

Advanced Public Management

La Follette School of Public Affairs

PA 885

Fall Semester 2008

Instructor: Donald P. Moynihan
Time: Monday, 3.30-5.30 p.m.
Location: Bascom 54
Phone: (608) 263 6633
E-mail: dmoynihan@lafollette.wisc.edu
Office Hours: Wednesday 10 a.m. – noon or by appointment

About This Course

The main goals of this course are (1) to enhance your ability to think analytically about problems of public management; (2) to enhance your ability to make good arguments concerning how public management issues might be addressed and (3) to learn about the craft of management by working with practitioners.

The primary theme of this class is the issue of **how to manage change**. Most of you will soon be in an organization where you face the issue of trying to lead change in how the organization does something, e.g. how a program delivers its services, how personnel are managed. Your organization will also face pressures for external change, from stakeholders, elected officials or funders. The ability to lead and manage change, to get things done, is therefore a fundamental skill for someone who expects to prosper in an organizational environment. This course examines a number of concepts that affect the manager's ability to shape change, including managerial craft, constraints, organizational culture, the ability to learn, collaboration and contracting, autonomy, ethics and leadership.

The secondary theme is to **understand the contingencies of management**. There is plenty of prescriptive advice about how to manage well. This advice is often persuasive, but not attentive to the particular factors that led to success or failure. A managerial strategy that works in one instance (e.g. "set clear goals and delegate") might fail in another because it does not align with organizational culture, employee motivations, the nature of the task, the skills of the leader, the political context, etc. There are no absolute rules in management. Rather, the good manager understands the contingent nature of the environment, and adapts accordingly. The process of case-based analysis can help us understand the importance of context, but only if you are willing to examine and identify what contextual factors that might have affected outcomes, and use the case analysis as a way to probe existing claims about public management.

The course materials include conceptual and analytic literature as well as case materials and examples drawn from a variety of sources. The idea is that you should use the conceptual materials to analyze issues raised by the cases and examples.

The cases include studies of schools, examining the role of senior managers such as the heads of the World Bank, the Department of Defense, and the White House, the

challenges NGOs face in a developing context, learning to better wage the war in Iraq, contracting negotiations between a non-profit and a local government, and seeking solutions to homelessness. Each case develops major themes relevant to anyone providing public services in either a domestic or international context.

Required Readings

All assigned readings are either available on electronic reserve or will be distributed to you prior to class. A reader will be available for purchase from Pickwick Papers (formerly Bob's Copy Shop) at 1401 University Ave. You need not buy any books.

Assignments

You are expected to complete the following assignments:

- Case Memos: 6 case analyses/memos (no more than two single spaced pages, 12 point font, Times New Roman, 1 inch margins). Cases are due to me via email before the beginning of class on dates listed in the syllabus, with the exception of the Fog of War memo. There are 11 teaching cases in the syllabus. Three of these cases are for in-class discussion. The other eight ask you to prepare a memo. You may complete all eight memos and have your best six count. There is no obligation to complete more than six cases. You are required to complete the contracting exercise. Even if you do not complete the case memo, you are expected to have read the case and able to discuss it in class.
- Course Papers: As part of the course, you will be asked to “shadow” an actual public manager. Based on your contact with this manager, you will be asked to produce a 15 page (double spaced) course paper, due no later than 9am on December 16; a 6 page paper on the organizational culture due on November 3, and a 2 page prospectus due on October 6. During the semester you should think about how the topic we examine in any given week is relevant to the manager you are studying.

Note that all written assignments must be submitted electronically. More detail on the assignments is provided below.

Grading

Your maximum score for the entire course is 100 points. These points may be earned as follows:

- each case analysis 10 points, for a total of 60 points;
 culture paper 15 points;
 final paper 25 points;

Course grades will be based on a modified curve. In general, one standard deviation above the class mean will earn an A, one standard deviation below the class mean will earn a C, unless the class mean is sufficiently high to warrant more A's and fewer C's. Any student scoring above a 90 automatically receives an A.

Case Discussions

For most classes, we will discuss and analyze teaching cases. A typical teaching case tells a story (that is, something happened, then something else happened, then something else happened, and so on) about a problem or issue facing a public manager and brings the reader to a point at which a decision must be made. A good way to get to the heart of a case is to try and summarize the story in case in one sentence. You may be asked for such summaries during case discussions.

