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CARP proposal

CALIFORNIA AGENCY RECONNAISSANCE PROJECT:
TEACHING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION THROUGH FIELD RESEARCH

Undergraduate courses in public administration predominately depend on classroom work emphasizing information which can be gained through lectures, class discussion and academic texts. This approach - chosen as much for logistical and instructors' energy limitations as a prime preference - works moderately well when students have significant experience in moderate to large scale organizations. They at least have their own subjective bases for relating social behavior to abstract concepts. Often, however, such experience does not accompany students to the classroom. At the same time, the heterogeneity of public organizations grows more rapidly than our academic research efforts to chart their structure and dynamics. We and our students confront growing relative ignorance.

In an effort to address both of these conditions, we have been working on a program of student conducted organizational reconnaissance as an integrated complement to the usual classroom activities. This program - the California Agency Reconnaissance Project - emphasizes hands-on projects, carried out at a pace that allows for the preliminary results to be shared in class. It is based on individual and small team field research to provide students with their own organizational experiences and allow them to apply these experiences to theoretical concepts in course readings and lectures. It also examines public organizational settings and phenomena that have drawn surprisingly little attention in the past. The product of this mixed teaching strategy is a class filled with students who have become relative "experts" on "their" state administrative agencies, who share that expertise rather enthusiastically with other students, and who discuss textbook theories from the vantage point of the agency which they have examined. Dynamics of classroom discussion and debate markedly change through the term as the range of "expertise" grows and student confidence increases.

The California Agency Reconnaissance Project (CARP) was initiated in 1984 to complement the teaching of upper division undergraduate courses in public administration and administrative behavior. The project's purpose is to provide students with an on-site sense of how administrative processes work, as well as to involve students in original research. While it is a class/team process, each student has independent jurisdiction over a part. Early in the term, each student is assigned a department in the state executive branch. Course reading and discussions are integrated with project planning and information gathering. (See the course syllabus, Appendix A.) The course instructor and the
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CARP field supervisor carry on periodic sampling of how students are progressing through individual and small group sessions. By the end of the project, students will have considerable information about and exposure to their department. They will know what budgetary patterns have affected departmental operations. They will learn about their department's reorganizations and turf battles. They will begin to understand some of the processes whereby decisions are made in their department and some of the considerations which affect those decisions.

As it affects the student, CARP is divided into two phases—the bibliographic research phase and the interview phase. Two more phases must be added to the process for those who administer the project: set-up and report review/editing. This paper reviews the history of CARP, its research phases, its contribution as a learning tool to the teaching of public administration, the "products" to emerge thus far, and student evaluations of the course. These evaluations were gathered in a survey conducted as much as three years after students had completed the course.

Overview

California state agencies administer an annual operating budget of over $36 billion and are responsible for a jurisdiction with a GNP which is larger than most independent nations. Surprisingly, there exists very little systematic information about these agencies and how they have accomplished their tasks, especially in this recent period of extraordinary budgetary and intergovernmental turbulence.

The CARP project has been designed to give students a better sense of the drama of organizational life. Most undergraduates have only modest organizational experience. This results in a sense of distance and abstraction regarding descriptive and analytical course materials. One vehicle to close this gap is to venture into an ongoing organization with pertinent questions about its recent past and current activities. Field research is almost always useful, but agency personnel's time is valuable. If access can be gained, time with agency people should be well spent. In the California case, this would also be genuinely original research in a nearly unknown area, thus there is a need for research rigor. Could an upper division class of some 25 undergraduates do this kind of research, and do it well enough to be a contribution to the academic community? We think this is clearly possible with considerable benefit to both students and classroom dynamics.

---

2 In 1987, post-course interviews were conducted with administrators, students, and teaching assistants who had participated in the process.
The CARP process has been repeated three times - spring and fall, 1984, spring, 1987. A fourth iteration, spring 1990, complements an administrative behavior course. Each semester has improved our understanding of the operation of the some 50 state agencies studied thus far. Students report the project to be an "exciting," "surprising," and "challenging" approach to the study of public administration. The instructor and the two graduate field supervisors have found the experience to be extraordinarily interesting, challenging, and fruitful as complements to traditional classroom materials and activities.

Set-Up

In laying the groundwork for the project, State agencies are assayed, rudimentary statistics gathered and priorities for initial selections are fixed. Agencies are selected for study because of their size (budget and personnel), recent turbulence in their policy arena, and because of their general policy importance.

The target state agencies are invited to cooperate with the project. (See Appendix B for this list.) A "tree of contacts" system is used. The course instructor writes letters to the directors of the participant departments alerting them to the project and requesting the department's cooperation. The project coordinator or teaching assistant follows-up with a phone call a week later to identify four or five staff members who would be available for interviews. With rare exception, the agencies have been most welcoming. In many cases, it was as if they had been waiting to see someone from the university. Logistical preparations for two trips to the state Capitol in Sacramento are undertaken. Mini-vans are reserved, maps assembled, meeting places in the Capitol are identified, and other technical matters arranged.

Classroom Preparation/Bibliographic Research

The classroom preparation and library research phase begins the first week of class. Students are given an orientation to the project and a list of candidate agencies which includes their last year's personnel and budget totals. Students are asked to indicate which agencies they might find interesting. A week later, they are assigned to an agency matched as nearly as possible to their preferences. (Larger agencies draw two-person teams.)

During Part I of the CARP process, students gather bibliographic information about their agency's evolution over the past fifteen years. In the main, the only systematic data about these agencies are available in the annual state budget. The objective is to seek out significant changes in agency mission,
organization, program goals, budget, work force and outputs. To facilitate this search process, a special workshop is arranged with the librarians of the Institute of Governmental Studies. They explain an assortment of state government reference sources and give an introduction to interpreting the voluminous state budget documents. Students then integrate budgetary and other organizational information into a preliminary (mid-term) report following a common format. (See Appendix B for an example.)

The student uses the bibliographic research to develop a preliminary summary of the department. A key element of this summary is an emphasis on the major changes which occurred in the agency during the past 15 years. In a sense, these changes can be seen as significant "independent variables" in the agency's evolution. The origins of these changes and the agency's coping responses to them become an important source of questions for the next research phase: interviewing agency personnel.

As students prepare the preliminary report, classroom sessions in the familiar lecture/discussion format provide a counterpoint of planning, preparing and executing the CARP program. Class readings, lectures and discussion sections describe recent history of public organizations, national trends in intergovernmental relations and the theories about large scale public organizations. This assists students in deriving hypotheses about the ways their organizations may have coped with the changes that are documented in the record. Students refine these perspectives and hypotheses in consultation with the field supervisor and instructor. These hypotheses provide a major emphasis for students' interviews with senior agency officials.

