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COURSE DESCRIPTION
This class examines the sources and varieties of political behavior within and among organizations. The readings cover the organizational context of politics and the nature of power and politics in organizations, including how we might manage these dynamics in our careers.

REQUIRED TEXTS
The following texts are available at the University at Albany Bookstore:
- Matthews, Chris (1999). Hardball: How Politics Is Played, Told by One Who Knows the Game

BLACKBOARD
Additional readings, weekly assignments and essay questions will be made available on the course’s Blackboard site.

PARTICIPATION (and ATTENDANCE)
Students are expected to attend all classes and to complete all course requirements (assignments) on time. If you are unable to maintain a pattern of attendance, please do not take the class. Missing a class may result in a deduction of two (2) “points” per class missed (see GRADING, below).
For example, if a student compiled 90 points through the duration of the course and misses three class meetings, six (6) points will be deducted resulting in 84 total points bringing the final course grade from an “A-“ to a “B.”

“Participation” means engagement, informed by knowledge of readings and other materials. It requires more than simply coming to class but it does not mean an effort to dominate discussions.

Indications of continuous learning through thoughtful in-class participation — such as the integration of readings in your work and comments throughout the semester — may contribute as many as five (5) additional points to your final course grade.

For example, a student who compiled 85 points and contributes in a thoughtful manner throughout the course can earn five additional points resulting in 90 total points. Their final course grade would go from a “B” to an “A-.”

**WEEKLY REACTION PAPERS (24 points)**
Each week, beginning with class on September 2, you should prepare a 300-word (one page) reaction paper based on the readings for the week’s class. This is NOT a summary of the readings, but rather an opportunity to synthesize the week’s readings in a meaningful way.

You should place particular emphasis on applying readings from the text to the assigned article for the week.

Each reaction paper is worth a maximum of 2 points (12 reaction papers X 2 points each = 24 total points). **Reaction papers should be submitted via Blackboard by 4:15pm.** Only 12 reaction papers will count towards your final grade (there are 13 weeks worth of readings).

**ESSAYS (30 points)**
The purpose of the papers is to have you engage the readings in a thoughtful way. Beginning September 30, you should submit a three-page paper addressing the essay question provided the preceding week while incorporating key themes found in the readings. **Papers should be submitted via Blackboard by 4:15pm.**

You should try not to exceed three pages but if you must go a bit beyond that to avoid cutting an argument short, feel free to do so. At least one week in advance, an essay question will be posted on Blackboard; you should address the question in your paper. It is essential that the topics address the assigned readings in a direct, explicit, and meaningful way. The paper should not be a summary of the readings (i.e., reporting just what the readings say, or relying substantially on quotations from the readings) but rather should represent your independent work with the material.

The purpose of the papers is to give you a chance to develop some thoughts on the readings prior to coming to class and so they are due at the relevant class sessions. No papers will be
accepted after the Tuesday class for the applicable week. Some slack to allow for emergencies, peak periods for other projects, and so forth is built into the grading scheme outlined below. The papers must be typed and edited, double-spaced, with no less than 1 inch margins, conventionally sized fonts, and stapled. Edit the papers carefully, because writing is crucial to the quality of the work. Shoddy preparation (e.g., several spelling or punctuation errors) will lead to a lower grade. Find a good guide to grammar and punctuation and use it. An example of such a guide on-line is [http://andromeda.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/Writing/c.html](http://andromeda.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/Writing/c.html).

You may revise and re-submit one of the weekly papers after receiving the comments and grade on the paper. The resubmitted paper will be reviewed and the grade adjusted for the paper if appropriate. To earn a higher grade a revision must improve substantially the clarity, organization, and strength of the paper, drawing on the comments made on the initial submission. The revision must go beyond correcting in a mechanical way writing or editing errors noted in the initial submission. You should submit your revision within two weeks of receiving the original graded paper.

