P10 / Collaborative Governance as a Bridge Between Public Policy and Public Administration

Topic : POLICY FORMULATION, ADMINISTRATION AND POLICYMAKERS

Chair : Lihi Lahat (Sapir Academic College, Israel/ Azrieli Institute of Israel Studies, Department of Political Science,Concordia University, Montreal.)

Second Chair : Neta Sher-Hadar (Sapir Academic College and Mandel School for Educational Leadership)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Collaborative governance arrangements are becoming more familiar as a policy tool that can better cope with the challenges of the current era (Ansell, Sørensen & Torfing 2017; Emerson et al., 2012, 2015; Kekez, Howlett & Ramesh, in process). The term “collaborative governance” refers to specific features of formal, long-term, consensual arrangements involving different stakeholders to promote public policies or programs (Ansell & Gash, 2008). While many use the term “collaborative governance,” some refer to it in the same manner as other practices, such as cooperation and coordination (O'Flynn, 2009). However, using these terms interchangeably masks the unique characteristics of collaborative governance. Collaborative governance is a formal arrangement of consensual and reciprocal practices that involves various stakeholders who engage in more profound, diverse and lasting collaborations and that demand mutual contributions and shared responsibilities. Thus, while there is a growing interest in collaborative governance arrangements as a possible tool that can be added to the range of instruments used by governments, we still need to investigate its contribution, features, and outcomes, as well as when and where it has added value in comparison to other tools, and when it does not.

We claim that one of the reasons for the growing interest in collaborative governance is its ability to serve as a bridge between public policy and public administration. While there is an obvious connection between the two, in many cases, both in theory and practice, these streams diverge from one another (Lahat, 2017; Moynihan & Soss, 2014). Policies focus more on the processes, the definitions of public problems and their solutions regarding diverse populations and on the interaction between different actors, while public administration emphasizes the role of the organizational structures and human resources that can achieve these goals. In recent decades, the public policy literature has emphasized the role of different voices in the policy process as an intrinsic feature. By the same token, the public administration literature discusses the next generation of administrative models in the post-NPM era, focusing especially on the need to enhance collaboration and trust. In this context, collaborative governance arrangements can be perceived as a bridge that connects the two. It facilitates the organizational structures that promote insightful dialogue between different stakeholders, including the construction, definition and legitimization of social problems and their solutions.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Collaborative governance arrangements are becoming more familiar as a policy tool that can better cope with the challenges of the current era (Ansell, Sørensen & Torfing 2017; Emerson et al., 2012, 2015; Kekez, Howlett & Ramesh, in process). The term “collaborative governance” refers to specific features of formal, long-term, consensual arrangements involving different stakeholders to promote public policies or programs (Ansell & Gash, 2008). While many use the term “collaborative governance,” some refer to it in the same manner as other practices, such as cooperation and coordination (O'Flynn, 2009). However, using these terms interchangeably masks the unique characteristics of collaborative governance. Collaborative governance is a formal arrangement of consensual and reciprocal practices that involves various stakeholders who engage in more profound, diverse and lasting collaborations and that demand mutual contributions and shared responsibilities. Thus, while there is a growing interest in collaborative governance arrangements as a possible tool that can be added to the range of instruments used by governments, we still need to investigate its contribution, features, and outcomes, as well as when and where it has added value in comparison to other tools, and when it does not.

We claim that one of the reasons for the growing interest in collaborative governance is its ability to serve as a bridge between public policy and public administration. While there is an obvious connection between the two, in many cases, both in theory and practice, these streams diverge from one another (Lahat, 2017; Moynihan & Soss, 2014). Policies focus more on the processes, the definitions of public problems and their

solutions regarding diverse populations and on the interaction between different actors, while public administration emphasizes the role of the organizational structures and human resources that can achieve these goals. In recent decades, the public policy literature has emphasized the role of different voices in the policy process as an intrinsic feature. By the same token, the public administration literature discusses the next generation of administrative models in the post-NPM era, focusing especially on the need to enhance collaboration and trust. In this context, collaborative governance arrangements can be perceived as a bridge that connects the two. It facilitates the organizational structures that promote insightful dialogue between different stakeholders, including the construction, definition and legitimization of social problems and their solutions.

The panel seeks to develop the theoretical aspects of collaborative governance by considering theories from both perspectives, those of public policy and public administration. Our goal is to enrich our knowledge about collaborative governance arrangements and their role in the changing nature of public administration and democracy. We emphasize strong theoretical aspects and innovative empirical works that contribute to this connection between public administration and the public policy literature with regard to collaborative governance. Examples include:

· collaborative governance and implementation

· collaborative governance as a policy tool

· collaborative governance arrangements and post-NPM models

· collaborative governance and the stages of formulating policy

· critical aspects of collaborative governance

· collaborative governance and the spanning of borders

P10 / Collaborative Governance as a Bridge Between Public Policy and Public Administration

Chair : Lihi Lahat (Sapir Academic College, Israel/ Azrieli Institute of Israel Studies, Department of Political Science,Concordia University, Montreal.)

