



JSGS 801 – Governance and Administration

	University of Regina Campus	University of Saskatchewan Campus
Instructor:	Greg Argue	
Phone:	537-1965	
E-mail:	Greg.Argue@uregina.ca	
Office Hours:	By appointment	
Office Location:	110.17 – 2 Research Drive U of R	
Term:	Winter 2012	
Room:	RIC 208	
Date and Time:	January 10 th ; Tuesdays 5:45 – 8:30	

CALENDAR DESCRIPTION

This course analyzes governing institutions and the process of modern government within Canada as a means of enhancing a student's understanding of policy formulation and implementation. This course is intended to provide a basis for critically assessing political and administrative decision-making and policy outcomes.

COURSE CONTENT AND APPROACH

As students of public sector governance and administration, we endeavor to understand the theory and practice of institutions; public sector managers and management; and the political, social, and economic environment that surrounds governance.

The course is divided into two parts. The first focuses on the institutions of policy making in Canada with some additional comparative material. We consider the vital institutions of the Canadian public sector, including the Constitution, parliamentary government, the Cabinet system of government, federalism, the judiciary and the rule of law, and the public service. The format will be lectures, discussion lead by the professor and presentations by knowledgeable people in the field (practitioners).

The second part is devoted to contemporary challenges in public sector management. The institutional frame is still there, but this part of the course is focused on contemporary problems including the changing focus on government accountability, developing more effective policies and programs, the relationships between governments and citizens, and how governments provide services to their citizens. The sessions will be lead by students with questions and discussion from other members of the class expected throughout.

REQUIRED READINGS

- Dunn, Christopher (Editor). 2010. *The Handbook of Canadian Public Administration*. 2nd ed. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press. (available from the University Bookstore) It would be helpful to have reviewed the assigned chapters in this book before the start of class. Once class begins, you may not

have sufficient time the evening before to do the readings and prepare the assigned written course work.

- Additional journal articles listed under the Session Headings below. If you do not have time to read all of the selections, at least do some reading starting with the selections that interest you the most. All articles can be accessed electronically through the UR Library. Search for the journal title under the link to “Electronic Resources.” UR Library reference personnel help if assistance is required. It would be useful before the start of the course to search for several of the articles from your computer to make certain that you are familiar with how the system works.
- Forsey [Senator] Eugene, 2010. *How Canadians Govern Themselves*. 7th ed. Ottawa, ON: Library of Parliament. Very short and highly readable classic on how Canadian democracy and federalism, and how the institutions of Canadian government, function.
Online at: <http://www2.parl.gc.ca/sites/lop/aboutparliament/forsey/index-e.asp>

SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS

For students who require some additional background on public administration, Canadian politics and structures, and government decision-making, there are a number of textbooks and other pieces on government that are worth consulting. I recommend the following sources in particular, all of which have been put on reserve in the library for the course:

- McIvor, Heather. 2008. *Parameters of Power: Canada's Political Institutions*. 5th ed.
Thomson Nelson. JL 65 P373 2008
- Kernaghan, Kenneth and David Siegel. 1999. *Public Administration in Canada*. 4th ed.
Thomson Nelson. JL 108 K45 1999
- Johnson, David. 2006. *Thinking Government: Public Sector Management in Canada*. 2nd ed.
Broadview Press. JL 108 J64 2006

Book Review (1,200 words)	15 %	February 7 th - emailed through UR Courses
E-Scan (1,500 words)	15 %	February 28 th – emailed through UR Courses
Group Presentations	30 %	(Weeks 7 – 13)
Participation	10 %	Verbal Contributions and In-class Assignments
Policy Brief (2,000 words)	30 %	April 10 th – emailed through UR Courses

LATE ASSIGNMENTS

Late penalties will be in operation except for documented medical reasons. There are no exceptions. Extensions will not be granted.

Penalties:	1 day –	5 %
	2-4 days -	15 %
	5-7 days -	25 %

Assignments are not accepted after 7 late days except for documented medical reasons.

STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Students in this course, who, because of a disability, may have a need for accommodations, are encouraged to come and discuss accommodations with the instructor and to contact the Coordinator of Special Needs Services at 585-4631.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND CONDUCT

Ensuring that you understand and follow the principles of academic integrity and conduct as laid out in the University of Regina's Graduate Calendar and the University of Saskatchewan's Guidelines for Academic Conduct is vital to your success in graduate school. Ensuring that your work is your own and reflects both your own ideas and those of others incorporated in your work is important: ensuring that you acknowledge the ideas, words, and phrases of others that you use is a vital part of the scholarly endeavour. If you have any questions at all about academic integrity in general or about specific issues, contact your course instructor and to discuss your questions.

DESCRIPTION OF WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS

Book Review:

We have selected books that are contemporary assessments of the state of public administration and governance in Canada. You can purchase these books independently through Chapters or Amazon, or your own preferred book provider. Review the book on the merits of the argument, paying close attention to the insights they provide for governing and governance. It should outline the main purposes of the book, briefly summarize the methodology and the theoretical perspectives (assuming the latter exist) and offer critical observations on its strengths and weaknesses. You are not supposed to simply summarize the book chapter by chapter. Rather, you are required to situate it in the broader topic of governing and governance and provide an analytical assessment of the piece. It should be no more than **1,200 words or 4 pages**.

- David Good, *Politics of Public Money: Spenders, Guardians, Priority Setters, and Financial Watchdogs inside the Canadian Government*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Eddie Goldenberg, *The Way It Works: Inside Ottawa*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2007.
- F.L. Morton and Rainer Knopff, *The Charter Revolution and the Court Party*, Peterborough: Broadview press, 2000.
- Andrew Sancton, *The Limits of Boundaries: Why City-regions Cannot be Self-governing* McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008.
- Richard Simeon, *Federal-Provincial Diplomacy: The Making of Recent Policy in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- David E. Smith, *Federalism and the Constitution of Canada* Toronto; University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Environmental Scan (E-Scan):

Your **second writing assignment** is to conduct an environmental scan for a governance organization of your choice. This could be a government department, an international organization, or a non-governmental organization. An environmental scan is an attempt to identify what is going on in an organization's external environment that may pose challenges or offer opportunities in the future. Typically, a scan will identify trends, events and emerging issues that are likely to have an impact on the way an organization performs its functions and meets its goals. Although scans can be conducted in a variety of formats, please follow the format from the document below <http://www.finance.gov.sk.ca/PlanningAndReporting/EnvironmentalScanGuidelines.pdf> and present information for each of the five components of a scan identified in these guidelines. Each section should be about 300 words in length for a total of **1500 words**. Remember, although the analysis and synopsis components begin to suggest possible solutions, a scan is largely a descriptive exercise.

Policy Brief

Your **third writing assignment** is to prepare a policy paper of **2000 words** based on a problem identified in your environmental scan. While a policy paper is based on research, it is not an academic research paper. It is a focused piece of writing designed to frame an issue as a problem requiring the urgent attention of policy makers and to provide a policy recommendation from among the available alternatives. The paper generally includes a short statement of the problem and its context, the identification of alternative policy responses and a choice amongst the alternatives. The statement of the problem should make it clear why the problem is important and the context should provide only the bare minimum of detail needed to support this claim for attention. The recommendation should be clearly justified as advancing a satisfactory solution to the problem. A policy paper provides the essential background on the basis of which a more formal policy analysis of the options could be conducted and shorter documents such as the briefing note or cabinet decision item can be prepared.

DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTATION AND PARTICIPATION

In smaller groups, you will be responsible for leading one of the seminars from Week 7 to Week 13 so that you will act as the course professor for the week. In a good seminar, everyone will have read all of the required texts (supplemented by a few of the recommended readings) and speak to the general themes and issues for that week – rather than simply summarizing each article in turn. Everyone will have considered the theme questions and have some responses to them. Participants will come with questions and make verbal contributions to the seminar (this is a component of your participation grades).

