

Examining the Political Environment of Policymaking beyond U.S. Borders:  
The Development of Public Policy Case Studies in the Israeli Context\*

ABSTRACT

The case method and policy workshops have been identified as two pedagogical pillars in public policy instruction for over the past two decades in the United States and beyond. In this paper we examine two instructional innovations for analyzing the political environment of policymaking based upon our pedagogical experience in the Israeli context. First, we discuss the utility of developing a coherent series of case studies in a context beyond U.S. borders. We do so by drawing upon our experience of developing original cases for instruction in Israel, and of compiling a collection of these cases in an edited book which aims to enhance Israeli public policy analysis and instruction (Galnoor, Oser, & Gadot-Perez, Forthcoming). A distinction emerged in our instruction between “foundational issues” that are fundamental to understanding the political environment of policymaking in Israel in general, versus cases which address a variety of specific policy-related topics. Second we review the pedagogical innovation of our development of a “Political Strategy Appendix” for policy paper writing which was developed in the process of preparing and teaching these cases. This appendix essentially serves to integrate the two pedagogical pillars of the case method and policy workshops, which are often too distant to build a strong curricular foundation – particularly in political environments like Israel in which the gap between technocratic policy analysis and successful policy adoption implementation can seem insurmountable. In the process of examining our development of original public policy cases in the Israeli context, we suggest the potential utility of these innovations both within and beyond U.S. borders of instruction.

Jennifer Oser, [jennifer\\_oser@hks.harvard.edu](mailto:jennifer_oser@hks.harvard.edu)

*Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Ph.D. candidate*

*Harvard University and the University of Pennsylvania, Visiting Scholar*

Itzhak Galnoor

*Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Professor Emeritus*

Alma Gadot-Perez

*Milken Institute, Director of the Israel Center*

Paper prepared for presentation at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) Research Conference, November 3-5, 2011, Washington D.C.

\*Working paper, please request permission before citing. Last revision: October 28, 2011.

## INTRODUCTION

In a now-classic examination of political and organizational analysis in the policy curriculum over two decades ago, Donald Stokes (1986) explored two central pedagogical devices in policy curricula: the **case method** and **policy workshops**. In this paper, we examine our experience of developing original case studies in a non-U.S. context in an effort to better integrate these two pillars, and the resulting pedagogical innovation of developing a “Political Strategic Appendix” for policy paper writing.

Recent reassessments of policy instruction note that these two central pedagogical devices of the case method and policy workshops are still front and center, although two sets of concerns have arisen regarding their U.S.-centric development and application. The first set of concerns relates to the need for the development of case material beyond U.S. borders to enhance global policy instruction. Universities located in a variety of national contexts with varied levels of democratic development already began approaching American institutions like the Kennedy School more than two decades ago to request permission to use U.S.-focused cases and to solicit support for developing new cases for their own national contexts (Husock, 1993). Yet, a recent assessment of emerging policy programs around the world found that while several countries have attempted to adopt normative policy analysis and methods as developed in the United States, these efforts have yielded mixed results in different settings (Geva-May, Nasi, Turrini, & Scott, 2008).

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

To set the stage for presenting how our pedagogical developments in the Israeli context address these two related sets of concerns, we briefly review the importance of developing original case studies in diverse contexts, and provide an overview of the development of policy instruction in the Israeli context.

## **The Importance of Developing Original Case Studies in Different Contexts**

To examine the contribution of developing original case studies in different contexts, it is worth pausing to review what constitutes a “good case” for the purposes of policy instruction. The objective of the case method is to help students learn from past and future experiences in order to prepare them for engaging with the world of practice (Zimmerman, 1985). A classic articulation of the pedagogical purpose of a single case is that it serve as “the vehicle by which a chunk of reality is brought into the classroom to be worked over by the class and the instructor” (Lawrence, 1953, p. 215). As a general pedagogical approach, the case method is an inductive teaching and learning process in which cases are used to train students to analyze the specifics of a case, as well as to draw generalizable lessons (Garvin, 2003). Instructional cases do not aim to provide a definitive documentation of a historical event; rather, the presentation of a “chunk reality” is intended to provide a substantive vehicle for elucidating a specific theoretical question or action dilemma (Kennedy & Scott, 1985, p. 1).

