

**Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration**  
**Spring 2023; PPPA 8174 – Seminar: Public Management (CRN: 65323)**  
MON 110; Thursday, 5:10PM-7:00PM

---

**Professor:** Sanjay K. Pandey, PhD  
Shapiro Professor of Public Policy and Public Administration

**Email:** [skpandey@gwu.edu](mailto:skpandey@gwu.edu)

**Office location:** 601R, MPA Building, 805 21<sup>st</sup> Street NW

**Office phone:** 202-994-1084

**Office hours:** Thursday 4PM-5PM and by appointment

**About the Professor:**

Much of Professor Pandey's scholarship has focused on public organizations and management. **Public Management Research Association**, the leading scholarly association for the study of public organizations and management, honored Professor Pandey with the H. George Frederickson Award for Career Contributions to Public Management Research at its 2022 annual meeting.

Professor Pandey has a number of other research interests -- for more on his research interests, please see his TSPPPA profile at <http://tspppa.gwu.edu/sanjay-k-pandey> (**ResearchGate profile** at [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sanjay\\_Pandey15](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sanjay_Pandey15); **Google Scholar profile** at <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=KjmhYp4AAAAJ&hl=en&oi=ao>) Professor Pandey also teaches a PhD seminar on mixed methods research design and convenes the *Mixed Methods Research Interest Group* at the Trachtenberg School. He recently coedited, with other colleagues, a *Public Administration Review* symposium on race and gender (see <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/puar.13501>)

**Course Description (from bulletin):**

**PPPA 8174. Seminar: Public Management. 3 Credits.**

Public organization theory and behavior. Organizational behavior, organization theory, and public management. Key traditions of inquiry in the study of public organizations.

**Course Description & Learning Outcomes:**

The public management doctoral seminar covers public organization theory and behavior. Organizations and management are central not only to administration but to other areas of inquiry in public policy and public administration.

There are numerous disciplinary and multi-/inter-disciplinary approaches to the study of organizations. Three approaches that you will hear a lot about are: Organization Behavior, Organization Theory, and Public Management. Organization behavior has its roots in Industrial

and Organizational Psychology and primarily seeks to understand individual and small team behavior in organizational settings. Organization Theory has its roots in sociology and typically focuses on larger units of analysis than individuals and/or small teams.

The public management tradition on the study of organizations came into its own in the 1980s and 1990s. The public management tradition is eclectic and inclusive, drawing upon organization theory and behavior as well as public policy and public administration to advance knowledge of public organizations and management. Hal Rainey's book, *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations* – through its different editions – has provided one of the most thorough and ambitious accounts of the evolution and growth of knowledge in the public management tradition. I view public management scholarship as grounded in a distinctive worldview. Although public management draws from other perspectives (notably political science and generic organization theory and behavior literatures), it offers major insights that traditional disciplinary perspectives do not (for further elaboration of this point, see Pandey and Wright 2006; and Pandey 2010).

Given the fact that the study of public management and organizations -- as a field of inquiry -- draws upon so many sources, comprehensive coverage is impossible in one course. So, my goal is not to be comprehensive in coverage. This seminar, however, aims to introduce you to key traditions of inquiry and some of the most vibrant and intriguing themes in the study of public organizations.

The **learning outcomes** for the seminar pertain to both substantive matters in public management and the art and craft of conducting scholarly research. Specifically, this course has the following learning outcomes:

- 1. Develop a sense of critical importance for some of the best scholarship in the study of public organizations and management**
- 2. Obtain a rich “insider” perspective on scholarly research enterprise**
- 3. Develop and hone the abilities and skills needed to be a successful scholar**

### **Readings:**

A variety of readings, mostly articles from peer-reviewed journals, will be used in this course. Course readings are available from GWU libraries. You may need to obtain some of these readings from the library. The syllabus provides a list of required and recommended readings. Additionally, you are encouraged to obtain a copy of and read the following book carefully.

Rainey, H. G., Malatesta, D., & Fernandez, S. (2021). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

**(Note: This book is available, for free, as an ebook from the GWU library.)**

### **Course Requirements and Grading:**

#### **GRADING:**

Grades will be based on completing following requirements (specific details on each requirement provided below):

- Readings and Participation – 30%
- Peer Review Exercise – 10%
- Charting the Intellectual Landscape Project – 20%
- Final Paper – 40%

### **Grades and Expectations:**

A (Excellent): Exceptional work for a graduate student. Shows a strong command of the material.

A-(Very Good): Very strong work for a graduate student. Shows signs of a strong understanding of appropriate analytical approaches and meets professional standards.

B+ (Good): Sound work for a graduate student. This grade indicates the student has fully accomplished the basic course objectives.

B (Adequate): Competent work for a graduate student with some evident weaknesses. Demonstrates competency in the key course objectives but the understanding or application of some important issues is less than complete.

B- (Inadequate): Weak work for a graduate student. Understanding of key issues is incomplete. A cumulative GPA of B- will lead to academic probation.

Grades of below B- indicate extremely weak performance and insufficient grasp of the material.

### **Specific detail on course requirements:**

#### *1) Readings and Participation (30% of the grade)*

Your success as a scholar is determined partly by the breadth and depth of your reading. You will report on either a specific reading or a set of readings during class sessions. These assignments will be made the week before the session. If you are assigned a single reading, I encourage you to go beyond the assigned reading and also briefly share some of the latest research on the theme of the reading. Every time you discuss reading(s) in class, you are expected to prepare a report on the reading(s) – this report should cite sources in APA format, summarize key arguments, and discuss future directions. Your report should consider using tables or other diagrammatic representations. As you read, learn from, and report on papers, I want you pay particular attention to two points:

- **Pay careful attention to theoretical and conceptual elements of the papers you read.**
- **If you use language from the assigned reading in your report, I expect you to put this language within quotation marks and note the page**

**number(s).**

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

- a) Discussion leader (reporting on readings)
- b) Discussion participant and other assigned analyses and presentations
- c) Making a thoughtful brief post every week to Blackboard weekly discussion forum (we will refer to this as “color commentary”)
- d) Presentations on “art and craft” aspects of scholarship (A&C)

**Please review the document titled, “PhD Seminar Reading and Presentation/Participation Guidelines” for further details and guidelines.**

*2) Peer Review Exercise (10% of the grade)*

It is important for a scholar to be familiar with the peer review process. Guidelines about good reviewing practices will be provided and you will write a peer review report on an assigned manuscript. We will also discuss how one can successfully engage the peer review process as an author.

