

JSGS 801 – GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA CAMPUS	
INSTRUCTOR:	Robert E. Hawkins
PHONE:	306-789-2888
E-MAIL:	robert.hawkins@uregina.ca
OFFICE HOURS:	Anytime by appointment
OFFICE LOCATION:	110 2 Research Drive
TERM:	Winter 2014
ROOM:	210 – 2 Research Drive
DATE AND TIME:	Thurs. Jan, 2014 to Thurs April 3, 2014 @ 5:30 to 8:15 pm <u>except</u> Thurs. Feb. 20-mid-term break

CALENDAR DESCRIPTION

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

COURSE CONTENT AND APPROACH

This course is divided into two parts. The first focuses on a series of well-known challenges faced by the institutions of policy making in Canada (with some additional comparative material) together with an assessment of the ability of the institutions to meet these challenges. For the most part the format will be one of lectures and interactive dialogue between professor and student. The second part of the course is devoted to a more detailed examination of contemporary public sector management. The institutional frame is still there but this part of the course is focused on a series of more recently identified challenges and opportunities, including the changing focus on government accountability, the desire to create more effective policies and programs, the changing relationships between governments and citizens, and new governing instruments. Teams of students, assisted by detailed comments and questions from the class, will present these seminars. Time permitting, the final session will provide students with a chance to make group presentations that reflect on and integrate the material covered in the whole course.

REQUIRED READINGS

There is no textbook assigned for this course. Readings for individual classes are noted in the detailed course calendar outline below. In the first part of the course we have sometimes divided the readings into

“required” and “recommended. We expect you to do a significant amount of reading. In the second part of the course, where students are responsible for presentations, we are asking for fewer readings and have asterisked the ones that everyone should do, whether you are presenting or not.

A very basic and short introduction to Canadian governmental institutions can be found at: Eugene A. Forsey, *How Canadians Govern Themselves*, 8th ed. (available on line at http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/SenatorEugeneForsey/book/assets/pdf/How_Canadians_Govern_Themselves8.pdf)

Access to readings: Journal articles can be found online through the UR Library e-journals.

EVALUATION

Environmental Scan (1500 words)	15%	(Feb. 6)
Lead a seminar	35%	As assigned
Participation / Blueprint 2020	15%	Throughout
‘Future of Public Service Paper’ (2,500 words)	35%	(March. 27)

DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENTS

All written assignments are to be handed in by 5:00 p.m. of the due date. They are to be sent as a Word attachment to the instructor’s email address: robert.hawkins@uregina.ca.

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

Your **second writing assignment** is to prepare a paper of 2,500 words on the future of the federal public service dealing with some aspect of its form and function. In June 2013, Wayne Wouters, the Clerk of the Privy Council and Head of the Public Service, launched the Blueprint 2020 vision on the future of the federal public service, and an engagement initiative encouraging public servants and Canadians to contribute their ideas on how to make the Blueprint 2020 vision a reality.

As part of the process of engagement, the Canada School of Public Service announced a graduate student paper competition aimed at obtaining "thoughtful research on matters related to the Blueprint 2020 vision, for example: how the vision could be implemented; how this exercise compares to other reform initiatives; topics related to the four guiding principles; or other questions related to ensuring Canada continues to have a world class public service in the decades ahead. Papers will be assessed on their overall contribution to new knowledge and understanding about the public service that will help to turn Blueprint 2020 into reality."

The deadline for entry into the competition sponsored by the Canada School of Public Service passes on November 15, 2013. Nonetheless, students in this 801 class will prepare a paper as if it were to be entered into the competition. The paper can be no longer than 2,500 words. The rules for the paper are the same as those that applied to the original competition and can be found at:

<http://www.ipac.ca/documents/Guidelines-EN.pdf>

More information on the Blueprint 2020 initiative can be found on line.

In the second part of the course, students, working in groups, will be required **to present, provide discussion questions and lead a discussion** of one of the seminars assigned for a class. Basically, the student group will conduct the seminar. Presentation skills and content form part of the grade.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS

Late penalties will be assessed except for cases with documented medical reasons. There are no exceptions.

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

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

STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

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

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND CONDUCT

Ensuring that you understand and follow the principles of academic integrity and conduct as laid out in the University of Regina's Graduate Calendar is vital to your success in graduate school (available at http://www.uregina.ca/gradstudies/calendar/policy_univ.shtml#conduct). Ensuring that your work is your own and reflects both your own ideas and those of others incorporated in your work is important: ensuring that you acknowledge the ideas, words, and phrases of others that you use is a vital part of the scholarly endeavour. If you have any questions about academic integrity, contact your course instructor to discuss your questions.

