

## JSGS 801 – GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

### University of Saskatchewan Campus

<b>Instructor:</b>	Michael Atkinson, Murray Fulton, Lindsay Martens, Jeremy Rayner and Travis Reynolds
<b>Phone:</b>	306-966-1984
<b>E-mail:</b>	michael.atkinson@usask.ca
<b>Office Hours:</b>	By appointment
<b>Office Location:</b>	Diefenbaker Building
<b>Term:</b>	Winter 2014
<b>Room:</b>	Diefenbaker Building, Prairie Room
<b>Date and Time:</b>	Tuesdays 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.

### 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, not counting the Introduction and Integration. The first focuses on the concept of governance and three distinct approaches to bringing order to political and economic relations. The second part of the course is devoted to a more detailed examination of contemporary public sector management. We presume that you have taken advantage of Michael Atkinson's short course on Canadian constitutional history. If you haven't you should review the slides (available on the website) and the text that he used. This section of the course will presume that knowledge and will focus on government accountability, the desire to create more effective policies and programs, the changing relationships between governments and citizens, and new governing instruments.

The format in both parts of the course is one of short introductory comments by the instructor(s) followed by presentations and discussions. Two sessions will be devoted to case work. They 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 issued separately. In each section the first reading(s) constitutes background. Initial comments by the instructor will likely feature this material and everyone is expected to have read it. Two or three other readings will constitute the meat of the class, and individual students will make presentations and lead the discussion. Everyone

should have read these pieces as well. The instructor will call on members of the class with impunity: be forewarned. Finally, each section contains additional readings. Anyone dipping into this material will be better armed for the discussion (and will impress us mightily).

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

## EVALUATION

Environmental Scan (1500 words)	15%	(Session 5)
Lead a seminar	20%	As assigned
Participation	10%	Throughout
Group Presentation	15%	(Session 6)
Group Presentation	15%	(Sessions 12)
Final Exam	25%	(Session 13)

## DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENTS

Your **first assignment** is to conduct an environmental scan for one of the following governance organizations: the United Way, Parks Canada, Ministry of Advanced Education (Saskatchewan), the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, a unit in the World Bank, and Federated Cooperatives. We will assign you, at random, to one of these organizations. 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 assignment** is to make a presentation, in Session 6, about your organization explaining how shifts in organizational logics would assist the organization in confronting its principal challenges. This will be done in combination with those who have been given the same topic.

Throughout the course, students will be required to **present, provide discussion questions and lead a discussion** of one of the articles assigned for a class. In the final two classes, students will be asked to reflect on the main themes of the course and the challenges of modern governance and administration and make **group presentations and lead discussion**.

**Note:** Separate grade distributions will be compiled for each student with and without the grade for the group work presentation. The grade for the group work presentation will only be counted if it improves a student's overall final grade.

## LATE ASSIGNMENTS

Late penalties will be in operation except for lateness caused by 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 come and discuss accommodations with the instructor, and to contact Disability Services for Students (DSS) at 966-7273.

## ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND CONDUCT

Understanding and following the principles of academic integrity and conduct as laid out in the University of Saskatchewan's Guidelines for Academic Conduct is vital to your success in graduate school (as attached; and available at [http://www.usask.ca/university\\_council/reports/archives/guide\\_conduct.shtml](http://www.usask.ca/university_council/reports/archives/guide_conduct.shtml)). Ensuring that your work is your own and reflects both your own ideas and those of others incorporated in your work is important: ensuring that you acknowledge the ideas, words, and phrases of others that you use is a vital part of the scholarly endeavour. If you have any questions at all about academic integrity in general or about specific issues, contact any faculty member and we can discuss your questions.

## COURSE CALENDAR OVERVIEW

### I Introduction

#### Session 1 Jan 7: Governance and Administration: What (if anything) makes the Public Sector Special? [Fulton and Atkinson]

Governing is not what it used to be. Since the introduction of new schemes of public service delivery and concepts like network governance, governing is apparently no longer about command and control (although it is about "management"). It seems that traditional thinking and old categories need to be reconsidered. These readings provide a hint of the shifting sands; the first part of the course does even more sifting. If it is true that major changes have occurred, does it make sense any more (if it ever did) to talk about the "public sector." If everywhere there are networks of organizations and if governments have become hyper-porous, what is so special about the public sector?

