**Special APPAM Teaching Workshop:**
**Teaching Policy Analysis and Management in Cross-National Settings**
Session C: "Teaching Comparative Public Management."
November 10, 2007

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_SessionC.pdf.

**Chair:** Chris de Neubourg, Maastricht University Graduate School of Governance.

**Panelists:** Claudia Scott, Victory University of Wellington (New Zealand) and the Australia and New Zealand School of Government; Mary Kay Gugerty, University of Washington; Scott Fritzen, National University of Singapore.

**Themes:** *How do policy implementation, government budgeting, and performance management operate in countries with different state capacities? How can the curriculum encompass management differences among advanced industrial and less developed countries? Is it possible to have a "unified" approach to teaching public management across cultures? If so, what are the elements of such an approach?*

**Chris de Neubourg:** First, talking about what environment I'm working in. I think we have pretty different experiences behind the table here—European and U.S. and really, the other side of the globe in Australia and New Zealand and Singapore. So I would like to ask Claudia Scott to start off.

**Claudia Scott:** Thank you very much. Again, thanks to the organization of this symposium which is a very great opportunity. I noticed that Robert [Walker] made a comment at the beginning [of the prior session] which was that he was asked [to speak] because he was from another country and he should not really know anything about this. And having announced that I'm from Australia and New Zealand, that is true; that is where I have been for 30 years. But I am American and I have had a lot of life in this country as well. So maybe I'm an impostor or I'm somebody who is wrapped up in sheep's clothing or something. But, anyway, for that reason I'll say some things that are not just derived out of my experiences in New Zealand but more about my experiences coming back and forth. So I'm going to try and say a few things which do not have the justification behind them about my professional life in New Zealand.

To that extent a lot of my work has been in public policy as much as in public management. But having gone to the other side of the world, I was disappointed. I started out in the economics

department and that was not really what I wanted to do, so I had to create a public policy school in New Zealand. So I have spent a lot of time developing MPPs, MPMs, and my latest, a variant of a program in New Zealand is a Masters in Strategic Studies.

But do not think it is what it normally is in the rest of the world because if you are a latecomer, you can turn it into something else. So ours is about strategic analysis and strategic thinking. We are are catering to people in our public service who are supposed to serve governments of the future. And we are trying to develop those skills for them to do that.

I'm also, as you saw from programs, associated with the Australian and New Zealand School of Government. That is very much a new innovation; it is now in its sixth year. That is a consortium of governments that got together; initially, the proposal was out of Australia because it was deemed that public servants in Australia needed to have one premier school, and no single university or state in Australia was going to be large enough. So the Boston Consulting Group was called in and they made a proposal for the Australia and New Zealand School of Government.

Luckily, I had a relationship with the Australian National University at that stage as the capital city thing, and I was informed about this. So I managed to squiggle New Zealand into this and it has just been a wonderful experience. That is probably where some of my comparative public management expertise comes from.

I'm going to just start out with a quick outline of what I'm going to try and do in my allotted 10 minutes. I'm going to just start out with some big issues about what are the options and what are the issues on the table when you are talking about internationalizing teaching of public management. I want to talk about the implications of some of these options for the teaching—the content that we decide to choose and, in particular, this whole question about the responses we have within those programs to the different needs of domestic and foreign students. I think that is a really important question.

I'll then talk very quickly about VUW where I work in New Zealand and ANZSOG, but appreciating that both of those schools are very much focused around large government, and in the case of New Zealand, particularly, very little outside of government in the way of advisory services. So then I'll end up with some of what I call my preferences which are just things to be provocative. And Mike [O'Hare] said he was coming along and wanted it to be provocative. So that is what I'm going to try to do.

The first slide is hard to read but there are copies coming around. I just wanted to identify—there are lots of different groups for which we are interested in what we call internationalizing the curriculum. We have identified some of these. Sometimes, we are talking about domestic students working in foreign settings; sometimes, we are talking about international students coming into U.S. universities. We are talking about a range of different needs which are listed on that slide. I think it is helpful if we had more time; we could break these down and talk about them in more detail because the needs are different and the curriculum would have to be different to address the needs of these different groups.

My next slide is really talking about just a list of some of the specific choices that you have to make as you start thinking about these programs. One thought I wanted to start out with is I think we would need a much bigger discussion about what public management is in relation to public policy, governance and other related areas. I find when I come to APPAM, public management can sometimes mean policy implementation, being very blunt about it.

Whereas, in my part of the woods, public management programs are much more structured, in some cases at least, on a management curriculum so they have a set of courses on human resource management and financial management. So we use the word public management and we are talking about policy implementation on the one hand and a management curriculum on the other. We are talking about quite different things. We need to think about that.

The whole issue about what are core subjects and what are electives and whether or not people could migrate from one to the other gets back to a whole set of issues which I think is really important, having to do with what I like to call learning outcomes. What are the learning outcomes that we are trying to get from these programs and how do we deal with the different needs of our students?

My own experience in New Zealand has been very much focused on the post-experience professional level of people who are working in government. And that is very different from the U.S. environment where in many cases we are taking this professional program and then we are launching ourselves to work in a variety of different settings in which government is only one of the employers.

I think the issue about disciplines is really important. I like to debate whether public policy and public management are disciplines, topics, multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary—or what are they? I do not think we can just announce that this is a discipline because it is not. But what we think about it will affect how we structure our programs and whether things like economics methods are just add-ons, building up to the final thing we are trying to produce in the program or whether we are actually trying to integrate the disciplines.