COURSE CALENDAR OVERVIEW

Part One: The Framework Under Stress

Session 1: Introduction to Governance and Administration (Jan. 9)

Session 2: Who governs? The scope and limits of modern ministerial responsibility (Jan. 16)

Session 3: The Trouble with Central Agencies (Jan. 23)

Session 4: The Contemporary Public Service (Jan. 30)

Session 5: Courts Make Policy: Democratic Dialogue or Dialogue of the Deaf? (Feb. 6 – Scan due)

Session 6: The New Federalism: Internat’l Obligations, Decentralization and Multilevel Gov. (Feb. 13)

No Class: Feb. 20 (mid-term break)

Part Two: New Challenges and Opportunities

Session 7: Accountability: Transparency, Ethics and Financial Management (Feb. 27)

Session 8: “New” Governance: Steering or Drowning? (including ‘Lean’)(Mar. 6)

Session 9: Governing in Networks (Mar. 13)

Session 10: “Proximity”: Citizen Responsiveness and Democratic Engagement (Mar. 20)

Session 11: Service Provision: Procurement, Contracting Out and P3s (Mar 27- Blueprint 2020 paper due)

Session 12: Governance in the Digital Age: IT, e-government and e-governance (April 3 – last class)

There will be no class on April 10, 2014 to accommodate the Tansley Lecture which is recommended to all students.

DETAILED COURSE CALENDAR

Part One: The Framework Under Stress

Session 1: Introduction to Governance and Administration (Jan. 9)

The art of governing takes place in an institutional environment that sets the basic ground rules for making and implementing public policy. Beginning in the mid-1990s, it became commonplace to hear that the locus of policy making was no longer to be found in the traditional institutions of government but in a broader institutional context of “governance”. Whether or not this claim was ever well-founded (a question that will be a major theme of this course), significant changes in the institutional environment have certainly taken place. Whether the resulting new institutional mix is capable of satisfying contemporary requirements of democratic governance is an abiding normative concern. Can public sector managers draw strength from the new environment or are they hobbled and compromised by a framework that cannot be adequately reformed to supply policy innovation, public responsiveness and accountability?

Required readings:

Rhodes, R.A.W. 1996. “The New Governance: Governing Without Government.” *Political Studies* 44(4), 652-667.

Peters, B. G., and J. Pierre. 1998. “Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(2), 223-44

Hajer, M. 2009. “The Authority Problem of Governance”, in Hajer, *Authoritative Governance: Policy Making in the Age of Mediatization* (Oxford University Press). Available at <http://fds.oup.com/www.oup.com/pdf/13/9780199281671.pdf>

Stoker, Gerry. 1998. “Governance as Theory: 5 Propositions,” *International Social Science Journal* 155(50), 17-28.

Vans Kersbergen, K., and F. Van Waarden. 2004. “‘Governance’ as a Bridge between Disciplines: Cross-Disciplinary Inspiration Regarding Shifts in Governance and Problems of Governability, Accountability and Legitimacy.” *European Journal of Political Research* 43(2), 143-71

Session 2: Who governs? The scope and limits of ministerial responsibility (Jan. 16)

The central principle of parliamentary government is the idea of a political executive drawn from and responsible to the legislative assembly. While much of the traditional political science literature continues to agonize over the inability of elected Members of Parliament to hold the government of the day to account, arguably the more serious challenge comes from the increasingly ineffectual character of ministerial responsibility. Does the system work as it was originally designed to work? Is it a system that is adequate for the demands of contemporary governance? What are the consequences for public servants?

Required readings:

Skogstad, Grace. 2003. "Who Governs? Who Should Govern? Political Authority and Legitimacy in Canada in the Twenty-First Century." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 36(5), 955-973.

Sutherland, Sharon. 1991. "Responsible Government and Ministerial Responsibility: Every Solution is its Own Problem." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 24(1), 91-111.

Smith, David. 2007. "Clarifying the Doctrine of Ministerial Responsibility as it Applies to the Government and Parliament of Canada." *Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities Research Studies* I. 101-43. http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/GomeryII/ResearchStudies1/CISPAA_Vol1_4.pdf

Brown, David C.G. 2013. "Accountability in a collectivized environment: From Glassco to digital public administration." *Canadian Public Administration* 56 (1): 47-69

Mulgan, Richard. 2010. "Where Have All the Ministers Gone?" *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 69 (3): 289-300.