Participations grades are cumulative, based on attendance, verbal contributions, and results on in-class assignments. No rescheduling of in-class assignments will occur. If you are excused from that day of class, you will be excused from the assignment. Assignment structure will be determined by the professor and only announced that day. It will involve questions from the week's required readings and will be designed to gauge whether or not you have come prepared to class and help develop your abilities to write under pressure.

EMAIL POLICY

To help with communication, all emails should be sent through UR Courses rather than to the instructor's personal email. Also, as this is a professional environment, all emails are to be composed using professional language and appropriate formatting. This means proper salutations, punctuations, grammar and sentence structure, ending with an appropriate closing.

GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Session 1: Introduction

Tuesday January 10th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

The art of governing takes place in an institutional environment that both constrains and liberates public policy. This course focuses on that institutional environment in Canada beginning with the country's evolving constitutional framework. It assesses the ways in which original institutional designs constrain key actors, namely politicians and bureaucrats, and the ways in which institutions have been changed to meet new challenges. Whether the resulting institutional mix is capable of satisfying contemporary requirements of democratic governance is an abiding normative concern. Can public sector managers draw strength from institutions or are they hobbled and compromised by a framework that cannot be adequately reformed to supply policy innovation, public responsiveness and accountability?

Required readings:

- Stoker, Gerry. 1998. "Governance as Theory: 5 Propositions." *International Social Science Journal* 50: 17-28. Online
- Skogstad, Grace. 2003. "Who Governs? Who Should Govern? Political Authority and Legitimacy in Canada in the Twenty-First Century." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 36: 955-973. Online
- Roberts, Alastair. "Chapter 12: A Fragile State: Federal Public Administration in the Twentieth Century." *The Handbook*
- Sossin, Lorne. "Chapter 15: Democratic Administration." *The Handbook*

Supplementary reading

- Fredrickson, H. George. 2005. "Whatever Happened to Public Administration? Governance, Governance Everywhere." In Ewan Ferlie, Lawrence Lynn, and Christopher Pollitt eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 282-304.]

Session 2: The Canadian Constitution - Parliamentary Government

Tuesday January 17th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

The animating principal of parliamentary government is the idea of a political executive drawn from and responsible to the legislative assembly. All of the advantages and shortcomings of parliamentary government are ultimately traceable to this principal. Critics of responsible government take aim at two features: first, the relatively inconsequential role assigned to elected Members of Parliament; and second, the ineffectual character of ministerial responsibility. Does the system work as it was originally designed to work? Is it a system that is adequate for the demands of contemporary governance?

- Smith, David. "Clarifying the Doctrine of Ministerial Responsibility as it Applies to the Government and Parliament of Canada." *Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities Research Studies I*, 101-43. Online

<http://site.ebrary.com.libproxy.uregina.ca:2048/lib/uregina/docDetail.action?docID=10119488>

- Sutherland, Sharon. 1991. "Responsible Government and Ministerial Responsibility: Every Solution is its Own Problem." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 24: 91-111. Online

- Aucoin, Peter, Jennifer Smith, and Geoff Dinsdale. 2004. *Responsible Government: Clarifying Essentials, Dispelling Myths and Exploring Change*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development. Online at

http://www.cspcs-efpc.gc.ca/pbp/pub/pdfs/P120_e.pdf

- Polidano, Charles. 1999. "The Bureaucrat Who Fell Under a Bus: Ministerial Responsibility, Executive Agencies and The Derek Lewis Affair in Britain." *Governance* 12: 201-229. Online

Session 3: The Modern Government

Tuesday January 24th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

The traditional fear of Cabinet domination of parliament has been overtaken in recent years by an even greater anxiety, namely that Cabinet itself has been eclipsed by the Prime Minister who, with a small cadre of senior officials and partisan advisors, now dominates all aspects of policy and administration. Is the idea of "court government" a gross exaggeration? Is it an accurate description of the exercise of power but unproblematic? Do the current government models "work"?