Because I teach practitioners, the real value they get out of working with academics such as me is we provide them with frameworks to which they can relate their practice. That is quite a different process than dealing with more inexperienced people where they will soak up the frameworks, but they do not have the experience to actually test them. So I think it is again a very important dividing line in terms of what kind of program you are developing. They find that incredibly valuable but the impact of that on what you are doing as a teacher is quite different. So in other words, I do not worry in saying, "Wait. Some of my colleagues at APPAM seem to adapt. Do we have the expertise to stand up and do X or Y?" I talk about coproduction. I talk about facilitating. I talk about mentoring.

At the [APPAM] Park City Conference [in June 2006] we had some discussion about that, which I thought was very creative. Some of the nervousness that I feel in the room from talking to people about how could I teach a student from X because I do not know a lot [about] country X, I think, would go away if we just had a different attitude to what the role was that we play [in their education]. I would encourage us to think about that.

I have been forced to become a case study teacher as a result of working with the Australian and New Zealand School of Government. I'm a very reluctant case study teacher. I find case studies quite descriptive; most of them are management-related. But I have had to do it and I have learned certain things. One thing I'll just mention very quickly I learned is if you want to teach a case and you want people [to learn from it]—there is no right answer in a case is rule number one.

Rule number two is that you are all in it together. When I first started teaching cases I came in with all the answers and that is not how you teach a case. So I then got taught by people who know how to do this, and the answer that they gave me is stop looking for the answers; put the questions, write down what people say whether it be confirming. And if there is a problem, just walk back yourself into the audience and become one of them. It was very hard for me to do because I want to move through things and time is running out, but I have had to learn to do it.

So I do not think we can talk about should we use cases; cases are incredibly different. There is a huge shortage of analytical cases and cases take more time than traditional teaching. So those are all sorts of things that we have got to balance out besides the question about cases and whether we need local cases or international cases. ANZSOG has put a huge investment in cases, and when we put the materials together I'll give you websites for that. They include not only cases on Australia and New Zealand but also on developing countries because the money comes from the Commonwealth Secretariat.

Okay, moving right along—in thinking about the programs, someone mentioned today the whole issue about working in groups and cooperative behaviors; certainly within governments, this is high priority. We are talking about collaboration and cooperation. So in the programs that I work, we are putting much more emphasis on group work for that particular reason. But again, it is about what is that balance and that is a big issue in the U.S. when you bring international students in with American students. Sometimes, there is resistance to having international students, and how do you cope with that?

What practical experience will you expect your student to have? If they do not have experience, will you create that? And do you create local experiences for them? We have internships. We have some success in locating our students in New Zealand in government departments but it is increasingly difficult, and it is not just for security reasons. It is just that people are busy. Governments are kind of pushed to the core and they are not necessarily going to have the time to host too many students. Questions about student assessment are pretty important as well.

I just wanted to quickly go through a couple of questions about different stances that we can have in terms of public management practices. These are just three things that you might want to talk about. Firstly, if we are going to look at these practices, are we trying as a program to remain neutral and objective and to make comparisons and to observe and not to say anything in terms of benchmark or what we think would be good practice if not best practice? Do we use text on these or classification systems and maybe even as an alternative to countries as a way of getting that comparison? Or do we try and think about sets of values, practices, frameworks that have been used in our public management program?

Here in ANZSOG, we use the Mark Moore public value framework, which, frankly, I think is pragmatically helpful but it does not answer the question about what public value is. So it has some light but not full light in terms of its potential to run and drive a program.

The next slide is just to get some further choices but I'm going to slip one for the sake of time. I have already kind of quickly told you about Victoria and ANZSOG in terms of what I do. The key thing for me is that we are working in a different environment. We are working with public servants primarily; we are working with people who are trying to go from practice to theory; we are working with a smaller number in international students. In New Zealand, I have international students but in Australia, the whole ANZSOG program is a controlled selection by the contributors to that organization. So there is no open entry in that sense.

Should we put international and domestic students together on classroom assignments?. My answer is unequivocal yes, but it is very complex in terms of deciding how to do that so each group gets what they want. I'm a great firm believer that you have to have some principles and frameworks to drive these programs; it is just not enough to start talking about different things and leaving it on the table.

I also think that you have an obligation to international students to allow them opportunities to reflect on their practice in their countries in a very explicit way through research or through comparative approaches or something. It is not enough to say come and learn about America. You could put it all together when you have time. So that is my idea.

I think we have to work terribly hard in all of our programs to deal and create this multidisciplinary environment; we say it but the disciplinary warfare continues. One of the ways that we have tackled that is by trying to recruit people from public policy schools who are less what I call re-treads, and I call myself one of those people [do not draw on a ]single discipline, and when push comes to shove, it is about whatever it is - power, incentives. You can just tell where they come from by what they say when they are put under pressure.

I have a few other slides here which you can perhaps read because I know we are getting very short of time. I think what you do with these groups depends not only on whether they are local, foreign or what their ultimate role is going to be in terms of work or experience later on because careers are changing over time, so we should not pigeon-hole people. But I think we do have a difference in terms of whether they are going to be doing graduate work, whether they can do technical training. So we do have to think about that in a way that I said in the case of if we are going to teach public management, allows both groups to reflect in some way.

I think that within public management there are areas of public management where we can establish those benchmarks. I think it is, for example, much easier in financial management. So there are places where we could get to some principles or concepts or rules or at least some taxonomies; others, where we might have more debate. If we are dealing with students that come from economies where we do not have governance in place, we have corruption and so on, we have to think about how to handle it. But to just walk away from it and hope it goes away, I think, is personally not the way to go.

So I have some suggestions on my slides, and I do not have enough time because the chair is going to be telling me to stop. My basic point is I think we need to impact this. We need a little more time. This is a school individual session. It is not something that somebody's going to tell you from a podium, so I'm not going to try to do that. So I think we do need to, in many cases, decide what our catchment is that we are looking for and then make that decision.

