

School of Government

PUBL 302 MANAGING THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Trimester Two 2010

COURSE OUTLINE

Names and Contact Details

Course Coordinator Dr Michael Di Francesco
Room Rutherford House, Level 8, Room 831
Phone (04) 463 5082
Email michael.difrancesco@vuw.ac.nz

Administrator Mara Robertson
Room Rutherford House, Level 8, Room 821
Phone (04) 463 6599
Email mara.robertson@vuw.ac.nz

Trimester Dates

Teaching Period Monday 12 July – Friday 15 October 2010
End of Year Study Period Monday 18 October – Thursday 21 October 2010
Examination Period Friday 22 October – Saturday 13 November 2010 (incl)

Class Times and Room Numbers

<i>Lectures</i>	Monday	9.30am – 10.20am	RWW 129 (Pipitea)
	Thursday	9.30am – 10.20am	RWW 129 (Pipitea)
<i>Tutorials</i>	Monday	10.30am – 11.20am	RWW 128 (Pipitea)
	Thursday	10.30am – 11.20am	RWW 315 (Pipitea)

Course Learning Objectives

This course is an introductory survey of management in the public sector. Public management – or what is also known as public administration – is about the *technique* of government and seeks to answer questions such as: How should government be organised to deliver services? On what basis should policy be decided and resources allocated? How can the community know whether resources are used efficiently, or that services are achieving what was intended? But public

management is also inherently *political* because these technical questions about structure, process and roles are about the way authority is (or should be) exercised and accounted for by Ministers and public servants: almost invariably there is no *one* best way to organise government.

This course will use the Westminster democracies (chiefly Australia and New Zealand, but also Canada, Ireland and the United Kingdom) as a reference point for examining developments in the theory and practice of public management, as well as for undertaking comparisons with developments in other political systems. Prominent international organisations – notably the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) – have been at the forefront of international ‘benchmarking’ in public management, and the course will encourage you to use this international literature to contextualise current approaches to managing in the public sector, and to critically analyse the key ideas and actors that have driven reform.

Most students enrolling in this course will be candidates for the BA and/or BCA degrees. There is a set of learning and teaching Major Attributes for students completing a BCA major in Public Policy. The following table explains what you can achieve by successfully completing this course, and shows how these objectives relate to the relevant Major Attributes.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES By studying PUBL 302 you should be able to:	PUBLIC POLICY MAJOR ATTRIBUTE (MA) The learning objective relates to these MAs:
1. Explain key elements, including public accountability and ethical requirements, that differentiate public from private management	MA2: Demonstrate an understanding of the influence of political ideas and philosophies, and of constitutional and political institutions on public policy MA12: Demonstrate an understanding of the significance of ethics and accountability in the study and practice of public policy
2. Explain key developments in public sector management within the Westminster democracies	MA7: Apply the comparative method to policy analysis, and identify insights that might be drawn from other policy jurisdictions MA2, MA12
3. Explain the key legal and institutional arrangements that govern financial and human resource management in the public sector	MA2, MA12
4. Explain and evaluate key theories of public management and politician-bureaucrat relations in the context of current practice	MA2, MA7, MA12
5. Explain and evaluate the key features of performance-based management in the public sector	MA6: Judge the relevance and importance of evidence in policymaking MA12
6. Explain the wider political context of public sector reform and evaluate the merits of different approaches to organising and managing the public sector	MA8: Judge and articulate the relevant criteria that might be used in assessing the advantages and disadvantages of particular policy options MA2, MA12

Course Content and Delivery

This course will be delivered through two 50-minute lectures and one 50-minute tutorial each week.

The *lecture programme* appears on pages 10-11 of this course outline and comprises a mix of theory and practice lectures, guest speakers and (time permitting) large group seminars. This means there should be opportunities for discussion during most lectures. The lecture programme may vary slightly to accommodate the availability of guest speakers or to enable topical issues to be addressed.

The *tutorial programme* appears on page 12 of this course outline and comprises a mix of small group seminars to promote interactive discussion and debate, and workshops set aside for group-based assessment work. Tutorials will focus mainly on a specific topic or issue arising from previous weeks' lectures that deserves further exploration.

Expected Workload

You are expected to undertake on average between three and four hours of self-directed study per week for each contact hour. This course has three contact hours. Therefore, the expectation is that you will be investing *no less than twelve (12) hours per week, inclusive of class time*. It is important that you read the material assigned for each weekly class in advance of class discussion.

Group Work

Assessment for this course includes a group work component.

It is expected that students will allocate *no less than twelve (12) hours to the group work*, inclusive of research, allocated tutorial workshop hours and meeting times. The assessment criteria for the group work component are outlined on pages 6-7 of this course outline, and will also be discussed in class with more detailed criteria to be posted on Blackboard.

Readings

There is no textbook for this course.

All of the *required* readings for both lectures and tutorials will be available for download from Blackboard.

A list of both required and supplementary (i.e. further) reading appears in the 'Readings for Lectures and Tutorials' section on pages 13-22 of this course outline. Most of the supplementary reading will be available from the Library.

Assessment Requirements

The learning objectives for this course relate to two main competencies: being able to *explain* and *evaluate* the key institutional arrangements, concepts and practices that relate to public management.

The assessment tasks for this course will gauge progress and/or accomplishment against these competencies by asking you to:

- write an *essay* in the form of a Cabinet Paper involving the sub-tasks of designing an essay, assembling material on specialised topics, analysing the material, and presenting arguments in literate and structured form;
- contribute to the design, development and writing of a group *wiki*, testing your ability to contribute effectively in a group context, and to present material in a coordinated and structured manner designed to meet the information needs of a specified audience; and
- write *examination* answers, testing your overall grasp of the content of the course and your ability to structure ideas quickly and to answer questions in brief, relevant essays.