Required readings:

- Dunn, Christopher. "Chapter 5: The Central Executive in Canadian Government: Searching for the Holy Grail." In *The Handbook*.
- D'Ombrain, Nicolas. 2007. "Ministerial Responsibility and the Machinery of Government," *Canadian Public Administration* 50: 195-218.
- Bakvis, Herman. 2001. "Prime Minister and Cabinet in Canada: An Autocracy in Need of Reform?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 35: 60-79.
- Bourgault, Jacques. "Chapter 28: The Role of Deputy Ministers." In *The Handbook*.

Supplementary readings:

Savoie, Donald. 1999. *Governing From the Centre* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

White, Graham. 2006. *Cabinets and First Ministers*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rasmussen, Ken and Gregory P. Marchildon. 2005. "Saskatchewan's Executive Decision-Making Style: The Centrality of Planning." In *Executive Styles in Canada: Cabinet Structures and Leadership Practices in Canadian Government*, edited by Luc Bernier, Keith Brownsey and Michael Howlett, 184-207. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Weller, Patrick. 2003. "Cabinet government: An elusive ideal," *Public Administration* 81: 701-722.

Session 4: The Public Service: Form and Function

Tuesday January 31st 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

The public service in Canada was created in the struggle between the local requirements of patronage and political mobilization and the national requirements of bureaucratization imposed by nation wide projects. Since the early 20th century the public service has undergone a number of transformations and followed a number of “models.” New entities have been created to improve, program delivery, policy formation, and horizontal coordination. Is the current public service organized to meet the governance challenges of the 21st century?

- Molot, Henry L. “Chapter 3: The Public Service of Canada.” *The Handbook*
- Thomas, Paul G. “Chapter 6: Parliament and the Public Service.” *The Handbook*
- Zussman, David R. 2008. *The New Governing Balance: Politicians and Public Servants in Canada*. The Tansley Lecture. March 13: http://www.uregina.ca/sipp/documents/pdf/Tansley_08_online.pdf
- Lindquist, Evert. 2006. *A Critical Moment: Capturing and Conveying the Evolution of the Canadian Public Service*. Ottawa, ON: Canada School of Public Service. Online at http://www.csps-efpc.gc.ca/pbp/pub/pdfs/P134_e.pdf
- Aucoin, Peter. 1995. *The New Public Management: Canada in Comparative Perspective*. Montreal: IRPP. Online at <http://libproxy.uregina.ca:2048/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uregina/Doc?id=10210291>

Supplementary readings:

- Mulgan, Geoff. 2008. *Taking Public Sector Innovation Seriously*. The Manion Lecture (Canada School of Public Service), May. http://www.csps-efpc.gc.ca/events/manion/mlt2008_e.html
- McMullen, Kathryn. “Chapter 26: Restructuring Government: Human resource Issues at the Workplace Level.” In *The Handbook*.
- Whitaker, Reg. 1987. “Between Patronage and Bureaucracy: Democratic Politics in Transition,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 22: 55-71.

Session 5: Federalism I

Tuesday February 7th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

Modern governance is, and some say should be, dispersed across multiple authorities. But how should multi-level governance be organized, how large should jurisdictions be, and what responsibilities should be assigned where? Federalism as a form of multi-level governance makes a number of promises. It promises to protect local minorities assembled in sub-national units, to enhance democracy by allowing greater local autonomy, and to allow for policy innovation. Here we focus on federal-provincial dynamics before moving the following week to consider other dimensions.

Required readings:

- Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2003. “Unraveling the central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance” *American Political Science Review*. 97, 2 (May)

- Cameron, David and Richard Simeon. 2002. "Intergovernmental Relations in Canada: The Emergence of Collaborative Federalism." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 32: 49-71.
- Hooge, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2003. "Unravelling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance" *American Political Science Review* 97: 233-243.
- Scharpf, Fritz. 1988. "The Joint Decision Trap: Lessons from German Federalism and European Integration," *Public Administration* 66: 239-278.
- Simeon, Richard and Christina Murray. 2001. "Multi-sphere governance in South Africa: An Interim Assessment." *Publius* 31 (4): 65-92.
- Pierson, Paul. 1995. "Fragmented Welfare States: Federal Institutions and the Development of Social Policy," *Governance* 8: 449-478.