*3) Charting the Intellectual Landscape Project (20% of the grade)*

The goal of this project is to better understand and appreciate how scholarly journals add to our stock of knowledge. In consultation with the instructor, self-managing teams will come up with and execute a work-plan for this project. We will form teams in the first meeting. **For more details, see document titled “Charting the Intellectual Landscape Guidelines”.**

*4) Final Paper (40% of the grade)*

There is no maximum length requirement for the final paper. Ideally, however, your paper will be between 15 to 20 double-spaced pages, excluding the bibliography. Your final paper will be based on a review of the relevant scholarly literature. To write the paper, you will read and draw upon a range of scholarly articles (approximately 20 articles\*). I encourage you to schedule a consultation with me, once you have made some progress.

**For more details, see document titled, “Final Paper Expectations and Consultation Guidelines”.** \*see comment on this number in the guidelines.

**Research Paper FAQ:**

*1. How do I get inspired to write?*

It is hard to pin this down and come up with a universal prescription. I try different strategies such as reading books/columns on the art of writing/reading.

*2. What is the secret of writing a great research paper?*

Reading, planning, reflection, writing, being responsive to “specific and non-specific feedback”, rewriting, rewriting and rewriting! Get started now!

## Course Calendar\*

*\*Subject to change*

### Week 1 (Jan 19) Introduction & Overview

- \_ Check Reviewing Resources at: 1) <https://aom.org/research/publishing-with-aom/reviewer-resources> ; 2) <https://plos.org/resource/how-to-write-a-peer-review/>
- \_ Practice Review Assigned

### Week 2 (Jan 26) On Theory (#1)

#### **\*Review Due**

- \_ Charting the Intellectual Landscape Workshop #1

### Week 3 (Feb 2) Perspectives on Public and Nonprofit Management (#2)

- \_ A&C

### Week 4 (Feb 9) Publicness Theory (#3)

- \_ A&

### Week 5 (Feb 16) Nonprofit Organizations (#4)

- \_ A&C

### Week 6 (Feb 23) “Hybridity” / Social Enterprise / Multi-Sector Approaches (#5)

- Charting the Intellectual Landscape Workshop #2 (if needed)
- \_ A&C
- Begin thinking about the final paper

### Week 7 (Mar 2) Organizational Goals, Mission, Public Values, and Performance (#6)

- \_ A&C

### Week 8 (Mar 9) Organizational Structure - Red Tape and Administrative Burden (#7)

- Schedule a consultation on the final paper – see consultation guidelines (optional)

\*\*\*\*\*March 13-18; Spring Break \*\*\*\*\*

### Week 9 (Mar 23) Public Service Motivation (and Motivation) (#8)

- \_ A&C

**Week 10 (March 30) \*\*\*Charting the Intellectual Landscape Presentations\*\*\***

**\*PowerPoint and Reflective/Integrative Summary Due**

- \_A&C

**Week 11 (Apr 6) Leadership (#9)**

- \_A&C

**Week 12 (Apr 13) Social Equity, Representative Bureaucracy, and Street-level Bureaucracy (#10)**

**Week 13 (Apr 20) Race and Gender (#11)**

**Week 14 (Apr 27) Final Paper Presentations**

**Week 15 (May 4)—Final Paper**

**\*Final Paper Due on Monday, May 8<sup>th</sup>**

## Readings for the Public Management Seminar\*\*

(\*\*subject to change – selected readings will be discussed in class)

### Strongly Recommended:

Rainey, H. G., Malatesta, D., & Fernandez, S. (2021). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

(Note: This book is available as an ebook from the GWU library.)

### Strongly Recommended:

Rainey, H. G., Malatesta, D., & Fernandez, S. (2021). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

(Note: This book is available as an ebook from the GWU library.)

### #1 On Theory:

\*Acker, J. (2011). Theorizing gender, race, and class in organizations. In Emma Jeanes, David Knights, Patricia Yancey Martin (editors) *Handbook of gender, work and organization*, Wiley (p. 65-80)

Alvesson, Mats, and Jörgen Sandberg. 2011. Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review* 36(2): 247-271.

Bartunek, J.M. and S.L. Rynes. 2014. Academics and Practitioners Are Alike and Unlike: The Paradoxes of Academic-Practitioner Relationships, *Journal of Management*, 40(5): 1181 – 1201.

\*Bozeman, Barry. 1993. Theory, “Wisdom,” and the Character of knowledge in Public Management: A Critical View of the Theory-Practice Linkage. In Barry Bozeman (ed.) *Public Management: the State of the Art*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass (pp. 27-39).

\*Cornelissen, Joep. 2017. Editor’s comments: Developing propositions, a process model, or a typology? Addressing the challenges of writing theory without a boilerplate. *Academy of Management Review* 42(1): 1-9.

Cornelissen, Joep. 2018. Imagining Futures for Organization Studies: The Role of Theory and of Having Productive Conversations towards Theory Change. *Organization Studies*. 40(1): 55-58.

Cornelissen, Joep, Markus A. Höllerer, and David Seidl. 2021. What Theory Is and Can Be: Forms of Theorizing in Organizational Scholarship. *Organization Theory* 2(3): 1-19.

Davis, Gerald F., and Christopher Marquis. 2005. Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. *Organization Science* 16(4): 332-343.

