DIGITAL GOVERNMENT II
WEEK 4: IT AND
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE (2)

Mar 24, 2009

tonight's plan and announcements

- ## Admin, other stuff:
  Ann Arbor News (cf. 532 discussions)

  DG I grades

  weekly reading notes

  Next week's reading, revised syllabus

- ## Final paper assignment

- ## Small-group discussions (taxes, security, immigration)

- ## My lecture (bureaucratic histories and cultures; political economy of government IT)

- ## Small / large group discussions (comparative government IT strategies)

DGII Final Paper

From the syllabus: "Working individually, students will be responsible for formulating an 8-10 page (double-spaced) paper on a digital government research topic of their choosing... Materials from DG I (SI 532) are welcomed where they support your argument, but the subject matter of the term paper should fall principally under the topical areas of DG II (SI 533). Students may also opt to work in groups of up to 3 people to pursue somewhat larger scale and/or comparative projects (an example might be a comparative analysis of e-government frameworks across three separate national or state-level jurisdictions, or a proposal to incorporate new IT resources or processes into existing administrative functions); if you're thinking of this option, please come speak to me relatively soon in the term. Up to one page descriptions of the proposed paper are due *in class* on April 7th, and will be returned with ideas and suggestions the following week. Students are also encouraged to come speak with me and/or Anthea about their paper ideas at any point in the term. Two hard copies of the final paper are due in my mailbox NO LATER than 12 p.m. (noon) on Monday, April 27th; please also submit an electronic copy to your drop box on the course Ctools site.

DG II Final Paper (cont'd)

- analysis of planning / public comment / stakeholder engagement processes (cf. March 10th readings)

- analysis of a particular IT implementation or administrative reform process within or across government agencies (cf. Fountain, Dunleavy et. al.)

- evaluation of the online presence, initiatives or activities of a public agency at the municipal, state, or federal levels (cf. West)

- analysis of e-government initiatives, frameworks and barriers in countries beyond the United States (cf. Apr 14th readings)

- analysis of e-government rankings or research methodologies (West, Dunleavy), including proposals for alternative assessment criteria and research methods

- evaluation or proposal for next generation services ('M-gov,' web 2.0 & user-generated content strategies, etc.)

Small-group discussions:
(tax, social security, and immigration cases from Dunleavy et. al.)

□ 5-7 mins per reading + 5 min conclusion

- outline the empirical case and key findings from each of the tax, social security, and immigration chapters in Dunleavy et. al.;

- indicate the distinctive features and challenges of taxation / social security /immigration for efforts at e-government implementation

- connect these to larger arguments around barriers, challenges, and lessons for more effective e-government implementation

Comparative government IT performance

Table 3.5 Summary codings for the components of the performance of government IT, 1990–2003

Country	IT projects succeed and are rarely can-celled (S)	Government IT provision is competitively costed (C)	Government IT is comparably modern to private sector provision (M)	Government IT performance is effective: the intersection set S . C . M *(minimum)*	Union set S + C + M *(maximum)*
Netherlands	1	1	1	1	1
Canada	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
USA	0.75	0.75	0.5	0.5	0.75
New Zealand	0.5	1	0.25	0.25	1
Japan	1	0.25	0.75	0.25	1
Australia	0	0.25	0.75	0	0.75
UK	0	0.25	0.25	0	0.25

☐ *Question: Are there **other** criteria by which we would want to evaluate government IT performance beyond those considered by Dunleavy et. al.? Other objectives of e-gov strategies (in the U.S. and elsewhere)?*

Bureaucratic histories and cultures
('governance institutions and bureaucratic cultures')

Table 4.5 Summary codings for the components of the influence of bureaucratic and governance institutions, 1990–2005

Country	Governance system has few checks and balances on the executive (G)	Weak cultural and institutional systems for handling technology decisions and projects (C)	High openness to new public management changes (M)	No strong or centralized e-government initiative (E)	G . C . M . E *(minimum)*	G + C + M + E *(maximum)*
New Zealand	0.5	0.75	1	1	0.5	1
Japan	1	0.5	0.25	1	0.25	1
UK	1	0.75	1	0	0	1
Australia	0.75	0.25	0.75	0	0	0.75
Canada	0.5	0.25	0.25	0	0	0.5
USA	0	0.25	0.5	0.5	0	0.5
Netherlands	0	0	0.25	0.25	0	0.25

Source: Patrick Dunleavy et. al., *Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, the State, and Egovernment* Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2006

□ *Are there **other** dimensions of bureaucratic histories and cultures that might shape patterns of government IT adoption and 'success' (and that more detailed case or comparative studies might want to account for)?*

The Political Economy of Government IT
('competitive tension and power of gov't IT industry')

Table 5.4 Summary codings for the components of the industry's influence in relation to government, 1990–2004

Country	De-emphasis on open competition (N)	Large firms' market and technical predominance (L)	Little public sector in-house IT capacity (I)	The IT industry is in a powerful position vis-à-vis government: the intersection set N . L . I (minimum)	Union set N + L + I (maximum)
UK	1	1	1	1	1
Australia	0.75	1	1	0.75	1
Japan	0.5	1	1	0.5	1
Canada	0.5	0.5	0.25	0.25	0.5
New Zealand	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
USA	0	0.25	0.25	0	0.25
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Patrick Dunleavy et. al., *Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, the State, and Egovernment* Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2006

- ☐ *(nb: this a stronger effect, according to Dunleavy et. al.'s analysis, than bureaucratic histories and cultures)*

- ☐ *Are there **other** dimensions or characteristics of the relationship between government and private sector IT firms that might shape patterns and evaluations of government IT adoption and 'success'?*

Group discussion

Dunleavey et. al.'s comparative country survey suggests three rough positions or strategies for the management of government IT expertise:

1. **Core competence model** (where capacity to develop and manage government IT systems is retained substantially or primarily in-house);

2. **Intelligent customer model** (where governments out-source most or all IT functions to private firms, retaining only capacity to act as 'intelligent customer' in the evaluation and negotiation of bids);

3. **Hybrid model** (where substantial portions of government IT are outsourced when conditions are favorable, but governments retain substantial capacity and may opt for in-house provision under particular conditions and services)

What are the pros and cons of each of these positions? Which do you think represents the most feasible or promising strategy for, say, the U.S. State Department going forward? The State of Michigan? The City of Ann Arbor? How might the public character of government agencies lead to different priorities and decisions around the above than those taken by organizations in the private sector?