Special APPAM Teaching Workshop:
Teaching Policy Analysis and Management in Cross-National Settings
Session A: "Are There Universals of Policy Analysis?@

Edited transcript of remarks prepared by Doug Besharov and Justus Myers at the University of Maryland/American Enterprise Institute and Erik Devereux at the APPAM office from a transcription of the session tape. Because some remarks were made at a distance from the tape recorder or without use of amplification, those that could not be discerned on the tape have been deleted. Certain remarks have been edited for clarity and flow in written format.

Citation: Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, "Workshop: Teaching Policy Analysis and Management in Cross National Settings," November 10, 2007, available at http://www.appam.org/conferences/workshops/pdf/APPAMworkshop_20071110_SessionA.pdf.

Chair: David Weimer, University of Wisconsin.

Opening Remarks: Douglas Besharov, University of Maryland; Sandra Archibald, University of Washington

Panelists: Sonja Wälti, Hertie School of Governance (Germany); Younguck Kang, KDI School of Public Policy and Management (South Korea); Peter Reuter, University of Maryland; Kent Weaver, Georgetown University.

Themes: *How do different cultures and political and social institutions affect the policy process, policy choices, and, hence, policy analysis? How is policy analysis used (or not used) in different countries? Are there a common set of skills that all policy analysts should possess? if so, what are they? Should they be taught in different ways depending on the national, cross-national, or multi-national setting? How can international cases and materials be used in core analytic classes, and how can they be used to create special value-added?*

Douglas Besharov: Schools that teach public policy around the world sometimes seem to have more in common than my school has with some of the other colleges and schools on my campus. And that goes beyond the fact that much of what happens in my school is in the English language, as is the case of many of your other schools, but also we often share the same curriculum, the same approach to cost-benefit analysis, the same materials. I=m embarrassed that there are only American materials [in much of our curriculum], but I think that is going to change very rapidly.

So our purpose here is to think about this more global world of public policy. I=m known for speaking directly about this. Look, there is a global competition for students. There is a global competition for faculty. We are in this all together, and the more we recognize that the students that one school has could have easily gone to another school, the more we recognize that we are in this together and that there are themes that emerge as a result.

The other thing I want to mention is, why we are doing this within the ambit of APPAM and what that means? APPAM is predominantly at this point a domestic U.S. association. The bulk

of our members like it that way just fine and we are not going to do anything that disturbs what the bulk of our members want to do. However, a substantial portion of our members including many of the institutional members—and Sandy will talk about that—recognize the globalization of public policy and want APPAM to provide its traditional role, its traditional services in this now global marketplace of public policy analysis and management. With that, Sandy.

Sandra Archibald: I, too, will be brief because Doug summarized our expectations and our goals very well. I just want to say that I feel like I=m a catalyst or a vessel for Jeff [Straussman] and Michael O=Hare, and Kent [Weaver], and Joe Cordes. We have been talking about these issues for 10 years and every time we get together, as Michael [O'Hare] said, there is a lot more people in the room than our core mission would indicate [should be there].

We have always been talking about what our syllabi looked like. What our curriculum looks like. What our needs look like. And Doug and I decided that we wanted to have this global perspective and so, if you see all of the panels that are talking about curricula, teaching in a global environment, looking at policy research needs, or a policy curriculum in a global environment have both international and domestic or they are cross-border, cross-national participation.

A lot of us are doing individual thingsCyou heard that from everybody [in the opening luncheon discussion]. There are some emerging collaborations going on. Many of us are being pushed very hard at the institutional level [to be more international/comparative].

We have demand not just from students to offer them a broader perspective on their skills and their craft and their knowledge. We have a lot of demand from our donors, both the state government and our private foundation donors, and we have a lot of demand from our institutions to make sure that we are addressing student trainings, student education, and research in a global environment. So we see that this is an opportunity to help us develop collaboration, cooperation, and frankly, to think about how this potential cooperation-competition-collaboration might affect our institutions, whether it is APPAM, NASPAA, or if we are going to be responding to this and providing some support.

So we are very much looking forward to this. The University of Washington is very international, and we have been international for 45 years, but we are struggling with many of the same things you are. What does it mean to globalize your curriculum? Does that mean you are really teaching your students a broad, outward looking skill set? Who could more address that than the panel?

So what we are really looking for is all of our information and our collaboration to take this next step in making sure that our students truly have a global perspective, and having skills that they need to deal with the world that they are facing.

David Weimer: As I have already mentioned, my name is Dave Weimer and I am with the University of Wisconsin-Madison. My task for this panel is to introduce our very interesting panelists and be the timekeeper.

So let me begin by introducing Sonja. Sonja Wälti is at both American University here in the United States and also the Hertie School of Governance in Germany. She is a particularly valuable person to have on this panel because she has done policy analysis in a number of countries: Switzerland, Canada, Germany, and Italy. And also, she has experience at the Hertie School, which to my understanding has a substantial number of non-German students. She has been on the front lines of teaching people from a variety of countries.

Our second panelist will be Younguck Kang from the KDI School of Public Policy and Management in Korea. He also has experienced doing research in a number of countries, particularly Korea and Japan, but also he was a student in the United States, and earned his Ph.D. here. So he has experience with our training and system as well. My understanding is that KDI also enrolls a substantial number of non-Korean students. So he also has had direct experience in teaching cross-culturally.

Our third panelist is Peter Reuter. Peter is an economist at the University of Maryland. He is also a senior economist with RAND, and Peter has two important experiences that make him valuable for this panel. One is that, in the course of his work on drug policy, he has looked cross-nationally at policies in a number of countries and along the way has gotten experience with seeing how analysis is done in those countries. Also, he served as editor of our journal, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, so he has experience seeing probably the dearth of theses coming across the trends that deal with international issues.

Our fourth panelist is Kent Weaver, who is at Georgetown University. Kent brings a number of things to the discussion. One is that he has been a longtime advocate of paying attention to pedagogy in policy analysis and public management; particularly, he has been very active in the past on getting panels in the program that deal with pedagogy. Also, he has been instrumental in organizing exchange programs for Georgetown, which has given him experience in this area. And finally, he teaches courses on Comparative Policy Processes which in some ways make him think about the differences, perhaps in ways that those of us who teach the skills courses do not.