Dowding, Keith. 2016. What is a Theory. In *The Philosophy and Methods of Political Science*. Palgrave, Chapter 4 (pp. 68-101)

Merton, Robert K. 1968. On Sociological Theories of the Middle Range. In Robert K. Merton. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press (pp. 39-72).

Morrow, Paula C. 1983. Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review* 8(3): 486-500.

\*Perry, James L. 1991. Strategies for building public administration theory. *Research in Public Administration*, 1: 1-18.

Podsakoff, Philip M., MacKenzie, Scott B., & Podsakoff, Nathan P. 2016. Recommendations for Creating Better Concept Definitions in the Organizational, Behavioral, and Social Sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(2):159-203

Post, Corinne, Riikka Sarala, Caroline Gatrell, and John E. Prescott. 2020. Advancing theory with review articles. *Journal of Management Studies* 57(2): 351-376.

Reed, Mike, and Gibson Burrell. 2018. Theory and organization studies: The need for contestation. *Organization Studies* 40(1): 39-54.

\*Roberts, Alasdair. 2020. Bridging levels of public administration: How macro shapes meso and micro." *Administration & Society* 52(4): 631-656.

Sandberg, Jörgen, and Mats Alvesson. 2021. Meanings of theory: Clarifying theory through typification. *Journal of Management Studies* 58(2): 487-516.

Schmidt, Mary R. 1993. Grout: Alternative Kinds of Knowledge and Why They Are Ignored. *Public Administration Review* 53(6): 525-530.

\*Suddaby, Roy 2010. Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 35 (3) 346-358.

Sutton, Robert I., and Barry M. Staw. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40(3): 371-384.

Whetten, David A., Teppo Felin, and Brayden G. King. 2009. The practice of theory borrowing in organizational studies: Current issues and future directions. *Journal of Management* 35(3): 537-563.

## **#2 Perspectives on Public and Nonprofit Management:**

Acker, Joan, and Donald R. Van Houten. 1974. Differential recruitment and control: The sex structuring of organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 19(2): 152-163. \*Notable comment on history of organizational research.

\*Bozeman, Barry and H. George Frederickson. 2006. On the Origins of Public Management Research Association. *Management Matters*. 4(1):1-7



\*Bushouse, Brenda K. 2017. Leveraging Nonprofit and Voluntary Action Research to Inform Public Policy. *Policy Studies Journal*. 45(1): 50-73.

\*Kelman, Steven, Fred Thompson, L.R. Jones, and Kuno Schelder. 2003. Dialogue on Definition and Evolution of the field of Public Management. *International Public Management Review*, 4(2): 1-19.

Lan, Zhiyong and Kathleen K. Anders. 2000. A Paradigmatic View of Contemporary Public Administration Research: An Empirical Test. *Administration & Society*. 32(2): 138-165.

Nkomo, Stella M. 1992. The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting “race in organizations”. *Academy of Management Review* 17(3): 487-513. \*Notable comment on history of organizational research.

\*Pandey, Sanjay K., Yuan Cheng, and Jeremy L. Hall. 2022. Epistemic decolonization of public policy pedagogy and scholarship. *Public Administration Review* 82(6): 977-985.

Pandey, Sanjay K. 2010. Cutback management and the paradox of publicness." *Public Administration Review* 70(4): 564-571.

\*Pandey, Sanjay K., and Bradley E. Wright. 2006. Connecting the dots in public management: Political environment, organizational goal ambiguity, and the public manager's role ambiguity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(4): 511-532.

\*Pandey, Sanjay K. and Jasmine McGinnis Johnson. 2019. Nonprofit Management, Public Administration, and Public Policy: Separate, Subset, or Intersectional Domains of Inquiry? *Public Performance and Management Review*.

Perry, James L., and Hal G. Rainey. 1988. The public-private distinction in organizational theory: A critique and research strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(2): 182-201.

\*Rainey, Hal G., Sergio Fernandez, and Deanna Malatesta 2021. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc. (Chapter 1, 2)

\*Roberts, Alasdair. 2020. Bearing the White Man's Burden: American Empire and the Origin of Public Administration. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* 3(3): 185– 96.

### **#3 Publicness Theory**

\*Antonsen, Marianne, and Torben Beck Jørgensen. 1997. The ‘publicness’ of public organizations. *Public Administration* 75(2): 337-357.

\*Bozeman, Barry. 2013. What organization theorists and public policy researchers can learn from one another: publicness theory as a case-in-point. *Organization Studies* 34.2: 169-188.

Bozeman, Barry, and Stuart I. Bretschneider. 1994. The 'Publicness Puzzle' in Organization Theory: A Test of Alternative Explanations of Differences between Public and Private Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 4(2): 197-224.

Moulton, Stephanie. 2009. Putting together the publicness puzzle: A framework for realized publicness. *Public Administration Review* 69(5): 889-900.

\*Pesch, Udo. 2008. The Publicness of Public Administration. *Administration & Society*, 40(2): 170-193.

\*Rainey, Hal G., Sergio Fernandez, and Deanna Malatesta 2021. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc. (Chapter 3)

#### **#4 Nonprofit Organizations:**

\*DiMaggio, Paul J., and Helmut K. Anheier. 1990. The sociology of nonprofit organizations and sectors. *Annual Review of Sociology* 137-159.

Eikenberry, Angela M., and Jodie Drapal Kluver. 2004. The marketization of the nonprofit sector: civil society at risk?" *Public Administration Review* 64(2): 132-140.

\*Hansmann, Henry 1980. The role of nonprofit enterprise. *The Yale Law Journal* 89(5): 835-901.

Hansmann, Henry. 1987. Economic theories of nonprofit organization. *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. 27-42.

\*Eikenberry, Angela M. 2009. Refusing the market: A democratic discourse for voluntary and nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38(4): 582-596.

Lohmann, R. A. 2016. The Ostroms' Commons Revisited. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(4\_suppl), 27-42S

Mitchell, George E., and Hans Peter Schmitz. 2019. The Nexus of Public and Nonprofit Management. *Public Performance & Management Review* 42(1): 11-33.

