

Management Matters

From the PMRA President, Rosemary O’Leary

Dear PMRA Members,

We are off to a great start this academic year! A PMRA committee is looking at ways to make our organization more international, another committee is examining how to run our organization more effectively, and our colleagues at the University of North Carolina have issued a call for proposals for our next research conference. The longer I am a member of PMRA the more I realize what a great organization this is: Our conferences are among the best venues in the world to present public management research. Our journals—the *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* and *Perspectives on Public Management & Governance* are rigorous and highly ranked. Our book series with the Cambridge University Press “Elements” series is publishing amazing short volumes showcasing cutting-edge research. Our newsletter offers diverse perspectives on compelling public management issues with the theme this issue being “public administration and border crises.” In addition, PMRA serves as a voice for the public management research community, sharing our work through social media and supporting new and innovative research in public management and related fields. Thanks for all you do to make PMRA a success!



Rosemary O’Leary
Edwin O. Stene Distinguished Professor of Public Administration
School of Public Affairs and Administration
University of Kansas
oleary@ku.edu

In This Issue

From the PMRA President,
Rosemary O’Leary 1

Essays of Public
Administration and
Border Crises 2-11

Comings & Goings 12-14

Newsletter Editor:
Peter Stanley Federman
The University of Kansas
peter.federman@ku.edu

Essays on Public Administration and Border Crises

We invited a diverse group of scholars from around the world to weigh in on the topic of Public Administration and Border Crises. We hope you will enjoy these fresh perspectives and challenging analyses.

Lean on Me: The Roles of Local Public Administrators and Federalism in Immigrant Detention

Zachary Bauer
Jocelyn M Johnston
American University School of Public Affairs

Public administrators are familiar with balancing the often-conflicting imperatives of the three branches of government, and federalism – and sometimes both simultaneously. They certainly are doing so as they manage organizations in today’s immigration policy environment. Administrators are caught in the conflict between the executive and legislative branches because of Congressional inaction on needed immigration reforms, yet must respond to shifting priorities expressed through executive orders affecting the Department of Homeland Security’s Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency. A particularly salient issue in the current immigration landscape is the inability of the federal government to, on its own, detain and house undocumented immigrants at required levels. That’s where federalism comes in.

ICE’s administrators now rely on partnerships with states, but mostly localities, to help them accomplish their agency mission. Federal immigration administrators craft agreements with local jails through programs such as *Secure Communities* (through which jails share data with and submit fingerprints to ICE databases). ICE managers also use 287(g) Agreements, which “deputize” local governments; under this scenario, ICE enters “agreements with state and local law enforcement agencies, permitting designated officers to perform immigration law enforcement functions” (<https://www.ice.gov/287g>).

Finally, ICE administrators also seek contracts with state prisons and local jails for immigrant detention. While political and policy imperatives drive ICE administrators to detain more individuals, they must also address the reality that federal capacity to house these detainees is grossly inadequate. ICE uses Intergovernmental Service Agreement, or IGSA, to tap into the capacity of 850 county and municipal jails across all 50 states. On average, 440,000 individuals flow through the immigration detention system every year, and more than 35,000

individuals are held daily; these numbers are rising; DHS recently routed \$93 million from other units (including FEMA) to ICE for immediate detention increases (Kopan 2018). Thus, due to shifting policy and capacity strains, only 30 percent of detainees can be held in federal public and private detention facilities. The remaining 70 percent are in local jails, with some in state prisons.

IGSA jail administrators are therefore now responsible for holding the vast majority of civil immigrant detainees, whom are typically housed with criminal detainees until immigration courts decide their fates. The consequent confinement issues raise a host of issues for local public administrators related to basic civil rights, access to legal support, and detainee exposure to more violent inmates and criminal detainees, among others.

Local governments, however, are not always open to these voluntary “partnerships,” data sharing arrangements, or detention contracts. We are conducting research on the factors that affect local decisions on ICE contracts. There is evidence that some local administrators view immigrant detention as an economic development tool. Under typical ICE-local government contracts, local jails receive approximately \$119 per-individual, per-diem. ICE contracts can therefore enhance “efficiency”—a managerial value—by putting excess jail “beds” to use. Indeed, our preliminary research indicates that some managerial objectives are salient in local government officials’ decisions to contract with ICE. It appears that local managers behave like good collaborators and contractors in that they are more likely to house ICE detainees if they already partner formally with ICE through 287g agreements; these pre-existing relationships effectively reduce the “transaction costs” of drawing down detention contract revenue.

But most other management factors don’t seem to play a role in contract decisions, including those related to excess capacity or economic development needs—resident income, unemployment, etc. Instead, local administrators seem to be responding more to immigration-specific community characteristics. They appear to be more willing to supply detention services under contract when their communities have higher percentages of Hispanic residents and higher levels of undocumented immigrant deportations. Interestingly, though, we see a pattern in which local officials and administrators in the “middle of the country” respond to these factors by contracting with ICE, while their counterparts in southern border states or communities with the highest levels of undocumented immigrants do not. Presumably, in these latter circumstances, local administrators are attuned to the political and cultural accep-

tance of undocumented immigrants in their communities, and the dependence of their economies on immigrant labor, undocumented or not.

In related research we have found that decisions about detention facility management models shape the immigrant detainee experience; more specifically, in federal detention facilities managed privately under contract with ICE, major disturbances related to ICE detainees are more frequent. Comparisons across public federal, private federal, and state-local facilities indicate significant differences in one or more performance categories related to detainee safety. A 2016 Department of Justice report (U.S. DOJ 2016) prompted a decision to phase out all federal contracts for private prisons, due to “safety and security” deficiencies. Left unmentioned was the fate of undocumented immigrants, yet some, including skyrocketing” numbers of child-detainees (Dickerson 2018), are also detained in federal private facilities under contract with ICE, typically managed by the same firms as those cited in the DOJ report. The DOJ decision was, in any case, reversed by the Trump administration. In short, whether federal or local, administrators involved in decisions about outsourcing immigrant detention services need to be cognizant of the implications of their choices for detainee safety. ICE-apprehended individuals are almost always non-violent, civil detainees who must often cope with environments designed for criminals.

In short, we have learned that ICE administrators are finding ways to respond to political demands for more undocumented immigrant detention. But their primary strategy—partnerships with local governments—means that perhaps the most critical public administrators for those detained through ICE regulations are local. Local public administrators are involved in decisions about whether to participate in ICE’s mission by assisting with detainee apprehension, supplying detention services under contract, and also whether to operate jails holding detainees publicly or through private contracts.