Given this review of the pedagogical objective of the case method, it is clear that the past and future experiences of students are inevitably shaped by their context. Hence, perhaps the most pressing argument for developing original case studies in different contexts is that a number of substantive policy topics which are not germane enough in the U.S. context to merit serious analysis from American scholars and practitioners are crucial issues elsewhere. In his discussion of policy process curricula Straussman lists a number of these topics: “the privatization of state-owned enterprises, deregulation, the marketization of government services, rule of law, transparency, and accountability” (2008, p. 631). From an Israeli perspective this is a remarkable list: all of these topics are of essential importance in the Israeli policymaking environment, even though they have remained largely unexplored in U.S.-focused case studies. To extend Stoke’s (1986, p. 51) analogy of policy workshops as “flight simulators”, the omission of these kinds of crucial topics in U.S. instructional materials means that their rote application to other contexts may entail an increased danger of pedagogical “crashing and burning” in the effort to prepare policy students for the world of practice.

In addition to this central concern of appropriately addressing substantive issues in different contexts, we have found two key practical advantages to the development of contextually-

sensitive case studies. First, decades of experience in using the case study method in many fields of study has shown that case study preparation, when done well, is a demanding assignment for students in terms of the breadth of material to master and the importance of understanding detailed nuance (Garvin, 2003). The added challenge of constantly decoding foreign cultural and institutional nuances in a non-native language has led, in our experience, to superficial and unsatisfying implementation of the case method. In addition, although the primary goal of cases is not to create a definitive historical account, we have found inherent utility in deeply examining cases in the political context in which students are most likely to implement their gained knowledge and skills. As detailed below in the next section in the review of our experience in Israel, teaching contextually-grounded cases has the added value of elucidating the centrality of specific institutions in a given context, and of analyzing political issues which may have perennial importance.

### **The Development of the Case Method in the Israeli Context**

In the Israeli context, public policy pedagogy is relatively in its infancy, which is fodder for an array of challenges and opportunities. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem's Federmann School of Public Policy which supported the development of our case study material and instruction is scarcely a decade old. From the American perspective, it is almost unimaginable that Israel's leading research university by most measures would have such a recently developed program, and that policy instruction and research in other academic institutions in Israel are likewise in a period of major development and growth.

A challenge presented by such a recent development of the field in Israel is the appropriate adaptation of existing pedagogical materials – which are often developed in American institutions and focused on U.S.-based policy content – to be instructive in the Israeli context despite significant differences between Israeli and American institutional structures and policymaking environments. Bringing this general tension to life, Scott Fritzen articulates a central question facing policy schools worldwide in an era of increased globalization, as asked in Singapore: “Are we an Asian school of public policy, or simply a school of public policy in Asia? What would make the difference?” (Fritzen, 2008, p. 207). At Hebrew University, a clear

decision has been made to develop an Israel school of public policy, and to do so by drawing on the best possible teaching and research practices around the globe. To contemplate what is required to achieve that end, it is worth revisiting Stokes's description of what he considers to be the "most priceless gift" of policy instruction: to develop students' capacity "to see an issue or problem through the eyes of the quite different actors it involves (Stokes, 1986, p. 52)."

Toward the goal of developing an Israeli school of public policy - and not only a school of public policy that happens to be in Israel – the Federmann School of Public Policy at Hebrew University invested in the development of a series of original case studies for the purposes of developing a course on the "Political Analysis of the Public Policymaking in Israel". In the following two sections we describe our experience in developing both the original cases for instruction, as well as the pedagogical innovation of requiring students to develop a "Political Strategy Appendix" to accompany their policy papers. This presentation of our experience is intended to elucidate our pedagogical learning, as well as to inspire similar efforts in other international settings which would undoubtedly lead to new instructional innovations.

