

Developing Policy Analysis “Flight Simulators” in Different National Settings

Jennifer Oser
University of Pennsylvania

Alma Gadot-Perez

Itzhak Galnoor
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

ABSTRACT

This article reviews two sets of generalizable lessons learned from adapting pedagogical material on the case method and policy workshops for Israeli Master of Public Policy programs. First, we discuss the considerations involved in the development of a cohesive series of original case studies in the Israeli context. Second, we review the creation of a specific exercise that integrates the case method and policy workshops pedagogy in the classroom—namely a Political Strategy Appendix—as an example of how the development of original pedagogical material in different settings may lead to instructional innovations that can be useful to the international community of policy scholars. Building on Stokes’s (1986) analogy of policy workshops as “flight simulators,” this article contributes to the recognition that as the worldwide community of policy scholars continues to grow and diversify, contextually specific flight simulators will enrich policy instruction both in and beyond U.S. borders.

Keywords: case method, policy workshop, international pedagogy, political strategy

In a now-classic examination of political and organizational analysis in the policy curriculum over two decades ago, Donald Stokes (1986) explored two central pedagogical devices in policy curricula: the case method and policy workshops. Recent reassessments of policy instruction note that these two central pedagogical devices are still front and center, although concerns have arisen regarding their U.S.-centric development and application.

The first set of concerns relates to the need for case material that goes beyond U.S. borders to enhance global policy instruction. Indeed, universities located in a variety of national contexts with varied levels of democratic development began approaching American institutions such as the Kennedy School more than two decades ago to request permission to use U.S.-focused cases and to solicit support for developing new cases for their own national contexts (Husock, 1993). Yet, a recent assessment of emerging policy programs around the world found that although several countries have attempted to adopt normative policy analysis approaches as developed in the United States, these efforts have yielded mixed results in different settings (Geva-May, Nasi, Turrini, & Scott, 2008).

The second set of concerns relates to what Straussman termed the “collective hand-wringing” (2008, p. 630) in American policy schools regarding attempts to adjust curricula to better meet the needs of an increasingly international student body. The typical internationalization effort of attempting to “include a Kennedy School case or a couple of readings that are ‘international’” (Straussman, 2008, p. 630) has clearly fallen short of meeting the needs of a changing student body.

To address how the two pedagogical pillars of case studies and policy workshops can be better integrated in varied national settings, this article reviews two main pedagogical developments in our adaptations to the Israeli setting. First, we review our experience of developing a coherent series of original policy case studies that were designed to address contextually specific issues of theory and practice. The central lessons learned from this adaptation are particularly relevant for those instructors beyond U.S. borders who may be interested in launching a similar effort to develop original policy cases that are contextually sensitive and relevant. Yet, given the increased internationalization of the student body of public affairs and public policy programs in the U.S. that became prominent over a decade ago (cf. Devereux & Durning, 2001), this topic may also be instructive for American instructors considering the use of international cases in U.S. domestic-focused policy programs.

Second, we review the creation of a specific exercise that integrates the case method and policy workshops pedagogy in the classroom, namely a Political Strategy Appendix. Although this exercise was developed for our instruction in the Israeli setting, the central contribution as reviewed in this article is not context-specific. We therefore review this exercise as an instructional contribution in and of itself, and even more importantly, we review it as a heuristic example of how the development of original pedagogical material in different settings may lead to instructional innovations that can be useful to the international community of policy scholars.

DEVELOPING ORIGINAL CASE STUDIES IN DIFFERENT NATIONAL CONTEXTS

To examine the contribution of original case studies in different contexts, it is worth reviewing what constitutes a “good case” for the purposes of policy instruction. The objective of the case method is to help students learn from past

and future experiences in order to prepare them for engaging with the world of practice (Zimmerman, 1985). A classic articulation of the pedagogical purpose of a single case is that it serves as “the vehicle by which a chunk of reality is brought into the classroom to be worked over by the class and the instructor” (Lawrence, 1953, p. 215). As a general pedagogical approach, the case method is an inductive teaching and learning process in which cases are used to train students to analyze the specifics of a case, as well as to draw generalizable lessons through the interplay of theory and practice (Foster, McBeth, & Clemons, 2010; Garvin, 2003; Massie, 1995). Instructional cases do not aim to provide a definitive documentation of a historical event; rather, the presentation of a “chunk of reality” is intended to provide a substantive vehicle for elucidating a specific theoretical question or action dilemma (Kennedy & Scott, 1985, p. 1). Given this review of the pedagogical objective of the case method, it is clear that the past and future experiences of students are inevitably shaped by their context.