I have two offices on my campus [at the LaFollette School and at the Political Science Department] and when I=m sitting in [LaFollette] office, I=m usually thinking about teaching skills courses, policy analysis and cost-benefit analysis. And when I=m sitting there, I usually think what I=m teaching has legs; it carries. I believe usually, what I=m teaching will be valuable to students to apply in their own countries.

However, when I take my short walk across campus to my office in Political Science, I start to have some second thoughts. On the one hand, I believe that there are some general principles of politics that we can discover, but at the same time, decisions are made in very different sorts of contexts. I have to believe that some of the things that I think are universal, sitting in my other office, really do need some modification when they travel.

So the one other bit of a personal experience is that I taught in Hong Kong for a year, and there are some cultural differences in the classroom. American students are very comfortable if you call upon them and they are also very comfortable speaking up as individuals. At that time in Hong Kong, my students really were not comfortable as individuals; and indeed, after I taught

for a few weeks the first semester, a delegation of students came to me—an elected delegation—pointing out that I used some words that they did not understand and spoke a little too fast. So I had to appoint a monitor for each of those to raise his or her hand when I was not complying.

Okay, without any further introduction, I would like to call up Sonja to enlighten us. And I think each panelist will take about 10 minutes, and that should leave us plenty of time for questions and interaction.

Sonja Wälti: Yes, I will go through that just to give an idea of the curriculum. Well, first of all, thank you very much for inviting me to this. I'm very excited. I am like some of you probably; I have expressed among those who tend to see the trees and no longer the forest. I try to put things together here in terms of trying to express things that I see without really having much of a distance, and I think it will help also to try to put together our ideas in terms of, what is general? What is specific? What do we make of this? And I'm just kind of delivering the facts as I see them.

I wanted to briefly go through the program at the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin where I taught up until this summer. I'm at the American University at the School of Public Affairs, Department of Public Administration and Policy right now, but still affiliated with the Hertie School. So I would just like to introduce you briefly to the Hertie School. We are located in the middle—really the center of Berlin—and let me see that I actually manage to organize. Okay, probably all for those who have been to Berlin do not need the pictures here.

The Hertie School of Governance was initiated by the Hertie Foundation, one of the biggest foundations in Germany and that is essentially who pays for it, including scholarships and also the operational cost, the startup cost, faculty, etc. It was founded in 2003, but the MPP program, the Masters in Public Policy really only started in 2005 and that is when the faculty started as well.

The classes are in English, and there are about 25 nationalities since it has started and that is still the case. If we look at the composition of the students, it is invariably about half-Germans, barely half-Germans, and a lot of other countries, really from around the world, particularly of course, due to the location of Berlin, Eastern European former Soviet countries.

What I would like to point out and not really very briefly is the Hertie School advertises itself as being a European take on governance, and when you say governance, here it really means public policy. The Hertie School of Governance has substituted the term public policy with governance pointing to the fact that it puts together a take on international, national, as well as non-governmental elements.

This is what the program looks like; there is the Master's Program; aside from that, there is an executive education that actually started somewhat earlier but at this point anyway, is less important. There is research. There is more knowledge transfer.

What should be noted is that the Hertie School of Governance is not part of a big university. So it is an institute, a stand-alone institute affiliated with the Free University of Berlin but not part of it.

The structure of the MPP is designed in different modules. There is a core curriculum, essentially required courses and our electives, integrated workshops where practitioners come and sort of show what they are actually currently doing and there is an internship, a required internship. And finally, there is a student project, the capstone project, Master's thesis - whatever you want to call it - at the end of it, applied if at all possible. The courses are divided. The core curriculum or the required courses are divided in what could be termed, U-courses to understand courses, and C-courses.

The development of governance is a more historical approach to governance know-how. The state has developed essentially and it is more of a history course, applied quantitative and qualitative methods; economic analysis - tying into states and markets; two semesters - governance and laws with a more legal approach to governance; and governance or public policy process - negotiation, mediation, sort of a skills coursework; and finally, the public management.

There are areas of concentration very similar to what you would see in the U.S., international governance also in Berlin - that is a major draw, economics, and welfare, and sustainability for now in the same package, public management and then democracies transition, of course, of particular interest to Eastern European and countries actually in transition.

This is what the curriculum looks like put together. It is a two-year program with an internship in between, starting out with a lot of core courses, the first and second semester, and then a lot of elective courses. The third and fourth semester, with the student project that actually gets a lot of the credits in the third and fourth semester. But we can go into details if this is of interest [inaudible]. That is qualitative and quantitative methods.

[Audience question, speaker unidentified]: Which is which?

Sonja Wälti: It starts out with qualitative then it goes into quantitative, so the first Q would stand for qualitative and then the second—I will get to that actually, that is an interesting point. I think a difference that we will see in terms of methods, what kinds of methods are taught? (Yes, let me skip over that.)

There are some partnerships and I think that, that is part of what is important and not maybe, one of the normative conclusions that you can draw. Part of what is important for international programs, they do leave a lot of partnerships like within the GPPN, Global Public Policy Network[1], and then a bilateral partnerships that arise from that or that developed alongside where students going into either to a Dual-Degree Programs, doing one year in there, one year in some other place or on an exchange basis. For example, we have an exchange with the Georgetown

[1] The Global Public Policy Network (GPPN) is a consortium of public policy graduate programs anchored in the U.S. by Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. More information is at this website maintained at the London School of Economics: http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/GPPN/Default.htm.

Public Policy Institute; that kind Weaver said, where students go into third semester, come over here, and go from here to there, on a one-on-one basis, essentially for each student to going to Berlin, one student could come back here and that is definitely very attractive, I think.

Just to give you an idea - not necessarily the pictures here - but just to see what the backgrounds are. Some faculty background is in Economics, Public Economy, Public Management, Methods backgrounds, Law backgrounds, Sociology, Economics, Sociology again, Political Science, Political Science, so just to give you an idea. That is where people come from.

Let me move to the other presentation, if you could put that up in terms of what I put together: Are there universals in policy analysis? I would like to proceed by first, showing you what I think the U.S. tradition or—coming from abroad, I'm Swiss and I had started to teach here in 2001 at the Georgetown Public Policy Institute as a visiting scholar and was at the Hertie School for two years between 2005 and 2007. So I started to develop a sort of a comparative understanding of these different programs and as I said, I see the trees more so than the forest, at this point.

