

PUAD 8020: Doctoral Seminar in Public Management
School of Public Affairs
University of Colorado Denver

COURSE SYLLABUS

Professor: John C. Ronquillo, Ph.D.
Office: Lawrence Street Center, 500Q
Phone: (303) 315-0187
E-Mail: john.ronquillo@ucdenver.edu
Student/Office Hours: By appointment

Term: Spring 2017
Class Meeting Day: Wednesday
Class Meeting Hours: 4:00-6:45 p.m.
Class Location: LSC 525A (deLeon)

University Course Catalog Description: An in-depth examination of contemporary literature, concepts, and theories of public management. Current issues and research problems are emphasized to prepare students for their advanced research.

Course Objectives: This course is designed to increase students' theoretical and practical understanding of public management. The course focuses on giving students knowledge of the predominant theories, as well as the opportunity and space to critically assess those theories, and develop ideas for where the future of the field will be charted. Various topics include, but will not be limited to public sector reforms, networks and collaborative governance, bureaucracy, administrative discretion, organizational behavior and theories of motivation, and the influence of political economy and socio-economic conditions of public beneficiaries.

REQUIRED TEXTS AND MATERIALS

The required texts to be used throughout this course are:

- Rainey, H. G. (2014). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 5e. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ferlie, E., Lynn, Jr., L. E., and Pollitt, C. (eds.) (2007). *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brodtkin, E. Z., and Marston, G. (eds.) (2013). *Work and the Welfare State: Street-Level Organizations and Workfare Politics*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Emerson, K., and Nabatchi, T. (eds.) (2015). *Collaborative Governance Regimes*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Miller, G. J., and Whitford, A. B. (2016). *Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Additionally, the following books will be required reading during specific weeks of the semester:

- Kettl, D. F. (2005). *The Global Public Management Revolution*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Bertelli, A. M. (2012). *The Political Economy of Public Sector Governance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynn, Jr., L. E. (1996). *Public Management as Art, Science, and Profession*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Bozeman, B. (1987). *All Organizations are Public*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meier, K. J., and O'Toole, Jr., L. J. (2006). *Bureaucracy in a Democratic State: A Governance Perspective*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Teodoro, M. P. (2011). *Bureaucratic Ambition: Careers, Motives, and the Innovative Administrator*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- O'Leary, R., and Bingham, L. B. (eds.) (2009). *The Collaborative Public Manager: New Ideas for the Twenty-First Century*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Hood, C., and Lodge, M. (2006). *The Politics of Public Service Bargains: Reward, Competency, Loyalty—and Blame*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Resh, W. G. (2015). *Rethinking the Administrative Presidency: Trust, Intellectual Capital, and Appointee-Careerist Relations in the George W. Bush Administration*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

The remaining readings for the course will be provided in the form of journal articles and/or selected book chapters. Students bear responsibility in obtaining these.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

The following list details each of the assignments for the course. *I will provide you with additional instructions for each of these assignments in advance.*

- **Book Reviews.** This assignment will be dedicated to critiquing one of the ancillary titles on our reading list. **DUE DATES: February 8th and March 15th.**
- **Research Papers.** These papers will be primary theory-oriented papers on a public management related topic, and will be subject to peer review. Please bring two copies of your submissions. **DUE DATES: February 22nd and April 5th.**
- **Peer Reviews.** In addition to writing a research paper, you will also be responsible for peer reviewing a paper of one of your colleagues. These peer reviews are due one week after papers are due. **DUE DATE: March 1st and April 12th.**

- **Final Take-Home Exam.** The exam will be a take-home, comprehensive exam style test covering the entirety of the course. A week before the due date, I will distribute a list of four questions in class. You must respond to any two (and only two) of the questions in essay format. **DUE DATE: May 3rd**.

The grading breakdown for the course assignments is as follows:

Assignment	Possible Points	Percent of Final Grade
Book Reviews (2)	100	15%
Research Papers (2)	100	35%
Peer Reviews (2)	100	15%
Final Take-Home Exam	100	35%
TOTAL	700	100%

Course Grading Scale (%)

95-100 A	84-86.9 B	74-76.9 C
90-94.9 A-	80-83.9 B-	70-73.9 C-
87-89.9 B+	77-79.9 C+	70 and less F

Course Grading Criteria for Individual Written Assignments

The A paper reflects excellent performance in the assignment that exceeds expectations for a graduate student. It is original, engaging, and full. It will have virtually no grammatical, usage, punctuation, or spelling errors. It is an original contribution and speaks with authority and clarity. It is rich in detail, showing a clear understanding of differences in levels of specificity; it provides justification or support for all general assertions. It addresses all aspects of the assignment including specific requirements and excels in writing structure, clarity, focus, style, analytical systematization, critical analysis and creativity. It often includes unique or unusual perspectives.

