

Management Matters

Reflections on a Diverse 2016 PMRC at Aarhus University

The 14th Public Management Research Conference (PMRC) was held at Aarhus University, Denmark, in June of 2016. As part of PMRA's endeavors to become an international organization, the conference in Aarhus was the first full PMRC to be held outside the U.S. The number of applicants was higher than anticipated and even though we could only accommodate 75% of the abstract proposals, the number of participants, papers, and panels was greater than initially planned. Around 270 people participated in three-day conference.

The international character of the conference was also reflected in the fact that 41% of the participants came from the U.S. and 51% from Europe. The rank of the researchers showed an almost equal balance between Ph.D. candidates, Assistant, Associate and Full Professors. About one-third of these participated for the first time—for those interested in a qualitative account of the conference, Raul Pacheco-Vega offers his thoughts on the experience as a first-time attendee and participant from outside the field of public administration: <http://www.raulpacheco.org/2016/07/my-experience-at-the-2016-public-management-research-conference-aarhus-denmark-pmrc2016/>. According to the subsequent evaluation survey 66% per-

cent were fully satisfied with the conference and 31% reasonably satisfied.

This year's gathering continued the use of pre-conference workshops that were introduced at the 2013 PMRC in Madison. Four pre-conference workshops were held on Representative Bureaucracy, Experiments, Performance regimes, and a doctoral workshop on reviewing and publishing hosted by the *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. Forty-four percent of the survey respondents participated in one of the workshops and 98% of these were either fully or reasonably satisfied with the workshop—which may suggest that this is an innovation worth pursuing.

With its mix of U.S. and Europe scholars—from 11 different countries in Europe—PMRA has definitely succeed in broadening its membership and collaboration beyond the U.S.

Finally, we wish to thank the organizers, attendees, and participants who made this year's conference a success and we hope to see you at the 2017 PMRC in Washington, D.C.

Don Moynihan, PMRA President
(University of Wisconsin-Madison)
Simon Calmar Andersen, Co-Chair of
the 2016 PMRC (Aarhus University,
Denmark)

In This Issue

Reflections on a Diverse 2016 PMRC	1
Call for Proposals for 2017 PMRC	2
PMRA's New Home on the Internet	3
The Convivium	4-7
The Work & Legacy of Keith Provan	7-12
Comings & Goings	13-16
Job Announcements	17-20
Odds & Ends	21

Newsletter Editor:
Andrew Osorio
The University of Kansas
andrew.osorio@ku.edu

2017 Public Management Research Conference – Call for Proposals

We are excited to open the call for proposals for the 2017 Public Management Research Conference. PMRA furthers research on public organizations and their management by organizing and sponsoring an annual Public Management Research Conference as well as other conferences and symposia; stimulating research through other print and electronic platforms, advancing professional and academic opportunities, and serving as a voice for the public management research community. PMRA owns *The Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* ([JPART](#)), one of the field's premier journals. It also recently initiated a new journal *Perspectives on Public Management & Governance*. The [School of Public Affairs](#) at the American University will host the 2017 PMRC, June 8-10, 2017.

The 2017 PMRC Program Committee consists of Committee Chair Anna Amirkhanyan (American University), Robert Christensen (Brigham Young University), Amanda Girth (The Ohio State University), Tima Moldogaziev (University of Georgia), Alasdair Roberts (University of Missouri), Dan Smith (University of Delaware), Lars Tummers (Utrecht University), and Brian Williams (University of Georgia).

Individual Paper Proposals. The program committee welcomes proposals featuring high quality theoretical, qualitative, or quantitative research. Empirical proposals will be evaluated based on the significance and quality of the research question, design, methods, data, and implications. The program committee also welcomes theoretical proposals. Theoretical proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the proposal provides insight into a compelling public management subject, identifies foundational assumptions and key concepts, and results in testable hypotheses.

Full Panel Proposals. The program committee encourages the submission of complete panels consisting of four individual papers and a chair. Panel submissions should bring together complementary papers that tackle compelling research questions or subjects of study in public management. The panel organizer will formally make the submission on behalf of the full panel. The panel organizer will also provide information on the overall theme of the panel and indicate how each of the proposed papers connects to the panel's theme. The panel submission should include information on the panel chair. Each of the papers in the panel will be evaluated separately on whether the piece meets the criteria for individual paper

submissions. The program committee may drop or add papers to proposed panels.

Additional Information on Paper and Panel Proposals. All proposals will be evaluated using a double-blind peer review process with the program committee serving as the evaluators. Participants will be able to choose to submit a paper or panel. Paper proposals should be no more than 400 words. Panel proposals should include a panel title and description (400 words or less), as well as four individual paper proposals (400 words or less each). A person may submit no more than two proposals (including both single-authored and co-authored papers). Individuals will be limited to two acceptances. The online submission system will be available beginning October 1, 2016. All proposals must be submitted no later than **November 30, 2016**. Notifications of proposal acceptance or rejection will be sent by January 31, 2017. If a proposal is accepted, the presenter must register for the conference in order to participate. Persons interested in serving as panel chairs should email Anna Amirkhanyan at amirkhan@american.edu.

Pre-Conference Workshops. The conference will feature a limited number of pre-conference sessions and workshops to be held on June 8, 2017, the first day of the PMRA Conference. These sessions are meant to be very engaged learning opportunities, and we encourage workshop proposals on any topic that has significant potential for advancing public management research and impact. Sessions/workshops will typically be planned as half day or full day.

Proposals for pre-conference sessions and workshops must be submitted through the online system and include the following information: 1) Title, 2) Statement of objectives and scholarly importance, 3) Detail on the length and format of the session, 4) Names and affiliations of session organizers and leaders, 5) Ideal number of participants. The proposals should not exceed 1000 words in length. Submissions for pre-conference workshops are due on November 30, 2016 and decisions will be made in March 2017.

Submission. Online submissions may be made through <http://www.pmrc2017.com/> by November 30, 2016. Any questions regarding the proposal submission process may be directed to Anna Amirkhanyan at amirkhan@american.edu. We look forward to your submission.

PMRA's New Home on the Internet

As part of PMRA's continual efforts to more effectively communicate and connect with our growing membership, we are proud to announce the debut of our newly redesigned website which can still be found at www.pmranet.org. While the previous version of our site served the community well for many years, changes in the way individuals interact with the internet (i.e. the proliferation of mobile devices) and our desire to engage in real-time with PMRA members through various platforms necessitated change.

Our new site was built using WordPress—a free, open-source software platform—which allows PMRA to provide quick updates and dynamic content for our members. In addition to increased flexibility and an updated appearance, our revamped site offers increased functionality and a host of features including:

- Optimization for browsing on mobile devices;
- Access to tools for managing your PMRA membership (<http://pmranet.org/manage-membership/>);
- Live feeds from JPART's social media on Twitter and Facebook;
- “PMRA Insights,” a new blog from PMRA scholars on issues relating to the study and practice of public management (the inaugural post from Brint Milward can be found at <http://pmranet.org/pmra-insights/>);
- A gateway to PMRA's sister journals JPART (<http://pmranet.org/jpart/>) and PPMG (<http://pmranet.org/ppmg/>);
- An archive of PMRA's newsletter, *Management Matters* (<http://pmranet.org/pmra-newsletter/>);
- News and information about the Public Management Research Conference (<http://pmranet.org/conference/>); and
- PMRA-related announcements (<http://pmranet.org/announcements/>).

We invite you to visit our newly remodeled home on the internet and provide feedback that will help us as we continue to roll out new features and content. Your questions, comments, and suggestions can be submitted to jpart@ku.edu.

Andrew Osorio

On behalf of the PMRA Website Redesign Committee:

Holly Goerdel (Univ. of Kansas)

Austin Johnson (Texas A&M)

Ines Mergel (Univ. of Konstanz, Germany)

Lisa Morris (American Univ.)

Rosemary O'Leary (Univ. of Kansas)

For the latest news and
information from the
**Public Management
Research Association**
please visit our website at:

www.pmranet.org

The Convivium

The Convivium is a new academic forum presented by PMRA where faculty within the field of public administration are invited to exchange ideas and arguments on timely topics of public management and policy. In creating this new venue our goal is to present diverse points of view on the current challenges and opportunities confronting students, scholars, and practitioners of public administration around the world. As such, we have asked four faculty from different institutions, with diversified research interests, in various phases of their careers to comment in response to the questions below:

The site for the 2017 PMRC was moved from Chapel Hill to Washington, D.C., because statutory law in North Carolina currently discriminates against transgender individuals. The passage of such “bathroom bills” is but one example of a larger trend of divisive and exclusionary public policies among state and local governments that also includes laws aimed at restricting the right to vote, denying public and private services based on sexual orientation, or attempts to limit immigration and the resettlement of refugees. What is the implication of these discriminatory policies for ideals such as social justice and deliberative democracy, or practices such as collaborative governance and networking? What, if any, is the role of scholars and practitioners of public administration in addressing these discriminatory policies and the atmosphere of alienation they engender?