## **I. DEVELOPING A SERIES OF ORIGINAL CASE STUDIES BEYOND U.S. BORDERS**

The most important question to ask about the development of a good case is what pedagogical issues it is intended to raise (Robyn, 1986). This guideline was foremost in our minds in developing the series of original case studies for instruction which have recently been edited for the forthcoming book, "The Political Environment of Policymaking in Israel" (Galnoor, Oser, & Gadot-Perez, Forthcoming), to address the need for contextually sensitive case studies. This book is a product of a course taught by the authors in the Honors Program of the Federmann School for Public Policy and Government at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, as well as an intensive workshop for the Faculty of Management at Ben Gurion University of the Negev. Chapters of the book are original case studies on various aspects of Israeli policymaking which were written specifically for the pedagogical purpose of developing this course.

The central aim of the course development and the edited book of cases is to develop students' and readers' skills in analyzing the political considerations that influence the development and

implementation of policy in democratic contexts. The audience for the book is intentionally broad, including policy students, government workers, policy advisors and social change leaders in non-governmental organizations and businesses alike. The general message of the course and book is that policy analysts must first tackle their work as if there are no political considerations, and then this analysis must be re-assessed with a deep understanding of the contextual political environment. The book therefore aims to broaden the often technical approach to policy analysis as taught in academic policy workshops by developing a contextually-sensitive understanding of the dynamic challenges regarding the achievement of lasting policy change that are inherent in democratic political culture in general, and in Israel in particular.

The case studies are designed to present an opportunity for students to take a deep look inside a real policy case in Israel in order to glean lessons that are gained from policy practitioners over years of experience including successes and failures. In this way, case studies are a unique avenue for learning about the gap between theory on policy change on the one hand, and the actual professional challenges faced by those interested in influencing public policy on the other.

The cases are designed with two levels of learning in mind. On the first level, the cases bring life to actual historical events in the Israeli context which were selected and developed in order to address a specific theoretical question or dilemma. Throughout the reading of a case, the reader is confronted with the central question of “what would you do if you were one of the central characters in this case?” Even seemingly straightforward questions such as “what was the problem which caused the crisis described in the case?” concretize the difficulties decision-makers face in the eye of a storm. On this first level, the case allows for the analysis of particular interests, central characters, and successful or problematic strategic moves. This first level can be thought of as the level of inspecting the trees within a forest, in which each case can be thought of as a single tree that must be studied in great detail. Through the personal and organizational history of the characters, the interpersonal interactions, and the unique politics of a particular case, insights arise regarding general guidelines for action.

The transition to the second level of generalization and lesson-learning – in other words, to gain a sense of the forest based on the trees – is a critical challenge in effectively using the case

method. Each case in the book provides an opportunity for readers to gain experience with diagnosing problems and challenges that are inherent in a particular case, but are by no means unique to the specific case at hand. Therefore, developing a general understanding of the problems identified in a case is critical for future implementation of the insights and lessons that are presented in a single case.

Each case begins with a brief introduction which aims to provide a conceptual framework for analyzing the case. The cases conclude with lists of targeted questions and recommended readings intended to guide the interested reader – student and instructor alike – in analyzing the dilemmas that arise in each case.

During the process of testing and developing these cases in the Israeli classroom, it became clear that a number of key issues proved to be foundational topics that students returned to again and again in their learning process. Therefore, over time the course was restructured into two distinct sections which also frame the book. The first “Foundational Issues” section includes four chapters which lay the conceptual framework for understanding key elements of the policymaking environment in Israel. The second “Policy-Related Topics” section includes a cases selected to touch on a variety of topics which round out a holistic understanding of the policymaking process in Israel.

### **Section 1: Examining Foundational Issues**

Following an introductory overview chapter, the “foundational issues” section includes three chapters that deal with the central issues we identified over time to be crucial topics for gaining an operational understanding of the policymaking environment in Israel: values, the legal framework, and budgeting. As noted, delineation of this “foundational issues” section emerged inductively through the pedagogical development of the course when it became clear that a number of key issues continually arose in different guises in a variety of cases. Therefore, the course was redesigned over time to frontload the teaching of these key topics so that they could readily be referred to as touchstones in later cases. In this section, we provide an overview of the key theoretical questions at the heart of each of these foundational issues chapters.