I would like to proceed by showing you what I think and what I perceive to be, the American tradition as a benchmark. If I was standing in Berlin and said, "What do we want to imitate?" And then I will depict that. I would like to show you what I perceive to be the driving factors of that tradition; and then, I will walk a little bit through the empirical details that I think that I see similarities and differences were universals, to say, "Well, they are applicable here, as well as in Europe." In this case, in terms of content as well as pedagogy and that is a bit what Dave Weimer asked us to do. I think those are two very important dimensions that we can distinguish and then draw a few lessons from there.

How to teach policy analysis to an international body of students? That is basically the question, kind of subdivided into questions. Can we simply transpose the U.S. public policy tradition into other context? Does the eightfold path, as you put it, travel into other context? What and how do we teach if there are universals?

So if we can just transpose generic curriculums elsewhere, what and how do we teach if there are no universals, or less universals that are local driven? In terms of the content, for example, curriculums but in particular, how do we teach policy analysis? Which is part of that curriculum, how do we teach skills? And then, pedagogy in terms of learning as well as testing sometimes is interesting if there are notable differences.

This is how I see the policy analysis in the U.S. As far as I understand policy analysis being one part of the public policy curriculum, teaches about the profession, the professional development. Ethics for example, teaches about problems, most often in terms of market failures, reason for government intervention or no reasons thereof. Solutions, it focuses on what we could term generic policies or instruments tools, such as taxation, subsidies, regulation, government intervention, et cetera.

An assessment in choice among those tools very often is propagated. And I'm simplifying here, in terms of cost-benefit analysis, efficiency is a driving factor. This is embedded as I perceive it

in other elements of the public policy curriculum such as, the policy process which includes politics, political strategy, then public administration implementation, public management. And then finally, certainly, substantive policy areas, there are a variety of subject depending on what the school=s topic is, methods and skills statistics.

This is how I see it driven. What are the factors actually driving a curriculum? Policy analysis and other elements and methods are driven, I think, by the discipline itself, by how we developed, by the requirements and tradition. It is driven by demand and professional tradition. It is driven by the composition of students, by the availability of faculty, and by what I term here, infrastructure; you know, with all the universities, et cetera, present in that particular environment.

So internally, I see and we could maybe walk through some of these details during the discussion a little bit more. Where do I see the differences? Where do I see the similarities? Universals, and if I conclude that there are universally—I conclude here and a little bit rapidly to see universals, to see universal applicability where I see no differences. For example, I see few differences in terms of the profession [sounds like], both Europe and U.S. tradition place an emphasis on scientific and integrity in terms of professional integrity, in terms of teaching, and in terms of doing policy analysis.

I do not see many differences in terms of the solutions necessarily—what do I—instruments in markets is what the U.S. tradition is derived—oh, this is [inaudible]. In terms of solutions, instruments and markets is usually what solutions are preferred in the U.S. in terms of taxation, et cetera. Whereas in the European context, the instruments are much more important to our direct government regulation spending; EU regulation, we will hear—policy, more about that. So the instruments may be somewhat different, although the measures by which we look at them are similar.

In terms of the assessment, however, I think that very often the Europeans will assess policies much more in terms of effectiveness, in terms of compliance, in terms of justice; whereas in the U.S., I see it a stronger emphasis on efficiency, mainly using cost-benefit analysis. So there is more of an outcome legitimacy that drives policy choices in the U.S., more of an input legitimacy process, legitimacy that drives policy choices in Europe. And I'm almost through that.

In terms of some of the other elements that I find interesting here and differences I see, mainly in the way that substantive policy areas are taught. Of course, they depend on a domestic context most vividly.

Then another major difference I see in terms of the methods and skills that are taught is statistics data handling. Memo writing skills, for example, are very high in the agenda in an American context of policy analysis; whereas then in a European context, you have a much more stronger emphasis and that is driven by demand, driven by what government and other think tanks and such, ask for a stronger emphasis on law, political science, statistics, somewhat analytical writing, academic writing, is much more at the forefront.

In terms of the tradition and the demand that drives policy analysis, an important difference is the government who is asked, and I think we will hear a little bit more on that. Very often in Europe and that certainly is true for the European Union, you have a demand for specialists and of course, lawyers, more so than economists. And in the U.S., I see specialists and economists asked for on the market. The private sector, if you say think-tank, you put that all bluntly into the private sector, much bigger in the U.S.; much smaller, if at all present, sometimes it is government think-tanks is more what drives it in the European context. Universities are very different, however, than [sounds like] the non-profit sector and especially international non-profit sector seems to drive in terms of demand very much in a similar way.

And finally, the students and faculty, in terms of students, interestingly, at least where I was, I do not see a lot of differences. The composition of students and where they come from, the backgrounds are very similar. There may be a few more history students that we have in Europe but other than that, it is very similar. However, the faculty very often has a different background. There are more lawyers in public policy. There are more scholars of law in public policy than there definitely are here. And that is what you have seen earlier, when I showed you very briefly how our faculty is composed.

Pedagogy, I think we will go over that later.

In terms of lessons, I think what we should draw from that, because that has really more questions that I put out there—as lessons that I could see, that what I see missing in the content is that there is a need for development of a unifying disciplinary tradition or at least a distribution, thereof. Like you just mentioned APPAM, for example, is American to a large extent. And there really is not an equivalent aside from these GPPN networks as such developing and there really is not also, an equivalent in terms of where academic contributions are published that really do transgress the U.S. and beyond.

Emphasis on the international policy process—very few textbooks are available that do include the international policy process or that include sort of a comparative policy process approach to things in terms of pedagogy. And I'm down to my last two points; that we have to work with multiple pedagogical means to address a heterogenous classroom and that is not as easy as it sounds. That has to do with using different kinds of cases which are very difficult to come by, and we also need to make room for an exchange among the students, which is something that sounds easy and is easier done in a homogenous classroom than in a classroom where you have students from 25 nationalities. It is harder to get them to learn from one another in meaningful terms.

Thank you very much.

David Weimer: Thank you. I think we will hold questions after all the panelists have gone. And I would like to call Younguck Kang next.

Younguck Kang: Hi, my name is Younguck Kang and it is a great honor to be able to give this presentation because you are all such an outstanding scholars and researchers. I believe that you were dying to know about what we do differently than what you do in the States, but in

fact if you look closely at that, we are basically teaching what we learned. My basic training is from the U.S. institutions, so that the teaching that I do is not so much different than what you really do in States.