\*Moulton, S., & Eckerd, A. 2012. Preserving the Publicness of the Nonprofit Sector: Resources, Roles, and Public Values. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(4), 656-685

Young, Dennis R. 2006. Complementary, supplementary, or adversarial? Nonprofit-government relations. In *Nonprofits and government: Collaboration and Conflict*, Edited by Elizabeth T. Boris and C. Eugene Steuerle pp. 37-80.

#### **#5 "Hybridity" / Social Enterprise / Multi-Sector Approaches:**

\*Kerlin, Janelle A. 2006. Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and learning from the differences. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit*

*Organizations* 17(3): 247-263.

Kraatz, Matthew S., and Emily S. Block, 2008. Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, Edited by Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Roy Suddaby, and Kerstin Sahlin, pp. 243-275. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Barnett, Michael L., Irene Henriques, and Bryan W. Husted. 2020. Beyond good intentions: Designing CSR initiatives for greater social impact. *Journal of Management* 46(6): 937-964.

\*Battilana, Julie, and Matthew Lee. 2014. Advancing research on hybrid organizing—Insights from the study of social enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals* 8(1): 397-441.

Denis, Jean-Louis, Ewan Ferlie, and Nicolette Van Gestel. 2015. Understanding hybridity in public organizations. *Public Administration* 93(2): 273-289.

Dart, Raymond. 2004. The legitimacy of social enterprise. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 14(4): 411-424.

Ebrahim, Alnoor, Julie Battilana, and Johanna Mair. 2014. The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 34: 81-100.

\*Faulk, Lewis, Sheela Pandey, Sanjay K. Pandey, and Kristen Scott Kennedy. 2020. Donors' responses to profit incentives in the social sector: The entrepreneurial orientation reward and the profit penalty. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 39(1): 218-242.

Pandey, Sheela, Joseph Cordes, Sanjay K. Pandey, and William Winfrey. 2018. Use of social impact bonds to address social problems: Understanding contractual risks and transaction costs. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 28(4): 511-528.

Pandey, Sheela, Saurabh Lall, Sanjay K. Pandey, and Sucheta Ahlawat. 2017. The appeal of social accelerators: What do social entrepreneurs value? *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 8(1): 88-109.

\*Skelcher, Chris, and Steven Rathgeb Smith. 2015. Theorizing hybridity: Institutional logics, complex organizations, and actor identities: The case of nonprofits. *Public Administration* 93(2): 433-448.

Saebi, Tina, Foss, Nicolai J., and Linder, Stefan 2019. Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past Achievements and Future Promises. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 70–95.

Smith, Wendy K., Michael Gonin, and Marya L. Besharov. 2013. Managing social-business tensions: A review and research agenda for social enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 23(3): 407-442.

## #6 Organizational Goals, Mission, Public Values, and Performance

\*Andersen, Lotte Bøgh, Andreas Boesen, and Lene Holm Pedersen. 2016. Performance in public organizations: Clarifying the conceptual space." *Public Administration Review* 76(6): 852-862.

Beck Jørgensen, Torben and Barry Bozeman. 2007. Public values: An inventory. *Administration & Society* 39(3): 354-381.

\*Bozeman, Barry, and Japera Johnson. 2015. The political economy of public values: A case for the public sphere and progressive opportunity. *The American review of public administration* 45(1): 61-85.

\*Hirsch, Paul M. and Levin, Daniel Z., 1999. Umbrella advocates versus validity police: A life-cycle model. *Organization Science*, 10(2), pp.199-212

Hood, Christopher. 1995. The "new public management" in the 1980s: Variations on a theme. *Accounting, organizations and society* 20(2-3): 93-109.

\*Hood, Christopher. 1991. A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration* 69(1): 3-19.

Moynihan, Donald P., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2010. The big question for performance management: Why do managers use performance information? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(4): 849-866.

Moynihan, Donald P., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2005. Testing how management matters in an era of government by performance management. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(3): 421-439.

\*Nabatchi, Tina. 2012. Putting the "public" back in public values research: Designing participation to identify and respond to values. *Public Administration Review* 72(5): 699-708.

Ouchi, William G. 1979. A Conceptual Framework for the Design of Organizational Control Mechanisms. *Management Science*, 25(9): 833-848.

Pandey, Sanjay K., and Hal G. Rainey. 2006. Public Managers' Perceptions of Organizational Goal Ambiguity: Analyzing Alternative Models. *International Public Management Journal*, 9(2): 85-112.

Piotrowski, Suzanne J., and David H. Rosenbloom. 2002. Nonmission-based values in results-oriented public management: The case of freedom of information. *Public Administration Review* 62(6): 643-657.

\*Rainey, Hal G., Sergio Fernandez, and Deanna Malatesta 2021. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc. (Chapter 6)

Rainey, Hal G. and Chan Su Jung. 2014. A Conceptual Framework for Analysis of Goal

Ambiguity in Public Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(1): 71-99.

Rainey, Hal G., and Paula Steinbauer. 1999. Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of public administration research and theory* 9(1): 1-32.

Simon, Herbert A. 1964. On the Concept of Organizational Goal. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9(1): 1-22.

Van der Wal, Zeger, Tina Nabatchi, and Gjalte De Graaf. 2015. From galaxies to universe: A cross-disciplinary review and analysis of public values publications from 1969 to 2012. *American Review of Public Administration* 45(1):13-28.

Wright, Bradley E., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2011. Public organizations and mission valence: When does mission matter? *Administration & Society* 43(1): 22-44.

### **#7 Organizational Structure -- Bureaucratic Red Tape and Administrative Burden**

Borry, Erin L. 2016. A New Measure of Red Tape: Introducing the Three-Item Red Tape (TIRT) Scale. *International Public Management Journal* 19(4): 573-593.