Yet, a review of the best-selling cases from the Kennedy School of Government found that most cases use a “hero-centered” model of social and organizational change that focuses on the dilemmas and actions of individual leaders without accompanying historical, social and institutional contextualization (Chetkovich & Kirp, 2001). This focus on the “figure” of the public leader rather than the “ground” of organizations and politics has been attributed to the disciplinary shift from public administration to public policy (Lynn, 1996), and there is no evidence that this hero-centered model of case studies has changed over time. Chetkovich and Kirp’s review clarifies that this hero-centered instructional approach is both unachievable and undesirable, because it encourages students and practitioners to conclude that politicians and the polity should be considered as secondary to the role of analysts and managers. Their conclusion was to encourage instructors who taught these cases to work to counter this hero-centered message by self-consciously teaching about the contextual and historical elements of a case. As discussed in Yang’s (2005) overview of efforts made in China to adapt Western cases and to create original cases based in China, it can be difficult to achieve a meaningful balance between local context and global standards of instruction.

Although contextual cases beyond U.S. borders were once rare, they have become more common in recent years through sources such as the Kennedy School’s case program, Electronic Hallway, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s research unit, and the International Institute for Asian Studies. The preponderance of publicly available instructional cases are still American-focused, however, evidenced by the fact that the Kennedy School’s case program in 2013 includes 1,977 cases, only 50 of which are contextually set outside of North America.¹ An implication of this U.S. contextual focus is that instructional cases tend to deal with substantive policy topics that are most germane to American practitioners and scholars. In a discussion of policy process curricula, Straussman lists a number of topics that have received minimal attention in U.S. case studies

even though they are important topics elsewhere, such as “the privatization of state-owned enterprises, deregulation, the marketization of government services, rule of law, transparency, and accountability” (2008, p. 631). From an Israeli perspective, this is a remarkable list; all of these topics are essential in the Israeli policy-making environment, even though they have received little attention in U.S.-focused instructional case studies.

To extend Stokes’ (1986, p. 51) analogy of policy workshops as “flight simulators,” the dearth of these kinds of topics in U.S. instructional materials that are critical for policy analysis in other national contexts means that the direct use of existing U.S. case studies to other national contexts risks a pedagogical “crashing and burning” in the effort to prepare policy students for the world of practice in different national contexts. If centrally relevant issues in a policy professional’s day-to-day life are simply not addressed in policy instruction, then the case method and policy workshops are ill equipped to serve the purpose of meaningfully integrating theory and practice. In addition to this central theoretical concern, we experienced other practical advantages of the development of contextually sensitive and relevant case studies.

A key practical advantage of original case studies in a local context is the resulting capacity to effectively hone in on the most important theoretical and practical content to maximize student learning. Decades of experience of using the case study method has shown that case study preparation, when done well, is a particularly demanding assignment for students in the breadth of material to master and the importance of understanding detailed nuance (Garvin, 2003). In our experience, the added challenge of constantly decoding foreign cultural and institutional details in a nonnative language has led to superficial and unsatisfying implementation of the case method. In addition, although the primary goal of cases is not to create a definitive historical account, we have found inherent utility in teaching cases within the political context in which students are most likely to implement their gained knowledge and skills. As detailed in the next section, teaching contextually grounded cases has the added value of elucidating the centrality of specific institutions in a given context and of analyzing political issues that may have perennial importance.

