

**GRAD-C3: Public Management**

Salvador Parrado

**1. General information**

Class time	Group C: Wednesday, 16-18h Group D: Wednesday, 18-20h Group E: Thursday, 10-12h
Course Format	This course is taught online via the platform Clickmeeting. Clickmeeting allows for interactive, participatory seminar style teaching. Classes will have a maximum of 23 students. The online lecture will also be recorded for later viewing.
Instructors	Salvador Parrado
Instructors' office	tba
Instructors' e-mail	<a href="mailto:sparrado@poli.uned.es">sparrado@poli.uned.es</a>
Assistant	Name: tba Email: <a href="mailto:adjunctsupport@hertie-school.org">adjunctsupport@hertie-school.org</a>
Instructor's Office Hours	<b>tba</b> , preferably per appointment to <a href="mailto:sparrado@poli.uned.es">sparrado@poli.uned.es</a>

Link to Module Handbook [MIA](#) and [MPP](#)Link to [Study, Examination and Admission Rules](#)Instructor Information:

Salvador Parrado teaches public management and comparative administrative systems at the Spanish Distance Learning University (UNED) in Madrid and is associate faculty at Hertie since 2009. He has written several reports alone or in co-authorship for international organizations like OECD, SIGMA, UNDP, World Bank, IABD, CEMR and various national governments like Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Mexico, Norway, and Spain on different topics related to citizen empowerment. At present, he is associate editor of the Journal Public Administration ([goo.gl/uOUUn6C](http://goo.gl/uOUUn6C)) and director of Governance International ([www.govint.org](http://www.govint.org)).

**2. Course Contents and Learning Objectives**Course contents:

Public policy making relies on organisations. In principle, different roles are assigned to different organizations. On the one hand, ministries and central agencies *make* the policies by drafting bills, negotiating with interest groups or designing regulations. On the other hand, public agencies, private sector organisations and NGOs deliver public services and implement public policies (i.e. schools, hospitals, social services). This course is about the design and operation of these organisations that matter for public policy. The course introduces concepts that:

- Help students understand how these organisations shape the design and implementation of public policies and how they can, in turn, be 'governed'
- Engage with controversies regarding the design and operation of public organisations – such as the advantages and disadvantages of using market-type mechanisms to govern public services.

#### Main learning objectives:

The major aim of this course is to equip students with an analytical 'tool-kit' that allows them to engage in real-world organisations' public management problems. Critical thinking about solutions offered in public and policy debates related to public management issues will be encouraged. By the end of this course, students should be able to:

- Apply academic debates and literature to real-world public management problems
- Reflect on contested issues – i.e. design solutions to such problems, and
- Develop approaches to address such problems, in particular, using systematic analysis.

#### Target group:

1<sup>st</sup> year MPP Students

#### Teaching style:

The course is taught in a participatory manner. It includes the discussion of some controversial concepts that are relevant to the topic and a presentation of the instructor of the main ideas of the session. Typically, the second part of each class is devoted to class exercise in which the practical readings of the session are applied.

#### Prerequisites:

There are not specific prerequisites for this course.

#### Diversity Statement:

Given the broad experience of the instructor working with governments of different parts of the world, his examples include experiences from Latin American, Asian and Eastern European countries. Moreover, examples from countries with different majoritarian religions are included.

### **3. Grading and Assignments**

#### Composition of Final Grade:

<b>Exam</b>	Deadline: Mid-term exam week, (19-23 October). Concrete date to be announced		30%
<b>Assignment 2: Memo</b>	Deadline: November, 6 <sup>th</sup> , 23h55	Submit via Moodle Memo instructions to be uploaded on Nov, 4 <sup>th</sup> 8:00 AM	30%
<b>Assignment 3: Group Project</b>	Deadline: For group projects to be delivered on week 11, Nov. 22, 23:55.	Submit via Moodle	30%

	For group projects to be delivered on week 12, November 29, 23:55		
<b>Participation grade</b>	Quiz for sessions 9.	Submit via Moodle during the class	10%

### Assignment Details

These assignments are outlined below. More detailed description, as well as grading criteria, will be posted on Moodle or distributed in class on the dates indicated in the next section.