The B paper reflects very good performance in the assignment that meets expectations for a graduate student. However, it falls short of an A paper usually in style, depth and analytical development. It has some errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, or spelling, but usually few; or it has some awkward phrases--but in neither case enough to impede the reading of the paper. Its development is consistently strong, with detail and support present in most, but perhaps not every, instance. Its sense of audience is clear. The B paper addresses the assignment directly and satisfies almost all requirements.

The C paper reflects fair performance in the assignment, which however falls below expectations for a graduate student. It addresses the assignment relatively clearly but without significant depth or clarity. Stylistic errors may be noticeably present, but not in such quantity as to impede the reading in a significant way. A C paper generally provides some support for assertions, but not enough to give the impression of complete thoroughness. The tone and

voice of a C paper usually lack a sense of individuality of the author or a sense of authority. The C paper often has an anonymous quality to it, restating standard opinion or assertions without going into significant depth.

The F paper reflects very poor performance in the assignment. It is reserved for students who fail to turn in assignments or turn in assignments that demonstrate basic incomprehension of the assigned topics and an insufficient effort to overcome these problems.

Grade Dissemination: If at any time you are curious about your performance in class, I would encourage you to talk with me personally. As a PhD-level seminar with fewer students than a standard class, my objective in grading is to give you as thorough feedback as possible, and therefore, quick turnaround is not guaranteed. My advice: worry less about grades and more about understanding the readings and discussions, and using whatever knowledge you build in this course for your future exams and work.

Written Work: Please use a standard Microsoft-style font (e.g. Times New Roman, Cambria, Calibri or similar) on each written assignment, with one-inch margins on each page. Please be sure to include your name and paginate accordingly. Also, please use Chicago or APA-style citations for your written work. I do not care which style you use, so long as it is consistent throughout your work.

COURSE POLICIES: GRADES

Attendance Policy: Students are solely responsible for obtaining the information necessary to succeed in this class, and that comes primarily from class attendance. My expectation is that, as PhD students, you will strive to attend every class. Life happens, however, so I would ask that if you anticipate missing a class, to please advise me at your earliest convenience. I do not repeat the content of past courses in person, or via email, so if you miss a class, please make sure to consult a fellow student and stay current on the readings.

Late Work Policy: I will accept late work within 24 hours of the original due date. Anything later than that is at my discretion.

Grades of "Incomplete": Per university policy, incomplete grades are given only in situations where unexpected emergencies prevent a student from completing the course and the remaining work can be completed the next semester. You should be earning a grade in the range of 80-100% on assignments prior to the Final Exam to be given consideration. Incomplete work must be finished by the end of the subsequent semester or the "I" will automatically be recorded as an "F" on your transcript.

Grade Challenges: I would ask that you allow 24 hours to pass before contacting me about a grade inquiry; this allows time for me to realize any potential error, or for the student to process the result. I do not discuss grades for this course over email, and would therefore encourage you to set up an in-person meeting. Any challenges to final grades should be

handled through the appropriate formal procedures. *Final grades are indeed final. I do not round up to the next letter grade.*

COURSE POLICIES

Email: The primary communication method for this course will be via email. Please check your university email often, or the address to which you forward your email. All official university communications will only be delivered to your university email address. I am typically quick with emails, though I would ask that you allow me at least 48 hours to respond. Responses on weekends are not always guaranteed, so please plan accordingly. If you need to discuss a complex issue, I would suggest arranging a phone conversation or scheduling a time to meet with me in person.

Canvas: Canvas will be employed minimally in this course, and to the extent the students desire and necessitate it. It will be used for basic things like syllabus posting and grade viewing.

COURSE POLICIES: STUDENT EXPECTATIONS

Professionalism: All participants are expected to act with professionalism and civility in the classroom and when communicating with one another and with me. Please be courteous and respect the time and efforts of those contributing to group discussions and work.