The assessment for this course comprises:

ASSIGNMENT	TYPE	LENGTH	DUE DATE	WEIGHTING
1. Essay	Written	2000 words	13 August 2010	20 marks
2. Group Wiki	Online	8000 words*	1 October 2010	30 marks
3. Examination	Written	Three hours	To be advised	50 marks
Total possible mark				100 marks

* This is the total minimum word length for the Group Wiki. It assumes groups of four with individual contributions equivalent to 2000 words. Further information on the Group Wiki Assignment can be found on pages 6-7 of this Course Outline.

If you have difficulties meeting course requirements because of personal problems please see the Course Coordinator as soon as possible (and *before* the due date for submitting an assignment).

Note: Your assessed work may also be used for quality assurance purposes, such as to assess the level of achievement of learning objectives as required for accreditation and audit purposes. The findings may be used to inform changes aimed at improving the quality of FCA programmes. All material used for such processes will be treated as confidential, and the outcome will not affect your grade for the course.

ASSIGNMENT TASK 1 – ESSAY (20 MARKS)

A research essay worth 20% of your final grade is due on **Friday 13 August 2010**.

The essay should be no more than 2000 words in length.

Instructions

A new Government is concerned that the impact of public sector reform on the New Zealand public service has been paradoxical: it seems to have increased responsiveness but decreased capacity to deliver. Cabinet wants to know what the problem is, what has caused it and what can be done to fix it. Prepare a Cabinet Domestic Policy (DOM) Committee Paper from the Minister of State Services that explains how the ‘new public management’ has (or has not) affected the role of the public service within Westminster systems, and what the options are for strengthening public service capacity.

The research essay must:

- be prepared using the Cabinet Paper format requirements set out on the CabGuide website at <http://cabguide.cabinetoffice.govt.nz/>

and

- follow normal academic referencing requirements using the Harvard (author date: page) referencing system, appropriate citation practices and a full bibliography listing in alphabetical order all sources cited in the essay.

Essays should be placed in the secure box at the School of Government reception (Level 8, Rutherford House) during office hours (8.30 am – 5.00 pm). The assignment box is cleared daily, and assignments will be date stamped.

You must keep a secure copy of all assignments (i.e. hard copy and e-file). Late essays will be accepted only with a medical certificate (or other appropriate documentation). Essays submitted late for no acceptable reason will be penalised.

ASSIGNMENT TASK 2 – GROUP WIKI (30 MARKS)

A group Wiki assignment worth 30% of your final grade is due on **Friday 1 October 2010**.

Assessment of the Wiki assignment will comprise two components:

- *individual assessment* (20 marks) will be based on individual input to the group project
- *group assessment* (10 marks) will be based on the coherence and quality of the Wiki page as a group product. All members of the group will be assigned this mark.

Instructions

Prepare a Wiki page of no more than 8000 words* on recent public management reform that compares *one* of the Westminster countries with *one* other OECD country.

Your group must select one country from each of the following groups:

- Westminster: Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand* and the United Kingdom
- OECD: member countries are listed at www.oecd.org and a useful data source on public sector reforms in member countries is *Government at a Glance 2009* (which can be accessed through Blackboard).

* *If your group selects New Zealand as the Westminster country, the Wiki must be 9000 words in length and must cover reforms across three (3) of the components listed under Part C below.*

The Wiki must cover the following areas:

- A. a short overview of geography and demography
- B. a short overview of the structure of government (e.g. presidential or parliamentary, unitary or federal, civil service structure etc) and the scope of government (e.g. size and composition of the public sector etc)
- C. a detailed description of recent reforms across *two* (2) of the following components of public management:
 - strategic and performance management
 - budgeting and financial management
 - human resource management
 - external accountability
- D. a comparative analysis of the recent reforms that:
 - identifies important differences and/or similarities
 - sets out the problems that were being addressed
 - uses available evidence to evaluate the extent to which the reforms addressed these problems (or, alternatively, generated unanticipated consequences).

The Wiki may use text and non-text media (i.e. graphics, video clips etc). It is to be prepared for an educated but non-specialist audience with no background in the countries you have selected.

The Wiki assignment:

- is to be completed using Blackboard *and*
- must follow normal academic referencing requirements using the Harvard (author date: page) referencing system, appropriate citation practices and a full bibliography listing in alphabetical order all sources cited in the Wiki.

The tutorial programme sets aside two tutorials as Wiki Assignment Workshops. These are common class times where (a) your group can have face-to-face discussion on the assignment and (b) the Course Coordinator will be available to answer questions and provide assistance.

ASSIGNMENT TASK 3 – EXAMINATION (50 MARKS)

There will be a three hour, closed book examination. Details of the structure and content of the examination will be advised in class in advance of the examination.

The final examination for this course will be scheduled at some time during the period from Friday 22 October to Saturday 13 November 2010 (inclusive). Students who enrol in courses with examinations are obliged to attend an examination at the University at any time during the formal examination period.

You should make yourself familiar with the University's rules about cases where illness, bereavement or other exceptional circumstances prevent attendance or impair performance at an examination. Students who would benefit from special facilities at examination time because of medical or other reasons should contact the relevant Faculty Student Administration Office, or a member of the Student Health, Counselling or Disability Services, as soon as possible.

Penalties

Extensions beyond the due dates for assignment tasks will be granted only to those who meet the University's aegrotat rules, i.e. a medical certificate, personal bereavement or personal circumstances beyond your control. If you are encountering difficulties let the Course Coordinator know immediately.

Please note the following:

- requests for extensions must be received before the due date of an assignment
- late essays must be handed in at School of Government reception (Level 8, Rutherford House) during office hours
- essays not handed in, or a Group Wiki not completed, by the due date or by the date of an agreed extension may have their mark out of 100 reduced by 5 percentage points for each day the essay was late
- essays handed in, or a Group Wiki completed, more than 5 days late after the due date or after the date of an extension may not be accepted.