1. Mid-term Exam (open-book take-home exam) (30%)
  - Purpose: To ensure that students master the main approaches and themes that are addressed in the sessions.
  - Duration: 2 hours in the online platform.
  - Coverage: The topics of the first six sessions
  - Structure of the exam:
    - Part 1: (60% of the exam grade) It consists of short-answer questions. The questions relate to one or several real-life situations for which the student needs to apply and reflect on the contents of the course.
    - Part 2: (40%) Answer to essay question(s).
2. Memo ("take-home assignment") (30%)
  - Purpose: To support the students in applying in practice the knowledge acquired from the readings.
  - Description: The memo assignment will be pitched as a review/comment on a real-world report, paper or web presentation of an existing organisation or a newspaper article. The scenario will ask students to relate the provided text to the state of the art in public management research on issues related to sessions 6, 7 and 8 of the course.
  - Extension: 1,200 word
  - Timeline: To be written over three working days.
3. Group Project (30%)
  - Purpose: To encourage the students to find managerial solutions to real problems in a collaborative way.
  - Description: Students will choose one of the topics below. The instructor will compose groups based on students' stated preferences of the topic. The five topic areas are:
    - **Education** (schools, childcare, higher education)
    - **Enforcement authorities** (tax offices, food safety and environmental agencies, police forces)
    - **Social services and health care**
    - **Urban transport and infrastructure**
    - **International Organisations** (aid organisations, intergovernmental organisations)
  - Once established, groups will narrow down their topic in terms of subject and regional area. Based on the analysis of a particular case, students are encouraged to draft recommendations to improve the current situation by using tools taught in the course or elsewhere.

- Deliverables:
  - A set of slides in PowerPoint to be used for the presentation and distributed among all colleagues of the class
  - A policy brief (max. 1,500 words) summarising the problem to be solved and its solution.
  - An oral presentation in the final two sessions.
- Evaluation: The group project will be jointly evaluated. All students will receive the same grade. In the event of 'free-riding', a joint evaluation procedure will be established. As a result of this procedure, grades might be individually applied.

#### 4. Class participation (10%)

- Purpose: To encourage the ability to present/defend ideas in oral or in written format to the class.
- Description: The grading of class participation will be based on students' active engagement in course discussions, with special attention paid to the understanding of the compulsory course literature (such as main concepts, trade-offs, and key empirical findings) and a critical reflection of that literature.
- Caveat: The discussion in class will be adapted to the nature of the teaching model (face-to-face or online).
- Participation instruments:
  - Participation in the discussion of the main topics in the interactive sessions (either orally or in the chat of the online platform or any other forum selected by the instructor). Participation in the sessions devoted to the project presentations will be also assessed.
  - Fulfilling one short quiz in class on each one of the sessions 8 to 10.

**Late submission of assignments:** For each day the assignment is turned in late, the grade will be reduced by 10% (e.g. submission two days after the deadline would result in 20% grade deduction).

**Attendance:** Students are expected to be present and prepared for every class session. Active participation during lectures and seminar discussions is essential. If unavoidable circumstances arise which prevent attendance or preparation, the instructor should be advised by email with as much advance notice as possible. Please note that students cannot miss more than two out of 12 course sessions. For further information please consult the [Examination Rules](#) §10.

**Academic Integrity:** The Hertie School is committed to the standards of good academic and ethical conduct. Any violation of these standards shall be subject to disciplinary action. Plagiarism, deceitful actions as well as free-riding in group work are not tolerated. See [Examination Rules](#) §16.

**Compensation for Disadvantages:** If a student furnishes evidence that he or she is not able to take an examination as required in whole or in part due to disability or permanent illness, the Examination Committee may upon written request approve learning accommodation(s). In this respect, the submission of adequate certificates may be required. See [Examination Rules](#) §14.

**Extenuating circumstances:** An extension can be granted due to extenuating circumstances (i.e., for reasons like illness, personal loss or hardship, or caring duties). In such cases, please contact the course instructors and the Examination Office *in advance* of the deadline.

#### 4. General Readings

None

#### 5. Session Overview

Session	Session Date	Session Title
1	09/10.09.2020	Introduction: Four Approaches to Public Management
2	16/17.09.2020	Coordination and Turf (Designing Policies I)
3	23/24.09.2020	Tools, Rules & Nudges (Designing Policies II)
4	30.09/01.10.2020	Making Policies Stick: Implementation & Enforcement
5	07/08.10.2020	How to Assess Public Services: Goals and Trade-Offs
6	15/16.10.2020	Performance Management
Mid-term Exam Week: 19.10 - 23.10.2020 – no class		
7	28/29.10.2020	Voice and Choice
8	04/05.11.2020	Politicians and Bureaucrats
9	11/12.11.2020	Financing and Budgeting
10	18/19.11.2020	Organisational Design
11	25/26.11.2020	Student Presentations and Evaluation
12	02/03.12.2020	Student Presentations and Evaluation
Final Exam Week: 14.12 - 18.12.2020 – no class		

#### 6. Course Sessions and Readings

All readings will be accessible on the Moodle course site before the semester starts. In the case that there is a change in readings, students will be notified by email.