The way I plan to proceed is this. I'm just going to briefly explain to you about our school and what we do. Second I will briefly talk about my own experience in teaching policy analysis at the KDI School. And then I'll try to look at what could be a universal and what could be local. And I need to apologize for the handouts that you have that are different from the presentation on the screen. The presentation was made for the purpose of promoting our school, so it has a lot more pages in that and it does not have some of the pages in this presentation.

These are the academic programs that we offer currently. We also have an MBA program in our KDI School, and there is a part-time program called MFDI and MAM. It is part of the MBA program, and this table shows you a brief description of what each of these degree programs are—the program length and the credits. And we also offer a number of non-degree programs through the Center for Economic Cooperation— short-term courses designed for the foreign government officials.

Upon their request we design one-week, two-weeks, and sometimes one-year teaching programs, and non-degree teaching programs and this particular year we have about 28 Iraqi officials that are going through the training throughout the year. Also, we had in collaboration with Syracuse University about a hundred Indian government officials visiting KDI for about two weeks. And if you look at the content, most the things, the training topics, the interest is about economic development, naturally, and about the WTO entry.

This is the academic calendar year completion. We allow our students to take one full year of courses and then go back to their own countries and finish up their theses that supplements the credit requirement. That arrangement was necessary for KDI School because most of the foreign government officials, they visit foreign institutions for just a period of one year, typically.

And this is the general student body of the KDI School. There are about 23 percent international students. This is including the MBA and the part-time programs. And I'm going to show you the slide that concerns the MPP program in a bit. And this slide shows you the number of different countries, the list of different countries from different continents that we are enrolling students. As you can see, there are very diverse profiles of students and with many different countries. This is the student body composition of the MPP program for the current year. As you can see, we have a large portion of government officials, both Korean and international, upon which they count about 90 percent of the student body. That makes a job a little easier for us because we do not have to find a job for them.

But the thing that I want you to notice is the average age of the government officials. They are about 40, in the 40s for the Korean government officials. The foreign government officials are relatively younger, and the average work experience is about seven and eight years. On the other hand, the foreign government officials - the work experience is about six years. So the KDI School would have a student body that has relatively well-experience with their own jobs.

So with this setting that we have designed the program, the objective is to provide about the same objectives that you would have [in the U.S.] and that the concentration field that we have are a little different from the typical policy schools in States. The strength is that more than half of the faculty members have their firsthand experience in the government. So they have actually gone through and dealt with the policy issues themselves. So they can tell or teach our students of the details of the experiences they had.

We require all students to have a minimum core of analytical skills – economics and statistics – before they enroll. The basic approach of KDI School is that, since it is only a one-year program, and since the students have relatively more experience, we allow [the students] to design their own course of training by providing them a large group of selection of courses they can take. And each of the courses would specialize in certain areas, so [the students] may learn the areas they felt while they were working that they wanted to learn whenever they might have the chance to go back to school.

Now, I'm going to talk about my own experience at the KDI School. I'm teaching policy analysis and, by training, I try to teach the basic theories and tools and also, I extensively use cases. Typically, most of them are U.S. cases. I sometimes use Korean cases but unfortunately we do not have well-developed Korean cases that we can use in a classroom setting. Although there are many cases that have been done for research, we do not have many teaching cases, as of now.

And by teaching the case-based method I also focus on developing the communication skills, the policy memo writing, presentation and debate. But the thing is that most of the foreign government officials, as well as the Korean government officials of that particular age group had no formal training in writing in their own languages even, so it becomes very difficult to teach them. And the main purpose, I think, in policy analysis is to develop the analytical thinking and approaches in students in a skill set. And the only way for me to make sure that they have such skills is by having them write something. And since their language skill—they do not have the language skill; it becomes very difficult to check the progress they are making. But still, I'm working very hard to overcome that issue.

And that moves me toward the last slide. What do I think as common and what do I think is a local universal? As I was preparing this table, I wrote down the common universal themes as analytical tools, frameworks, policy process, implementation, evaluation. And then I had a second thought that it is true that the basic elements in frameworks of these fields must be taught to the students.

But for the international student, I need to do some little tweaking; that some things apply and some things do not apply. For instance, talking about the analytical tools, we sometimes talk about market incentives, but in some countries they do not even have a market. We talk about rules and regulations and in some society there is so little respect for the rules, so it does not work that effectively. So we have to address those differences in those areas as well.

And for the local issues, of course, the values, institutional settings are different; the policy environment is different. We teach analytical skills sets of quantitative method but in some countries they do not have the data. So they cannot use that skill at all.

Common social problems are the usual suspects for cases. It is very helpful for the students because they are genuinely interested in learning what others have done to deal with the same types of social problems. So it gives them a comparison point of their own experiences with other countries' experiences. But there are local and very specialized topics. I tend to believe it is due to the path dependency of society.

For instance, if I may, that I could talk about Korea; you all may believe that Korea has actually achieved the state of the democratic society, but I believe otherwise because the institutional settings are still intact. Korea has the same institutional settings as those that we had under the dictatorship. The only thing that is different now is that we elect our own dictator.

So this is an important difference in social settings and it becomes quite difficult if you have a group of students from—like, one student from this country and the other student from other countries, they all have different institutional settings. So what I tend to focus upon as the core things like the reasons why the institutions are set up that way, rather than describing what the institutions are. So that when they go back and they can think and they could develop their own institutions.

So I guess that about sums it up. Thank you very much.

David Weimer: Okay, perfect timing. Let's turn now to Peter Reuter.

Peter Reuter: As David said, I do a fair amount of work overseas, particularly in Europe. You know, the rest of the world is not very pro-American at the moment, has not been for some years. Since I am originally Australian I sort of put on a thicker Australian accent when I am overseas and try in various ways to keep my American-ness not too conspicuous. However, I turn to a real chauvinist when it comes to talking about graduate public school—public policy education. It is striking to me that we, in fact, have something here to offer and the rest of the world does not seem to be interested in taking it. And when Doug [Besharov] asked me last week if I would participate in this, I sort of hesitated because I am not sure I know the answers to the questions. But I really am very interested in trying to proselytize for this because I think that we in fact have a great deal to offer.