*Readings for Discussion:*

Hal G. Rainey, *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley, chapter 3 "What Makes Public Organizations Distinctive?"

Herbert Simon. 1991. "Organizations and Markets," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5(2): 25-44.

Rhodes, R.A.W. 1996. "The New Governance: Governing Without Government." *Political Studies* XLIV, 65 (2) 667.

Albert Weale. 2011. "New Modes of Governance: Political Accountability and Public Reason, *Government and Opposition* 46 (1): 58-80.

### *Additional Readings*

Peters, B. G., and J. Pierre. 1998. "Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8: 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>

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

## **II Framework**

While the term governance has a variety of uses, and some, like Rhodes and Fredrickson, would prefer to use it in conjunction with all that is new and shiny, we are taking the term to its highest level and using it to distinguish ways of creating political order for policy purposes. Think of these three—hierarchy, markets and networks—as "modes" or "logics" of governing all of which are in play, in different measure, at different times, and in different places. We then take up the question of whether good governance can be measured and how much faith we should place in governance metrics.

### **Session 2 Jan 14: Governance I: Hierarchy [Atkinson and Rayner]**

There can be no understanding of hierarchy without Max Weber. The required selection is taken from his 1922 opus *Economy and Society*, a work that is enormous in scope. Weber's analysis is clinical and historical; he is not necessarily a fan of bureaucracy, just a believer in its power. Sociologists and anthropologies are generally drawn to the "dark side of organizations" (see Merton and Scott); they worry about bureaucratic pathologies. Political scientists, like Wilson and Miller, are intent on modernizing and formalizing bureaucratic relationships so we have a better understanding of their shape and their vulnerabilities.

#### *Required:*

Max Weber. 1946. "Bureaucracy," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, eds. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills New York: Oxford University Press, 1,2,3,4,6,7.

#### *Readings for Discussion:*

James Q. Wilson. 1989. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books, chapters 1,2,7,9.

Miller, Gary J. 2005. "The Political Evolution of Principal-Agent Models." *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 203–225.

James C. Scott. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press: introduction and chapters 9 and 10.

#### *Additional Readings:*

Robert K. Merton. 1957. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press, chapter 6, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality."

Lynn, Laurence E. 2001. "The Myth of the Bureaucratic Paradigm: What Public Administration Really Stood For." *Public Administration Review* 61: 144-160.

### **Jan 21 Session 3: Governance II: Markets [Fulton]**

Beginning in the 1980s in the United Kingdom under the Thatcher government and continuing under the Mulroney and Chrétien governments in Canada and the Clinton administration in the United States, the administration and management of the public sector has undergone a profound change. Taking place under various names, including New Public Management and Reinventing Government, public management has become much more market-oriented – everything from privatization to a greater reliance on competition to a greater emphasis on customer needs to greater decentralization. The readings in this section provide a snapshot of the large literature that examines the use of markets as a form of governance.

#### *Required:*

Fredrick A. Hayek. 1945. "The Use of Knowledge in Society." *American Economic Review*, 35(4), 519–530.

#### *Readings for Discussion:*

Hood, Christopher 1991. "A public management for all seasons?." *Public administration* 69 (1): 3-19.

D. Osborne. 1993. "Reinventing government." *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 16(4).

Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler. 1992. "Chapter 10 – Market Oriented Government: Leveraging Change Through the Market." In *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Plume: New York.

Moore, M. H. 2000. "Managing for Value: Organizational Strategy in for-Profit, Nonprofit, and Governmental Organizations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 183–204. doi:10.1177/089976400773746391

W.L. Megginson and J.M. Netter. 2001. "From state to market: A survey of empirical studies on privatization." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 39(2), 321–389.

*Additional Readings:*

R. N. Stavins. 1998. "What can we learn from the grand policy experiment? Lessons from SO<sub>2</sub> allowance trading." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(3).

Ronald C. Mo. 1994. "The 'reinventing government' exercise: Misinterpreting the problem, misjudging the consequences." *Public Administration Review*, 54(2).