Required readings are to be read and analysed thoroughly. Optional readings are intended to broaden your knowledge in the respective area and it is highly recommended to skim them at least.

### Session 1: Introduction: Four Approaches to Public Management

<b>Learning Objective</b>	To understand the underlying assumptions of different management approaches
<b>Required Readings</b>	<i>(suggested order of reading)</i> Hood, C. (1998) <u>The Art of the State. Culture, Rhetoric, and Public Management</u> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, chapters 1 and 2. Lodge, M. and Wegrich, K. (2012) <u>Managing Regulation: Regulatory Analysis, Politics and Policy</u> . Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, Introductory Chapter.
<b>Optional Readings</b>	Hood, C. (1998) <u>The Art of the State: Culture, Rhetoric, and Public Management</u> . Oxford: OUP. Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7 (These chapters are not uploaded on Moodle. There are copies of the book in the reserve collection for this course and also among the general library books.)

### Session 2: Coordination and Turf (Designing Policies I)

	To discuss why the development of coherent policies is inherently problematic when issues cut across organisational boundaries (i.e. involving various ministerial departments).
<b>Required Readings</b>	<i>(suggested order of reading)</i> Wilson, J.Q. (1989) <u>Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It</u> . New York: Basic Books, Chapter 10: 'Turf'. Hustedt, T. & Danken, T. (2017). Institutional logics in inter-departmental coordination: Why actors agree on a joint coordination output. In: <u>Public Administration</u> 95 (3): 730-743. Wegrich, K. and V. Stimac (2014) 'Coordination capacity', M. Lodge and K. Wegrich (eds.) (2014) <u>Governance Report 2014</u> . Oxford, Oxford University Press, ch. 3.
<b>Optional Readings</b>	Scharpf, F.W. (1994) 'Games Real Actors Could Play. Positive and Negative Coordination in embedded Negotiations', <u>Journal of Theoretical Politics</u> , 6 (1): 27-53. Busuioc, E. (2015) 'Friend or Foe? Inter-agency Cooperation, Organizational Reputation, and Turf' <u>Public Administration</u> 94 (1): 40-56

### Session 3: Tools, Rules & Nudges (Designing Policies II)

<b>Learning Objective</b>	To explore the range of policy instruments ('tools') available to policy makers; to analyse the use of rules as devices to steer behaviour; to consider 'nudges' as alternatives to prescriptive regulation and incentives.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<i>(suggested order of reading)</i>

	<p>Peters, G. (2018) <u>Policy Problems and Policy Design</u>. (Edward Elgar) Chapter 4.</p> <p>Lodge, M. and Wegrich, K. (2012) <u>Managing Regulation</u>. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, (Chapter 3).</p> <p>Baldwin, R. (2014). From regulation to behaviour change: Giving nudge the third degree. <u>The Modern Law Review</u>, 77(6), 831-857.</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	<p>Braithwaite, J. (2002) 'Rules and Principles: A Theory of Legal Certainty', <u>Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy</u>, 27: 47-82.</p> <p>Baldwin, R. (1990) 'Why Rules Don't Work'. <u>Modern Law Review</u>, 53(3): 321-337.</p>

#### Session 4: Making Policies Stick: Implementation & Enforcement

<b>Learning Objective</b>	To consider factors that influence compliance with rules as well as the difficulties of implementing public policies.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<p><i>(suggested order of reading)</i></p> <p>Lodge, M. and Wegrich, K. (2012) <u>Managing Regulation</u>. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, (Chapter 4).</p> <p>Gofen, A., Blomqvist, P., Needham, C. E., Warren, K., &amp; Winblad, U. (2019). Negotiated compliance at the street level: Personalizing immunization in England, Israel and Sweden. <i>Public Administration</i>, 97(1), 195-209.</p> <p>Holland, A. C. (2016). Forbearance. <i>American Political Science Review</i>, 110(2), 232-246.</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	<p>Various papers on compliance with Covid-19 social distancing rules in different countries:</p> <p>Reinders Folmer, C., Kuiper, M. E., Olthuis, E., Kooistra, E. B., de Bruijn, A. L., Brownlee, M., ... &amp; van Rooij, B. (2020). Compliance in the 1.5 Meter Society: Longitudinal Analysis of Citizens' Adherence to COVID-19 Mitigation Measures in a Representative Sample in the Netherlands in Early April, Early May, and Late May. <i>Early May, and Late May</i> (June 11, 2020).</p> <p>Van Rooij, B., de Bruijn, A. L., Reinders Folmer, C., Kooistra, E., Kuiper, M. E., Brownlee, M., ... &amp; Fine, A. (2020). Compliance with covid-19 mitigation measures in the united states. <i>Available at SSRN 3582626</i>.</p> <p>Kooistra, E. B., Reinders Folmer, C., Kuiper, M. E., Olthuis, E., Brownlee, M., Fine, A., &amp; van Rooij, B. (2020). Mitigating covid-19 in a nationally representative uk sample: Personal abilities and obligation to obey the law shape compliance with mitigation measures. <i>Available at SSRN 3598221</i>.</p> <p>Ayres, I. and Braithwaite, J. (1992) <u>Responsive Regulation: Transcending the Deregulation Debate</u>. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (Chapter 2).</p>