The Development of Original Cases in Israel: Specific Example of a Global Practice

In this section, we review our efforts to create a series of original case studies in Israel in order to provide a specific example of original case development beyond U.S. borders. The following section reviews generalizable lessons from this experience. The original case studies discussed in this article were developed for instruction in a master’s level course titled Political Analysis of Public Policymaking in Israel taught by the authors in the Federmann School for Public Policy and Govern-

ment at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. We then adapted the cases for an intensive workshop for the Faculty of Management at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. These cases were recently published, along with additional instructional material, in a coedited book in Hebrew intended for students, instructors and policy practitioners (Galnoor, Oser, & Gadot-Perez, 2012). The audience for the book is intentionally broad and includes policy students, government workers, policy advisors, and social change leaders in nongovernmental organizations and businesses alike. Indeed, cases from this book have been used for instruction in master’s programs for policy students at various stages of their careers, including those who are full-time workers and managers in government ministries and institutions, private corporations, and nongovernmental entities.

The tension between the universal and the particular in the development of non-U.S. policy programs writ large is aptly posed as a dilemma by Fritzen from his perch in Singapore: “Are we an Asian school of public policy, or simply a school of public policy in Asia? What would make the difference?” (Fritzen, 2008, p. 207). From the perspective of this global dilemma, Hebrew University is clearly an Israeli school of public policy (and not simply a school of public policy in Israel), evidenced by the fact that, as of this writing, the language of instruction is Hebrew, and almost all students are Israeli citizens. Foreign students are not systematically recruited, and there is no institutionalized exchange program. Yet, even though the program has a clear national identity, it aims to be globally competitive in terms of excellence in research and instruction, and the curriculum has been developed with the intention of drawing on the best possible teaching and research practices around the globe.

The relatively recent development in Israel of master’s programs in public policy and public affairs leads to an array of challenges and opportunities. Hebrew University’s School of Public Policy and Government is just more than a decade old, and policy instruction and research in other academic institutions in Israel are likewise in early stages of development. A challenge presented by such a recent development of this academic discipline in Israel is the appropriate adaptation of existing pedagogical materials, which are often developed in American institutions and focused on U.S.-based policy content. How is it possible, then, to make this material effectively instructive in the Israeli context despite significant differences between Israeli and American institutional structures and policy-making environments?

For the purpose of highlighting general guidelines for developing context-sensitive case studies, the unique features of Israeli public institutions are not important *per se*. Yet, to relate to the Israeli context as an exemplar for identifying useful original case study topics, we review a few noteworthy features of Israeli public administration. In particular, in the early years following the founding of the state in 1948, political parties were so central to governance that the country was referred to as a “party-state” (Akzin, 1955). Even in the 1960s, the sector

boundaries between the government, private economy, and the civil society were almost nonexistent. Although strong ideological differences remained among political parties vying for power, parties lost their central role in shaping the public agenda over time in favor of public-bureaucratic mechanisms, the media, and a variety of interest groups.

In comparison to the American policy-making context, however, Israeli policy processes are still remarkably concentrated in the hands of a small number of governmental ministries and elected representatives. In recent years, public administration in Israel is affected by three main shifts in sector boundaries. First, the scope of state tasks has continued to narrow as part of the contraction of the traditional welfare state. Second, the private sector has become increasingly dominant in ideology as well as practical influence. Third, civil society and the third sector have increased markedly since the state-centric founding period. Building on our experience in the Israeli context, the following section reviews the development of a series of original cases for instruction with a focus on clarifying lessons learned for supporting similar efforts in other settings.

Lessons Learned From Developing a Series of Original Case Studies Beyond U.S. Borders

Building on the Kennedy School's case program advice of almost three decades ago, our case selection and development process began by clarifying the pedagogical issue each case was intended to raise (Robyn, 1986). The central aim of the course development and the edited book of cases was to hone students' and readers' skills in analyzing the political environment of policy making. The general message of the course and book is that policy analysts must first tackle their work as if there were no political considerations, and then reassess this analysis while taking the contextual political environment into account. The book therefore aims to broaden the often technical approach to policy analysis by developing a contextually sensitive understanding of this topic in advanced democracies in general and in Israel in particular.

The case studies are designed to give students opportunities to look deeply inside historic policy cases in Israel to learn from policy practitioners' years of experience, including their successes and failures. In this way, the case studies are a unique avenue for learning about theory on policy processes, as well as the actual professional challenges faced by those engaged in policy making. Each case begins with a brief introduction that aims to provide a conceptual framework for analyzing the case. The cases conclude with a series of targeted questions and recommended readings intended to guide readers—students, instructors, and practitioners alike—to analyze the dilemmas that arise in each case.