Local administrators will continue to play a critical role in immigrant detention, at least in the near term. Current federal priorities will expand the number of immigrant detainees, and striking deals with local government actors is necessary for that priority to be satisfied. It appears that local public administrators will have to add to their current decision portfolios; in addition to making decisions about public works, roads and bridges, economic development, and other traditional local services, they will be called on to decide whether to help the federal government fix its immigrant detention capacity problem. In doing so, it seems that they will consider some familiar managerial values and strategies, but will also respond to the political and cultural contours of their communities.

References:

Dickerson, Caitlin. 2018. Detention of migrant children has skyrocketed to highest levels ever. *New York Times*. September 12.

Kopan, Tal. 2018. It’s not just FEMA: ICE quietly got an extra \$200 million. *CNN*. September 12. <https://www.cnn.com/2018/09/12/politics/ice-more-money-fema-dhs/index.html>

U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Secure Communities. Overview. www.ice.gov/secure-communities

_____. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Delegation of Immigration Authority Section 287(g) Immigration and Nationality Act. www.ice.gov/287g

U.S. Department of Justice Office of Inspector General. 2016. *Review of the Federal Bureau of Prisons’ Monitoring of Contract Prisons*. Evaluation and Inspections Division 16-06. August.

Notes from the Field: Public Managers Cooperate on the U.S. Mexico Border

Kirk Emerson
Elizabeth Baldwin
Laura López-Hoffman
University of Arizona

The U.S.- Mexico border conjures images of intense public conflict on the ground, in the courts, and across our polarized political discourse. Within this conflict-laden setting, however, cooperative engagement has become the norm between Border Patrol (BP) agents and federal land managers (LMAs) protecting natural resources along the border, despite their divergent agency missions. For the past seven years, a field research team at the University of Arizona has been studying how BP and LMAs interact to fulfill national security and natural resource protection obligations along the 2,000 mile U.S. -Mexico border.¹

Conflicts between BP and LMAs escalated post 9/11

Federal agencies own much of the land along the border and are required to protect the nation’s natural heritage. Undocumented border crossing through these protected wildlife refuges and wilderness areas increased after 9/11, when stepped-up border security pushed crossers deep into the wildlands between formal points of entry.² To interdict border crossers, BP agents would need to track and apprehend crossers on these public lands, as well as build permanent and temporary infrastructure to support its enforcement activities. This cross-border traffic and rapid mobilization began to have a direct and extensive impact on federal lands. Unsanctioned crossers and BP agents alike cut hundreds of miles of roads into the vast desert landscape, and thousands of pounds of abandoned trash, gear, and vehicles accumulated in riparian areas.

Potential for conflict between BP and LMAs escalated when Congress authorized the waiver of environmental laws to expedite construction of border fencing. Without environmental safeguards in place, BP began to build infrastructure on public lands, including poorly graded roads and fencing that collapsed in the Sonoran desert's monsoon rains. These early incursions made LMAs hostile and reluctant to cooperate with BP agents.

Interagency cooperation started on the ground and has become the norm over time

As tensions mounted on the ground, BP and LMAs began to meet informally to prevent and resolve conflicts. They collaborated on low-hanging fruit first, co-sponsoring multi-year efforts to remove border crosser trash on federal lands. LMAs began to assist BP in training agents on how to operate on federal lands. Informal meetings became formalized as quarterly interagency border task force meetings, allowing LMAs and BP managers to meet regularly to exchange information and share concerns.

Conflicts in the field were elevated to departmental headquarters, leading the secretaries of DHS, the U.S. Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to negotiate a 2006 interagency memorandum of understanding (MOU) that clarified BP's right to operate on public lands, but also acknowledged and rectified interorganizational conflicts by creating new public lands liaison positions within BP, establishing conflict resolution procedures, and dedicating resources to manage ongoing challenges. BP recruited and promoted senior managers to improve working relationships between the agencies.

Managers interviewed in 2010, 2013, and 2017 report that interagency conflict has significantly diminished since the mid-2000s and that cooperative activities have contributed to improving border security *and* protection of public lands. Those interviewed from BP and land management agencies repeatedly and explicitly expressed respect for each other's missions, see border security and protection of natural resources as a joint obligation, and acknowledge the concrete benefits each provide to the other. For example, BP presence has improved security for Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument and the Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge, allowing both units to fully re-open to the public after previous closures due to dangerous conditions. Routine cooperation includes:

- *Enhanced interagency communications* through radio interoperability and shared communication infrastructure;
- *Enhanced public safety* through joint surveillance, training, and mapping exercises, as well as sharing first responder duties, acting as "force multipliers" for both agencies;

- *Assistance from LMAs to BP* through improved access on public lands, consultation on infrastructure construction, and information sharing on border crosser activity;
- *Assistance by BP to LMAs* through road and vegetation maintenance, joint planning, clean-up, conservation, and restoration efforts; and

Interagency cooperation continues to be a work in progress.

Cross-boundary cooperation has not eliminated all areas of conflict between BP and LMAs. Cooperation with LMAs can delay BP's infrastructure development, as when the installation of a fixed surveillance tower was rescheduled to avoid a protected bird species' nesting season; and BP actions on public land can interrupt other agency actions, for example, when BP off-road incursions interfere with pilot training sorties on a desert Air Force range. The persistent turbulence found on the U.S. – Mexico border, however, demands ongoing commitment to and enactment of cooperative aspirations at all levels.

Endnotes

¹Research findings are based on over 80 interviews and meetings with BP officials and federal land managers, in 2010, 2013, and 2017 in all four border states. See Emerson, Kirk. 2010. *Interagency Cooperation on U.S.-Mexico Border Wilderness Issues A Report on Interagency Cooperation*, http://www.u.arizona.edu/~kemerson/Interagency_Cooperation.pdf; Emerson, Kirk, and Tina Nabatchi. 2015. Evaluating the Productivity of Collaborative Governance Regimes. *Public Performance and Management Review*. 38(4). 717-747.

²The Real ID Act of 2005 (Pub.L. 109–13); the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Pub.L. 109–367).