Recommended readings:

Polidano, Charles. 1999. "The Bureaucrat Who Fell Under a Bus: Ministerial Responsibility, Executive Agencies and The Derek Lewis Affair in Britain." *Governance* 12(2): 201-229.

D'Ombain, Nicolas. 2007. "Ministerial Responsibility and the Machinery of Government," *Canadian Public Administration* 50(2): 195-218

Session 3: The Trouble with Central Agencies (Jan. 23)

The traditional fears that Cabinet domination of parliament threatens responsible government and undermines the principle of ministerial responsibility have been overtaken in recent years by an even greater anxiety. What if Cabinet itself has been eclipsed by the Prime Minister who, with a small cadre of senior officials and partisan advisors, can now dominate all aspects of policy and administration? To long standing concerns about the "presidential" character of the modern Prime Minister has been added the even more sinister idea of "court government". Are they plausible? What are the implications for the public service and public service reform?

Required Readings

*Paul Thomas. 2003. Governing From the Centre: Reconceptualizing the Role of the PM and Cabinet. *Policy Options* (Dec., 2003). Available at <http://www.irpp.org/assets/po/paul-martin/thomas.pdf>

Savoie, Donald. 1999. The Rise of Court Government in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 32(4): 635-64.

Weller, Patrick. 2003. Cabinet Government: An Elusive Ideal? *Public Administration* 81(4): 701-722.

Bevir, Mark and Rod Rhodes. 2006. Prime Ministers, Presidentialism and Westminster Smokescreens. *Political Studies* 54: 671-690.

Recommended Readings

Courtney, John. 1984. Has the Canadian Prime Minister become 'Presidentialized'? *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 14(2): 238-241.

Harrison, Kathryn. 2007. The Road Not Taken: Climate Change Policy in Canada and the United States. *Global Environmental Politics* 7(4): 92-117

Session 4: The Contemporary Public Service / Blueprint 2020 (Jan. 30)

The public service in Canada was created in the struggle between the local requirements of patronage and political mobilization and the national requirements of bureaucratization imposed by national projects. Since the early 20th century the public service has undergone a number of transformations and followed a number of "models", in the course of which new entities have been created to improve, program delivery, policy formation, and horizontal coordination. To what extent is the contemporary public service organized to meet the governance challenges of the 21st century? Why have there been so many efforts at public service "renewal" in recent decades and is the latest version (Blueprint 2020) really any different from all the others?

Required Readings:

Blueprint 2020 – Getting Started – Getting Your Views Building Tomorrow's Public Service Together. Available online at <http://www.clerk.gc.ca/eng/feature.asp?pagelD=349>

Zussman, David R. 2008. *The New Governing Balance: Politicians and Public Servants in Canada*. The Tansley Lecture March 13. Available online at http://www.uregina.ca/sipp/documents/pdf/Tansley_08_online.pdf

Wouters, Wayne G. 2013. Twentieth Annual Report to the Prime Minister on the Public Service of Canada. For the year ending March 31, 2013. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada. Available online at <http://www.clerk.gc.ca/eng/feature.asp?pagelD=319>

Mulgan, Geoff. 2008. *Ready or Not? Taking Public Sector Innovation Seriously*. Available online at <http://www.nesta.org.uk/library/documents/readyornot.pdf>

Gow, James Iain. 2005. "Quality Management and Organizational Innovation in Canada." Paper prepared for the International Conference on Public Management in North America at El Colegio de Mexico, October 27-28, 2005. Available online at http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style/quality_management3org2rev.pdf

Session 5: Courts Make Policy: Democratic Dialogue or Dialogue of the Deaf? (Feb. 6)

The judiciary's role in governance is contested in many quarters, if only because the judiciary itself is able to influence its own role. Recent years have also seen increasing debate and dialogue about the respective roles of the courts and legislatures in a democratic society. Is the constitutional value of the rule of law sufficient justification for the principle of judicial review? How much judicial independence is consistent with democratic norms? Do these models serve the best interest of the public? How seriously are we to take judicial protestations that judges are engaged in a "democratic dialogue" rather than usurping the roles of legislatures and executives?

Required readings:

Hogg, Peter W. and Cara F. Zwibel. 2005. "The Rule of Law in the Supreme Court of Canada," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 55(3): 715-33.