If you would like to suggest a topic for a future convening of The Convivium or if you are interested in the possibility of contributing your own essay, please contact andrew.osorio@ku.edu.

We hope you enjoy this new offering from PMRA.

-Andrew

“A Duty to Explain,” Ben Merriman

This symposium is about a class of policies whose obvious effect is to limit the opportunities and legal protections available to vulnerable groups, or to make it more difficult for individuals to exercise fundamental rights. The harm done by these policies is substantial. As vigorous public opposition has demonstrated, it is obvious to many Americans that such policies are objectionable in both their effects and their underlying intention. Many disciplines can help advance the public understanding of the effects of these policies.

Perhaps less obviously, this symposium is about a class of

policies that have engendered sharp intergovernmental conflict. These policies function by reconfiguring allocations of power between levels of government; in particular, they operate by concentrating administrative power at the state level, either by preempting local policies or expanding state activity in areas—such as election law—where courts have recently circumscribed federal authority. The messy practicalities of intergovernmental relations therefore lie at the heart of these conflicts.

To a greater extent than any other academic discipline, public administration concerns itself with the question of how governments do or do not cooperate, as well as the laws, rules, and practices define the way governments interact. Public administration is therefore uniquely equipped to provide the public with answers to some important questions about the operation (rather than intention or effect) of these policies. The following are important questions for which public administration has answers that are often not known to Americans in general, and that are infrequently explained in popular media cover of new, discriminatory policies:

Why do so many voting laws with demonstrably disparate racial effects survive judicial review? (And for that matter, why are the most stringently enforced voting laws the ones most likely to survive?) Why is employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation still legal in many states when every state now conducts and recognizes same-sex marriages? Why has it become possible, in practice, for some states to define their own immigration policies? On what legal basis can a state preempt local government efforts to create safer and more inclusive communities?

It is important for the public to know the answers to these questions: understanding the practical matter of how a discriminatory policy is drafted and implemented is essential for combating discrimination. Likewise, it is important for the public to know that the answers to these questions are based in ordinary government activity. There is frequently a suggestion of conspiracy in media coverage of these policies. However, the policies have generally been lawfully enacted through legitimate, publicly observable means, albeit means that often have low public salience. (That these policies were devised and enacted in plain sight is, to my mind, more worrisome than conspiracy.) Public administration has a specific ability and responsibility to advance public understanding of the legal and institutional context in which new discriminatory policies are created. Public administrators can also contribute by joining in larger efforts to rebuke governments that adopt discriminatory laws. Refusing to meet in North Carolina is a fine place to start.

Ben Merriman is an Assistant Professor at the School of Public Affairs & Administration at the University of Kansas. Ben's ongoing work is about contemporary intergovernmental conflicts. A book in progress examines how state elected officials have used new administrative practices, and new legal arguments grounded in administrative procedure, to restrict voting rights and frustrate the implementation of federal environmental protection and immigration policies. Other research explores interstate conflicts over water resources, and the adaptation of interstate water compacts to address emerging water management challenges.

“Willful Ignorance and the De-legitimization of the Lived Experience,” Brandi Blessett

Evidence of systemic injustice and institutional racism continues to reveal itself. The water crisis in Flint, Michigan, the “bathroom bill” in North Carolina, and the dozens of deadly interactions Black people have had with law enforcement officers are only the tip of the iceberg. At a time when dominant society argues the United States is post-racial, social media has helped expose a different reality. Let's face it, despite evidence via cell phone or dashcam footage or the anger and frustration of people who live through discrimination on a daily basis, policymakers, administrators, and society at-large have turned a blind eye to the concerns of its fellow citizens. Therefore, the ability to justify injustice for any reason demonstrates privilege and an (un)conscious acceptance of the benefits that result from differential treatment. To be silent is to be complicit and to be complicit is to sanction illegal and/or unethical behavior.

Differential treatment suggests that to be a person of color, to be poor, to have a fluid sexual identity, to be differently abled, to be gender non-conforming, or to be dissimilar than what society expects, relegates a person to second-class citizenship. While acceptance is an individual choice, within the context of government (e.g. administrators, institutions, resources) all people should be treated with respect, dignity, and have equal protection under the law. When injustice is allowed to pervade the structure and functioning of government, the very fabric of U.S. society and its public institutions are undermined. Administrators and institutions are either accessible or not, promote fairness or facilitate disadvantage, are inclusive or exclusionary. In all cases, public administrators are the face of the public institutions they represent and those institutions are the foundation of U.S. democracy. For many citizens, rhetorical ideals of equality and liberty have fallen on deaf ears based on the horrific realities marginalized groups face when interacting with representatives of government.

Change is possible, but it does require public administra-

tors to stand up and speak out against injustice. Scholarship is needed to amplify and legitimize the voice of marginalized groups. Too often hegemony dictates the way problems are understood, thus limiting the ability to envision a different reality. Critical race theory argues that history and context matter. The ways in which situations are interpreted matter. A person's voice and lived experience matter, particularly when it has traditionally been silenced or discounted as irrelevant. Praxis also matters. For public administration, action requires: scholarship that exposes students to alternative perspectives and innovative ways of thinking; empowers students to have difficult conversations about the intersectional experiences of citizens; and provide opportunities for meaningful engagement with diverse constituents.

Talk is cheap. Without a commitment, strong leadership, an investment of time and resources, and action public administration remains complicit in the marginalization of its citizenry. Such an obligation goes beyond legal requirements, but becomes embedded in the lifeblood of organizational processes, permeates to its employees, and is valued and viewed as legitimate by the citizenry.

Brandi Blessett, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Policy and Administration at Rutgers University-Camden. Her research broadly focuses on issues of social justice. Her areas of study include: cultural competency, social equity, administrative responsibility, and disenfranchisement. She can be reached at bb520@camden.rutgers.edu.

“The Public Management Scholar as Public Intellectual,” Sharon Mastracci

PMRA moved its research conference from Charlotte, NC to protest that state's now-infamous “bathroom bill.” Moving the conference out of the state is meant to send a message, Tiebout-style, to lawmakers that scholars notice and reject such exclusionary policies. When we accept our roles as public intellectuals and take a stand on contemporary issues, does anyone listen? People will listen if we dare to speak their language.

Public Administration is fundamentally linked to practice. Speaking the language of practice means turning away from notions of truth divorced from context, abandoning the search for an ahistorical, non-contingent, capital-T Truth, abandoning “the attempt to render all knowledge claims commensurable” (Rorty, 2009, p. 357) and to reject “truth as correspondence to reality [as] the only sort of truth worthy of the name” (Rorty, 1991, p. 35). Speaking the language of practice means taking seriously “the notion of knowledge as accurate representation made possible by special mental processes and intelligible through a general theory of representation needs to

be abandoned” (Rorty, 2009, p. 6). In their articulation of the present state of post-normal science, Funtowicz and Ravetz underscore the dangers of objectivity in applied social science: “The approach used by normal science to manage complex social and biophysical systems as if they were simple scientific exercises has brought us to our present mixture of intellectual triumph and socio-ecological peril” (2003, para. 1). They further assert that “invoking ‘truth’ as the goal of science is a distraction, or even a diversion from real tasks” (Funtowicz & Ravetz, 2003, para. 3). Richard Rorty concurs: “The vocabulary which centers around traditional distinctions [of truth and reality] has become an obstacle to our social hopes” (1999, p. xii). What is our objective as social scientists if not to realize social hopes? What is the point of taking a stand? In taking a stand, we seek to “hold reality and justice in a single vision” (Rorty, 1999 p. 13). We want to be both right and good.

Speaking the language of practice means pursuing goals that matter. Post-normal science embraces co-production of solutions in partnership with extended peer communities. This approach “considers truth to be something that emerges from social practices” (Rorty 1982, p. xxv). Beyond Type I and Type II error in hypothesis testing, Funtowicz and Ravetz warn that scholars risk irrelevance by ignoring Type III error: “When the whole artificial exercise has no relation to the real issue at stake. Type III errors are a characteristic pitfall when the ‘normal science’ approach is deployed in post-normal situations” (2003, para. 15). The scholar as public intellectual—one who speaks the language of practice, takes a stand, and makes a difference—is not the isolated thinker in pursuit of first principles transcending time and circumstance, but rather, one who is engaged with her community in the coproduction of knowledge. How willing are we to play the role of public intellectual?

Someone who is able to spin webs of intriguingly shiny new metaphors, and thus create fresh and imaginative ways of talking about things, has a much better chance of influencing the way speakers at large use language than someone who constructs a cast-iron argument for assenting to certain definite propositions about the nature of reality (Malachowski, 2014, p. 102).