The introductory chapter of the book provides a description of public administration in general, a focused introduction to the public sector in Israel in particular, and a schematic overview of the policy analysis process. The schematic overview provides the framework for considering whether a thorough policy analysis as presented in this schema would lead to different decisions than those made in the brief exemplary case study presented in this chapter. The gap between the schema and the case narrative highlights that the dilemmas which arise in the cases go beyond technical analytical considerations to issues that are grounded in the conflict between actors' interests, world views and professional stances. This introductory chapter introduces the central terms used in the book, including the classic distinction introduced by Woodrow Wilson (1887) between politics and administration, and evolving understandings of that distinction over time.

*Chapter 1. Values as a Basis for Policy: "Attempts to Institute a Stock Market Tax (1994-2003)"*

This chapter addresses perhaps the most fundamental tension in the political environment of policymaking, certainly in the Israeli context: that policy conflicts which stem from differing motivating values cannot be resolved through a technocratic approach to policy analysis. In fact, in a political environment like contemporary Israel which is characterized by strong ideological cleavages of all kinds, these kinds of value conflicts are more likely to arise than not. Two central questions arise from this focus on motivating values: first, must policy analysts identify ideologically with the values inherent in the policies they are analyzing and advancing? Second, what can be done when policy analysts are asked to develop a policy which is in conflict with their personal values?

The case study of this first chapter analyzes efforts made between 1994 and 2003 to institute a stock market tax in Israel. This case highlights the importance of understanding the process of decision-making on a particular policy issue, including pragmatic issues of developing consensus, managing potential pitfalls, and desirable democratic processes for advancing policy reform. Mapping the values that a certain policy advances, including distinguishing between conflicting the values and interests at stake, is a crucial first step in the analysis of the political environment of policymaking. This chapter shows that the distinction between values and interests is both subtle and critical for comprehensive policy analysis.



*Chapter 2. The Law as a Means for Policy Change: “Affirmative Action or Reverse Discrimination? The Advancement of Women, Arabs and Druze in Public Service”*

This chapter focuses on legislation, a central tool in democratic governance in any advanced democracy, and an increasingly central tool for understanding the policymaking process in the Israeli context. A central question addressed in this chapter is whether the goal of achieving social change is best achieved through advancing legislation, or whether attempts to affect civic norms could yield more meaningful results. The case study of this chapter presents the gap between the positions taken by the Israeli Civil Service Commissioner and the Israeli Women’s Lobby, as an example of the tension between the capacity of laws versus norms to advance policy change.

A leading Israeli expert on public policy, Professor Yehezkel Dror, noted that one of the greatest challenges for policy analysts is “to have a cool head while thinking about hot topics”. In our teaching experience, this case is an excellent way to enter deeply into the heat of this controversial topic in the Israeli environment with a cool head. The intention of affirmative action is to afford opportunities to minority populations which traditionally have not benefitted from equality of opportunity, salary, and work conditions in comparison to others. However, the fact that this policy is also known as “reverse discrimination” hints at the controversial nature of this policy and the lack of consensus regarding its fairness and capacity to achieve intended policy outcomes. Even though this case could be used to debate the pros and cons of this specific policy, in the context of the book the case is focused on distinguishing between the advantages and disadvantages of different ways of achieving policy change.

*Chapter 3. The Budget as a Political and Administrative Tool*

The third chapter examines the budgeting process. There is no accompanying case study, but rather a focus on central principles of the budgeting process in Israel with an emphasis on the history of the budgeting process and the organizational context of the Budget Department in Israel. This historical overview includes an emphasis on the organizational culture of the Budget Department, which was established during the financial crisis in Israel in the mid-1980s. This chapter includes definitions of key terms which describe common terminology in the internal language of those involved in the budgeting process, as well as a brief review of the principles

motivating the reforms in the budgeting process. A list of recommended reading refers the reader to foundational writings about the budgeting process in Israel, particularly a book on the budgeting process by Avi Ben-Bassat and Momi Dahan (2006), economists at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem with extensive experience working in the Finance Ministry. Given the centrality of the budgeting process to policy change in Israel, the content in this chapter is referred to in some way in almost every case study in the book, providing the reader with a variety of opportunities for analyzing the ways in which the Finance Ministry translates its budgeting power into a central political tool for policymaking.

