Policy Implementation and Innovation – UEP 275
Fall 2014
INITIAL VERSION

Wednesdays 6:00-9:00 pm
Bromfield/Pierson 005

Instructor: Laurie Goldman, Ph.D.
laurie.goldman@tufts.edu (617) 627-5053
Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, Tufts University
72 Professors Row, 2nd Floor
Office Hours: By appointment and strongly encouraged

Course Objectives:
This course is about translating visions for urban, environmental, and social policies and programs into practice. Two central questions guide our inquiry:

1. What challenges impede successful policy and program implementation?
2. How can we devise and adopt innovative solutions to these challenges to help realized desired outcomes?

We address these questions while wrestling with the tension between *fidelity* to initial designs and *creativity* to pursue results that matter to key stakeholders and that work in practice as well as in theory.

The first several sessions train students to identify implementation challenges and understand what's at stake in efforts to address them. The remainder of the course introduces a tool kit of creative problem solving strategies:

- for aligning individuals' and organizations' actions with the goals
- for exploring, developing, and adopting innovative ideas
- for coordinating and collaborating with diverse policy actors
- for persuading critical actors to embrace novel ideas with commitment (and perhaps even enthusiasm)

We examine these strategies while paying attention to interactions among actors who span public, nonprofit, and public *sectors*; cross national, state, and local *levels*; and bridge policy *domains*.

Format and Expectations:
We make use of a mix of readings, case analyses, short lectures, discussions, and exercises. In addition, each participant will focus on a specific policy, program, plan or initiative of her or his choosing. These "cases" serve as a filter for reflecting on the readings and issues that arise in class discussions. Writing assignments are opportunities to elaborate on the insights gleaned through the examination of these "cases."

Readings: Assigned readings draw both from academic scholarship and publications geared to professionals who work in public, nonprofit, and (less frequently) private sector organizations. They will introduce us to the strategies and help us examine them critically to understand their limitations and their utility as well as to discern when they are more likely to be effective.

Reading requirements for this course reflect the norms of a graduate level course. The assignments assume a general understanding of the policymaking process yet do not require any particular prior basis of knowledge. Those who are more familiar with the material are encouraged to read the optional, recommended readings. All of you are expected to read purposefully rather than passively. It is more important to engage the readings so that you learn from the experience of reading than to be able to summarize every point.

All of the required readings will be posted on the Trunk site for the class, either as links to electronic sources or as downloadable "pdf" files. Additional references on each of the course themes will be posted on the Trunk site. *I will modify the reading selections throughout the course in response to students' specific interests and the topics that emerge in the discussions.*

Students are responsible for identifying sources for their individual cases with guidance from me, as needed.

Two Options for Written Assignments: There are two options for fulfilling the writing assignments. Both afford you the opportunity to reflect critically on the course themes in relation to the policy, plan, program, or initiative you have chosen for your focus.

Option 1: Three Response Papers and a Proposal for Action or Further Inquiry

The first response paper will describe your case and identify the implementation challenges and the relevant stakeholders whose perspectives matter for determining implementation success and who might participate in the addressing the challenges. The second and third response papers will each examine one of the creative problem solving strategies in light of implementation challenges or latent opportunities relevant to your case. Strong papers will also elaborate or critique arguments raised in the readings and discussions or explore tensions or tradeoffs among alternative approaches.

The proposal for action or further inquiry aims to synthesize ideas you explored in your responses papers in addition to other relevant themes discussed throughout the course. A proposal for action identifies desired outcomes and procedural objectives, the anticipated challenges for achieving them, the recommended strategies for addressing the challenges, and the roles of each of the actors to be involved in carrying it out. A proposal for further inquiry presents your analysis of the challenges and potential solutions and then details a process for investigating which options are most suitable.

It is strongly recommended that you focus on the same case for each of the first three assignments. This will facilitate your preparations for the project proposal due at the end of the term. However, you may focus on different aspects of the case for each assignment or you may choose an entirely different case if you think it will allow you to explore a particular theme in greater depth.

Detailed guidelines for each of these assignments will be distributed as the deadlines approach. See the chart below for due dates, all of which are on Friday afternoons.

***Option 2*: Research Paper** (*A good option for those exploring a UEP thesis topic or for those who do not have experience in their field of interest*.)

This option is for students interested in examining one of the issues of implementation, innovation, and learning in greater depth. The paper should examine the theoretical assumptions underlying one of the problem-solving strategies. Analysis should reference additional readings on the theme of focus beyond those required for the class discussions.