References

- Funtowicz, S., & Ravetz, J. (2003, February). Post-normal science. In *Internet Encyclopedia of Ecological Economics*. Retrieved from isecoeco.org/pdf/pstnormsc.pdf
- Malachowski, A. (2014). *Richard Rorty*. Durham, NC: Routledge.
- Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- . (1991). *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth: Philosophical Papers I*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

———. (1999). *Philosophy and Social Hope*. London, UK: Penguin Books.

———. (1979/2009). *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature, 30th Anniversary Ed.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sharon Mastracci is an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Utah. Her research has focused on women in public administration and gendered organizations, emotional labor in public service, and human resource management. She was a 2014–2015 Fulbright Scholar to the United Kingdom and is a faculty fellow at the Hinckley Institute of Politics at the University of Utah.

“Civil Rights in Public Service: Getting Beyond Reaction,” Phillip J. Cooper

Discussions of civil rights in public service today tend to be reactions to an extremely serious situation. There have been so many actions that have killed African Americans, targeted Latinos, attacked Moslems, harassed women, discriminated against people on the basis of sexual orientation or identity, excluded those with disabilities, and continued a long train of appalling actions toward Native Americans. It is essential to address the specific cases, but it is even more important to take a positive and proactive approach that addresses the fundamental role of civil rights in public service in a way that is ongoing and integrated into the very core of the public service profession.

When a crisis occurs, there is a wave of media attention and many ask how such a thing could happen today. There is a demand for immediate action to address a situation like Ferguson, Missouri or the North Carolina gender identity legislation. It is, however, rare that there is a serious and sustained effort to ensure change. The spotlight soon fades and political leaders move on to other things. This pattern leads to an understandable cynicism.

It is past time to move away from the reactive approach and make civil rights in public service an ongoing central commitment in a proactive approach with several key elements.

First, different groups of people understand civil rights differently and have had different experiences that shape their understanding of civil rights. The African American experience includes challenges that run from slavery to the fight for desegregation to the contemporary policing. Although Latinos share some elements of that history, many have experienced stereotypes that Latinos are recent arrivals or that speaking Spanish is somehow a problem. Women have clearly experienced sexual harassment and discrimination on the basis of pregnancy. Society is only beginning to engage issues related to sexual orientation and identity. Challenges confronting persons with disabilities are different as well. An effective future

approach to civil rights requires attention to these different experiences and perspectives.

Second, Justice Thurgood Marshall argued that it is not just the lived experience of a particular individual that matters, but also the pattern of treatment by the society of the groups to which they belong. There is a legacy from the way the courts and other leaders have described persons of color and ruled on their calls for equality. It matters that as late as 1954 a state argued in the Supreme Court that the equal protection clause did not apply to Latinos. One cannot understand the drive for full civil rights to address sexual orientation and identity without reading the hateful words of congressional reports of earlier years. Marshall insisted that we must engage that history to move beyond it.

Third, civil rights is a long way from a fully developed fabric of law and policy. This is a work in progress with much remaining to be done. There is a continuing need to find and address the gaps and weaknesses. It should always be a work in progress because civil rights in public service must evolve as the society evolves.

Fourth, civil rights is a key element of public service that requires effective ongoing administration. The usual focus is

on compliance, which is in its nature reactive. It is necessary, but not sufficient to ensure civil rights.

Fifth, civil rights is something that must be learned and taught. It is a critically important aspect of education for public service and of professional development for those in the field. Because the law, policy, and society change, this also needs to be an important part of professional development in the field.

Finally civil rights is not a problem to be solved or a set of rules to be enforced. Rather, civil rights is a fundamental element of who Americans say they are and what they expect from each other and from public service professionals. A narrow rules-based or crisis management perspective is not the same as a positive and proactive approach to civil rights. It is critically important to deal with immediate crises, but it is even more important to commit to a positive and proactive approach to civil rights over the long term as a central part of the public service profession.

Phillip J. Cooper is Professor of Public Administration in the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University. He is the author of *Civil Rights in Public Service*. He is also a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration.

The Work and Legacy of Keith Provan

Joseph Galaskiewicz, University of Arizona*

I was fortunate enough to get to know Keith Provan while both of us were faculty members at the University of Arizona. When I was recruited to Arizona in 2001 I was very interested in the work of both Provan and H. Brinton Milward, and their presence on campus was an important factor in my deciding to come there. We were all interested in studying the various ways that organizational actors came together to address common problems through collective action. My work on the Twin Cities' corporate grants economy focused on both informal networks and new institutions which companies and their executives created to motivate and sustain corporate support of nonprofit organizations in Minneapolis-St. Paul. Provan and Milward were interested in how a mix of public, for-profit, and nonprofit organizations organized themselves in a network to provide services to severely mentally ill populations in urban communities. While the actors and the networks were different, the common interest was in collective action. We all felt that we had something to learn from one another, and hope-

fully our conversations and mutual respect helped socialize the many graduate students who took classes from the three of us.

Keith Provan died February 16th, 2014 from brain cancer. He was a native of New York City and was 66 years old. He received his B.S. from American University in 1969, his M.B.A. from Boston University in 1972, and his Ph.D. from the School of Management, State University of New York at Buffalo in 1978. From 1980 to 1985, he was an assistant professor at the Vanderbilt University Owen Graduate School of Business. He was an associate and full professor at the University of Kentucky from 1985 to 1995 (in the same management department and School of Public Administration as Brint Milward) and then came to the University of Arizona in 1995 joining Milward who came to Arizona in 1988. At Arizona he held the titles, McClelland Professor of Management & Organizations, Professor in the School of Government & Public Policy, and Co-director of the Center for Management Innovations in Health Care. He was also Senior Research Fellow in the Department of Organization Studies at Tilburg University in The Netherlands from 2007 to his death. He is survived by Jill, his

wife of 44 years, and two children, Olivia and Alexander. He died peacefully at home with his family by his side.

Quoting from the official U of AZ communication (February 18, 2014): “During his long and productive career, Provan published more than 70 academic journal articles and scholarly book chapters both in management journals – such as *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Management*, and *Journal of Management Studies* – and in public management journals – such as the *Journal of Public Administration Research* and *Theory and Public Administration Review*. Provan was a charter member – one of only 33 scholars – of the Academy of Management Journal’s Hall of Fame. In September, he was elected as a fellow of the prestigious National Academy of Public Administration.”

Keith was also an incredible educator and had numerous graduate students who worked with him. These include Jonathan (Jeb) Beagles, Julia Carboni, Scott Feyereisen, Amy Fish, Jennel Harvey, Kun Huang, Sherrie Human, Kim Isett, Alex Joosse, Judy Keagy, Robin Lemaire, and Juliann Sebastian. I think that Keith left his mark on the profession as much in the students whom he taught as in his writings.

The purpose of this commentary is to reflect on Keith’s contribution to organizational scholarship and the literature on inter-organizational networks. Thinking back over Keith’s career, there were several noteworthy articles, and I think that it is best to divide his work into four parts although the parts overlap. First, there is the Provan who studied organizational behavior and inter-organizational ties from a power perspective. Second, there is the Provan who studied the impact of health and human service network delivery systems on organizations. Third, there is the Provan who studied network structure per se and its effectiveness. Finally, there is the Provan who studied efforts to fight cancer.

Studying Organizational Behavior and IOR from a Power Perspective

My introduction to Keith’s work was Provan, Beyer, and Kruytbosch (1980) in *ASQ*. It had a major impact on my work and I have cited it many times as an outstanding example of how to test resource dependency theory. It was based on his dissertation, and Janice Beyer was his adviser. In short, if social service agencies had linkages with important community elements, they were perceived as more powerful vis-à-vis the United Way and were less dependent upon the UW than the UW was upon them. This was accompanied by two papers on inter-organizational linkages among social service agencies with power between organizational actors as a recurrent theme (e.g., Provan, 1980a; Provan, 1980b; see also Provan, 1989). Provan and Skinner (1989), and Provan and Gassenheimer (1994) were interesting extensions, because they applied resource dependency theory to buyer-supplier relations (focus-

ing on businesses) and they noted the connection between resource dependency theory and transaction cost economics. All of this work focused on the organization or dyad and was not yet at the level of the network, yet we can see the groundwork that he built on later in his career.