## **Section 2: Cases on Varied Policy-Related Topics**

The second section of the book, including chapters four through ten, presents a variety of cases in which technical policy analysis interfaces with issues of normative and political importance. All of these cases touch in some way on the three fundamental topics of values, legislation, and budgeting covered in detail in the first section. Each case in the second section provides a rich opportunity for analyzing political processes in public administration in Israel, and points to key considerations in the formation of public policy.

Some of the questions raised in this section include: what is the connection between corruption and creativity? How is it possible to distinguish between professionalism and organizational politics? How are structural problems affected by the time constraints of political pressures? How effective is civil society in influencing public policy? What is the role of investigative committees in the process of advancing policy change? To provide a window into the content of these chapters, this section provides an overview of the central theoretical issues addressed in each chapter and the topical case study through which these theoretical issues are examined.

*Chapter 4. Systemic Problems and Political Time Lines: “The Crisis in the Local Authorities, December 2003 to January 2005”*

This chapter examines the crisis of salary payment in the local government in Israel, a topic which often receives major headlines at least three times a year: toward the end of budget discussions in December, leading up to the Jewish holiday of Passover in March, and the high holidays in late August. The case details the problematic legal infrastructure regarding the

operation of local government in Israel, as well as the budgeting relationship between the local and central governments. Since the ideology which motivates the functioning of the local government in Israel is mired in controversy, the three foundational issues addressed in the first section of values, legislation and budgets are framed in sharp relief in this case. Given the complexity and richness of this case, we recommend two lenses for interpreting it: first, gaining an understanding the central issues and key players in the Israeli context, and second, outlining the key conflicts between different governmental institutions and ministries in Israel's governance structure. Two main conflicting roles of the local government in Israel come into stark relief: as a supplier of services of the central government, and as a layer of local democratic governance.

*Chapter 5. The Political Environment of Public Administrators: "The Rackover Affair"*

This chapter is dedicated to organizational politics, and the varied interpretations of regulations and policy briefings. The case describes the policy brief presented by a senior public servant in a parliamentary committee. The reaction of the Civil Service Commissioner and the subsequent chain of events following the steps taken by different actors teach about the unique political challenges which arise in public service. Through this case, it is possible to distinguish the connection between personal and political interests when a public servant speaks before parliament in his role as an associate legal advisor on a case fraught with sensitive political conflicts. The primary issue in this chapter is the intensity of the different stances taken by various bureaucratic decision-makers, and the contextual constraints that guide decision-makers in making "commensurate responses". This case raises issues that must be faced by those interested in leading complex organizational change of any kind in a range of contexts, including in business, as well as in social and governmental organizations and institutions.

*Chapter 6. Delegating Authority and Leading Change: "Exemplary Offices, 1993-1996"*

This chapter addresses the importance of the delegation of responsibility in the process of leading organizational change. This case is closely connected to structural reforms in public service that have taken place in a number of developed countries in the past thirty years. This wave of reforms, known as "New Public Management" brought with it changes in the nature and operation of different arms of the executive authority. These reforms took place in the 1990s in

Israel, but were never fully integrated in the public sector. This case begins with an overview of Israel's unique trajectory in comparison to many advanced democracies in not having undertaken meaningful structural change in its public sector in the 1980s and 1990s. The case provides an overview of the various strategies developed by the staff of the civil service commission in its efforts to initiate reform processes.

*Chapter 7. Political versus Professional Responsibility: "The State Health Insurance Law Committee's Decision Regarding Covered Services, 2005"*

The case in this chapter describes the dilemma faced by a "rebellious" health services committee in 2005 which decided to repeal the government's establishment of a budget limit for covered medical drugs and services. In this case, the Israeli government changed its policy and enlarged the dedicated budget following the strategic steps taken by the committee, the resignation of a senior committee member, and the broad media coverage devoted to the topic. Despite the increase in the dedicated budget, people whose medicines were not covered by the revised services submitted an appeal to address their needs. The chapter deals with a number of substantive questions related to the tension between politicians, professionals in a given field, and representatives of the public who serve on professional committees such as this one. The case raises the broader dilemma of "tragic choices" in public policy, and how limited resources can be best allocated when matters of life and death are at stake.