N. Bilodeau, C. Laurin and A. Vining. 2006. "Choice of Organizational Form Makes a Real Difference": The Impact of Corporatization on Government Agencies in Canada. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17(1), 119–147. doi:10.1093/jopart/mul014

**Jan 28 Session 4: Governance III: Voluntary and co-operative organization [Rayner and Fulton]**

The confrontation between governments and markets – traditional public administration and new public management – has been dramatically transformed by the emergence of an alternative governance mode based on networks and other kinds of partnerships. Much of the original attraction of the new mode lay in its suggestion of a "third way" out of the noisy debate about the desirability (or lack of it) of transforming governments into customer-oriented service organizations. However, the undoubted appearance of new forms of relationship between agencies and organizations, both within and across the boundaries of state and society, led to an interest in describing and assessing these relationships in the own right. What are they? What do they do well? What (if anything) do they do better than hierarchies and markets? In this session, we will present the characteristics of the third mode of governance and look carefully at a couple of examples of this governance mode in action. Networks have been proposed as solutions to problems of managing change based on technological innovation, an alleged weak point of both governments and markets. Attention has also begun to be paid to the role of voluntary and co-operative organizations in the provision of public services. The key insight of this work is that in many instances public services are co-produced by both civil servants and the consumers of the public services.

*Required:*

R.B. Parks, P. C. Baker, L. Kiser, R. Oakerson, E. Ostrom, V. Ostrom, V., et al. (1981). "Consumers as Coproducers of Public Services: Some Economic and Institutional Considerations." *Policy Studies Journal*, 9(7), 1001–1011. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.1981.tb01208.x

Matthijs Hisschemoeller, Ries Bode and Marleen van der Kerkhof. 2006. "What governs the transition to a sustainable hydrogen economy? Articulating the relationship between technologies and political institutions." *Energy Policy* 34: 1227-1235

J. L. Brudney and R.E. England. 1983. "Toward a Definition of the Coproduction Concept." *Public Administration Review*, 43(1), 59–65. doi:10.2307/975300

*Readings for Discussion:*

M. Jakobsen. 2012. "Can Government Initiatives Increase Citizen Coproduction? Results of a Randomized Field Experiment." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(1), 27–54. doi:10.1093/jopart/mus036

Timothy Besley and M. Ghatak. 2003. "Incentives, choice, and accountability in the provision of public services." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 19(2), 235–249.

#### Additional Readings:

Mark Considine. 2012. "Governance Networks and the Question of Transformation." *Public Administration* 91: 438-447

Elinor Ostrom. 2005. "Unlocking public entrepreneurship and public economies." Helsinki, Finland: WIDER Discussion Papers // World Institute for Development Economics (UNU- WIDER), No. 2005/01. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/52899>

T. Brandsen and V. Pestoff. 2006. "Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services." *Public Management Review*, 8(4), 493–501. doi:10.1080/14719030601022874

T. Bovaird. 2007. "Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services." *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846–860.

J. E. Mosley and C. M. Grogan. 2013. "Representation in Nonelected Participatory Processes: How Residents Understand the Role of Nonprofit Community-based Organizations." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(4), 839–863. doi:10.1093/jopart/mus043

L. Haiven and J. Haiven. 2011. "Nonprofit Co- operatives: An Alternative to State or the Profit- Making Private Sector for the Delivery of Public Utilities." Institute for Nonprofit Studies Working Paper #5, Mount Royal University (pp. 1–50).

#### Feb 4 Session 5: Good Governance: Concepts, Measures and Metrics [Atkinson and Reynolds]

Prompted in part by the World Bank and in part by the legacy of New Public Management, the study of governance indicators is entering adolescence. This stage is characterized by a distinctly normative preoccupation with the "good" in good governance, and with the challenge of measuring governance for purposes of making allocative decisions. Good governance indicators are now ubiquitous and some argue insidious. As usual there are gaps between the concept and its metrics. What is the core of good governance (government) anyway?

#### Required:

Bo Rothstein. 2013. "The Three Worlds of Governance: Arguments for a Parsimonious Approach to the Quality of Government." The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gottenberg

#### Readings for Discussion:

Mirko Noordegraaf and Tineka Abma. 2003. "Management by Measurement? Public Management Practices Amidst Ambiguity." *Public Administration* 81 (4): 853–871.

Bohdan Budura and Les Pal. 2010. "The Globalized State: Measuring and Monitoring Governance," *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 13 (4): 511-530.

Leslie A. Pal and Ian D. Clarke. 2013. "Best Practices in Public Management: A Critical Assessment." A Working Paper for the Best Practices in Public Management Project.