Second Chair : Neta Sher-Hadar (Sapir Academic College and Mandel School for Educational Leadership)

Session 1Collaborative Governance as a Bridge Between Public Policy and Public Administration

Thursday, June 27th 16:30 to 18:30 (MB 2.265)

Discussants

Neta Sher-Hadar (Sapir Academic College and Mandel School for Educational Leadership)

Anka Kekez Kostro (Faculty of Political Science University of Zagreb)

Four Challenges that Global Health Networks Face

Jeremy Shiffman (Johns Hopkins University)

Global health networks have proliferated over the past quarter century. Global health networks are transnational forms of collaborative governance--webs of individuals and organizations with a shared concern for a particular condition. They link governments, UN agencies, international NGOs, academic institutions, foundations, private sector entities and other kinds of institutions. They differ in their effectiveness, a factor that may help explain why resource allocations vary across global health conditions and do not correspond closely with disease burden. This study, grounded in policy process, public administration and global governance theory, summarizes findings from recently concluded investigations of eight global health networks--addressing alcohol harm, early childhood development (ECD), maternal mortality, neonatal mortality, pneumonia, surgically-treatable conditions, tobacco use, and tuberculosis. These studies, employing political ethnographic methods, were conducted by a cross-national research team and involved nearly two hundred interviews with actors in these networks, observation of network activity, and analysis of several hundred documents internal and external to the networks.

In this paper we identify four primary challenges that networks face in generating attention and resources for the conditions that concern them. The first is problem definition: generating consensus on what the problem is and how it should be addressed. The second is positioning: portraying the issue in ways that inspire external audiences to act. The third is coalition-building: forging alliances with these external actors, particularly ones outside the health sector. The fourth is governance: establishing institutions to facilitate collective action. The research indicates that global health networks that effectively tackle these challenges are more likely to garner support to address the conditions that concern them. In addition to the effectiveness of networks, we also consider their legitimacy, identifying reasons both to affirm and to question their right to exert power.

How Social Capital Shapes Citizen Willingness to Coproduce Public Service: Evidence from the Water Sector

Youlang Zhang (Texas A&M University)

Xinsheng Liu (Institute for Science, Technology, and Public Policy, Bush School, Texas A&M University)

Over the past several decades, coproduction has become an increasingly popular research topic in political science, public administration and public policy. The concept of coproduction captures a variety of processes in which citizens are directly involved in the design, delivery, monitoring, and evaluation of government services with professional service agents (Ostrom 1996; Jo and Nabatchi 2016; Natatchi, Sancino, and Sicilia 2017). While coproduction studies have widely explored the effects of organizational

factors and citizen characteristics on the establishment of coproduction relations (Voorberg, Bekkers, and Tummers 2015), little is known about whether citizens from communities with more social capital are more likely to participate in coproducing public service. Given the widely cited role of social capital in inducing collective action, promoting economic growth and fostering political accountability, it is reasonable to expect that social capital will influence citizens' willingness to coproduce public service.

In this study, we examine how social capital shapes citizens' choices in terms of engagement in coproduction and why. We propose two competing mechanisms through which social capital might shape citizens' engagement in coproduction. Theoretically, one may argue that social capital can motivate citizens to exhibit altruistic behaviors and voluntarily cooperate with governments to coproduce public goods, thus having a complementary (positive) impact on citizens' willingness to directly engage in coproduction; but one may also argue that social capital can empower citizens to collectively create a credible political threat (e.g., voting during election, initiative referendum or recall) and demand local officials to produce public goods to meet their needs, thus having a substitute (negative) impact on citizen's willingness to directly engage in coproduction. While both arguments seem to have its own merits and reasons, which one of the two hypothesized effects dominate the impact of social capital on citizens' coproduction willingness?

We use data from a recent national public opinion survey on water issues covering 1,979 respondents from 757 counties in the United States to empirically test the above theoretical arguments. Our data analysis indicates that citizens who live in a county with more measurable social capital are less willing to coproduce public service that would require citizens to pay more in their water bills to guarantee no or little local flooding. Further analysis shows that two components in local social capital, i.e., voter turnout and the number of social associations in a county, are negatively associated with citizens' willingness to coproduce public water service. These findings provide strong evidence to support the substitute effect hypothesis.

Exploring the Dynamics and Mechanism for Collaborative Governance: The Case of Community Renewable Energy Development in Pingtung County, Taiwan

Tze-Luen Lin (Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University)

There is an increasing trend in policy design towards greater collaboration in policy-making process by engaging a wide range of stakeholders. This paper intends to explore the evolution of collaborative governance in the planning and implementation process of a local community-based renewable energy project, the solar aqua farm project in Pingtung County, Taiwan. The aim of this paper is to twofold: First, it seeks to explore the evolving role of local governments, as well as to investigate the involvement of various stakeholders and actors during the planning and implementation process of a local community-based renewable energy project . Most significantly, it hopes to identify and highlight the appropriate institutional condition, mechanism and factors for success. The research provides an important look at the unique and critical role of the local government in moving forward renewable energy projects, and contributes to the question of how local governments can create a green economy.

Second, it sets out to illustrate an innovative community renewable energy project that integrates both mitigation and adaptation strategies. The Pingtung Solar Aqua Farm project not only serves as a mitigation effort, creating renewable energy and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but more intriguing, contributes to adaptation efforts by preventing flooding and restoring once devastated lands. It shows the possibility of an integrated strategy that results in social, economic, and environmental co-benefits. Analysis of this case study provides policy makers a promising integrated approach for developing future community level renewable energy projects that considers both mitigation and adaptation. It should also be a key interest for local and national government officials and researchers alike.

A collaborative network structure will be identified to look at the unique role of the local government in collaborative governance. Finally, the paper will highlight a number of factors and challenges affecting the dynamics and success of collaborative governance.

Presentation of "Collaboration in Public Service Delivery: Promise and Pitfalls": Kekez, A.,Howlett, M. and Ramesh (Eds)

Anka Kekez (University of Zagreb)

Presentation of “Collaborative Governance: Theory and Lessons from Israel”: Sher-Hadar, N. Lahat, L. and Galnoor. I (Eds.)

Neta Sher-Hadar (Sapir Academic College and Mandel School for Educational Leadership)