Public Administration and Border Crises: A European Perspective

René Torenvlied

University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

Recently, the U.S. news was captivated by the crude separation of young children from their parents while being deported back to their country of origin. At the same time, similar events transpired in Europe. In The Netherlands, my country, two Armenian teenage siblings, who were in naturalization procedure for ten years and well-integrated in the Netherlands, fled from a shelter home. By doing so, they escaped deportation by the Dutch Ministry of Justice and Security. Their flight unveiled a massive political and societal polarization on immigrant rights that exists in my home country. Ultimately, the Dutch Minister for Migration used his discretionary powers to make an exempt,

and granted the kids a residence permit. While half of the country was relieved, the Minister himself was severely threatened and needed high security protection by special forces.

While U.S. government is occupied building a high-rise wall on the Mexican border, the French border town of Calais has become the symbol of a “jungle” surrounded by high-rise fences. The Moria refugee camp, situated on the beautiful Greek island of Lesbos, has recently been declared a “public health risk”, effectively reframing its real condition as a highly dangerous, overly congested concentration area where small children and single mothers are confronted with criminal anarchy on a daily basis.

These examples illustrate the breadth and persistence of cross-border crises in our modern civilized world. While cross-border crises are the object of study by political scientists, scholars of international relations, and cultural studies, the mainstream field of public administration has remained quite silent—with a notable exception for studies of administrative capacity building in post-conflict situations. A broader scholarly interest in cross-border governance would provide a new stimulus to public administration research and education. In the first place, the study of cross-border governance and crises requires us to rethink the core of our discipline: the study of political-administrative relations in a comparative perspective. In the second place, it further raises our awareness to educate a new generation of scholars, leaders, and public managers who take responsibility for making a better world.

The phenomenon of cross-border crises is important for the discipline of Public Administration because it forces us to rethink the core of the discipline. National borders are the expression of inclusive rights, and the defense of these rights has become stronger and stronger in our globalized world. As a consequence, the rise of nationalism, world-wide, has put a strain on political-administrative relations. Traditional democracies become increasingly polarized, many young democracies have fallen prey to nationalist trends or even autocratic rule. The global change in these contexts forces us to rethink the models and explanations we developed in our discipline. Returning to one of the founding fathers of Public Administration, Max Weber, makes us realize that he—as a liberal patriot—pleaded for a closure of the German borders to Polish workers. A major question today is: how can current nationalist politics and divided administrations properly serve polarized citizenships? This question can only be addressed by rethinking our intellectual legacy. The new contexts produce intellectually fascinating puzzles and ethical dilemmas to our legacy. Two examples may illustrate such puzzles and dilemmas. For example, how can we model the behaviors of high-ranked White House officials who obstruct presidential decision-making? Another illustration: when the two teenagers fled for deportation, the Dutch police sent out an “AMBER alert”—thus calling upon Dutch citizens to “coproduce” in tracing down the kids. The

projected citizen coproducers reacted furiously, referring to autocratic regimes and occupation during WWII. These examples illustrate that Public Administration as a discipline will benefit much from allocating scarce resources to understanding the bigger, comparative picture of modern governance systems from a border crisis perspective.

The second impact cross-border crises can have on Public Administration is to further strengthen the cross-border perspective on globalization and internationalization in public administrations. Cross-border inter-regional and inter-municipal cooperation create public values on geographic scales that address, in a productive way, questions asked by nationalist agendas in politics and society. Cross-border public management and governance steer cooperation between many, and diverse, subnational governments—navigating across often rigid institutional, cultural, and language barriers. Even without high-rise walls, electrified fences, or patrolled seas these barriers are not easily overtaken. Public managers and public leaders who operate in cross-border contexts must have a strong sense of intercultural awareness and a great respect for different perspectives. These managers must have a perseverance to level out national public institutions that rigidly impede their cross-border initiatives. To deal with different national public institutions is a daunting task for public managers; especially because those institutions reflect congealed national identities, prejudices, and fears for the inclusion of foreign entities. That daunting task must be closely studied. Managerial strategies must be well-thought through.

Given the importance to create public values—and foster cohesion—at the border regions of national public administrations, it is necessary that academic programs in public administration offer specializations in cross-border governance and management. Personally, I am prejudiced in that respect. I currently co-direct (with my colleague Oliver Treib) the degree program “Public Governance across Borders”, jointly offered by University of Twente (at Enschede, The Netherlands) and University of Münster (Germany). Co-directing a degree program across borders has turned us into true professionals in the field of cross-border management. And not only we are cross-border professionals: the mayors of our home cities trade places for a few days a year. One of the most enlightening parts of the joint degree program is when German and Dutch students, after a “speed dating” session, engage in small intercultural project teams—working on real-life governance and management challenges. Students learn to respect their different cultures, values, languages, and perspectives. And students get much frustrated about differences in institutional systems and learning approaches. But at the end of the day, our graduates report to be open-minded citizens and respectful colleagues. We should stimulate that future generations of such students flock over the world, with the competences to, actually, cross borders. Ultimately, our future is theirs.

Management Matters and the Border Crisis

Angel Molina, Jr.
Arizona State University

Immigration has solidified its place among the list of society's foundational issues. Although the salience of the matter may ebb and flow, immigration represents a sphere of public policy that is, in some form or another, disputed on the agendas of governing bodies across the globe. The most visible immigration deliberations tend to center on the subset of people referred to as *the undocumented*. Take for example the current debates over undocumented immigrants in Italy. There, lawmakers have proposed legislation to expel nearly half a million immigrants of African origin. Spain and other EU countries also find themselves in the midst of what some would consider to be defining moments in their nation's immigration climates. Still, perhaps the most visible of these debates are those unfolding against the backdrop of the United States and its border with Mexico.

The US-Mexico border spans nearly 2,000 miles. From San Diego and Tijuana to Brownsville and Matamoros, this border is home to numerous binational communities and sister cities influenced by conditions on both sides of the international divide. While these communities are home to many people born on the US side of the border, they are also home to immigrants with legal status along with those who have yet to secure formal documentation. Recent estimates indicate that most of the nearly 11 million undocumented immigrants residing in the United States are of Latino origin. Not surprisingly, the Latino community has been at the center of debates over policies such as Deferred Action of Childhood Arrivals (DACA), and the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act.

Immigrants of Latino origin are often framed as a threat to American institutions, and this negative framing has led some to believe that their presence has an adverse effect on the lives of other groups. But systematic analyses find that the much of the framing surrounding Latino immigrants is not supported by empirical observations. The immigrant dynamic has motivated new research into the policy implications of current migration trends. From health care to law enforcement, empirical advances are being made at a time when the immigration policy debate needs them the most. Yet the vast majority of such work is not being published within the pages of public administration journals, and it appears the most visible contributions of social science to the immigration debate are not being advanced by public administration scholars.