I suppose one experience I would share with you is that I think, as academics, we may need to be less cautious than we have been and see that we can place some other roles with respect to these students. And that might mean that we can reach out a little bit more and find ways of having students work with other students or bringing in expertise. Find area specialties; find practitioners to bring, and find other ways to get that expertise in the room rather than saying, "I have not got time. I cannot do it myself."

I'm going to stop here and let the other panelists go.

**Mary Kay Gugerty:** Good afternoon. My name is Mary Kay Gugerty. I'm actually not on your program, so I'm sorry to be the bearer of news; you actually have to sit through one more presentation in addition to what you were expecting, so I apologize for that, a little bit of administrative complication there. But I'm on the faculty at the Evans School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington. I just like to take the next 10 minutes to tell you a little bit about what we have been working on at the Evans School in the hopes to shed some light and that I can get some good feedback from you guys on how this fits into the discussions that have been happening today.

I'm going to focus on a couple of things to try to say something different and new which is always hard at the end of the day. I'm going to talk a little bit more about process and institutionalizing some of these mechanisms, which is something that we have been working very hard on. I'm going to talk a little bit about what I think the requirements are from the field of public management, whether or not it exists, and some of those struggles as we face them both in recruiting people and in retraining people.

And I guess I'll offer a little bit of perspective of someone who has been doing this for a shorter period of time than some of the other people that are speaking today. So looking forward, what has been my experience? What do I hope for the field as I move forward in it for the next whatever period? All right.

So just to give you very briefly our context—so we are obviously located in the United States. We have a student population that is increasingly international but still largely domestic U.S. students. We are teaching management across four programs - our regular traditional MPA program; a new executive MPA program, which I'll come back to at the end because that has offered us some really interesting insights; an international development certificate program, which is a university-wide certificate for graduate students who are interested and have some field experience in international development, and then a new Ph.D. program in which we are really trying to train people who can do some of the teaching and the research that we have all been talking about in this room and earlier this week.

So one of the things that has really informed the way we have thought about this at the Evans School is the fact that our students are definitely increasingly crossing the disciplinary boundaries and global boundaries over the course of their career. So part of our work has been driven by student demand and also in the hopes, I suppose, of student supply, making ourselves more attractive.

But we find our students start off internationally; they come back and work here; they move around across all kinds of settings. And they move from the public sector to the private sector, to the nonprofit sector. In Seattle, we are really located in a place where there is a ton of private, public, nonprofit collaboration and new hybrid forms of governance. So that has really pushed us as a faculty in the school to think about how do we integrate that into the way that we teach management?

We have made a deliberate decision not to have a separate comparative or international track in our core public management programs for a lot of different reasons but, in particular, because we feel like if it is a global world then we need to come forward with a global curriculum. Everybody needs to know those things, not just people who say that they have an interest in international affairs. What has been interesting to me over the time that we have been trying to work to globalize our management curriculum is that there has been no pushback from the students that are "domestic." The students know this; the students recognize this; that is the kind of education that they seem to want.

We also really try to make it a course in management. So it is not a public management course because there are students who are crossing those sectoral boundaries. So we are explicitly trying to integrate across public, private, nonprofit; across local, national, global boundaries. So we, therefore, have a focus on managerial decision making and frameworks, an actor-centered approach, to use the language that Kent [Weaver] had used earlier today [in the first workshop session].

Just to show how we have operationalized that in some ways, I will not go through our whole curriculum. But instead of calling this a course in public management, we have two courses in managing policy and the policy context, and the context piece of that helps us to try to compare across different institutional context, and then a second part of that which is managing organizational performance. So again, variation in the kinds of organizations you might be managing and some of the classic organizational performance things you might want to measure.

Some of the ways in which we operationalize this, we use two tests. We use the Mark Moore classic text[2] and we also use a text by Brinkerhoff and Crosby[3], which is set internationally. And so that allows us to move back and forth between different ways of thinking about those issues.

[2] Mark H. Moore, *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1997.
[3] Derick W. Brinkerhoff and Benjamin L. Crosby, *Managing Policy Reform: Concepts and Tools for Decision-Makers in Developing and Transitioning Countries.* Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2001.

We use a lot of teaching cases. I acknowledge that Kent made some great points earlier about the limits of some of the actor/hero-centered approaches. We have tried to use some actual cases from business schools which have a very different approach and tend to throw a lot of data at you, which really ask the students to say, "Which data do I care about? Which data do I not care about?" So it really helps them to learn to sift through a pile of information about a particular situation.

We have also invested ourselves in a lot of new cases, many of which are—I'll put a plug up for the Electronic Hallway, which is run and supported by the Evans School. We have a grant from the Ford Foundation to do a bunch of new cases related to issues of diversity which includes both U.S.-based domestic diversity issues but also international cases; the marginal cost is zero of those. Of course, we ask institutions to help to underwrite the cost of providing those. So I would suggest that is one opportunity and also one place where we could just start to work with people to put up different kinds of cases and to really increase the availability of these kinds of cases.

I'm not going to talk [more] about that. I want to talk about some of the institutional challenges, which Claudia has already mentioned. Faculty is not trained to teach in this way, and so you have to retrain and you have to make a huge investment in faculty, a huge investment in junior faculty, to get people to work on this. One of the ways we have done this and have been really lucky to do this at the Evans School was to really have the faculty spend a lot of time talking to each other, which was a revelation to me.