Supplementary readings:

Stepan, Albert. 1999. "Federalism and Democracy: Beyond the U.S. Model," *Journal of Democracy* 10: 19-34.

Lenihan, Donald G., Tim Barber, Graham Fox, and John Milloy. 2007. "Canadian Federalism: Adapting Constitutional Roles and Responsibilities in the 21st Century." *Policy Options* April: 89-95.

The Judiciary

- Baar, Carl. "Chapter 7: Judicial Administration." *The Handbook*

- McLachlin, Beverly. 2001. "Courts, Legislatures and Executives in the Post-Charter Era." In *Judicial Power and Canadian Democracy*, ed. Paul Howe and Peter Russell, 63-72. Online-UR Library ebook

- Hogg, Peter W. and Cara F. Zwibel. 2005. "The Rule of Law in the Supreme Court of Canada." *University of Toronto Law Journal* 55: 715-33. Online

- Morton, F.L. 2001. "Dialogue or Monologue?" In *Judicial Power and Canadian Democracy*, ed. Paul Howe and Peter Russell, 111-117. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Online-UR Library ebook

Session 6 – Federalism II

Tuesday February 14th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

Here we move from focusing on two levels to considering multiple levels of governance and how they can fit in within a particular system. Canada is one of the most urbanized countries in the world. Has the federal bargain adjusted to meet this new reality? Aboriginal Peoples are also developing another order of governance in Canada. Has federalism in Canada delivered on the promise of flexibility? Is it evolving institutionally toward a more or a less legitimate way of governing?

- Stoney, Christopher and Katherine Graham. 2009. "Federal-municipal relations in Canada: The Changing Organizational Landscape" *Canadian Public Administration*. 52, 3 (September): 371-394.
- Papillon, Martin. 2008. "Canadian Federalism and the Emerging Mosaic of Aboriginal Multilevel Governance" *Canadian Federalism: Performance, Effectiveness, and Legitimacy*. Herman Bakvis and Grace Skogstad, Eds. Don Mill, ON: Oxford University Press, 291-313 [Course Reader]
- Sancton, Andrew and Scott Sams. Chapter 25: Provincial and Local Administrations." In *The Handbook*.
- Wolfe, Jeanne. 2003. "A national urban policy for Canada? Prospects and challenges" *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 12, 1 (Summer).

Session 7: Governance and Networks

Tuesday February 28th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

In spite of the extraordinary continuity and very traditional look of the formal institutions of government in Canada, much of the academic interest in the institutional context of policy making over the last decade has been focused on the supposed shift from top-down, hierarchical “government” with a typical policy output of hard law, towards a flatter, more participatory style of governing, “governance”, that typically produces a range of less formal policy outputs. The institutional context of policy making has certainly changed; questions remain about whether the change is adequately captured by the idea of a “government to governance” shift and what have been the consequences for policy makers and citizens alike.

Governments have different means of achieving their objectives. In recent years, dissatisfaction with “top-down”, hierarchical government and its successor, the creation of markets for public services, has created an interest in governing through loose networks of public and private actors, sometimes called “horizontal governance”. Nonetheless, network governance has proved a challenge. Since networks are based on ties of trust and exchange, it is unclear how networks of public and private actors can be managed and “steered” in the direction of public goals without becoming hierarchical again. If they can’t be steered, then public managers have ceded authority over public policy to non-state actors with potentially embarrassing, or even catastrophic, consequences.