Field Interviewing

With departmental changes and organization study based "hypotheses" in hand, students prepare questions for interviews with agency officials. What caused these changes in the agency's budget, its mission statement or program specifications? How did these changes affect relationships within the agency? Between the agency and external actors? And, most importantly, how did the agency manage to cope with the results of changes in order to maintain agency effectiveness? (The general interview outline is displayed in Appendix C.)

In preparation for the field interviewing, senior agency officials have been contacted about the study and their advice sought about who would be good people to talk with about the agency's recent evolution. Students are now placed in contact with the persons each agency has designated for that purpose. For logistical reasons, the class travels to the capital in two groups.
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on separate days to conduct interviews. Students work out their own schedules with the agencies. Generally from 3 to 5 interviews with top agency officials are arranged. Follow-up interviews are sometimes carried out if particularly interesting situations are discovered. Agency participants generally include the director/executive officer, assistant directors, budget officers and planning or administrative officials. Interview schedules are reviewed with each student, and prior to the field trip, students participate in a workshop on elite interviewing (led in the past by Harriet Nathan, author of *Critical Choices in Interview*, 1986)

Arriving in the capitol by UC van (driven by the instructor and the field supervisor) at the beginning of the working day, students are dropped off at their agencies to take up a grueling day of interviewing. Students are on their own—an experience they report as exhilarating, terrifying, and surprisingly informative. Officials usually take up the exercise with a will and become good teachers. Invariably students check-in with us at "CARP base camp," the renovated coffee shop in the basement of the old capital building. They eagerly swap stories about the people they have interviewed or about an "inside scoop" which they found. They often come loaded down with agency reports, financial statements and even videotapes!

By now students have a reasonably good idea of agency functions and recent changes. They often discover that budget and other written documentation give a distorted view of what has really occurred. Now they know! They have in this time become the class' single expert on this agency. It is their agency. By two-thirds through the term, the dynamics of class discussions change dramatically. The class now is a group of mini-experts teaching each other and the instructors about what happens in "their agency".

A systematic class feedback session is held shortly after the capitol trip. Working with categories derived from the theoretical literature, a first attempt to organize the differences students are reporting about their agencies is made. For example, which agencies have turned to cutbacks in service to cope with reduced resources? Which ones have taken to expanding the range of fees for service; or mounting a campaign among politically effective clientele? What accounts for these differences? Is there a pattern among public agencies in California? If so, does it correspond to what the literature would lead us to expect?
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This material is also used in the second debate held in the class. Like the first one, it pits students divided up into different roles, - politically appointed executives, career bureaucrats of the middle level, unionized workers, and representative of the agency's clientele - against each other in a debate about the problem of accountability in the agency.

The information gathered in Sacramento and insights derived from class discussion and debates are integrated with the earlier statistical data to make up the final report or term project. These papers follow a common, but flexible, format which calls upon students to organize their presentations in terms of the agency's internal environment and external task environment. Each of these broad categories is elaborated with several theoretically derived sub-categories. (Appendix D) These papers are the culmination of an intense and cumulative teaching process. Individually, they bear witness to an exciting process in which students discovered their own capacity to pose questions, carry out a reconnaissance of reasonable sophistication, and gain unusual insight into organizational processes. Together the papers also represent a potentially valuable research resource - if they can pass sufficiently rigorous research muster.

Report Review and Editing

The final phase of CARP takes place during the summer after the course. The graduate student project coordinator and two paid class members form a "report review team" to clean the data sets and review the reports. (Funding for this phase was provided by the Institute of Governmental Studies.) The intent is to provide a rigorous review of the data and analysis, and deposit as many reports as achieve a high reporting standard in the Institute's library as a basis for subsequent research.

First, the team inspects the quality of each student report. An appraisal is made about its overall merits and whether further work is warranted. Those that pass muster are returned to the agency for their comment. While agencies review the draft reports,

---

3 It is asserted that administrative decisions can and should be shared among executives, middle level managers, and union representatives?

4 The assertion: The problem of accountability is largely solved. Professionals are competent; executives control budgetary and personnel systems; and the legislature speaks for citizens.
The review team members review the budgetary and personnel data from the state budget for each of the departments to assure accuracy. Using common spreadsheet and graphics software, the review team uses these data to prepare tables and graphs of budgetary and personnel trends during the past 15 years. These tables and graphs—not those in the original student reports—are used in the final product.

As departments return their comments on the student reports, their suggestions are evaluated and integrated into the reports. In a few instances, additional interviews may be needed to finish up nearly adequate work. For example, a department may complain that an important departmental function has been omitted from the original report. Additional interviews may be arranged to fill this gap. Inevitably, a few departments reject the student report entirely. Here, the instructor and project coordinator make their best estimate of the value of the draft report and the validity of the criticisms from the department.

Over 50 agencies have been studied, some twice and over 250 state officials have been interviewed. Of the reports that resulted, 26 became "finished reports," deposited under the student author's name in the IGS library. (See Appendix B for a list of agencies studied with an indication of those resulting in deposited reports.) They each follow a common format with verified technical statistical appendices, and graphic presentations developed by the summer class member research assistants.

**Tips for Project Coordinators**

The project coordinator for CARP faces short bursts of frenzied activity dispersed among periods of relative calm. It is useful to complete as many of the logistical preparations as possible prior to the beginning of the semester. This means, vans should be reserved and agency contact letters drafted.

The first flurry of activity occurs in about the third week of the semester with the initial phone calls to agencies. Some agencies designate a single contact person who will arrange all interviews. Some give lists of individuals from which interviewees must be culled. Some agencies attempt to be helpful by targeting interviews to accommodate the students' questions. They may inquire about the student's particular interests, so you may need to shuttle some between student and agency.

The second flurry of activity occurs about one-third of the way through the course. Students are preparing their bibliographic summaries of the department and are anxious about finding adequate sources of information. Librarians are very helpful, but students will often turn to the project coordinator for direction. They
will also test hypotheses on the coordinator: Would you interpret this change the same as I do? Why do you think they reorganized this division? Is this a budget reduction or just another way of accounting for the same appropriation? Also, we gave students many categories in which information might be available. The students will often get frustrated if they cannot find information on, say, active unions in their agency. We were flexible in our demands for pre-interview information.