[http://portal.publicpolicy.utoronto.ca/en/BestPractices/Documents/Best\\_Practices\\_in\\_Public\\_Management\\_-\\_A\\_Critical\\_Assessment,\\_Pal\\_and\\_Clark,\\_8\\_March\\_2013.pdf](http://portal.publicpolicy.utoronto.ca/en/BestPractices/Documents/Best_Practices_in_Public_Management_-_A_Critical_Assessment,_Pal_and_Clark,_8_March_2013.pdf)

#### *Additional Readings:*

Magnus Agnafors. 2013. "Quality of Government: Toward a More Complex Definition." *American Political Science Review* 107 (3): 433-445.

Thomas Weiss. 2000. "Governance, Good Governance, and Global Governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, *Third World Quarterly* 21 (5): 795-814.

Merilee Grindle. 2007. "Good Enough Governance Revisited." *Development Policy Review* 25 (5): 533-574.

### **Feb 11 Session 6: In-class Exercise: [Atkinson and Fulton]**

Presentation of organization overviews. Instructions will be provided.

### **MID-TERM BREAK**

### **III Contemporary Issues**

There are certain problems of governance that remain on the public administration agenda, although they take different forms as technologies and governments change. We continue to struggle with how to make key constitutional conventions work (Session 7), whether to centralize or decentralize (Session 8), how to engage citizens in an efficient and fulfilling way (Session 9) and how to conduct our affairs in an ethically justifiable fashion (Session 10).

### **Feb 25 Session 7: Principals, Agents and Ministerial Responsibility: Still relevant? [Martens]**

The key principle of parliamentary government is the idea of a political executive – the prime minister or premier and cabinet – that is drawn from and responsible to the legislative assembly. While the traditional political science literature has long agonized over the inability of elected representatives to effectively hold the government of the day to account, another serious challenge with this system relates to the concept of ministerial responsibility. Does it work as it was originally designed to work? Is it adequate for the demands of contemporary governance? What are the consequences for public servants?

#### *Required reading:*

David Smith. 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. Available at:

[http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/GomeryII/ResearchStudies1/CISPAA\\_Vol1\\_4.pdf](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/GomeryII/ResearchStudies1/CISPAA_Vol1_4.pdf)

Readings for discussion:

C. Polidano. 1998. "Why bureaucrats can't always do what ministers want: multiple accountabilities in Westminster democracies." *Public Policy and Administration*, 13(1): 35-50.

O. Soudry. 2007. "A principal-agent analysis of accountability in public procurement", in P. Piga and K.V. Thai, (Eds), *Advancing public procurement: Practices, innovation and knowledge-sharing*, PrAcademics Press, Boca Raton, FL. Available at: [http://www.ippa.org/IPPC2/BOOK/Chapter\\_19.pdf](http://www.ippa.org/IPPC2/BOOK/Chapter_19.pdf)

Additional readings:

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

Parliament of Canada. 2013. "The doctrine of ministerial responsibility." *Governance in the Public Service of Canada*. <http://www.parl.gc.ca/housepublications/publication.aspx?docid=1812721&file=33>

### **Mar 4 Session 8: Centralization-Decentralization and Network Governance [Martens and Rayner]**

In this class, we take a closer look at governing through loose networks of public and private actors, sometimes called "horizontal" or "collaborative" governance. In spite of considerable promotion by network advocates, 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 when networks are stressed by external events.

Required

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

Readings for Discussion:

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

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

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

### Additional Readings

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

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

### Mar 11 Session 9: Engaging Citizens: Governance in the digital age [Rayner]

Two related developments have challenged all three governance modes and the administrative institutions created by them. One is the drive to give citizens a greater say in both the making and implementation of public policy. Public engagement has been proposed on the grounds of democratic citizenship and rights, on the basis of administrative law or even the pragmatic grounds that it improves both policy design and outcomes to have "buy in" from those most directly affected. The other development has been the digital revolution, notably the web and, later, interactive technologies such as many social media. While the claim that digital technologies have made traditional public administration obsolete by allowing for focused interaction between government and citizens on an issue-by-issue basis is clearly an exaggeration, digital media have had interesting consequences for new public management as well. And, as the tide of prediction recedes in the face of digital reality, much is revealed, once again, as hype: in public administration, at least, the death of the telephone conversation has been greatly exaggerated.

