

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
School of Public Administration

PA 553, Fall 2013—Instructional Television—ITV—Professional Paper Capstone Course

Mario A. Rivera, Ph.D., and Uday Desai, Ph.D., Professors in the School of Public Administration

Class Meetings: Wednesdays, 7-9:15 p.m., Albuquerque Studio Classroom, Woodward Hall 149

Office locations: Social Sciences Building, #3007 (Dr. Rivera), #3016 (Dr. Desai)

Telephone contact numbers: Dr. Rivera 277-3560; Dr. Desai 277-3261; SPA Fax 277-2529

E-mail addresses: marivera@unm.edu & ucdesai@unm.edu; *webpage:* www.unm.edu/~marivera

Office hours: (Rivera) Fridays 3:45-6 p.m. and by appointment; appointments encouraged

Scope and Purpose of the Course:

This course is the first ever implementation of a classroom version of the MPA capstone, integrative assignment, the Professional Paper. It is intended to provide opportunities for all students enrolled to analyze case material and ancillary readings to produce cogent, incisive, and insightful professional-quality critiques of agency, community, policy, and leadership dilemmas and challenges actually faced by public servants in the public and nonprofit sectors, and in cross-sector collaborative management. The vehicle for this exploration, to be undertaken through substantial written assignments and, complementarily, class discussion and group work, will be four case studies specifically chosen by the instructors for the accomplishment of these aims.

In discussing three introductory cases and one more substantial, final case study, and in writing three short case analyses and one long case analysis corresponding to these, students will be integrating knowledge gleaned from their MPA course of study—particularly in the major subdisciplines of human resource management, public management, fiscal and budgetary administration, and accountable management (per courses like program evaluation and intergovernmental administrative problems). Students and instructors will draw from their practitioner and life experiences, as well. Finally, they will both draw broadly from the extensive public administration academic and applied literature in informing their analyses (verbal and written) of the cases assigned.

This course is unique in the nearly half-century-long history of the School of Public Administration (SPA), in at least three ways. *First*, it will serve as a pilot for the eventual institutionalization of a capstone ProPaper course in SPA, subject to its evaluation by the instructors and the rest of the SPA faculty, and informed by your evaluation, as well. Consequently, your views on the course's progress and success will be solicited in various ways, including *Opinio* mid-semester and end-of-semester surveys, along with the traditional IDEA online course evaluation. *Secondly*, your assessment of the course will not only serve this evaluative purpose but also inform the course's implementation in progress. Simply put, the instructors will ask you on an ongoing basis what is working well and less well, and what may be needed at present to improve the course, so that appropriate adjustments to the class may be made whenever possible. *Thirdly*, this is a team-taught course, which is rare in the SPA's experience, so designed in the hope that both instruction and student support (help with drafts, questions, and the like) will be sufficient to student needs.

The course, therefore, should break new ground for the School and for students in the future. To this end, it will build on close collaboration and consultation among students and instructors.

Functioning much like a seminar (despite high enrollment), the course is intended to help students find culmination in their MPA experience, developing and mastering their critical-analytical skills, consistent with *best practices* and core competencies required in the discipline. It also aims to strengthen their research, writing, verbal, and team-based skills in contexts of professional public service in public administration.

The competencies involved (which translate into course priorities) centrally include the following: (1) public ethics and accountability; (2) the ability to address the challenges of diversity, globalization, and inter-organizational and cross-sector collaboration; (3) the ability to consciously address institutional constraints and opportunities in the law, economy, and public policy; and (4) the ability to summon the information, methods, sensibilities, and commitments that are essential for efficacy in public service.

There is no required textbook for the course. Course materials, in particular case studies and readings, are posted to the UNM LEARN system. To access LEARN, students need to login to their My UNM accounts. From there, in the top right hand corner is an icon labeled “UNM Learn.” It is located next to the “logout” icon. Once you click on that, you are in LEARN. From there, you just need to click on the PADM 553 class under “My Courses” and then find the appropriate folder, labeled “Syllabus,” “Case Studies,” “Readings,” etc.

Important Accommodation Note:

Anyone requiring special accommodation or assistive technology is asked to advise Dr. Rivera within the first two weeks of class, so that reasonable accommodation may be provided. The School of Public Administration is committed to providing all necessary and feasible accommodation to students with disabilities so that they may fully participate in and contribute to their classes. Confidentiality will be maintained as indicated by the student’s circumstances.