The final flurry of activity for the project coordinator occurs during the last week before the trips to the capital. Even if arrangements have been made far in advance, be prepared for foul-ups. The motor pool should be recontacted a week before departure and again a day before departure. (We used a private rental agency and THEY offered us the wrong vans at first.) State laws only allow you to drive a limited number of passengers in one vehicle without a chauffers license. The project coordinator must know the time of each student's first interview and plan a route around the capital such that each student is on time. Some offices may be on the periphery of the city, so be prepared to do some driving. (Sometimes, state officials may wish to show peripheral facilities to a student. This is fun for the student, but may also result in additional driving for the coordinator.) Doughnuts and coffee are a must in the van on the morning of departure.

In all, the position of project coordinator is a rewarding one. You work with students in a coordinator/peer relationship which is quite different from a normal teaching assistant-student relationship. As peer, you work as a team to find answers to research questions and to make agency connections. As coordinator, you delegate work to students where possible, and engage in a mix of cheerleading and hand-holding as the students explore their departments. If you wish to produce publishable reports, you will emphasize the need for precise work.

Evaluation

During the 1987 CARP iteration, the review team conducted a series of follow-up evaluation interviews with state agency participants, former students, librarians who helped students find materials, and former teaching assistants/project directors. Respondents were asked to evaluate various facets of the project as well as the overall value of the enterprise. Of particular interest are the responses from graduate assistants and students who have been away from the University of California for several years.

Students who had taken the course three years before remembered the CARP project vividly. They described both their
feelings while preparing the CARP papers and what they learned from the course in retrospect. The agency interviewing particularly stood out in the students' memories as an eye-opening experience. Several reported nervousness before the interviews and a sense of accomplishment--and exhaustion--afterwards. The interviews themselves went very smoothly. Students were generally pleased with the cooperation they received. Agency personnel were generally quite cooperative. According to one student,

I recall interviewing four persons and only one did not say a lot. The others were very helpful and even suggested other staffers who might be interviewed. The interviewees saw that someone was interested in what they do and were more than happy to help.

The interview process, according to the students, was informative and practical. They felt that common stereotypes about administrative agencies had been dispelled. In earlier informal feedback, several students commented on how they began to realize how much they knew about the agency compared to the people they talked with and that they (the student) could actually organize themselves to deal with the situations presented to them.

They gained a better understanding of the problems confronted by a public organization and learned about the dynamics of agency survival. Students felt that the project gave a practical understanding of concepts covered in course readings and lectures. For example, one felt that the interview process helped him to better understand personnel management and the administration of budget reductions.

Some students noted that the project had taught them how to work as an independent member of a team research project. They particularly remembered a sense of structured autonomy. One woman "liked the fact that the professor left much of the report's design to the student." Another student enjoyed the substance of the course, but found particular gratification from challenge of "developing our own project."

Students complained that the project's objectives were not always clear. As a wide-ranging reconnaissance, the project frustrated some students by failing to prioritize information requested or to direct them in areas on which they should focus. Some students noted that the project lacked "clear-cut objectives."

A second complaint is familiar to most researchers. The workload was heavy as the report deadline neared - during the final two weeks of the semester. While students generally felt their interest in the CARP project rewarded them for the additional work,
they generally felt they had not had enough time to digest and write their reports at the end of the semester.

Students had some difficulty during the bibliographic research phase in using state budget materials. The library workshop which was integrated into the course was very helpful, but the documents were still imposing. Some had to be led through the documents step by step. It is important to have a project coordinator who is familiar with budgets.

Students generally reported very favorable memories of the course. Several specifically noted that it had been useful in post-university careers. One student had worked for a county supervisor and for a congressman after college and felt that the experience with state administrators had been useful in understanding intergovernmental and interbranch relationships. Others commented more generally that they had learned about dilemmas confronted by organizations and different ways to manage organizations.

Not surprisingly, state administrators who participated in CARP remembered the project only vaguely. It did give the University some visibility for they found that UCB students were bright and well-organized and that interviews had gone quite well. They generally liked the concept of the project as a learning tool, though one was skeptical about its value to their departments.

Teaching assistants evaluated the course positively, emphasizing the value of the CARP project as a teaching supplement, and the unusual opportunity to be a teacher/project manager in an academic setting. They generally found the mixture of lecture/theory and empirical field work to be exciting and stimulating to the classes. One teaching assistant noted that the project provided "an unusual opportunity to develop skills for teaching undergraduate students the basics of designing and conducting original research."

Teaching assistants also found CARP instructive in their own research. They felt greater confidence in approaching public officials for cooperation. Project coordinators claimed that CARP had improved their ability to coordinate a team approach to a complex research program.

Afterword

Our experience with a process like the CARP program has been very satisfying and clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of complementing classroom activities with an informal semi-structured research process. However, as many of you will no doubt have noted, the resources needed to effect the sorts of activities we
have described here are significantly greater than those normally allocated for teaching. First, it is almost mandatory that the instructor have the assistance of a field supervisor if the class is to be much bigger than a moderately sized seminar. Second, the transaction costs in dealing with the agencies, while not excessive, is burdensome unless departmental secretarial assistance is available to help with mailings, phone calls and some help with student logistical needs. And a small university subsidy for the use of vans was necessary. The assistance of the Institute's library staff and interviewer briefings was quite important. Finally, we were fortunate to be able to garner modest summer funds again from the Institute to employ sufficient assistance - two undergraduates and the project coordinator - to assure that the quality of reported data and analysis was rigorous enough to allow deposition in the Institute's research library.

The gains, in our view, in enhanced learning and the development of original research findings and data certainly justify the resources. These gains have been substantial and strongly increase the effectiveness of our undergraduate offerings. But it must be remembered that this cannot be done without support from local university administration and modest additional resources. The extra effort is significant and is not likely to be sustained for many iterations on the usual store of course support.
CARP APPENDIX A. Course Syllabus, Readings and CARP

Introduction.

Public Organization and Administration
Political Science 181
Spring 1987

Prof. Todd R. La Porte

Assisted by: Sean McClosky
Project Coordinator: David Hadwiger

This course explores the ordering power of large-scale public organizations in the service of a democratic society and the limits that constrain this service. Our objectives - to provide:

1) a view of the shape and dynamics of public organizations and an initial basis for your own involvement in and/or criticism or support of public organizations; and

2) an opportunity, through a term project, to "get into" organizational life more deeply.

Through lectures, discussion, and debate we will examine aspects of the structure and process of public organizations. Analytical conceptions are introduced to improve our understanding of the behavior of organizational participants as they seek to forward the public interest, especially in a time of limited resources. Other themes include political critiques of bureaucracy, the extraordinary demands Americans place on public organizations, and the political context of public management. Sections emphasize particular perspectives or "roles" in the "bureaucracy," especially as they respond to recent changes in national/state relations.