Two levels of learning were used as criteria for case selection. On the first level, the cases bring life to actual historical events in the Israeli context, which we selected and developed to address a specific theoretical question or dilemma.

Throughout the reading of a case, the reader is confronted with the central question of “what would you do if you were one of the central characters in this case?” Even a seemingly straightforward question—such as “what was the problem that caused the crisis described in the case?”—concretizes the difficulties decision makers face in the eye of a storm. On this first level, the case allows for the analysis of particular interests, central characters, and successful or problematic strategic moves. This first level can be thought of as the level of inspecting the trees within a forest, in which each case can be thought of as a single tree that must be studied in great detail. Through the personal and organizational history of the characters, the interpersonal and institutional interactions, and the unique politics of a particular case, insights arise regarding general guidelines for action.

The transition to the second level of generalization and lesson learning—in other words, gaining a sense of the forest based on the trees—is a critical challenge in effectively using the case method. Each case in the book provides an opportunity for readers to gain experience with diagnosing problems and challenges that are inherent in a particular case but are not necessarily unique to the specific case at hand. Therefore, developing a general understanding of the problems identified in a case is critical for future implementation of the insights and lessons learned.

During the process of testing and developing these cases in the Israeli classroom, a number of key issues clearly proved to be foundational topics that students returned to again and again in their learning process. Therefore, over time the course was restructured into two distinct sections that also frame the book in order to frontload the teaching of these foundational topics. The first Foundational Issues section lays out the conceptual framework for understanding key elements of the policy-making environment in Israel. The second Policy-related Topics section includes cases selected to touch on a variety of topics to round out a holistic understanding of the policy-making process in Israel. Some of the questions raised by these cases include: What is the connection between corruption and creativity? How is it possible to distinguish between professionalism and organizational politics? How are structural problems affected by the time constraints of political pressures? How effective is civil society in influencing public policy? What is the role of investigative committees in the policy process?

To provide a window into design considerations in developing the case studies, Box 1 reviews the theoretical issues addressed in all three of the Foundational Issues case studies and a selected number of cases in the Additional Policy-related Topics section. Some of the additional policy-related topics cases in the book use a well-known historical case in Israel to exemplify a topic that is also well covered in American cases, such as the tension between political versus professional responsibility, and the political environment of public administrators. The cases summarized in Box 1 include only cases that address topics of central importance to Israeli policy making and policy analysis that have received less attention in American instructional cases.²

Box 1.

Original Israeli Case Studies

I. Foundational Issues

Values as a basis for policy

Given the ideological polarization and political divisiveness in Israel, we found it crucial to address values as a basis for policy making as a topic in and of itself. The case study developed to highlight this issue analyzes efforts made between 1994 and 2003 to institute a stock market tax in Israel. This case highlights the importance of understanding the process of decision making on a particular policy issue, including pragmatic issues of developing agreements and desirable democratic processes for advancing policy reform.

Law as a means for policy making

Legislation is a central tool in responsible governance in an advanced constitutional democracy, and it is an increasingly central tool for understanding the policy-making process in the Israeli context. The case study developed to address this issue presents the gap between the positions taken by the Israeli Civil Service Commissioner and the Israeli Women's Lobby on the topic of the advancement of women from all backgrounds, Arabs and Druze in the public service in Israel. The central question addressed in the case is whether the goal of achieving social change is best achieved through advancing legislation or whether (and under what circumstances) attempts to affect civic norms could yield more meaningful or effective results.

The budget as a political and administrative tool

The heightened centrality of the Finance Ministry in the policy-making process in Israel, particularly in comparison to other advanced democracies, merited a systematic review of the unique aspects of the Israeli budgeting process. To present this foundational issue, we chose to outline central principles of the budgeting process with an emphasis on reviewing historical developments and the organizational context of the Budget Department in Israel. This historical overview includes a review of the organizational culture of the Budget Department, which was established during a major financial crisis in Israel in the mid-1980s. Given the centrality of the budgeting process to policy making in Israel, the content in this chapter is referred to in some way in almost every case study in the book.