I will not tell you where I did my graduate work, but the faculty did not talk to each other. So we can actually talk to each other and we could learn from each other, which is really important because if you are only going to have one track and you are going to globalize it, then everybody is teaching outside their comfort zone at some point. I'm not that comfortable teaching cases about the U.S. federal bureaucracy; it is not an environment I have spent any time in. Some of my colleagues would rather not teach a case on implementing the policy in rural Zambia, but we all have to do it. So we spend time talking and preparing with each other. That helps to give us some of that confidence to be able to go in and teach that case.

Then, it really requires institutional support. The institution has to be willing to support faculty to recognize the time it takes. Senior faculty has to be willing to work and mentor and support junior faculty, so all of those kinds of things within an institution make a big difference. We are really lucky in that we have had a lot of institutional support within the Evans School but also in the wider university community that really recognizes that these kinds of investments need to be made.

Some of the challenges in terms of the student perspective—the students often lack a comparative institutional perspective, particularly the U.S. students, which is not surprising. So there is a real tension in trying to get that kind of tools, actor-centered analytic frameworks that can travel approach, and then asking those conditionality questions that Kent was talking about earlier: What if the context was this? What if the context was that? And that is the thing that we are really struggling to work on. I think what I call live cases but what Kent was calling quasi-cases are one important way to do that and be able to do it in real time.

There is also a lack of cases on new forms of governance; it does take a long time for the [Harvard] Kennedy School to produce cases. There are a lot of cases on contracting but there are all kinds of new interesting network forms of organizations that are out there, and there are not a lot of traditional teaching cases on those. How do we start to get those kinds of innovative governance forms that are emerging into the public management or the strategic management curriculum, I think, is also a real challenge.

I guess the last comment about the way in which we tried to approach this; there is only so much you can do, and we are on a quarter system and two quarters of management. So what we tried to do is then leave electives and start to build in some of the context-specific information that students need. So we have a development certificate in which students can learn about issues that are very specific. There is something about the way in which international funding is structured that you need to know about it to understand it in order to manage in that environment. So that is where they get that kind of information.

We have a lot of students interested in nonprofit management, so we have a series of courses related to that because there are certain things that are very specific to the nonprofit context - managing volunteers, managing your board with other governance structures. So we use our electives to try to build some of that context, building on top of that common core which, because there are six or eight of us that have all worked on the common core, we are all very well aware of. So we can explicitly build on what we know the frameworks were in the common core in those secondary courses because each person is teaching in the core and each person is teaching the same material on the core.

The last thing that I will not talk about but I just want to suggest is something that has been interesting for us and is very much in progress. We started an executive MPA program a few years ago, and that could not be organized obviously in these very traditional policy analyses, public management statistics, economics, ways in which we tend to organize MPP and MPA programs. So we ended up thinking about new ways of integrating that.

Again, because everybody is working across all of the programs, that is starting to help us think about what is the right way to organize our MPA core because maybe we can move away from this very traditional model of boxed-in sets of skills and think about what is the skill that we would need to have. How could it work across the entire curriculum for the entire year of core classes? So again, the institutionalization of that collaboration, we hope and we think, is starting to allow us to do some things in some really interesting and innovative ways.

I guess the last thing I'll say because I may be out of time is the other way in which we are trying to do this—this is another bit of a shameless plug—is we started a Ph.D. program a few years ago and we are trying to make this explicit commitment to really integrate in the management and the policy and the analysis aspects of that program and not to allow students to just default to the economics right away or default to the management right away. So we are hoping that we can train some people in the next few years that can come out and do this teaching and thinking. We will see how it goes; it is a work in progress. But that is what we have been trying to think about and I'm really excited to hear what you guys have to say. So thank you.

**Scott Fritzen:** Good afternoon, everyone. I'm all that is separating you from the rest of your evening. That is a bit of a challenge but I have to interject something new in my presentation and that is to, possibly, Doug [Besharov]'s horror, no PowerPoint. But actually, there is a reason for that; I have sworn off PowerPoint for a couple of months now. The final straw was a presentation of a policy analysis exercise by a student of mine a couple of months ago in which she had one of those fancy interactive effects. This particular one was interesting—every letter was flying in from the side of the page while she was giving the presentation. But that was not the only thing; it was, too, the sound effect of alternately—I'm not sure which—a typewriter or a machine gun. So I thought, "That is it. I'm going to lead a crusade to rename our masters a Master in Public Policy." Of course, now, we have been giving out the Master in PowerPoint for awhile. So I thought it is time to turn a new leaf there.

These sessions have been really interesting to me because coming from the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy [at the National University of Singapore] for the last few years, these are very existential issues that we are dealing with; they are not side issues at all—how to teach public management effectively and across national context; how to deal with the balance of theoretical issues and pedagogical issues—very central. So I thought I would just briefly introduce the context and then introduce nine questions that we have been struggling with at the school and taking them very seriously in a very interactive dynamic way over the last few years among our colleagues.

The context—we have three masters' programs—a Master in PowerPoint—I mean soon to be renamed Public Policy; a Master in Public Administration, and an MPM—Master in Public Management. The core curriculum, actually, is recognizable from a North American perspective. If you just looked at the titles of the courses, they would look quite similar to that being done anywhere. It is where the content and approach comes in that we are trying to distinguish ourselves, but struggling in the process.

The key aspect of our program—I think, something that makes it very exciting to be there—is that the student body is incredibly diverse. Our target group for a long time has been one-fifth each for Singapore; the rest of Southeast Asia; South Asia, broadly defined, and East Asia. Sorry to the U.S.—one-fifth also for the rest of the world in which the U.S. is just one component. And we are fairly close to that composition. We have also grown very quickly over the last few years. Our faculty and our students have been growing at about the same rate as interest in this topic at APPAM meetings. So we have doubled and then doubled again over the last few years. We are up to about 300 masters' students at the present time.