Course Requirements—Sources of and criteria for the final evaluation of student coursework:

Unlike your regular MPA courses, this course is graded just as the Professional Paper one-on-one course, and as are theses and dissertations at UNM, as CR (credit). This evaluation criterion will be explained fully in class and in the final syllabus, along with all of the other evaluative criteria for the course.

The papers are expected, at minimum, to meet the standard of professional papers in practitioner contexts. The cases and all research and reading sources must be acknowledged and cited using the American Psychological Association (APA) citation style—this is the citation style required for School of Public Administration professional papers. A brief, free guide to APA citation may be accessed at the following URL: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01>. If the hyperlink does not work, cut and paste the URL to your web browser—this webpage, from Purdue University, is regularly updated).

Acknowledgement of sources is essential, in order to avoid plagiarism. *Plagiarism, defined as presenting someone else's work as one's own, may result in failure in the paper assignment and may also eventuate in failure in the course. If referred to the University Dean of Students, it may also eventuate in other disciplinary action including suspension or expulsion from the Public Administration program, or from the University. This is consistent with the University's student code of conduct as well as University and School of Public Administration policy.*

Important case analysis paper submission requirements: It is stressed that papers failing to meet all of the following submission requirements:

1. The papers must be submitted electronically in any version of Microsoft Word (Word), to marivera@unm.edu, and to ucdesai@unm.edu. Both instructors will review and evaluate all written assignments, first independently and then in consultation with each other.
2. Papers must be submitted to the instructors as attachments to an email with "553" in the subject line. Any papers submitted without the 553 identifier on the subject line may not be readily retrieved and may therefore not be evaluated in a timely way. Sample case summary/analyses, other sample papers, and other resources for presentations and papers are available on the class webpage and the UNM LEARN online blackboard system.

Paper revisions: Each of the four case analysis papers may be submitted once based on the instructors' comments on the first submission, as indicated in the reading and assignment schedule below. Each initial paper submittal is to be proofread, clean, and in final form—***it is not considered a draft***. The paper is to be a finished, proofed, version. It may be revised, rewritten, and resubmitted once (based on instructor comments on the first submission) by the dates provided in the final syllabus.

The very best written-analysis and verbal-presentation work is accurate, evidence-based, clear, and creative, and of well-sustained, consistently high quality. Expository and analytical quality for written work includes a well-organized paper or essay, paragraphs that correspond to separate topics and subtopics, cogent sentences with appropriate use of adjectives and adverbs, correct syntax, and other basic elements of grammatical, effective writing. Essential in this connection is concise, compelling, clear argumentation and analysis. Written work in every instance should draw on the case study under examination and the two course texts, as well as class lectures.

Correct grammar and spelling. Remember that the spell-checker function cannot distinguish, for instance, between *their*, *there*, and *they're*, or between *discrete* and *discreet*. Reread and edit your work (at least twice, preferably half a dozen times) before you hand it in. Your paper submission is ***not considered a draft***, even when submitted for comments and possible revision. It is to be a closely edited, corrected paper that is as well executed with reference to these criteria as you can make it. As indicated previously, papers with excessive spelling and grammar, and expository writing quality and clarity, problems, will be returned without further comment for revision.

Only consistently excellent written work for the final 'long' case analysis will warrant a designation of 'With Distinction' rather than 'Pass' for the final Report of Examination submitted for each student at the end of the semester. These designations are standard for theses and dissertations and

for the Professional Paper and similar capstone projects at UNM. Historically, only about one of ten or twelve Propapers at SPA has received the ‘With Distinction’ designation, which is therefore reserved for truly exceptional work. However, ‘Pass’ is sufficient for completion of the MPA and for graduation. These designations and expectations will be explained more fully to the class. It should be noted, however, that all four papers should exhibit excellent writing and analysis, and that consistently excellent work across the board will have a bearing on the final Pass or Pass-with-Distinction determination.

Requests for clarification or reconsideration of instructor evaluation of student work: Evaluation of student work is always done with care, rigor, and thoroughness, aiming for fairness and for an assessment that reflects the quality of a student’s work. Questions about the evaluation given in any given assignment must be raised in a timely manner, within one week of return of the assignment.

Any explanation of the criteria making for a specific evaluation of student work will be provided only in a one-on-one meeting of one or both of the instructors with the student—such discussions are privacy-protected and confidential and may only be carried out with the individual student involved. In order for a student to receive a ‘Pass With Distinction’ designation for work in this course, *both instructors and the third reader in the student’s ‘committee’ have to agree* it is warranted by the quality of that student’s work in the long case analysis but also in the shorter analyses submitted throughout the course.