Mandatory Course Requirements

To pass PUBL 302 you must do the following:

- submit the essay assignment on or before the due date
- contribute to the preparation and submission of a group wiki on or before the due date
- attend at least nine (9) of the eleven (11) scheduled tutorials
- sit the examination.

Students who fail to satisfy the mandatory requirements for passing this course, other than the requirement to obtain a C grade overall, will not receive a graded result, and their records will

show a “K” (fail due to not satisfying mandatory course requirements, even though the student’s course requirements reached the level specified for a pass).

TO PASS PUBL 302 YOU MUST MEET THE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS AND ACHIEVE AT LEAST A TOTAL OF 50% OVER ALL THE ASSESSMENT.

Communication of Additional Information

Any additional information about the course will be posted on Blackboard. Please ensure that you check Blackboard on a regular basis for notices.

Class Representative

A class representative will be elected in the first class, and that person’s name and contact details will be available to VUWSA, the Course Coordinator and the class. The class representative provides a communication channel to liaise with the Course Coordinator on behalf of students.

Academic Integrity, Plagiarism and the use of Turnitin

Plagiarism is presenting someone else’s work as if it were your own, whether you mean to or not.

‘Someone else’s work’ means anything that is not your own idea. Even if it is presented in your own style, you must still acknowledge your sources fully and appropriately. This includes:

- material from books, journals or any other printed source
- the work of other students or staff
- information from the Internet
- software programs and other electronic material
- designs and ideas
- the organisation or structuring of any such material.

Acknowledgement is required for all material in any work submitted for assessment unless it is a ‘fact’ that is well known in the context (such as “Wellington is the capital of New Zealand”) or your own ideas in your own words. Everything else that derives from one of the sources above and ends up in your work – whether it is directly quoted, paraphrased, or put into a table or figure, needs to be acknowledged with a reference that is sufficient for your reader to locate the original source.

Plagiarism undermines academic integrity simply because it is a form of lying, stealing and mistreating others. Plagiarism involves stealing other people’s intellectual property and lying about whose work it is. This is why plagiarism is prohibited at Victoria.

If you are found guilty of plagiarism, you may be penalised under the Statute on Student Conduct. You should be aware of your obligations under the Statute, which can be downloaded from the policy website (www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/policy/students.aspx). You could fail your course or even be suspended from the University.

Plagiarism is easy to detect. The University has systems in place to identify it.

Student work provided for assessment in this course may be checked for academic integrity by the electronic search engine <http://www.turnitin.com>. Turnitin is an online plagiarism prevention tool which compares submitted work with a very large database of existing material. At the discretion of the Head of School, handwritten work may be copy typed by the School and subject to checking by Turnitin. Turnitin will retain a copy of submitted materials on behalf of the University for detection of future plagiarism, but access to the full text of submissions will not be made available to any other party.

There is guidance available to students on how to avoid plagiarism by way of sound study skills and the proper and consistent use of a recognised referencing system. This guidance may be found at the following website <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/plagiarism.aspx>. If in doubt seek the advice of your course coordinator.

PLAGIARISM IS SIMPLY NOT WORTH THE RISK.

For the following important information follow the links provided:

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/plagiarism.aspx>

General University Policies and Statutes

<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/policy>

AVC (Academic) Website: information including: Conduct, Academic Grievances, Students with Impairments, Student Support

http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about_victoria/avcademic/Publications.aspx

Faculty of Commerce and Administration Offices

<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/fca/studenthelp/>

Manaaki Pihipihinga Programme

http://www.victoria.ac.nz/st_services/mentoring/

Withdrawal from Courses:

Your fees will be refunded if you withdraw from this course on or before **23 July 2010**.

The last date for withdrawal from this course is the three-quarter point of the teaching period, i.e. **Friday 24 September**.

After that date, permission to withdraw requires the permission of the Associate Dean (Students) as set out in section 8 of the Personal Courses of Study Statute:

<http://policy.vuw.ac.nz/Amphora!~policy.vuw.ac.nz~POLICY~000000001743.pdf>

To apply for permission, fill in the Late Withdrawal form available from either of our Student Customer Service Desks.

LECTURE PROGRAMME

WEEK	DATE	LECTURE TOPIC
One	12 July	Introduction and Course Organisation
	15 July	The Public Sector and Comparative Methodology
Two	19 July	Bureaucracy and Public Administration
	22 July	The Westminster Model and Politician-Bureaucrat Relations
Three	26 July	The New Zealand Version of Westminster
	29 July	New Public Management – Concepts and Practice
Four	2 August	The New Zealand Model of Public Management
	5 August	New Public Management – Drivers and Developments
Five	9 August	Public Value
	12 August	Managing Strategy
Six	16 August	Managing Organisational Performance
	19 August	Managing Organisational Performance – Do organisations in the New Zealand public sector use performance information?
Mid- Trimester Break	23 August – 5 September	No Lectures
Seven	6 September	Managing Money
	9 September	Managing Money – How are finances managed in the contemporary New Zealand public sector?
Eight	13 September	Managing People
	16 September	Managing People – How well does the Chief Executives appointment and performance framework work?
Nine	20 September	Managing Services – Citizens, Clients or Customers?
	23 September	Managing at Arm’s Length – Control and performance in non-departmental public bodies

Ten	27 September	Accountability in the Public Sector
	30 September	Ethics in Public Service
Eleven	4 October	Ethics in Public Service – How has public management reform affected ethical behaviour in practice?
	7 October	Evaluating Public Management Reform
Twelve	11 October	Course Review
	14 October	No Lecture