Another quality of a good teaching case is that there is no obvious right answer. Rather, there are many possible answers (decisions, solutions), each of which has advantages and disadvantages and about which reasonable people may disagree. Therefore, the questions I ask for each case (at the end of the syllabus) are intentionally broad. You will be asked to make a good argument for the answer that you believe is the best one. Each case is intended to force a decision of some kind, and if you complete a memo without making some sort of recommendation you will lose points. You must take account of the pros and cons of the approach you are recommending, supporting your answer with evidence from the case and theoretical insights from the readings. Good arguments usually require a close and insightful reading of the case.

Case discussions will generally focus on the actions or problems of public managers in the case as they are caused or influenced by contextual (structural or institutional) factors. You may be asked, “What would you do (and why)?” You may be asked to play the roles of actors in the case, and there may be brief, spontaneous, in-class “role plays.” You should take this role playing (that is, the issues facing the actors in the case) seriously, but it is OK to have some fun with it.

To prepare for a case discussion, read the case and answer the following questions:

- Who is the decision maker? What decision is to be made?
- What are the decision maker’s objectives?
- Are there other important actors?
- What are their objectives?
- What are the key issues (matters of fact or assumption that must be resolved in reaching a decision)?
- What is the context (constraints/opportunities)?
- What alternatives should the decision maker consider?
- What would you do, and why?

Course Paper and Shadowing Public Managers

It is never fully possible to replicate the context of public management in the classroom. Instead, this class asks you to shadow an actual public manager. The instructor will provide a list of managers who have agreed to work with the class, and you will have a chance to express a preference about which manager you wish to work with (if there is a

manager you would prefer to work with, and is not on the list, please tell the instructor). Starting in mid to late September, you should start meeting with your assigned manager. For the remainder of the semester, you should have at least 15 hours contact with the manager, and at least four visits. The exercise involves more than just interviewing the manager, but also following the manager around in his/her work context, observing how the organization works, and talking to other employees.

As a result of shadowing the manager, you will develop a final paper and a presentation. That paper should a) discuss the organization (its function, culture, political context) and briefly describe the manager (experience, responsibilities), b) a specific topic that you identify in conjunction with your manager (e.g., some decision, committee, report, event, management issue), and c) what you learned from the experience. The specific topic you study should be the heart of the paper. You should also include a one page appendix that details the dates, times and nature of your contacts with the manager.

In general, you are expected to use applicable concepts and ideas from the course to analyze your topic. That is, while your paper may (indeed, should) include descriptive material, you are expected to be analytical and not merely descriptive. By analytical, I mean that you attempt to answer a “why” question: Why did the manager choose a particular strategy? Why did an innovation succeed or fail? Why is an agency managed the way that it is? I will be looking for arguments that are based on a theoretical/conceptual logic applied to the evidence you have gathered.

Do research! Draw upon the class readings relevant to your chosen issue/problem, readings from other classes (especially the Public Management class taught by Professor Dresang), check e-indices and databases for relevant articles and information, including policy and public administration journals and news analyses/editorials. Once you have defined the issue, identify alternative courses of action for the public manager(s), including different approaches to dealing with the issue/problem. You should also consider the context and constraints under which public managers in this agency are operating. What have we learned from research and practice that is relevant to your analysis, and what knowledge or information is lacking that the public manager might need?

In order to start you thinking about your final paper early, you will have a **prospectus** to complete by October 6. The prospectus for the course paper should be organized as follows:

- your topic: the question or issue you intend to address and why you believe it to be interesting;
- your research plan: how you will gather information and evidence to address your question;
- obstacles/constraints: any difficulties or problems you might encounter in completing the course paper;
- what sort of theories or readings you anticipate using;
- the kinds of conclusions (or claims) you hope to be able to reach.

You will also be asked to prepare a paper on **organizational culture** due on November 3. In this paper you will do a six page analysis of the nature of the culture in the organization you are studying, using the guidance of the Schein reading assigned for that day. What is the nature of the organizational culture? How do you know? What are the relevant symbols and artifacts? Are there multiple organizational cultures in place? How does the organizational culture shape the behavior of the employees? Is your manager aware of the organizational culture? Do they try to use it? Use specific examples!

Here are a few guidelines for preparing your final paper.