“Safe Space” policy—some ground rules for a positive classroom environment and experience: We would all agree that classroom discourse must exhibit respect for all other persons, not only within the confines of the classroom but also in general. There can be no denigration of anyone (in relation to case materials or readings, videos, or any other point of reference), on account of race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, sexual orientation, religion, or political perspective. In short, there is to be real consideration in all our dealings and communications with one another.

Explicit statement of this policy is necessary to ensure that everyone feels comfortable and free to articulate ideas or viewpoints. Class discussion allows for disagreement, but comments have to be sustained by evidence, in particular evidence from class materials and readings, and not unsupported assertions of opinion, and never personal. Unnecessary interruption of others is also unacceptable. This includes carrying on conversations during class, checking cell phones or other electronic devices for messages, texting, and other distractions. *None of these problems is anticipated*, but they do come up on very rare occasion.

However unlikely, breaches of this policy may result in administrative and/or University sanctions, including administrative drop of a student from the course. The instructors will not be interrupting class to correct or call attention to these kinds of problems if they arise unless it is necessary for the continued conduct of the class. No other notification will be required for any of these options to be taken up by either or both of the instructors. Stated more positively, we all owe one another consideration and respect, and positive regard, so that everyone can benefit from class interaction and therefore produce their very best work in this final class.

Case Analysis Guidelines

Case studies in brief:

For purposes of this course, a case study is defined as a carefully structured and delineated narrative reconstruction of events that presents essential information on the operations of a governmental or nonprofit agency in the context of a public management problem. The focal agency (along with key agency actors) is often cast as working in concert with other organizations across sectors in addressing the management problem, challenge, or crisis involved. The focus of the narrative and of the case analysis may therefore be a set of collaborative agencies. It may also be an entire array of decisions and actions rather than a single decision point or issue (more often the case with business administration case studies).

Case analysis in brief:

Things to keep in mind when analyzing a case study:

- Read the case carefully and make notes as to any terms which are unfamiliar, or portions that seem unclear, or problems or issues which appear to be salient in the case
- Bring your questions and observations from your reading of the case to the next class meeting or to the UNM LEARN platform for everyone to consider; helpful suggestions may be forthcoming from the instructors or other students.
- The material you will require to carry out your case analysis, in particular the ‘short ones,’ is in your case study text, class readings, and class lectures—additional research is not required in most instances, though you may bring in apt outside material. Additionally, some cases lend themselves to updating with just a modicum of web-based, follow-on research.

After reading and thinking about the case, identify major administrative issues, decisional challenges, implementation obstacles, or other problems and challenges found in the case. Case writers generally (and specifically in all of our case study selections) tell their story in such a way as to highlight these analytical elements—that’s the reason the case is written in the first place.

It is not always necessary to offer a solution or solutions to the issues, obstacles, or problems posed in the case. In fact, it is seldom necessary to do so. What is important is to understand what happened and why it happened, to provide plausible reasons for the situations posed in the case, and to carry out corresponding critique and analysis. In analyzing these issues, obstacles, or problems remember to look below the surface and go beyond simply describing what happened in the case. In fact, only in the long case analysis is there room for picking up selective summary (retelling) of such issues in the case. You are best served by going as directly as possible to the analysis of the case. This is certainly so with the ‘short’ case analyses of 4-6 pages length. Again, the long case analysis may warrant selective incorporation of background and possibly also external (research) material.

If you think you have a solution or set of solutions to the issues, obstacles, or problems entailed in/by the case, be sure to carefully consider unexpected outcomes of your proffered solutions. Please

remember that many such concerns have no ideal solution; each potential solution has its own problems, costs, disadvantages, drawbacks, etc. What is most essential is that you provide a nuanced and incisive, critical analysis of what transpired in the case, as the case writer depicts it. To use a medical analogy, it is better for you to focus on diagnostics rather than prognosis, and it is seldom necessary to suggest a course of treatment for the ‘patient.’

You are being provided with several guides or sets of suggestions for carrying out a case analysis. Some are from business administration curricula or simply adapted to purposes, only partially overlapping with our own in this capstone course. What is essential for this course is how well you execute your critical written analysis. You will be carrying into your analytical effort everything from theoretical and conceptual frameworks (drawn from your readings, class lectures, discussion, and materials, the whole of your MPA experience) to your own professional experience and expertise. Insight is the key, along with clear communication of it on paper in incisive ways. So is compelling argumentation of whatever position(s) you take with respect to the case material.