TUTORIAL PROGRAMME

WEEK	DATE	TUTORIAL TOPIC
One	12 and 15 July	No Tutorials
Two	19 and 22 July	Introduction and Course Organisation Comparing Public Institutions
Three	26 and 29 July	The Westminster Model
Four	2 and 5 August	New Public Management
Five	9 and 12 August	The New Zealand Model of Public Management
Six	16 and 19 August	Wiki Assignment – Workshop
Mid- Trimester Break	23 August – 5 September	No Tutorials
Seven	6 and 9 September	Public Value
Eight	13 and 16 September	Managing Organisational Performance
Nine	20 and 23 September	Wiki Assignment – Workshop
Ten	27 and 30 September	Managing Money
Eleven	4 and 7 October	Accountability and Ethics
Twelve	11 and 14 October	Course Review

READINGS FOR LECTURES AND TUTORIALS

This section lists required and supplementary readings for each week's lecture and tutorial topics.

- The required *lecture reading* complements the key topic listed under the relevant week in the Lecture Programme. These are available on Blackboard.
- The required *tutorial reading* relates to the topic that will be discussed in the relevant week in the Tutorial Programme. These are available on Blackboard.
- The *supplementary reading* is further reading relating to the relevant lecture topics in that week. This reading is NOT required, but may be helpful for assignment tasks. Most of the supplementary reading will be available from the Library.

WEEK 1

No reading

WEEK 2

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
O. E. Hughes. 2004. <i>Public Management and Administration: An Introduction</i> . 3rd Edition. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 2 'The Traditional Model of Public Administration': 17-43.	R. Hague and M. Harrop. 2007. <i>Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction</i> . 7th Edition. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 5 'The Comparative Approach': 83-98. Chapter 17 'Public Management and Administration': 355-374.
Tutorial Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which techniques and levels of analysis are most appropriate for the comparative study of public management? • What are the key institutions, concepts and theories that characterise the 'old and new agendas' of the study of public management and administration? 	
Supplementary Readings – Public Administration and Westminster	
<p>D. Beetham. 1996. <i>Bureaucracy</i>, 2nd Edition, University of Minnesota Press.</p> <p>C. Campbell and G. K. Wilson. 1995. <i>The End of Whitehall: Death of A Paradigm?</i>, Blackwell.</p> <p>R. Gregory. 2007. 'New Public Management and the Ghost of Max Weber: Exorcised or Still Haunting?' in T. Christensen and P. Laegreid (eds), <i>Transcending New Public Management: The Transformation of Public Management Reforms</i>, Ashgate: 221-244.</p> <p>H. Patapan, J. Wanna and P. Weller (eds). 2005. <i>Westminster Legacies: Democracy and Responsible Government in Asia and the Pacific</i>, UNSW Press.</p> <p>J. Pierre (ed.). 1995. <i>Bureaucracy in the Modern State: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration</i>, Edward Elgar.</p> <p>R. A. W. Rhodes, J. Wanna and P. Weller. 2009. <i>Comparing Westminster</i>, Oxford University Press. Chapter 3 'Living Traditions': 45-77.</p> <p>M. J. Smith. 1999. <i>The Core Executive in Britain</i>, Macmillan.</p> <p>M. Weber. 1968 [1922]. <i>Economy and Society</i>, University of California Press.</p> <p>J. Q. Wilson. 1989. <i>Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It</i>, Basic Books.</p>	

WEEK 3

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>O. E. Hughes. 2004. <i>Public Management and Administration: An Introduction</i>. 3rd Edition. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 3 ‘Public Management’: 44-70.</p>	<p>R. A. W. Rhodes, J. Wanna and P. Weller. 2009. <i>Comparing Westminster</i>. Oxford University Press. Chapter 6 ‘The Public Service’: 155-186.</p> <p>M. Prebble. 2010. <i>With Respect: Parliamentarians, officials and judges too</i>. Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington. Chapter 3 ‘The Iron Rule of Political Contest’: 33-46. Chapter 4 ‘The Everyday Paradox’: 47-58.</p>
<p>Tutorial Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the ‘iron rule of political contest’ and ‘everyday paradox’ that Prebble refers to? Do you agree that these ideas are the ‘bedrock’ of government in Westminster systems? • What is the notion of a ‘constitutional bureaucracy’ in Westminster systems? What are the dilemmas that have forced public servants to re-evaluate the beliefs and practices that define their role? 	
<p>Supplementary Readings – New Public Management</p>	
<p>P. Aucoin. 1995. <i>The New Public Management: Canada in Comparative Perspective</i>, Institute for Research on Public Policy.</p> <p>C. Aulich, J. Halligan and S. Nutley (eds). 2001. <i>Australian Handbook of Public Sector Management</i>, Allen and Unwin.</p> <p>T. Bovaird and E. Loffler (eds). 2009. <i>Public Management and Governance</i>, 2nd Edition, Routledge.</p> <p>T. Christensen and P. Laegreid (eds). 2007. <i>Transcending New Public Management: The Transformation of Public Sector Reforms</i>, Ashgate.</p> <p>B. Guy Peters and D. J. Savoie. 1998. <i>Taking Stock: Assessing Public Sector Reforms</i>, McGill-Queens University Press.</p> <p>C. Hood. 1991. ‘A Public Management for All Seasons?’, <i>Public Administration</i>, 69 (1): 3-19.</p> <p>C. Hood and B. Guy Peters. 2004. ‘The Middle Aging of New Public Management: Into the Age of Paradox?’, <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i>, 14 (3): 267-282.</p> <p>C. Pollitt and G. Bouckaert. 2004. <i>Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis</i>, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press.</p> <p>OECD. 1995. <i>Governance in Transition: Public Management Reform in OECD Countries</i>, OECD.</p> <p>D. J. Savoie. 1994. <i>Thatcher, Reagan, Mulroney: In Search of a New Bureaucracy</i>, University of Toronto Press.</p> <p>S. Schiavo-Campo and H. M. McFerson. 2008. <i>Public Management in Global Perspective</i>, M.E. Sharpe. Chapter 15 ‘Public Administration Reform in Developing Countries’: 451-464.</p> <p>S. Zifcak. 1994. <i>New Managerialism: Administrative Reform in Whitehall and Canberra</i>, Open University Press.</p>	