II. Additional Policy-Related Topics

Systemic problems and political timelines

Israeli media are saturated with reports of local government salary payment crises at least three times a year: toward the end of budget discussions in December, leading up to the Jewish holiday of Passover in March, and the high holidays in late August. The case details the problematic legal infrastructure regarding the operation of local government in Israel as well as the budgeting relationship between the local and central governments. Two main conflicting roles of the local government in Israel come into stark relief through the examination of this case: local government as a performer of services provided by the central government, and local government as a substantive layer of democratic governance.

Box 1.

Original Israeli Case Studies (continued)

Delegating authority and leading change

The delegation of responsibility in the process of leading organizational change is particularly important in Israel given the institutional tendency toward centralization of government authority. A case dealing with this topic reviews an attempt in the mid-1990s to create Exemplary Offices to serve as role models for institutional change in public service writ large. Through a review of this historic experiment, the case opens a window to better understanding the structural reforms, known as New Public Management that have taken place in the past thirty years in a number of developed countries, but were never fully integrated in Israel’s public sector.

Procedural rules versus responding to opportunities and threats

In a young and rapidly developing country like Israel, it is not uncommon for procedural rules to seem unnecessarily cumbersome in the face of dynamic opportunities and threats. To highlight this tension, a case was developed that reviews the decision to establish a private oil company instead of a governmental company to manage the oil fields in Sinai that were conquered and seized in the Six Day War in 1967. Key questions posed through the case study include: What role does improvisation play in the effort to take advantage of opportunities or to avoid threats in conditions of uncertainty? How should proper management and managerial supervision be prioritized in the face of unexpected opportunities and constraints? And what are the definitive distinctions between creativity and corruption?

Organizational conflict in political and administrative systems

Political rivalry in administrative settings is often a barrier to the development of sound policy, and this is a particularly problematic dynamic in a small country like Israel where political and professional networks are highly enmeshed. A case reviewing the attempt to establish a school of public policy in the mid-1990s delves into the need for professionals to develop coalitions, recruit support, and ensure that their professional plans are not torpedoed by organizational politics. This case presents a rivalry between different public service units in order to frame fundamental questions regarding the role of interorganizational conflict in policy making.

Citizen involvement in public policy making

The role of citizens and civil society organizations in raising policy problems on the public agenda has changed rapidly over time in Israel, where the once state-centric “party state” of the 1950s has given way to the relatively vibrant role of civil society in contemporary politics (Oser, 2010). A case reviewing the legislation of a public housing law in 1998 presents the success of a grassroots coalition’s efforts to place social issues on the public agenda, while also highlighting the challenges faced by citizens attempting to influence policy outcomes. Given the public demonstrations of thousands of Israelis over social and economic justice sparked by a crisis of housing affordability in the summer of 2011, this case deals with perennial issues of the potential for citizen influence on policy processes in Israel.

ORIGINAL CASE DEVELOPMENT IN NON-U.S. SETTINGS AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION

In this section we review an example of how the creation of original case materials in non-U.S. settings may lead to generalizable instructional innovations, in addition to the benefit reviewed in the previous section of improving case study instruction. Through the process of academic instruction, which led to the development of a coherent set of cases, we also developed an exercise to support students learning to write a Political Strategic Appendix for the purpose of training professional policy analysts in the Israeli context.

As a supplement to traditional policy analysis workshops, we sought existing textbooks and instructional materials that would address the topic of how to supplement policy analysis papers to take into account the political environment of policy making. If an Israeli policy analyst does not carefully consider the structure, limitations, and opportunities of governmental ministries and representatives, any amount of brilliant policy analysis will likely remain on the shelf regardless of how well various constituencies are recruited to support the recommendations in the paper. Given the centralized nature of Israeli governmental decision making discussed above, a political strategic appendix is therefore a crucial supplement to a successful policy paper in the Israeli setting.

We found that in American instructional material, however, the topic of political strategy tended to be separated as an entirely unrelated instructional topic. We therefore created an exercise that would help students to integrate the lessons learned from the original case studies about the political environment of policy making into their policy analysis writing. Box 2 outlines the schematic description of policy paper development, which we designed to consist of two main components. The first component of policy paper preparation, outlined in steps one through six, represents a schematic outline of standard elements in a policy paper, as often presented in canonical guides to policy analysis (e.g., Bardach, 2008; Weimer & Vining, 2005). The second component, outlined in step seven, reviews the Political Strategic Appendix exercise.

