

Subject Description Form

Subject Code	APSS3241											
Subject Title	The Philosophical Foundations of Policy Planning											
Credit Value	3											
Level	3											
Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion	<u>Pre-requisite :</u> APSS2200 The Art of Reasoning APSS345 Social Research Methods											
Assessment Methods	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 33%;">100% Continuous Assessment</th> <th style="width: 33%;">Individual Assessment</th> <th style="width: 33%;">Group Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Seminar presentation and participation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40 %</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Written assignment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">60 %</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. Seminar presentation and participation	40 %	--	2. Written assignment	60 %	--
100% Continuous Assessment	Individual Assessment	Group Assessment										
1. Seminar presentation and participation	40 %	--										
2. Written assignment	60 %	--										
Objectives	<p>The subject aims to introduce students to major philosophical perspectives to analyze the nature of “theory” and “ practice” in policy planning, as well as to evaluate critically the place of knowledge, self, value, and context in policy planning. 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 policy planning.</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” and “practice” in policy planning; b. evaluate critically the place of knowledge, self, value, and context in policy planning; c. acquire alternative perspectives in perceiving human nature, rationality, knowledge and social context, and their relations with policy planning. 											
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflections on the meta-theoretical underpinnings of concept formation and theorizing in policy planning; assumptions about the nature of nature of knowledge, the nature of self, value, power, and society, and the relationship between theory and practice in policy planning 2. The problem of fact-value distinction in policy planning 3. The nature of theory in policy planning 											

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The involvement of practical reasoning in policy planning 5. Technical, political, and communicative accounts in policy planning; the interplay between public interests, structural constraints and power dynamics, and policy planning 6. Making sense of public interests in policy planning: socio-cultural context, self conception, and the formation of public interests 7. Case reflection: insights drawn from selected issues and cases 																																						
Teaching/Learning Methodology	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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 policy planning. Students are encouraged to discuss current policy issues in class. 2. 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 policy planning. 																																						
Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes	<table border="1" data-bbox="432 904 1455 1346"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="6">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Seminar presentation and participation</td> <td>40 %</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Individual written assignment</td> <td>60 %</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100 %</td> <td colspan="6"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes:</p> <p>Seminar presentations and small group discussions enable the students to show their own understanding and analysis of the issues concerning policy planning.</p> <p>Individual written assignments enable the students to show their own understanding and analysis of the issues concerning policy planning.</p>	Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)						a	b	c				1. Seminar presentation and participation	40 %	✓	✓	✓				2. Individual written assignment	60 %	✓	✓	✓				Total	100 %						
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting			Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																			
		a	b	c																																			
1. Seminar presentation and participation	40 %	✓	✓	✓																																			
2. Individual written assignment	60 %	✓	✓	✓																																			
Total	100 %																																						
Student Study Effort Expected	<table border="1" data-bbox="424 1682 1487 2074"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Class contact:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Lecture</td> <td></td> <td>24 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Seminar</td> <td></td> <td>15 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Other student study effort:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Preparation for seminar presentation</td> <td></td> <td>38 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Writing term paper</td> <td></td> <td>38 Hrs.</td> </tr> </table>	Class contact:			▪ Lecture		24 Hrs.	▪ Seminar		15 Hrs.	Other student study effort:			▪ Preparation for seminar presentation		38 Hrs.	▪ Writing term paper		38 Hrs.																				
Class contact:																																							
▪ Lecture		24 Hrs.																																					
▪ Seminar		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>Fay, Brian (1975). <i>Social Theory and Political Practice</i>. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.</p> <p>Forester, John (1993). <i>Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism</i>. State University of New York Press, Albany.</p> <p>Ricucci, Norma M. (2010). <i>Public Administration: Traditions of Inquiry and Philosophies of Knowledge</i>. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.</p> <p>White, Jay D. (1999). <i>Taking Language Seriously: The Narrative Foundations of Public Administration Research</i>. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.</p> <p>阮新邦 (2005)。 <i>迈向崭新的社会知识观</i>。北京市：北京大學出版社。</p> <p><u>Supplementary</u></p> <p>Bernstein, Richard J. (1983). <i>Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis</i>. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.</p> <p>Fay, Brian (1996). <i>Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science</i>. Blackwell, Oxford.</p> <p>Fischer, F. & Forester, J. (ed.) (1993). <i>The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning</i>. Duke University Press, Durham and London.</p> <p>Flyvbjerg, Bent (1998). <i>Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice</i>, translated by Steven Sampson. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.</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. (1989). <i>Planning in the Face of Power</i>. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.</p> <p>Forester, John (1999). <i>The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes</i>. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.</p> <p>Jennings, Bruce (1983). "Interpretive Social Science and Policy Analysis," in <i>Ethics, The Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis</i>, eds. Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings, 3-35. Plenum Press, New York and London.</p> <p>Wagenaar, Hendrik (2011). <i>Meaning in Action: Interpretation and Dialogue in Policy Analysis</i>. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, N.Y.</p> <p>Zimmermann, Jens (2015). <i>Hermeneutics: A Very Short Introduction</i>. Oxford University</p>	

	Press, Oxford.
--	----------------