## Session 5: How to Assess Public Services: Goals and Trade-Offs

<b>Learning Objective</b>	To gain familiarity with the mechanisms of governing public services and criteria for assessing their quality.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<p>(suggested order of reading)</p> <p>Le Grand, J. (2007) <u>The other Invisible Hand: Delivering Public Services through Choice and Competition</u>, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press (Chapter 1, up to page 22).</p> <p>Bovens, M. (2005) 'Public Accountability', in: Ewan Ferlie, E., Laurence E. Lynn Jr., L. E. Jr. and Christopher Pollit, C. (eds) <u>The Oxford Handbook of Public Management</u>, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 182-208.</p> <p>Stone, D. (2012). <u>Policy paradox: The art of political decision making</u>, revised edition. London and New York, NY: WW Norton and Company, Ch. 2.</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	<p>Schillemans, T. and M. Busuioc (2015) 'Predicting Public Sector Accountability: From Agency Drift to Forum Drift', <u>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</u>, 25(1): 191–215. doi: 10.1093/jopart/muu024</p> <p>Overman, S., Schillemans, T., &amp; Grimmeliikhuijsen, S. (2020). A validated measurement for felt relational accountability in the public sector: gauging the account holder's legitimacy and expertise. <u>Public Management Review</u>, 1-20.</p> <p>Peeters, R., Gofen, A., Meza Canales, O. D., &amp; Boin, A. Gaming the System: Responses to Dissatisfaction with Public Services Beyond Exit and Voice. <u>Public Administration</u>.</p>

## Session 6: Performance Management

<b>Learning Objective</b>	To discuss the logic, and the limits of performance management as a tool to govern public services.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<p>(suggested order of reading)</p> <p>Le Grand, J. (2007) <u>The other Invisible Hand: Delivering Public Services through Choice and Competition</u>. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, (Chapter 1, pp. 23-30).</p> <p>George, B., Baekgaard, M., Decramer, A., Audenaert, M., &amp; Goeminne, S. (2020). Institutional isomorphism, negativity bias and performance information use by politicians: A survey experiment. <u>Public Administration</u>, 98(1), 14-28.</p> <p>Boswell, C. (2018). <u>Manufacturing Political Trust</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Chapter 4: Monitoring Public Administration).</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	<p>Hood, C. (2006) 'Gaming in Targetworld: The Targets Approach to Managing British Public Services', <u>Public Administration Review</u>, 66(4): 515-521.</p> <p>Wilson, J.Q. (1989) <u>Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It</u>. New York: Free Press, (Chapter 9: 'Compliance').</p>



	Baekgaard, M., Christensen, J., Dahlmann, C. M., Mathiasen, A., & Petersen, N. B. G. (2019). The role of evidence in politics: Motivated reasoning and persuasion among politicians. <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> , 49(3), 1117-1140.
--	--

## Mid-term Exam Week

Session 7: Voice and Choice	
<b>Learning Objective</b>	To explore the direct participation of users in the production of public services and their choice between different service providers as two modes of governing public sector organizations.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<p>(suggested order of reading)</p> <p>Le Grand (2007) <i>The Other Invisible Hand: Delivering Public Services through Choice and Competition</i>, (Chapters 1 - section on 'Voice', 2, 3, &amp; the Afterword).</p> <p>Rahman, K. S., &amp; Gilman, H. R. (2019). <i>Civic Power: Rebuilding American Democracy in an Era of Crisis</i>. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	<p>Jilke, S., Van Dooren, W., &amp; Rys, S. (2018). Discrimination and administrative burden in public service markets: Does a public-private difference exist?. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i>, 28(3), 423-439.</p> <p>Tummers, L.G., Jilke, S.R. &amp; Van de Walle, S. (2013). Citizens in charge? Reviewing the background and value of introducing choice and competition in public services. In Y.K. Dwivedi, M.A. Shareef, S.K. Pandey &amp; V. Kumar (Eds.), <u>Public Administration Reformation: Market Demand from Public Organizations</u>. London: Routledge: 9-27.</p>