Students are asked to produce two written projects:

a) by mid-term, a short note discussing the evidence of public organizational influence "seen from street corner" observations;

b) a term report based on participation in - the California Agency Reconnaissance Project (CARP) - a review of selected agencies of California state government which includes at least one field trip to Sacramento. Little systematic work has been done on California's administrative agencies; an extraordinary situation for a government that presides over a population about the size of Canada's. This project of original research, begun in this class two years ago, continues to close this gap. Support for the project is provided by the Institute of Governmental Studies.
Course Structure

Lectures -- Mon., Wed., Fri. 2-3pm, Rm 259 Dwinelle Hall -- cover the main descriptive and analytical topics for the course, raising questions and issues for further clarification and explorations in section meetings. Sections will meet generally for an hour & a half each week. Two debates are scheduled between the class groups during the semester.

Course evaluations will be based on contributions to section discussions and class debates, completion of the term project and performance on mid-term and final examinations. Grades will be based 40% on the final exam, 40% on the term project, and 20% on the mid-term exam, "street corner" note and section evaluations. The mid-term and final exams will include materials from your section, as well as the more general course readings. They will be based on review questions, and allow the use of prepared outlines.

Text Materials

Required Texts:

Ira Sharkansky, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (Freeman, 1982)

Charles Goodsell, THE CASE FOR BUREAUCRACY (Chatham House, 1983)

[Amitai Etzioni, MODERN ORGANIZATION (Hopkins, 1962.) ***Salient sections in Course Reader.***]

Course Readers: (Available at Kinko's)

Includes readings on: a) Federalism , b) California government, and c) critiques of bureaucracy;

These materials are also on reserve in the IGS library (109 Moses Hall).
Course Syllabus and Readings

P.S. 181. Public Administration, Spring, 1987

Week I. The Study of Public Administration—In these times

.. The course overview (expectation and mood)

.. Scope of public administration—basic distinctions

Text: Sharkansky, ch.1.; Goodsell, ch.1;

Week II. Public Organizations in Perspective

.. Present situation: contrasts & evolution—a Cal. hypothesis. Speaker, T. Bradshaw

.. Public organizations "in these times": central questions

.. Demand, growth and challenge

Text: Sharkansky, ch.2. pp.16-26; esp. re:states;

Week III. Environment of Public Organization


.. Emerging public organizational complexes

.. Intergovernmental "mazes," and constraint

CARP Agencies assigned

Text: Sharkansky, ch. 3 & 13;

Week IV. Reducing Disorder, Pursuing the Public Interest

NOTE: CARP info. briefing at IGS BE THERE

.. Political & technical complexities: Bases for uncertainty
.. Bases for administrative organizing
.. Hierarchies, participation and "effectiveness"

Text: Sharkansky, ch. 4; Reader: Etzioni, chs. 1-5; "Bur. as the New...," Hummel, ch.1, 19-29, 42-49.

Week V. Current Context(s) of Public Management
.. Resource scarcity & coping with Prop. 13 Prof. J. Citrin
.. Decisions & Compliance: "Control equals management?"
.. "Seeing" organized actions - "On the Street Corner"
   NOTE:"Street-corner" Note due, Mon.


Week VI. Choice and Action in Times of "Turbulence"
.. Inside Organizations II: David Nichols, County Manager, San Mateo County.
.. Information, and survival politics
.. Systems process and disruption
   NOTE: CARP, Part I, draft due Fri.

Text: Sharkansky, ch.4 & 10; Reader: Etzioni, ch.6,7, & 8

Week VII. Policy Dynamics and Conflict
.. Bases for decision-making: self-interest, skill, position?
.. DEBATE I: Can/should decisions be shared?
.. The bureaucrat as "lighting rod, scapegoat, champion"?

Text: Sharkansky, ch. 11&5; Goodsell, ch. 3 &4, Readings: Hummel, ch.2, p. 60-69, 83-90
Week VIII. Bureaucratic Politics & Evaluating the Public's Interest

**ALERT - MID-TERM EXAMINATION NEXT MONDAY**

.. Systems performance and evaluation -as if one had information or - Have there been cutbacks?!

.. Inside Organizations III: Access and Discovery
   Set-up for agency recon. Hadwiger, et al

.. Review and Catch-up
   
   **Text:** Sharkansky, ch.9; Goodsell, ch.4

Week IX. Allocating (and Securing) Resources

.. MID-TERM ESSAY (based on review questions)

.. Budget process: "Stoking the Fires"

.. Hard Choices in times of uncertainty and demand

   **NOTE:** CARP Field work orientation (IGS, 6:30-8P)

   **Text:** Sharkansky, ch.7;

Week X. SPRING BREAK - Sacto Set-up.

Week XI. Program Survival "in These Times"

.. "Cutbacks" and bureaucratic politics

.. Ways Agencies Cope: CARP Hypotheses - class reports before Sacramento interviews

.. Set-up for Sacramento trip. Final briefing


Week XII. Information, Personnel and Persons: View of Life Within.

   **CARP Field Trips**

   .. Information Systems and Organizational Control

   .. Personnel systems: Incentives for competence
   .. CARP Interview De-briefing - Intuitive Comparison
Text: Sharkansky, ch.8; Goodsell, ch.5
Reader: Hummel, ch.3. p. 99-110,117-133

Week XIII. The Accountable Relation: Can It Exist?
.. Persons in-our-service: relations within
.. Across the boundaries-citizens and "servants"
.. Formal accountability: in the Courts

Text: Sharkansky, ch.14; Goodsell, ch.6
Reader: Hummel, ch.5,p.185-199, 205-208

Week XIV. Issues of Bureaucracy and Democracy
.. Political accountability: Formal and Informal Relations
.. DEBATE II: Who is accountable in bureaucracies?
[Assertion: The problem of accountability is largely solved. Professionals are competent, executive control budgetary and personnel systems, and the legislature speak for citizens.]
.. Bureaucracy as a Personal Trap?

Text: Sharkansky, ch.16 (rev.); Goodsell, ch.6
Reader: Hummel, ch. 4, p. 152-161, 170-175.

Week XV. Public Organizations: Prospects
.. Patterns in the future of public organizations
.. Future Developments in California's Bureaucracy
.. Speculations on the behavior of persons within ...