- *Peters, B.G. and J. Pierre. 1998. “Governance with Government? Rethinking Public Administration” *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory* 8: 223-44. Online
- *Esmark, Anders. 2009. “The Functional Differentiation of Governance: Public Governance Beyond Hierarchy, Market and Networks.” *Public Administration* 87: 351-70. Online
- Jordan, A., R.K.W. Wurzel, and A. Zito. 2005. “The Rise of ‘New’ Policy Instruments in Comparative Perspective: Has Governance Eclipsed Government?” *Political Studies* 53: 477-96. Online
- Moran, M. 2001. “Not Steering but Drowning: Policy Catastrophes and the Regulatory State.” *The Political Quarterly* 72: 414-27. Online
- Howlett, Michael, Jeremy Rayner, and Chris Tollefson. 2009. “From Government to Governance in Forest Planning? Lesson from the Case of the British Columbia Great Bear Rainforest Initiative.” *Forest Policy and Economics* 11: 383-91. Online
- Provan, Keith G., and Patrick Kenis. 2007. “Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18: 229-52. Online
- deLeon, Peter, and Daniella M. Varda. 2009. “Toward a Theory of Collaborative Policy networks: Identifying Structural Tendencies.” *Policy Studies Journal* 37: 59-74. Online
- Agranoff, R. 2006. “Inside Collaborative networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers.” *Public Administration Review* 60: 56-65. Online

Governance Challenges

Session 8: From Government to Governance?

Tuesday March 6th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

In spite of the extraordinary continuity and very traditional look of the formal institutions of government in Canada, much of the academic interest in the institutional context of policy making over the last decade has been focused on the supposed shift from top-down, hierarchical “government” with a typical policy output of hard law, towards a flatter, more participatory style of governing, “governance”, that typically produces a range of less formal policy outputs. The institutional context of policy making has certainly changed; questions remain about whether the change is adequately captured by the idea of a “government to governance” shift and what have been the consequences for policy makers and citizens alike.

Required readings:

- Peters, B. G., and J. Pierre. 1998. “Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8: 223-44.
- Vans Kersbergen, K., and F. Van Waarden. 2004. “Governance’ as a Bridge between Disciplines: Cross-Disciplinary Inspiration Regarding Shifts in Governance and Problems of Governability, Accountability and Legitimacy.” *European Journal of Political Research* 43: 143-71.
- Jordan, A., R. K. W. Wurzel, and A. Zito. 2005. “The Rise of ‘New’ Policy Instruments in Comparative Perspective: Has Governance Eclipsed Government?” *Political Studies* 53: 477-96.
- Moran, M. 2001. “Not Steering but Drowning: Policy Catastrophes and the Regulatory State.” *The Political Quarterly* 72: 414-27.

Supplemental readings:

Savan, B., C. Gore and A. Morgan. 2004. “Shifts in Environmental Governance in Canada: how are citizen environmental groups to respond? *Environment and Planning C* 22: 605-619. <http://works.bepress.com/cdgore/6/>

Howlett, Michael, Jeremy Rayner, and Chris Tollefson. 2009. “From Government to Governance in Forest Planning? Lesson from the Case of the British Columbia Great Bear Rainforest Initiative.” *Forest Policy and Economics* 11: 383-91.

Vries, Michiel S. de. “The Changing Functions of Laws and Its Implication for Government and Governance” *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 68, no. 4 (2002): 599-618.

Session 9: Network Governance – Public/Private Networks

Tuesday March 13th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

Governments have different means of achieving their objectives. In recent years, dissatisfaction with “top-down”, hierarchical government and its successor, the creation of markets for public services, has created an interest in governing through loose networks of public and private actors, sometimes called “horizontal governance”. Nonetheless, network governance has proved a challenge. Since networks are based on ties of trust and exchange, it is unclear how networks of public and private actors can be managed and “steered” in the direction of public goals without becoming hierarchical again. If they can’t be steered, then public managers have ceded authority over public policy to non-state actors with potentially embarrassing, or even catastrophic, consequences.