Well, my own—I teach policy analysis and here I am going to use the term quite narrowly. I am talking about the course, that is, the Policy Analysis course. I am not talking about the whole curriculum that we think makes up a policy analysis degree. I am talking specifically about the course that many of us have as a project course but, often, it has the word Apolicy analysis@ in it, which tends to build on everything else. Students have taken economics, microeconomics, statistics courses; they have gotten something on institutions, normative finance, et cetera. And now they are here to do policy analysis. And—just look at—it is APPAM cross-national. It is not actually pretty.

Now, I teach primarily a policy analysis course both to graduate criminology students who have had no economics and I teach them to our master=s students who had some economics. In both cases I use what I think of as the canonical text to policy analysis. And I am curious how many people would think if I say the canonical text—that [Gene] Bardach is the answer to that; they cannot say Aidan Vining because Aidan=s here.

I do believe that this is a book which is getting to be more and more the center of policy analysis teaching when we are talking of policy analysis as a craft, not policy analysis as the collection of all the tools that go into the Masters= curriculum.

And Michael [O'Hare] and I, we are talking about how many languagesCGene Bardach is off trekking in Bhutan, which is why he is not here and why I cannot ask him the simple question, which is how many languages has his book been translated into. But we think it is six or seven and still growing. It is a book which comes out of a long series of sort of drafts that were around in Berkeley in the ›70s, I think already—something in the ›80s. And it is called the Eightfold Path of Policy Analysis.

And what I really want to do today is really ask how well does the Eightfold Path travel. Michael [O'Hare] stole my line—how portable is this? I am actually reminded about a line in my Family Law, which is my—I announced to my parents that I was going to marry an American and the letter back from my father said, "Remember, American women, like Australian wines, do not travel well," which was a great line in my judgment. And so telling my wife - then, girlfriend - about it was perhaps not so great.

But anyway, the question is how well—does Bardach travel better than Australian wines? I think the answer is yes but only to some places. So the Eightfold Path—for many of you this is well-known; I think for many of you it is not well-known. It is a very—the labels look very simple and every one of them turns out externally daunting to students. Define the problem—how can defining the problem be difficult? Well, I mean, as you know they struggle for weeks trying to figure out "What is the problem that I=m answering?" In some ways the one that completely baffles them is project the outcomes; I mean, nothing they have learned has ever taught them how to do that.

In fact it is not even clear the faculty knows how to do that. I mean, again, one of the interesting things is how—there are odd paradoxes of academic life, like we are hired to teach but only rewarded for research. And in the public policy school we are brought in because of our research capabilities and then we are here to teach them how to do something that is really quite different, which is policy analysis. And so many of us have never had to project an outcome in our life and now we have to teach students how to do that and we sort of figure out some way of doing it.

But these are all, it turns out, very challenging components and I think it is just sort of masterful, the way that Gene after 25 years has gotten it right as to how to lay it out. It is a very pragmatic approach. I mean, the language of the book is very non-technical, one reason I can use it with criminology students who would be scared by the term "elasticity"; the term elasticity is there

but it is sort of buried underneath. And in general it assumes the tools and you can have more of them or less of them and that will affect exactly how you do it.

But it gives you guidance in which the technical part is not particularly challenging. On the other hand it is very disturbing because you think as a student that there has got to be stuff there and there is not; nobody has estimated an elasticity that is really relevant to your particular calculation. It turns out it is not a formula; students would very much like it to turn into a formula. I would like it to be a cost-benefit formula of the Aidan Vining type, instead of whichCno, it is a way of thinking and you start all the way and then you probably have to go back and circle around again. These are very disturbing things.

It is also for students often the first time they have had contact with collecting data. Remember, quantitative courses taught mostly by people who come out of economics departments are about analysis; the data are there—the things. Well, you do the policy analysis only to discover you have to find data and this is—I mean, this is a very troubling thing. I am sure those of you who have taught this spend a lot of time trying to explain to the students that the data is whatever information you can get and it may not be very close to what you want. And so I think that the approach is—I realize I have to move on.

How American is this? Well, I do not have an answer. I think it is a decent question, so I will give you my guesses about this. It does sort of assume that there is data out there that can be collected. People answer questions and it is amazing in this country that graduate students in some university can call up mid-level officials in agencies and they will take the call and they will try to answer the question and they will often even provide data; I mean, some numbers, numbers that are not required to—they will even sometimes go to some trouble.

I have been really surprised at how often my students can go and talk to somebody and this sort of official tries to enlist them in some way in sort of helping the agency. And then you can find information about how to tackle—how other agencies—there is not an assumption of openness, both of the agencies that you are dealing with and other agencies you might need to get information from that really underpins doing policy analysis.

Well, not every country is like that. Just to put up one of my favorite examples, shortly after I left Australia, some sergeant in the police who had given the local newspaper last year's arrest statistics was carted off to prison, actually, because of violation of [laws governing release of government data] —whatever penalties were for; he should not do it. The tradition that allows you to get data informally to talk to people at any time is not a tradition that is by any means universal.

Similarly - and is consistent with what the first two speakers said - we are very much in a society which you think about policy as a set of options. I mean, we are doing what we are doing but we could do something differently. Well, not all the world thinks like that. There are many countries in which we do what we do because we have been doing it for a long time and it would take an immense amount of effort to change it. So the ability to ask questions, to see that there are choices, is not one that I think is so universal.

I am now being quite chauvinist in saying I think in this country in many circumstances analysts can be honest. And that is again I think not a universal; that is in part because we have a plethora of institutions. You are unhappy working in this particular institution with these skills; there are other institutions to which you can go. That is not true in lots of countries. Smaller countries, it is inevitable. But even in some large countries, in large democratic countries, it is highly a centralized structure and the flexibility that I think facilitates honesty in part of policy analysts can be lacking. And I have run out of time, so thank you.

David Weimer: Thank you, Peter. Kent, and then we will throw it open.

Kent Weaver: Thanks very much. I teach at the Georgetown Public Policy Institute. About a third of our students are in our international policy track. Most of them are Americans; many of them are foreign. But what that means is that we have a very high demand. That is about 45 students a year who want a very international curriculum, and we have changed substantially over the last four years. To do that, I am going to make some general arguments and then tell you a little bit about what we have done.