WEEK 4

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>R. Mulgan. 2008. 'Public Sector Reform in New Zealand: Issues of Public Accountability', <i>Public Administration Quarterly</i>, 32 (1) Spring: 1-32.</p>	<p>P. Aucoin. 1990. 'Administrative Reform in Public Management: Paradigms, Principles, Paradoxes and Pendulums', <i>Governance</i>, 3 (2) April: 115-137.</p> <p>J. Blum and N. Manning. 2009. 'Public management reforms across OECD countries' in T. Bovaird and E. Löffler (eds) <i>Public Management and Governance</i> 2nd Edition, Routledge: 41-58.</p>
<p>Tutorial Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In his classic article, Aucoin identifies two paradigms driving administrative reform in Westminster systems. What characterises the paradigms, why are they in tension, and what have been (are) the consequences? • What have been the key contemporary public sector reform trajectories across OECD countries? To what extent do these echo the issues identified by Aucoin? 	
<p>Supplementary Readings – The New Zealand Model of Public Management</p>	
<p>J. Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallott and P. Walsh (eds). 1991. <i>Reshaping the State: New Zealand's Bureaucratic Revolution</i>, Oxford University Press.</p> <p>J. Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallot and P. Walsh. 1996. <i>Public Management: The New Zealand Model</i>, Oxford University Press.</p> <p>J. Boston and C. Eichbaum. 2007. 'State Sector Reform and Renewal in New Zealand: Lessons for Governance' in G. E. Caiden and T. T. Su (eds), <i>The Repositioning of Public Governance: Global Experience and Challenges</i>, Taiwan National University.</p> <p>R. Gregory. 1998. 'A New Zealand Tragedy: Problems of Political Responsibility', <i>Governance</i> 11 (2): 231-240.</p> <p>R. Gregory. 2000. 'Getting better but feeling worse? Public sector reform in New Zealand', <i>International Public Management Journal</i>, 3 (1): 107-123.</p> <p>J. Kelsey. 1997. <i>The New Zealand Experiment</i>, Auckland University Press.</p> <p>R. Norman. 2003. <i>Obedient Servants: Management Freedoms and Accountabilities in the New Zealand Public Sector</i>, Victoria University of Wellington.</p> <p>A. Schick. 1996. <i>The Spirit of Reform: Managing the New Zealand State Sector in a Time of Change</i>, State Services Commission.</p> <p>G. Scott and P. Gorringer. 1989. 'Reform of the Core Public Sector: The New Zealand Experience', <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 48 (1): 81-92.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 1998. <i>New Zealand's State Sector Reform: A Decade of Change</i>, SSC.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 2001. <i>Review of the Centre Advisory Group Report</i>, SSC.</p> <p>The Treasury. 1996. <i>Putting It Together: An Explanatory Guide to the New Zealand Public Sector Financial Management System</i>, The Treasury.</p>	

WEEK 5

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>M. H. Moore. 1995. <i>Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government</i>, Harvard University Press. Chapter 2 ‘Defining Public Value’: 27-56.</p>	<p>G. Scott. 2001. <i>Public Sector Management in New Zealand: Lessons and Challenges</i>, Centre for Law and Economics, Australian National University. Chapter 1 ‘Launching the Revolution to the State Sector in 1987’: 1-10. Chapter 2 ‘The Reforms: Contents and An Analytical Perspective’: 11-36.</p> <p>J. Chapman and G. Duncan. 2007. ‘Is there now a new “New Zealand model”?’ , <i>Public Management Review</i>, 9 (1): 1-25.</p>
<p>Tutorial Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the late 1980s and early 1990s Graham Scott was one of the architects of what became known internationally as the New Zealand model of public management. What are the key elements of the model? Who and what drove the changes? • Which elements of the model have been modified, and why? Does it still make sense to talk about a distinct New Zealand approach to public management? 	
<p>Supplementary Readings – Public Value and Managing Strategy</p>	
<p>J. Alford and J. O’Flynn. 2009. ‘Making Sense of Public Value: Concepts, Critiques and Emergent Meanings’, <i>International Journal of Public Administration</i>, 32 (3): 171-191.</p> <p>J. Boston and J. Pallot. 1997. ‘Linking Strategy and Performance: Developments in the New Zealand Public Sector’, <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 16 (3): 382-404.</p> <p>M. Cole and G. Parston. 2006. <i>Unlocking Public Value: A New Model for Achieving High Performance in Public Service Organisations</i>, John Wiley.</p> <p>H. K. Colebatch. 2010. ‘Valuing Public Value: Recognising and Applying Knowledge About the Governmental Process’, <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 69 (1): 66-78.</p> <p>R. Gregory. 1995. ‘The Peculiar Tasks of Public Management: Towards Conceptual Discrimination’, <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 54 (2): 171-183.</p> <p>G. Kelly, G. Mulgan and S. Muers. 2002. <i>Creating Public Value: An Analytical Framework for Public Service Reform</i>, UK Cabinet Office Strategy Unit.</p> <p>J. O’Flynn. 2007. ‘From New Public Management to Public Value: Paradigmatic Change and Managerial Implications’, <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 66 (3): 353-366.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 2003. <i>Managing for Outcomes: Guidance for Departments</i>, SSC.</p> <p>J. Wells. 2001. ‘Strategic Management and Corporate Planning’ in C. Aulich, J. Halligan and S. Nutley (eds), <i>Australian Handbook of Public Sector Management</i>, Allen & Unwin: 47-59.</p> <p>R. G. Stewart. 1999. <i>Public Policy: Strategy and Accountability</i>, Macmillan.</p> <p>J. Stoker. 2006. ‘Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance?’, <i>American Review of Public Administration</i>, 36 (1): 41-57.</p>	

