Course Description and Objectives

For a country who historically mistrusts government, the US has an enormous number of governments. These governments are not neatly organized into a hierarchy with a clear chain of command. In contrast, governmental relationships and interactions are complex and evolving. Such interactions may be collaborative, cooperative, or competitive. Our approach will include both a theoretical understanding of intergovernmental relations, a case study of a federal block grant program, and administrative skills commonly employed at the federal, state, and local government levels. Competencies gained in the course align with several employment positions at all level of governments including program manager and grants administration.

Students are asked to do the following:

1. Students must be prepared to discuss reading assignments.
2. Read and understand assignments that may not be discussed during class times. Terminology and themes from readings will be on tests.
3. Students will develop competencies in the following areas:
   a. Constitutional, policy, and administrative relations between the Federal and state governments.
   b. Constitutional, policy, and administrative relations between state and local governments.
   c. Collaborative and competitive relations between local governments.

In summary, students should expect to read materials, to take extensive notes before and during class, to synthesize those materials, to conduct independent research. Students who apply themselves in all these areas are more likely to be successful in the course.

Course Materials

The following books are required and available at local bookstores or online.


Simulation software. The cost will be $10 to $25, but we will work in teams so not everyone needs to purchase the software.

Additional online material on Blackboard.
Course Evaluation and Grades

Below you will find a brief description of each component and its weight in the evaluation process. There are 1,000 possible points in the course. The traditional 10-point scale for letter grades will be applied.

1. **Paper** (25%). Each student will write a 5 page paper (double-spaced 12 pt Times New Roman font). The paper will describe and analyze one state’s non-entitlement CDBG program.

2. **Simulation** (25%). Each student will participate in a group that engages others in an online simulation. Participation in the simulation and a short report will constitute the materials and activities to be graded.

3. **Exams** (40%). We will take four exams in the course and each is worth (15%) of the total grade for the course.

4. **Instructor Evaluation** (10%). The instructor will evaluate your in class and group participation on a qualitative, observational basis. This includes in-class discussion, interactions with colleagues, contributions to group activities, and assessments of the knowledge of your reading assignments.

Other Course Policies

*Students with Disabilities*

The Department of Public Administration, in cooperation with the Office of Disability Accommodation, complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act in making reasonable accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. Please present your written accommodation request during regular office hours before the 12th class day of regular semesters (4th class day of summer sessions).

*Withdrawals*

Students may withdraw from the course, but you must follow university procedures. The instructor is not responsible for failure to meet withdrawal deadlines.

*Classroom Civility*

Students must help maintain a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning. Please refrain from engaging in activities that are disruptive to the learning process such as tardiness, use of phones or other electronic devices, or engaging in other activities. Moreover, students should engage in civil discourse with their colleagues and instructor. Argumentation and debate do not necessitate the use of language that denigrates others. Students are encouraged to express their positions and opinions, even controversial ones, but they must do so in a civil manner. Failure to maintain a civil environment will be incorporated into your participation assessment.
Excused absences for religious holidays

In accordance with State law, students absent due to the observance of a religious holiday may take examinations or complete assignments scheduled for the day missed within a reasonable time after the absence. Travel time required for religious observances shall also be excused. Please see the UNT Student Handbook for information on which holidays or holy days are covered by this policy. State law also requires that students notify their teachers at the beginning of the semester if they expect to miss class on a religious holyday during the semester but want to make up the work missed. Students will be allowed to make up the work provided they have informed their teachers in writing within the first 15 days of the semester. Once again, all assignments and scheduled work must be turned in before the date of the excused absence. University policy requires that students provide their teachers with an official notification card issued by the university if they want to make up any in-class work they missed while they were involved in a university authorized activity.

Academic Ethics

The issue of academic ethics can be a problem and thus any instance of cheating, plagiarism, falsification, or failure to do original work for this course can result in one or more of the following consequences.

- Failing grade for assignment
- Failing course grade
- Recommendation for additional disciplinary action
- Removal from the university

Course Syllabus

The following schedule indicates our plan for the semester. The instructor may and likely will change the plan to facilitate course objectives. Students are responsible for any changes made to the syllabus that are announced in class. Students are also expected to read the material before coming to class so they can be prepared to discuss the material.