Well, one of the things we have done—first of all, we changed our core institutions and processes track, our core curriculum, which is three classes. You can now choose either domestic or comparative policy process, domestic or comparative public management, a domestically focused ethics course or ethics in a globalized world course.

And I have syllabi for any of you who are interested, both compared to policy process and compared to public management up here. So we changed the curriculum. We also have instituted the Study Abroad Program either in the summer or in the third semester. Students can go to the U.K., Switzerland, Germany, India or China.

And over the last year, what we have done is revised our institutions and processes course to make them more what we call actor-centered up there. And by "actor-centered" I do not mean "Kennedy School-type decision maker as hero" actor-center; I mean looking at various actors in the policy making process and how they try to navigate the process to achieve their objectives. I am going to focus in my comments today on political analysis skills which are the course and the skills that we focus on in our comparative policy process class and talk about how we teach them, starting with a few propositions, then what I think we need to teach our students and then ask some specific suggestions for the classroom that are built on our experience.

First proposition is that when you talk about the policy making process, most of the universals are in fact that conditionality and uncertainty in locality matter. Things like policy makers have multiple objectives; well, which ones do they act upon in a particular situation? Institutions matter. Institutions differ. Actors act on the basis of local knowledge so the universal essentially is that you need to know about the local.

Second proposition—that, well, you can make this simplistic; you can just say policy making is about rent seeking. I think if you do that there are two bad consequences. One, you are not describing the real world because in part it is about rent seeking but there are a lot of other things

that go on in policy making as well. I think it really breeds a dangerous cynicism on the part of the students.

Third proposition—we need to teach them more than technical skills. Why? Most of our students —certainly most of our students and, I suspect, most of your students - do not spend their careers as technical policy analysts, at least not their entire careers. And they need to navigate a political world in which, generally, decisions are made on the basis of the second- or third-best, and they need to know how to sell ideas.

Fourth proposition is that students in any policy analysis class are likely to try to retreat to what I call the "comfort zone" of the technical in context three; you know, they will do the cost-benefit analysis because they sort of know how to do that and it is not very hard. And they think, "Well, you know, I can do that." But you know, it leads to student projects, for example, that have no connection to the outside world.

How many of you have had students present group projects and the first question, you know, sort of says, "Yeah, but that could not possibly happen, could it?" And the students sort of—"Well, yeah, actually, no it could not." And sort of "Where do you go from there?" We need to get students thinking about what is politically feasible.

Okay, so what do we need to teach our students? First thing I think we need to teach our students is concepts and theories that can help them understand how policy is actually shaped in a variety of contexts; macro societal factors like culture and ideas, institutions, feedback from previous policies. We need to get them to understand at a conceptual level all of those things and how they affect policy-making.

They also need to know political skills and this includes some sort of things that are generally Bardachian, to use a term, that come out of the Eightfold Path and others that are not; things like how are interests mobilized and constrained? How do you manage a complex interest coalition? How do you venue-shop if you are a legislator or an NGO or something else and go to the legislature and working for you? So what else might you try to achieve your objectives?

So in short, the most important thing I think we need to teach our students how to do is how to ask the right questions; to figure out how actors, including potentially themselves and their future careers, navigate the political process in a specific policy environment and develop the confidence to say, "I know the right questions to ask if I am going into, let-s say, Ghana or Singapore or wherever, and to figure this out." But it means asking a lot of questions. And we need to do it through hands-on learning whenever we can.

Okay, so what are some ways that we might go about doing this? Some specific suggestions: first suggestion is I kind of get the students to think about the world in terms of four political slices, one of these sort of broad understanding of causes and constraints, macro-societal factors, institutions, et cetera, to think in terms of the stages of the policy making process which are not, of course, always [indiscernible] to think about policy making task and skills. And then how do you apply those? How do you put them all together? In the handout I think you haveCshow how

that course is structured so that in fact students do go through all of those things over the course of the semester.

Second suggestion I have is it is a very complicated world out there. They cannot understand all of the countries in the world so focus on a smaller number of countries. I would say three to five maximum - I tried to do six in my course, which is too many - so that by the end of the semester they really get a sense of, "Well, yeah. I can sort of know how this kind of political system works. And even if it is not exactly the same, I can sort of figure out what kinds of questions to ask," rather than doing a different country every week.

Thirdly, I suggest focus on creating group projects that focus on political skills as well as technical ones. So when I say—my group project says, "Okay, in the introduction, which is a collective product," I want your policy analysis. I want your options and I want your recommendations. And then in the later parts of the project, which each student does individually, tell me how you are going to make this happen. How do you frame the issue? How do you mobilize an interest group coalition? How do you respond to potential challenges from the courts? How do you get it implemented from the perspective of your client? And we use full-client projects. So these are just some examples of some different political skill projects that my students have done over the last couple of semesters. I will skip over that.

Also, focus on memo writing assignments that focus on political skills as well as technical skills. If you are a Mexican NGO coalition working the border lands, how do you set priorities? How do you develop coalitions [indiscernible] provide them with materials that they do not [sounds like] have to figure out how to do that?

Fifth thing I would say is most Kennedy School cases for teaching the policy making process I find not very helpful. They are too decision-maker focused; they are too short; they do not give you enough context. You can actually build your own cases, I think, relatively easily using articles from journalists. In the longer version of the handout that you have, I actually have some examples of cases that I have put together using things from journals, things from local media, et cetera.

Sixth thing is use simulations that mimic real life. We did one in our class this semester about the Canadian—about coalition government and whether—opposition parties who bring down the minority government when they gave the Speech from the Throne. We actually did the simulation the morning before the Speech from the Throne. So this was real-time stuff and students got really excited about it because they could then see whether what they had chosen was mimicked by reality. I also suggest using country-generated primary materials when they are available.

And lastly, I have movie nights. I think looking at movies from the countries you are studying, in fact, are a great way to provide context and depth to students= understanding not as part of course time but as an optional thing to do.

I will stop there.

David Weimer: Great, excellent. Thanks to all the panelists. Now we would like to open it up for our questions from the floor. If you would direct your question, at least initially, to one of the panelists and then we will let the other panelists chime in as appropriate. Yes? And if you could just tell us who you are again.

David Birdsell: David Birdsell from Baruch College. I am going to address my question to the three panelists. It has to do with cases that I have heard three fairly strikingly different approaches to cases which are very specific to the U.S. context and do not travel well in the European context. In fact, you have had some universal precedents in Canada. How do we make cases more usable than they are today?