WEEK 6

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>C. Talbot. 2005. 'Performance Management' in E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn and C. Pollitt (eds), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Public Management</i>, Oxford University: 491-517.</p>	<p>No Reading</p>
<p>Supplementary Readings – Managing Organisational Performance</p>	
<p>K. Baehler. 2003. 'Managing for Outcomes: Accountability and Thrust', <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, (62) 4: 23-34.</p> <p>R. Behn. 2003. 'Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures', <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 63 (5) September/October: 586-606.</p> <p>G. Bouckaert and J. Halligan. 2008. <i>Managing Performance: International Comparisons</i>, Routledge.</p> <p>N. Carter. R. Klein and P. Day. 1992. <i>How Organisations Measure Success: The Use of Performance Indicators in Government</i>, Routledge.</p> <p>C. Hood. 2007. 'Public Service Management by Numbers: Why Does it Vary? Where Has it Come From? What Are the Gaps and the Puzzles?', <i>Public Money and Management</i>, April: 95-102.</p> <p>D. P. Moynihan. 2008. <i>The Dynamics of Performance Management: Constructing Information and Reform</i>, Georgetown University Press.</p> <p>OECD. 1997. <i>In Search of Results: Performance Management Practices</i>, OECD.</p> <p>M. Schacter. 2002. <i>What Will Be, Will Be: The Challenge of Applying Results-based Thinking to Policy</i>, Institute on Governance, Ottawa.</p> <p>P. Smith. 1995. 'On the Unintended Consequences of Publishing Performance Data in the Public Sector', <i>International Journal of Public Administration</i>, 18 (2/3): 277-310.</p> <p>State Services Commission and The Treasury. 2008. <i>Performance Measurement: Advice and examples on how to develop effective frameworks</i>, SSC.</p> <p>P. Thomas. 2006. <i>Performance Measurement, Reporting, Obstacles and Accountability: Recent Trends and Future Directions</i>, ANZSOG and ANU E-Press.</p>	

WEEK 7

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>J. Boston and C. Eichbaum. 2008. 'Financial management and democratic accountability: Lessons from New Zealand' in M. Ezzamel, N. Hyndman, A. Johnsen and I. Lapsley (eds) <i>Accounting in Politics: Devolution and Democratic Accountability</i>, Routledge: 109-133.</p>	<p>R. A. W. Rhodes and J. Wanna. 2007. 'The Limits to Public Value, or Rescuing Responsible Government From the Platonic Guardians', <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 66 (4): 406-421.</p> <p>J. Alford. 2008. 'The Limits to Traditional Public Administration, or Rescuing Public Value from Misrepresentation', <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 67 (3): 357-366.</p>
<p>Tutorial Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do Rhodes and Wanna find the application of the public value approach in Westminster systems 'disturbing'? What do they mean by public managers as 'platonic guardians'? • In contesting Rhodes and Wanna, is Alford correct to argue that the politics-management 'pendulum' has swung too far in one direction, and that public value is a useful way of 'reinvigorating' the role of public servants? Is his argument context specific? • How relevant do you think this 'academic' debate is for practising public managers? 	
<p>Supplementary Readings – Managing Money</p>	
<p>J. Kelly and J. Wanna. 2001. 'Are Wildavsky Guardians and Spenders Still Relevant? New Public Management and the Politics of Government Spending' in L. R Jones, J. Guthrie and P. Steane (eds), <i>Learning From International Public Management Reform</i>, Elsevier: 589-614.</p> <p>S. Newberry and J. Pallott. 2005. 'A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing? Wider Consequences of the Financial Management System of the New Zealand Central Government', <i>Financial Accountability and Management</i>, 21 (3): 263-277.</p> <p>O. Olson, J. Guthrie, and C. Humphrey (eds). 1998. <i>Global Warning! Debating International Developments in New Public Financial Management</i>, Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.</p> <p>OECD. 1995. <i>Budgeting for Results: Perspectives on Public Expenditure Management</i>, OECD.</p> <p>OECD. 1997. <i>Modern Budgeting</i>, OECD.</p> <p>M. Robinson. 1999. 'Contract Budgeting', <i>Public Administration</i>, 78 (1): 75-95.</p> <p>M. Robinson (ed.). 2007. <i>Performance Budgeting: Linking Funding and Results</i>, Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>I. S. Rubin and J. Kelly. 2005. 'Budget and Accounting Reforms' in E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn and C. Pollitt (eds), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Public Management</i>, Oxford University: 563-590.</p> <p>A. Schick. 2008. 'Performance Budgeting and Accrual Budgeting: Decision Rules or Analytic Tools?', <i>OECD Journal of Budgeting</i>, 7 (2): 109-138.</p> <p>C. Thain and M. Wright. 1995. <i>The Treasury and Whitehall: The Planning and Control of Public Expenditure 1976-1993</i>, Clarendon Press.</p> <p>The Treasury. 2005. <i>A Guide to the Public Finance Act</i>, The Treasury, Wellington.</p> <p>J. Wanna, L. Jensen and J. de Vries (eds). 2003. <i>Controlling Public Expenditure: The Changing Roles of Central Budget Agencies – Better Guardians?</i> Edward Elgar.</p> <p>J. Wanna, J. Kelly and J. Forster. 2000. <i>Managing Public Expenditure in Australia</i>, Allen & Unwin.</p>	