Returning to case studies:

As already suggested, with our public management cases the problem or problems and issues to be scrutinized may obtain within a complex of linked (often networked/collaborative) organizations, among themselves or with other organizations, community advocacy groups, or overseers—the possibilities are many. While business administration case studies are often drawn around strategic analysis or the study of a single firm, in public administration they focus as readily on decisional, programmatic, and/or policy dilemmas that require a more holistic, integrative analysis and evaluation. With our case studies, there are a number of problematic issues at work in each instance, although there may also be one that is particularly salient (a decisional dilemma, for instance).

In this course, we will study cases that lend themselves to *integrative* analysis. That kind of analysis is a stated purpose of the Professional Paper capstone in the School of Public Administration. What this means is that the student/analyst may and should draw widely and deeply from coursework in the MPA course of studies in major functional specialization areas (such as Human Resources Management, Budgeting and Finance) as well as in generalist areas (such as Intergovernmental Administrative Problems, Program Evaluation, Comparative Public Administration, and Research Methods). Of course, each of you will summon analytical skills from the whole of your education and experience in bringing your best effort to the four case analysis papers.

The key determinant for any and all of the four case analysis writing assignments should be those elements of course coverage and of practitioner experience that can be logically brought to bear in a particular case study. Integrative analysis should come naturally, organically, with disciplinary sources (HRM, Budget and Finance, etc.) clearly identified or identifiable in some instances but not in others. Disciplinary integration should never be forced, but rather should be drawn naturally in the process of analysis. A particular case may prompt sourcing from one or another subdiscipline of public administration, though not likely all, while another case may elicit analysis that relies on different subdisciplines.

Some further pointers are as follows.

Delimited analysis:

For the three cases requiring short papers, you should limit yourself largely or solely to the information set out in the case. For the one case tied to a longer, end-of-semester paper, you can do outside research as necessary but should still rely principally on the material laid out in the case, along with any assigned readings that may complement your analysis. Do not make judgments on matters for which no information or data has been provided or secured in your outside research, depending on whether you are doing the short or long case analysis. Therefore, you should ask yourself, first and foremost, in each instance: What information is in the case that supports my critical observations, judgments, and conclusions?"

Looking for a leadership issues in case studies:

According to Fred David, in "How To Analyze a Case," the leadership kind of case study (common to our cases) . . . is one which presents information on the leadership style of the [organization's] executive officer[s]. David continues by saying that "[i]n these cases, specific information is usually provided on the actions . . . that may have [have been taken]." These focal points include, among many possibilities, directed change in organizational culture, in organizational structure (i.e., change management), in human resource management practices, information systems, and the like.

David suggests that "the student-analyst is required to show an understanding of the rationale for each [one of several] separate strategic policies and actions [undertaken]," and how these policy decisions and actions have contributed or failed to contribute to the resolution of the problem(s) or challenges at hand, and how these reflect on the leadership capabilities of the manager(s) depicted in the case. David adds the following:

Be patient and *read the case through once* in its entirety before taking notes and trying to make judgments about the material that is set out in the case. After you have done that, push yourself to come to an understanding of why the author wrote the case . . . Asking yourself a series of questions will also help. For example:

- Does the case present a problem or series of problems to be solved?
- Does the case present an overview of the role of the [agency head or manager(s)] in bringing about change?
- Does the case present a more generalized view of the scope and content of the [policy arena or programmatic context the organization] is in?

Once you have come to a reasonable conclusion here, you can more readily absorb the case material and then analyze and present it cogently.

Other general suggestions adapted from the Fred David Guide:

If critiquing the decisions and actions taken by public managers, do not assume that they were entirely inept or did not know what they were doing. Most public managers have a reasonable, cogent basis for their decisions, even if they did not attain the result as anticipated. Do exercise critical analysis, but not to the point of caricaturing the protagonists in the case (unless the case

writer has already caricatured them, which is unlikely). In other words, find constructive, incisive criticisms and articulate your arguments thoughtfully and thoroughly, marshalling evidence from the case, readings, and other sources to sustain your argumentation.