Younguck Kang: Typically what happens in U.S. classrooms, I believe, is that the instructors tend to believe that [international] students are already well aware of the institutional settings of the U.S. society, which they [actually] are not all. They do not know that much and so it is very difficult for them to get the nuances in the cases because those nuances come from the institutional-setting. And I think it is very helpful if the instructor can highlight those points to the international student and that would probably enhance their understanding of the case and that will help them tremendously to understand the materials in the case. And naturally, since they look at their own experiences and they will naturally make comparisons. And on top of that you can force international students to share their experience with other students.

David Weimer: Sonja?

Sonja Wälti: I would say there are three points that I would like to make with regard to case teaching. I do think it is possible to teach an international body of students with case-based methods and I have done so successfully. There are three difficulties, however. One is pedagogy, and I had not mentioned that due to time but I would like to mention it here.

Not all national backgrounds are receptive to case-based teaching. The European students very often expect the much more linear approach; you give them theories, frameworks and then towards the endCclike the traditional way of teaching, towards the end you show them applications. If you throw them into a case, unlike most of the American students - not all of them - they are lost. They feel that this is not science, this is not serious. They do not know where to start. They do not have a problem-solving way of thinking. They do not backward-map; they forward map, to use that terminology that you use in your textbook. So it is a pedagogical way so you have to ease them into that. That is one point.

The second is that you have to spend time—and I think Kent Weaver explained it very well and how he approaches it. We have to spend time giving them a common terminology. For example, the sheer notion of institutions—not that we all agree what institutions are, anyway, but I think it is even more difficult to get that cross-nationally. To students coming from an authoritarian background, the institutions have a whole different meaning than students coming from a democracy. And it does not make sense to spend time to develop a common terminology - what the process is, what the institutions are, what kind of types of actors are out there? You know, just where to look, and then only do we start the case based teaching.

And then, thirdly, the sheer putting it together—and I would agree with Kent on that that it is actually time-consuming but in the end it is fairly easy to do. I stopped looking for cases in the Kennedy School case database for the same reasons but I have been really successful. We heard it from him - partly to just looking in the very empirical journals, very often there are very thick descriptive journal articles that actually give you a lot of case background. They are very useful to sharing. You can compliment it with some other things.

David Weimer: Kent?

Kent Weaver: A couple of things. First of all, like Sonja, I do not just do cases. I spend usually about the first half of class on more theoretical material and then move into the cases for the second half of class. Like last—how much do cases cost? And I would say, on average, about two or three hours of your time and zero dollars.

Google Scholar is the best thing that has ever happened to academia. If I decide, gee, I really would like a case on Sharia Law here, first thing I do is the Google Scholar search. I find articles and journals that I do not normally read like the *Journal of Modern African Studies* or the *Latin American Politics and Society*. And oftentimes they just fit exactly; it is amazing. And you can get a list of 10 plausible candidates in two or three seconds. And then I supplement that with regular Google searches, particularly for local media.

I bias my countries towards English language countries. I have four of the six speak English at least to some extent so their English language materials—because I want them to be able to read some articles from the *Economic and Political Weekly*, which is a wonderful journal in India where they are getting a local perspective. And the reason I think these are better than Kennedy School cases is because they just rip out all the context and you do not have to figure out what information is relevant. For students to figure out what information is relevant is a big part of the job. If you may have to read 25 pages of it and 10 pages of it is not directly relevant, for me that is part of the task.

David Weimer: Let-s move on to another question.

Douglas Besharov: I just want to follow up here. At the risk of over-generalization, Sonja and everyone else in the panel, you made a contrasting comparison between American students and European students. Can you talk about the other students that you teach, about their ability to work under the case system or a more linear system?

Sonja Wälti: We all know the difficulties with generalizations but I think that, especially Eastern European students, more so even than the German students, are used to being taught first and then apply or even imitate; that is a much more common tradition. And then you see the participation of German students being fairly bold [sounds like] in the beginning and then their participation is less even in case based teaching just because they do not know where to start. They also are humble and feel that they would rather not just chime in. Also, women tend to not participate in case-based teaching as much as men and also are more frustrated by it. That is another thing I have realized and then we also saw it in our surveys.

So the sheer case-based teaching method which is important in this prospective policy analysisClike when we talk about policy analysis, the actual course of policy analysis, where a lot of it is prospective thinking, here is a problem - how do we solve it and get to be creative like you described? And the case-based approach in a way is something that we really need to practice. And that is difficult to those categories of people and needs to be practiced in a way. And smaller groups often work; putting them together into smaller groups and then they are more easily able to practice that kind of teaching.

David Weimer: Any other comments on this one? Kent?

Kent Weaver: If I could start on the last one, in the handout that I handed out with the small slides on pages five and six, there are some examples of cases that I put together using different materials.

David Weimer: Great, great. Another question—way in the back?

[Question inaudible.]

David Weimer: So the question would be does it make sense to use a particular policy problem as a window on different political systems? Any reactions?

Kent Weaver: One thing that I do is I hand out study questions in advance on the readings. I vary it from week to week but some weeks I say, AOkay, these three students are responsible for this question.@ And, you know, that question comes up some time during class and I start with them. In that way the foreign students whose English language capacity is less or maybe coming from a culture where it is less speaking sort of know thatCtheir turn, that they have to pitch in, and generally they do quite well and it gets them started.

David Weimer: Scott [Fritzen]?

Scott Fritzen: I agree with you. Actually I have not had any trouble in Singapore. My context is the National University of Singapore. There is a lot spoken about these stereotypically Asian students being passive and so on. I found it comes down much more to the style of the lecturer in the classroom and how at ease you make them feel, and calling [on them] without threatening, without the threat of humiliation if they do not answer very well and so on. So I just wanted to underline that point: Creating a participatory classroom culture does not seem to be any more difficult in my setting which is working on some 15 countries from Asia.

David Weimer: Yes?

Susan Collins: Susan Collins, University of Michigan. Two quick things. One, what you were just sayingCI could imagine in Singapore would be rather different than the U.S. classroom where the majority of the students are Americans and are able to speak up. And foreign students are feeling like the minority and also grappling with the language barrier giving their answers less quickly than the Americans can.