So now, for those nine controversies that we are struggling with, six of them are on the content side; I'll just introduce them briefly. The first one is a question we have returned to a few times that you may or may not find interesting: Are we a school of public policy in Asia or are we an Asian school of public policy, and what would the difference be? We started with that difficulty as we tried to define what a distinctive approach to public policy in the context of teaching our diverse student body might be. I think, in general, we have come down in practice on the answer we are a school of public policy in Asia, broadly speaking. But I'm sure that our dean would want us to be an Asian school of public policy; we are trying to work between those two tensions right now.

The second question is, I think, an interesting one which is we know that there can be too much home country context in an internationalized world and with the demands for the curriculum. Is it possible to have too little home country context in the curriculum? Like I said, we are actually growing the Singaporean segment of our student body to about 20 percent. Now, it is surprisingly low even with the addition of a part-time program for the MPA.

We have noticed that, actually, the home country setting can provide an important glue for the students. One of the reasons that they actually come to Singapore is to learn what is going on in the Singaporean context. So we have tried to interject more and more home country activities, context, and content into the curriculum.

We are trying to treat it almost as a running case study in itself, something that people will refer back to again, but with—I guess my point is this: You have to be very conscious about the balance that you strike in the examples, case studies and de facto assumptions about the institutional context that you are using. Whether you are trying to move away from a home country dominant curriculum or trying to move away from too little of the home country context, the point is you will not get to a dynamic balance spontaneously; it requires a lot of conscious effort, I think.

The third question is: How can we really go beyond the recognition that I think has emerged here that we can draw in a broad range of case studies used very creatively, just going beyond the Kennedy School case studies to a broad range of approaches? How can we share these more effectively and with lower transaction costs? I think there is a tremendous amount of material that is out there waiting to be tapped and I'm looking forward to seeing how the institutional mechanisms to facilitate that actually pan out in the years ahead; there is room to be entrepreneurial there, I think.

Just in terms of my personal experience, I have been using a lot of comparative case studies within the same session. So, for example, drawing two or three mini case studies or even Kennedy School case studies with the right preparation from different country context and then structuring the discussion around the question of a contingency approach: What works where? Why? What is common to these cases and what is different?

Another slant that I have been experimenting with is the use of more simulations in the classroom so that you are not just dealing with narrative cases but, actually, students generate their own experiences in simulations about unequal power relations, for instance; that, more in the negotiation and conflict management side of my teaching. But it has been very productive, very interesting when what happens in the four walls of the classroom actually becomes the raw material for the discussion.

Fourth, what kinds of innovations on the theoretical side do we need? It is interesting that I was going to mention that one of the core texts in my class on public management is also Mark Moore, *Creating Public Value*. It actually works very well from a pragmatic point of view, as I think Claudia mentioned; it is a great pragmatic approach to case study analysis and so on; it helps them locate their experience within the framework that is offered.

What is interesting is that as you start probing beneath the surface of Moore's framework, you notice that it is actually very rich but it is very grounded in the U.S. experience so that, for instance, the issue of the democratic foundation of accountability systems in public management is very much present in his work and very explicitly acknowledged in it. But when those frameworks are applied to multiple country case studies to which Moore was never intending, really, to direct his work, there can be some awkwardness.

For instance, Claudia's question: How do you define public value and its framework? It is not that he does not give an answer; he does, but it is one very much rooted in American political traditions. So this is one of those issues where I think some of the most interesting, innovative, necessary, theoretical work in public management will come out of cross country contexts, I think.

Fifth: Leadership training work. We are struggling with the question of can you teach leadership in a cross-national fashion. What would it look like to integrate leadership across different elements in the core curriculum and elective offerings, not just confining it to a course called Leadership or Leadership in Public Management? So we are struggling with that. Collectively, those five faculties or so who are very interested in leadership issues or who teach public management, we are trying to get together and form an interest group in a sense to share our approaches to leadership and make sure that there is a more integrated rollout of the concepts and applications across the year.

Finally, on the content side: Sectoral tensions and expectations. Where are the major gaps in our public management curriculum? Jeffrey Straussman wrote a fascinating paper for [APPAM's 2006] Park City Utah conference that reviewed public management syllabi and came to the conclusion that there were major gaps in such areas as the importance of regulation or the whole existence of the private sector, that even in a predominantly American context that he was reviewing, there were these major gaps.[4] That is certainly true for us as well. So a very productive question could be how we can identify those gaps and work across national boundaries, really, across schools to identify, for example, some of the network forms of governance that are emerging and how we can teach those more effectively.

On the pedagogy side, there are just a few quick issues. We also have special projects. I think here, the question is how do we ensure quality? We all have internship programs, integrated policy analysis presentations or projects, those kinds of elements in the curriculum that are aimed at taking the public management side and bringing it into a more integrative analysis, drawing on the other tools that have been presented. When you are dealing with a 20-country context in a cohort, though, you have to know a lot about those contexts in order to make sure that the students are really gaining a lot from those exercises if they are going back home to do a

[4] Draft paper available online at:
http://www.appam.org/conferences/spring/parkcity2006/pdf/2006Spring_paper_session3C.pdf
and published as Jeffrey Straussman, "Public Management, Politics, and the Policy Process in the Public Affairs Curriculum," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, **27**(3) (Summer 2008), pp. 624-635.

consultancy like policy analysis exercise, for instance. So how can we develop those networks that will make this into a very qualitative exercise?