If the case analysis write-up is more general, with no particular or single problem to be solved, but rather a complex of issues to be addressed, provide a more comprehensive analysis of the case in its entirety. It may be, for instance, that public officials involved took technically-sustained decisions but failed to enlist community support, or they may have allowed “mission creep” to set in, or failed to think strategically, or any number of concerns. If so, look at the overall picture critically rather than try to unearth one overriding problem. All of the cases will be discussed in class, and part of the discussion should tease out whether or not a case is leadership-connected, problem-oriented, or more comprehensive in nature.

Returning to an adaptation of David’s guide and framework:

Given all of the foregoing, we should assume that there is no one right answer to a case analysis—just as there is seldom a single question posed by a case study. At best, there are answers or solutions (plural) that are *reasonable* given the information in the case. But these are only reasonable if there is information in the case that can be used to back up your conclusions. This means, parenthetically, that you need to do check your paper draft occasionally (all papers should go through numerous drafts before being finalized). Compare the facts as presented in the material in the case with your completed analysis. Do the facts support your conclusions? Are you certain that you have thoroughly covered the issues in the case on the basis of evidence in the case?

Consider that you can learn a lot from your peers if you discuss their work and yours with them as fully as possible in class—class will in part serve as a forum for sharing drafts of written work with fellow students, so as to elicit their suggestions and constructive critiques. In this class, the instructors will work with you to devise various means of systematically sharing your analyses of the four cases, including use of UNM LEARN as a forum. It would be instructive to all in the class to have you share your work in progress with one another. With over twenty five students enrolled, we could have six to seven students lead discussion of each of four cases and have you share drafts in progress of their analyses. This process would entail some verbal presentation of case material for the case you are assigned as well as circulation of draft papers to the rest of the class.

Limited information in cases:

The reality of most cases is that they contain a great deal of information that is not as easily analyzed and understood as one would like. However, most case studies also leave out information, more or less on purpose, and you may well be left wanting to know more about what occurred. Your own analysis may be similarly limited. Consulting with your colleagues in the class, informally in class discussion or even one-on-one or in group work, helps here. As David argues,

Any serious analyst brings his [or her] own background to the case study. If [s/he] is a finance person, [s/he will] look to the numbers first as a way of getting at the required case analysis [while an HR person will use that lens, etc.]... Since you are neither expected to, nor can you, in fact, know everything that you would like to know, getting into a work sessions with your peers can be a time-saving way of maximizing the learning process . . .

ONE RECOMMENDED FORMAT FOR CASE ANALYSIS PAPERS

<i>Sections (flexible)</i>	<i>Guidelines</i>
I. Abstract	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One to two paragraphs in length, on the cover page of the report along with the course number and your name 2. Briefly identify the major problems, challenges, or general or specific issues facing the manager/key players and/or organizations involved. 3. Briefly outline the major thrust of your analysis (a couple of sentences).
II. Characterization of Problems and/or Issue(s), Challenges, Constraints	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State the problems, issue, etc., facing the manager(s)/key person(s) and organizations involved; identify and link the symptoms and root causes of the problems or issues you have identified. 2. Differentiate short term from long term problems. Critique decisions and actions already taken, based on your own judgment as informed by the literature and course readings.
III. Causal Analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a more detailed analysis of the problems identified in brief at the beginning of the paper, 2. In the analysis, apply theories and models from the class readings or readings from courses you've taken in the MPA program, and if necessary outside research sources. 3. Support conclusions and /or assumptions with specific references to the case and to these readings and sources
IV. Decision Criteria and Alternative Solutions or Solution Paths	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the (operational, ethical, or whatever) criteria against which you evaluate alternative solutions (e.g., alternative decisions, changes in the course of implementation indicated in the case, alternative or additional criteria or options based on your judgment and on readings) Include one or two possible alternative solutions, providing more than one whenever possible. 2. Evaluate the pros and cons of each alternative against the criteria you have identified. If the case does not lend itself to problem/solution identification, offer a broader critique of the case.
V. Conclusion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final critique should address the problems and causes of problems identified in the previous sections. 2. The recommended plan of action (if any) might include contingency plans and/or consideration of possible ramifications of these (secondary and tertiary consequences, possible unintended consequences). 3. Using models and theories and analytical frameworks from this or previous MPA courses, justify your recommended course(s) of action (if any) or why you offered the critique you did of decisions/actions taken. 4. Provide a comprehensive concluding analysis if not a problem-oriented case requiring options but rather a case presenting broader set of issues and implications—whether it pertains to leadership qualities or managerial principles, that may be as complex or more complex than a problem-oriented case study.

