Posted at LEARN@UW)

Assignment:

- Critiques of Tables and Figures: Examine the Tables and Figures in the report and set of slides written last year for [PA 869 \(Domestic\)](#) “Full Exclusion of Retirement Income from State Taxation: Evaluating the Impact in Wisconsin”. What did the authors do well in terms of displaying data? What could have been better? Re-create one table and one figure and make improvements.

* **Wednesday March 5** Meet instructor at prearranged times
Note: Teams should be writing and collecting data.

* **Wednesday March 12** Meet instructor at prearranged times
Note: Major components of Near-Full Draft should be completed.

Note: Karen FASTER can be contacted to meet with each group on style issues (citations, references, and formatting) before turning in the third report draft.

* **Wednesday March 17** No class. Spring break

* **Wednesday March 25** **Nearly Full Draft Due.**

Assignment:

- “Nearly Full Draft” due. Provide to instructor and to client.
 - Client has one week to provide feedback.
- The near-full draft of the student report will be a preliminary document, and major components of the final project may not be completed/included [such as, final recommendations].
 - This draft will contain full information regarding the project’s introduction, research question(s), policy background, data analysis strategy, initial data collection, and preliminary recommendations.
- Client feedback will ensure that the student teams are on the correct track and are conceptualizing the research question(s) and information correctly.

*** Wednesday April 2**

Individual meetings as needed.

Note: Professor Moynihan is not available during class time this week; please schedule alternate time

Wednesday April 9

Class meeting: Presenting your findings.

Presentation skills will be practiced and discussed.

Readings

- Chris Anderson, Harvard Business Review, 2013 “How to Give a Killer Presentation” (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Frances Cole Jones, *How to Wow*, Ch 6 Presentations (Posted at LEARN@UW)
- Frances Cole Jones, *How to Wow*, Ch 9 Answering Questions (Posted at LEARN@UW)

Team Assignment:

- Second major draft due, share with client. Client has one week to provide feedback. The second draft will be the most important draft document of the semester. All major substantive components will be included in this second draft, including (draft) final recommendations will be made. The client should read this draft very carefully because this is the client’s main opportunity to provide substantive feedback to the student team on their work. Please look at several past reports to make sure all necessary materials are included.
- Due Friday, April 11 by 5:00 p.m. as Dropbox submission
- Karen Faster and Terry Shelton will copy-edit your third drafts, depending on when they are ready, most likely sometime between April 11 and 22nd
- Presentation. Your group should be prepared to present your recommendations in a polished 5-minute presentation, *without PowerPoint*. Six to ten students will be chosen to present at random, then we will discuss how to improve each presentation.

*** Wednesday April 16**

No meeting. Prep time.

*** Wednesday April 23**

Meet instructor at prearranged times

*** Monday April 28**

Final report due

Note: Actual dates of submission will be staggered determined by lot – dates will be staggered to manage editing process.

This draft will be evaluated for citations and the Works Cited. The following information is required:

1. Title of the report
2. Names of the authors as they will appear on the report's cover
3. Full and complete name of the client as it will appear on the report's cover

4. Another list of the authors with their contact information - phone and e-mail -- that indicates which person is Karen FASTER's primary contact.
5. Date, time and city of presentation. If presentation is not in Madison, indicate the probable time and day of departure.
6. Number of reports to print for client (each student will receive one printed copy).
7. Word-processing file with the report
8. Single-sided hard copy of the report.
9. Reference list that is organized and punctuated consistently and completely. It must include every source that the report cites. Every source in the reference list must be cited in the report.
10. The draft must follow the style guidelines discussed in class and listed at <http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/publications/style.pdf> and <http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/publications/references.pdf>

Wednesday April 30 **Class meeting:** In-class presentations

- In-class presentations precede presentations to client, and will be critiqued by instructors and fellow students. Presentations will also be recorded and made available to students.
- The student teams will generate 15-minute presentations of their report and findings and will take at least 15-minutes of audience questions. Arrange additional time for presentation feedback before formal presentation, if necessary. All teams will use a similar PowerPoint "template" for their presentations (see template from presentation slides attached to last years report).
- These presentations, including the transitions between speakers, should be well practiced and near flawless in their execution. We want to impress.

*** Monday May 5**

Individual assignment:

- peer and self-evaluations due

*** [May 7 to May 14]**

Client Presentations. All students must participate in the client presentations. The exact date will be announced when finalized.