Papers should explore a specific policy, program, plan, or organizational initiative to ground the theoretical analysis. You may also take a comparative approach to examine two related cases that exhibit responses to the same strategy, contextual factors, or other dimensions of the research question.

Students pursuing this single-paper option should submit Assignment #1 to identify the case to be explored and the array of implementation challenges it poses for further exploration. The final paper will be due on the same date as the Proposals for Option 1. You must also submit memos to me on each of the due dates for the response papers of the other option to demonstrate your progress on the paper and raise questions or dilemmas you have encountered thus far for my feedback and suggestions. *The paper will be worth 80% of the grade for the course. (I will give you comments on the initial implementation analysis and memos but will not grade those interim assignments.)*

	Assignment	***Due Date*** Friday afternoons	***% of Grade***
Case Analysis Paper #1	Case description, analysis of implementation challenges, and accountability analysis (5-7 pages, including diagrams)	Oct. 3rd	20%
Case Analysis Paper #2	Critical application of a strategy for improving performance through performance measurement (w. or w/o incentives) and/or communities of practice (5-7 pages)	Oct. 24th	20%
Case Analysis Paper #3	Critical application of diffusion & adaptation of an innovation or coordination or collaboration (5-7 pages)	Nov. 21st	20%
Final Project	Project Proposal (15-20 pages, plus appendices) *or* Research Paper (25-30 pages)	Dec. 19th	20%
Reading memos	*see below*	weekly	10%
Contribution to discussions	*see below*	weekly	5%
Class presentation/s	*see below*	T.B.A.	5%

Preparation and Participation*:* Because the objective of the course is to help you develop management skills, active participation in each of its dimensions is essential.

All assignments must be completed by the due dates. Timely submission is critical to class discussion and sequential development of the course material. I *may* consider accepting late submissions based on a plan the student will devise and submit to detail how she or he will compensate for the impact of delayed completion on the class learning process, other course work and life obligations, and my capacity to provide useful feedback on the work.

- **Weekly Insight/Question Reflections:** To facilitate vibrant class discussion, all course participants will post to the Trunk Discussion Board a *brief* reflection (*no more than 300 words*) on the readings by 4pm on the day of the class meeting. You can raise questions about the readings, share insights or critiques about a claim the authors have raised (or overlooked), surface a tension among the readings, or explore a connection to the case you have chosen to explore in the class. Occasionally, I will provide specific guidelines for these reflections. <u>*Do not summarize the readings*</u>.

  In addition, each student will comment on one (or more) of the other student's reflections either before the class session (preferable) of after the class discussion.

  These reflection pieces will count for 10% of the grade for the course. The reflections will not be graded on a per-submission basis. Rather, the grade will reflect the insightfulness and timeliness of the submissions throughout the semester. (You may choose to skip <u>one</u> response during the semester.) You are encouraged, yet not required, to read one another's reflections either before or after the class sessions.

- **Active Participation in Class Discussions:** Class discussions provide a valuable opportunity to digest and elaborate on the ideas presented in the readings, presentations, and explorations of your interest area. I'm interested in your contributions to the quality of entire the class discussion rather than the quantity of your comments. Strive to engage other class participants in mutual exploration. Raising a probing question and observing connections among other students' comments is as critical as sharing your own insights.

  The skills of communicating clearly and listening actively are among the most important for effective management. Thus the quality of your contributions to the discussion will determine 5% of your grade for the course. This grade will be assessed in three ways:
  a) your own assessment of your performance and how your skills have developed over the course; b) participants' collective assessment of the quality of class discussions; c) my synthesis of your contributions and improvements.

- **Presentations and Facilitation:** You will practice the skills of presenting your ideas and eliciting constructive feedback in conjunction with each of written assignments. We will discuss the logistics of these responsibilities after the first few sessions.

***The Course as a Case of "Creative Implementation"*:**
The course is also intended as project we will implement together over the span of the semester. This syllabus and the activities it describes represent the initial design and strategy for reaching the objective of learning about policy implementation and innovation. Consistent with the approach to implementation we will be studying in the course, it will evolve over the course of the semester in response to the developing interests, capabilities, and perspectives of the core stakeholders – **You!**

The ideas of responsibility, expertise, and capacity development apply to each of us. As the instructor, I am responsible for providing illuminating readings, exercises, and assignments and for presenting additional conceptual handles to facilitate our collective inquiry. Yet the contributions of each of you are equally fundamental to our learning process. Your responses, questions, curiosities, and concerns will trigger changes to this initial syllabus. So the course has elements of both top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation, or what Richard Elmore (1980) terms a dynamic of "forward and backward mapping."[1]

The course is also an occasion to practice learning from the different perspectives we each bring to the class. Your exploration of specific cases, your reactions to the readings and examples we examine together, and your prior learning from theory and practice are key materials for innovation and learning.