Note on External Sources:

For the long case analysis in particular, consider identifying ten or so external sources (in addition to your present and past course readings and outside research). These should be referenced to back up your recommendations or to identify issues or to frame your analysis in the public administration and policy literature. This information would be ideally found in relatively recent journal articles and should reflect current public management thought or practice with respect to the issues identified.

Note on Spelling, Grammar, and Expository Quality of your Analysis:

Your case analysis should:

- Include the sections listed in the outline above, or a similar sequence and structure that makes sense for you and for the given case
- Be double spaced, and the pages should be numbered
- Have 1 inch margins – top, bottom, left and right
- Use 12 point font size and any version of MS Word. Do not submit a PDF file.
- Analysis is to be closely proofread, free of spelling, grammar, syntax, and expository quality and clarity errors
- Use APA citation style
- Present the executive summary on the first page of the assignment along with your name, course number and name (PADM 553, Professional Paper Capstone) and due date

Other submission requirements are specified elsewhere in this syllabus. All papers are to be electronically submitted (by email) as previously indicated.

Please consult sample case analytical papers prepared by students in previous classes. These are identified in the reading and assignment schedule that follows and are posted to UNM LEARN.

Short-paper case studies for the first half of the semester:

While the longer analysis case is yet to be selected, three cases have been chosen from a case source called The Electronic Hallway, for the short analytical papers previously described: “Ellen Schall and the Department of Juvenile Justice,” “[An] Ethics Case: What’s Really Going On?,” and “Preventing Drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge: The Gwich’in Tribes and their Role in the National Policy Debate.” Following are case descriptions adapted from the Hallway website:

Short case analysis case summaries:

1. *Ellen Schall and the Department of Juvenile Justice*

This case begins in January 1983, when Ellen Schall is appointed commissioner of New York City's Department of Juvenile Justice, an agency in upheaval. DJJ was established to detain seven- to fifteen-year-old youth between arrest and adjudication. Most are held in a 25 year old secure

detention facility called Spofford, a notoriously violent and dilapidated facility in the South Bronx. The case describes the situation as Schall walks into it. In addition to internal tensions and significant operational problems in every division, the agency has a history of bad press and feuds with City Hall. The department is also struggling with deep-seated racial and class tensions among employees, and with great confusion over its mission. The case ends with Schall planning to speak to a new group of juvenile counselors, trying to articulate her vision for the agency.

The case offers students the chance to diagnose the ills of the agency and to chart a strategic course of action. Among the topics for debate: How should Schall go about assembling an executive team? How should she address the confusion over agency mission? What should she do about racial tensions? How involved should she get with the fine-grained operational problems of her agency?

2. Ethics Case: What's Really Going On?

A public sector chief executive is faced with a dilemma: recommend the selection of a vendor based upon objective criteria and potentially lose her job, or revise her recommendation in response to an oblique request from one of her bosses that might actually have been a threat. The situation is further complicated by the fact that she gained information about the potential job threat through confidential channels. A central focus of the case is to determine which ethical guidelines should govern the choices that the administrator makes.

3. Preventing Drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge: The Gwich'in Tribes and their Role in the National Policy Debate: Rebirth of a Nation

Members of the Gwich'in Nation, which means *caribou people*, number only in the thousands. But they are united, even reborn in pursuing their steadfast goal: to prevent oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Refuge is their home and the calving grounds of the caribou, upon which the Gwich'in rely for food and a way of life. Over the course of fifteen years they have effectively organized themselves and built strategic alliances with environmental and human rights groups, young people, and others. Tribal spokesperson Sarah James describes how they have operationalized the following:

- Form a representative steering committee: Solidifying 15 tribes from U.S. and Canada was a crucial first step and is an ongoing organizing mechanism.
- Broaden the message: The Gwich'in have shaped a global human rights message, going beyond environmental protection.
- Form strategic alliances: Leaders have taken their message far beyond the Arctic Circle. They pursue alliances with a range of groups and individuals, at times despite criticism.
- Decrease tribal dependence on oil: Tribal leaders have evaluated their own practices and are building environmental sustainability in areas such as energy and waste disposal.

- Train young people to carry on the struggle: Education, mentoring and training of young Gwich'in tribal members and youth leaders are important to the ongoing strategy.

This leadership story—about collective, intergenerational leadership—offers an introduction to the Gwich'in Nation and their role in a formidable public policy struggle that continues to this day.

