

The Overloaded State

Research and political reasoning



State capacity, public-service implementation and lawful accountability

Purpose

Teach students to connect political responsibility, practical capability and lawful public delivery. Article A supplies an observational association between stronger policy-process integration and smaller burden-capacity gaps; Article B develops procedure, expertise and fear mechanisms through a research-informed essay. Students should preserve those positive contributions while testing their local application. Several Riverbend priorities can be defensible. The final unfamiliar task asks whether students can locate different unfinished work, distinguish authority from expertise and specify a feasible protected test without being handed its explanation.

Prepare the assignment

Use the simplified explanations inside the activity during class. The primary articles and further reading are optional for students. Give students time to read, ask questions and return to a passage while answering. Keep the primary sources available for your own checks.

Read the current teacher key and six-criterion rubric. Review the D1, A1 and A2 selection rules, unknown stock entries/exits, Riverbend packages and water cost cards.

Choose the class requirements in the existing instructor controls. Workspaces, written justifications, graph checks and note reuse are separate assignment decisions; tell students which are assigned.

Plan access to the student guide and readable exports, and create a separate Canvas submission instruction. Keep this instructor guide and worked answers outside the student packet.

No advance student reading is required. Use the simplified explanations inside the activity, with time for questions, analysis and saved continuation across sessions.

A first class session with in-app reading

This suggested first class session starts with the in-app explanations. No advance reading is required. It is a planning example, not a measured completion time; use further sessions for the rest of the inquiry.

Phase	Min	Teaching move
Opening question	5	Begin from the fictional notice and save a first idea. No advance reading is assumed.

Phase	Min	Teaching move
Learn from the explanations	15	Read the two in-app explanations together. Ask students to say in their own words what was compared, what was found and one limit. Use the vocabulary help.
First evidence inquiry	15	Write an explanation and alternative, predict a new observation, then inspect the next record. Return to the explanations when needed.
Discuss the analysis	10	Compare evidence and reasons in pairs or small groups. Resolve unclear instructions before evaluating the argument.
Save and plan continuation	5	Save progress and a backup. Continue remaining data, decision, new-case and final-record tasks in further sessions.

Continue the complete inquiry

Continue the full inquiry from the saved stopping point. Read explanations during the activity whenever needed. Keep the data, decision, new-case prediction and reasoned revision, allowing time for questions and discussion. No human student completion time has been measured.

Teaching moves

Ask 'What work remains, who can do it, and who can authorize it?' Require a task and dated path before a diagnosis. Equal staffing and a queue do not identify equal relevant capacity.

Require each quantity to carry its sample passport or flow unit. Invite students to write unknown terms in a stock identity instead of supplying an assumed starting backlog.

Give Article A's responsibility and feedback relationship one job and Article B's procedural, expertise or fear mechanism another. Ask which joint conclusion follows and which local link still needs evidence.

Make institutional protection observable. Ask who receives the warning, who controls factual publication, how nonretaliation is checked, what response is owed and which actor may lawfully refuse a resource request.

Keep comparison outcomes fixed across rival accounts and inspect actual exposure as well as assignment. Offer method questions without choosing the pilot; after revision, reread the current action beside its cost and stopping rule.

Respond to misconceptions

Arrivals minus decisions gives the exact backlog increase and the capacity gap.

The supplied flows are approximate. Unknown starting stock, reopenings, other exits and duplicate counting matter. Completed decisions measure throughput; relevant capability requires skill and task-time evidence.

The delayed-file sample and denied-file audit describe the same people.

D1 and A1 have different selection rules and dates; overlap is unknown. Their conditional rates describe separate groups. A2 is a third purposive interview group and cannot repair either missing population base.

The alternative to assistance is abolishing every review.

The actual P2 offer retains high-risk review, 20 independent-check hours and every appeal. Evaluate that offer's uncertain tradeoff and classification rule. A critique of wholesale abolition does not assess P2.

A protected channel or a timely ministry reply proves useful learning.

Separate assignment, candid use, receipt, unchanged publication, nonretaliation, response and subsequent authorized decisions. P5 records a lawful reasoned refusal; it supplies neither applicant outcomes nor complete protection follow-up.