WEEK 8

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>OECD. 2005. <i>Modernising Government: The Way Forward</i>, OECD.</p> <p>Chapter 6 ‘Organising and Motivating Public Servants: Modernising Public Employment’: 157-183.</p>	<p>State Services Commission and The Treasury. 2008. <i>Performance Measurement: Advice and examples on how to develop effective frameworks</i>, SSC.</p> <p>Module 1 ‘Why measure performance?’: 11-18.</p> <p>Module 4 ‘Defining outcomes, intermediate outcomes and outputs’: 31-40.</p> <p>Module 5 ‘Developing measures and indicators’: 41-54.</p> <p>C. Hood. 2006. ‘Gaming in Targetworld: The Targets Approach to Managing British Public Services’, <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 66 (4) July/August: 514-521.</p>
<p>Tutorial Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the State Services Commission and Treasury guidelines on performance measurement in the New Zealand public sector. What are the key steps in defining the impact of government services, and developing meaningful performance measures? Based on the examples provided, what are the key methodological challenges? • What does Hood mean when he refers to ‘gaming behaviour’ in public sector performance management systems? Is this a new phenomenon? Is it possible to design performance systems to mitigate these problems? 	
<p>Supplementary Readings – Managing People</p>	
<p>Australian Public Service Commission. 2003. <i>The Australian Experience of Public Sector Reform</i>, APSC. Chapter 4 ‘Staffing the Public Service’: 53-72, Chapter 5 ‘Leadership’: 73-86.</p> <p>J. Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallot and P. Walsh. 1996. <i>Public Management: The New Zealand Model</i>, Oxford University Press. Part V – Human Resource Management: 204-259.</p> <p>H. Derlien and B. Guy Peters (eds). 2008. <i>The State At Work, Volume 1: Public Sector Employment in Ten Western Countries</i>, Edward Elgar.</p> <p>J. Halligan. 1991. ‘The career public service and administrative reform in Australia’, <i>International Review of Administrative Sciences</i>, 57 (3): 345-360.</p> <p>Horton, S. 2009. ‘Human Resource Management in the Public Sector’ in T. Bovaird and E. Löffler (eds), <i>Public Management and Governance</i>, 2nd Edition, Routledge: 121-134.</p> <p>B. Guy Peters and J. Pierre (eds). 2004. <i>Politicisation of the Civil Service in Comparative Perspective</i>, Routledge.</p> <p>OECD. 2005. <i>Performance-related Pay Policies for Government Employees</i>, OECD.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 1998. <i>New Zealand’s State Sector Reform: A Decade of Change</i>, SSC. Chapter 7 ‘Human Resource Management in the Public Service’.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 2009. <i>Human Resource Capability Survey of Public Service Departments as at 30 June 2009</i>, SSC.</p> <p>P. Walsh. 1991. ‘Industrial Relations and Personnel Policies under the State Sector Act’ in J. Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallott and P. Walsh (eds), <i>Reshaping the State: New Zealand’s Bureaucratic Revolution</i>, Oxford University Press: 114-139.</p> <p>R. A. W. Rhodes and P. Weller (eds). 2001. <i>The Changing World of Top Officials: Mandarins or Valets?</i>, Open University Press.</p>	

WEEK 9

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>J. Alford. 2009. <i>Engaging Public Sector Clients: From Service Delivery to Co-production</i>, Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 1 ‘The Co-production Concept’:15-29. Chapter 5 ‘Postal Service Customers as Co-producers’: 73-95.</p>	<p>No reading</p>
<p>Supplementary Readings – Managing Service Delivery</p>	
<p>S. Barrett. 2004. ‘Implementation Studies: Time for a Revival?’, <i>Public Administration</i>, 82 (2): 249-262.</p> <p>J. A. Chandler, J. A. (ed.). 1996. <i>The Citizen’s Charter</i>, Aldershot.</p> <p>J. Cribb. 2006. ‘Agents or Stewards? Contracting with Voluntary Organisations’, <i>Policy Quarterly</i>, 2(2): 11-17.</p> <p>J. Hartley, C. Donaldson and C. Skelcher (eds). 2008. <i>Managing to Improve Public Services</i>, Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>L. McGuire. 2001. ‘Service Charters: Global Convergence or National Divergence? A Comparison of Initiatives in Australia, United Kingdom and the United States’, <i>Public Management Review</i>, 3 (4): 493-524.</p> <p>G. Mulgan and A. Lee. 2001. <i>Better Policy Delivery and Design</i>, United Kingdom Cabinet Office.</p> <p>OECD. 2009. <i>Focus on Citizens: Public Engagement for Better Policy and Services</i>, OECD.</p> <p>C. O’Faircheallaigh, P. Graham and J. Warburton. (eds) 1991. <i>Service Delivery and Public Sector Marketing</i>, Macmillan.</p> <p>J. Pierre. 1995. ‘The Marketization of the State: Citizens, Consumers, and the Emergence of the Public Market’ in B. Guy Peters and D. J. Savoie (eds), <i>Governance in a Changing Environment</i>, McGill-Queen’s University Press: 55-81.</p> <p>B. Ryan. 2006. ‘Managing for Outcomes: Understanding Clients’, <i>Policy Quarterly</i>, 2 (4): 39-46.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 2009. <i>Kiwis Count 2009: New Zealanders Satisfaction with Public Services</i>, SSC.</p> <p>P. Weller and S. Vardon. 1997. ‘Are Prisoners Clients?’, <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 56 (1): 125-129.</p>	