Studying the Impact of Health and Human Service Network Delivery Systems on Organizations

The second Keith Provan was transitional. It happened between 1982 and 1988 and overlapped with the power dependence writings. These papers all recognized that organizations were often embedded within inter-organizational networks or ‘systems’ and that these systems often impacted their behavior. Provan (1982) examined the same agencies and United Way as Provan et al. (1980), but this time examined if an “agency’s dependence on United Way for scarce resources as well as its linkages to other resource suppliers is related to United Way influence over agency decision-making (p. 444).” Provan (1984) offered hypotheses on “how the general strategic-level decisions of hospitals may be influenced as a result of consortium affiliation (p. 494).” Provan (1988) examined multihospital system involvement on the decision-making of individual hospitals. But more importantly, Provan (1993) merged his work on buyer-supplier relations with the idea that maybe the network structure as a whole could reduce the opportunistic behavior of individual suppliers. As it turns out, this was a radically new idea.

These first two Provan periods were mostly exploratory. He extended resource dependency theory in modest ways, examined empirically transaction cost analysis, and explored the implications of embeddedness theory. These were the items on the table during the 1980s, and many management scholars were exploring these different frameworks. However, like some of his more perceptive peers he recognized that we were becoming a network society where networks themselves were an alternative governance structure. Powell’s (1990) article was, of course, the breakthrough piece, but in the 1980s Provan was right there looking at federations, hospital systems, and social service funding networks.

Studying Network Structure and Effectiveness

The “big publication,” of course, was Provan and Milward (1995) may have been titled a “*preliminary* theory of interorganizational network effectiveness (*italics added*),” but it certainly laid the groundwork for work on these topics for the next twenty-five years. It has received over 500 citations to date. The most memorable takeaway was that the most effective networks were not the most decentralized or the densest. Rather they were more centralized. Resource munificence, external control, and system stability were also important, but a centralized network

structure is what the literature remembered. It also remembered that the focus shifted from the dyad to the network as a whole, and any other study afterwards had to somehow measure the impact of a network on its stakeholders or its service domain. They set a new standard for network researchers.

The 1995 piece spawned a number of subsequent studies which built on the basic idea that we should be studying networks of organizations and the resources and structure of these networks matter in explaining service delivery effectiveness (see Provan, 1997) and the formation of referral ties (Provan, Sebastian, & Milward, 1996). Milward and Provan (1998a) clearly attempted to align themselves with transaction cost analysis and a ‘political economy’ perspective and used that to interpret their 1995 *ASQ* paper. They were institutionalists but not *neo*-institutionalists! Other papers followed. Milward and Provan (1998b) talked about measuring network structure and Provan and Milward (2001) examined different ways of measuring network effectiveness at different levels—community, network, participant. Still, of course, there were skeptics—as there should be.

What is less recognized is that Provan also made important contributions to neo-institutional theory during this period. There was an interesting paper published in *JPART* in 1991 where Provan and Milward examined organizational involvement in a “service-implementation network” and focused on systemic effects (Provan & Milward, 1991). In particular, they examined institutional-level professional norms and how this could affect participants’ behaviors. To me this paper is important because it was the first time I remember Keith talking about institutional norms and related topics. Also it was the first piece with Brint, and, to feed the conspiracy minded, Woody Powell is thanked for his input at a seminar held at the University of Arizona. Few have identified Keith as a neo-institutionalist, however, his later publication with Sherrie Human was a major statement on the evolution of whole networks and their legitimacy. Human and Provan (2000) studied two regional networks of firms in the U.S. secondary wood-products industry, showed how network legitimacy comes about, and argued that internal legitimacy, not external legitimacy, was more important for small firm networks to weather crises and prosper (see also Human & Provan, 1997; Provan, Lam, & Doyle, 2004).

Given that a network administrative organization played a central role in their cases, Provan and Milward realized they were studying a new governance form and what ‘third party government’ had become. Three articles, “Governing the Hollow State” (Milward & Provan, 2000), “Managing the Hollow State” (Milward & Provan, 2003), and “Do Networks Really Work?” (Provan & Milward 2001) tied what they found in the mental health service networks to the more general phenom-

enon of privatization where both public and private entities would deliver services together but under the watchful eye of a *non-governmental* third party. Also we see in these articles the language of “governing” and “managing” these new governance forms and attention to measuring performance. These new forms were not simply organic and the evolutionary product of individual organizational or dyadic choices. Rather they can (and maybe should) be organized from above, and how they are organized can make a big difference in how well they can further government’s goals and achieve outcomes. However, as Milward and Provan (2000, p. 359) state in their abstract, “The normative question this research has raised, but not answered, is, What effect does government contracting with third-party providers have on the perceived legitimacy of the state?” This question still remains unanswered. However, if the service delivery network becomes too autonomous of government, the hollow state becomes a state of agents and government is out of the picture altogether. This was the conclusion of Milward, Provan, Fish, Isett, and Huang (2010).

At this time Provan was involved in three new, but related streams of research. First, Provan and Milward were studying two very different mental health systems within the state of Arizona—Pima County (Tucson) which was controlled by nonprofits and very egalitarian and Maricopa County (Phoenix) which had an out-of-town for-profit firm as the network administrative organization (NAO) and was more hierarchical. They did four network surveys: 1996, 1999, 2000, and 2004.

A series of papers came out of this line of research that focused on network structure and the position of agencies in this network. Provan, Milward and Isett (2002) examined how managed care affected the network of providers in Pima County (Tucson) between 1996 and 1999-2000. Their findings were interesting. In this nonprofit managed care system, network cooperation and coordination increased over time, while services to severely mentally ill decreased and services to less costly clients increased. Provan, Isett and Milward (2004) and Isett and Provan (2005) examined the same network. The latter focused on the dyadic links among organizations and how they did not become more informal over time as they tend to do in the private sector. However, they did become more multiplex and were remarkably stable. That is, the ties among agencies deepened under a contract system, but they did not become more familiar.

Huang and Provan (2007) presented network statistics on five different types of subnetworks among organizations in a for-profit managed care mental health network in Maricopa County (Phoenix). They found different networks had different structural properties with some apparently governed by a managerial logics (the contract network was highly centralized with the network administrative organization at the center)

and others governed by professional logics (information and reputation networks were decentralized). The lesson was that introducing a contractual system with a Network Administrative Organization (NAO) did not undermine professionalism, but rather it created multiplex networks among partners which created a hybrid form of social organization which combined both managerial and professional logics.

Provan, Huang, and Milward (2009) used data from Huang and Provan (2007) and added comparable network data on Maricopa County collected in 2004. They found that the organizations' network centrality was related to their trustworthiness, reputation for quality, and influence more so in 2004 than 2000. They argued that it took time for these structural effects to work themselves out. Network age then becomes an important scope condition on network centrality effects. Provan and Huang (2012) used the network data in Provan, Huang, and Milward (2009) and extended the research presented in Huang and Provan (2007). They found that as the network of resource flows became more centralized, while the flows of information and reputation remained decentralized, the organizations' perceptions of network effectiveness became more positive. This, they argued, augurs for policy makers to recognize that NAO administered human service networks are multi-dimensional, relations within them follow different logics, and this hybridity has a positive effect on outcomes.

The most important article that came out of the Maricopa-Pima County research was clearly Milward, Provan, Fish, Isett, and Huang (2010). They compared the nonprofit and for-profit administered mental health networks in Pima County (Tucson) and Maricopa County (Phoenix) examining their structure, inter-organizational relationships, and performance when each system was formed and again four years later. Although it is an over-simplification: agencies in Pima County became more densely tied, while information and referral ties among partners in Maricopa County declined in density; the quality of the relationships with the NAO in Pima County were somewhat higher than in Maricopa County although the latter improved with time; and both networks improved their performance over time and there were *insignificant* differences in client outcomes across the networks. This paper was an important statement on the role of the network administrative organization in the functioning of these networks showing that the administrative processes of the nonprofit and for-profit forms were different but the outcomes were similar.

As the articles progressed, they focused more on the formal properties of the network digging deeper into the social structure and trying to interpret what they found. Yet, even in the earliest Tucson papers there was mention of the network administrative organization and its special role in the network. This period is marked by attention to both the formal prop-

erties of the network and network governance, and Provan's work with Patrick Kenis built considerably upon Keith's Arizona research.

Second, Provan undertook a longitudinal whole network study of 15 health and human service agencies in a Southwest border town with colleagues from the University of Arizona, College of Public Health and his graduate students. The focus was on how to build communities' capacity to address their health needs, particularly obesity-related chronic diseases, like diabetes using networks of collaboration. Provan, Nakama, Veazie, Teufel-Shone, and Huddleston (2003) described the network and presented the results of organizations participating in a collaborative network after one year. They showed how the structure of the network and participants' attitudes changed over time for the better. Provan, Veazie, Teufel-Shone, and Huddleston (2004) examined how network analysis can be used as a tool to evaluate how well a broad range of organizations can cooperate to prevent chronic disease. Provan, Harvey, and deZapien (2005) examined correlates of organizations' network centrality. They found a strong relationship with agency reputation, but weak effects for trust and perceived benefit. Provan used this research site to learn more about the structural features of whole networks and the shortcomings of this governance form.