A lower closed-case mean or an unrecorded priority reason proves a reform worked or proves favoritism.

Open cases and case mix can change the mean. A missing required reason is an accountability problem; independently checked risk, chronology and explanations may clarify it. They do not automatically establish motive or a treatment effect.

Debrief questions

Which specific observation supports your process, and which supports a competing priority?

What useful positive contribution does each source make to your decision?

Which person or file is outside your measure, and what follows from that exclusion?

What is the strongest case for the actual safeguarded option you left for later?

Which independently observable event would show that a protection is operating?

After the water record, why did you retain or revise the current action, and does its stopping rule still fit?

Assessment within six scoring homes

Score six criteria once each on a 0–3 scale, for a maximum of 18: Source contribution; Finding supported by the evidence; For the same result rival discrimination; Lawful feasible decision; Numerical interpretation and representation; Unfamiliar transfer and revision. Use 0 for missing or materially inaccurate reasoning, 1 for emerging work with an unsupported link, 2 for developed and mostly correct bounded reasoning, and 3 for convincing, specific evidence with a credible rival or limit. The detailed task descriptors guide feedback and add no extra score. Completed cells, correct options and valid totals establish structural completion, not semantic mastery. Political agreement, grammar, speed, help use and changing one's mind for its own sake are not criteria.

Source contribution

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Which specific design/responsibility link comes from Article A and which procedure/expertise/fear link comes from Article B? Does the learner preserve observational versus essay evidence and make a joint inference rather than repeat two summaries? Review here once; do not award extra points for the same source detail elsewhere. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Which specific design/responsibility link comes from Article A and which procedure/expertise/fear link comes from Article B? Does the learner preserve observational versus essay evidence and make a joint inference rather than repeat two summaries? Review here once; do not award extra points for the same source detail elsewhere. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Bounded positive finding

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Does the learner state an actual positive comparative association and the essay's substantive mechanism, with their scope, rather than only generic limitations? Which local implication survives those limits, without inventing an effect size? Assess the

warranted finding rather than political agreement. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Does the learner state an actual positive comparative association and the essay's substantive mechanism, with their scope, rather than only generic limitations? Which local implication survives those limits, without inventing an effect size? Assess the warranted finding rather than political agreement. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Same-outcome rival discrimination

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 For one record-specific outcome, would the proposed observation differ under the learner's process and credible rival? Is assignment/compliance/selection handled, and can both causes coexist? A generic call for another meeting, matching or risk adjustment is not an identified contrast. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 For one record-specific outcome, would the proposed observation differ under the learner's process and credible rival? Is assignment/compliance/selection handled, and can both causes coexist? A generic call for another meeting, matching or risk adjustment is not an identified contrast. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Lawful feasible decision

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Is one 120-hour Riverbend package defended against the strongest actual safeguarded deferred offer? Does the actor have authority, do rights operate in the comparison, and do receipt/use/unchanged publication/nonretaliation/response records make protection observable? A reasoned refusal may be lawful. Assess this institutional choice once, using overlapping legacy rubric labels only as feedback prompts. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Is one 120-hour Riverbend package defended against the strongest actual safeguarded deferred offer? Does the actor have authority, do rights operate in the comparison, and do receipt/use/unchanged publication/nonretaliation/response records make protection observable? A reasoned refusal may be lawful. Assess this institutional choice once, using

overlapping legacy rubric labels only as feedback prompts. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Numerical interpretation and representation

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Are D1/A1/A2 populations kept separate, weekly excess distinguished from unknown unresolved stock and skilled capacity, and Hillford chart bases/captions read correctly? Are the eligible-open, correct-denial, withdrawn and missing paths retained and coded without fabricated certainty? Review calculations and objects, not cautious vocabulary alone. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Are D1/A1/A2 populations kept separate, weekly excess distinguished from unknown unresolved stock and skilled capacity, and Hillford chart bases/captions read correctly? Are the eligible-open, correct-denial, withdrawn and missing paths retained and coded without fabricated certainty? Review calculations and objects, not cautious vocabulary alone. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Unfamiliar transfer and revision