Immigration dynamics provide the field of public administration an opportunity to shed novel and much needed light on governance within border communities. While there are various paths to the inclusion of society's various groups,

public sector organizations play an integral role in the incorporation of immigrant communities within their host society, citizenship status notwithstanding. The choices made by public managers and street-level personnel affect the short-term outputs and long-term externalities associated with various immigration policies. In turn, they also influence the daily experiences of immigrant and surrounding communities. Exactly how such choices affect border communities remains unclear. This is an empirical question that seems ripe for investigation by social scientists who navigate the interdisciplinary waters of public administration. Driven by their tenuous situation and a desire to improve the prospects of future generations, immigrant communities have long been a positive force in the United States.

How does public administration contribute to this process? The social science and practice of public administration must be viewed as a collective lens through which we understand the successes and failures of immigration policy not just in the United States, but in other countries as well. Interestingly, the environments created by contentious immigration climates have the potential to create organizational decisions that feed into the relationship between border communities and organizations in settings that are not directly related to immigration. Researchers in other disciplines are now finding that the effects of immigration policies are not limited to the immigration context itself. From fields such as political science and sociology we can infer that the management and implementation of immigration policies now have consequences for outcomes in other policy settings, such as public health and public education.

But what about the border? How are immigration, education, and other bureaucracies responding to shifting policy narratives and their community's newest entrants? How does the border context shape facets of governance such as public value, the use of performance information, and organizational learning? As it relates to the US, new insights into governance along the US-Mexico border are particularly important given that the distinct features of this region call into question the ability of border-blind research to inform policy and service delivery in border communities. We know from decades of empirical evidence that bureaucracies across multiple policy arenas are influenced by their surrounding environments. This perspective suggests that the distinct social, political, and economic features of the US-Mexico should be accounted for in analyses of organizations that operate within the region. Especially during of periods of contentious implementation that have been created by the debates over immigration policies at the national level.

Bringing Light to Darkness: Centering the 2018 Border Crisis within Public Administration

Apolonia Calderon
University of Maryland, School of Public Policy

We are past the July 2018 deadline to reunify the thousands of families separated at the U.S-Mexico border. This deadline came in response to the Trump Administration's Zero Tolerance Immigration Policy that brought crisis to thousands of individuals attempting to migrate to the U.S and significant media attention to the implementation practices of U.S federal departments and their agents. With the U.S. government restricting the rights and aid to the individuals detained in their custody, the nonprofit community continued to lead as major advocates for immigrants within detention by providing legal services and serving as watchdogs for inhumane practices. The U.S. government failed to reunify all the individuals affected by their deterrence policy. In fact, as I write this piece, new reports continue to shine light on the treatment of hundreds of children, those without sponsors under the care of the Department of Homeland Security, who continue to be transported across county and state lines to await their "release" at the Tornillo Shelter, located in Southwest Texas (Dickerson 2018).

"What is done in the dark, will eventually come to light," is the most fitting phrase to describe U.S. immigration policies and implementation practices (including those prior to the Trump Administration such as the Obama Administration's Secure Communities Program) that may go unnoticed. While "border crises" like those of this year and the Obama Administration's Unaccompanied Minors Crisis affect, if not all, most public organizations, the field of Public Administration remains in the dark as our scholarship lacks attention to the 14% of the U.S. population without formal political citizenship (López & Bialik 2017). A simple search within the Journal of Public Administration and Theory's (JPART) repository, found four articles published since 2010 containing "immigrants" or "immigration" in their abstract compared to the 11 articles in Public Administration Review (PAR) since 2003. Post the 2014 Unaccompanied Minors Border Crisis, only one article related to immigration decision making was published in JPART and four articles in PAR. We lack theory and a connection to the reality of the foreign-born population in the United States as our published research fails to address the differences between states of citizenship and how outcomes vary between citizens and non-citizens.

Furthermore, our current research in public administration remains underdeveloped as it simply evaluates the outcomes of Hispanics who have connections to the immigrant community by including acknowledgements of the role that immigration might play. Although a good starting point, an acknowledgement does not suffice as the outcomes may be far

worse or better for immigrants within our populations of interest. As a first-generation Latina whose scholarship is shaped by living close to the Hidalgo, Texas Border Port of Entry, I intentionally do not include research on Hispanics in my count of published research focused on immigration. In my opinion, it does my community a disservice to say that our experiences with public organizations and their representatives are genuinely reflected within the broad categories of Latinos. While it is difficult to get accurate counts of the immigrant community and their racial and ethnic background, we cannot continue to just mention how issues of immigration might affect the different target populations we study. We have to make a concentrated effort to promote research and theory development that attempts to address the complexity between communities that contain citizens and non-citizens like the Latino community. I know that the Latino community is not the only one with a rich history of immigration. We must attempt to develop and extend existing theories and data collection that reflect the foreign-born population within the U.S.

In addition, an additional pitfall of current immigration research in public administration is that it is typically focused on a crisis. By focusing on U.S-Mexico Border crisis and other punctuated immigration crises in our nation's history, public administration scholarship fails to acknowledge that the border crisis is rooted in systemic inequities affecting all of our public organizations and their actors due to a broken immigration system. When we respond only when policy and its implementation have created crisis along our southern border, we continue to perpetuate the negative social constructions around immigration and immigrants. Focusing on the border crisis as a "timely" issue continues to propagate a focus on "illegal immigration" rather than on the broader problem with the U.S. immigration system that affects the interactions of immigrants, (i.e. permanent residents, naturalized citizens, visa over-stayers, etc.), with our various public organizations and their outcomes from health to criminal justice. Furthermore, we only reinforce the image of "illegal immigration" as synonymous to Latino immigrants crossing along the U.S. Mexico border.

Lastly, I want to echo Kelly LeRoux's call for public administration to embrace nonprofit research as part of its mainstream focus. With limitations on service delivery across the various types of immigration status, public organizations are restricted in the services they can and do provide to the immigrant community. It is immigrant-serving nonprofits who take on the role as advocates on the behalf of the non-citizen community by assisting them with critical services to aid in their integration process and provide legal services from applications to deportation defenses. They are important organizations that influence the environment and shape interactions with public organizations. As the nonprofit community influences policy outcomes, public administration needs to situate research on nonprofits into its mainstream focus.