Text: Goodsell, ch. 7. Reader: Hummel, ch.6;

Week XVI. Review and Reconsideration
TERM PROJECTS DUE Mon. May 4 IN class!!
.. Final Discussion of CARP Process
.. Preview of Project trends and class discussion
Hadwiger and La Porte
.. Initial review discussions

Week XVII. Final Review and Essay: (Modified take home exam.)
.. Review discussion and last chance for questions

Final Exam Essay (Based on review quests., write ~3 hrs.)
Overview: Agencies have faces and they are in the midst of change. To gain a better appreciation of the organizational world, we will be part of an on-going program of reconnaissance at the state level. Students enrolling in P.S. 181 will be assigned a California State administrative agency for preliminary analysis of its development and the ways it has sought to cope with changes in the past decade. The project is in two parts: 1) Statistical trends describing the agency's overall development since 1970; and 2) Analysis, based especially on interviews with agency officials, of the changes within the agency and between its chief clients and overseers. [The project builds on the experience of its first two phases, CARP 84.1 and 84.2, in which some 30 agencies (about 70% of the more significant) were examined. See examples of this work on reserve in the IGS library.]

INTRODUCTION. These have been tumultuous times for public organizations in the U.S., indeed for all advanced industrial societies. Prompted by economic distress and ideological programs, central governments are sharply limiting their involvement in civil sectors of society. The trend toward increased national oversight and support of economic and social sectors is attenuating. The Federal government, in a number of areas, is stepping away from activities that are also carried on by state and local governments. In Washington, we see stabilized or declining resources allocated to agencies across a wide range of functions. At the same time, state and local governments are confronted with greater demands and a decrease in locally derived resources. Thus, the dynamics of Federal agencies are likely to be quite different from those of State and local organizations. [At the same time, the military is experiencing one of the most rapid periods of growth and modernization in recent history.]

In California, these changes have been especially intense. State agencies confronted with both a severe financial climate (ushered in by Prop. 13, et al) and the recent economic recession at a time when Federal support is waning. If our administrative agencies have strong capacities, the devolution of functions is likely to improve local flexibility without degrading services or the quality of public life. All would be well for our state government; now serving a population on a par with Canada's, in a state economy generating a "GNP" ranking among the world's top ten nations. If, however, California's agencies are not flexible and robust, the long term results for State services are problematical.

EXAMINING CALIFORNIA'S ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES. What do we know about California's administrative agencies? How do they compare in vigor with their Federal counterparts? To Canada's bureaucracy? What responses have they made to the rapid onset of severe .pa resource constraints, conditions very different from those characterizing much of their history?
A good deal is known about California's legislature and politics,
but systematic descriptions and analyses of its administrative
agencies - data necessary for understanding the effects of national
policy on state and local administration - is simply missing. While
information can be found scattered in government documents,
especially budget and operating materials, it is dispersed, uneven
and of little immediate assistance in answering our questions.

This "gap" in knowledge becomes increasingly serious as the scale of
Californian economy and society continues to grow. With modest
resources from the Institute of Governmental Studies, our situation
presents a rare opportunity to begin filling the "gap". Initially
supported by a grant from the UCB Council on Educational
Development, it was taken up in this course, spring, 1984.

The 20 Calif. agencies most closely parallel to the Federal
agencies' devolving activities, and another have received an
initial review, along with another 10 or 15 more exclusively
oriented to state relations. (See CARP 84.1 & 84.2, IGS library.) In
this phase, we shall begin to follow-up earlier work, testing its
accuracy and teasing out a bit deeper relationships.

One or two students, depending on the size of the agency, will be
assigned to a California. With the help of data and format guides
prepared for this project, (and prior reports as they are available)
each team is responsible for two, somewhat different types of
information:

Part I. A description of the agency's development, since 1970,
as depicted in statistical data in the annual budget statements (on
reserve in the IGS library.) This description should include:

* Budget trends, absolute and controlled for inflation,
incl. % of state budget total;
* Personnel allocation, incl. % state total;
* Program statement, incl. significant changes, reorganizations
  with increase or reduced functions/units;
* Formal reporting relationships - hierarchy and oversight
  vis-a-vis the legislature;
  (* Informal relationships with interest groups, et al., if
evidence in available materials)

  ***(Part I, DUE, Mon., 23 Feb.)***

Part II. An analysis of the agency's coping strategies, and
adjustments in the face of the changes its confronted as described
in Part I. Based on interviews with agency officials (arranged by
students in cooperation with La Porte/Hadwiger.)

  ***(Revised Part I and II DUE, 4 May)***
The California Agency Reconnaissance Project (CARP) was undertaken in 1984 to improve our knowledge of the organizational dynamics of state agencies. In 1984, students prepared analyses of 36 State agencies (representing 60 percent of the total state budget) from information drawn from public documents and from interviews with over 100 state officials. This year's CARP will build upon those efforts, returning to some departments which have experienced significant changes during the past three years and launching investigations into new agencies.

CARP87 has two goals:

(1) First and foremost, it is a tool for students to gain first-hand knowledge about public organizations at the state level: how they are structured to reach their objectives; how they operate; and how they are influenced by actors and events over which they may have little or no control. It is our assumption that by examining, in depth, a single public organization you will become more sensitive to the realities of organizational life and will gain a richer understanding of public organizations.

(2) Second, the results of this project will fill some of the gaps we have in our knowledge of California's state administrative apparatus. This area, as you will discover, is notable for its lack of systematic treatment. Existing "data" is limited to formal budget descriptions and agency mission statements; sporadic and sometimes narrowly focused reports undertaken by legislative committees, by other government agencies, and by the organizations themselves; and, the occasional article in the California Journal or the popular press. This is surprising given the centrality of state organizations in nearly every important area of modern life. Your contributions will build onto work carried out in 1984 by students in this course. These data will be retained, updated, and used by future students, and may be condensed and distributed to public affairs facilities in other parts of California.

To help us reach these goals, we have constructed a "project design" in the form of a data sheet. This data sheet was designed to satisfy two conflicting needs: the need, on the one hand, to have comparable information about the agencies we choose to study, on the other hand, allowing the student the flexibility necessary to analyze what are in some cases quite different types of organizations. Hence, you will notice that most of the questions on the data sheet are phrased in general terms.

The basic model, or premise, underlying the project is a substantial simplification of a complex phenomenon. It divides the
object of study into three classes of events: (1) the internal environment of the organization; (2) the "task environment" of the organization (that is, the institutions, organizations, groups, and actors in the organization's immediate environment which are relevant or potentially relevant to goal setting and goal attainment); and, (3) the larger environment in which the organization must act. The long term goal is to explore the interactions between these classes of variables. Realistically, however, given time and resource constraints, we hope that at the very least you are able to specify what is going on in your organization with respect to these three classes of events.

The data sheet guide is divided into two phases:

PHASE I -- In this phase, track your organization's "vital signs" over a 15-year period. This phase is rather like a scavenger hunt: you are "set adrift" with a general idea of where to look for answers. Nearly all of the data requirements in Phase I can be found in the public record of documents and reports. DO NOT PANIC if a) your organization has only been around since 1975, b) your organization was five separate agencies prior to 1979, or c) you simply cannot find year-to-year data going back to 1968. Do the best you can and TELL US!