In our instruction of this exercise, we clarify that a first draft of the strategic appendix should be written only after the policy alternatives have been identified and that it should never be undertaken at the beginning of the policy analysis process. This approach encourages students to release themselves from narrow conceptions of what seems politically feasible in their first round of analysis, while also encouraging them to hone their pure analytical recommendations given considerations of opportunities and constraints in the political environment. Through this exercise, students learn that the initial stages of problem definition and the intellectual search for solutions to the defined problem require freedom from political constraints. This exercise also emphasizes, however, that more advanced stages in the policy analysis process require a keen understanding of the political context, including potential sources of resistance.

A standard policy workshop is conducted in Hebrew University’s School of Public Policy in which students gain experience in policy paper preparation in steps one through six. The course on the political analysis of policy making aimed to help students hone their policy paper writing skills with the additional tool of preparing a political strategic appendix based on the steps outlined in Box 2. The steps recommended for developing a strategic appendix are intended to cover the broad range of tools that students can draw upon to consider the political environment of policy development, and they are in no way meant to be narrowly prescriptive. Indeed, in reviewing these steps with students, we highlight the inherent tension between producing a high-quality analytic policy paper in comparison to the more fluid development of a political strategic appendix, depending on the policy topic under consideration.

In general, our experience has been that the main steps outlined in Box 2 encourage students to develop a fairly comprehensive Political Strategic Appendix. In line with our identification of values as a foundational issue in policy analysis in the Israel context, the first step of drafting the strategic appendix is to identify the values-based implications of the recommended policy alternatives, including a consideration of who potentially benefits and who is potentially harmed. Mapping the benefits and the losses of a given policy enables analysts to develop both a greater understanding of the meaning of the policy recommendations and knowledge of potential limits of compromise between professional policy proposals given the extant political constraints. Then more practical issues are taken into consideration, including a mapping of opposing and supporting actors, proposals for increasing the likelihood of political implementation, preparing a timeline, and developing a media strategy.

The content of the initial policy paper is then revised based on this analysis of the political environment. In this way, an initial policy analysis based on scholarly and policy research focuses on developing an ideal policy recommendation, which is then informed and adjusted given the opportunities and limitations uncovered in the process of developing the strategic appendix. In this final process of revision, students are also encouraged to establish what Fisher, Ury and Patton (2011) refer to as the nonnegotiable “red lines,” meaning to clarify issues of substance that are not subject to compromise, regardless of considerations of implementation and feasibility.

In sum, this Political Strategic Appendix exercise developed as an organic outgrowth of our creation of original case studies in the Israeli setting, and our efforts to better integrate the two pedagogical pillars identified by Stokes (1986) as constituting the “flight simulator” of policy instruction, namely the case method and policy workshops. Although we created this exercise with the centralized nature of governmental decision making in Israel in mind, it is likely that this exercise could be useful in a variety of national contexts, including those with

less centralized decision-making and policy-making structures. We therefore conclude this review of the Political Strategic Appendix exercise by noting

Box 2.

Developing a Political Strategic Appendix

I. Policy Paper Preparation

1. *Background*: Provide information on the topic, actions taken in the past, and an overview of the timelines or urgency of the issue.
2. *Goal*: What is the goal of the policy paper? A brief and clear formulation of the goal(s) for which the paper is being written. This description should relate to the values motivating the policy paper.
3. *Problem definition*: The definition of the problem that allows for actionable solutions.
4. *Policy alternatives description and assessment*: Analysis of different policy alternatives that can solve the defined problem. The different solutions should be assessed in light of the goals and values identified in section 2 above. The comparison of alternatives can be conducted through the use of different criteria in relation to the overarching goal of the policy paper.
5. *Identification of opportunities and constraints*: timeline, budget, etcetera.
6. *Recommendation*: The recommended policy alternative, justification of the choice including an identification of the weaknesses, analysis of sensitivities, and potential backup recommendation(s).