Third, Keith began working with Patrick Kenis who was at Tilburg University at the time. "The External Control of Public Networks" (Kenis & Provan, 2006) outlined the problem of control of (or within) public networks and its possible effects on network performance. They were correct, there was very little interest at that time in addressing the issue of control. Powell (1990) said that networks were attractive because they were "lighter on their feet," "relational," and based on "norms of reciprocity." It was thought that this gave them their competitive advantage. While perhaps it did in some arenas (e.g., bio-tech), in others it seemed that a "ring leader" (if not a tyrant) was needed to keep the cats from straying too far. Yet as collective actors, it seemed entirely reasonable that some mechanisms of coordination were necessary if only the acceptance of a set of rules, although, as they said, control can take on a variety of forms.

However, "Modes of Network Governance" by Provan and Kenis (2008) was the important statement. It has garnered 381 citations to date. Here they formalized the distinction between participant-governed networks, lead organization-governed networks, and network administrative organizations. They then offered a contingency model predicting when different modes or forms would be more effective and how these forms deal with contradictions that are inherent in these networks. Finally, they talked about how governance forms evolve over time. The theory they offered was a masterful blend of

contingency theory, transaction cost analysis, and neo-institutionalism. There have been some efforts to test these ideas as well as the Provan and Milward (1995) theory using a configurational approach (e.g., Raab, Mannak, & Cambre, 2015), but clearly the paper opened up a whole new range of topics for researchers to explore for years to come.

During this phase of his career, Provan also wrote a number of highly influential literature reviews on service delivery networks which gave us important concepts and methods to study these phenomena and manage them. This includes Provan and Lemaire (2012), Kenis and Provan (2009) and Provan, Fish, and Sydow (2007). The latter won the 2011 Five Year Journal of Management Scholarly Impact Award. Provan, Veazie, Staten, and Teufel-Shone (2005) was the winner of the Public Administration Review Brownlow Award for 2005. One cannot downplay the significance of these synthetic works.

Studying Efforts to Fight Cancer

The fourth and final Provan was still a work in progress when he passed away. Just like the rest of his work, its ultimate goal was to improve practice. In this case, to eradicate cancer. It was also heavily empirical. A recurring theme is that researchers and health practitioners need information, and particularly information on best practices, in order for them to accomplish their goals. However, informal social structure sometimes facilitated this and sometimes prevented this from happening. The earliest paper on cancer research and prevention was in 2008. Provan, Clark, and Huerta (2008) was a national study of 67 top tobacco-control researchers. They examined their network ties to one another and found that intra-disciplinary ties were more common than transdisciplinary ties. Their purpose was to provide evidence which would compel policy makers to incentivize more transdisciplinary research. They saw scientists working within disciplinary silos as counter-productive.

Provan, Leischow, Keagy, and Nodora (2010) presented research on the networks among 18 organizations within the Arizona Cancer Coalition. All were involved in discovery, development, and/or delivery of research and built inter-organizational networks around these goals. The authors compared the structures of these three networks and found that organizations that were central in the discovery and development networks were more likely to see cancer research as central to their mission while those which were central in the delivery network did not. Harris, Provan, Johnson, and Leischow (2012) examined the same network of Arizona cancer research organizations and sought to establish a relationship between participants' perception of drawbacks and benefits associated with inter-organizational collaboration and the presence of collative ties between any two

network members. The findings were mixed, but it seemed that organizations that collaborated both thought that geography was not a barrier to collaboration and that collaboration improved knowledge exchange. However, partners were less likely to believe that collaboration resulted in additional funding or the development of new tools. The authors correctly concluded that inter-organizational collaborations do not always result in tangible benefits and proponents of the 'network approach' must recognize and compensate for this.

The final set of papers was on the North American Quitline Consortium. This network had everything: funders, researchers, practitioners, and a network administrative organization scattered across two countries. The agenda was to examine the evolution of network forms and continue his research on network effectiveness, which, of course, extended the agenda set forth in Provan and Kenis (2008). Provan, Beagles, and Leischow (2011) provides a descriptive overview of how this cross-national network of 21 U.S. and Canadian organizations that provide telephone-based counseling for people trying to quit smoking came about, became institutionalized, and governed itself. Altogether there were 63 publicly funded 'quitlines' across states and provinces across North America. The paper highlighted both the internal and environmental factors that shaped its evolution and identified 'best practices' for those interested in setting up comparable networks. Leischow, Provan, Beagles, Bonito, Ruppel, Moor, and Saul (2012) examined the inter-organizational ties among the 63 quitlines focusing on information sharing for best practices. They found that quitlines tended to seek out information from quitlines within their country, more reputable quitlines tended to be more central, and the network administrative organization was more central. Provan, Beagles, Leischow, and Mercken (2013) found that funders of the quitline consortium were more aware of evidence-based best practices used in the network if they were strongly connected to researchers and indirectly connected to the NAO. This was Provan's last paper, and, most appropriately it was published in *JPART*.

As we can see in Table 1, taken from his Vita just before his death, Provan was far from done and had many, many projects underway. In the last phase of his career Provan focused on network diffusion processes. This can be seen in several of the articles that he was working on. He was also continuing his work on measuring network performance. Provan was also studying other types of network organizations, e.g., children and youth health networks, the Dutch water sector. He also had become fascinated with configurational approaches, e.g., qualitative comparative analysis (e.g., Raab, Lemaire & Provan, 2013), and statistical modeling of social networks, e.g., exponential random graph models (ERGMs). He was always ready to learn something new.

Table 1 Keith Provan Papers Under Review and Work in Progress
Provan, Keith G., Lemaire, Robin H., Beagles, Jonathan E., Feyereisen, Scott, and Leischow, Scott J. Network Governance and Trust: A Whole Network Configurational Perspective.
Provan, Keith G., Sydow, Joerg, & Podsakoff, Nathan. Toward a Behavioral Perspective on Inter-Organizational Networks: A Case for Network Citizenship Behavior.
Lemaire, Robin H., Provan, Keith G., and Leischow, Scott J. Getting People to Quit Smoking: The Evolution of Information Sharing Ties in the North American Quitline Consortium.
Provan, Keith G. and Lemaire, Robin H. Knowledge Sharing and Relationship Intensity in Community Source Software Development: The Case of Kualu.
Provan, Keith G. and Lemaire, Robin H. Structural Embeddedness and Interaction Intensity in a Community-Based Software Development Project.
Knoben, Joris, Provan, Keith G., Oerlemans, Leon A.G., and Krijkamp, A.R. What do They Know? Information Accuracy Differentials in Interorganizational Networks.
Lemaire, Robin H. and Provan, Keith G. Network Governance, Structure, and Performance in a Publicly Funded Child and Youth Health Network.
Raab, Joerg, Neijland, Roy, Provan, Keith G., and Vugts, Miel. Network Governance in the Dutch Water Sector: Testing Propositions from Provan and Kenis 2008.
van Raaj, Denise P.A.M., Patrick Kenis, and Keith G. Provan. How Do Networks Assess Their Performance?

Conclusion

Having reviewed a great deal, but certainly not all, of Keith Provan's written work, what can we say about his long term contribution to the fields of management, public and health care administration, and social network analysis? More than anyone else, Provan's research highlighted the unique features, problems, and advantages of the network form of organization. Powell (1990), and earlier Granovetter (1985), may have made us aware of this third type of governance form, but Provan did much, much more showing how this unique governance form is actually governed and with what effects. He developed methodologies for measuring these networks, he utilized state-of-the-art network analytics, he delved into the context in which these networks were constructed, he analyzed the impact of these contexts on the networks themselves, he looked at outcomes and measured performance at various levels, and he was always aware that his research had implications for public managers and policy makers.

While often claimed by public administration scholars as one of their own, Provan was very much a part of the public health community. Especially over the last 25 years of his career he was a major player in the field of public health administration. There is, of course, his work with Milward on community mental health networks, his research on a Southwest border community's efforts to address chronic disease, and his work with Kenis which clearly had practical implications for public health. His contribution to health care administration continued in his research on cancer prevention networks. The

latter spoke to finding cures for cancer using a network approach, and it talked about the organization of a public health initiative to help people quit smoking. It seemed that Provan's passion was not in developing abstract theories of new organizational forms or new network methodologies that could be applied across sectors and across time and space. Rather Keith was interested in making society healthier for all of us.