PHASE II -- In this phase, collect is less descriptive and more analytical in character. Through interviews in Sacramento and the ongoing gathering of data in the public record, you are likely to find answer to some the important questions in each of the three areas: What is the character of the organization's internal environment? What is the nature of the relationships between the organization and the actors in its task environment? What are the major sources of external instability facing the organization? We will discuss this phase in more detail later on. For the time being, search out the basic data you will need to construct a "profile" of your organization and begin to think about the implications and consequences of what you find out.
II. Detailed guides for agency description

1. Basic Data and Information Requirements

PHASE I

I. Budgetary Data

a) legislative appropriations: 1968-1983 (actual and corrected for inflation)
b) percent of total state budget appropriated to agency: 1968-1983
c) description of major programs and outlays (i.e., the 3 or 4 programs to which a large portion of the agencies budget is committed): 1968-1983
d) $ amount derived from federal government transfers: 1968-1983

II. Personnel Data

a) number of employees: 1968-1983
b) distribution of employees by job category (e.g., number of professionals—lawyers, engineers, accountants, chemists, etc.): as many years as possible
c) union representation
d) number of organizational members who are gubernatorial appointments
e) number of organizational members who are under a civil service personnel system

III. Organizational Age and Structure

a) when was the agency established and what were the circumstances of birth? (if the agency evolved by combining other organizations, trace the evolution)
b) major reorganizations: under what circumstances? with what circumstances? with what results? when?
c) is the organization "tall" or "flat"? centralized or geographically dispersed?
d) organization chart: as many years as possible
e) specific characteristics of agency structure (e.g., number and purpose of major subunits; the relationship between subunits; other characteristics you can come up with)

IV. Organizational Goals, Outputs and Responsibilities

a) what are the organization's formal goals? (for Phase II, you should also be on the lookout for additional "informal" goals that are not part of the official agency mission).
b) have the goals been changed over time? when? why?
c) how specific are the goals? do they allow the organization a wide degree of discretion in implementation?
d) nature of organization's output: who does the organization regulate or to whom does it provide services? what does the organization produce or what services does it provide?
e) what are the organization's areas of responsibility? (for Phase II—does this organization's areas of responsibility overlap with other organizations?)
f) what types of formal authority does the organization possess?

V. Miscellaneous Surprise

a) what other types of information have you come across which you believe to be significant?

VI. Bibliography

a) list both sources you have used and sources you would have used but were unavailable on the UC campus.
2. Phase I Data Report Outline

This memo outlines the format to follow in reporting the data collected in Phase I. On doing so, keep in mind these guides and suggestions.

1) Completion of every category, in detail, is the ideal, but realistically we do not expect that this is possible in every case. Try to complete the categories to the best of your ability given the availability of information about your agency. WARNING: Not obtaining basic and easily found data may be hazardous to your grade.

2) Do not feel limited or constrained by these categories. Use this outline as a guide, not as a substitute for your own thoughts. If you find that some significant aspect of your agency is not covered by our categories, introduce new ones.

3) Some of the categories from the "working" data sheet distributed earlier this semester have been collapsed together and few have been de-emphasized for the time being. (For example, we have discovered that the "percent of total state budget appropriated to agency" is not so easy to determine. For the time being, leave that category blank.)

4) The amount of space devoted to each category will vary from organization to organization. If it takes a whole page to describe the formal goals of your agency, so be it.

5) This time around is not your only chance to collect this data. There will be opportunities when we get to Sacramento to fill in informational "blind spots."

6) Type up the data using the titles and roman numerals provided in the outline where applicable. This will help us to compare the data across organizations. We will provide graphed paper for those categories that need to be plotted on to charts, i.e. the agency budget and the number of personnel.

7) Attach selected photo-copied documents or other information that is too difficult to type out (for example, organization charts).

If you have any questions or problems see me, your TA, or Professor La Porte.
I. Introductory Paragraph

II. Budgetary Data
   substitute graph paper with headings when this appears......

   b) Description of Major Programs and Amount of Budget Commitment
      
      | Year | Description | Amount |
      |------|-------------|--------|

   c) Amount Derived from Federal Transfers
      
      | Year | Amount |
      |------|--------|

III. Personnel Data

   a) Number of Employees
      substitute graph paper with headings when this appears

   b) Distribution of Employees by Job Category
      
      | Year | Categories | Note: If you wish, you may plot this information on the chart. |
      |------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|

   c) Union Representation
IV. Organizational Age and Structure

a) When established and circumstances of Birth

b) Major Reorganizations

c) Characteristics of Agency Structure
   1- General
   2- Specific

d) Organization Charts: Attach if Available

V. Organizational Goals, Outputs, and Responsibilities

a) Formal Organizational Goals. If they have changed, note circumstances and timing.

b) Do the formal goals allow the organization a wide degree of discretion in implementation?

c) Nature of the organization's output. Who does the organization regulate or to whom does it provide services?

d) What are the organization's area of responsibility?

e) What types of formal authority does the organization possess?
4. INFORMATION SOURCES (most are available in IGS Library)

**Governor's Budget**, 1968-69 to 1984-85 (on reserve at IGS)

**California Blue Book**, 1982-83 (on reserve at IGS)

Card catalogue at IGS and Government Documents (seek annual reports to the legislature and other summary type documents)

**California Journal**, various editions

**California State Publications**, published monthly by the California State Library in Sacramento. This publication lists every report issued by every state agency in a given month (caution: last several years are indexed very poorly--get help from library staff). Available at IGS and Government Docs Library.

**California Regulatory Law Reporter**, a quarterly journal which updates significant trends among regulatory type agencies in California state government. In IGS reading room.

**Almanac of California State Government**, California Journal (on reserve at IGS)

**Constitutional Officers, Agencies, Boards and Commissions in California State Government, 1849 to 1975**, Elizabeth Capell (on reserve at IGS); and **Supplement, 1976 to 1978**, E. Capell (use these to trace the lineage of your organization if you are confused about where it came from and when)

**Book of the States, 1983-84** (section on California)

ADDITIONAL SOURCES: Compiled by George Brookrookas in connection with the organizational study and policy evaluation of the California Department of Corrections (CDC) for Political Science 171, California Politics and Government, Fall 1983. The project, in part, includes some data sources regarding city, state, federal, and internal aspects of government organizations.

Reference librarians at the Institute of Governmental Studies, Government Documents Department, and Social Sciences Library can provide additional orientation to these and other government document sources.

