

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
School of Public Administration

PA 524—ITV, Summer 2013— Intergovernmental Administrative Problems

Dr. Mario A. Rivera, Regents' Professor of Public Administration

Office: Social Sciences Bldg. #3007; Tel. 277-3560; Fax 277-2529; e-mail marivera@unm.edu

Class webpage: www.unm.edu/~marivera

Summer office hours: By appointment. Dr. Rivera will be available in the ITV classroom for fifteen minutes after each class to answer questions from studio and distance students or set up appointments.

Scope and purpose of the course:

This course provides for the advanced and focused study of selected management topics associated with intergovernmental relations (IGR). IGR, often used synonymously with “federalism,” is concerned with how responsibility for addressing various policy issues is or should be assigned to different levels of government, and with how these distributions of coordinate or overlapping functions work out in practice, within the framework of American federalism.

The School of Public Administration (SPA) has played a key historical role in developing the IGR management literature, dating to the seminal work of Deil Wright while a visiting Hatch Professor with SPA in the eighties, when he wrote a 3rd edition of *Understanding Intergovernmental Relations*, one that helped launch development of collaborative, negotiation, and bargaining analysis in IGR.

After a brief consideration of the IGR framework in the United States, the class will turn to two defining areas of concern: (1) the logic of accountability in public management, in the context of intergovernmental and inter-organizational networks, and (2) the impact of the structure of American federalism on public policy and corresponding administrative challenges. In short, the class will focus on selected administrative and managerial challenges associated with federal, state, and local governments, nonprofits, and public-private partnerships, in intergovernmental and federalist contexts. The interlinked sets of “*Problems*” of central emphasis will therefore include ones relating to

1. new approaches to the study and practice of collaborative network management in IGR;
2. cross-sector networks;
3. substantive policy and program areas that range from healthcare to labor, education, the environment, public safety, disaster response, fiscal relations, and other policy areas; and
4. issues related to the intergovernmental relations of sovereign Native American peoples.

Required texts:

1. *For purchase:* O’Toole, Jr., Lawrence J., and Robert K. Christensen, *American Intergovernmental Relations: Foundations, Perspectives, & Issues*, 5th Edition, Sage/CQ Press, 2013, ISBN 978-1-4522-2629-3 (paperback).

2. *And, posted free to the class webpage:*

Agranoff, Robert, J. Edwin Benton, et. al, *Intergovernmental Relations in 2020: Theory and Practice*, A Symposium of the American Society for Public Administration, San Jose, California, 2010 (hereafter *IGR 2020*).

All other course readings and case studies are posted to the class webpage. The course will rely heavily on the use of teaching cases, with case studies posted on the class webpage.

Course Requirements—Sources of and criteria for the final course grade:

There are three main sources of evaluation in determining final course grade: a case summary and analysis paper based on one of two case studies for which the student has participated in class presentations; each of two case presentations; and general class participation. The paper will count for 40 percent of the final grade, and the presentations for 25 percent of the final grade each. Case presentations are the principal way in which class participation is organized in the class; however, ongoing contributions to class discussion are essential to the functioning of the class as a seminar. This latter form of participation, each individual student's contributions to class discussion through comments in class, will count for 10 percent of the final course grade.

In summary, the final course grade is determined as follows:

1. The course paper counts for 40 percent of final grade;
2. each of two case presentations counts for 25 percent of final grade; and
3. contributions to ongoing class discussion through comments in class counts for 10 percent

Case grade substitution provision: If it benefits the student's grade average, the better of two case presentation grades will be counted as the grade for both presentations. For instance, in the event that a student has a higher grade on one presentation than in the other presentation, such as an A and a B+, only the better of the two will count, and will be applied to both presentations—in this instance, an A will be assigned as the grade for each of the two presentations.

The written assignment is as follows:

(1) Written Assignment: One case summary and analysis paper of approximately 10-15 pages length (typed, double-spaced, in Times New Roman 12-size font). The paper will provide a selective summary and critical analysis of one of the two cases the student helped present.

It is the student's choice as to which of the two cases to summarize and analyze in the paper. This paper assignment will be explained in detail in class, and sample papers are posted to the class webpage. The paper must integrate (i.e., make consistent reference to) pertinent course readings. It is not to be a research paper, but rather an essay that builds explicitly on the case itself, germane course readings, and class lectures. If outside research or other material is incorporated in the paper, it must constitute no more than half of the paper. The paper must directly and explicitly address and integrate course readings and case material. Any paper submission (initial submissions or final versions) with excessive grammatical or other expository errors or problems will be returned without comments, without a grade, and counted late when resubmitted in acceptable form. "Excessive errors" is taken to mean four or five spelling or other grammatical or expository writing problems, in Dr. Rivera's judgment and at his discretion.