Another issue that came up prominently in the Park City Utah Conference was: Are we trying to cram too much into our curriculum? Could we get by with teaching less but actually getting better learning outcomes in the bargain? That had special resonance for us in a multinational setting for our students because of the different levels of academic preparedness and English ability that inevitably show up in the classroom. It is interesting because many of the faculty are saying, "No, you have to maintain standards, and that means covering five books a week just as I did at Harvard 10 years ago." Others are saying, "Well, that might not be the best approach to maximizing learning for the students," and we are struggling with that issue.

Finally, national sensitivities come up increasingly, probably, in all of our classrooms. My question looking both at the Singaporean context, which has a unique political system as well with its oddities, and also a mixed multinational classroom where students from India are often engaged in a lot of debate with students from China and so on is how critical a social science do we have to have in a professional school setting? How far can we push those boundaries?

What I'm saying is many of the home country contexts of emerging policy schools are themselves grounded in very different political traditions. It will just be interesting to see how they manage that tension. So far, we are doing well in Singapore on this issue; I think we have maintained a fairly critical, robust response to our challenges, but this will continue to raise delicate issue as we address Singaporean issues and controversies more prominently in the years to come, and given that our students from the wide range of Asian countries also bring their own political sensitivities at times.

Well, thank you. I think I have gone over my time. Thanks for your patience.

**Chris de Neubourg:** Thank you very much to all the panelists and also to sticking to the time schedule.

I will say a few things about my experience that bear on all the issues just raised. First of all, demands—demands for public policy analysis is also a power thing. We spend around the globe about $4,000 billion every year on social transfer programs. There are a handful of programs in the world that educates specialists to run these programs around the world. But there are hundreds of business schools that manage much more amounts of money and teach students to do that. And so, it is also a question of effective demand in economic terms.

Students—we have a classroom. [The Maastrich School of Governance] is a small school - 70 Master's students, 55 Ph.D. students in a small city about twice the size of Oxford, and we have 47 nationalities. So we do not have any dominant group among the student bodies, even not the Dutch; I mean, the Dutch are a minority group in the student body.

This third point I have—no faculty. Get rid of your [traditional concept of] faculty; that is the best way to internationalize. I have a budget. I can hide the teachers from the faculty within the University of Maastricht. The result is that our faculty or the teachers come from about 30

different nationalities across the globe, and that differentiates very much the classroom. So you do not need all these things that things come in comparatively by nature. That also brings in to research, our Ph.D. students coming also from all these different backgrounds, which means that with the research atmosphere in the school where not one country is dominant, there are like 30 countries discussed and empirical research has been done by these Ph.D. students.

And that creates like a very international atmosphere where there is little question about, "What is nationality?" "Are we too much—not enough Singaporean or Dutch or European?" I think that is an interesting experience. But it really was a humbling experience for us.

We also trained the senior staff of UNICEF at about 250 people a year and these people coming from 129 country offices. And they want to have examples from all these countries. And so, we really—I have been working very, very hard to make our teaching material as comparative as possible, digging in old materials, all these countries we are working in.

And the final thing, a final thought that was not discussed yet and I think it is an interesting thing—we started to do it—we are not very good at it yet, but I think we will become better at this—is alumni. What we found—most of our Masters' students go back to their own countries after they studied with us. They are lonely there because they are specialists in very lonely fields in developing countries; sometimes also in developed countries. And what we set up is kind of community of practice where they talk to each other; they can post questions to us; if we have time we answer them.

But they also post these questions to each other. And that works very well, also for internationalizing our curriculum because we have got a lot of other material coming in questions, interesting databases, questions for advice where there is no money for—but at least it comes in with an interesting database. And sometimes the Ph.D. student or another Master's student is interested in that. So these are six small thoughts I would like to share from the Maastricht side. The floor is open to questions to all of us.

Can I collect like three questions and then go back to the panel?

**[Unidentified speaker]:** I would like to ask all of you, do you also teach in film or most types of communication because it is not the same if they are together. But if they are trained in that means and the second question is that, it is not only true that—because on the paper are there also differences between, for example, United States and European universities, or United States and Asian universities? I think it is a special—interesting if you are teaching comparative public management.

**Chris de Neubourg:** Thank you. Take two more questions and then go back to the panel then come back to you.

**[Unidentified speaker]:** I have a question for Mary Kay but maybe some others want to answer. She spoke about the challenges of getting the faculty to work together across programs, across disciplines. And she said you have to investin them. How do you do that when—you also said that the core faculty knew everything about the foreign program so that they can integrate

what they were teaching. How do you get the faculty to do that when that is not the kind of work that faculty often get rewarded for doing? And maybe the answer lies not strictly on you do not have any faculty at all.

**Chris de Neubourg:** Did you want to follow-up on one of the questions?

**[Unidentified speaker]:** Something that is connected and it is maybe best to start, but a general question that I am making. When I taught at Singapore for a very short stint, the first thing that I was told is that they are following the Harvard way of doing policy analysis but that I should be warned that somebody who finished the program went back to his country, ended up in jail because he wrote that, "I love Harvard policy analysis," which did not take into account the context in Korea. So this was one of the things that I was warned against. And I was wondering: Given that you have so many people from so many countries, which come to Singapore and they are from various Asian countries, not necessarily Singapore, how do you address the issue of culture and of context in your teaching? And in fact, this is a question that I am asking all of the panelists.

**Chris de Neubourg:** Okay, thank you. Scott, do you want to start?

**Scott Fritzen:** Sure, I will try. It is pretty challenging. I guess the logical place to start is with the last question; it is an expression of mine. You know, we are on the sharp edge of some of these issues. I am not sure who the case is you are referring to but there was a case of a Burmese student, for instance, who was jailed for a couple of years while doing his policy analysis exercise in his home country between the first and second year of his MOP. He was finally released but did not come back to our program. There is another less dramatic example of the fact that it is difficult to gain access to information data sets and so on in Singapore, which has the administrative traditions of great secrecy in a sense; everything that is not explicitly labeled as "For Public Consumption" is treated as a state secret, I think, by law. And so, it is quite challenging for students in terms of their policy analysis exercise.