Auraria Library: Students are expected to be familiar with the suite of services offered to them through the Auraria Library. A listing of subject specialist librarians by topic can be viewed here: <http://library.auraria.edu/services/researchhelp/specialists>

Writing Center: If you find that you might need some additional support in your written work, I would encourage you to take advantage of the services offered by The Writing Center at CU Denver. Online consulting is available for both day and evening hours. <http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/CLAS/Centers/writing/Pages/TheWritingCenter.aspx>

Disability Access: The University of Colorado Denver is committed to providing reasonable accommodation and access to programs and services to persons with disabilities. Students with disabilities who want academic accommodations must register with Disability Resources and Services (DRS) in North Classroom 2514, Phone: 303-556-3450, TTY: 303-556-4766, Fax: 303-556-4771. I will be happy to provide approved accommodations, once you provide me with a copy of DRS's letter.

Student Code of Conduct: Students are expected to know, understand, and comply with the ethical standards of the university, including rules against plagiarism, cheating, fabrication and falsification, multiple submissions, misuse of academic materials, and complicity in academic dishonesty. For suggestions on ways to avoid academic dishonesty, please see the Academic Honesty Handbook at— http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/center-for-faculty-development/Documents/academic_honesty.pdf

Plagiarism is the use of another person's ideas or words without acknowledgement. The incorporation of another person's work into yours requires appropriate identification and acknowledgement. Examples of plagiarism when the source is not noted include: word-for-word copying of another person's ideas or words; the "mosaic" (interspersing your own words here and there while, in essence, copying another's work); the paraphrase (the rewriting of another's work, while still using their basic ideas or theories); fabrication (inventing or counterfeiting sources); submission of another's work as your own; and neglecting quotation marks when including direct quotes, even on material that is otherwise acknowledged. *NOTE:* TurnItIn plagiarism detection software is used for all written assignments.

Cheating involves the possession, communication, or use of information, materials, notes, study aids, or other devices and rubrics not specifically authorized by the course instructor in any academic exercise, or unauthorized communication with any other person during an academic exercise. Examples of cheating include: copying from another's work or receiving unauthorized assistance from another; using a calculator, computer, or the internet when its use has been precluded; collaborating with another or others without the consent of the instructor; submitting another's work as one's own.

Fabrication involves inventing or counterfeiting information—creating results not properly obtained through study or laboratory experiment. Falsification involves deliberate alteration or changing of results to suit one's needs in an experiment or academic exercise.

Multiple submissions involves submitting academic work in a current course when academic credit for the work was previously earned in another course, when such submission is made without the current course instructor's authorization.

Misuse of academic materials includes: theft/destruction of library or reference materials or computer programs; theft/destruction of another student's notes or materials; unauthorized possession of another student's notes or materials; theft/destruction of examinations, papers, or assignments; unauthorized assistance in locating/using sources of information when forbidden or not authorized by the instructor; unauthorized possession, disposition, or use of examinations or answer keys; unauthorized alteration, forgery, fabrication, or falsification of academic records; unauthorized sale or purchase of examinations, papers, or assignments.

Complicity in academic dishonesty involves knowingly contributing to or cooperating with another's act(s) of academic dishonesty.

If students are found to be in violation of any of the above, I reserve the right to fail you for the course. Should you have any questions about violations of academic integrity, I would encourage you to take the online module "Academic Integrity for Students," accessible here: <https://cuonline.catalog.instructure.com/browse/student/courses/academic-integrity>

IMPORTANT DATES TO REMEMBER

CU Denver's Academic Calendar for the Spring 2017 Semester can be found here:
<http://www.ucdenver.edu/student-services/resources/Registrar-dev/Documents/AcademicCalendars/AcademicCalendarSpring2017.pdf>

CLASS SCHEDULE

(Week #) Week of	Topics	Readings	Additional Readings	Due
(1) January 18	What is Public Management?		Bozeman, All Organizations Are Public	
(2) January 25	"Publicness" and Sectoral Contexts	<p>Oxford Handbook, Chs. 1, 2 & 4 Rainey, Chs. 3 & 4 Brodtkin & Marston, Chs. 1 & 2</p> <p>Moulton, S. (2009). Putting Together the Publicness Puzzle: A Framework for Realized Publicness. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 69(5): 889-900.</p> <p>Andrews, R., Boyne G., & R. Walker. (2011). Dimensions of Publicness and Organizational Performance: A Review of the Evidence. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 21(suppl3): i302-1319.</p> <p>Brooks, A.C. (2002). Can Nonprofit Management Help Answer Public Management's "Big Questions?" <i>Public Administration Review</i> 62(3): 259-266.</p>	<p>Lynn, Public Management as Art, Sciences, and Profession</p> <p>Meier & O'Toole, Bureaucracy in a Democratic State</p>	
(3) February 1	Democracy and Bureaucracy	<p>Oxford Handbook, Chs. 3 & 5 Rainey, Ch. 5 Brodtkin & Marston, Ch. 3 Miller & Whitford, Chs. 1 & 2</p>		