In conclusion, Keith Provan was truly an exceptional social scientist who devoted his entire career to studying some of the most important issues in the field of public administration, policy and public health. He used the latest network methodology and organizational theory to answer his research questions, and, because of this, sometimes discovered that things were not as simple as theory alone would lead one to believe. When he made these discoveries he changed his mind and went in another direction. It was remarkable. He made very strong statements on how government, nonprofits, and for-profits could work together collaboratively to serve better the public. Yet he never was an advocate for a particular theory or point of view. He respected the data and knew that another study may nullify his initial conclusions. Perhaps it was his search for something better, a cure, which kept him skeptical and restless. Scholars of public and nonprofit organizations as well as health care practitioners owe him a great deal. His life and work made him a role model for all of us.

*To see notes and references, please visit www.pmrnet.org where we have posted this tribute in its entirety.

Comings & Goings

Publications

Ethan Kapstein, Arizona Centennial Professor of International Affairs, Arizona State University, has a forthcoming book, *The Seeds of Stability: Land and Developing World Conflict in US Foreign Policy*, to be published by Cambridge University Press.

Gary Miller of Washington University in St. Louis and **Andy Whitford** of the University of Georgia announce the publication of their book *Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment in the Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions* series of Cambridge University Press. Full information about the book can be found at: <http://www.cambridge.org/us/academic/subjects/politics-international-relations/political-theory/above-politics-bureaucratic-discretion-and-credible-commitment>. Those interested in this title can obtain a 20% discount from Cambridge by using the code WHITFORD16 at checkout.

David Swindell, Associate Professor, Arizona State University, has a forthcoming book, *World Class Cities: Recruiting and Hosting Political Conventions*, to be published by SUNY Press (with **Erick Helberlig** and **Suzanne Leland**).

Scholarly Awards & Achievements

Whitney Afonso, Assistant Professor at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, was awarded the 2015 Jesse Burkhead Award for her article “Leviathan or Flypaper: Examining the Fungibility of Earmarked Local Sales Taxes for Transportation.” The Burkhead Award recognizes the best article published in *Public Budgeting & Finance* each year.

Emma Aguila, Assistant Professor, received the USC Sol Price School of Public Policy’s academic year 2016 Faculty High Impact Research award, for research that spurred reforms to improve the financial security of millions of retirees in Mexico.

Dr. **Jade Berry-James** (North Carolina State University) is the recipient of the 2016 Public Service Award of the National Conference of Minority Public Administrators.

Nicole Darnall, Professor, Arizona State University, won the 2016 Academy of Management, Public and Nonprofit Division’s Best Journal Article Award for her paper with **Yoonsung Kim**, “Business As A Collaborative Partner: Understanding Firms’ Socio-Political Support for Policy Formation,” published in *Public Administration Review* in 2015.

Nicole Darnall, Stuart Bretschneider, Lily Hsueh, and Justin Stritch (all of Arizona State University) received a \$200,000 grant from the V. Kann Rasmussen Foundation to assess sustainable public procurement in state and local governments.

Stephen Holt, Ph.D. Candidate in Public Administration at American University, received a NASPAA Emerging Scholar Award.

Bruce Jones received his Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Dallas in December of 2015 and was the recipient of the 2016 Leonard D. White Award for the best dissertation successfully defended during the previous two years in the field of public administration for his dissertation “An FMRI Study of the Reward Preferences of Government and Business Leaders.”

Yoonsung Kim (George Mason University) and **Nicole Darnall** (Arizona State University) won the Best Journal Article Award from the Academy of Management, Public and Nonprofit Division, 2016, for their paper: Business as a collaborative partner: understanding firms’ socio-political support for policy formation. *Public Administration Review*, 76(2), 326-337.

Asmus Leth Olsen has been awarded the 2016 Herbert Kaufman Best Paper Award by the American Political Science Association. He received the award for his paper “Negative Performance Information Causes Asymmetrical Evaluations and Elicits Strong Responsibility Attributions.”

William Resh, Assistant Professor at USC Price, is a co-recipient of the 2015 American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) William C. Mosher Award for best paper published in *Public Administration Review*.

Lisa Schweitzer, Associate Professor at USC Price, received the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning 2016 Margarita McCoy Award for advancing women in planning at institutions of higher education.

New Positions & Promotions

Khalidoun AbouAssi, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Administration and Policy at American University, was elected to the Board of Directors of ARNOVA for a three-year term and will chair the Board's Diversity Committee.

Amanda J. Abraham (Ph.D., Louisiana State University, 2006) joins the Department of Public Administration and Policy in the University of Georgia's School of Public and International Affairs. Her work focuses on the adoption, diffusion and implementation of evidence-based practices for substance use disorder treatment, organizational change, workforce development, and the impact of federal and state policy on the organization, accessibility and quality of SUD treatment services. Dr. Abraham's work has been published in top addiction and health services journals, including *Health Affairs*, *Health Services Research*, *Psychiatric Services*, *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, and *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*.

Jason Anastasopoulos (Ph.D., University of California-Berkeley, 2013), joins the School of Public and International Affairs faculty at the University of Georgia as a joint hire in the Departments of Public Administration and Policy and Political Science. Formerly a data science fellow at UC Berkeley's School of Information, and a Democracy Fellow at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Dr. Anastasopoulos' research interests include the application of machine learning methods for text and image classification to the study of political behavior, political violence and race, ethnicity and migration in the United States.

The Department of Public Administration and International Affairs at the Maxwell School has appointed Professor **Robert Bifulco** as Chair and Associate Dean of the Department, and Professor **Catherine Bertini** as Vice Chair with responsibilities for the graduate International Affairs Program.

Ben Brunjes (Ph.D., University of Georgia, 2016), has joined the faculty at the University of Washington's Evans School of Public Policy and Governance as an assistant professor. Dr. Brunjes is a public management specialist who will teach courses related to cross-sector governance and the management of public organizations, government grants, and contracts.

The Center for California Studies, at the California State University, Sacramento selected **Richard Callahan** (Professor, University of San Francisco) as its 2016-17 Visiting Scholar. Professor Callahan will be conducting research on strategies for innovation in public health leadership.

Benjamin Y. Clark (Ph.D., University of Georgia), has accepted a position on the faculty of the Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon. Dr. Clark was most recently the Executive Director of the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center and as a faculty of the Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University. Dr. Clark starts his position with Oregon in the Fall of 2016.

Elizabeth Currid-Halkett, Professor, was appointed the James Irvine Chair in Urban and Regional Planning at the USC Sol Price School of Public Policy.

Katharine Destler, Ph.D., joined the Political Science department at Western Washington University as an Assistant Professor in Fall 2016. She was recently awarded a Postdoctoral Research Fellowship from the National Academy of Education and Spencer Foundation to study how school choice and educational markets affect the racial and economic distribution of students across schools.

Jennifer Dodge, Assistant Professor of Public Administration & Policy in the Department of Public Administration & Policy at Rockefeller College, University at Albany (SUNY) will serve as the Co-Editor of the global *Critical Policy Studies* journal starting in January 2017.

Dr. **Christopher Galik** was hired in August of 2016 by the Department of Public Administration at North Carolina State University. Dr. Galik obtained a Ph.D. in forestry and environmental resources from North Carolina State University. Galik returns to NC State via Duke University's Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, where he worked for the last decade on a variety of environmental and energy policy research and outreach initiatives. He has published multiple peer-reviewed articles in journals such as *Applied Energy*, *Energy Policy*, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *GCB Bioenergy*, and others.

Mila Gascó, Ph.D., has joined the Center for Technology in Government (CTG) at the University at Albany as Associate Research Director. In addition to guiding CTG's research initiatives, Mila will also serve as an Associate Research Professor at Albany's Rockefeller College of Public Affairs & Policy.

Paul Ginsburg, USC Price Professor of the Practice of Health Policy and Management and Norman Topping Chair in Medicine and Public Policy, was appointed to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, which advises the U.S. Congress.

Dana Goldman, Professor, Leonard D. Schaeffer Chair, and Director of the Schaeffer Center for Health Policy and Economics at USC Price has been named a USC Distinguished Professor; only one of 25 at USC.

Richard Green, Professor; Director of the USC Lusk Center for Real Estate at USC Price, has been elected a global trustee to the Urban Land Institute, the only academic among the institute's 48 new trustees.

Carolyn J. Heinrich accepted a position with Vanderbilt University in August of 2015. Dr. Heinrich is a Professor of Public Policy, Education and Economics, with appointments in the Peabody College, Department of Leadership, Policy and Organization, and in the College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Economics. She also co-directs the International Education Policy and Management Program in the Peabody College and currently holds a Research Professor appointment with the University of Texas at Austin, where she continues to direct research projects.

The Department of Public Administration and Policy in the School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Georgia is pleased to announce the appointment of **J. Edward Kellough** as the Director of the MPA and Ph.D. programs.

Ken Meier, Ph.D., will be joining American University School of Public Affairs as Distinguished Scholar in Residence in January 2016.