Ironically, since we are trying, after all, to increase the relevance of our school to the home country setting and the interaction to be derived there, I just wanted to note on the double degree program, I think we are part of the Global Ppublic Policy Network which is four universities that have an arrangement where you do your first year in the home country and the second year in any of the partners.[5]

It is currently four universities and you get a double degree. It is wonderful. I wish it had existed when I was going to school. But it is potentially, also, on the cutting edge of issues of curriculum coherence and compatibility on the one hand, but also specialization on the other. So you could have different patterns emerging in the different institutions, but also sharing a certain bedrock of core curriculum.

[5] 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.

So I look forward to seeing that network as, possibly, being a platform for more intensive faculty exchanges about what they are doing in the curriculum to complement and go in parallel with many other networks. And on the American exceptionally question, faculty at Singapore are intellectually less diverse than the home country settings of our students. They are ethnically diverse and so on but intellectually we tend to come from similar academic training and backgrounds. So we think we know what we want to teach.

On the other hand, we are on the sharp end of the contradiction that Singapore on the one hand is often touted as a model of good—sometimes bad—governance; it depends on who you are asking in what aspect. But it is often seen as an exceptional kind of home country setting. And students come wanting to know what Singapore is doing but on the other hand, there is almost—I hate to say this but there is almost nothing that Singapore is doing that could be easily transferred to most of the other countries that our students come from. So it becomes very important to structure projects in a way that elicit a thoughtful, comparative, nuanced set of conclusions.

In our Master of Public Management program, we have mid-career professionals who come to us for one year and they tend to be senior among the mid-careers as well; it is a very select program. They do an attachment program with a Singaporean agency, and they are required to write a paper that describes how Singapore does it and, essentially, whatever it is and what the relevance is to their home country setting. And we take pains to point out that that second part, the difficulties of institutional transfer, is the most important element in the whole exercise. But invariably I would say 80 percent of the papers do not adequately reflect that.

So it is a constant challenge for us because the default position is simply to repeat the wonderful things they have seen Singapore doing, essentially, and to stop there. So those are just a few answers to the questions I will pass on to Mary Kay.

**Mary Kay Gugerty:** I know we are very short on time so I will answer the one question that was addressed to me and then [say a few things about] the others. So I think in terms of how you get faculty to work together in these kinds of issues, it is like we are trying to create some of the multi or interdisciplinary program, sort of an interdisciplinary set of incentives and practices I think that happen to work.

I think you do have to have incentives; whether it is providing some course relief at times to people for making certain investments, I think we were lucky to have an institutional culture that supported that. We had some early leadership in people who had kind of invested aspects of their career and being innovators and new ways of teaching management. And so when somebody has invested in it, then they are invested in getting other people invested in it. And so that worked really well.

I think for us now, it has also become a way in which we market ourselves so that now it has sort of market value to us, both in terms of recruiting for students—we have actually found in terms of recruiting for faculty that people are really interested in what we are doing and it has really made people interested in coming to the Evans School. So that has been terrific.

And then to return to my somewhat economic roots, I think in a way, there are always going to be defectors in a situation like that, people who are not interested in doing that and that is fine. But given that most people are interested in doing that and people are working across these programs, if you are a defector you lose the opportunity ultimately to participate in some of the other programs. And so that keeps people who might have a tendency to want to work more independently—which is certainly a perfectly valid way to work. It makes them have less opportunities and so that kind of keeps people always willing to keep their toe in because that is kind of where the action is now in terms of our management stuff. And so that keeps people involved.

And maybe just to briefly address that cross-cultural communication, we have had explicitly to build that into the first course at our management curriculum. It is always a trade-off between the topical stuff and the process stuff. And I do not know if we have enough, but we do have explicit readings on that and we also do some explicit things on working in groups because, as I am sure, you all know the group project processes. It took me [a lot of effort] and so we tried to provide them with very explicit strategies that could help them surmount the typical obstacles.

**Claudia Scott:** I will just comment on a few issues. I wanted to address this whole question about—the discussion we had today about institutions and actors. I think it is a really interesting question. I am quite a fan of the Moore book because it really is taking a systems perspective and my answer to that really is the whole book. But the idea of system perspective is good because you can tell anyone to look at policy issues in the country and then to map the relative importance of actors and institutions in a particular context. That has the benefit of bringing international institutions which are increasingly important. So one of the problems I have with the country studies is you may leave off the influence of international institutions, which are tending to make policy more homogeneous across countries if you do not put that extra really important layer. So I think that it is important.

I also think that the systems perspective allows you to bring in those other disciplines in an integrated way. So when I teach policy analysis, I do try and put those different disciplinary perspectives. So we talk about market failure but then we talk about social capital and public value and we talk about other frameworks.

And then we try to get students to look at all those different what I call lenses; they struggle. But the way I do it is to tell them they are advising a yet to be elected governor. And since our students work in the public sector, they frankly have a huge amount of trouble doing that because they want to know who the minister is that they are writing a paper for. So we just say, "Sorry, we do not know." And I think that that is a good exercise that you can inspire the students as well.

People say from Australia [more than from] Victoria, there would be five options, all about social capital, and they are very negative to economic frameworks. I suspect the Congress might return some public policy schools here when you get extreme views rather than forcing them to engage with different concepts and frameworks. So that is my insight.

