

Subject Description Form

| Subject Code | APSS460 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|-----|----|---|--|-----|----|
| Subject Title | Integrative Seminar in Social Policy & Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credit Value | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion | <u>Pre-requisite:</u> APSS4680 Professional Attachment II / APSS4681 Professional Attachment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Methods | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;"></th> <th style="width: 45%;">100% Continuous Assessment</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Individual Assessment</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Group Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1. Written Assignment</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">60%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2. Seminar Presentation and Participation</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">40%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grade is calculated according to the percentage assigned; The completion and submission of all component assignments are required for passing the subject; and Student must pass all the components if he/she is to pass the subject. | | | | 100% Continuous Assessment | Individual Assessment | Group Assessment | 1. Written Assignment | | 60% | -- | 2. Seminar Presentation and Participation | | 40% | -- |
| | 100% Continuous Assessment | Individual Assessment | Group Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Written Assignment | | 60% | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Seminar Presentation and Participation | | 40% | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | <p>The objective of this subject is to introduce students to major meta-theoretical perspectives to analyze the nature of ‘theory’, ‘practice’, and ‘integration’ in social policy and administration, as well as to evaluate critically the place of knowledge, self, value, and context in policy planning and administrative practice. It is expected that students will be able to acquire alternative perspectives in perceiving human nature, rationality, knowledge and social context, and their relations with social policy and administration.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intended Learning Outcomes | <p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. articulate the nature of ‘theory’, ‘practice’, and ‘integration’ in social policy and administration; b. evaluate critically the place of knowledge, self, value, and context in policy planning and administrative practice; c. to acquire alternative perspectives in perceiving human nature, rationality, knowledge and social context, and their relations with social policy and administration. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflections on the meta-theoretical underpinnings of concept formation and theorizing in social policy and administration: assumptions about the nature of knowledge, the nature of self, value, power, and society, and the relationship between theory and practice in policy planning and administrative practice. 2. The problem of fact-value distinction in policy planning and administrative practice. 3. The nature of theory in policy planning and administrative practice. 4. The involvement of practical reasoning in policy planning and administrative practice. 5. Technical, political, and communicative accounts in policy planning and administrative practice: the interplay between public interests, structural constraints and power dynamics, and policy planning. 6. Making sense of public interests in policy planning and administrative practice: socio-cultural context, self conception, and the formation of public interests. 7. Case reflection: insights drawn from selected issues and cases. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------------|-----|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|-----|---|---|---|--|--|--|--------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Teaching/Learning Methodology | <p>Lectures and seminars are used to facilitate students' learning of the subject. In the lectures, the instructor introduces students to major concepts and arguments related with relevant topics. The instructor demonstrates to them the relevance of those concepts and arguments for social policy analysis. Students are encouraged to discuss current policy issues in class.</p> <p>Students are expected to pay their effort to organize presentations and small group discussions in seminars on assigned topics. It is hoped that they can draw insights from the concepts and arguments they have learnt in the lectures to illuminate their reflections on issues and cases in social policy and administration.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2" style="width: 30%;">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2" style="width: 10%;">% weighting</th> <th colspan="6">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">a</th> <th style="width: 5%;">b</th> <th style="width: 5%;">c</th> <th style="width: 5%;">d</th> <th style="width: 5%;">e</th> <th style="width: 5%;"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Written Assignment</td> <td>60%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Seminar Presentation and Participation</td> <td>40%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100%</td> <td colspan="6"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Specific assessment methods/tasks | % weighting | Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate) | | | | | | a | b | c | d | e | | 1. Written Assignment | 60% | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | 2. Seminar Presentation and Participation | 40% | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | Total | 100% | | | | | | |
| Specific assessment methods/tasks | % weighting | | | Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | a | b | c | d | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Written Assignment | 60% | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Seminar Presentation and Participation | 40% | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------|
| | <p>Seminar presentations and small group discussions enable the students to show their own understanding and analysis of the nature of ‘theory’, ‘practice’, and ‘integration’ in social policy and administrative; the place of knowledge, self, value, and context in policy planning and administrative practice; and the alternative perspectives in perceiving human nature, rationality, knowledge and social context, and their relations with social policy and administration.</p> <p>Individual written assignments enable the students to show their own understanding and analysis of the nature of ‘theory’, ‘practice’, and ‘integration’ in social policy and administrative; the place of knowledge, self, value, and context in policy planning and administrative practice; and the alternative perspectives in perceiving human nature, rationality, knowledge and social context, and their relations with social policy and administration.</p> | |
| Student Study Effort Expected | Class contact: | |
| | ▪ Lectures | 24 Hrs. |
| | ▪ Seminars | 15 Hrs. |
| | Other student study effort: | |
| | ▪ Preparation for seminar presentation | 38 Hrs. |
| | ▪ Writing term paper | 38 Hrs. |
| | Total student study effort | 115 Hrs. |
| Medium of Instruction | English | |
| Medium of Assessment | English | |
| Reading List and References | <p><u>Essential</u></p> <p>Bellah, Robert N., Madsen, Richard, Sullivan, William M., Swidler, Ann and Tipton, Steven M. (1992). <i>The Good Society</i>. Vintage Books, New York.</p> <p>Flyvbjerg, Bent. (2001). <i>Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again</i>, translated by Steven Sampson. Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Forester, John (1993). <i>Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism</i>, esp. Essay 2 “Understanding Planning Practice: An Empirical, Practical, and Normative Account”. State University of New York Press, Albany</p> <p>Forester, John (1999). <i>The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes</i>, esp. Chap. 1. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.</p> <p>Schön, Donald A. and Rein, Martin (1994). <i>Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies</i>, Chaps. 1 & 2. Basic Books, New York.</p> | |

阮新邦(編) (1993)。 *批判詮釋論與社會研究*, 第一章。八方, 新澤西。

阮新邦 (1997)。 *批判理性、社會實踐與香港困境*, 第三、四章。八方, 新澤西。

Supplementary

Allen, David S. (2002). "Jurgen Habermas and the Search for Democratic Principles," in *Moral Engagement in Public Life: Theorists for Contemporary Ethics*, eds. Sharon L. Bracci and Clifford G. Christians, 97-122. Peter Lang, New York.

Brand, Arie (1990). *The Force of Reason: An Introduction to Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action*, Chaps. 3-6. Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Fay, Brian. (1975). *Social Theory and Political Practice*. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.

Flyvbjerg, Bent (1998). *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*, translated by Steven Sampson. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Forester, John. (1989). *Planning in the Face of Power*, Chaps. 2, 8 & 9. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Hekman, Susan J. (1983). *Max Weber and Contemporary Social Theory*. Martin Robertson, Oxford.

Jennings, Bruce (1983). "Interpretive Social Science and Policy Analysis," in *Ethics, The Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*, eds. Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings, 3-35. Plenum Press, New York and London.

Kaplan, Thomas J. (1993). "Reading Policy Narratives: Beginnings, Middles, and Ends," in *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, eds. Frank Fischer and John Forester, 167-185. Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Leonard, Stephen T. (1987). *Critical Theory in Political Practice*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

MacIntyre, Alasdair (1977). "Utilitarianism and Cost-Benefit Analysis: An Essay on the Relevance of Moral Philosophy to Bureaucratic Theory," in *Values in the Electric Power Industry*, ed. Kenneth Sayre, 217-237. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame and London.

MacIntyre, Alasdair (1984). *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 2nd ed. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Ind.

Schön, Donald A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

劉兆佳(編) (2000)。 *香港21世紀藍圖*。中文大學出版社, 香港。