Dr. **Ines Mergel**, most recently a faculty member with the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, was appointed Full Professor of public administration at the University of Konstanz (Germany), Department of Politics and Public Administration in August of 2016.

Professor **Don Moynihan** has been appointed the Director of the La Follette School of Public Affairs. Dr. Moynihan was previously the Associate Director of the School.

Rebecca Nesbit (Ph.D., University of Indiana, 2008), has been granted tenure and promoted to Associate Professor in the Department of Public Administration and Policy at the University of Georgia. Dr. Nesbit's research focuses on non-profit management, volunteerism and philanthropy.

Asmus Leth Olsen has been promoted to Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen, Denmark. His research involves behavioral and ex-

perimental public administration with a focus on how citizens are affected by performance information.

David Rosenbloom, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor for American University School of Public Affairs, will be joining Renmin University in China as a Thousand Talents Program professor from 2016 through 2019.

Dr. **Ellen Rubin** was tenured and promoted to Associate Professor at the University at Albany, State University of New York (SUNY). She is also the new Director of the Ph.D. program in Public Administration and Policy.

Rhucha Samudra (Ph.D., American University), began her appointment as an Assistant Professor at SUNY-College of Brockport.

David M. Van Slyke was appointed Dean of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.

Neeraj Sood, Professor; Vice Dean for Research at USC Price; Director of Research, Schaeffer Center for Health Policy and Economics, has been elected to the board of the American Society of Health Economists.

Professor **Susan Webb Yackee**, the former Director of the La Follette School, has been appointed as the school's first Director of its Board of Visitors.

Arizona State University School of Public Affairs wishes to announce the following new faculty and promotions:

Elisa Bienenstock, has been appointed College Research Professor. She has a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of California. Her research is in applied mathematical and computational social science, game theory, social network analysis, statistics, and agent-based modeling.

Ulrich Thy Jensen, has been appointed Assistant Professor. He completed his Ph.D. at Aarhus University, Denmark, and his research is concerned with the impact of leadership and management on the attitudes and behaviors of public service providers.

Joanna Lucio, was promoted to Associate Professor with tenure. Her research is in urban governance and policy, affordable housing, and neighborhood segregation, focusing on implications for citizenship and for public administration.

Andrew Waxman, has been appointed Assistant Professor. He completed his Ph.D. at Cornell University and his current research is in urban transportation, environmental economics, and public policy.

New York University's Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service welcomes three new junior faculty members:

Tatiana Homonoff, Assistant Professor; **Patricia Satterstrom**, Assistant Professor; **Cassandra Thiel**, Assistant Professor, NYU Wagner; Assistant Professor, NYU Langone School of Medicine.

The Department of Public Administration at North Carolina State University wishes to congratulate the following 2016 Ph.D. recipients:

Dr. **Candice Bodkin** (Assistant Professor, Georgia Southern University); Dr. **Clare Fitzgerald** (senior research associate, SAS); Dr. **Casey Fleming** (Visiting Professor, University of North Georgia); Dr. **Sherrie Godette**, (Evaluation Consultant for Wake County, North Carolina); Dr. **Sittichai Tanthasith** (Human Resource Officer, Bureau of Manpower and Position Audit Office of the Civil Service Commission, Royal Thai Government); Dr. **Melissa Thibault**, (Vice Chancellor for Distance Education, North Carolina School of Science and Math); Dr. **Anne-lise Knox Velez**, (Post-Doctoral Scholar, School of Public and International Affairs, North Carolina State University); Dr. **Zheng Yang**, (Assistant Professor, California State University – Dominguez Hills); and announce that Dr. **Bruce McDonald** was appointed incoming Director of the MPA Program and Dr. **Branda Nowell** was promoted to Full Professor and appointed incoming Director of the Ph.D. Program.

The School of Public Affairs & Civic Engagement at San Francisco State University is pleased to welcome three tenure-track assistant professors and to announce two promotions among its faculty:

César Rodríguez (Ph.D. in Sociology, University of California at Santa Barbara, 2014) joins the faculty as Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice Studies. His work focuses on race, class & hegemony. In particular, he examines two prominent racial regimes in the US—the prison and the border—as well as whiteness as a form of authoritarian populism.

Autumn Thoyre (Ph.D. in Geography, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2014) joins the faculty as Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies. Her research into the politics of sustainable energy transitions focuses on energy efficiency and conservation, the “low-hanging fruit” of climate change mitigation.

Dilara Yarbrough (Ph.D. in Sociology, University of California at San Diego, 2016) joins the faculty as Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice Studies. Her research focuses on gender, race and criminalized work in the production of marginality. She examines the ways in which the experiences of sex workers, transgender people, and people experiencing homelessness illuminate the workings of systems that manage poverty.

M. Ernita Joaquin was promoted to Associate Professor. Dr. Joaquin studies the dynamics of public management reforms and their implications for institutional capacity, administration theory, and civic engagement. She has recently collaborated on projects looking at nontraditional MPA course designs.

Janey Qian Wang was granted tenure and promoted to Associate Professor. Dr. Wang's research focuses on tax and expenditure incidence, debt administration, infrastructure finance in China, and revenue diversification in housing nonprofits.

Job Announcements

San Francisco State University, Assistant Professor in School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement, Gerontology Program

San Francisco State University, School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE) invites applicants for a tenure-track Assistant Professor position in Gerontology beginning August 2017. The school seeks individuals with a background in Gerontology with a specialty area in healthy aging and/or long-term care.

PACE is an interdisciplinary school of scholars formed in 2012 that offers degree programs in criminal justice studies, environmental studies, gerontology, public administration, and urban studies and planning. Candidates would primarily be responsible for expanding the School's curricular offerings in Gerontology; candidates who can also contribute more broadly to the School's mission are strongly desired. More information can be found at <http://pace.sfsu.edu/>

Qualifications:

- Candidates should have a Ph.D. or equivalent degree in health or human services-related field with specialization in Gerontology.
- Candidates should have a strong background in the study of Gerontology with content specialization in applied and interdisciplinary research, policy and practice.
- Candidates must demonstrate the ability to teach courses in the areas of their specialization, as well as core courses in the Gerontology M.A. curriculum related to aging processes, research methods and social policy. Ability to teach on the intersections between Gerontology and other PACE programs is preferred.
- Candidates must have an active record of scholarship related to their specialty area and evidence of external support or the potential for external funding of these activities. Excellence in teaching and scholarship must be demonstrated as well as potential for securing external funding.
- Candidates are preferred who have teaching and/or research experience with a large, diverse study body. Candidates are preferred who have experience in multicultural settings.
- Candidates who embrace the mission and values of the School are particularly encouraged to apply. Building on an ethos of social justice and sustainability, PACE faculty prepare graduates with critical and analytical skills necessary to understand and address the issues and challenges of the twenty-first century. Social justice also comprises a core value of the university, and the setting of San Francisco provides ample opportunities for civic and community engagement within a richly diverse urban setting. Candidates who can help expand the School's offerings in Gerontology, while also demonstrating a commitment to School, College and University core missions and values are desired. Preferred candidates are those who have an ability to work cooperatively, are committed to participating in interdisciplinary curriculum design and development, and provide evidence of interpersonal skills and collegiality.

Responsibilities: The position requires graduate teaching in Gerontology, mentoring and advising graduate students, developing an active ongoing scholarship program in ones area of specialty, and ongoing committee and service assignments. Detailed position description is available at pace.sfsu.edu.

Rank and salary: Assistant Professor. Salary commensurate with qualifications and experience. The CSU provides generous health, retirement and other benefits.

Application process:

- Submit letter of intent/interest, a current CV, a sample of scholarly papers, a statement of teaching philosophy and research interests, and names and contact information of three references. Letters of recommendation upon request at a later date.
- Submit all materials online to pace@sfsu.edu by October 17, 2016. Review of applications will continue until the position is filled.
- San Francisco State University is a member of the California State University system and serves a diverse student body of 30,000 undergraduate and graduate students. The University seeks to promote appreciation of scholarship, freedom

and, human diversity through excellence in instruction and intellectual accomplishment. SFSU faculty are expected to be effective teachers and demonstrate professional achievement and growth through research, scholarship, and/or creative work.

- San Francisco State University is an Equal Opportunity Employer with a strong commitment to diversity. We welcome applicants of all ethnic, racial and gender identities, sexual orientations as well as people with disabilities. We particularly encourage those who may be from historically underrepresented groups.

A background check (including a criminal records check) must be completed satisfactorily before any candidate can be offered a position with the CSU. Failure to satisfactorily complete the background check may affect the application status of applicants or continued employment of current CSU employees who apply for the position.