*Chapter 8. Procedural Rules versus Responses to Opportunities and Threats: "The 'Netivei Neft' Affair: Are Administrative Procedure and 'Getting the Job Done' Inherently at Odds?"*

This chapter presents a historical case study which provides an excellent example of how principles of proper management can come into direct conflict with the possibility of taking advantage of meaningful economic opportunities. At the heart of the case is the decision to establish a private oil company in to manage the oil fields in Sinai that were conquered in the Six Day War in 1967 instead of operating through the governmental oil company. Key questions posed through the case study include: What role does improvisation play in the effort to take advantage of opportunities or to avoid threats in conditions of uncertainty? How should proper management and managerial supervision be prioritized in the face of unexpected opportunities

and constraints? What is the optimal balance between planning and improvisation? And what are the definitive distinctions between creativity and corruption?

*Chapter 9. Organizational Conflict in Political and Administrative Systems: “The Attempt to Establish a School of Public Policy, 1993-1996”*

This chapter focuses on political rivalry in administrative settings, and the need for professionals to develop coalitions, recruit support, and to confirm that their professional plans are not torpedoed by organizational politics. Due to the plethora of governmental offices and legal authorities that relate to different aspects of public service in Israel, inter-organizational politics plays a central role in the political environment of policymaking in Israel. This case presents a rivalry between different public service units in order to frame fundamental questions regarding the role of organizational conflict in policymaking.

*Chapter 10. Citizen Involvement in Public Policymaking: “Legislating the Public Housing Law, 1998”*

This chapter examines the role of citizens and civil society organizations in raising policy problems on the public agenda. This case presents the complex success of a grassroots coalition’s efforts to create meaningful policy change, while also highlighting the challenges of implementation and lasting policy change. Given the public demonstrations of thousands of Israelis over social and economic justice sparked by a crisis of housing affordability as we completed this book manuscript in the summer of 2011, this case clearly deals with perennial issues of citizen influence on policy change.

## **II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF A “POLITICAL STRATEGIC APPENDIX”**

Through the process of academic instruction which led to the editing of this book of collected cases, we developed the pedagogy of assisting students to write a “Political Strategic Appendix” as a central tool in training professional policy analysts in the Israeli context. Through our instruction of the schematic description of policy paper development outlined in the text box below, we clarify that a first draft of the strategic appendix should be written after the policy alternatives have been identified, and should never be undertaken at the beginning of the policy analysis process. The initial stages of problem definition and the intellectual search for solutions

to the defined problem require freedom from political constraints. However, more advanced stages in the policy analysis process, including the selection of the desired policy alternative require a keen understanding of the political context, including potential sources of resistance.

The first stage of developing the political strategy is an analysis of feasibility of the leading potential policy alternatives. In the second stage of writing the strategic appendix, we transition to analyzing the different values and interests that are involved in the process of advancing the selected policy. At this stage the leading concern is who the proposed policy may benefit and may harm. Mapping the benefits and the losses of a given policy enables analysts to develop a greater understanding of the meaning of the policy recommendations, as well as the potential limits of compromise between professional policy proposals given the extant political constraints.

### Developing a “Political Strategic Appendix”

*The first six points represent a schematic outline of standard elements in a policy paper often present in standard guides to policy analysis (see for example Bardach, 2008; Weimer & Vining, 2005). The seventh point addresses the strategic appendix approach developed in our pedagogy.*

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

7. Political Strategic Appendix: Political strategy for implementation of the policy recommendation. Central points in the analysis of this plan include:

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

Note: There is an inherent tension between a high quality analytic policy paper as developed in sections 1-6 versus the Political Strategic Appendix in Section 7. This tension is the reason for the necessity of establishing the non-negotiable “Red Lines” regarding policy substance and political strategy development that are not subject to compromise.