As public administration scholars, we seek to positively influence public management, but we cannot evaluate levels of social equity within our institutions if we have not addressed how immigrants are affected by the policies, practices, or management styles studied. We owe it to the future of democracy and future administrators to provide research that has diligently identified how immigration influences public management from the decision-making of executives and middle managers, to the outcomes of service delivery by street-level bureaucrats. Unless research begins to explore the effects of immigration on public organizations and the impacts of public institutions on immigrants, we will remain a homogenous discipline disconnected from the realities of the more than 40 million individuals in the U.S. With the lives of millions on the line and self-proclamations of pursuing equity, public administration cannot afford to remain in the dark.

References:

- Dickerson, Caitlin (2018). "Migrant Children Moved Under the Cover of Darkness to a Texas Tent City." *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/30/us/migrant-children-tent-city-texas.html>
- López, G. & Bialik, K. (2017). "Key Findings about U.S. Immigrants." *Pew Research Center*. 10 Jan. 2018. Web.

The Politics of Management at the Local Level: Navigating the Border Crisis in Local Government

Shannon Portillo
University of Kansas

Border crises coupled with discussions of immigration and refugees around the globe highlight the increasing nationalism and right turn many industrialized western democracies are currently facing. The border crisis in the U.S. is no different. In reality, the "crisis" is the manifestation of inhumane immigration policies primarily aimed at keeping Latin American migrants and refugees out of United States. Journalists highlight the immediate issues along the border as well as the impacts of the crisis on agriculture in California and the Midwest. But, in reality, this crisis has touched communities throughout the country

Academic discussions of the border crisis are often siloed within particular policy arenas—law enforcement, education, executive power, etc.—and for good reason, studying these areas at the federal and state level involves complexity and nuance in each area of policy and management. Local government scholarship provides us a unique lens where we see how interrelated these issues of management and policy really are and how politically daunting it is for local government manag-

ers to directly address the impacts of the border crisis. It is in local governments where residents have the most frequent contact with government through law enforcement, educational institutions, parks and recreation, housing, and other services. Many local communities see the benefits of welcoming immigrants and working closely with these communities.

Law enforcement touts the benefits of working collaboratively with communities, and with increased immigration enforcement there is a decrease in residents reporting crimes or cooperating with investigations. All children, regardless of immigration status, are mandated to participate in K-12 education, and a well-educated population has economic benefits for local municipalities. However, strict immigration enforcement has the potential to decrease parental engagement with schools and student enrollment. Many immigrant families in the United States are mixed status where some members may lack documentation, while others have citizenship or legal status. However, with increased immigration enforcement there is less engagement of mixed status families with health care and public health institutions, leading to potential missed preventative care and negative public health outcomes.

Many localities are currently wrestling with how they create welcoming, inclusive communities under the current administration. President Trump has repeatedly threatened to deny municipalities federal dollars if they declare themselves sanctuary cities that will not cooperate with federal immigration authorities attempting to deport undocumented immigrants. However, there is little consensus on the legal definition of what constitutes a sanctuary city, and cities have implemented varying understandings of what it actually means to be a sanctuary city. Further, federal authorities noted that it would be nearly impossible to walk back all federal dollars that often flow through various agency grant programs and intergovernmental collaborative efforts. Thus far, the threat to sanctuary cities is purely political, but the political rhetoric has had real impacts on local policy making and civic engagement.

Public administration scholars recognize that the border crisis is not just a discussion of politics or a discussion of resources or management, but a fundamentally a normative crisis about who we are and what values we expect organizations to implement from policy makers through the frontline. These policy changes, and changes in interpretations of policies, may be political, but public managers and the staffs that report to them must implement these policies. As we talk about the border crisis, it makes sense to refer back to H. George Frederickson's classic question about public administration, "Efficiency and effectiveness for whom?" How does the implementation of these new policies affect the equity that administrators should strive to achieve? How does the implementation of these policies fit into our understanding of good governance?

Academic research already highlights some of the negative impacts of the border crisis at the national level. Discussions of

contracting for immigrant detention centers highlight what it means to have for profit companies benefit from these policies. Discussions of national security highlight what it means to focus resources on preventing hardworking people from coming to this country under the guise of combatting terrorism. And, economic analyses highlight that the crisis at the border hurts job growth as well as providing a scapegoat for underpaid labor in the U.S. As children are torn apart from their families, causing lifelong trauma for both children and parents, we increasingly understand how these actions affect the health, education, and legal outcomes for individuals and communities.

It is imperative for public administration scholars to recognize the ways in which normative values and political ideologies play out with the border crisis, not just in direct discussions of the border itself but as we consider how we should implement policies. The local level gives a unique lens to see how this crisis is playing out on the ground in communities. It is a space for reflection and intervention. Our field recognizes there is no such thing as neutral implementation, implementation is the final stage of the policy making process. Calls for neutrality are often calls for inaction and silence in the face of injustice. As scholars we should build from Frederickson's classic question and ask ourselves, how do we ensure that our scholarship and our field aren't neutral in a time of crisis?

Public Administration and Border Crises

Alketa Peci
Brazilian School of Public and Business
Administration, EBAPE
Fundação Getulio Vargas, FGV
Brazil

Border crises are growing worldwide, affecting not only a handful of wealthy countries, like the US, and Central and North European countries, but also "frontline" territories, like Greece, Turkey¹ or Brazil, recipients of temporary immigrants. The chaos resulted from the flows of immigration, fuels the rise of anti-immigrant feelings and violence, and sets governments against each other. Instead of approaching border crises by building collaborative strategies, governments, at their best, have demonstrated a piecemeal approach to immigration flows, or opted for questionable moral and legal bilateral agreements. Strong border control policies have become common strategies adopted by governments, which reflect the urge of authoritative and right-wing political leadership, despite evidence that collaborative strategies deliver better outcomes in reducing immigration flow.

Public Administration (PA) approaches to border crises reflect these ambiguous governmental policies and broader

societal feelings. In this brief essay, I shall focus on three PA relations with the border crises: a) the massive, but underestimated, investment in PA resources needed to implement tightened border control policies; b) the pressing demand for PA resources to address the growing immigration flow in "frontline" territories, whose populations, in general, are subject to scarce PA capacities and precarious public service delivery; c) the fact that PA institutions and street-level bureaucrats are permeated by broader societal values, pro or anti-immigration, and the consequences of this cultural environment for non-citizen immigrants allocated in fenced camps and detention facilities.