And the other thing that I just wanted to mention is I think we could look to some other sources of information to bring in those international students. And one group that I am working with at the moment is the Bertelsmann Foundation; I am working on the country report for them on their reforming project. So if you are not familiar with them, there is a whole literature out there in terms of fragile states and so on. And they just have reports on country after country that you can just download and then get students to—in a sense we use their concept of good governance rather than your having to promulgate it, and can have people benchmark against that.

So I think this is the [value of] the Bertelsmann Foundation. And they have done a whole set of rankings over a number of years for developing countries and they are just about to finish one now for developed countries. So that is another source of information.

**Chris de Neubourg:** Okay, thank you very much. Mark's intercultural skills—no, we do not teach it but we provide the kit to the students. [Different] faculty, especially cultural clashes—yes, we have them. Two instances where we had them that was very interesting—one was with our American—the U.S. students against the rest of the bunch around the world with the war in Iraq, which was really a students' discussion.

The other one was really into culture in the sense—Japanese teacher teaching a course on actuarial mathematics with the Chinese students. That was also difficult to handle [classroom]. For the rest, I think the normal thing works better than reading. I mean joint programs—yes, we wrote the two Ph.D. programs. We wrote together with—in one case 10 parts; the other case, five parts. We have time for two more questions.

**[Unidentified speaker]:** Do you teach comparative research methods? If so, what text would you recommend?

**Claudia Scott:** We are training managers to interpret and understand research. We come from a practitioner perspective, so we are not training the researchers. But the courses that I do at local university are just basically traditional courses that put together readings. I do not think readings are texts at all—combinations of readings and applications. Sorry.

**Chris de Neubourg:** In our case we bring it backwards. Again, this is what we do. We bring in econometricians; we bring in people who specialize in qualitative research, and teachers, students they are quite—if you mean cultural?

**[Unidentified speaker]:** I mean research which requires a comparison [among jurisdictions] to [get to the heart] of the question.

**Chris de Neubourg:** We do it one case but only in one.

**Claudia Scott:** We do it all the time in our program between Australia and New Zealand because we have got a natural comparator built into the program and different jurisdictional arrangements and institutions built into the program. So we do it all the time.

**Scott Fritzen:** Just one more follow-up. For our Master of Public Management attachment paper, which I mentioned was meant to be a comparative approach at the end, we used our Richard Rose's comparative lesson, drawing work as a kind of foundation.

**[Unidentified speaker]:** Chris, this is addressed to you, which is you presented this very challenging notion about school, about faculty do not want to hear about what you mean by that not having a faculty in order to be comparative/cross national?

**Chris de Neubourg:** I suppose we do have some opposition and of course, it is not without a faculty; we have some faculty but it is a very small groupin order to show that we have some assets. But they have decided we have to—I have to say that beside these assets we have also one of the best healthcare systems in the world and the teaching methods are limited by everyone. So we do not do many evaluations but we care about people.

**Alberto Martini:** And there is just that one thing I was just thinking about, one question about the quality of programs. And our experience—we have been through public management programs that are addressed to international students— and that I can figure out how to address quality and we are insisting on that.

First, we believe that public management is different from private management. And that means that public administrations are completely different from business; they are more complex; they do not have [inaudible] efficiency about, of course, outcomes. And they have to deal with diversity and this is related to inclination of students because also in the Italian programs we deal with diversity in terms of diversity of figures, diversity of gender, diversity of leaderships.

So this is very helpful to think about public management as a type of management that deals with diversity. Because we are trained in this and so why not askof students to go abroad that came to think about diversity and there are not many comments in being comfortable with being in a foreign land—continents. So this is more about the quality that I think that is good for a public management students.

**Chris de Neubourg:** One final question.

**[Unidentified spaker]:** Just a final point following up on the research. I had a conversation that also links the teachings to the knowledge base and what we still think could be learned in terms of the research and the evidence base. I guess I am very aware that we would not think we could teach the best medicine by having just 300 case studies. Maybe teach the case studies because they are a great, great teaching tool but we would want the evidence base. I think we have got part of that on this comparative policy—global policy.

**Chris de Neubourg:** I think that is a very beautiful roundup for this long afternoon. I would like to thank our panel.

**Sandra Archibald:** I'm standing between everybody and the drinks so this will be extremely short. But I hope that you feel the way that Doug [Besharov] and I do, that these comments absolutely exceeded our expectations and probably the exchange. The fact that you

have been here for five, four hours after you have already been here for three days, and no one has really left, I think that speaks to itself. There has been a great deal of demand in conversation already this afternoon about how we are going to quickly share the information that we have all heard this afternoon.

Doug and I will make sure that we get a website up. Mike [O'Hare] wants to make sure that we have a way to access and have a list of everybody participating. I think it would be a little more exciting; maybe a Face Book, or something like that. Because I just think that if you see what we heard about, the demand shock, I think that demand shock is really already here and this response that we are doing is all of us trying to meet what we perceive of that change in our own way. That collaborating—ensuring that each other is going to make this happen in a short time frame because we have to be responsive and dynamic.

I was thinking about the Hilton Head conference in 1986 where APPAM public policy schools took a big leap. We had the Park City Conference organized by Michael [O'Hare]. We might say that this is the next game. We are about to think of another place where we can move this forward. I am now committed. I will talk to [APPAM president-elect] Kathy Swartz, and Doug and I will talk to take in a spring conference that we are planning to have about cooperation, collaboration, and competition. Who is teaching policy analysis and management and what can we do to move this forward?

I just cannot thank the panelists enough; I cannot thank Doug enough. And everybody who is a co-sponsor because I truly think we exceeded our expectations. So now please join us for the reception and we look forward to being in conversation with you.