Participating in the implementation of the course is intended to help you develop your skills in extracting lessons from seemingly disparate fields to apply to your own projects and areas of interest. The objective is to *create* value that is useful to you rather than to learn the details of other substantive areas.

Who Can Benefit from the Course:
The course is designed for students who are interested in careers in a range of social, urban, and environmental fields and who expect to work in public, nonprofit, or private sector organizations or as consultants to such organizations. For students who have already worked in their fields of interest, the course offers an opportunity to reflect on this experience; the readings and assignments afford a chance to deepen what you already know while learning and critiquing ideas about good management practice. Those who have not yet amassed practical experience will begin to develop these skills and sensibilities to help you in future roles.

Core Competencies the Course Seeks to Develop:

- *Knowledge domains*: policy and planning implementation; administrative aspects of policy and planning; roles and relationships among actors across levels of government and policy domains, between sectors, and in relation to clients and constituents; public and nonprofit management and organizational behavior; and the social, cultural, and political influences in each of these domains.

---

[1] Elmore, R. (1980). "Backward-Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decision." *Political Science Quarterly* , Vol. 94: 601-16.

- *Practical skills:* assessing and predicting implementation challenges; creative problem solving; coordination and collaboration; strategic communication; leadership; and discerning practical ethical concerns about accountability and responsibility in light of multiple stakeholders' perspectives and community resources.
- *Critical thinking:* problem defining; assessing strategies in relation to problems and goals; comparative analysis; and critical reasoning and applying theory to practice.

READING ASSIGNMENTS AND DISCUSSION TOPICS
INITIAL VERSION

Session 1: Sept. 3th Introduction: What Do *We* Know about Implementation?

- Clarify the goals of the course and learning approach
- Surface what we know about why following through with what seems like a good idea is so difficult and what helps us overcome obstacles

Session 2: Sept. 10th Implementation Challenges and the Test of What Works

Case: Lin, A. C. (2000). *Reform In the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. From Chapter 1: "Why 'What Works' Is the Wrong Question" p. 15-18, Chapter 2: "Keeping the Peace: Institutional Needs, Institutional Values and Implementation" pp. 33-59; Chapter 3: "Unsuccessful Implementation" pp. 60-97.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1973). The preface to *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland; Or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All, This Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals on a Foundation of Ruined Hopes.* First Edition, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fixen, D., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication # 231). http://nirn.fmhi.usf.edu Chapters 1 and 3: pp. 2-6; 11-22.

Optional:

deLeon, P., & deLeon, L. (2002). What ever happened to policy implementation? An alternative approach. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 12*(4), 467-492.

Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2002). *Implementing Public Policy*. London: SAGE Publications. Introduction, pp. 3-17.

Session #3 Sept. 17th Accountability in the Context of Ambiguity & Conflict

Matland, R. E. (1995). Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 5*(2), 145-174.

Case: Howard, Wrobel, & Nitta (2010) Implementing Change in an Urban School District: A Case Study of the Reorganization of the Little Rock School District. *Public Administration Review* 70(6): 934-41.

Ospina, S., Diaz, W. and O'Sullivan, J.F. (2002) Negotiating Accountability: Managerial Lessons from Identity-Based Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* Vol. 31 (1): 5-31

“A Note on Mapping: Understanding Who Can Influence Your Success.” Electronic Hallway, Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington. (Focus on the first part of this for this week and complete for the following week.)

Prepare for Your Implementation Challenges Assignment:

- Think about the “case” you will explore throughout the course in relation to Matland’s Ambiguity-Conflict model.
- Identify the stakeholders who are most pertinent to your “case.” Sketch a “back of the envelope” stakeholder map based on the “Note on Mapping.”
- Consider the most significant “accountability pulls.”

Supplementary Readings: *to fuel more thinking about accountability in nonprofit and public sectors:*

Brown and Moore (2001) “Accountability, Strategy, and International Nongovernmental Organizations.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*,30(3): 569-87

Kilby (2006) “Accountability for Empowerment: Dilemmas Facing Non-Governmental Organizations.” *World Development* 34(6): 951-63.