Please review the University policy regarding plagiarism in the current Undergraduate Bulletin. Plagiarism is a serious offense. If a paper shows signs of plagiarism the University policy will be enforced strongly and an Academic Integrity Report will be filed with the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education.

Your grade for this component of the course will be based on your ten highest grades for papers over the course of the semester. Thus, if you miss a paper that will count as a dropped grade; if you are satisfied with the result of the first ten papers you need not complete additional weekly papers; and if you do papers beyond the ten, the lowest grades will be dropped.

**FINAL PRESENTATION**

On December 2 or 9 you will be expected to present to the class a synopsis/snap-shot of your final integrative paper. Your presentation, like your final integrative paper, should express key issues you have gained from the course. Presentations should be between seven and ten minutes in length.

**FINAL PAPER**

By 4pm on Friday, December 12 you should submit a 12-15 page paper, drawing on each of the books and, if you wish, other readings over the semester. Final papers should be submitted via Blackboard by 5:00 pm.

An Integrated Paper requires the student to choose a book, movie, organization or individual, provide a short summary of the general story line or background of said individual or organization, and analyze it using a certain number of terms and/or concepts from the various texts and articles read throughout the semester, and then provide a brief conclusion with any thoughts he or she has after analyzing the book, movie, organization or individual. The assignment is between six and seven pages typed, double-spaced pages.
Your **Integrated Paper** should address:
- At least THREE key concepts or themes addressed during the course of the semester;
- Specifically, a key concept or theme from the course texts;
- Apply these key concepts or themes to a book (scholarly or otherwise), movie (of your choice), organization (either one covered in class or your own), or individual (again, either one covered in class or one that interests you personally).

**Key Concepts** or Themes *might* include:
- Sources of Power
- Gaining/Losing Power
- Interdependence

Your **Integrated Paper** should:
- Not exceed **15 pages in length** (including references/bibliography).
- Have one-inch margins;
- Be typed in 12-point Times New Roman font;
- Have numbered pages, including appendices and references/bibliography.

**USE OF CELLULAR TELEPHONES**
The use of cellular telephones is prohibited during class. Please silence or turn off cellular phones (even setting them to vibrate can be distracting) prior to the start of the class session. Texting, tweeting or utilizing your cellular phone in any like manner during class will not be tolerated.

**GRADING**
Students’ final course grades are based the following components:

a. **Weekly Reaction Papers (2pts x 12 papers)**  
   24 pts
b. **Essays (10pts x 3 papers)**  
   30 pts
c. **Participation (and attendance)**  
   11 pts
d. **Final Presentation**  
   15 pts
e. **Final Paper**  
   20 pts

**TOTAL:** 100 pts

Points translate to the following letter grades: A (96 – 100), A- (90 – 95), B+ (87 – 89), B (83 – 86), B- (80 – 82), C+ (77 – 79), C (73 – 76), C- (70 – 72), D+ (67 – 69), D (63 – 66), D- (60 – 62), E (<60).

**A NOTE ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY** (adapted from the 2013-14 Undergraduate Bulletin: [http://www.albany.edu/undergraduate_bulletin/regulations.html](http://www.albany.edu/undergraduate_bulletin/regulations.html))

The following behaviors are examples of academic dishonesty and are therefore unacceptable:
“Plagiarism: Presenting as one’s own work the work of another person (for example, the words, ideas, information, data, evidence, organizing principles, or style of presentation of someone else). Plagiarism includes paraphrasing or summarizing without acknowledgment, submission of another student’s work as one’s own, the purchase of prepared research or completed papers or projects, and the unacknowledged use of research sources gathered by someone else. Failure to indicate accurately the extent and precise nature of one’s reliance on other sources is also a form of plagiarism. The student is responsible for understanding the legitimate use of sources, the appropriate ways of acknowledging academic, scholarly, or creative indebtedness, and the consequences for violating University regulations.