Baekgaard, Martin, and Tara Tankink. 2021. Administrative Burden: Untangling a Bowl of Conceptual Spaghetti. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvab027>

\*Bhargava, Saurabh, and Dayanand Manoli. 2015. Psychological Frictions and the Incomplete Take-Up of Social Benefits: Evidence from an IRS Field Experiment. *American Economic Review*, 105 (11): 3489-3529.

\*Campbell, Jesse W., Pandey, Sanjay K., and Arnesen, Lars. 2022. The Ontology, Origin, and Impact of Divisive Public Sector Rules: A meta-Narrative Review of the Red Tape and Administrative Burden Literatures. *Public Administration Review* 1– 20.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13527>

\*Bozeman, Barry. 1993. A Theory of Government 'Red Tape'. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(3): 273-303.

Brodkin, Evelyn Z., and Malay Majmundar. 2010. Administrative exclusion: Organizations and the hidden costs of welfare claiming. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(4): 827-848.

\*Carrigan, Christopher, Sanjay K. Pandey, and Gregg G. Van Ryzin. 2020. Pursuing Consilience: Using Behavioral Public Administration to Connect Research on Bureaucratic Red Tape, Administrative Burden, and Regulation." *Public Administration Review* 80(1): 46-52.

Coursey, David H., and Sanjay K. Pandey. Content domain, measurement, and validity of the red tape concept: A second-order confirmatory factor analysis. *The American Review of Public Administration* 37(3): 342-361.

DeHart-Davis, Leisha. 2009. Green Tape: A Theory of Effective Rules. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 19(2): 361-384.

Döring, Matthias. 2021. How-to Bureaucracy: A Concept of Citizens' Administrative Literacy. *Administration & Society* 53(8): 1155-1177.

\*George, Bert, Sanjay K. Pandey, Bram Steijn, Adeliën Decramer, and Mieke Audenaert. 2021. Red tape, organizational performance and employee outcomes: meta-analysis, meta-regression and research agenda. *Public Administration Review*. 81(4): 638-651.

\*Hattke, Fabian, David Hensel, and Janne Kalucza. 2020. Emotional Responses to Bureaucratic Red Tape. *Public Administration Review* 80(1): 53–63.

\*Herd, Pamela, and Donald P. Moynihan. 2018. *Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. (chapter 1)

Kaufmann, Wesley, Erin L. Borry, and Leisha DeHart-Davis. 2018. More than Pathological Formalization: Understanding Organizational Structure and Red Tape." *Public Administration Review*. 96(2): 368-385.

\*Krogh Madsen, Jonas, Sass Mikkelsen, Kim and Moynihan, Donald (2021), Burdens, Sludge, Ordeals, Red Tape, Oh My! A User's Guide to the Study of Frictions. *Public Administration*. Accepted Author Manuscript. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12717>

Moynihan, Donald, Julie Gerzina, and Pamela Herd. 2021. Kafka's Bureaucracy: Immigration Administrative Burdens in the Trump Era. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvab025>

\*Moynihan, Donald, Pamela Herd, and Hope Harvey. 2014. Administrative Burden: Learning, Psychological, and Compliance Costs in Citizen-State Interactions." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 25(1): 43-69.

\*Nielsen, Morten Meyerhoff, Nuno Ramos Carvalho, Linda Gonçalves Veiga, and Luís Soares Barbosa. 2017. Administrative Burden Reduction over Time: Literature Review, Trends and Gap Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance*, 140– 48. New York: ACM.

Pandey, Sanjay K., and Patrick G. Scott. 2002. Red Tape: A Review and Assessment of Concepts and Measures. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(4): 553-580.

Pandey, Sanjay K., Sheela Pandey, and Gregg G. Van Ryzin. 2017. Prospects for experimental approaches to research on bureaucratic red tape. In *Experiments in public management research: Challenges and contributions*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 219-243.

\*Pandey, Sanjay K. 2021 The Psychological Process View of Bureaucratic Red Tape In *Research Handbook on Human Resource management in the Public Sector*, Edited by Bram Steijn and Eva Knies., pp. 260-275. Edward Elgar Publishing

Rainey, Hal G., Sanjay Pandey, and Barry Bozeman. 1995. Research note: Public and private managers' perceptions of red tape. *Public Administration Review* 55(6): 567-574.

\*Rainey, Hal G., Sergio Fernandez, and Deanna Malatesta 2021. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc. (Chapter 8)

### **#8 Public Service Motivation (and Motivation)**

\*Bakker, Arnold B. 2015. A job demands–resources approach to public service motivation. *Public Administration Review* 75(5): 723-732.

Bozeman, Barry, and Xuhong Su. 2015. Public Service Motivation Concepts and Theory: A Critique. *Public Administration Review*. 75(5): 700-710.

\*Hatmaker, Deneen M., Amy E. Smith, Sanjay K. Pandey, and Sushmita Subedi. 2017. Coauthorship networks in public service motivation scholarship: Implications for the evolution of a field. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 37(3): 295-322.

Moynihan, Donald P., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2007a. The role of organizations in fostering public service motivation. *Public Administration Review* 67(1): 40-53.

Moynihan, Donald P., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2007b Finding workable levers over work motivation: Comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration & Society* 39 (7): 803-832.

\*Pandey, Sanjay K. and Pandey, Sheela and Breslin, Rachel A and Broadus, Erica D. 2017. Public Service Motivation Research Program: Key Challenges and Future Prospects. Chapter 19 in: *Foundations of Public Administration*, Edited by Jos Raadschelders and Richard Stillman, Irvine, CA: Melvin and Leigh, pp. 314-332. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2895762>

Pandey, Sanjay K., and Edmund C. Stazyk. 2008 Antecedents and correlates of public service motivation. In *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* edited by James Perry and Annie Hondeghem, Oxford University Press. (pp. 101-117).

\*Perry, James L., and Lois Recascino Wise. 1990. The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367-373.