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Do the new paths generate distinct district accounts, a primary same-outcome rival and justified retention/revision after W4? Are preparation/tasks/checks feasible in each 100-hour envelope, assignment/exposure/follow-up prespecified, truthful risk evidence retained and each current action paired with its own stopping rule? Review this once; a changed mind is not automatically better. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Do the new paths generate distinct district accounts, a primary same-outcome rival and justified retention/revision after W4? Are preparation/tasks/checks feasible in each 100-hour envelope, assignment/exposure/follow-up prespecified, truthful risk evidence retained and each current action paired with its own stopping rule? Review this once; a changed mind is not automatically better. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Worked data and case interpretation

Instructor reference. Keep these calculations and case interpretations separate from learner commitments until the corresponding work has been attempted. All local case data and added teaching examples are fictional; article findings retain their stated sources, units and uncertainty.

Approximate weekly flows

The supplied Riverbend figures give about $160 - 100 = 60$ applications per week of arrivals-decisions excess. A defensible identity is next unresolved stock = previous unresolved stock + genuinely new arrivals + reopenings – completed-case exits – other nonduplicated exits. Withdrawals, transfers and duplicate corrections depend on the counting convention. Exact stock growth of 60 would require no other net changes and consistent counting; the starting stock and a capacity-gap magnitude remain unknown.

D1 delayed-file population

In the 1 May sample of 60 still-delayed files, $36/60 = 60\%$ await regional review after a local decision and $24/60 = 40\%$ lack a required estimate. Completed files are excluded. These percentages locate stages within D1; they neither describe every applicant nor estimate how many cases a reform would release.

A1 denied-file audit and A2 interviews

In the separate 6 May audit, $12/60 = 20\%$ of locally denied files sent to review had wrongful denials corrected. The remaining 48 are not all verified correct. Neither $12/36$ nor pooling $36 + 12$ into one starting group is supported. A2's six renters and six owners are purposive interviews: documentation costs and lawful assistance matter, but no population prevalence or pilot effect follows.

Hillford starting-cohort graph

East records $48/60 = 80\%$ independently checked correct decisions by day 30; West records $72/120 = 60\%$. The observed difference is 20 percentage points. West's larger raw count is compatible with its lower rate. Every entrant remains in the denominator, including open, withdrawn and missing-follow-up paths. Assignment, difficulty balance and skilled-capacity data are absent, so the contrast is descriptive.

Riverbend package arithmetic and follow-up

Choose one full package: P1 uses 120 hours; P2 uses $100 + 20 = 120$; P3 uses $100 + 20 = 120$. Starts in weeks 3, 2 and 1 indicate feasibility, not effectiveness. P4 enrolls entrants over eight weeks and follows each for 56 days from individual entry, so the last entrant's follow-up extends beyond enrollment. Ten-day timeliness is a separately defined threshold. Existing processing, appeals and routine monitoring retain their stated baseline funding.

Difficult paths at day 56

E is confirmed eligible but still open: no correct completed decision or timely correct access is observed by day 56. I is confirmed ineligible and lawfully denied on day 4 with reasons and a usable appeal: a correct timely decision can count, subject to the independent check. W is an unresolved withdrawal with unknown entitlement; M has missing final follow-up. Retain all four in the starting denominator. Do not impute W or M correct, drop them or manufacture an average time to correct decision.

North's selected open files and cost offers

W1 places $21/25 = 84\%$ of North's currently open files at assay interpretation and $4/25 = 16\%$ at district signature. These are selected open files. N-Q costs $12 + (18 \times 4) + (4 \times 4) = 100$ hours. N-T costs $12 + (2 \times 20) + 20 + 16 + 12 = 100$, including both participants and instructor. N-P costs $12 + (6 \times 4) + (4 \times 6) + 20 + 20 = 100$. No task quantity guarantees a permit, a qualification or an improved outcome.

South's selected open files and cost offers

W2 places $17/25 = 68\%$ of South's currently open files at regional authorization and $8/25 = 32\%$ still needing laboratory work. S-R costs $12 + (17 \times 4) + (5 \times 4) = 100$ hours. S-P costs $12 + (12 \times 3) + (6 \times 4) + 16 + 12 = 100$. S-Q uses the same $12 + 72 + 16 = 100$ schedule as N-Q. Each district chooses one operative option; count every extra worker's time once and retain routine appeals and standards.