Benjamin (2008) “Account Space: How Accountability Requirements Shape Nonprofit Practice” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 37(2): 201-23.

Ebrahim (2005) “Accountability myopia: Losing sight of organizational learning.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 34(1): 56-87.

DeLeon, L. (1998). Accountability in a 'reinvented' government. *Public Administration, 76*(3), 539-558.

September 24th ***Independent Work on Your Assignments***

Due to the Jewish holiday of Rosh Hashana, we will not meet as a group.

Continue using the “Note on Mapping” to analyze your “case” in preparation for the presentation in class on Oct. 1st and the paper due Friday, October 3rd.

Session #4 Oct. 1st Responsibility for Creating Public Value

Cels, De Jong, and Nauta (2012) “Chess Masters and Acrobats” in *Agents of Change: Strategy and Tactics for Social Innovation,* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, pp. 3-43.

O'Leary, R. (2006). Guerrilla Government and the Nevada Wetlands. *The Ethics of Dissent: Managing Guerrilla Government.* Washington, D.C., CQ Press**:** 26-40.

Prepare a short presentation describing your case, the implementation challenges, and opportunities for contending with them. (Use this as an opportunity to get feedback on **the paper assignment due on Friday, October 3rd**.)

Session #5 Oct. 8th Performance Measurement – *Why Measure?*

Behn, R. D. (2003). Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. *Public Administration Review, 63*(5), 586-606.

Metzenbaum (2006) *Performance Accountability: The Five Building Blocks and Six Essential Practices.* Washington, DC: IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Kegan and Lahey (2001) The Real Reason People Won't Change. *Harvard Business Review.* November: 85-92

Case: Blumstein (2010) "Program evaluation and incentives for administrators of energy-efficiency programs: Can evaluation solve the principal/agent problem?" *Energy Policy* 38: 6232-9.

Session #6 Oct. 15th Performance Measurement – *What and How to Measure*

Case: Sawhill, J. and Williamson, D. (2001) Mission Impossible? Measuring Success in Nonprofit Organizations, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership,* 11(3): 371-86

Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide, January 2004.

Lampkin and Hatry (2003). *Key Steps in Outcome Management.* Urban Institute.

Kaplan, R. (2001) Strategic Performance Measurement and Management in Nonprofit Organizations, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership,* 11(3): 353-70.

Moore, M. (2003) "The Public Value Scorecard: A Rejoinder and an Alternative to 'Strategic Performance Measurement in Non-Profit Organizations" The Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard Univ., Working Paper #18.

Session #7 Oct. 22nd Learning Together

Learning from Differences

Foldy, E. G. (2004). Learning from diversity: A theoretical exploration. *Public Administration Review*, *64*(5), 529-538.

Communities of Practice

Wenger and Snyder (2000). Communities of Practice: The Organizational Frontier. *Harvard Business Review*, January/February, pp.139-45.

Snyder, W. M., & Briggs, X. D. (2003). *Communities of Practice: A New Tool for Government Managers*. Arlington, VA: IBM Center for the Business of Government, pp. 4-19 and choose one of the 4 case descriptions (pp. 20-51).

Resident Involvement in Measurement *[Stay tuned for instructions about how we will learn about this theme]*

Epstein, Wray, and Harding (2006) "Citizens as Partners in Performance Management." *Public Management*, pp. 18-22.

Case: City of Somerville's SomerStat: http://www.somervillema.gov/dashboard/ and ResiStat: http://somervilleresistat.blogspot.com/

Optional: Wichowsky and Moynihan (2008) "Measuring How Administration Shapes Citizenship: A Policy Feedback Perspective on Performance Management." *Public Administration Review* 68(5): 908-20.

Oct. 24th (Friday) 2nd Assignment Due: Critical application of a strategy for improving performance through performance measurement (with or without incentives) and/or communities of practice

Session # 8-9 Oct. 29th & Nov. 5th Diffusion and Adaptation of Innovations

{*Guidance for preparing for these sessions will be distributed prior to the first of these sessions.}*

Case (tentative): Affordable Health Care Act – from Massachusetts to the Nation

Rogers (2003) *Diffusion of Innovations.* 5th Edition. New York: Free Press. Focus on Chapters 1 and 5.
Dees et al (2004) "Scaling Social Impact" *Stanford Social Innovation Review,* Spring, pp. 24-32.
Evans and Clarke (2011) "Disseminating Orphan Innovations" *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter, pp. 42-7.
Shipan and Volden (2012) "Policy Diffusion: Seven Lessons for Scholars and Practitioners" *Public Administration Review*, 72 (6): 788-96.
Mulgan and Kholi (2010) "Scaling New Heights: How to Spot Small Successes in the Public Sector and Make them Big." Center for American Progress and the Young Foundation.