[Hogg, Peter W., et al.](#) 2007. "Charter Dialogue Revisited - or Much Ado About Metaphors." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 45: 1-66

F.L. Morton. 1999. "Dialogue or Monologue?" *Policy Options*, April. Available at <http://archive.irpp.org/po/archive/apr99/morton.pdf>

Reasons for Judgement of the Supreme Court of Canada in R. v. Marshall (No. 1) [1999] 3 S.C.R. 456 and R. v. Marshall (No. 2) [1999] 3 S.C.R. 533 Available at <http://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1999/1999canlii665/1999canlii665.html> and <http://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1999/1999canlii666/1999canlii666.html>

Session 6: The New Federalism: International Obligations, Decentralization and Multilevel Governance (Feb. 13)

Modern governance is, and (some say) should be, dispersed across multiple authorities. But how should multi-level governance be organized, how large should jurisdictions be, and how should responsibilities should be assigned? Federalism as a form of multi-level governance makes a number of promises. It promises to protect local minorities assembled in sub-national units, to enhance democracy by allowing greater local autonomy, and to allow for policy innovation. Has federalism in Canada delivered on these promises? Is it evolving institutionally toward a more or a less legitimate way of governing? What are its consequences for public policy and public administration?

Required readings:

Hooge, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2003. "Unravelling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance" *American Political Science Review* 97(2): 233-243.

Cameron, David and Richard Simeon. 2002. "Intergovernmental Relations in Canada: The Emergence of Collaborative Federalism." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 32(2): 49-71.

Bickerton, James. 2010. "Deconstructing the New Federalism." *Canadian Political Science Review* 4(2-3): 56-72

Leo, Christopher. 2009. "Multi-Level Governance and Ideological Rigidity: The Failure of Deep Federalism". *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 93-116.

Simeon, Richard and Beryl Radin. 2010. "Reflections on Comparing Federalisms: Canada and the United States." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 40 (3): 357-365

Recommended readings:

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

Howlett, Michael and Joshua Newman. 2010. "Policy analysis and policy work in federal systems: Policy advice and its contribution to evidence-based policy-making in multi-level governance systems". *Policy and Society* 29(2): 123-136.

Bakvis, Herman and Douglas Brown. 2010. "Policy Coordination in Federal Systems: Comparing Intergovernmental Processes and Outcomes in Canada and the United States." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 40 (3): 484-507.

Mid-Term Break Feb. 20

Part 2: New Challenges and Opportunities

NOTE: readings marked with an asterisk * are to be read by all students.

Session 7: Accountability, Transparency, Ethics and Public Value (Feb. 27)

Canadians want their tax money to be spent appropriately (financial probity), their interests served by conscientious public servants (ethics), the affairs of government conducted in an open manner (transparency) and to enjoy access to a variety of public goods (public value). Is this all too much to ask in the age of governance? Those who want to protect whistle-blowers, permit access to information and strengthen audit capacities answer strongly in the negative. On the other hand, have we, in pursuing these goals, gone overboard, misunderstood what can actually be achieved, and put at risk other important goals, such as efficiency, privacy, innovation and public value?

*Savoie, Donald J. 2004. "Searching for Accountability in a Government without Boundaries." *Canadian Public Administration* 47(1): 1-26.

Moynihan, Donald P. et. al. 2011. Performance Regimes Amidst Governance Complexity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(1): 141-155.

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

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

Malloy, Jonathan. 2006. "The Standing Committee on Public Accounts," *Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities Research Studies V.1*

http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/GomeryII/ResearchStudies1/CISPAA_Vol1_3.pdf

Saint-Martin, Denis. 2004. "Managerialist Advocate or 'Control-Freak'? The Janus-faced Office of the Auditor-General." *Canadian Public Administration* 47(2): 121-140.

Benoit, Liane E. and C.E.S. Franks. 2005. "For the Want of a Nail: The Role of Internal Audit in the Sponsorship Scandal," *Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities Research Studies V. 2*: 233-303. http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/GomeryII/ResearchStudies2/CISPAA_Vol2_6.pdf

Langford, John W. 2004. "Acting on Values: An Ethical Dead End for Public Servants," *Canadian Public Administration* 47(4): 429-450.

Paul G. Thomas. 2005. "Debating a Whistle-blower Protection Act for Employees of the Government of Canada," *Canadian Public Administration* 48(2): 147-184.