**State Budget Information** [All of these resources may be found in either IGS or Government Documents.]

1) Governor's Budget
2) Salaries and Wages Supplement
3) Governor's Budget Summary
4) Legislative Analyst's Analysis of the Budget--
   Published each February by Legislative Analyst
5) Legislative Analyst's Summary of Legislative Action on the Budget Bill -- each August
6) Assembly Ways and Means Budget Report—Available from: Assembly Ways and Means Office; Rm. 9026; State Capitol; Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 323-9707
7) Department of Finance Final Chance Book—Published after completion of budget process each year in July.
8) Department of Finance Final Budget Summary -- also annual

Federal Budget Information [These source can be found in either IGS of Government Documents]
1) Budget of the U.S. Government
2) Budget Appendix
3) Budget in Brief
4) Major Themes and Additional Budget Details
5) Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance
6) Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals - Each Fiscal Year, Senate

Indexes [Unless noted, all indices available in IGS or Govt. Doc.]
--- State
1) California State Publications 1945 -- Lists only those state publications received by the State Library but not everything published by the state. Arranged by agency author with annual cumulated subject index.
2) California Statistical Abstract -- Dept. of Finance

--- Federal
1) Federal Index -- Social Science Library (Stephens)
2) GPO Monthly - on line also
3) Monthly Catalog
4) CIS Annual Index and Abstracts -- Congressional Information Service
5) SRI Reference Index 1980 -- State, trade, business, university, and private source statistical information. Complete microfiche collection of all indexed materials available in Social Sciences Library.
6) American Statistics Index
7) Public Affairs Information Service

Directories and Manuals [All available at IGS]
1) California Blue Book -- latest is 1975
2) State of California Telephone Directory
3) California Roster -- City and County information
4) California Journal Roster and Government Guide
5) The Green Book -- Appointments to executive branch positions
6) Almanac of California State Government
   by E. Capell
8) State Executive Directory -- latest Fall 1983
9) Economic Report of the Governor -- annual
10) Book of States -- 1983-84
13) Congressional Quarterly's Federal Regulatory Directory
14) U.S. Governmental Manual -- 1983-84 most recent

**Other Resources and Aids**

-- California Academic Libraries' List of Serials
-- Catalog 2 Microfiche (Serials and Books)
-- IGS card catalogs -- Assembly Senate or Congressional committee hearings, agency publications, ann (Serials and Books)
-- IGS card catalogs -- Assembly Senate or Congressional committee hearings, agency publications, annual and newsletters
-- IGS rotary file -- agency publications, annuals and newsletters
-- Government Documents Card Catalogs -- Area Catalog -- under state or United States filed by agency heading; 1973-1980 catalog.
-- California Journal
-- Congressional Quarterly Index) plain language explanations
-- National Journal Index) of federal-state phenomena
-- S.F. Chronicle/Examiner Index -- Newspaper Microcopy room -- article copy machines available
-- Boalt Hall Library Card Catalog -- documents, legislative and judicial publications -- especially helpful on agencies of the criminal justice system

**Computer based systems**

-- Melvyl Database -- not to be trusted as complete resource
-- RLIN Database -- Quick service at Government Documents Reference Desk
-- NTIS on-line Database -- Accompanies Government Reports Announcements -- in book form includes abstracts of technical reports (federally funded). On-line study available from National Technical Information Service for a fee (at a number of branch libraries).
III. Priorities and agency assignments:

Criteria: The agencies are divided into two general groupings: (1) organizations which we have reason to believe are undergoing or have recently undergone relatively serious threats to their stability due to forces external to themselves and organizations which, due to their size and/or central location in the workings of state administration, cannot be ignored if this project is to be fairly comprehensive; and (2) a residual category of potentially interesting and/or politically important organizations that can be taken on as resources permit. An * indicates that a published CARP report is available in the Institute of Governmental Studies Library.

2. Priority Listing of California Administrative Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1</th>
<th>1983-84 Budget (x1000)</th>
<th>Personnel Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE AGENCIES NOT UNDER DIRECT CONTROL OF GOVERNOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Justice (projected team size: 2)</td>
<td>$132,461</td>
<td>3,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Education (2+)</td>
<td>9,274,418</td>
<td>2,623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| STATE AND CONSUMER SERVICES | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| *Dept. of Fair Employment and Housing (1) | 10,473 | 257 |
| *Department of Consumer Affairs (1) | 109,715 | 2,813 |
| *Franchise Tax Board (1) | 148,282 | 2,422 |
| Dept. of General Services (1) | 58,004 | 620 |

| ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| *Air Resources Board (1) | 54,284 | 549 |
| *California Waste Mgmt. Board (1) | 4,190 | 80 |
| *Water Resources Control Board (1) | 35,551 | 510 |

<p>| RESOURCES | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| *California Coastal Commission (1) | 6,928 | 130 |
| Dept. of Conservation (1) | 15,528 | 328 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Program</th>
<th>Budget 1</th>
<th>Budget 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Conservation Corps (1)</td>
<td>28,619</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish and Game (2)</td>
<td>73,999</td>
<td>1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Water Resources (2)</td>
<td>935,428</td>
<td>2,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Forestry (2)</td>
<td>149,899</td>
<td>3,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*State Lands Commission (1)</td>
<td>12,027</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUTH AND ADULT CORRECTIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Corrections (2)</td>
<td>613,935</td>
<td>13,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH AND WELFARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dept. of Health Services (3)</td>
<td>5,524,313</td>
<td>3,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Programs: Medical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dept. of Social Services (2-3)</td>
<td>5,535,788</td>
<td>3,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Programs: Welfare Program Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dept. of Mental Health (2)</td>
<td>632,308</td>
<td>4,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Employment Development Dept. (2-3)</td>
<td>5,075,847</td>
<td>12,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dept. of Developmental Services (2)</td>
<td>680,105</td>
<td>13,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Housing and Community Development (1)</td>
<td>96,502</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dept. of Transportation (2)</td>
<td>2,261,406</td>
<td>15,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Department of Commerce (1)</td>
<td>11,572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Department of Corporations (1)</td>
<td>8,081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Department of Real Estate (1)</td>
<td>19,799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CABINET LEVEL AGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Food and Ag. (2)</td>
<td>114,831</td>
<td>2,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Finance (1)</td>
<td>21,093</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUASI-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Energy Commission (1)</td>
<td>30,824</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Labor Relations Board (1)</td>
<td>7,411</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Employment Relations Board (1)</td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(1-) Public Utilities Commission (1)</td>
<td>41,643</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Department of Industrial Relations (1)</td>
<td>102,316</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Office of Emergency Services (1)</td>
<td>10,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Personnel Board</td>
<td>25,803</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Economic and Business Development</td>
<td>11,505</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Banking Dept.</td>
<td>7,469</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Insurance</td>
<td>16,962</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F. Bay Conservation and Development Commission</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Aging</td>
<td>75,946</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development</td>
<td>10,664</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Rehabilitation</td>
<td>138,221</td>
<td>1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Arts Council</td>
<td>9,294</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Political Practices Commission</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Personnel Administration</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dept. of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>158,943</td>
<td>2,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>347,798</td>
<td>7,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Seismic Safety Commission</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*California State Lottery Commission</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Military Department</td>
<td>17,565</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Teale Data Center</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rough outline for 3 to 5 44 min.+ interviews. (Writing space deleted.) A form like this is used for each interview.

