

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
School of Public Administration

PUBAD 521— Summer 2017—*Institutional Development and Behavior: preliminary syllabus 2*
(subject to modification and revision, including grading criteria and reading/assignment schedule)

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

Office: SSCI. 3007. Reception number is 277-1092; direct 505-750-4314, email: marivera@unm.edu

Summer office hours: by appointment; appointments are encouraged

Scope and Purpose of the Course:

This course will provide an advanced introduction to organizational and leadership theories and practitioner frameworks in the public sector, based on disciplinary foundations of public policy and administration theory in business management, economics, political science, and the social and behavioral sciences generally. The course will focus on the decisional processes and leadership qualities needed to guide public, nonprofit, and cross-sector governance endeavors. It will address both *organizational behavior and change management*, from these varied perspectives. There will be major concern with (a) administrative and public ethics, and public service values; (b) institutional responsiveness, accountability, and efficacy; (c) the management of communications with internal and external stakeholders and publics; (d) strategic alignment in these same contexts; and (e) the co-creation of public value across organizational and sectoral boundaries, in relation to what has become a (or *the*) leading managerial model in public administration, *Public Value Management* (PVM).

The course will therefore approach the study of organizational behavior in an interdisciplinary manner, taking the view that societal purposes and collective-action projects are formed by decisions made in both public and private institutions, including nonprofit ones. As Charles Lindblom argues in *Politics and Markets*, “the greatest distinction between one government and another is the degree to which market replaces government or government replaces market.” While markets and economic rationality are now important drivers in government, the “marketization” of governance—e.g., in the privatization of public services—may adversely affect democratic accountability and effectiveness. The course will therefore be concerned with both the accountability and the efficacy of institutions, considered through the value-creation (PVM) model pioneered by Mark H. Moore of the Harvard Kennedy School.

In public, private, and not-for-profit contexts alike, there is reciprocal influence between (1) decisions and actions with public impact and (2) various institutional arrangements that provide for their implementation and accountable assessment. In studying the interaction of organizational structure and administrative behavior, the course will cover major management theories concerned with the demands of directed change, or change management. There will be heavy reliance in all of these contexts on case study and analysis, in other words on case analysis pedagogical methods.

The course aims to strengthen the research, expository writing, and verbal communication skills of students through group-based case presentation projects and papers. It specifically aims to assist students in mastering analytical tools for (1) assessing the functioning of organizations cross-sectorally; (2) defining and assessing organizational strategies, and (3) conducting decisional, organizational, policy, and programmatic assessments and evaluations. Finally, it aims to strengthen students' capacity to address the complex administrative and performance-accountability demands of public governance today, particularly the challenges involved in developing, deploying, sustaining, and evaluating cross-sectoral networks and collaborative relationships, for instance in public-private partnerships—sometimes characterized as challenges to *governmentality*.

Course Text: Mark H. Moore, *Creating Public Value* (Harvard University Press, 1997), ISBN-10: 0674175581// ISBN-13: 978-0674175587 (either paperback 1997 edition or hardback 1995 may be purchased—they are identical except for the binding). Available at the UNM Bookstore and also on the web, for example at Amazon.com, textbooks.com, or dealoz.com, and the publisher’s website.

All other course materials are to be available on UNM LEARN.

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. Please consult and make sure that you follow and meet the UNM Accessibility Resource Center documentation requirements for disabilities at <http://as2.unm.edu/students/current-students.html>

Title IX Compliance Note:

In an effort to meet obligations under Title IX, UNM faculty, Teaching Assistants, and Graduate Assistants are considered “responsible employees” by the Department of Education (see page 15—<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/qa-201404-title-ix.pdf>). This designation requires that any report of gender discrimination which includes sexual harassment, sexual misconduct and sexual violence made to a faculty member, TA, or GA must be reported to the Title IX Coordinator at the Office of Equal Opportunity (oeo.unm.edu). For more information on the campus policy regarding sexual misconduct, see: <https://policy.unm.edu/university-policies/2000/2740.html>

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 group-based case presentations*; and *general class participation*. The paper will count for 30 percent of the final grade, and the presentations will similarly count for 30 percent of the final grade. Case presentations are graded on an individual basis and 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. Consequently, final course grade is determined as follows:

1. The course paper counts for 30 percent of final grade;
2. each of two case presentations counts for 30 percent of final grade; and
3. contributions to ongoing class discussion through comments in class counts for 10 percent

As to the paper and presentation assignments, each of which count coequally at 30 percent, as just described, only the best two of three grades will be counted toward the final grade. That means, for instance, that a student receiving A grades for the two case presentations will not need to submit a paper for the class. Alternatively, a student receiving an A and a B in the two presentations may

wish to write and submit the paper as a potential way of raising their course grade (A and B grades in two presentations and an A in the paper would result in an A average on these assignments). One alternative to writing the paper for a third grade will be an additional, third case presentation, Minnesota Urban Partnership Agreement, to be scheduled either 7/17 & 7/19.

The written assignment is as follows:

(1) Written Assignment: One case summary and analysis paper of approximately 10 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. Sample excellent papers will be posted to UNM LEARN.