		<p>Wood, B.D., & R.W. Waterman. (1991). The Dynamics of Political Control of the Bureaucracy. <i>American Political Science Review</i> 85(3): 801-828.</p> <p>Meier, K.J. (1997). Bureaucracy and Democracy: The Case for More Bureaucracy and Less Democracy. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 57(3):193-199</p> <p>Carpenter, D. & G.A. Krause. (2015). Transactional Authority and Bureaucratic Politics. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 25(1): 5-25.</p>		
(4) February 8	Public Management Reform	<p>Oxford Handbook, Ch. 18 Brodkin & Marston, Chs. 6 & 7</p> <p>Moynihan, D.P. (2006). Managing for Results in State Government: Evaluating a Decade of Reform. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(1): 77-89.</p> <p>Pollitt, C. (2000). Is the Emperor In His Underwear? An Analysis of the Impacts of Public Management Reform. <i>Public Management Review</i> (2)2: 181-200.</p> <p>deLeon, L. & R.B. Denhardt. (2000). The Political Theory of Reinvention.</p>	<p>Kettl, The Global Public Management Revolution</p> <p>Resh, Rethinking the Administrative Presidency</p> <p>Bertelli, The Political Economy of Public Sector Governance</p>	Book Review 1 Due

		<p><i>Public Administration Review</i> 60(2): 89-97.</p> <p>Christensen, T., & P. Lægreid. (2007). The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 67(6): 1059-1066.</p>		
(5) February 15	Methods and Modes of Governance I: Organizational Structure and Design	<p>Rainey, Ch. 6-8</p> <p>Mintzberg, H. (1980). Structure in 5s: A Synthesis of the Research on Organization Design. <i>Management Science</i> 26(3): 322-341.</p> <p>Macey, J.R. (1992). Organizational Design and Political Control of Administrative Agencies. <i>Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization</i> 8(1): 93-110.</p> <p>Meyer, J.W., & B. Rowan. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 83(2): 340-363.</p> <p>Agranoff, R. & McGuire, M. (2001). American Federalism and the Search for Models of Management. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 61(6): 671-681</p>		

(6) February 22	Methods and Modes of Governance II: The Logics of Governance	<p>Emerson & Nabatchi, Introduction & Ch. 1 Brodin & Marston, Chs. 4 & 5</p> <p>Romzek, B., & J.M. Johnston. (2005). State Social Services Contracting: Exploring the Determinants of Effective Contract Accountability. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 65(4): 436-449.</p> <p>Brown, T.L., & M. Potoski. (2004). Managing the Public Service Market. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 64(6): 656-668.</p> <p>Hill, C., & L.E. Lynn. (2004). Governance and Public Management, an Introduction. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 23(1): 3-11.</p>		Paper 1
(7) March 1	Networks and Collaboration	<p>Oxford Handbook, Chs. 11, 15 & 16 Emerson & Nabatchi, Chs. 2-4</p> <p>Provan, K.G., & P. Kenis. (2008). Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 18(2): 229-252.</p> <p>Ansell, C., & A. Gash. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. <i>Journal of Public</i></p>	O’Leary & Bingham, The Collaborative Public Manager	Paper 1 Peer Reviews

		<i>Administration Research and Theory</i> 18(4): 543-571.	
(8) March 8	Performance Management	<p>Oxford Handbook, Ch. 21 Brodkin & Marston, Ch. 8 Emerson & Nabatchi, Chs. 8 & 9</p> <p>Heinrich, C.J. (2002). Outcomes-Based Performance Management in the Public Sector: Implications for Government Accountability and Effectiveness. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 62(6): 712-725.</p> <p>O'Toole, L.J., & K.J. Meier. (2015). Public Management, Context, and Performance: In Quest of a More General Theory. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 25(1): 237-256.</p>	
(9) March 15	Research Methods in Public Management	<p>Oxford Handbook, Ch. 26</p> <p>Behn, R. (1996). Public Management: Should It Strive to be Art, Science, or Engineering? <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 6(1): 91-123.</p> <p>Bretschneider, S., Marc-Aurele, F.J., & J. Wu. (2005). Best Practices Research: A Methodological Guide for the Perplexed. <i>Journal of Public</i></p>	Book Review 2