Session 8: “New” Governance: Steering or Drowning? (Mar. 6)

In the first half of the course, we stressed the extent to which the apparent continuity and very traditional look of the formal institutions of government in Canada mask the changes that have taken place to meet new governance challenges. One interpretation of these changes – the “new governance” thesis – argues for a shift from top-down, hierarchical “government” with a typical policy output of hard law, towards a flatter, more participatory style of governing, or “governance”, which typically produces a range of less formal policy outputs. In this class we will review the extent to which such a shift has actually taken place and consider the consequences for citizens and public servants.

* Moran, M. 2001. "Not Steering but Drowning: Policy Catastrophes and the Regulatory State." *The Political Quarterly* 72(4): 414-27.

Pierre, Jon. 2009. “Reinventing governance, reinventing democracy?” *Policy & Politics* 37 (4): 591-609

Bell, Stephen and Andrew Hindmoor. 2009. “The governance of public affairs.” *Journal of Public Affairs* 9(2): 149–159

Jessop, Bob. 2011. “Governance and Metagovernance. Available online at:
<http://www.languageandcapitalism.info/wp-content/uploads/2006/08/jessopgovernance.pdf>

Kettl, Donald F. 2000. “The Transformation of Governance.” *Public Administration Review* 60 (6): 488-497

Howlett, Michael. 2000. “Managing the ‘Hollow State’: Procedural Policy Instruments and Modern Governance.” *Canadian Public Administration*. 43 (4): 412-431.

Capano, Giliberto, Jeremy Rayner and Anthony Zito. 2012. Governance from the Bottom Up: Complexity and Diversity in Comparative Perspective. *Public Administration* 90(1): 56-73

Session 9: Governing in Networks (Mar. 13)

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

* deLeon, Peter, and Daniella M. Varda. 2009. "Toward a Theory of Collaborative Policy Networks: Identifying Structural Tendencies." *Policy Studies Journal* 37(1): 59-74.

Weber, Edward P. and Anne M. Khademian. 2008. Wicked Problems, Knowledge Challenges, and Collaborative Capacity Builders in Network Settings. *Public Administration Review* 68(2): 334-349.

Greenaway, John, Brian Salter, and Stella Hart. 2007. "How Policy Networks Can Damage Democratic Health: A Case Study in the Government of Governance." *Public Administration* 85(3): 717-38

Montpetit, Eric. 2005. "A Policy Network Explanation of Biotechnology Policy Differences between the United States and Canada," *Journal of Public Policy* 25(3): 339-366.

Hendriks, C. (2009). "The Democratic Soup: Mixed Meanings of Political Representation in Governance Networks." *Governance* 22(4): 689-715.

Provan, Keith G., and Patrick Kenis. 2008. "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(2): 229-52.

Agranoff, R. 2006. "Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers." *Public Administration Review* 60(s. 1): 56-65.

Session 10: "Proximity": Citizen Responsiveness and Democratic Engagement (Mar. 20)

While network governance usually involves public managers and organized interests, there is a parallel movement to engage individual citizens directly in policy formulation and implementation. Citizens, it is widely believed, distrust interest groups and want to be consulted about their needs and interests in more sophisticated ways than through periodic elections. Learning what those needs and interests are is a new challenge; not all institutions of government are designed to monitor and react to changing public demands. Is public disenchantment with government a product of institutional deficiencies regarding responsiveness, or does the public have excessive and unrealistic expectations? Do some issues and problems respond better to a participatory approach than others or are the challenges of public engagement much the same across all policy sectors?

*Fung, Archon. 2006. "Varieties of Participation in Complex Government" *Public Administration Review* 66(s. 1): 66-75.

Ansell, Chris and Allison Gash. 2008. Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Policy Administration Theory and Practice* 18(4): 543-571.

Warren, Mark. 2009. Governance-Driven Democratization. *Critical Policy Studies* 3(1): 3-13, available at http://www.politics.ubc.ca/fileadmin/user_upload/poli_sci/Faculty/warren/Governance-Driven_Democratization_Corrected_Proofs.pdf

Carty, R. Kenneth. 2005. "Turning Voters into Citizens: the Citizens' Assembly and Reforming Democratic Politics". *Queen's University Democracy and Federalism Series*.

Available at <http://www.queensu.ca/iigr/WorkingPapers/Interdependence.html>

Soroka, Stuart N., and Christopher Wlezien. 2004. "Opinion Representation and Policy Feedback: Canada in Comparative Perspective." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 37(3): 531-559.

Hajer, Martin and Sven Kesselring. 1999. "Democracy in the Risk Society: Learning from the New Politics of Mobility in Munich," *Environmental Politics* 8(3): 1-23.