### COURSE SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/29</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31</td>
<td>Federalism or IGR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FWN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>Federal – State Relations: Constitutional Foundations and Political Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bill of Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FWN 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9/7   Federal – State: Constitutional Foundations and Political Theory
      • Federalist Papers 7, 9, 39, 44-46, 51
      • FWN 2

9/12  Implications for State-State Relations
      • FWN 5

9/14  Exam #1

9/19  Federal-State Relations: Policy Conflict and Regulation
      • Intergovernmental Lobbying Case Study in FWN

9/21  Federal-State Relations: Homeland Security and Immigration
      • TSA Case Study in FWN

9/26  Federal-State Relations: Healthcare & Marijuana
      • Marijuana Legalization in FWN

9/28  Federal-State Relations: Fiscal Federalism
      • FWN 3

10/3  Federal-State Relations: Fiscal Federalism
      • Review FWN 3

10/5  Exam #2

10/10 National-Local Relations
      • FWN 7
      • “Metropolitan reform…” Case Study

10/12 State-Local Relations: Constitutional Foundations
      • FWN 6
      • How Cities Work
10/17 State-Local Relations: Policy Conflict and Regulation

10/19 State-Local Relations: Fiscal Federalism
   • “State governments raid coffers…” Case Study in FWN

10/24 Federal-State-Local Relations: CDBG Block Grants
   • GAO Report 2010

10/26 Federal-State-Local Relations: CDBG Block Grants
   • GAO Report 2006
   • GAO Report 2013

10/31 Research Practicum

11/2 Research Practicum

11/7 Class Symposium: CDBG Block Grants
   • CDBG Report Due

11/9 Exam #3

11/14 Local Government Relations: Competition and Collaboration
   • FWN 8

11/16 Local Government Relations: Competition and Collaboration
   • FWN 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11/21 | Local Government Relations: Competition and Collaboration  
• National League of Cities pp. 1-40 |
| 11/23 | Local Government Relations: Simulation Prep             |
| 11/28 | Thanksgiving                                            |
| 11/30 | Local Government Relations: Simulation                  |
| 12/5  | Local Government Relations: Simulation                  |
| 12/7  | Local Government Relations: Simulation                   
• Simulation Report Due |
| 12/12 | FINAL EXAM #4 at 1:30PM.                               |

**CDBG Report**

Students will provide a quality research report about the Non-entitlement Community Development Block Grant. This program was initially administered by HUD and also by almost every state. It is designed to serve low-to-moderate income populations in cities with less than 50,000 persons and counties with less than 200,000 persons. Each student will be assigned a state. Each student will submit a report that describes program implementation and assess whether the program is meeting the requirements of the federal and state government. Recommendations will be included and data analysis is required. Meticulous documentation of all sources is required. Use Chicago Style. Each student will write a 5 page paper (double-spaced 12 pt Times New Roman font). The paper will describe and analyze one state’s non-entitlement CDBG program. It will involve a professional report and we’ll discuss this further in class.

**Simulation Report**

Each group will complete a summary report of the simulation exercise. The report should be no more than 1000 words. Follow the outline below:
1. Description of group’s strategy prior to the simulation.
2. Description of how collaboration and competition affected decision-making and outcomes.
3. Select two forms of local government collaboration arrangements discussed in the NLC document and explain how they could have improved governance and the outcomes your city desired.

## Grading and Evaluation

The following rubric will be used to grade papers and reports in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> - excellent</td>
<td>Written work is logically organized and professionally presented for the appropriate milestone. Written work must be free from grammatical errors, poor sentence structure, and poorly organized paragraphs. Documentation must be meticulous and follow Chicago style formatting. Research must be extensive and thorough. The quantity of research demonstrates a thorough range of resources and the quality is professional. Analysis and assessment of implementation shows insight and unique contributions from the authors that explicitly build on what is already known. There is a meaningful contribution based upon documented evidence and logical argumentation. Work is completed on time and previous recommendations are incorporated into revisions. The writing and presentation is professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> - good</td>
<td>Written work is presented with headers and organizational formatting, but not in an effective manner. Written work demonstrates consistent, but relatively minor, grammatical errors, poor sentence structure, and poorly organized paragraphs. Documentation does not follow Chicago style or fails to account for all research materials and sources used in the analysis. Research must be extensive and thorough. Research demonstrates that key resources were not utilized or underutilized. The quantity of research shows nontrivial omissions that should have been included. Analysis and assessment of implementation is descriptive without sufficient connection to logical arguments, previous research, or data analysis. Work is completed on time but there is a failure to incorporate all previous recommendations into revisions. Writing and presentation is not professional, but demonstrates general mastery of the language and data presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> - unacceptable</td>
<td>Written work is presented in a sloppy, disorganized document. Consistent and egregious grammatical errors, poor sentence structure, and poorly organized paragraphs are prevalent throughout the document. Negligent oversight of documentation (benign plagiarism is present). Research relies upon non-professional resources and omits important research that should have been acknowledged. Analysis and assessment of implementation is missing, illogical, or fails to address the key issues of implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Work is not completed on time, or there is a failure to incorporate previous recommendations into revisions.  

Writing has numerous errors that impede reader comprehension and fails to include data presentations that are comprehensible or not at all. |