***Optional*:**
Focus on Individuals:
Alvord, Brown, & Letts (2003) *Social Entrepreneurship: Leadership that Facilitates Societal Transformation*
Desouza, K.C. (2012) *Challenge.gov: Using Competitions and Awards to Spur Innovation.* Arlington, VA: IBM Center for the Business of Government.
Maranto and Worlf (2013) "Cops, Teachers, and the Art of the Impossible: Explaining the Lack of Diffusion of Innovations that Make Impossible Jobs Possible
Focus on Policies: (See Trunk for additional readings)
Sapat (2004) "Devolution and Innovation: The Adoption of State Environmental Policy Innovations by Administrative Agencies" *Public Management Review,* 64(2): 141-51.
Frederickson et al (2004) "The Changing Structure of American Cities: A Study of the Diffusion of Innovation." *Public Management Review*, 64(3): 320-30.
Berry and Berry (2007) "Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research." In *Theories of the Policy Process*. 2nd edition, P. Sabatier (ed), Boulder: Westview Press. http://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Challenge.gov_.pdf
Moore, M., & Hartley, J. (2008). Innovations in governance. *Public Management Review, 10*(1), 3-20.

Session # 10 Nov. 12th Coordination and Collaboration

Case: "Integrating Housing and Social Services: Local Initiative Versus Federal Mandate" (Electronic Hallway)

Milward, H. B., & Provan, K. G. (2006). *A Manager's Guide to Choosing and Using Collaborative Networks*: IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Provan, et al (2005) The Use of Network Analysis to Strengthen Community Partnerships. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 65, No. 5

Session # 11 Nov. 19th Challenges of Working Together

Case: "Trust as an Asset: Building a Managed Service Organization within MACC" (e-parc.org)

Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006) "The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature." *Public Administration Review* (Special Issue): 44-55.

Briggs (2003) *Perfect Fit or Shotgun Marriage?: Understanding The Power and Pitfalls in Partnerships* The Community Problem-Solving Project @ MIT Cambridge, Massachusetts http://www.community-problem-solving.net/

Huxham and Vangen (2004) Doing Things Collaboratively: Realizing the Advantage or Succumbing to Inertia? Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 33, No. 2: 190–201.

Nov. 21st (Friday) 3nd Assignment Due: Critical application of either replication and adaption of an innovation or of coordination or collaboration

NO CLASS on Nov. 26thst Happy Thanksgiving!

Session# 12 Dec. 3rd Making Change Make Sense

Cels, De Jong, and Nauta (2012) “Managing Meaning: The Art of Making Sense” in *Agents of Change: Strategy and Tactics for Social Innovation*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, pp. 44-54.
Foldy, Goldman, and Ospina (2008) Sensegiving and the role of cognitive shifts in the work of leadership *Leadership Quarterly* 19: 514-29.
Reinsborough and Canning (2010) *Re:Imagining Change: How to use story-based strategy to win campaigns, build movements, and change the world.* Oakland: PM Press. (see also http://www.storybasedstrategy.org)
(Optional) Bales and Gilliam (2004) *Communication for Social Good.* The Foundation Center.

Choose ***one*** of the following:
McBeth and Shanahan (2005) Public opinion for sale: The role of policy marketers in Greater Yellowstone policy conflict. Policy Sciences 37: 319–338
Goetz (2008) Words Matter: The Importance of Issue Framing and the Case of Affordable Housing *Journal of the American Planning Association;* Spring, 74: 222-9.
Schmidt (2008) From Pro-Growth to Slow-Growth in Suburban New Jersey, *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 27: 306-18.
Baez & Abolafia (2002). Bureaucratic entrepreneurship and institutional change: A sense-making approach. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 12(4): 525-552.

Session #13 Dec. 10 (?) Assessing the Toolkit, Integrating Course Themes & Student Presentations

Re-read the syllabus and review notes from the course.

Interactive presentations and discussion of course themes in relation to your final projects.

December 19th (Friday) Project Proposal or Research Paper Due

After December 19th: Ongoing reflection on implementation challenges and creative problem solving strategies by learning from practice in the company of colleagues and constituents.