Session 8: Politicians, Bureaucrats	
<b>Learning Objective</b>	To grasp the relation between politicians and bureaucrats as a key element for understanding how ministerial bureaucracies function and the role of leadership in the public sector.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<p>(suggested order of reading)</p> <p>Hood, Ch. And M. Lodge (2006) <u>The Politics of Public Service Bargains</u>. Oxford, Oxford University Press, Ch. 1.</p> <p>Burns, J. P., Wei, L., &amp; Peters, B. G. (2013). Changing governance structures and the evolution of public service bargains in Hong Kong. <i>International Review of Administrative Sciences</i>, 79(1), 131-148.</p> <p>Fernandez, S., Koma, S., &amp; Lee, H. (2018). Establishing the link between representative bureaucracy and performance: The South African case. <i>Governance</i>, 31(3), 535-553.</p> <p>Hustedt, T., &amp; Salomonsen, H. H. (2014). Ensuring political responsiveness: politicization mechanisms in ministerial bureaucracies. <i>International Review of Administrative Sciences</i>, 80(4), 746-765.</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	Hood, Ch. and M. Lodge (2006) <u>The Politics of Public Service Bargains</u> . Oxford, Oxford University Press, ch. 2, 3, 4. (These chapters are not

	<p>uploaded on Moodle. There are copies of the book in the reserve collection for this course.)</p> <p>Christensen, J. (2019). Representative bureaucracy, international organizations and public service bargains. <i>Public Administration</i>.</p> <p>Wade-Olson, J. (2019). Race, staff, and punishment: Representative bureaucracy in American state prisons. <i>Administration &amp; Society</i>, 51(9), 1397-1424.</p>
--	---

### Session 9: Financing and Budgeting

<b>Learning Objective</b>	To discuss budgeting as a political process, in which a set of institutional actors (ministries, agencies) compete for limited resources.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<p>(suggested order of reading)</p> <p>Wildavsky, A. (1964) <u>The Politics of the Budgetary Process</u>. New York: Little Brown, (Chapter 1: Budgets, and Chapter 2: 'Calculations').</p> <p>Coe, C. K., &amp; Wiesel, D. L. (2001). Police budgeting: Winning strategies. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 61(6), 718-727</p> <p>Rubin, I. (2015). Past and future budget classics: A research agenda. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 75(1), 25-35.</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	<p>Ho, A. T. K. (2018). From performance budgeting to performance budget management: theory and practice. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 78(5), 748-758.</p> <p>Krause, P. (2012) 'Executive Politics and the Governance of Public Finance', in: Lodge, M. and Wegrich, K. (eds.) <u>Executive Politics in Times of Crisis</u>, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 136-156.</p> <p>Raudla, R. (2012) 'The Use of Performance Information in Budgetary Decision-Making by Legislators: is Estonia any different?', <u>Public Administration</u>, 90(4): 1000–1015.</p>

### Session 10: Organisational Design

<b>Learning Objective</b>	To discuss the rise and decline of a policy template for reforming organisational structure associated with the New Public Management and the Regulatory State.
<b>Required Readings</b>	<p>(suggested order of reading)</p> <p>Scott, W. R. (2008) <u>Institutions and Organizations. Ideas and Interests</u>. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage (Chapter3)</p> <p>Roberts, A. (2010) <u>The Logic of the Discipline. Global Capitalism and the Architecture of Government</u>. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (Chapters 1 and 4).</p>
<b>Optional Readings</b>	<p>Moe, T. (1995) 'The Politics of Structural Choice: Toward a Theory of Public Bureaucracy', in: O.E. Williamson (ed.), <u>Organization Theory: From Chester Barnard to the Present and Beyond</u>. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 116-153.</p> <p>Olsen, J. P. (2005) 'Maybe it is time to rediscover bureaucracy'. <u>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</u> 16 (1): 1–34.</p>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Pollitt, C. (2009) Pathologies of The Neo-liberal State: From Bureaucracy to Fragmentocracy? <u>Norsk Statsvitenskapelig Tidsskrift</u> 25(2): 160–182.</p> <p>Stevenson, W. B. (2001) 'Organization Design', in R. T. Golembiewski (ed.), <u>Handbook of organizational behaviour</u>. New York, Marcel Dekker, pp. 145-174.</p> |
|--|--|

#### **Session 11: Student Presentations and Evaluation**

#### **Session 12: Student Presentations and Evaluation**

#### **Final Exam Week**