It is the student's choice as to which of the two cases s/he presented to summarize and analyze in the paper assignment. This paper assignment will be explained in detail in class, as will the grading framework. 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. Again, 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. Drafts may be submitted before the paper due dates—papers are due within two weeks of the corresponding case presentation in class.

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, which is defined as presenting someone else's work as one's own, will result in failure in the paper assignment and may also eventuate in failure in the course. If referred to the University Dean of Students, an instance of plagiarism 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 following URLs: <https://pathfinder.unm.edu/campus-policies/academic-dishonesty>; and <https://policy.unm.edu/regents-policies/section-4/4-8.html>

While case summary sections of papers may find some commonality among case 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 are to be submitted within two

weeks of a case presentation. 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 “521” in the subject line.** Any papers submitted without the 521 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 UNM LEARN page.

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 a week of the final class meeting will not provide enough time for revisions. 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. 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. Please note that the instructor will and need not notify a student of class-disruptive behavior in taking

remedial steps as noted in this policy—it is simply understood that civility in behavior and mutual respect are the norm for the class, in our mutual regard for one another..

“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 will 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 status, 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.

Incivility or rudeness of any kind is unacceptable. This includes carrying on conversations during class, checking cell phones or other electronic devices for messages, texting, and other distractions pertaining to electronic devices or any other conveyance. Any of these actions will result in a correspondingly low or failing grade in class participation for that day, which the instructor may take without taking the issue up with the student.

Serious breaches of this general “safe space” policy may result in administrative sanctions, 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. As already indicated, no other notification will be required for any of these sanction options. These problems very seldom occur, but when they do they can impact class experience adversely.

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. 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 reliably positive manner of contribution to the class.

An A+ is reserved for truly superb work sustained at an exceptionally high level of excellence; A is for (reflects) excellent work; A- is for 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.

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 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 a grade. When resubmitted, such a paper shall be considered late and graded as much as one grade lower in consequence.

Requests for grade clarification or reconsideration: Grade evaluation 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 grade received in any given assignment, or for the course as a final grade, must be raised in a timely manner, within one week of return of the assignment and (for the final grade) *within one week of the web-posting of the grade by the University Registrar*. Any explanation of a grade or grades will be provided only in a one-on-one meeting with the student—grade discussions are by privacy-protected and confidential and may only be carried out with the individual student involved. Requests for grade reconsideration, or protests of final grades, will, at Dr. Rivera's discretion, initiate a total reconsideration of the evaluation involved, so that *such a request could result in a grade being raised, lowered, or kept the same*.

This syllabus may be amended, augmented, or revised (for instance, with additional readings, revised class schedule, or modification of course requirements) even after web-posting as a final syllabus.

Reading and Assignment Schedule, by class meeting number and date:

#1, 6/5: Introduction to the course and to the administrative behavior subfield; review of course requirements. Planning case assignments based on the interests of students enrolled in the class.

#2, 6/7: Institutional and decisional dynamics. Initial discussion and PowerPoint lecture concerning Moore's Strategic Triangle value-added public management framework.

#3, 6/12: Introduction to Public Value Management. Read the following *required* readings, from the UNM LEARN Readings 1 folder titled "Opening readings on public value:" (1) 553 2013 Moore lecture notes; (2) Appraising public value--review of developing concept; (3) Mark H. Moore on public value (interview); and (4).Chapter 1 Bennington & Moore Public Value Theory &

Practice_2011. Also read (required, from the “Public Value and Ethical Frameworks” Readings 2 folder: Public value governance beyond traditional PA and NPM.

#4, 6/14: Who is a Public Manager, and what is their role? Read Moore Chapters 1-2 and discuss his “latchkey librarian” case. Continue discussion of Moore’s *Strategic Triangle* framework. Also read (required, from the Opening Readings folder):

1. Creating_Public_Value_Tightening_Connections with Policy Design.pdf
2. On Creating Public Value Moore & Khagram

#5, 6/19: Public Value Creation in Networks. *Group presentations, Moore chapter 3, DYS case, EPA case, plus the EPA and Ruckelshaus case material from the “Case studies supplementing Moore text cases” folder posted to UNM LEARN.* Also read (required, from the Opening Readings folder): Public value management--new narrative for networked governance, and (required, from the “Public Value and Ethical Frameworks” Readings 2 folder: Coping with Public Value Conflicts.

#6, 6/21: Leadership, organizational development and change: *Moore, chapter 3. Park Plaza case presentation, including the “Park Plaza A & B” extended case material (posted).* Read (required, from the “Public Value and Ethical Frameworks” Readings 2 folder: Justification in reconciling conflicting public values. Also read, from the UNM LEARN folder titled “Case studies supplementing Moore text cases,” the reading entitled Moore Creating Public Value through private-public partnerships.

#7, 6/26: Strategy and contingency in the public sector; managerial discretion and ethics; change and the identity and mission of organizations. *Moore, chapter 4-5, Swine Flu case.* Presentation and lecture by Dr. Rivera—no group presentation. Also read (required, from the “Public Value and Ethical Frameworks” Readings 2 folder): Geuijen-Moore-Creating Public Value in Global Wicked Problems. Also discuss the two decisionmaking addenda to this syllabus.