- Your final paper should include enough basic facts and descriptive material (maps, organization charts, budgets, time lines), either in the text or in appendices, so that a reader understands the context of your analysis. Provide basic descriptive material, charts and maps, budgets, organization charts, etc., as appropriate.
- State the question or issue you are addressing in your course paper clearly and concisely at the outset. Then tell the reader how your argument will be organized. If appropriate, give a brief summary of your conclusions.
- Do not “editorialize” (that is, give opinions unsubstantiated by facts or analysis). Your conclusions should emerge from dispassionate analysis of evidence. For example, if your paper is about a successful manager, provide the reader with the evidence on which to base such a positive conclusion. (Don’t assert that the Commissioner is such a charismatic, brilliant, caring, and selfless person that employees will leap off tall buildings for her. Say, instead, that four people leaped off tall buildings, leaving behind notes saying that they did it because of their Commissioner’s charisma and brilliance.)
- Choose topics that pose an intellectual challenge. Address a “why” question where the answer is by no means obvious, not even to people actually involved. You will earn more points if you choose a difficult rather than an easy topic and if your insights are clever or unique rather than ordinary.
- Your paper should show what is interesting about your topic. It could be something that is of pressing practical importance and/or of theoretical interest. For example, each of the case memos identifies something interesting in their respective organization. It could be the main challenge that the agency faces? In addition, you should advance some sort of argument about the matter of interest, e.g. the success of policy X will be limited by the organizational culture of front-line workers.

Criteria for Course Paper Grades:

Application of course concepts	8
appropriateness	(4)
execution	(4)

- clarity of question and soundness of argument 8
- intellectual challenge 6
- quality of writing/organization 3

Class Participation

You are required to attend each class. If you are unable to attend on any given day, please notify the instructor in advance. You will be expected to have completed all required readings before coming to class. Since the class is a small seminar, participation is essential, and will be considered in the case of borderline grades.

What you take away from this course will be determined largely by the quality of the class discussions. Thus, you should do all of the assigned reading BEFORE we meet for the class session. If you come unprepared, it will be difficult to make valuable contributions or to gain from the discussions. John Bryson offers four “hallmarks of good participation” that I suggest you attempt to follow: a) risk-taking (i.e., presenting an opposing view or a different interpretation of the readings/information); b) listening, (i.e., trying to understand what others are saying and why they are saying it); c) bringing in your own work-related experiences when relevant to the discussions; and d) monitoring your own participation in terms of both “air-time” and quality.

Ranking Arguments

Considerable emphasis will be placed on your ability to make sound arguments in your memos, class discussion and your course paper. Evaluation of arguments will generally use the following ranking scheme, from the least to the most appropriate type of argument.

- **(The “no argument” argument)** A public manager took particular actions. She should have taken other actions instead.

Problem: no evidence or reasons are supplied to support the conclusions.

- **(The “Well, Duh!” argument)** A public manager took particular actions. She should have acted differently
 - for reasons that are obvious in hindsight: (examples: she had no political support, so she should have mobilized the support she needed; she failed to win over the constituency that ended up defeating her);
 - because of principles that, on reflection, always apply (for example: always consider the values and feelings of your subordinates).

Problem: such answers, emphasizing hindsight, contain none of the kind of cause-and-effect insight that comes from taking a more analytical approach. Thus a reader gets warmed-over “counsels of perfection” rather than insight into how to handle complex public management situations.

- **(The “Who needs theory?” argument)** A public manager took particular actions. It would have been better had she taken different actions [supply clever, perceptive, non-obvious insight of the following forms]:
 - reasoning based on shrewd observation of the evidence in the case or lessons from personal experience;
 - reasoning that implies but does not state a more complex theory or concept of general but not universal validity (example: her actions assumed that her subordinates would comply, but they stood to gain more by noncompliance.)

Problem: argument lacks a conceptual or theoretical basis. An insightful argument of this kind can earn points, however.

- **(The “I know what this course is about” argument)** A public manager took particular actions. It would have been better had she taken different actions because this is an example of [apply a model/concept that incorporates a cause-and-effect logic and
 - use it as a source of vocabulary for interpreting the facts in the case, then state conclusions;
 - apply that logic to the facts of the case and derive conclusions].

The emphasis in these arguments is on applying the logic of analytic models to the facts of cases or real world problems in order to gain non-obvious, non-descriptive insights into how the managerial world works.