\*Perry, James L., Annie Hondeghem, and Lois Recascino Wise. 2010. Revisiting the

motivational bases of public service: Twenty years of research and an agenda for the future." *Public Administration Review* 70(5): 681-690.

Ritz, Adrian, Brewer, Gene A. and Neumann, Oliver. 2016, Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook. *Public Administration Review* 76(3): 414-426

Wright, Bradley E., and Adam M. Grant. 2010. Unanswered questions about public service motivation: Designing research to address key issues of emergence and effects. *Public Administration Review* 70(5): 691-700.

(and **Motivation** readings below)...

Ambrose, Maureen L. and Kulik, Carol T. 1999. Old Friends, New Faces: Motivation Research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(3): 231-292.

\*Grant, Adam M., and Sharon K. Parker. 2009. Redesigning work design theories: the rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals* 3(1): 317-375.

Hackman, Richard J., and Greg Oldham. 1976. Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory." *Organizational behavior and human performance* 16(2): 250-279.

Locke, Edwin A., and Gary P. Latham. 2004. What should we do about motivation theory? Six recommendations for the twenty-first century. *Academy of Management Review* 29(3): 388-403.

\*Rainey, Hal G., Sergio Fernandez, and Deanna Malatesta 2021. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc. (Chapter 9, 10)

Steel, Piers, and Cornelius J. König. 2006. Integrating theories of motivation. *Academy of Management Review* 31(4): 889-913.

Wright, Bradley E. 2001. Public Sector Work Motivation: Review of Current Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model. *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory*, 11(4): 559-586.

## **#9 Leadership**

Boin, Arjen, and Paul T. Hart. 2003. Public leadership in times of crisis: mission impossible? *Public Administration Review* 63(5): 544-553.

\*Breslin, Rachel A., Sheela Pandey, and Norma M. Riccucci. 2017. Intersectionality in public leadership research: A review and future research agenda. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 37(2): 160-182.

Currie, Graeme, Mike Humphreys, Deniz Ucbasaran, and Steve McManus. 2008. Entrepreneurial leadership in the English public sector: paradox or possibility?" *Public Administration* 86 (4): 987-1008.



Eagly, Alice H. and Steven J. Karau. 2002. Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders. *Psychological Review* 109(3): 573-598.

Kellerman, Barbara, and Scott W. Webster. 2001. The recent literature on public leadership: Reviewed and considered. *The Leadership Quarterly* 12(4): 485-514.

\* Rainey, Hal G., Sergio Fernandez, and Deanna Malatesta 2021. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc. (Chapter 11)

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2001. Gender, Status, and Leadership. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 637-655.

Ospina, Sonia M. 2017. Collective leadership and context in public administration: Bridging public leadership research and leadership studies. *Public Administration Review* 77(2): 275-287.

\*Ospina, Sonia, and Erica Foldy. 2009. A critical review of race and ethnicity in the leadership literature: Surfacing context, power and the collective dimensions of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 20(6): 876-896.

\*Tummers, Lars, and Eva Knies. 2016. Measuring public leadership: Developing scales for four key public leadership roles." *Public Administration* 94(2): 433-451.

Van Wart, Montgomery. 2003. Public-Sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public administration review* 63(2): 214-228.

Vogel, Rick, and Doris Masal. Public leadership: A review of the literature and framework for future research." *Public Management Review* 17.8 (2015): 1165-1189.

Wong, Leonard, Paul Bliese, and Dennis McGurk. 2003. Military leadership: A context specific review. *The Leadership Quarterly* 14(6): 657-692.

\*Wright, Bradley E., Donald P. Moynihan, and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2012. Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review* 72(2): 206-215.

## **#10 Social Equity, Representative Bureaucracy, and Street-level Bureaucracy**

\*Guul, Thorbjørn Sejr, Mogens Jin Pedersen, and Niels Bjørn Grund Petersen. 2021. Creaming among Caseworkers: Effects of Client Competence and Client Motivation on Caseworkers' Willingness to Help. *Public Administration Review* 81(1): 12-22.

\*Gooden, Susan T. 2015. PAR's social equity footprint. *Public Administration Review* 75, (3): 372-381.

Guy, Mary E., and Sean A. McCandless. 2012. Social equity: Its legacy, its promise. *Public Administration Review* 72(S1): S5-S13.

Lipsky, Michael. 1971. Street-level bureaucracy and the analysis of urban reform. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 6(4): 391-409.

Hupe, Peter, and Michael Hill. 2007. Street-Level bureaucracy and public accountability. *Public Administration* 85(2): 279-299.

Meier, Kenneth J. 2019. Theoretical frontiers in representative bureaucracy: New directions for research. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* 2(1): 39-56.

Pandey, Sanjay K., Kathryn Newcomer, Leisha DeHart-Davis, Jasmine McGinnis Johnson, and Norma M. Riccucci. 2022. "Reckoning With Race and Gender in Public Administration and Public Policy: A Substantive Social Equity Turn." *Public Administration Review* 82(3): 386-395.

\*Pfaff, Steven, Charles Crabtree, Holger L. Kern, and John B. Holbein. 2021. Do Street-Level Bureaucrats Discriminate Based on Religion? A Large-Scale Correspondence Experiment among American Public School Principals. *Public Administration Review* 81(2): 244-259.

Riccucci, Norma M., and Gregg G. Van Ryzin. 2017. Representative bureaucracy: A lever to enhance social equity, coproduction, and democracy. *Public Administration Review* 77(1): 21-30.

Tummers, Lars, Victor Bekkers, Evelien Vink, and Michael Musheno. 2015. Coping during public service delivery: A conceptualization and systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(4): 1099-1126

\*Van Ryzin, Gregg G. 2021. The perceived fairness of active representation: Evidence from a survey experiment." *Public Administration Review* 81(6): 1044-1054.

## **#11 Race and Gender**

\*Acker, Joan. Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society* 20 (4): 441-464.

\*Applebaum, Barbara. 2016. Critical whiteness studies. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*.