Later completed-case means

W4's reported mean falls from 18 to 12 days: 6 days lower, or $6/18 \approx 33.3\%$ below the earlier completed-case mean. The periods include different completed groups and omit twenty difficult open cases. This arithmetic describes the published means; it does not establish an all-applicant improvement, a pilot effect or pollutant compliance.

Review the workspace products

Keep the measurement populations separate

Check the dates and selection rules for D1, A1 and A2, correct within-sample fractions, unknown overlap and missing outside bases. Require a stock identity with unknown starting stock and all relevant entries/exits, an approximate weekly excess with assumptions, and a distinction between throughput, skilled capacity and applicant cost. A plausible caution without the actual calculation or counting account is incomplete.

Build a pilot memo before defending it

Inspect one actual 120-hour choice, its authorizer and implementer, distinct source contributions, meaningful supporting and complicating records, and the strongest safeguarded left for later offer. Require capacity, correct-delivery and applicant-experience measures; correct E/I/W/M coding; all entrants and equal individual follow-up; lawful assignment or stated observational assumptions; clustering, exposure and missingness. Review receipt, use, unchanged publication, nonretaliation and response separately. The current pilot needs a measurable protection rule with an authorized actor and deadline. Several priorities can earn equal credit.

Cost and test the current district pilots

For each district, require a single current action with preparation, operational quantities and independent protection labour at or below its separate 100-hour ceiling. Check all participants' hours and the cost-card assumptions; do not infer task success or training qualification. The primary claim and rival must predict different observations for the same outcome, starting group and follow-up. Examine baseline stages, skills, demand, assignment, actual exposure, clustering, correctness and pollutant compliance. After W4, a retained or revised action must carry its own operative stopping rule; a rule for a left for later shortcut cannot stand in for a reporting pilot's rule.

All seven evidence check keys

What does a funded promise establish?

Check comparison. Which claim is warranted by comparing the funded benefit, assigned work and administrative capacity?

Supported option A: Benefit money, posts and completed decisions measure different objects; inspect task time and relevant skills before interpreting the added work relative to capacity.

Funding pays lawful grants; relevant skills and work time make delivery possible. Unchanged posts do not establish unchanged expertise, and observed weekly decisions do not measure the whole potential capability.

Rationale to inspect: Use a Riverbend record and Article A's objects or scale to justify the chosen comparison; identify the specific conclusion that another option cannot make.

Invented Riverbend record. Article A: concepts, research design, and findings.

What did the essay test?

Check scope. Which use of article B respects what kind of evidence it provides?

Supported option D: Use its proposed mechanisms to guide local investigation while distinguishing cited studies from a new trial.

The essay supplies research-informed processes for local investigation. Its cited studies remain distinct from a new local experiment, and Riverbend evidence is needed to establish the operative links.

Article B: Introduction; Proceduralism; The New Model of Politicization; Conclusion.

A cleaner inspection dashboard?

Check transfer. Which recommendation applies the capacity argument without mistaking a metric for the goal?

Supported option A: Align monitoring work with relevant expertise and resources; compare full-starting group correct permit decisions and pollutant compliance alongside speed.

This connects assigned tasks to skills and measures the public goal. Excluding difficult files can lower a completed-case mean without improving correct permits or pollutant compliance.

Invented transfer case. Article A: sector differences; article B: procedures, goals, and expertise.

Which recommendation can you defend?

Check ruling. Which finding makes the best use of this evidence?

Supported option C: Prioritize a record-specific link, compare the strongest safeguarded alternative, and test full-starting group correct delivery with candid reporting protected.

This permits several justified first pilots. It weighs the actual alternative and evaluates protections and delivery without converting a queue, interview or source association into a local effect estimate.

Rationale to inspect: Use one supporting record and one complication to explain why the claim fits the actual safeguarded alternatives without establishing an effect size.

Invented agency records and audit. Article A: integration; article B: procedural tradeoffs and candid information.

Identify the conditional rates

Check data-read. Which interpretation uses both denominators correctly?

Supported option C: Among sampled delayed files, 60% awaited review; among separately sampled denied files, 20% had their wrongful denial corrected.