Something that Peter said that really struck me—talking about the differences between the U.S. and other countries in terms of the ability to use tools that you use because you cannot ask questions [in those countries]. The data are not available. I thought, yeah, that all sounds right but I could imagine myself [challenging] the sensitivities of my students from some of these other countries if I spoke about [problems gathering data] quite as clearly as I should. I wonder if you have run into that difficulty and if you have a way of avoiding that [situation]?

Peter Reuter: I am talking from a theoretical base. I teach very few international students policy analysis. I mean, I perceive this but it is not something I have actually had to deal with in a class.

David Weimer: Yes?

Ariane Hegewisch: Ariane Hegewisch from the Institute for Women's Policy Research. A couple of points. What I find interesting is that we are not talking about the gender and race and national origin of the instructor. It seems to me that when I teach classes, I am getting very different responses from the students. And I find that happening and I see the very different responses from students, and I=m willing to approach that a little bit towards what you are talking about. But it is also very different because of my style, but it is also about what sort of brings the [inaudible]. That seems to me an issue that we really need to think about if we are talking about teaching [in the U.S.] and then you change it somewhere else. Or teaching a group of students who look like me or do not look like me and what does it mean. That is one set of issues that I would like to raise.

The second question is directed to you, Mr. Weaver. I think it is fascinating that you do this kind of approach. And I am trying to do that but I find I cannot do it in two or three hours. It takes me much, much longer because I do not understand what is happening in Afghanistan quite as well and I need to read for 30 hours before I can actually teach for one, right? And then also, I put myself at risk of not being the expert because I am not an expert on Afghanistan. And I find therefore that when we are trying to globalize the curriculum, my colleagues are very, very sensitive to do these kinds of quasi-cases because it places their expertise at risk. And I really want to raise that because I think academics are not comfortable to do that.

David Weimer: Kent?

Kent Weaver: Yeah. Well, I end up saying I do not know a lot or I am not sure about that. But I mentioned that almost all my cases are drawn from the six countries that I do in the classCand, really, only five because the U.S. is sort of in the background. So it is Canada, Mexico, Sweden, Nigeria and India and I came into teaching knowing a lot about some of those countries and very little about others.

But the reason that I do a small number of countries is I do not—if I am just doing different cases from different countries, I would have to know more about Afghanistan and every other country. After I have done this a couple of years, I sort of—India has the most complicated political system in the world, but I sort of have a handle on it now. So that is one way to simplify the

problem for you and it also makes it for the students much easier because by the end of the class they had come back to India four or five times. And so I feel more comfortable and they feel more comfortable now doing India once they feel they sort of understand the political system.

Iris Geva-May: Iris Geva-May from Simon Fraser University and the International Comparative Policy Analysis Forum. What I seem to be hearing from everyone is really the fact that policy analysis has basic principles that in fact need to be adapted to the culture within which it is taught because from Sonja I heard that it is the institutions, the way policy analysis is perceived, and so on and so forth. That it has to be taught with traditions that are different; the approaches are different; the professors are different, and the students are different. You will have a more legal-oriented approach to policy analysis while, in other parts of the world, they would have different approaches. It seems to me that before we do that, it is very important to learn the anatomy of the context within which that policy analysis is being taught in order to be able to really address the real issues and the way of thinking of the those who really are going to use it, adopt it, utilize it, implement it and possibly continue using it.

Kent Weaver: I do not want to do them either, actually. But—

David Weimer: I think we have time for maybe two more questions. Yes, sir.

[Unidentified speaker]: I am a political scientist. This sounds like an Introduction to Comparative Politics course. Is there a course called the "Politics of Policy"? Can we find things that apply in all countries? I think this would be a benefit to the field. I do not want to do case studies.

Kent Weaver: How different actors frame that issue, and how that influences the policy debate and which framings are likely to be successful in that context and which are not. So we start off with macro societal forces, but then how do actors navigate given those?

To go back to Chris [deNeubourg]'[s] question at the beginning out of the course he teaches [at the Maastricht University School of Governance], the Politics of the Policy Making Process. And I start off with—well, here are some universal factors that are important. Like, clearly, globalization—I can give you five impacts that globalization may have. Multi-level governance—I can tell you four different effects—that federalism may lead to a race to the bottom and may lead to emulation; it may lead to a race to the top; it may lead to differences based on the fiscal capacity of the various actors. I say, AOkay, so those are sort of universal hypotheses.@ And then, the question always comes back to conditionality: Under what conditions will this affect the course [sounds like]? That is why I said at the beginning of my talk, universals are about conditionality, under what conditions you are going to get which effects.

David Weimer: Okay, we are out of time. There is one more question.

Heather Campbell: Heather Campbell from Arizona State University. I have a question for Sonja. I was interestedCand we were talking about the difference between the U.S. and

EuropeCit sounded to me like you said that the U.S. tradition is more demand-driven. Is that right?

Sonja Wälti: I meant actually two things, but it is interesting that you mentioned that. The demand is different; that is one thing I meant, that the demand in the U.S. is probably more economics, skills-based, than the demand in Germany. I agreed that will be applied to all of Europe but to some extent will be more law-based.

The other difference that I find important is that one is more outcome-driven; with the U.S. you have to teach students how to project outcomes, et cetera. That is the efficiency in the way of outcomes and how much money we spend for what we get is very important. Whereas the European is—certainly, Germany being the extreme case, is much more process-driven. You judge things by whether they are done legally, whether they are done democratically, and properly sort of input-driven. That is the answer to that. I would just like to add three points while I have time.

When you are talking about policy analysis, you are talking about policy process. I do think that there are a couple of things that came up in questions that were not answered yet and I think that they are important to just stress, to point to: Should we teach it country-based like Kent does, or should we teach it policy-based? And I-m more of a policy-based approach but that is because, as someone pointed out, it is impossible to become a country expert very quickly. I tend to let the students do the job of becoming country experts. I make sure that I teach them the basics that have implications for the textbooks.

So I use, like Kent does, the textbook that does not talk about cases. We have comparative policy textbooks out there; they are usually either country-based or policy-based but both do not do the job of introducing the contexts very well. So I use a conceptual textbook and do the cases and countries myself, or [indiscernible] have the students after that. So I had Japanese students and been through a lot of Japanese politics, and I learned from that in overtime except—become more of an expert on that.

David Weimer: I think we are actually out of time, so join with me in thanking the panel.