\*Bell, Derrick A. 1995. Who's afraid of critical race theory? *University of Illinois Law Review* 4: 893-910

Beteille, Andre. 1990. Race, caste and gender. *Man*\* 25(3): 489-504.

\*One of the oldest anthropology journals; renamed "*Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*" in 1995.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American*

*Sociological Review* 62(3): 465-480.

\*Budgeon, Shelley. 2014. The dynamics of gender hegemony: Femininities, masculinities and social change." *Sociology* 48(2): 317-334.

\*Calás, Marta B., Linda Smircich, and Evangelina Holvino. 2014. Theorizing gender-and-organization. In Savita Kumra, Ruth Simpson, and Ronald J. Burke (editors) *The Oxford handbook of gender in organizations*. Oxford University Press (pp. 17-52).

Connell, Raewyn. 2012. Gender, health and theory: conceptualizing the issue, in local and world perspective. *Social science & medicine* 74(11): 1675-1683.

Connell, Robert W., and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & society* 19(6): 829-859.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*. 139-167

\*DeHart-Davis, Leisha, Deneen Hatmaker, Kimberly L. Nelson, Sanjay K. Pandey, Sheela Pandey, and Amy E. Smith. 2020. *Gender Imbalance in Public Sector Leadership*. Cambridge University Press (Elements in Public and Nonprofit Administration).

Gooden, Susan T., and Samuel L. Myers. 2018. The Kerner Commission report fifty years later: Revisiting the American dream. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 4(6): 1-17.

\*Hurtado, Aida. 1989. Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of white women and women of color. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14(4): 833-855

Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & Society* 27(1): 105-138.

McIntosh, Peggy. 2012. Reflections and future directions for privilege studies. *Journal of Social Issues* 68(1): 194-206.

\*McIntosh, Peggy. 1988. White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies.

\*Pandey, Sanjay K., Amy E. Smith, Sheela Pandey, and Olanike A. Ojelabi. 2023. "Reimagining race and gender in public administration and public policy: Insights from an interdisciplinary systematic review." *Public Administration Review*. 83(1): 14-34.

\*Pratto, Felicia, and Andrew L. Stewart. 2012. Group dominance and the half-blindness of privilege. *Journal of Social Issues* 68(1): 28-45.

Ray, Victor. 2019. A theory of racialized organizations. *American Sociological Review* 84(1): 26-53.

Schippers, Mimi. 2007. Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and Society* 36(1): 85-102.

---

---

## **Course Policies: Grades**

Late Work Policy: Assignments turned in late will be assessed a penalty: a half-letter grade for anything from 1 – 12 hours late, a full-letter grade for 12-24 hours. Students will not receive credit for any assignments turned in after 24 hours.

Professor Pandey's Policy on grading concerns: The professor will not consider any verbal or oral statement of concerns about grading. The student must write a detailed memo to the professor explaining how his/her work met the requirements outlined in the respective evaluation rubric for the professor to consider the grade.

**Expectations of Written Work**: For all written material you submit or share in this course, be sure to use quotation marks to denote exact quotations and provide the page number(s). Failure to attribute sources correctly may constitute plagiarism and result in a grade of F for the course.

## **Course Policies: Technology and Media**

Blackboard: Blackboard may be used as an aid to the course for providing course readings and for sharing course materials and carrying out course-related exchanges.

Computer and cellphone usage: If you use a computer during class to take notes, please only take notes. The class is a cellphone-free zone. In the case of an emergency, please step out of the classroom discreetly and without distracting others. Any use of technology to distract one's self or others in the class may lead to suspension of the privilege to use technology during class.

## **Course Policies: Student Expectations**

### Course Policy on Classroom Recording and Accommodation for Legitimate Absence:

This is an in-person course in which students are expected to attend class sessions in person on a consistent basis. Synchronous remote participation will not be available for class sessions for this course with one exception. This exception pertains to the faculty member testing positive for COVID-19 and being required to isolate; the course may meet virtually during this isolation period if the faculty member is feeling well enough to teach.

Class sessions will be recorded and upon specific request made available to students who miss a class session for a legitimate reason.

Respect for Diversity: It is my intent that students from all backgrounds and perspectives be well-served by this course, that students' learning needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity that students bring to this class be viewed as a resource, strength, and benefit. I strive to create an inclusive classroom and present materials and activities that are respectful of diversity including gender, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, culture, and political affiliation. Your suggestions are encouraged and appreciated.

Civility Policy: Higher education works best when it becomes a vigorous and lively marketplace of ideas in which all points of view are heard. Free expression in the classroom is an integral part of this process. At the same time, higher education works best when all of us approach the enterprise with empathy and respect for others, irrespective of their ideology, political views, or identity. We value civility because that is the kind of community we want, and we care for it because civility permits intellectual exploration and growth.

Attendance and Participation Policy: Attendance and participation is crucial to learning and you are expected to attend all classes except in case of extreme hardship such as an unforeseen medical emergency.

Professionalism Policy: Per university policy and classroom etiquette; mobile phones, iPods, *etc.* must be silenced during all classroom lectures. Those not heeding this rule will be asked to step outside the classroom so that the learning environment is not disrupted.

Please arrive on time for all class meetings. Students who habitually disturb the class by talking, arriving late, *etc.*, and have been warned, will result in a letter grade reduction to their final grade.