36/60 is 60% within the delayed sample; 12/60 is 20% within the separate denied sample. Neither is an all-applicant rate.

The display is a teaching exercise, not an estimate from either published paper.

Test a review redesign

Check data-infer. Which proposed pilot best tests whether redesigning regional review improves timely, correct access, rather than merely changing which cases appear on a speed dashboard?

Supported option B: Chance-assign comparable offices to current or targeted review; retain every entrant, independently check correct approvals and denials, and preserve appeals.

The comparison concerns assignment to a design, with applicants nested in offices. Retaining every entrant and independently checking correct decisions avoids delayed-only or payment-only selection. Open, withdrawn and missing paths still need fixed follow-up coding, and actual implementation must be measured.

Rationale to inspect: Name the assignment unit, retained denominator and one day-56 open, withdrawn or correct-denial coding issue before explanatory feedback.

The display is a teaching exercise, not an estimate from either published paper.

Choose a display with the right base

Check data-design. Which revision lets readers compare the observed correct-decision share while preserving the populations and uncertainty?

Supported option D: Plot correct decisions divided by each starting group; label day 30 and percent, retain exact counts and bases, and describe the observed shares.

East is $48/60=80\%$ and West is $72/120=60\%$ at the same follow-up. Counts, bases and units remain visible. The display establishes these observed shares; it does not identify the cause or skilled capacity.

Rationale to inspect: Before feedback, identify the two numerator/denominator pairs and explain the unit or caption error in one alternative.

Fictional new representation exercise; not a result from either paper.

Instructor controls and the 5907 panel

Open Instructor controls and enter 5907 for this activity. This opens the local workbench, including task keys and check answers. To manage online classes, connect the saving service and enter 5907 again in the server workbench. Canvas remains a separate login and assignment.

Set the default Class or Fun route and which routes are available. Assignment switches cover research notes, political decision, data, unfamiliar transfer, structured workspaces, written justifications, the representation check and optional frontier availability or requirement. Select full or core response guidance; choose unlimited retries or first recorded answers, and feedback after submission or on request. Method hints, unrelated worked examples, badges and deliberate note reuse can also be assigned.

Save and export the assignment settings, or import a compatible settings file and inspect the staged changes before saving. Learner preferences include reading size, high contrast, reduced motion, art visibility and guided responses. Settings, learner work and display preferences are separate records.

Review the six human criteria and task key separately from completion. Load the learner record or an explicitly submitted snapshot to record a score and evidence for each criterion; do not treat word floors, mechanical checks or supported factual choices as a semantic grade.

The private instructor recovery key is separate from 5907; use it to reopen your owned classes. Instructor sessions and class ownership remain isolated. The server workbench can save defaults, create owned classes, update assignment switches and view explicitly submitted snapshots. Private personal drafts are not silently turned into submissions. Keep local progress and settings backups as well.

Private drafts consent and submission

Online saving is optional. Connecting to a saving service does not upload or submit the device draft. Use Save online personal draft only when you want to create or update that personal copy; keep its private recovery key and your local JSON backup.

A personal online draft is not an instructor submission. To submit through a configured hosted class, find the class with its student submission code, review the destination, apply the assignment switches if requested, complete the Class record and save the

current version online. Tick the explicit consent box and use Submit this response snapshot.

Submission sends that version to the identified class. Later edits stay personal until you explicitly submit again. This hosted-class route is separate from the Canvas assignment and its upload confirmation.

Device backups and Canvas

Keep compatible progress JSON and settings backups. A readable TXT or PDF export supports review; the JSON preserves continued work. Saving in the player, saving a personal online draft and explicitly submitting to a hosted class are different actions. Canvas remains a separate assignment upload; verify its requested format and submission receipt.

Research sources

Xavier Fernández-i-Marín, Christoph Knill, Christina Steinbacher, and Yves Steinebach (2024). Bureaucratic Quality and the Gap between Implementation Burden and Administrative Capacities. *American Political Science Review*. 118(3): 1240–1260 · DOI 10.1017/S0003055423001090

[Complete primary text](#)

Donald P. Moynihan (2025). Rescuing state capacity: Proceduralism, the new politicization, and public policy. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 44(2): 364–378 · DOI 10.1002/pam.22673

[Complete primary text](#)