## **CONCLUDING THOUGHTS**

In this paper we aimed to examine the lessons learned in our efforts to develop original case studies in the Israeli setting, and hopefully to inspire similar efforts in other contexts. In so doing, we documented that in developing original case studies, the existence of specific foundational issues became prominent in the Israeli setting. The choice of the particular topics included in this section is of course open to contestation, and ripe for emendation over time; nevertheless, it is clear that this general approach of selecting and elucidating foundational analytical issues in the contextual political environment yielded fruit in our teaching process, and could be a useful approach to consider in other contexts as well. Likewise, our development of the Political Strategy Appendix was motivated by our efforts to meaningfully translate the central pedagogical pillars of the case method and policy workshops to the Israeli context. Based on this experience, it seems likely that the considered development of contextually sensitive “flight simulators” in different international settings has the potential to enhance policy instruction around the globe, and in the U.S. as well.



## Authors

JENNIFER OSER is a Ph.D. candidate at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and a Visiting Scholar at Harvard University and the University of Pennsylvania. Her fields of research include social policy, political participation and participatory inequality. She has taught in courses on policy change and organizing at Harvard University, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and the University of Pennsylvania, and has worked as an organizer, trainer and consultant on a variety of social policy campaigns in the U.S. and Israel. Email: jennifer\_oser@hks.harvard.edu.

ITZHAK GALNOOR is the Herbert Samuel Professor (Emeritus) of Political Science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and a Senior Fellow at the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute. He is a leading scholar on Israeli politics and administration, and also served as the Head of the Civil Service Commission (1994-1996) and Deputy Chair of the Council for Higher Education (2007-2008). Professor Galnoor supported the founding and development of Hebrew University's Federmann School of Public Policy and Government, and is currently leading a multi-year project examining privatization policies Israel.

ALMA GADOT-PEREZ is the director of the Israel Center at the Milken Institute, where she leads projects for structuring innovative solutions to social, environmental and economic challenges through public policy, private sector tools and strategic philanthropy. She is a graduate of the first cohort of the Honors Program of Hebrew University's Federmann School of Public Policy and Government, and has led a number of innovative policy consulting, training and research efforts in academic institutions, government ministries and think tanks, including FINCA International and the Israeli Ministry of Social Affairs and Social Services.

## References

- Bardach, E. (2008). *A practical guide for policy analysis: The eightfold path to more effective problem solving* (3rd ed.): CQ Press.
- Ben-Bassat, A., & Dahan, M. (2006). *Balance of power in the budgeting process*. Jerusalem: Israeli Democracy Institute.
- Fritzen, S. A. (2008). Public policy education goes global: A multi-dimensional challenge. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(1), 205-214.
- Galnoor, I., Oser, J., & Gadot-Perez, A. (Eds.). (Forthcoming). *The political environment of policy making in Israel*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press [in Hebrew].
- Garvin, D. A. (2003). Making the case: Professional education for the world of practice. *Harvard Magazine*, 106(1), 56-65, 107.
- Geva-May, I., Nasi, G., Turrini, A., & Scott, C. (2008). MPP programs emerging around the world. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(1), 187-204.
- Husock, H. (1993). *Democracy and public management cases* (No. C16-93-1232.0): Kennedy School Case Study Program.
- Kennedy, D. M., & Scott, E. (1985). *Preparing cases in public policy* (No. N15-85-652.0). Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government Case Program.
- Lawrence, P. R. (1953). *The Preparation of Case Material*. In K. R. Andrews (Ed.), *The case method of teaching human relations and administration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Robyn, D. (1986). *What makes a good case?* (No. N15-86-673.0). Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government Case Program.
- Stokes, D. E. (1986). Political and organizational analysis in the policy curriculum. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 6(1), 45-55.
- Straussman, J. D. (2008). Public management, politics, and the policy process in the public affairs curriculum. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(3), 624-635.
- Weimer, D. L., & Vining, A. R. (2005). *Policy analysis: concepts and practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197-222.
- Zimmerman, P. B. (1985). *Case development and teaching: Communicating the results* (No. N15-85-653). Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government Case Program.