Required readings:

- Esmark, Anders. 2009. "The Functional Differentiation of Governance: Public Governance Beyond Hierarchy, Market and Networks." *Public Administration* 87: 351-70
- Greenaway, John, Brian Salter, and Stella Hart. 2007. "How Policy Networks Can Damage Democratic Health: A Case Study in the Government of Governance." *Public Administration* 85: 717-38
- Hill, C. J., and L. E. Lynn. 2004. "Is Hierarchical Governance in Decline? Evidence from Empirical Research." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15: 173-95.
- deLeon, Peter, and Daniella M. Varda. 2009. "Toward a Theory of Collaborative Policy Networks: Identifying Structural Tendencies." *Policy Studies Journal* 37: 59-74.

Supplemental readings:

Montpetit, Eric. 2005. "A Policy Network Explanation of Biotechnology Policy Differences between the United States and Canada," *Journal of Public Policy* 25: 339-366.

Provan, Keith G., and Patrick Kenis. 2007. "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18: 229-52.

Agranoff, R. 2006. "Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers." *Public Administration Review* 60: 56-65.

Agranoff, R., and M. McGuire. 1999. "Managing in Network Settings." *Policy Studies Review* 16: 18-41.

Session 10: Accountability, Transparency, Ethics, and Management

Tuesday March 20th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

Canadians want their tax money to be spent appropriately (financial probity), their interests served by conscientious public servants (ethics), and the affairs of government conducted in an open manner (transparency). Is this too much to ask? Those who want to protect whistle-blowers, permit access to information and strengthen audit capacities answer strongly in the negative. On the other hand, have we, in pursuing these goals gone overboard, misunderstood what can actually be achieved, and put at risk other things that we value such as efficiency, privacy, and innovation? Have mechanisms like the Federal Lobbyist Act created too many challenges for government and/or the public?

Required readings:

- Savoie, Donald J. 2004. "Searching for Accountability in a Government without Boundaries." *Canadian Public Administration* 37: 1-26.
- Johnson, David. 2006. *Thinking Government: Public Sector Management in Canada*. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, Ltd. Chapter 6: Public Sector Financial management and Chapter 11: Public Sector Accountability: Responsibility, Responsiveness, and Ethics.
- Juillet, Luc and Gilles Paquet. 2002. "The Neurotic State." In *How Ottawa Spends 2002-03*, ed. G. B. Doern, 69-87. Toronto: Oxford University Press. [Course Reader]
- Barker, Paul. 2008. *Public Administration in Canada, Brief Edition*. Toronto: Nelson. Chapter 10: Responsibility, Accountability, and Ethics and Chapter 20: Management of Financial Resources. [Course Reader]

Supplemental readings:

Dobell, Peter and Martin Ulrich. 2006. "Parliament and Financial Accountability" *Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities Research Studies V. 1*: 23-61.

http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/GomeryII/ResearchStudies1/CISPAA_Vol1_2.pdf

Benoit, Liane E. and C.E.S. Franks. 2005. "For the Want of a Nail: The Role of Internal Audit in the Sponsorship Scandal," *Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities Research Studies V. 2*: 233-303.

http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/GomeryII/ResearchStudies2/CISPAA_Vol2_6.pdf

Langford, John W. 2004. "Acting on Values: An Ethical Dead End for Public Servants," *Canadian Public Administration* 47: 429-450.

Paul G. Thomas, "Debating a Whistle-blower Protection Act for Employees of the Government of Canada," *Canadian Public Administration* 48: 147-184.

Session 11: Citizen Responsiveness and Participation (March 21st)

Tuesday March 27th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

While network governance usually involves public managers and organized interest, there is a parallel movement to engage individual citizens directly in policy formulation and implementation. Citizens, it is widely believed, want the state to respond to their needs without having to provide excessive instructions. Learning what those needs are is a new challenge; not all institutions of government are designed to monitor and react to changing public demands. Is public disenchantment with government a product of institutional deficiencies regarding responsiveness, or does the public have excessive and unrealistic expectations? Perhaps technology is the answer: is e-government a realistic possibility and would it be welcome if it were?