### Required

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

Sandford Borins. 2009. Digital State 2.0? Available at <http://www.sandfordborins.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/digital-state-20.pdf>

### Readings for Discussion

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

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

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

### Additional Readings:

Mark Warren. 2009. Governance-Driven Democratization. *Critical Policy Studies* 3(1): 3-13

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

### Mar 18 Session 10: Accountability and Transparency: Elusive and costly goals? [Reynolds and Fulton]

In the face of scandal, fiscal mismanagement, and moral transgressions, calls for governmental accountability have become commonplace. Accountability is considered a panacea, ensuring the proper behaviour of elected officials and civil servants alike. But accountability schemes don't always work and they come with costs.. As with all tools, proper application is essential. If misapplied, the demand for accountability can have unintended, negative consequences. In this class, the concept of accountability is examined, including the various types, and we consider when accountability has worked and when it has failed.

#### Required:

Gilles Paquet. 2007. Intelligent accountability. *gouvernance.ca*. Retrieved November 21, 2013, from <http://www.gouvernance.ca/index.php?page=embed&lang=ce&embed=publications/07-08.pdf>

#### Readings for discussion:

Mark Bovens 2010). Two Concepts of Accountability: Accountability as a Virtue and as a Mechanism. *West European Politics*, 33(5), 946–967.

B. S. Romzek. 2000. Dynamics of Public Sector Accountability in an Era of Reform. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 66(1), 21–44.

Donald J. Savoie. 2004). Searching for accountability in a government without boundaries. *Canadian Public Administration*, 47(1), 1–26.

#### Additional reading:

David Sax. 2013. 'Why Rob Ford Happened' *Businessweek*

<http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-11-18/why-rob-ford-happened>

Jeffery Simpson. 2013. 'Ford Nation stands by its man. No. Matter. What.' *Globe and Mail*

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/ford-nation-stands-by-its-man-no-matter-what/article15519571/>

### Mar 25: Session 11: Public Sector Ethics: Can we do better? [Reynolds and Atkinson]

Canadians believe that most institutions of government are corrupt, even though the vast majority of public servants exhibit exemplary professional conduct. To what extent are instances of unethical behaviour the product of adverse selection (the wrong people in power), cognitive deficiencies in ethical decision-making (well intentioned people, bad decisions) or genuine disagreement regarding what appropriate conduct requires (good people, differences of opinion)? In this section we consider a number of cases of allegedly unethical conduct and answer the question: what is the source of the problem? We will also debate the status of Mr. Snowden: whistleblower or criminal (or both?).

**Required:**

Michael M. Atkinson and Murray Fulton. 2013. "Understanding Public Sector Ethics: Beyond Agency Theory in Canada's Sponsorship Scandal." *International Public Management Journal*, 16 (3): 386–412.

**Readings for Discussion:**

Dennis Thompson. 1980. "Moral Responsibility of Public Officials: The Problem of Many Hands." *American Political Science Review* 74 (4):905-916.

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

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

**Newspaper articles:**

Ryan, Allan (2013) 'Snowden is not a Whistleblower' *Harvard Extension School*

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/hub/blog/extension-blog/snowden-not-whistleblower>

Erlick, June C. (2013) 'In praise of Whistleblowers' *Harvard Extension School*

<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/hub/blog/extension-blog/praise-whistleblowers>

Bloomberg editorial (2013) 'Edward Snowden: Criminal or Model Citizen?' *Bloomberg*

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-10/edward-snowden-criminal-or-model-citizen-.html>

German, Michael (2013) 'Edward Snowden is a Whistleblower' *American Civil Liberties Union*

<https://www.aclu.org/blog/free-speech-national-security/edward-snowden-whistleblower>

**Secondary readings:**

Government of Canada (2011) *Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector*

<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=25049&section=formats>

Office of the Auditor General (2010) *Report of the Auditor General: The Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada*

## **IV Integration**

### **April 1 Session 12: Case study**

Over the course of the term, we will have considered a variety of themes and models relating to governance and public administration. Through a review and consideration of the multiple issues addressed during the course, groups will respond to the questions raised by a case study that will be made available several weeks earlier. Tasks will be assigned, once again to groups, and you will be expected to play specific roles.