Indeed, PA institutions and bureaucrats are needed to implement border demarcation, control, and management. Stronger border control policies are reflected in growing numbers of border guards, military forces, border walls, fenced camps, and detention facilities. In other words, they demand massive PA resources. Unfortunately, this is not an exclusivity of Trump era policies². Many countries opt for closing or tightening border controls to deal with growing immigration flows. In 2016, some 20,000 Syrians languished in the desert next to Jordan, while Lebanon closed its borders (The Economist, 2016). Since 2010, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Cuba, and Argentina are receiving growing numbers of Venezuelan immigrants facing harsh humanitarian crises and an authoritarian government³. Brazil controls its border allocating growing numbers of military forces as the Venezuela exodus grows. Immigrants facing severe malnutrition and health issues demand different expertise from military forces, which goes beyond border control and defense—the primary expertise of the army - and pressure for additional public resources.

Also, tightened border control, despite demanding valuable PA resources, fails to deliver the desired outcomes and may, instead, produce unintended consequences that also fuel more significant demands for PA resources beyond the border territories. Tightened US border controls induced higher numbers of illegal Mexican immigrants to stay permanently in the US, different from what happened before the 1990s, when this population was in circular migration (Massey, 2005; Cornelius & Lewis, 2007; Sadowski-Smith & Li, 2014). Undocumented immigrants are also excluded from welfare programs and public service delivery, influencing growing poverty rates and illiteracy. Roraima, an impoverished Brazilian region is underserved with essential public services and is the entry point of most Venezuelan immigrants who face severe malnutrition and health problems (chickenpox and other diseases among children, and adults is common due to the lack of vaccinations). The growing precariousness of public services is making the local population resent immigrants, resulting in xenophobic attacks and forced returns of Venezuelan immigrants. The failure of PA to serve the local population, and extend service delivery to immigrants, is fueling xenophobic attitudes in Roraima and in other "frontline" territories.

Against this backdrop, the Brazilian government adopted a new policy, denominated “immigrant interiorization,” whose main goal is to transfer Venezuelan immigrants from Roraima to more prosperous Brazilian regions. This orchestrated effort also demanded the collaboration of several PA institutions, including the army, responsible for the transportation of the immigrants, and it looks like a promising strategy to shift the pressure from the borders and promote immigrant integration in more affluent regions of the country, better served with public service delivery.

The 2015–2016 peak of European immigration crises has mainly been controlled through collaborative policies and bilateral arrangements. These are highly questionable in terms of moral and legal concerns: the EU deal with Turkey⁴ and new border fences in the Balkans⁵ are some examples of these policies. Again, many of these policies impose challenges to PA institutions in “frontline” recipient countries, such as Serbia, Greece or Turkey. Lacking PA capacities for their citizens, these countries are demanded to provide essential public services to the growing number of immigrants. In 2017, most of the almost 8,000 Afghan refugees in Serbia, many of them unaccompanied children, lived in 18 state-run asylum centers that provided basic assistance. Children were enrolled in school and took Serbian language courses, along with English or German. However, highly skilled engineers, linguists or computer programmers cannot attain a job due to the scarce labor market, the impossibility of having a diploma, and the lengthy time of requiring legal status in Serbia. The lack of PA capacity is exemplified by the fact that the asylum office did not deliver a single decision in 2017. Out of more than 1,000 asylum claims launched in 2016, only 70 were decided upon⁶.

Finally, PA attitudes toward immigration and immigrants also reflect the broader pro or anti-immigrant values of society. Indeed, strong differences permeate PA institutions responsible for border control and management. These differences are also found among street-level bureaucrats distributed in a network of organizations responsible for implementing immigration policies, as Hall (2012) illustrates in her analyzes of detention centers in the UK. The very premises and conditions of a detention center differ from one context to another. As the voices of the crying children separated from their parents in US detention centers shocked the world as a case of non-humanized treatment, other detention centers are frequently considered to offer humanized treatment of non-citizens, protecting fundamental rights within the facility. This is, for example, the case of Swedish detention centers. Unlike detention conditions in other countries, the regime of movement within the center is relatively free all day, and neither detainees nor the staff wear uniforms, although certain ‘prison-like’ security measures still exist. Detainees can receive a daily allowance, have access to means of communication (such as the internet, cellphone) and are supposed to stay for a determined period, ranging from 48

hours to 1 year (Rodin, 2016). However, detention centers, even the humanized ones, also suffer criticism from scientists and civil activists against the very idea of detention – which is dominant in border control.

‘Non-citizens’ immigrants have a clear view of public servants’ anti-immigrant feelings and attitudes⁷. Afghan immigrants detained in Serbia gave the following testimonies:

- “In Hungary my family are in a 24-hour closed camp – when someone goes to the bathroom there are four police on every side of you,” said Weesa “They are not free like we are here.”
- Faqirzada says many countries could learn a lot from Serbia. “In Afghanistan, no one cares for each other. In Turkey there were no schools. In Bulgaria we slept in forests. But in Serbia, the people support each other. They support my family too, I do not forget this.” (Finnian, 2017)

Unfortunately, the underlying factors that have led more than 1.8 million migrants to Europe since 2014 have not disappeared, despite being alleviated from the bilateral agreements with “frontline” countries. People move or are forced to move, for humanitarian, political, economic, environmental and other reasons, that seem to grow worldwide. In their search for a better life, “non-citizen” immigrants face death⁸, hunger, and non-humanized treatment. There is a pressing need for PA resources that need to be channeled to the more humanized treatment of “non-citizens,” and, ultimately, to their integration as citizens in welcoming societies.

Endnotes:

¹In 2016, Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon hosted over 5 million Syrian refugees, including 2 million children. In. Forming an orderly queue; Europe’s migrant crisis. Anonymous. The Economist. London [Vol. 418, Ed. 8975](#), (Feb 6, 2016): 21.

²Trump’s Executive Order regarding border security and immigration enforcement, stated that the executive branch will “secure the southern border of the United States through the immediate construction of a physical wall on the southern border, monitored and supported by adequate personnel so as to prevent illegal immigration, drug and human trafficking, and acts of terrorism.”