Abelson, Julia and Francois-Pierre Gauvin. 2004. Engaging Citizens: One Route to Health Care Accountability. Health Care Accountability Papers – No. 2, Health Network. Canadian Policy Research Networks. Available at http://cprn.org/documents/28104_en.pdf

Wynne, B. 2006. "Public Engagement as a Means of Restoring Public Trust in Science – Hitting the Notes, but Missing the Music?" *Community Genetics* 9(3): 211-220.

Session 11: Service Provision: Procurement, Contracting Out and P3s (Mar. 27)

Traditional approaches to service provision have stressed the binary character of state's choices: either provide the service "in-house" or use the market. It is now clear that these are not the only choices. Collaborations among public sector agencies have changed the landscape as have the emergence of public-private partnerships. These test both the coordinative capacities of governments and their ability to create collaborative advantage. What are the institutional obstacles to creative procurement?

*Paquet, David. 1996. "Contextualizing Alternative Service Delivery."
<http://gouvernance.ca/publications/96-50.pdf>

*The Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships. 2011. "Public-Private Partnerships A Guide for Municipalities."
<http://www.p3canada.ca/files/file/P3%20Guide%20for%20Municipalities%20-%20English%20-%20Final.pdf>

*Loxley, John. 2012. "Asking the Right Questions: A Guide for Municipalities Considering P3s." (Canadian Union of Public Employees – CUPE)
http://cupe.ca/updir/P3%20Guide_ENG_Final.pdf

Boviard, Tony. 2006. "Developing New Forms of Partnership with the 'Market' in the Procurement of Public Services." *Public Administration* 84 (1): 81-102.

Phillips, Susan and Karine Levasseur. 2004. "The Snakes and Ladders of Accountability: Contradictions between Contracting and Collaboration for Canada's Voluntary Sector." *Can. Public Admin.* 47(4): 451-474.

Allen, Barbara. 2006. "How Ottawa Buys: Procurement Policy and Politics Beyond Gomery." In *How Ottawa Spends 2006-07*, ed. G. Bruce Doern, 95-115. Kingston and Montreal: Mc-Gill-Queen's Press (part 2).
<http://site.ebrary.com.libproxy.uregina.ca:2048/lib/uregina/docDetail.action?docID=10424011>

Vining, A.R. and A.E. Boardman. 2008. "Public-private partnerships in Canada: Theory and evidence." *Canadian Public Administration* 51(1): 9-44.

Tasis, Paul. 2008. "The politics of governance: Government-voluntary sector relationships." *Canadian Public Administration* 51 (2), 265-290.

Session 12: Governance in the Digital Age: IT, e-government and e-governance (April 3)

If networks and direct engagement have their drawbacks, perhaps technology is the answer. Service delivery – or e-government – has already been revolutionized by IT but what of e-governance? New information technologies, it is claimed, have dramatically altered the trade-off between participation and information exchange. The public engagement literature that we reviewed in the last class often assumes the "old" trade off, where the greater the citizen participation, the less information can be exchanged. Is there a new relationship in which information is costless and two-way communication between citizens and government achievable through technology? Is interactive e-governance a realistic possibility and would it be welcome if it were?

*Borins, Sandford. 2009. Digital State 2.0?

Available at <http://www.sandfordborins.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/digital-state-20.pdf>

Dunleavy P, Margetts H, Bastow S, Tinkler J. 2006. "New Public Management is dead – Long live Digital-Era Governance," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(3):467-494

Baldwin, J. Norman, Robin Gauld and Shaun Goldfinch. 2012. "What Public Servants Really Think of E-Government." *Public Management Review* 14(1): 105-127.

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

<http://www.publications.gov.sk.ca/details.cfm?p=25211>

McNutt, Kathleen and Leslie A. Pal. 2011. Modernizing Government: Mapping Global Public Policy Networks. *Governance* 24(3): 439-467.

Alexander, Cynthia .n.d. Deconstructing Digital Delusions and Dependencies: The Politics of Identity and Federal Citizenship in Canada's Digital Frontier.

Available at <http://www.policy.ca/reports/cynthia%20alexander/issue-report%20Deconstructing%20Digital%20Delusions%20and%20Dependancies.pdf>

Stefaniuk, Lorna. 2007. Outsourcing and transborder data flows: the challenge of protecting personal information under the shadow of the US Patriot Act. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 73(4): 531-548.

There will be no class on April 10, 2014 to accommodate the Tansley Lecture which is recommended to all students.