#8, 6/28: Managing conflict and consensus; reorganization and leadership. *Moore, chapter 6-7, HPD case. Group presentation.* Also read (required, from the “Public Value and Ethical Frameworks” Readings 2 folder:

1. riivari-lamsa-ethical culture *and* innovativeness
2. Role of Ethical Culture in Creating Public Value

Also read (required, from the Readings 3 folder: Public Value Creation, Assessment: Moore & Braga Police Performance_Measurement

Recommended reading, Readings 3 folder—Rivera Ward Framework for study of race & police violence.

There is no class on Monday, July 3rd, in observance of Independence Day weekend

#9, 7/5: Organizational intervention; organizational learning. *Moore, chapter 6-7, BHA case. Group presentation.* Also read (required, from the Readings 4 folder: Public Value Theoretical Frames: Multi-Actor Theory of Public Value Co-Creation.

#10, 7/10: Directed change in organizations and the creation of public value. Review and retrospective discussion of Moore's text and strategic triangle framework. Initial discussion and lecture overview of the Harvard Kennedy School case study "Ellen Schall and the Department of Juvenile Justice," from the UNM LEARN folder titled "Case studies supplementing Moore text cases." *Group presentation of the Ellen Schall case.*

#11, 7/12: Leadership, innovation and creative initiative. *Group presentation of the case study "Santa Clara Pueblo seeks ancestral lands,"* from the UNM LEARN folder titled "Case studies supplementing Moore text cases."

#12, 13, 7/17 & 7/19: Final group case presentation. Begin Course Review. Additional case presentation option, as a third assignment in place of the course paper, from the "Case studies supplementing Moore text cases" folder: Minnesota Urban Partnership Agreement Public Value Case Study. To be scheduled on one of these two nights.

#14, 7/24: Continue course review.

#15, 7/26: Conclude course review. Final class meeting.

#16, 7/31. No class meeting. Writing time extended with a deadline—final date for receipt of first-time paper submissions or paper revisions—of July 31st. ***All papers and paper revisions are due by 5 p.m. on Monday July 31st,*** via email (as explained in the body of the syllabus), to Dr. Rivera.

PA 521 Addendum 1: Cognitive and decisional syndromes and patterns found in organizations

in crisis. Adapted from Alan Dowty, "U.S. Decision-Making Under Stress: 1973," International Political Science Association, 1979, and Irving Janis and Leo Mann, *Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment* (New York: The Free Press, 1977).

Decisional conflict is likely to occur in crises--understood to mean situations involving high organizational and personal stakes, time pressures, and insufficient information. One form of decisional conflict, *value conflict*, occurs when there are irreconcilable or difficult-to-reconcile values at stake. Symptoms of *cognitive dissonance* in decisionmaking include defensive avoidance, premature closure, bolstering, and overcommitment to one option over others. Decisional conflict will remain high if no reconciling values or other resolution can be found. Research suggests that, depending on the case, crisis decisionmaking may be functional or dysfunctional. Janis & Mann and Dowty found, in their review of recurring findings in the literature, that *the greater the crisis,*

1. the greater the conceptual or mental rigidity on the part of decisionmakers, and the more closed to new information they become;
2. the greater the use of (often faulty) historical analogy;
3. the greater the felt need for information;
4. the more information that goes to the top of the organizational and decisional pyramid;
5. the greater the reliance on improvised channels of communication and information—the effective flow of information and effectiveness of communications may actually diminish;
6. the more active, but also more random and less productive the search for information;
7. the more frequent the consultation with persons outside the core decisionmaking unit, depending on the amount of time that is available to decisionmakers;
8. the greater the felt need for face-to-face proximity in making decisions;
9. the greater the likelihood of interpersonal and group conflict within decisionmaking units, particularly if the crisis extends significantly beyond expectations;
10. and the greater and more sustained the group conflict involved in reaching agreement or consensus, the more resistant a group becomes to rival analyses or conflicting information;
11. the more improvised--ad hoc--the organization of decisionmaking units becomes;
12. the more likely that decisionmaking will become unusually centralized;
13. the more likely that decisionmakers will become over-concerned with the immediate rather than medium- or long-term consequences of action;
14. the greater the search for alternatives and options, particularly if there is real consultation;
15. the more costly and time-intensive information search may become;
16. the greater small group pressures for consensus may become;
17. the likelier, with increasing value conflict, that there will be emotional loading of chosen options—choices often rationalized by such statements as "We've run out of options;"
18. the greater the *spontaneous regret* that may follow a decision, even before new information arises that calls the decision into question (similar to "buyer's remorse");
19. the greater the likelihood of *decisional bolstering*, as regret, continuing uncertainty, and confounding outcomes keep the decisional process stressful and full of conflict;
20. the greater the decisional focus, or *decisional vigilance* (Janis), resulting in the setting aside of customary decisional procedures or their selective incorporation into new decisional processes.

Addendum 2—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.