³Colombia Tightens Border Controls as Venezuelan Exodus Grows. In. Rosati, Andrew; Medina, Oscar. Bloomberg Wire Service; New York [New York]08 Feb 2018.

⁴Kingsley, P., & Rankin, J. (2016). EU-Turkey refugee deal–Q&A. The Guardian, 8. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/08/eu-turkey-refugee-deal-qa>

⁵Finnian, J. (2017). Blocked in the Balkans: The refugees that Europe won’t allow in. The Guardian, 8. Available

at:<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/aug/08/eu-refugees-serbia-afghanistan-taliban>

⁶Finnian, J. (2017). Blocked in the Balkans: The refugees that Europe won't allow in. *The Guardian*, 8. Available at:<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/aug/08/eu-refugees-serbia-afghanistan-taliban>

⁷Ibidem.

⁸Open Migration. The death toll in the Mediterranean, ever since the UNHCR started counting in 2008, has never been so high. Available at: <https://openmigration.org/en/analyses/the-mediterranean-why-so-many-deaths-at-sea-in-2016/>

References:

Cornelius WA, Lewis JM. 2007. *Impacts of Border Enforcement on Mexican Emigration*. Center for Comparative Immigration Studies: La Jolla, CA.

Hall, A. (2012). *Border watch: cultures of immigration, detention and control*. London: Pluto Press.

Finnian, J. (2017). Blocked in the Balkans: The refugees that Europe won't allow in. *The Guardian*, 8. Available at:<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/aug/08/eu-refugees-serbia-afghanistan-taliban>

Kingsley, P., & Rankin, J. (2016). EU-Turkey refugee deal—Q&A. *The Guardian*, 8. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/08/eu-turkey-refugee-deal-qa>

Massey DS. 2005. *Backfire at the Border: Why Enforcement Without Legalization Cannot Stop Illegal Immigration*. Center for Trade Policy Studies: Washington, DC.

Rodin, L. (2016). Biopolitics, Border Management and the Frame of Humanization of 'Total Institutions': Experiences and Representations of Swedish Immigrant Detention. *Zhurnal Issledovani Sotsialnoi Politiki= The Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 14(2), 275.

Sadowski-Smith, C., & Li, W. 2016. Return Migration and the Profiling of Non-Citizens: Highly Skilled BRIC Migrants in the Mexico-US Borderlands and Arizona's SB 1070. *Population, Space and Place*, 22(5), 487-500.

Call for Proposals

for the

2019 Public Management Research Conference
at University of North Carolina

Deadline - November 2

See <https://pmrc.unc.edu/call-for-proposals>
for additional information

Comings & Going

Awards & Achievements

Congratulations to the 2018 Fellows of the National Academy of Public Administration:

Roland Anglin, Professor and Dean, Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University

Christopher Ansell, Chair, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley

Donald Bathurst, Executive Director, Emergency Preparedness, U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Robert Bifulco, Associate Dean, Chair and Professor, Department of Public Administration and International Affairs, Syracuse University

David Brunori, Research Professor, The George Washington University

Matthew Chase, Chief Executive Officer, National Association of Counties

Hector Cordero-Guzman, Professor, Marx School of Public and International Affairs, Baruch College of The City University of New York

Lisa Danzig, Specialist Leader, Human Capital, Organizational Talent & Transformation, Deloitte Consulting LLP

Leisha Dehart-Davis, Professor of Public Administration and Government, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Elaine Duke, Principal, Elaine Duke and Associates

Michael Ettlinger, Director, Casey School of Public Policy, University of New Hampshire

Lee Feldman, City Manager, City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Ron Feldman, Chief Operating Officer, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis

Jay Fisette, former Board Member/Chairman, Arlington County, Virginia

Mridul Gautam, Vice President, Research and Innovation, University of Nevada, Reno

Greg Giddens, Partner, Potomac Ridge Consulting, LLC

Thelma Hite Harris, President and CEO, Hite Consulting, Inc.

Wendy Haynes, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Grants and Advancement Initiatives, University Advancement Division, Bridgewater State University

James Hendler, Tetherless World Professor of Computer, Web and Cognitive Sciences, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Robert Lightfoot, President, LSINC

Christopher P. Lu, Senior Strategy Advisor, Fiscal Note

Deborah Lucas, Director, Golub Center for Finance and Policy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Katie Malague, Vice President for Government Effectiveness, Partnership for Public Service

Justin Marlowe, Professor of Public Finance and Civic Engagement, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, University of Washington

Charles Menifield, Dean, School of Public Affairs and Administration, Rutgers University

Ines Mergel, Professor of Public Administration, Department of Politics and Public Administration, University of Konstanz, Germany

Kathleen Miller, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. Army
Christopher Paul Morrill, Executive Director/CEO, Government Finance Officers Association of The United States & Canada

Joseph Nimmich, Senior Executive Advisor, Civil and Commercial Group, Booz Allen Hamilton

John Paczkowski, Senior Vice President, Homeland Security and National Resilience, LCF International

Courtney Phillips, Chief Executive Officer, Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services

Maureen Pirog, Rudy Professor of Policy Analysis, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University

Erika Poethig, Vice President and Chief Innovation Officer, Research to Action Lab, The Urban Institute

Sean Stackley, Vice President, Strategy, L3 Technologies

Kurt Thurmaier, Professor and Chair, Department of Public Administration, School of Public and Global Affairs, Northern Illinois University

Eugenia Toma, Wendell H. Ford Professor of Public Policy and Administration, Martin School of Public Policy and Administration, University of Kentucky

Janine Velasco, Assistant Director, Business and Management Operations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

James Williams, Partner, Schambach and Williams Consulting

Orice Williams Brown, Managing Director, Congressional Relations, U.S. Government Accountability Office

Peter Winokur, Founder and President, Integrated Safety Solution, LLC

Steven R. Putansu, PhD (Senior Design Methodologist, U.S. Government Accountability Office) was awarded an Arthur S. Flemming Award in the area of leadership and management for his outstanding methodological leadership on several projects and teams with agency-wide efforts to improve guidance, practices, and tools for developing, assessing, and reporting on criteria in methodologically rigorous ways. Established in 1948, the Flemming Awards recognize outstanding federal employees with between 3 and 15 years of federal service.

Kenneth J. Meier, Distinguished Scholar in Residence at the School of Public Affairs American University, received an honorary doctorate in political science from Aarhus University (Denmark) on September 14, 2018 during the University's 90th anniversary festivities.