School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

The Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) is a multi-disciplinary professional school of Indiana University, committed to excellence in research, teaching, and civic engagement. The Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses make up one core school. Among public affairs programs, SPEA programs are ranked highly by U.S. News and World Report. SPEA IUPUI has 650 undergraduates in public affairs and criminal justice majors as well as 350 graduate students in the NASPAA-accredited MPA, Masters in Criminal Justice, and graduate certificate programs. IUPUI is a research-intensive institution, with about \$300 million annually in external grants and contracts. With over 30,000 students, IUPUI is the third-largest campus in the state, and the IUPUI campus is located in downtown Indianapolis within walking distance of the Capitol, museums and professional sports venues

All applicants for tenure-track positions must present evidence of high quality research and an ambitious research program. For candidates seeking a tenured position, an outstanding research record and scholarly reputation are required. Applicants should have a Ph.D. or expect a Ph.D. completion by August 2017 in an appropriate field (e.g, public affairs, public administration, management, arts administration, political science, sociology).

Teaching responsibilities include courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The standard teaching load within the school is four courses per year, typically with small class sizes.

Applications will be reviewed beginning October 17, 2016 and will be accepted until the positions are filled. SPEA and Indiana University are committed to diversity, and we seek candidates with a demonstrated sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disabled and ethnic backgrounds of the institution's students and employees. Please submit a letter of application, current CV, complete contact information, a writing sample, and three letters of reference (applicants with tenure elsewhere need only provide the names of three references) to:

Dr. Lilliard Richardson Executive Associate Dean c/o Ranna Johnson rannjohn@iupui.edu.

For more information see: <http://spea.iupui.edu/facultyandstaff/faculty-openings/index.php>.

Public Affairs Faculty Positions

SPEA at the Indianapolis campus seeks to fill one or more open-rank (assistant, associate, or full professor) faculty positions beginning in August 2017. The fields are open, but we have program priorities in research and teaching in public finance and other public affairs domains such as education policy, emergency management, environmental policy, policy analysis, and urban management and policy.

Nonprofit Management Faculty Position

The Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) at the Indianapolis campus seeks to fill an open-rank (assistant, associate, or full professor) faculty position in Nonprofit Management beginning in August 2017. The specialty fields are open, and we especially encourage senior candidates to apply.

University of Arizona, Assistant Professor

Deadline 10/31/16

Start Date: Fall 2017

The School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona invites applications for a tenure track position at the assistant or associate professor level in public management and/or policy analysis beginning in fall 2017. The successful candidate will have a PhD in public administration, political science, economics or a related field with demonstrated skills in quantitative analysis. The School is particularly interested in candidates with expertise in organizational research, but will also consider candidates with backgrounds in applied economics and policy analysis. All policy fields will be considered however a focus on race, crime or criminal justice is of interest. Candidates will contribute to teaching in the School's undergraduate and masters programs (MPP and MPA). In addition, the candidate will be expected to have a strong and active research program that will support the mentoring of PhD students, contribute to teaching PhD seminars, and is reflected in an excellent publication record. Under-represented minority candidates are strongly encouraged to apply.

The School of Government and Public Policy is housed within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and is home to an interdisciplinary faculty and a variety of degree programs including the MPP and the NASPAA accredited MPA program, as well as a PhD program. Additional information on the School of Government and Public may be found at <http://sgpp.arizona.edu/>. At the University of Arizona, we value our inclusive climate because we know that diversity in experiences and perspectives is vital to advancing innovation, critical thinking, solving complex problems, and creating an inclusive academic community. We translate these values into action by seeking individuals who have experience and expertise working with diverse students, colleagues and constituencies. Because we seek a workforce with a wide range perspectives and experiences, we encourage diverse candidates to apply, including people of color, women, veterans, and individuals with disabilities. As an Employer of National Service, we also welcome alumni of AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, and other national service programs and others who will help us advance our Inclusive Excellence initiative aimed at creating a university that values student, staff, and faculty engagement in addressing issues of diversity and inclusiveness.

A formal application may be made at <http://www.hr.arizona.edu> (job posting number F20660).

Vanderbilt University; Peabody College; Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organization

Faculty Position: Senior Lecturer in Organizational Leadership and Program Coordinator of Leadership and Organizational Performance

The Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations (LPO) of Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, seeks a faculty member in the area of Leadership and Organizational Studies. This appointment is for a non-tenure track position as Senior Lecturer.

The Senior Lecturer should have a strong background in the areas of organizational studies, and/or organizational performance. The role for this senior lecturer position is primarily instructional; therefore, evidence of success in teaching undergraduate and masters-level students is critical. This position will be responsible for teaching in the Leadership and Organizational Performance (LOP) program master's degree program and in the Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness (LOE) track of the Human and Organizational Development (HOD) major. **The individual will be well versed in organizational behavior and the use of data to drive organizational effectiveness.**

This position includes directing the LOP master's program. A number of administrative functions are associated with the coordination of the LOP professional program including curriculum development, admissions, prospective student outreach, program oversight, and internship development. This role requires someone who is very organized, diplomatic, decisive, and sees service to students and faculty as an essential part of the faculty position.

Candidates for Senior Lecturer must have an earned doctorate in a field of relevance to the study of leadership and organizational performance as well as instructional and professional experience relevant to their areas of instruction. For additional information about the position, please contact Mark Cannon, Chair of the search committee, at mark.d.cannon@vanderbilt.edu.

The Department

The mission of the Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations (LPO) is to understand and enhance the political, economic, organizational, and social contexts in which human learning takes place. The department offers five professional degree programs at the master's level and supports the undergraduate tracks in the Human and Organization Development major. For information about the Department of Leadership, Policy and Organizations, visit the Web site at:

<http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/departments/lpo/index.php>.

Applications

Review of applications will begin January 15, 2017 and will continue until the position is filled. Applicants should submit a cover letter addressing their qualifications; curriculum vitae; a one-page teaching statement; evidence of effective classroom instruction, including teaching evaluations and two sample syllabi; and the names and contact information of three references. Previous higher education experience in program management, curriculum development, admissions, or internship supervision is preferred. Please send all application materials to: Ms. Tammy Eidson at tammy.eidson@vanderbilt.edu or 414 GPC, 230 Appleton Place, Nashville, TN 37203. Electronic submissions are preferred. Indicate in your cover letter the position for which you are applying.

LPO is building a diverse faculty committed to a multicultural environment. Vanderbilt University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. We strongly encourage applications from all qualified candidates, without regard to race/color, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, disability, age or protected veteran status.

Odds & Ends

Call for Papers

Race and Public Administration

Issues of race, race-relations, and representation have become increasingly present in the United States and several countries around the world. There is a need to understand issues of race from a theoretical perspective that can inform practitioners tasked with policy and management issues related to race and equity.

We are seeking proposals on current research on race and the status of race in public administration across multiple substantive policy areas such as health, education, law enforcement, and welfare. Potential papers might address race and public administration in a substantive policy area (e.g., health, education, law enforcement), how public administrators deal with racial disparities, of how racial disparities are (or are not) changing for the recipients of public goods and services. Papers will be presented at a conference on May 19-20, 2017 at Texas A&M University. Papers may be developed into chapters for an edited volume on the status of race in public administration that can be used for MPA or similar courses. Papers, on average, will summarize the state of research on race in a specific policy area and will then discuss current research, ongoing research, and unanswered questions in these areas.

A one to two page proposal should be submitted by December 1 to Kenneth J. Meier (kenneth-j-meier@tamu.edu) and Amanda Rutherford (arutherford@indiana.edu). Individuals selected to participate will have all conference expenses covered and may receive a modest honorarium.

Other News

Introducing EBPA_L: The Mailing List of the Experimental and Behavioral Public Administration Network

https://email.rutgers.edu/mailman/listinfo/ebpa_l

The Experimental and Behavioral Public Administration Network aims to keep researchers and practitioners informed about new research, publications, and events in this emerging area of study. In addition, the Network is interdisciplinary, involving scholars from psychology, economics, management, law, political science, as well as public administration who share an interest in the application of experimental methods and behavioral insights to the study of public administration.

The Network's mailing list is managed by the Center for Experimental and Behavioral Public Administration (CEBPA) at Rutgers University-Newark, School of Public Affairs and Administration.

Network members receive messages and can also post messages to the mailing list.

You can subscribe to EBPA_L at: https://email.rutgers.edu/mailman/listinfo/ebpa_l.

To post a message to EBPA_L, send email to: ebpa_l@email.rutgers.edu.

We invite you to join and look forward to your participation.

Sebastian Jilke & Gregg Van Ryzin, Co-Directors
Center for Experimental and Behavioral Public Administration
School of Public Affairs and Administration
Rutgers University | Newark

Management Matters

THE PMRA NEWSLETTER

PMRA Secretariat
University of Kansas
School of Public Affairs & Administration
4060 Wescoe Hall
1445 Jayhawk Blvd.
Lawrence, KS 66045
jpart@ku.edu