		<p><i>Administration Research and Theory</i> 15(2): 307-323.</p> <p>Hill, C.J., & L.E. Lynn. (2005). Is Hierarchical Governance in Decline? Evidence from Empirical Research. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 15(2): 173-195.</p>		
(10) March 22	SPRING BREAK—NO CLASS			
(11) March 29	Human Relations and Resources	<p>Oxford Handbook, Ch. 22 Rainey, Chs. 9 & 10 Brodkin & Marston, Chs. 10 & 12</p> <p>Taylor, H.G. (2010). Human Relations 2.0. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 70(S1): S170-S172.</p> <p>Rosenbloom, D.H. (2010). Public Sector Human Resource Management in 2020. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 70(S1): S175-S176.</p> <p>Hays, S.W., & J.E. Sowa. (2006). A Broader Look at the “Accountability” Movement: Some Grim Realities in State Civil Service Systems. <i>Review of Public Personnel Administration</i> 26(2): 102-117.</p>	<p>Teodoro, Bureaucratic Ambition</p> <p>Hood & Lodge, The Politics of Public Service Bargains</p>	
(12) April 5	Legal and Ethical Dimensions of Public Management	<p>Oxford Handbook, Chs. 6 & 7 Miller & Whitford, Chs. 3-5</p>		Paper 2

		<p>Moe, R.C., & R.S. Gilmour. (1995). Rediscovering Principles of Public Administration: The Neglected Foundations of Public Law. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 55(2): 135-146.</p> <p>Rosenbloom, D.H., O'Leary, R., & J. Chanin. (2010). The Future of Public Administration and Law in 2020. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 70(S1): S314-S316.</p>		
(13) April 12	Leadership	<p>Oxford Handbook, Ch. 19 Rainey, Chs. 11 & 12 Miller & Whitford, Chs. 6 & 7</p> <p>Van Wart, M. (2003). Public-Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 63(2): 214-228.</p> <p>Moynihan, D.P., Pandey, S.K., & B.E. Wright. (2012). Setting the Table: How Transformational Leadership Fosters Performance Information Use. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 22 (1): 143-164.</p> <p>Oberfeld, Z.W. (2014). Public Management in Time: A Longitudinal Examination of the Full Range of Leadership Theory. <i>Journal of Public</i></p>		Paper 2 Peer Reviews

		<i>Administration Research and Theory</i> 24(2): 407-429.		
(15) April 19	Alternative Perspectives and Representation	<p>Oxford Handbook, Chs. 13 & 27 Brodkin & Marston, Ch. 11</p> <p>Bowling, C.J., Kelleher, C.A., Jones, J., & D.S. Wright. (2006). Cracked Ceilings, Firmer Floors, and Weakening Walls: Trends and Patterns in Gender Representation among Executives Leading State Agencies, 1970-2000. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(6): 823-836.</p> <p>Foldy, E.G. (2004). Learning from Diversity: A Theoretical Explanation. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 64(5): 529-538.</p> <p>Guy, M.E., & M.A. Newman. (2004). Women's Jobs, Men's Jobs: Sex Segregation and Emotional Labor. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 64(3): 289-298.</p> <p>Sowa, J.E., & S.C. Selden. (2003). Administrative Discretion and Active Representation: An Explanation of the Theory of Representative Bureaucracy. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 63(6): 700-710.</p>		

		<p>Ronquillo, J.C. (2011). American Indian Tribal Governance and Management: Public Administration Promise or Pretense? <i>Public Administration Review</i> 71(2): 285-292.</p> <p>Wilkins, V.M., & B.N. Williams. (2008). Black or Blue: Racial Profiling and Representative Bureaucracy. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 68(4): 654-664.</p>		
(16) April 26	Public Management and the Future	<p>Rainey, Chs. 13 & 14 Miller & Whitford, Chs. 8-10 Brodkin & Marston, Ch. 15 Emerson & Nabatchi, Conclusion</p> <p>Milward, B., et al. (2016) Is Public Management Neglecting the State? <i>Governance</i> (29)3: 311-334.</p>		<i>Final Exam Questions Distributed</i>
(17) May 3	EXAM DUE—NO CLASS			