Additional Guidelines

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITY STATEMENT. The Americans with Disability Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring accommodation, please advise the instructor.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: As commonly defined, plagiarism consists of passing off as one’s own ideas, the words, writings, music, graphs/charts, etc. that were created by another. In accordance with this definition, you are committing plagiarism if you copy the work of another person and turn it in as your own, even if you have the permission of that person. It does not matter from where the material is copied—a book, article,

interview, material off the web, another student's paper—all constitute plagiarism unless the source of the work is fully identified and credited. Plagiarism is cheating and a violation of academic and personal integrity and will not be tolerated. It carries extremely serious consequences. To avoid plagiarism it is necessary when using a phrase, a distinctive idea, quotation, concept or sentence from another source to reference that source in your text, a footnote, or endnote.

9/8

Public Management as Key to Governance?

Lynn, Laurence E., Jr. 2003. "Public Management." In J. Pierre and B. Peters, eds., *Handbook of Public Administration*, pp. 14-24.

Kaufman, Herbert. 2001. "Major Players: Bureaucracies in American Government" *Public Administration Review* 61(1):18-42

Kaufmann, Daniel. 2005. Back to Basics: 10 Myths About Governance and Corruption. *Finance & Development* 42 (3).

Moynihan, Donald P. 2007. "The MBA is Dead: Long Live the MPA!" *Public Management Review* 9(1): 155-158.

Additional reading:

You will be asked to write a good number of memos through the course of the semester. Some helpful advice about how to structure an argument and write a memo can be found in the following readings.

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 1995. *The Craft of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapter 7: "Making Good Arguments: An Overview," pp. 88-93.

From Electronic Hallway: "Memo Writing"; "Brief Guidelines for Writing Action Memos", "Writing Effective Memoranda: Planning, Drafting, & Revising".

9/15

Leadership: Managerial Craft

Readings: Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal. 1991. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 3-39.

Chase, Gordon. 1979. "Implementing a Human Service Program: How Hard Will It Be?" *Public Policy*, 27(4): 385-435.

Shalala, Donna. 1998. "Are Large Public Organizations Manageable." *Public Administration Review*. 58 (4): 284-289.

Sergio Fernandez and Hal G. Rainey. 2006. Managing Successful Organizational Change in the Public Sector. *Public Administration Review*. 66(2): 168-176

In-class case discussion: Gladwell, Malcolm. 2006. "Dept. of Social Services: Million Dollar Murray." *The New Yorker*.

9/22 The Risks and Benefits of Autonomy

Readings: Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, Chapter 1: "The Critical Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats, pp. 1-12; Chapter 2: "Street-Level Bureaucrats as Policy Makers," pp. 13-25.

Rathgeb Smith, Steven. 2003. Street-Level Bureaucracy and Public Policy. In J. Pierre and B.G. Peters, eds., *Handbook of Public Administration*, pp. 354-363.

William Ouchi. 2005. "Making Public Schools Work: Management Reform as Key." *Academy of Management Journal*. 48(6): 929-934.

Case: Two Steps Back. This American Life www.thislife.org, Episode # 275.

9/29 Networks, Networks Everywhere

H. Brinton Milward and Keith Provan. 2006. A Manager's Guide to Choosing and Using Collaborative Frameworks. IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Case: **Trust as an Asset**

In class exercise: Creating a Community Partnership

Online material:

For more case studies on collaboration, go to:

<http://www.businessofgovernment.org/allsearch/index.asp?Description=Collaboration%3A+Networks+and+Partnerships>

10/6 Learning under Difficult Circumstances

Arygris, Chris and Donald Schon, chapter 1, *What Is An Organization That It May Learn?*

Gladwell, Malcolm. 2003. "Connecting the Dots: The Paradox of Intelligence Reform." *The New Yorker*, March 10, 83-89.

Moynihan, Donald P. "Learning under Uncertainty: Networks in Crisis Management." *Public Administration Review*.

Case: Packer, George. 2006. "Knowing the Enemy." *The New Yorker*, December 18.
This American Life, #333, The Center for Lessons Learned (Prologue – Second Half: Prologue)
http://www.thislife.org/Radio_Episode.aspx?episode=333

Due: Final Paper Prospectus

10/13 Leadership: Constraints, Scandal and Accountability

Kaufman, Herbert. 1981. "The Confines of Leadership," in *The Administrative Behavior of Federal Bureau Chiefs*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, pp. 91-138.