II. Analysis of the Political Environment

7. *Political Strategic Appendix*: Political strategy for implementation of the policy recommendation. Central points in the analysis of this plan include:
 - a. The values-based implications of the recommended policy (including who benefits and who is harmed)
 - b. Mapping of opposing and supporting actors
 - c. Political implementation: proposals for recruiting the support or moderation of the opposition
 - d. Preparing an action timeline
 - e. Media strategy (including social media)
 - f. Analyzing the policy alternatives according to the suggested political strategy, and the preparation of alternative plans in the event of insurmountable political obstacles
 - g. Establishing “red lines” of proposed policy that are not open to negotiation in the political strategy development
-

that similar generalizable instructional innovations are likely to occur as policy scholars increasingly adapt the “flight simulator” of the case method and policy workshops to address substantive topics in different national contexts.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we aimed to examine the lessons learned in our efforts to develop original case studies in the Israeli setting with an intention of inspiring and informing similar efforts in other contexts. What are the key lessons learned from our pedagogical adaptation in the Israeli context?

First, our experience in developing a coherent series of original cases shows the added value of being able to identify foundational issues in a given setting. In place of the frequent approach of using the most common case studies available from American settings and adding one or a handful of “international” cases for variety, the approach outlined in this article is to consider the whole of a national context’s political and policy considerations and then deliberately develop a corpus of coherent case studies that addresses the most foundational and topical issues. For example, in the Israeli context, the choice to focus on “values” as a foundational case study is based on a consideration of the importance of ideological polarization in policy making and policy implementation and the importance of directly addressing this topic to enhance policy instruction in general. Of course, in varied national settings, different issues would be identified as foundational and, therefore, worthy of original case study development. Frontloading the teaching of case studies that deal with foundational issues provides a touchstone reference for subsequent instruction on additional policy topics.

Second, the development of original case studies in Israel created a dynamic learning opportunity for instruction on important elements of national affairs and encouraged students to wrestle with controversial issues in policy development. For example, the case on “delegating authority and leading change” provides a lively historical example of an attempt in Israel in the mid-1990s to implement New Public Management reforms that had already been implemented in many developed democracies. Considering why and how these reforms achieved only partial implementation in Israel educates students about contextual administrative capacities and obstacles at the same time that the case raises the general theoretical issue of authority delegation in public affairs.

Third, this description of developing a coherent set of non-U.S. cases may provide insight in domestic-focused American public policy and public affairs programs that are increasingly educating foreign students. Although it is clear that all issues of relevance to foreign students cannot be addressed in American programs that focus primarily on domestic policy, it could be advisable to consider the countries of origin of foreign students and consider how case adaptation and development could enhance classroom learning while raising theoretical issues that foreign students are most likely to face in the return to their home countries.

Finally, our development of the Political Strategy Appendix exercise was motivated by our efforts to translate the central pedagogical pillars of the case method and policy workshops to the Israeli context. In political environments such as that of Israel where the centralization of governmental decision making can lead to a large gap between technocratic policy analysis and successful policy adoption and implementation, this exercise can serve to integrate the two pillars of the case method and policy workshops. Based on this experience, it seems likely that the considered development of contextually sensitive “flight simulators” in different international settings has the potential to enhance policy instruction around the globe, including in the U.S.A.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Based on an online search of the Kennedy School’s Case Program, accessed April 4, 2013 (<http://www.case.hks.harvard.edu/search.asp>)
- 2 For a full review in English of all cases in the book and a more detailed description of each case, readers are invited to view the conference paper version of this article in the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) Teaching Workshop conference website (http://umdcipe.org/conferences/Classroom/agenda_and_abstracts.html).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For helpful comments at various stages of this article’s development, the authors would like to thank Doug Besharov, David Levi-Faur, and Beryl Radin. The authors also thank Momi Dahan for his support to represent Hebrew University’s Federmann School of Public Policy and Government at the APPAM Teaching Workshop, and the many students over the years who engaged with and improved the pedagogical materials presented in this article.