WEEK 10

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
<p>M. Bovens. 2005. 'Public Accountability' in E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn and C. Pollitt (eds), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Public Management</i>, Oxford University: 182-208.</p>	<p>T. Curristine. 2007. 'Experience of OECD Countries with Performance Budgeting' in M. Robinson (ed.), <i>Performance Budgeting: Linking Funding and Results</i>, Palgrave Macmillan / International Monetary Fund: 128-143.</p> <p>M. Robinson. 2002. 'Output-Purchase Funding and Budgeting Systems in the Public Sector', <i>Public Budgeting and Finance</i>, Winter: 17-33.</p>
<p>Tutorial Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has characterised reforms in OECD countries designed to integrate performance information with the budget process? What are the key influences on whether this information is actually used by decision-makers? • What are the key attributes of output-purchase funding systems as modelled in Australia and New Zealand? Which characteristics of the public sector make the model difficult to apply in practice? Do you agree with Robinson's general conclusion that such systems are 'in significant measure fictional'? 	
<p>Supplementary Readings – Accountability and Ethics</p>	
<p>P. Barberis. 1998. 'The New Public Management and a New Accountability', <i>Public Administration</i>, 76 (3): 451-470.</p> <p>T. L. Cooper (ed.). 1994. <i>Handbook of Administrative Ethics</i>, Marcel Dekker, New York.</p> <p>J. Greenaway. 1995. 'Having the Bun and the Halfpenny: Can Old Public Service Ethics Survive in the New Whitehall?', <i>Public Administration</i>, 73 (3): 357-374.</p> <p>M. W. Jackson. 1987. 'The Eye of Doubt: Neutrality, Responsibility and Morality', <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, XLVI (3): 280-292.</p> <p>K. Kernaghan and J. W. Langford. 1990. <i>The Responsible Public Servant</i>, Institute for Research on Public Policy.</p> <p>MAB-MIAC (Management Advisory Board-Management Improvement Advisory Committee). 1993. <i>Accountability in the Commonwealth Public Sector</i>, No. 11, AGPS.</p> <p>R. Mulgan. 2003. <i>Holding Power to Account: Accountability in Modern Democracies</i>, Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>OECD. 2000. <i>Trust in Government: Ethics Measures in OECD Countries</i>, OECD.</p> <p>OECD. 2005. <i>Public Sector Integrity: A Framework for Assessment</i>, OECD.</p> <p>C. Sampford, N. Preston and C. Bois (eds). 1998. <i>Public Sector Ethics: Finding and Implementing Values</i>, The Federation Press.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 1999. <i>Improving Accountability: Developing an Integrated Performance System</i>, Occasional Paper No. 11, SSC.</p> <p>B. Stone. 1995. 'Administrative Accountability in the Westminster Democracies: Towards a New Conceptual Framework', <i>Governance</i>, 8 (4) April: 505-526.</p> <p>P. G. Thomas. 1998. 'The Changing Nature of Accountability' in B. Guy Peters and D. J. Savoie (eds), <i>Taking Stock: Assessing Public Sector Reforms</i>, McGill University Press: 348-393.</p> <p>J. Uhr. 2005. <i>Terms of Trust: Arguments over Ethics in Australian Government</i>, University of New South Wales Press.</p>	

WEEK 11

Lecture Reading	Tutorial Reading
No reading	<p>M. W. Jackson. 2008. 'I, Burocrat', <i>Journal of Parliamentary and Political Law</i>, 1 (1): 359-368.</p> <p>State Services Commission. 2007. <i>Standards of Integrity and Conduct</i>.</p> <p>R. Gregory. 1998. 'Political Responsibility for Bureaucratic Incompetence: Tragedy at Cave Creek', <i>Public Administration</i>, 76 Autumn: 519-538.</p>
<p>Tutorial Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In his fictitious Wikipedia entry, Jackson distinguishes between 'accountability' and 'responsibility' in public management. What are the key differences between these concepts? Why is the 'Zeroth Law' inconsistent with public service accountability as currently understood in Westminster systems? Would the Three Laws of Burocratics provide for 'good' government? • What was the 'tragedy at Cave Creek'? Did the formal accountability framework established by the New Zealand public management system distinguish 'managerial accountability' from 'public responsibility'? Does the formal accountability framework acknowledge Jackson's so-called 'Zeroth Law'? 	
<p>Recommended Readings – Evaluating Public Management Reform</p>	
<p>J. Boston. 2000. 'The Challenge of Evaluating Systemic Change: The Case of Public Management Reform in New Zealand', <i>International Public Management Journal</i>, 3 (1).</p> <p>J. Broadbent and R. Laughlin. 1997. 'Evaluating the "New Public Management" Reforms in the UK: A Constitutional Possibility?', <i>Public Administration</i>, 75 Autumn: 487-507.</p> <p>C. Hood, R. Dixon and C. Beeton. 2008. 'Rating the Rankings: Assessing International Rankings of Public Service Performance', <i>International Public Management Journal</i>, 11 (3): 298-328.</p> <p>R. Laking. 1999. 'Don't Try This at Home? A New Zealand Approach to Public Management Reform in Mongolia', <i>International Public Management Journal</i>, 2 (2): 217-235.</p> <p>C. Pollitt. 1995. 'Justification by Works or by Faith? Evaluating the New Public Management', <i>Evaluation</i>, 1 (2): 133-154.</p> <p>C. Pollitt and G. Bouckaert. 2004. <i>Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis</i>, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press.</p> <p>P. Osborne. 2006. 'The New Public Governance?', <i>Public Management Review</i>, 8 (3): 377-387.</p> <p>A. Schick. 1998. 'Why Most Developing Countries Should Not Try New Zealand's Reforms', <i>The World Bank Research Observer</i>, 13 (1) February: 123-131.</p> <p>H. Wollmann. (ed.) 2003. <i>Evaluation in Public Sector Reforms: Concepts and Practice in International Perspective</i>, Edward Elgar.</p>	

WEEK 12

No reading