The paper is expected, at minimum, to meet the standard of professional papers in practitioner contexts. If outside research is incorporated in the paper, all 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 policy is consistent with the University of New Mexico Policy on Academic Dishonesty, which is available on the class webpage, as well as directly from the following URL: <http://pathfinder.unm.edu/policies.htm#academicdishonesty>

A case summary and analysis paper cannot have more than half of its material in common with the paper submitted any of the case presentation partners. While its case summary materials may find some commonality among presenters (though never in word-for-word writing), the analysis part of the paper (half or more of the paper) must be distinctly the individual student's preparing the assignment. Papers should be submitted within two weeks of a case presentation, although this is a flexible rather than absolute deadline. All papers and revisions must be submitted electronically no later than the beginning of the final class session. The provision for revising papers is explained below.

Important paper submission requirements: It is stressed that papers failing to meet all of the following submission requirements may not be opened or graded, and those papers submitted in some other way will not count as submitted on time. **The paper must be submitted electronically in any version of Microsoft Word (Word), to marivera@unm.edu, as attachments to an email with "524" in the subject line.** Any papers submitted without the 524 identifier on the subject line will not be readily retrieved and are therefore likely not to be evaluated. Sample case summary/analyses, other sample papers, and other resources for presentations and papers are available on the class webpage.

Paper revisions: The paper may be submitted once based on the instructor's comments on the first submission, as indicated in the reading and assignment schedule below. This first paper submittal is to be proofread, clean, and in final form—**it is not considered a draft**. The paper may be revised, rewritten, and resubmitted once (based on instructor comments on the first submission) by the final class period, for reconsideration of the grade. Papers submitted within less than two weeks of the final class meeting will not provide enough time for revisions, so all first submissions must be in no later than two weeks before the final class session, electronically as stipulated in the syllabus, in MS Word, to marivera@unm.edu. The paper revision option will be explained further in class.

In the event that a student is not satisfied with the grade outcome of a revised paper, she or he may submit a case summary and analysis of the other case she or he presented, or a literature review of the same length on a topic to be approved by Dr. Rivera. The grade for that alternative paper would replace that of the first if it improves the student's grade. All such compensating assignments must be discussed with and approved by Dr. Rivera.

(2) Case presentations—As already indicated, every student will participate in co-leading two case presentations with group partners. *The case presentation grade will be based on the quality of each individual's presentation of his/her part of the group case presentation—it is not a "group" grade.* Additionally, each group is to electronically submit its presentation materials (usually a PowerPoint

file) within a week of the presentation. Each section of the presentation presented by individual students should be tagged with the student-author's name.

(3) Class participation—General contribution to class discussion and to the quality of the class experience will also constitute this portion of the final grade, along with consideration of the quality of case presentations. *The entirety or totality of the student's participation and contribution will be weighed, therefore, in arriving at the class participation grade.* Consistent class attendance is presupposed for an excellent grade in class participation. Any more than three unexcused absences will result in a substantially lower class participation grade, and hence a lower course grade.

No one will receive an A grade (A+, A, or A-) without consistent attendance, consistent participation, and consistent, positive contribution to class discussion, in the way of quality presentations and readings-based general comments during class. In this context, it should be stressed that disruption of class discussion in any form is unacceptable, as detailed in the “Safe Space” policy that follows.

“Safe Space” policy—ground rules for a positive classroom environment and experience

All classroom discourse will 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 any context (including in relation to case materials or readings, videos, or any other point of reference), on account of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political perspective, or other personal trait.

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; however, comments must be sustained by evidence, in particular evidence from class materials and readings. Class comments are not to be unsupported assertions of opinion, and never any kind of personal slights.

Incivility or rudeness is unacceptable. This includes carrying on conversations during class, checking cell phones or other electronic devices for messages, texting, and other distractions. Any of these will result in a correspondingly low or failing grade in class participation for that day.

Depending on severity, breaches of this general “safe space” policy may result in a failing grade for class participation for the given class session, or even administrative sanction, including administrative drop of a student from the course, and/or referral to the University judicial system. There need be no other notice to students concerning this policy. As a rule, the instructor will not be interrupting class to correct or call attention to these kinds of behavior unless it is necessary for the continued conduct of the class. No other notification will be required for him to take any of these sanction options.