Reading and assignment schedule; by class # and date (subject to revision):

- 1 & 2—August 21 & August 28, 2013: **Introduction to the Course.** Discussion of the case method and of case analysis. Planning sessions for the course.

Three-week sequence on Case 1: Ellen Schall and the DJJ

3. 9/4: **Preparation for in-depth discussion of the Schall case. Lecture overview of case.** First-cut, general discussion of case material as presented in the lecture. Presentation of video background material, “Ellen Schall on Creating Leaders of Color in the Social Sector.” Discussion of assignment of readings and the first case analysis over the next two weeks, per the schedule that follows.
4. 9/11: **First full class discussion of the Schall case and supporting readings.** Read and discuss the case study, *Case 1: Ellen Schall and the DJJ*. Also read and discussed the following three *required* additional posted readings: *Notes on reflective practice*, by Ellen Schall; Ellen Schall, “Public-Sector Succession: A Strategic Approach to Sustaining Innovation,” *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Jan. - Feb., 1997), pp. 4-10; and *553 2013 How to Analyze a Case Study (Pathi).docx*
5. 9/18: **Final full class discussion of the Schall case and supporting readings.** Continue discussion of *Notes on reflective practice* and read/discuss “Public-Sector Succession: A Strategic Approach to Sustaining Innovation, both by Ellen Schall.”

Required additional readings—

553 2013 leading with ethics and values HKS.pdf,

553 2013 MORETOOLS HKS guide to management dilemmas_0.pdf

And a second case analysis guide entitled : *553 2013 An Approach to Case Analysis.docx*

Recommended readings (scan and read parts of interest): *ultimate_advocacy* (Schall and Vorsanger, 2001). Also recommended, *553 2013 policy and managerial mapping HKS.pdf* and *at least one of the following student case papers closely: 553 2013 Schall case summary and analysis example 1.doc, example 2.doc, and example 3.doc*

Two-week sequence on Case 2: Ethics Case: What's Really Going On?

6. 9/25: **First Discussion of the Ethics case and supporting readings.** Read and discuss posted case entitled *Ethics Case: What's Really Going On?* Also for class discussion: Are there parallels between the dilemmas faced protagonists of the Schall and Ethics cases?

Also read and discuss the following posted readings:

Required:

553 2013 *Big Questions in Administrative Ethics Cooper_Terry_L.pdf*

553 2013 *Accountability (internal and external) as expanding concept MulganR_02.pdf*

553 2013 *analyzingacasestudy-fanning-Notre Dame.pdf (third case analysis guide)*

Recommended:

“Public Service Ethics and Professionalism: A Primer for Public Officials,” Chapter 17 in the posted text 553 2013 *Bureaucracy and Administration*, Ali Farazmand (Ed.).

First submission of the Schall case analysis is due, electronically, by the beginning of class.

7. 10/2: **Final discussion of the Ethics case.** Continue discussion of case and of readings from the previous class. Also read and discuss:

Required: 553 3013 I Quit-Again (parallel business case)

553 3013 *Two dilemmas in dealing with work place bullies- Klein and Martin*

553 2013 *The Corporate Whistleblower’s Survival Guide-Excerpt*

553 2013 *Preparing_an_Effective_Case_Analysis.pdf (fourth analysis guide)*

Recommended (scan/read any two of the following):

553 2013 *Kernahan_post-bureaucratic organization and public administration values.pdf*

553 2013 *Accountability and Ethics Relationship Dubnick2003.pdf*

Read chapter/section in *Whistleblowing and Democratic Values*, edited by David Lewis & Wim Vandekerckhove—International Whistleblowing Research Network, 2011, “Preventing and Dealing with Retaliation Against Whistleblowers,” by Bjørkelo & Matthiesen pp. 127 ff.

553 2013 *COMPARING EXTRINSIC AND INTRINSIC PROCESSES OF WHISTLE-BLOWING: A MULTI-METHOD APPROACH—Dissertation by A. Kartikeya Vadera*

Two-week sequence on Case 3: Preventing Drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge The Gwich’in Tribes and their Role in the National Policy Debate

8. 10/9: **First Discussion of Case 3, Preventing Drilling case and supporting readings.**

Read and discuss the *Preventing Drilling* case. Also read and discuss:

Required: Endangered Species, Endangered Culture

The Debate Concerning Drilling in the ANWR.