### **Policies in The Trachtenberg School Courses:**

1. Incompletes: A student must consult with the instructor to obtain a grade of I (incomplete) no later than the last day of classes in a semester. At that time, the student and instructor will both sign the CCAS contract for incompletes and submit a copy to the School Director. Please consult the TSPPPA Student Handbook or visit <http://bulletin.gwu.edu/university-regulations/#GIIncomplete> for the policy on incompletes.
2. Submission of Written Work Products Outside of the Classroom: It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that an instructor receives each written assignment. Students can submit written work electronically only with the express permission of the instructor.
3. Submission of Written Work Products after Due Date: Policy on Late Work: All work must be turned in by the assigned due date in order to receive full credit for that assignment, unless an exception is expressly made by the instructor.
4. Academic Honesty: Please consult the “policies” section of the GW student handbook for the university code of academic integrity. Note especially the definition of plagiarism: “intentionally representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas of another as one’s own in any academic exercise; failure to attribute any of the following: quotations, paraphrases, or borrowed information.” All examinations, papers, and other graded work products and assignments are to be completed in conformance with the George Washington University Code of Academic Integrity. See the GW Academic Integrity Code at [studentconduct.gwu.edu/code-academic-integrity](http://studentconduct.gwu.edu/code-academic-integrity)

5. Changing Grades After Completion of Course: No changes can be made in grades after the conclusion of the semester, other than in cases of clerical error.

6. The Syllabus: This syllabus is a guide to the course for the student. Sound educational practice requires flexibility and the instructor may therefore, at her/his discretion, change content and requirements during the semester. Excused absences will be given for absences due to religious holidays as per the university schedule, but please advise the instructor ahead of time.

---

## University Policies and Information

---

### University policy on observance of religious holidays

Students must notify faculty during the first week of the semester in which they are enrolled in the course, or as early as possible, but no later than three weeks prior to the absence, of their intention to be absent from class on their day(s) of religious observance. If the holiday falls within the first three weeks of class, the student must inform faculty in the first week of the semester. For details and policy, see “Religious Holidays” at [provost.gwu.edu/policies-procedures-and-guidelines](http://provost.gwu.edu/policies-procedures-and-guidelines).

### Academic Integrity Code

Academic integrity is an essential part of the educational process, and all members of the GW community take these matters very seriously. As the instructor of record for this course, my role is to provide clear expectations and uphold them in all assessments. Violations of academic integrity occur when students fail to cite research sources properly, engage in unauthorized collaboration, falsify data, and otherwise violate the [Code of Academic Integrity](#). If you have any questions about whether or not particular academic practices or resources are permitted, you should ask me for clarification. If you are reported for an academic integrity violation, you should contact the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (SRR) to learn more about your rights and options in the process. Consequences can range from failure of assignment to expulsion from the university and may include a transcript notation. For more information, please refer to the SRR website (<https://studentconduct.gwu.edu/academic-integrity>), email [rights@gwu.edu](mailto:rights@gwu.edu), or call 202-994-6757.

### Use of Electronic Course Materials and Class Recordings

Students are encouraged to use electronic course materials, including recorded class sessions, for private personal use in connection with their academic program of study. Electronic course materials and recorded class sessions should not be shared or used for non-course related purposes unless express permission has been granted by the instructor. Students who impermissibly share any electronic course materials are subject to discipline under the Student Code of Conduct. Please contact the instructor if you have questions regarding what constitutes

permissible or impermissible use of electronic course materials and/or recorded class sessions. Please contact Disability Support Services at [disabilitysupport.gwu.edu](http://disabilitysupport.gwu.edu) if you have questions or need assistance in accessing electronic course materials.

## **Academic support**

### **Writing Center**

GW's Writing Center cultivates confident writers in the University community by facilitating collaborative, critical, and inclusive conversations at all stages of the writing process. Working alongside peer mentors, writers develop strategies to write independently in academic and public settings. Appointments can be booked online at [gwu.mywconline](http://gwu.mywconline).

### **Academic Commons**

Academic Commons provides tutoring and other academic support resources to students in many courses. Students can schedule virtual one-on-one appointments or attend virtual drop-in sessions. Students may schedule an appointment, review the tutoring schedule, access other academic support resources, or obtain assistance at [academiccommons.gwu.edu](http://academiccommons.gwu.edu).

## **Support for students outside the classroom**

### **Disability Support Services (DSS) 202-994-8250**

Any student who may need an accommodation based on the potential impact of a disability should contact Disability Support Services in Rome Hall, 801 22nd Street, NW, Suite 102, to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. For additional information see: [disabilitysupport.gwu.edu](http://disabilitysupport.gwu.edu)

### **Counseling and Psychological Services 202-994-5300**

GW's Colonial Health Center offers counseling and psychological services, supporting mental health and personal development by collaborating directly with students to overcome challenges and difficulties that may interfere with academic, emotional, and personal success. For additional information see [healthcenter.gwu.edu/counseling-and-psychological-services](http://healthcenter.gwu.edu/counseling-and-psychological-services)

### **Title IX Sexual Harassment and Related Conduct Policy**

- Under the university policy, faculty are considered “designated reporters” and are required to “promptly report any information they learn about suspected or alleged Sexual Harassment or potential violations of this Policy to the university’s Title IX Coordinator.”
- Confidential resources are available through the Colonial Health Center (CHC) at 202-994-5300 and the Office of Advocacy and Support (OAS) at 202-994-0443.



- To make a report to the Title IX Coordinator, please call 202-994-7434 or visit <https://titleix.gwu.edu/>

## **Student Support Information**

You can obtain a variety of useful information at <https://online.gwu.edu/student-support> (e.g., technical requirements and support, student services, obtaining a GWorld card, and state contact information).

## **Average Minimum Hours of Workload**

Students will spend ~2 hours per week on direct instruction and ~5.5 hours per week on independent activities, on average. Over the course of the semester, students will spend 7.5 hours in instructional time per week for a total of 112.5 hours for the semester.

## **Safety and security**

- In an emergency: call GWPD 202-994-6111 or 911
- For situation-specific actions: review the Emergency Response Handbook available at: [safety.gwu.edu/emergency-response-handbook](https://safety.gwu.edu/emergency-response-handbook)
- In an active violence situation: Get Out, Hide Out or Take Out: [go.gwu.edu/shooterprep](https://go.gwu.edu/shooterprep)
- Stay informed: [safety.gwu.edu/stay-informed](https://safety.gwu.edu/stay-informed)