REFERENCES

- Akzin, B. (1955). The role of parties in Israeli democracy. *Journal of Politics*, 17, 507–545.
- Chetkovich, C., & Kirp, D. L. (2001). Cases and controversies: How novitiates are trained to be masters of the public policy universe. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(2), 283–314.
- Bardach, E. (2008). *A practical guide for policy analysis: The eightfold path to more effective problem solving* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.
- Devereux, E. A., & Durning, D. (2001). Going global? International activities by U.S. schools of public policy and management to transform public affairs education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 7(4), 241–260.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W. L., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Penguin.
- Foster, R. H., McBeth, M. K., & Clemons, R. S. (2010). Public policy pedagogy: Mixing methodologies using cases. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 16(4), 517–540.
- Fritzen, S. A. (2008). Public policy education goes global: A multi-dimensional challenge. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(1), 205–214.
- Galnoor, I., Oser, J., & Gadot-Perez, A. (Eds.). (2012). *The political environment of policy making in Israel*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press. (In Hebrew).
- Garvin, D. A. (2003). Making the case: Professional education for the world of practice. *Harvard Magazine*, 106(1), 56–65, 107.
- Geva-May, I., Nasi, G., Turrini, A., & Scott, C. (2008). MPP programs emerging around the world. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(1), 187–204.
- Husock, H. (1993). *Democracy and public management cases: Kennedy School Case Study Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.case.hks.harvard.edu/casetitle.asp?caseNo=1232.0>
- Kennedy, D. M., & Scott, E. (1985). *Preparing cases in public policy*. Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government Case Program.
- Lawrence, P. R. (1953). The preparation of case material. In K. R. Andrews (Ed.), *The case method of teaching human relations and administration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lynn, L. E. J. (1996). *Public management as art, science, and profession*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers.
- Massie, C. Z. (1995). Teaching introduction to public administration via the case method. *Journal of Public Administration Education*, 1(2), 102–115.
- Oser, Jennifer. 2010. Between atomistic and participatory democracy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39(3), 429–459.
- Robyn, D. (1986). *What makes a good case?* Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government Case Program.

J. Oser, A. Gadot-Perez, & I. Galnoor

Stokes, D. E. (1986). Political and organizational analysis in the policy curriculum. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 6(1), 45–55.

Straussman, J. D. (2008). Public management, politics, and the policy process in the public affairs curriculum. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(3), 624–635.

Weimer, D. L., & Vining, A. R. (2005). *Policy analysis: Concepts and practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yang, K. (2005). Globalization and public affairs education: The case of China. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 11(2), 105–120.

Zimmerman, P. B. (1985). *Case development and teaching: Communicating the results*. Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government Case Program.

Jennifer Oser earned her PhD at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem's Federmann School of Public Policy and Government. She is currently a postdoctoral visiting scholar at the University of Pennsylvania and a senior postdoctoral researcher on a European Research Council project about democratic linkages between citizens and the state. Her fields of research include social policy, political participation, and participatory inequality, and she has taught in courses on policy analysis and organizing at Harvard University, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and the University of Pennsylvania. Email: oser@post.harvard.edu.

Alma Gadot-Perez acted as the director of the Israel Center at the Milken Institute and the first director general of its registered nonprofit in Israel. From 2008 to 2012 she focused on structuring innovative solutions to social, environmental and economic challenges through public policy, private sector tools, and strategic philanthropy. She is also the founder of Working Insight, a social venture connecting talented Israelis to their Diaspora communities through professional development. A graduate of the first cohort of the honors program of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem's Federmann School of Public Policy and Government, she led a number of innovative policy consulting, training, and research efforts in academic institutions, government ministries, and think tanks, including the Foundation for International Community Assistance International and the Israeli Ministry of Social Affairs and Social Services. Email: alma.gadot-perez@mail.huji.ac.il.

Itzhak Galnoor is the Herbert Samuel Professor (Emeritus) of Political Science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and a senior fellow at the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute. He is a leading scholar on Israeli politics and administration and also

served as the head of the Civil Service Commission (1994–1996) and deputy chair of the Council for Higher Education (2007–2008). Professor Galnoor supported the founding and development of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem’s Federmann School of Public Policy and Government, and is currently leading a multiyear project examining privatization policies Israel. Email: itzhakg@vanleer.org.il.