Yu-Che Chen, University of Nebraska-Omaha, is a co-PI on a \$2.4 million five-year (2017-2021) grant from the Nebraska Department of Transportation to be responsible for e-government services.

New Positions & Promotions

Vaiva Kalesnitkaite, has joined the Public Administration Department, at the College at Brockport, SUNY as an assistant professor. Vaiva was awarded her PhD at Florida International University in 2018.

Keith Baker, left Oregon State University to join the Public Administration Department at the College at Brockport, SUNY as an associate professor.

Jennifer Dodge was awarded tenure and promoted to associate professor this year at Rockefeller College, University at Albany. She continues as Editor of *Critical Policy Studies* and is currently extending her research on environmental management to Latin America where she's doing a new project with Diana Trujillo (University of Los Andes) about oil extraction in a protected area in the Macarena region of Colombia. She continues her research on the controversy over hydraulic fracturing in the US.

Robin H. Lemaire has been promoted to Associate Professor with tenure at the Center for Public Administration & Policy (CPAP) in the School of Public & International Affairs at Virginia Tech. Her focus is on organization theory and the management of public, nonprofit, and health care organizations, and specializes in inter-organizational networks and network analysis. She earned a PhD in Public Management from the School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona.

Yu-Che Chen, was promoted to Full Professor of Digital Governance in the School of Public Administration, part of the College of Public Affairs and Community Service at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Alex Henderson, associate professor, Long Island University, and **Hillary Knepper**, associate professor, Pace University, were named co-editors-in-chief of the *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration* starting January 1, 2019.

Institutional Announcements

The Ohio State University wishes to make the following announcements:

Jill Clark was promoted to associate professor with tenure.

Hongtao Yi was promoted to associate professor with tenure.

Andrea Headley was appointed as assistant professor.

Chris Rea was appointed as assistant professor.

Jim Landers was appointed as Enarson Fellow.

Greg Moody was appointed as executive-in-residence.

USC Sol Price School of Public Policy recent faculty and alumni achievements and appointments include:

Yusun Cho (PhD '18, Public Policy and Management) was appointed Research Professor at the Korea University's Institute of Governance Design.

Ryan Merrill (PhD '17), Doctoral Research Fellow, Singapore Management University, was honored with the Academy of Management 2018 William H. Newman Award for best paper based on a dissertation.

Juliet Musso, Associate Professor, was appointed as Vice Chair of the Price School Department of Governance.

Anthony Orlando (PhD '18, Public Policy and Management) was named to a tenure-track position as Assistant Professor in the Department of Finance, Real Estate and Law at California Polytechnic State University, Pomona.

Thomas Reilly (MPA '97) was appointed chancellor of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

Mindy Romero, (PhD in Sociology, UC-Davis), Director of the California Civic Engagement Project, joined the USC Price School in Sacramento as a Research Assistant Professor.

Shui Yan Tang, Professor, was named Chair of the Price School Department of Governance.

Johanna Thunell (PhD '18, Public Policy and Management) was named a postdoctoral fellow at the USC Schaeffer Center for Health Policy & Economics, with a research focus on gender and racial disparities in health care access and therapeutics.

Karen Van Nuys (PhD in Economics, Stanford University), joined the Price School as Research Assistant Professor. Her expertise includes value of life sciences innovation, health policy, pharmaceutical pricing and distribution, and organizational economics.

Bo Wen (PhD '18, Public Policy and Management) was named to a tenure-track position as Assistant Professor in the China Center for Special Economic Zone Research at Shenzhen University, China.

The University of Kansas School of Public Affairs and Administration is pleased to announce the following faculty and alumni achievements:

Rachel Krause won the 2018 “Emerging Scholar” award, given by the American Political Science Association’s section on Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy.

NASPAA recognized **Alfred Ho** as this year’s winner of the 2018 Leslie A. Whittington Excellence in Teaching Award. The NASPAA Excellence in Teaching Award recognizes faculty who have made “outstanding contributions to public service education through excellence in teaching over a sustained period of time”.

Steven Maynard-Moody was selected to be the recipient of the 2018 NASPAA Duncombe Excellence in Doctoral Education Award. Steven has mentored 31 doctoral students over a 30 year period.

The KU School’s Ph.D. student **Angela Park** was recognized by NASPAA with the Emerging Scholar award.

Shannon Portillo won the NASPAA Voinovich “pitch completion” that spotlights innovative collaborative partnerships. Shannon’s proposal outlined her vision to work with community colleges in the Kansas City region to bring first generation scholars and people of color into public administration.

Dave Toland, University of Kansas MPA Class of 2001, was selected to receive the 2018 NASPAA Alumni Spotlight Award. Because of David’s collaborative leadership in reinvigorating “the Appalachia of Kansas”, in 2017 rural Allen County, Kansas, was awarded the “Culture of Health Award” by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Heather Getha-Taylor was named Editor-in-Chief of Public Personnel Management starting January 1, 2019.

Odds & Ends

The Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at National University of Singapore held a Workshop on Decentralization in Asia at the School on 25 Oct 2018. For more information, please contact Alfred M. Wu, PhD, Associate Professor. Dr. Wu’s information can be found here: <https://lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/our-people/faculty/wu-alfred-muluan>.

Publications

David Horton Smith, Alisa Moldavanova and Svitlana Kravynska co-edited a new volume titled *The Nonprofit Sector in Eastern Europe, Russia, and Central Asia: Civil Society Advances and Challenges*. The book is an inaugural publication in Brill’s nonprofit research series that provides a research overview of the nonprofit sector, nonprofit organizations, and their management in eleven former Soviet Union republics, with each central chapter written by local experts and editorial introduction and conclusion setting the whole volume in several, relevant, larger intellectual contexts.

Jennifer Dodge has a forthcoming book chapter (with **Angel Saz-Carranza** and **Sonia Ospina**) called “Narrative inquiry in public network research” in the upcoming book: *Researching networks and collaboration in the public sector: A guide to approaches, methodologies, and analytics*, edited by J. Voets, R. Keast, & C. Koliba.

Yong Fan, Yan Wu, Alfred M. Wu, and Wei Wang published *Decentralised Governance and Empowerment of County Governments in China: Betting on the Weak or the Strong?* in Volume 44, Issue 5 of *Local Government Studies*.

For the latest news and information from the

**Public Management
Research Association**
please visit our website at:

www.pmrnet.org

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
Newsletter Editor - Peter Federman