Reich, Robert B. 1990. *Public Management in a Democratic Society*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Chapter 1: "Introduction," pp. 1-9.

Barbara Romzek and Patricia Ingraham. "Cross Pressures of Accountability: Initiative, Command, and Failure in the Ron Brown Plane Crash." *Public Administration Review*, 60 (3): 240-253.

Case: Leading an International Organization: The Fall of Wolfowitz

10/20 Contracting in the Hollow State

Romzek, Barbara S. and Johnston, Jocelyn M. 2005. "State Social Services Contracting: Exploring Determinants of Effective Contract Accountability." *Public Administration Review*, 65 (4): 436-49.

Carolyn Heinrich and Youseok Choi. 2007. "Privatization and Performance Based Contracting in Public Welfare Programs." *American Review of Public Administration*. 37(4): 409-435

Brown, Trevor L., Matthew Potoski and David Van Slyke. 2006. "Managing Public Service Contracts: Aligning Values, Institutions and Markets." *Public Administration Review* 66 (3): 323-331.

Dias, Janice J and Maynard-Moody, Steven. 2007. "For-Profit Welfare: Contracts, Conflicts, and the Performance Paradox." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17, 189-211.

Case: Contracting Exercise (required)

10/27 Motivation

Perry, James, Debra Mesch and Laurie Paarlberg. Motivating Employees in a New Governance Era: The Performance Paradigm Revisited. *Public Administration Review*. 66(4): 89-122.

Wright, Bradley. 2001. "Public Sector Work Motivation: A Review of the Current Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(3): 560-586.

Moynihan, Donald P. "The Normative Model in Decline: Public Service Motivation in the Age of Governance." Forthcoming in James L. Perry and Annie Hondeghem (Eds.), Forthcoming in *Motivation in Public Management*, James L. Perry and Annie Hondeghem (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

11/03 Understanding Change via Culture

Schein, Edgar. 1997. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. pp.3-48.

Khademian, Anne M., 2000, "Is Silly Putty Manageable? Looking for Links Between Culture, Management and Context," in *Advancing Public Management: New Developments in Theory, Methods and Practice* (also skim *Working with Culture*, also by Khademian, that you read in the Introduction to Public Management Class).

Moynihan, Donald P. "The Cultural Moment: Leadership and Responsiveness during Hurricane Katrina."

Due: Culture paper

In class case discussion: The cultural moment

11/10 NGOs and Development

- Readings:** Townsend, J., Porter, G. and Mawdsley, E. 2004, "Creating Spaces of Resistance: Development NGOs and the Clients in Ghana, India and Mexico." *Antipode*, 36 (5): 871-889.
- Stiles, K. 2002. "International support for NGOs in Bangladesh: Some unintended consequences," *World Development*, 30 (5): 835-846.
- White, S. 1999. "NGOs, civil society, and the state in Bangladesh: The politics of representing the poor," *Development and Change*. 30 (2) 307-326.
- Case:** Financing Slum Rehabilitation in Mumbai: A Nonprofit Caught in the Middle.

11/17 **Leading Change Responsibly**

- Readings:** Bertelli, Anthony and Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. 2003. "Managerial Responsibility." *Public Administration Review*, 63 (3): 259-268.
- Pollitt, Christopher. 2000. "Is the Emperor in His Underwear? An Analysis of the Impacts of Public Management Reform." *Public Management*, 2 (2): 181-199.
- The Angler series*, Washington Post.
- Case:** The Angler: Richard Cheney as Public Manager

11/24 **Managerial Ethics**

- Readings:** Dobel, J. Patrick. 2006. "Public Management as Ethics." In Ferlie, Ewan, Laurence E. Lynn Jr. and Christopher Pollitt (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. 157-181.
- Mackenzie, G. Calvin. 2002. *Scandal Proof: Do Ethics Laws Make Government Ethical?* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, Chapter 7: "Lessons," pp. 149-177.
- O' Leary, Rosemary. *The Ethics of Dissent: Managing Guerrilla Government*, chapter 1.
- Case:** The Fog of War. A transcript of the movie can be found at: http://www.errolmorris.com/film/fow_transcript.html

11/27 **Fog of War memo due by 9am**

12/1 **Final presentations I**

12/08 **Final Presentations II**

12/16 **Final paper due, 9 a.m.**

Case Assignment Instructions

Case Analysis #1

Two Steps Back

What are the management causes of the rise and decline of the Chicago public school presented in the show? What general public management principles can you draw from the case?