Agency:________________ Interviewee:________________________ Date:____

1. Intro: Of self and a brief reminder of the project's objectives

2. [If you are not reasonably sure of the person's responsibilities]

To make sure I have it straight, could you run down the sorts of functions carried on by this (div, unit)?

Your own particular responsibilities?

3. Have there been significant changes in Federal programs or regulations over the past decade that have affected the activities of your (unit)? (If so, what were they?)

How did the (unit) respond to these changes?

4-7. Ask about the several changes you have identified in your budget and documents review. Use this sequence for each change:

I've noticed that there was a significant change (increase/decrease) in the [agency's] (funds, personnel, program, organization, goals) in 19____. What led up to this change?

What happened as a consequence?

How did the agency respond to these changes? cope with them? (Review the strategies listed in the Levine paper in Reader)

How did these changes affect relations with the legislature? clients? How did they affect the internal organization?

Final page: end of interview: After you have covered changes-
8. (If you have time) Has the [agency] participated in any efficiency, productivity, or organizational development programs in the last ten years? If so, what were they? What were the consequences?

9. (If you have time) Have labor relations changed much in the past decade? If so, how? To what consequence?

10. Are there other aspects of the [unit's] development that I haven't asked about that we should be aware of?

11. Are there other people in the agency we should talk with? (These might be contacted during our summer follow-up.)

12. Are there any questions you wish to ask about the project? We don't want to leave any questions in your mind. (pause for response)

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. We will forward a copy of my report to the [agency] during the early summer. We would appreciate any additional comments you might have at that time!
CARP Appendix D. Final CARP Write-Up Guide.

In preparing your CARP project paper, follow the rough sequence of topics outlined below. Keep the text of sections I-IV to 12-15 pages.

I. Introduction:

Include a brief overview of the project, how your organization "nests" within the State's administrative structure, and something of the process you used to do the project.

II. Overview of the agency's development:

Use the information, including Tables and Graphs, drawn from Phase I data and what is relevant from your interviews. Identify major organizational 'events' which affected the agency's programs, funding, personnel, organization, goals, etc. Identify areas of stability or smooth growth in your agency.

NOTE: Review Phase I data and tables for accuracy and completeness, revise as needed and include the entire data sheets as Appendix A. Specific portions may be referred to in this section.

III. Sources of Change and Organizational Responses:

Based on your Phase I research and insights gained from interviews, discuss organizational changes, the sources of change, and the agency's responses/strategies for coping with changes. If your organization has been particularly stable, speculate on the circumstances which have promoted this stability (e.g. key actors, responsibilities, etc.). Your analysis should provide answers to most of the questions on pages 6-9 of the February 2, 1987 project outline -- ignoring section IV. (Draw upon course reading and class discussions.)

NOTE: Work up your interviews in typewritten or very legible hand written form and include as Appendix B.

IV. Additional Analysis:

Propose additional aspects of agency development or its present dynamics that might be examined next, i.e., the things you might wish to do yourself if you had more time, etc.

V. Endnotes

Bibliography: Include a revised bibliography (from Phase I plus any material you picked up in Sacramento.)

Appendices.
A. Revised and up-dated Phase I data
B. Complete, readable set of interview notes.
PHASE II Worksheet

Reminder: You may come across some of the information requested in Phase II while doing Phase I. Note the source of the information for future reference. Some of this information will be difficult to come by. DO YOUR BEST to provide at least impressionistic answers to these questions.

I. Characteristics of the Internal Environment

(1) who is involved in the decision-making process? the planning process?

(2) how are programs and plans evaluated? how often? by whom?

(3) do sub-units within the organization have different goals and objectives? are they in conflict? how is the conflict resolved?

(4) to what extent does the organization contract out for services? for information gathering and analysis? for anything else?

(5) can you provide any other information about the organization's structural characteristics? (i.e., the authority structure, the communication structure, how information is processed, etc.)

(6) do you get the impression that the members of the organization have a high or low level of motivation toward the work they do and/or the agency they represent? a high or low level of cohesion (are they pulling together to get the job done)?

(7) what kinds of incentives are used to ensure reliable and loyal members? what kinds of socialization procedures does the organization utilize to improve the chances of member compliance? (e.g., what kinds of training programs does the organization use?)
(8) do you get the sense that any professional groups or other organizational "roles" dominate the decision-making process?

II. Characteristics of the Task Environment

(1) identify and briefly describe the groups and actors with which the agency comes into frequent contact? to the extent that it is possible, explain why your organization must deal with these groups/actors and describe the nature of these relationships (e.g., are they formal or informal? cordial or adversarial?) Be sure to consider supporters, opponents, and neutrals from both the private and public sectors.

(2) to whom is the organization legally accountable? for what?

(3) does the organization command a good deal of constituent support (from interest groups and clients)? why or why not? has this changed over time?

(4) does the organization enjoy favorable public support? how visible are the organization's activities?

(5) is the organization susceptible to political pressures from the legislature and/or the governor? how? why?

(6) which groups or actors in the organization's immediate environment provides (or influences the provision of) scarce resources to the agency (e.g., authority, expertise, information, money)

III. Characteristics of the Environment; Sources of External Stress

What have been the sources of major instability confronting the organization both recently and in the past?

(1) budget reductions

a) due to changing federal policies
b) due to Prop.13/other manifestations of the "taxpayer revolt"
c) due to changing gubernatorial priorities
d) due to agencies inability to mobilize sufficient political support
(2) major changes in programs/organizational goals imposed from "outside"

(3) technological change

(4) major changes in the organization's relationship with its client group

(5) internal problems
   a) low morale
   b) high turnover
   c) leadership changes

(6) problematic political relationships with significant members of task environment
   a) legislative committee
   b) governor
   c) interest groups
   d) counterpart at federal level
   e) other state agencies
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