Recommended:

Read at least one of the following—to draw parallels to Navajo cultural outlooks and ethos:

553 2013 *“LIFE COMES FROM IT”: NAVAJO JUSTICE CONCEPTS_Hon. Robert Yazzie*

553 2013 *The Navajo Concept of Wind- 2010—Flaming & Usselman*

553 2013 *DEVOLUTION AND THE NAVAJO NATION: STRATEGIES FOR LOCAL EMPOWERMENT IN THREE NAVAJO COMMUNITIES—2012 dissertation-Hale*

First submission of the Ethics case analysis is due, electronically, by the beginning of class.

9. 10/16: **Final Discussion of Case 3, Preventing Drilling case and supporting readings.**

Required: 553 2013 Indigenous Peoples' Interests and the Oil-Gas Industry

553 2013 Effects of Western Imposition and Climate Change upon the oyukon.pdf

Recommended—read one of these two articles:

553 2013 He is a Good Horse and We Love Him_Landscape of the Indian Removal Period

553 2013 Agency and Resilience: Teachings of Pikangikum First Nation Elders, NW Ontario

Recommended—read both of the following:

553 2013 Two Rivers_The Politics of Wild Salmon, Indigenous Rights and Sustainability

553 2013 GWICHIN Drilling Case Summary & Analysis Paper.docx

10. 10/23: **Review of short cases and supporting readings—drawing linkages and parallels.**

Review and discuss selected themes and readings from the short-case sequence.

Required readings (reflections on use of cases in policy analysis):

553 policy analysis and mixed case approaches jpae 03_16n04_FosterMcBethClemons.pdf

553 2013 Sandfort & Stone JPAE summer 2008 policy fields 012908 (3).doc

553 2013 networks in public administrating O'Toole97.pdf

Recommended (read one of the following):

Cross functional team in a National Laboratory_Evaluation Case Study.pdf (Rivera-Valdez)

rivera&rogers evaluating innovation in networks.pdf

First submission of the *Preventing Drilling* case analysis due electronically by beginning of class.

Revised submissions of Schall and/or Ethics case analyses due electronically by beginning of class.

In the classes remaining in the course, we will turn toward discussion and written analysis of the 'long' case study. Readings from the following list, and/or other readings, will be assigned depending on the case study that is selected.

Remaining case analysis submission deadlines:

1. Revised submission of the *Preventing Drilling* case will be due on Monday, November 4, by noon, electronically, by the beginning of class.
2. There will be no class meeting on Wednesday November 27 because of the Thanksgiving Holiday that begins Thursday, November 28.
3. Monday, November 18th is the due date for first submission of the long case analysis, electronically, by noon, to both instructors' email addresses. Monday December 2 is the due date for any revised submissions of the final case analysis, electronically, by noon, to both instructors' email addresses.

Earlier submissions of any of the case analysis papers is welcome.

Please note that *Report of Examination* forms for the Office of Graduate Studies by Drs. Rivera and Desai on or by Friday, December 13.

Analyzing a Case Study Strategically—One Template

Important Facts—Notes from close reading of the case

--

Statement(s) of Principal Problems, Issues Posed by Case

--

SWOT Analysis (Optional)

Strengths	Weaknesses
Opportunities	Threats

Objectives (what you'd want your *solution sets or critiques* to do for this organization and protagonist[s])

Alternative Solutions/critiques (for each problem identified)

List alternative solutions and/or critiques for each problem identified in the case

Conclusion/Recommendations

Reading options for the second half of the semester (actual assignments will depend on the selection made for the final case analysis):

- 553 2013 Denhardt_The Future of Public Administration*
- 553 2013 deliberative democracy and democratic deficits Nabatchi_ARPA.pdf*
- 553 2013 strategic management of accountability in nonprofits.pdf*
- 553 2013 bounded rationality lessons from public administration and policy.pdf*
- 553 2013 public vs private sector organizational values zeger.pdf*
- 553 2013 PAR Kelly - public admin accountability and the dilemma of unsatisfied customer.pdf*
- 553 2013 public service motivation Brewer2000.pdf*
- 553 2013 Ostrom Public Choice Approach-Overview PAR.pdf*
- 553 2013 designing public participation processes theory to practice PAR.pdf*
- 553 2013 PAR-citizen participation and trust.pdf*
- 553 2013 citizen perceptions politics and ethics JPART.pdf*
- 553 2013 Accenture public sector value model 2Annex-Younger.pdf*