Case Analysis #2 (in-class discussion, not for credit)

Department of Social Service: Million Dollar Murray

What does the case tell us about the idea of managerial craft and change?

Case Analysis #3

Leading an International Institution: The Fall of Wolfowitz

Evaluate Wolfowitz as a manager of the World Bank. Was his resignation appropriate? What should he have done differently in your view?

Case Analysis #4

Knowing the Enemy/The Center for Lessons Learned

Using the readings and the This American Life show, how would you characterize the challenges to learning that the Department of Defense faces in Iraq? Are there any principles or practices they could follow to increase learning?

Case Analysis #5

Trust as an Asset (A)

At the end of the case the leaders of 13 community organizations need to consider how to grow their alliance. How would you recommend they proceed? What are the potential risks and benefits of the course of action you propose.

Case Analysis #6 (in-class discussion, not for credit)

Creating a Community Partnership

Follow the directions of the exercise, except that each group will have 30 minutes to develop an outline, and 10 minutes to present.

Case Analysis #7

Contracting Exercise

The case is a combination of a class memo and in-class exercise. The goal of the case is to develop a contract between a Local Mental Health Board (LMHB) and a nonprofit mental health services agency (Bridge). The case has its own instructions, which you should follow unless they contradict the instructions I lay out below. The following steps are involved:

- 1) Prepare a contract for the provision of services. Your initial contract is intended to further the goals of the entity you represent and be at least minimally acceptable to the other party. If your surname starts with a letter between A-M, you will represent the LMHB, and surnames N-Z will represent Bridge. Note that each individual prepares his/her own contract, and will accompany it with a 1-2 page explanatory memo that covers the basic principles behind the contract. Email me the contract and explanatory note before class, and bring enough copies for the rest of your team to read.
- 2) In class, each side will spend about 25 minutes turning the multiple contracts into one. Bring your laptop if you have one, but I will have mine on hand.
- 3) Following that, the LMHB and Bridge will negotiate a final contract for an additional 30 minutes.
- 4) This will be followed by a discussion period.

If you want to find actual performance contracts, some of the major W-2 contracts referred to in the Heinrich and Choi piece are available online. You are not expected to design a contract to this level of detail, but this is intended merely to give you a sense of how such contracts are actually done. For example, below is a link to a website you can obtain W-2 performance contracting in "2004-05 period".

<http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/dws/w2/contracts/20042005/default.htm>

Detailed information on performance-standards and measurements are specified in "Appendix B" section(Performance Standards for the 2004-2005 W-2 and Related Programs Contract). Below is a link to it.

<http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/dws/w2/contracts/20022003/appendixes.htm>

Case analysis #8

The cultural moment (in class discussion only)

What does the case tell us about the relationship between organizational culture and collaboration? About the potential for collaboration in crisis situations?

Case Analysis #9

Financing Slum Rehabilitation in Mumbai: A Nonprofit Caught in the Middle

What does the case (and the readings) tell us about the challenges that NGO managers like Patel face in a developing context? What should be her next steps?

Case Analysis #10

The Angler: Richard Cheney as Public Manager

Answer one of the following:

How would you rate Cheney as a managerial craftsman? How would you rate him as a responsible leader, according to criteria laid out by Bertelli and Lynn?

or

You are Richard Cheney. You have decided to return to the political science department at the University of Wisconsin Madison to complete your PhD. At the invitation of

Professor Moynihan, you agree to write memo containing the key managerial insights that you have gleaned from your career in the public sector.

Case Analysis #11

Case: The Fog of War

Pick one of the following two options.

Option A: The filmmaker Errol Morris offers a summary list of what he thinks are the lessons from McNamara's life. Come up with your own lessons for public managers, and where possible tie to readings supporting your point. Pick two or three, and write a two page summary.

Option B: McNamara had an extraordinary career ranging from the private sector, the Department of Defense and the World Bank. Is he an ethical person? Did he act ethically? What are the ethical lessons that we can take from his life?

You can find a transcript of the movie here:

http://www.errolmorris.com/film/fow_transcript.html.

Note that this assignment is due after the class rather than on the day of the class, on November 27th, at 9 a.m.