Required readings:

- Fung, Archon. 2006. "Varieties of Participation in Complex Government" *Public Administration Review* 66: 66-75.
- Salter, Liora. 2007. "The Public of Public Inquiries." In *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art*, eds. Laurent Dobuzinkis, Michael Howlett and David Laycock, pp. 291-314. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. [Course Reader]
- Snellen, Ignace. 2005. "E-Government: A Challenge for Public Administration." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, eds. Ewan Ferlie, Laurence Lynn and Christopher Pollitt, 398-421. Oxford: New York. [Regina Library – E-Book]
- Vigota, Eran. 2002. "From Responsiveness to Collaboration: Governance, Citizens, and the Next Generation of Public Administration" *Public Administration Review*. 62, 5: 527-540.

Supplemental readings:

Dunleavy P, Margetts H, Bastow S, Tinkler J. 2005. "New Public Management is dead – Long live Digital-Era Governance," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16:467-494

Borins, Sandford. "Chapter 24: Information Technology in the Public Sector." In *The Handbook*.

McNutt, Kathleen and Meaghan Carey. 2008. *Canadian Digital Government*. The Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy Public Policy Paper 57. Regina, SK: SIPP.

http://www.uregina.ca/sipp/documents/pdf/PPP57_McNutt_ONLINE.pdf

Session 12: Policy Development and Instrument Choice

Tuesday April 3rd 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

Governments have many different means of achieving their objectives. These different means have been referred to as “governing instruments”, “policy instruments” and “policy tools”. One might imagine that different instruments suit different goals, but there is no set theory about how instruments are chosen. It is clear, however, that instrument choice has consequences for the effectiveness of policy. Are there biases in instrument choice that might get in the way of efficiency and responsiveness? Are we overusing some instruments at the expense of others?

Required readings:

- Hood, Christopher. 2004. “Tools of Government in the Information Age” *Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. [Course Reader]
- Trebilcock, Michael J. 2005. “The Choice of Governing Instrument: A Retrospective” *Designing Government: From Instruments to Governance*. [Course Reader]
- Bemelmans-Videc, Marie Louise et. al. “Introduction” *Carrots, Sticks, and Sermons: Policy Instruments and Their Evaluation*. [Course Reader]
- Bennett, Colin J. 1997. “Understanding Ripple Effects: The Cross-National Adoption of Policy Instruments for Bureaucratic Accountability” *Governance* 10, 3 (July): 213-233.
- Birkland, Thomas A. *An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2001. Chapter 7 Partially readable at: <http://www.tower.com/books/preview/isbn/0765614898>

Session 13: Renewing the Public Sector – Merit, Neutrality and Competence

Tuesday April 10th 2012 – 5:45 - 8:30

The independence and competence of the public service is a major boon to program development and implementation. But for many years, critics of the public sector have argued that it has displayed too much independence and not enough competence. A series of managerial reforms have been introduced, most recently in the realm of human resources. These have been accompanied by periodic efforts to staff the public sector in ways that ensure it is responsive to political agendas. Furthermore, recent years have witnessed the rise of the “representative bureaucracy”. Are these changes legitimate efforts to create a more democratically accountable public service, or do they “break the bargain” and unnecessarily politicize governance?

- Gagnon, Alain and Luc Turgeon, “Representative Bureaucracy in Multinational States” Posted to UR Courses
- Kevin Lynch “Why Public Service Renewal Matters” <http://www.cappa.ca/news/KevinLynch.pdf>
- Report of the Expert Panel on Integrated Business”

<http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=expert/expert-eng.htm#2>

- Perry, James, Debra Mesch, and Lorrie Paarlberg. 2006. “Motivating Employees in a New Governance Era: The Performance Paradigm Revisited.” *Public Administration Review* 66: 505-514.
- Mulgan, Geoff. 2008. *Taking Public Sector Innovation Seriously*. The Manion Lecture (Canada School of Public Service), May. Available online at http://www.cspsefpc.gc.ca/events/manion/mlt2008_e.html