Preparing for case study discussion: It is up to each group presenting the given case what themes to develop most prominently. In every instance, cases are to be developed and presented in relation to assigned course readings. Every student is expected to read every case study, whether or not s/he is assigned to its presentation, as well as ancillary assigned readings, so as to inform his or her class comments on the case. *Readings-based comments in class are by far the likeliest to earn an A grade in general class participation.*

Additional remarks on grading policy: The provision for one revision of the course paper is intended to allow each student to maximize his or her control over the eventual grade, while

maintaining academic rigor. All work, including class discussion, is expected to be consistent with the nature of graduate professional study: original, supported by readings and evidence, and in general knowledge-based, incisive, and rigorous.

Plagiarism (presenting another's work as one's own) will result in failure for that assignment and, at the instructor's discretion, may also result in failure in the course and referral to the University Judicial system. The University code of conduct is available on the unmc.edu University webpage.

It is expected that students will also draw on their practitioner or other experience with organizations when pertinent. However, readings-based argumentation in papers and comments in class are the most reliable positive manner of contribution to the class.

An A+ is reserved for truly superb work; A is excellent work; A- is outstanding work, but not quite of the level of excellence of an A; B and B+ represent good, sound work and are still honor grades. Grades of B- and below mean that some portion of the basic, core concepts are missing, poorly understood, or poorly expressed in verbal or written articulation of ideas and analysis.

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.

Important Note: Anyone requiring special accommodation or assistive technology should advise Dr. Rivera within the first two weeks of class, so that reasonable accommodation may be provided.

Note: The syllabus is subject to modification as may be necessary, even after it is finalized.

Reading and Assignment Schedule, by class # and date:

1. Monday, June 3 & 2, Wednesday, June 5: Organizational sessions: **Introduction to the course and course requirements, and to the subfield of Intergovernmental Relations; case assignments**

3. Monday, June 10 & 4, Wednesday, June 12: **Intergovernmental networks and the IGR system.** Begin video documentary on Hurricane Katrina. Read, from the class webpage, available: www.unmc.edu/~marivera:
 1. "Administrative Strategies for a Networked World: Intergovernmental Relations in 2020," Christopher Koliba, Chapter 12 (pp. 363-391) in *IGR 2020*.
 2. Rivera & Rogers, "Evaluating Public Sector Innovation in Networks"

5. Monday, June 17, and 6, Wednesday, June 19: : **Disaster management: networked responses to intractable problems.** Conclude Katrina Videos. Read:
 1. "Managing Externalization: New Intergovernmental Role of Public Managers," Robert Agranoff, Chapter 3 (pp. 71-114) in *IGR 2020*.

2. “Disaster Response 2020: A Look into the Future,” William Lester, Chapter 4 (pp 115-145) in *IGR 2020*.
3. “The New Intergovernmental Role and the Necessity for Organizational Duality,” R. Leon Churchill, Jr., pp. 146-155 in *IGR 2020*.
4. Agranoff, “Understanding Networks ...”

7. Monday, June 24: **Network theory and federalism in contexts of disaster response.**

Presentation of **Case 1: Hurricane Katrina: A Man-Made Crisis?** Read:

1. Mener, ‘Analysis of Disaster Response in the U.S.’
2. Kettl, “Katrina and 9-11”

8. Wednesday, June 26: **Welfare Reform in the Context of Fiscal Federalism**

Presentation of **Case 2: Welfare Reform in Washington State.** Read: “The Rise of Social-Welfare Spending and the Exacerbation of Coercive Federalism,” John Kincaid, Chapter 2 (pp. 52-70) in *IGR 2020*.

9. Monday, July 1st: **Community Consultation in Environmental Remediation.**

Presentation of **Case 3: New Bedford Harbor.** Read:

1. Thomas, “Evaluating the Performance of Collaborative Environmental Governance”
2. O’Toole text: Part I, Conceptual and Theoretical Foundations, Chapters 1-4

Wednesday, July 3: No class

10. Monday, July 8: **State Experimentation, and Social Services; Legal Dimensions of Federalism**

Presentation of **Case 4: California Adoption Assistance Program.** Read:

1. “Finding Common Ground in Community Based Child Welfare: Qualitative Data on Los Angeles County’s Point of Engagement Initiative,” by McCroskey, et al., posted as “Network Evaluation.”
2. “Reframing the political and legal relationship between local governments and regional institutions,” David Miller and Raymond Cox, Chapter 11 (pp. 322-362) in *IGR 2020*.
3. O’Toole text: Part II, Legal Aspects of IGR, Chapters 5-8

11. Wednesday, July 10: **Collaboration in Networks; Politics of IGR in Cross-Sector Programs**

Presentation of **Case 5: Creating a Youth Services Collective in Savannah.** Read:

1. Walshe et al., “Evaluating Partnerships”
2. O’Toole text: Part III, Political Aspects of IGR, Chapters 11-13

12. Monday, July 15: **Fiscal Federalism; Waivers and Local Agency Discretion.**

Presentation of **Case 6: Integrating Housing and Social Services: Local Initiative versus Federal Mandate.** Read:

1. “Agency Forms and Reforms: Institutional Design for State-Centric Networks and Block Grant Administration,” Brian K. Collins, Chapter 6 (pp. 181-195) in *IGR 2020*.
2. “Performance Measurement and Accountability in the Intergovernmental System in 2020,” Beryl A. Radin, Chapter 5 (pp. 156-180) in *IGR 2020*.
3. O’Toole text: Part IV, Fiscal Aspects of IGR, Chapters 14-20, on the Political Economy of IGR

13. Wednesday, July 17: **Intergovernmental Challenges in Indian Country**

Presentation of **Case 7: Preventing Drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge: The Gwich'in Tribes and their Role in the National Policy Debate**

Read:

O'Toole text: Part V, Chapters 21-24: Administrative Aspects of Intergovernmental Relations. (From class webpage, required and recommended, respectively): *Endangered Species, Endangered Culture* and *The Debate Concerning Drilling in the ANWR*.

14. Monday, July 22: *Final review of cases and readings; closing discussions.* Read:

1. "State-City and State-County Fiscal Relations: A Look at the Past and Present Relations and a Glimpse at Different Relations in the Future," J. Edwin Benton, Chapter 1 (pp. 17-51) in IGR 2020.
2. O'Toole text: Chapters 25-28.

15. Wednesday, July 24: *Final review of cases and readings; closing discussions.* Read:

1. Bidjerano, "The Web and IGR"
2. O'Toole text: Chapters 29 & 30, and "American Intergovernmental Relations: Concluding Thoughts"
3. Other readings to be assigned.

Addendum—Overview of Decisionmaking and Decisional Analysis

Decisionmaking is the process of identifying and choosing from alternative courses of action in a manner appropriate to the demands of the situation. In public administration/management contexts, decisionmaking cannot be divorced from assessment of the impact of alternative courses of action on stakeholders and client groups, the public at large, and the public good.

Dealing with Complex Decisions—Singular Challenges:

1. *Multiple criteria.* The balancing of conflicting aims and interests is cognitively complex.
2. *Intangibles.* Intangibles such as public confidence and employee morale must be addressed.
3. *Risk and uncertainty.* The costs of poor decisions are high; decisionmakers' confidence is less the greater and more sustained the uncertainty.
4. *Long-term implications.* Decisions can have an unintended long-term impact.
5. *Interdisciplinary input.* Both time and complexity are increased by the need to consult technical specialists for some decisions.
6. *Time constraints:* In an era of accelerating change, the pace of decision making has quickened dramatically.
7. *Information volume and complexity:* Time pressures are coupled with vastly larger and more complex information challenges.
8. *Decision traps:* The decisional syndromes of cognitive conflict, group pressures toward concurrence, framing errors (such as faulty historical analogy), over-commitment, and the like—become more common the more constrained and critical the decision process.
9. *Dispersed or no accountability:* Greater reliance on group decisional processes and team-oriented management may broaden participation but make for a loss of personal accountability; personal accountability is essential when critical decisions are made.

The classic-rational sequence of problem analysis and decisionmaking can seldom be accomplished. It consists, ideally, of the following steps:

1. Analyzing the problem
2. Identifying corresponding decisional options
3. Projecting decisional outcomes
4. Rank-ordering options according to a decision rule or norm (e.g., cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit).
5. Choosing an alternative or alternatives based on rank ordering.

However, decisional constraints, cognitive limitations, and group and institutional pressures instead make for “satisficing” (Herbert Simon) or incremental decisionmaking (Charles Lindblom). Strategic decisionmaking is, in large part, a matter of taking into account not only cognitive constraints but also environmental or contextual ones for the organization.