Examples of plagiarism include: failure to acknowledge the source(s) of even a few phrases, sentences, or paragraphs; failure to acknowledge a quotation or paraphrase of paragraph-length sections of a paper; failure to acknowledge the source(s) of a major idea or the source(s) for an ordering principle central to the paper’s or project’s structure; failure to acknowledge the source (quoted, paraphrased, or summarized) of major sections or passages in the paper or project; the unacknowledged use of several major ideas or extensive reliance on another person’s data, evidence, or critical method; submitting as one’s own work, work borrowed, stolen, or purchased from someone else.

Multiple Submission: Submitting substantial portions of the same work for credit more than once, without the prior explicit consent of the instructor(s) to whom the material is being (or has in the past been) submitted.

Unauthorized Collaboration: Collaborating on projects, papers, or other academic exercises that is regarded as inappropriate by the instructor(s). Although the usual faculty assumption is that work submitted for credit is entirely one’s own, standards on appropriate and inappropriate collaboration vary widely among individual faculty and the different disciplines. Students who want to confer or collaborate with one another on work receiving academic credit should make certain of the instructor’s expectations and standards.

Falsification: Misrepresenting material or fabricating information in an academic exercise or assignment (for example, the false or misleading citation of sources, the falsification of experimental or computer data, etc.).

When a faculty member has information that a student has violated academic integrity in a course or program for which he or she is responsible and determines that a violation has occurred, he or she will inform the student and impose an appropriate sanction.”
**COURSE SCHEDULE**

The following schedule includes both reading and written assignments for the course. The schedule is subject to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 26</td>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>Kettl, Politics of the Administrative Process, pages 1 – 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “Noreen Beaman of Brinker Capital, on Accountability.” (Adam Bryant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9</td>
<td>Kettl, Politics of the Administrative Process, pages 189 – 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “How LBJ Saved the Civil Rights Act.” (Michael O'Donnell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>Kettl, Politics of the Administrative Process, pages 369 - 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodsell, The New Case for Bureaucracy, pages 1 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “The Quiet Movement to Make Government Fail Less Often.” (David Leonhardt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “Competing for Better Government.” (Stephen Goldsmith)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>Goodsell, The New Case for Bureaucracy, pages 41 – 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “Tom Erickson of Acquia, on the Philosophy of ‘Ready, Fire, Aim.’” (Adam Bryant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>Goodsell, The New Case for Bureaucracy, pages 166 – 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthews, Hardball, pages 11 – 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “What Timothy Geithner Really Thinks.” (Andrew Ross Sorkin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PAPER #1 DUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>Matthews, Hardball, pages 88 – 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “The Intervention...” (John Heilemann &amp; Mark Halperin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>Matthews, Hardball, pages 128 – 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “Planet Hillary.” (Amy Chozik)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Pfeffer, Power, pages 1 – 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “The Trials of Graham Spanier, Penn State’s Ousted President.” (Michael Sokolove)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>Pfeffer, Power, pages 125 – 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Article:</strong> “Mark Sanford’s Path of Most Resistance.” (Jim Rutenberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PAPER #2 DUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>Sandberg, Lean In, pages 3 – 103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Article: “Warner’s C.E.O. Is Bullish on the Big Screen.” (Brooks Barnes)

November 11
Sandberg, Lean In, pages 104 – 174
IN CLASS: Hartland Memorial Hospital Case Study
Article: “The Morning Muse of Television.” (Jacob Bernstein)

November 18
Cialdini, Influence, pages 1 – 140
Article: “James Gorman of Morgan Stanley, Going Against Type.” (Nelson Schwartz)
PAPER #3 DUE

November 25
Cialdini, Influence, pages 141 – 234
IN CLASS: Thirteen Days
*** FINAL INTERGRATED PAPER OUTLINE DUE ***

December 2
CLASS PRESENTATIONS

December 9
CLASS PRESENTATIONS

December 12
Final integrative paper DUE TODAY by 5:00pm