Innovation in the Public Sector

Publin Report No. D13-3

Israeli case study WP5

Regional Resource Centres of Special Education

By Nitza Schwabsky, Eran Vigoda-Gadot, Aviv Shoham and Ayalla Ruvio

PUBLiN

INNOVATION IN SOCIAL SERVICES:

REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, ISRAEL

Nitza Schwabsky, Eran Vigoda-Gadot, Aviv Shoham and Ayalla Ruvio

Contents

A. INTRODUCTION

This case study focuses on innovation in social services through the kaleidoscope of Special Education Regional Resource Centres (RRCs). Regional Resource Centres provide educational, psychological and paramedical services for children with special needs and serve as the "executive arm" of the Law of Special Education (1988; 2002-correction). The law promises free education for children with special needs in the least restrictive environment and through mainstreaming and inclusion whenever possible.

The context of special education was selected following the State Comptroller's Report of 2002 that instructed the inclusion of people with disabilities into the Israeli society, work and the community as part of the welfare system, this way, considering special education a social service.

The study uses the conceptual framework of innovation and learning within the context of special education to "paint a picture" of innovation in a social service from policy and service perspectives. Innovation in RRCs aims at providing intellectual and tangible resources, instruction and training for mainstream and special education institutions in means of service improvement.

The guiding statements, in this study, hold a '*problem driven view*' of innovation and focus on four segments that represent the innovation process: (1) design and development; (2) Organizational Learning, (3) selection, diffusion and utilization; (4) evaluation.

B. GENERAL CONTEXT

B1. Special Education as a social service: Why Special Education?

The Israeli State comptroller report of 2002, among its recommendations, instructs the "inclusion of people with disabilities into the Israeli society and work" and the community as part of the welfare system, thus, concerning with people of all ages. Special education is accordingly viewed in this study in line of this report.

B2. Basic Terms and Concepts

Innovation in this study, follows the Publin project case study guidelines' definitions of "new ways of doing things at the organizational level; a deliberate change of behaviour that leads to new and improved services, processes, technologies, administrative tools or ways of organizing activities at any level of the organization" (Green, Howells and Miles, 2003). The study focuses on service innovation.

Organizational learning is perceived as a collective, ongoing process of learning and knowledge accumulation (Argyris, 1977; 1995; Handy, 1989; Schön, 1973). It is also viewed as an organizational capacity to learn and to create the future (Senge, 1990; Glynn, 1996).

Policy learning refers to policy making, and policy development as a learning process. Policy learning thus is the learning process that underlies policy development and policy making. It follows Heclo's approach of Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden (1974, in Fiorino, 2001) of "efforts by policy makers to learn and to apply the lessons of that learning" (Fiorino, 322). Policy learning is also, "a relatively enduring alteration in behavior that results from experience" (p. 306). Policy learning calls for policy makers'

flexibility: "As the environment changes, policy makers must adapt if their policies are not to fail" (277).

Special education – the specially designed instruction and services provided by the school district or other local education agency that meets the unique needs of students identified as disabled. Special education may include instruction in a general education or special education classroom.

Special Education in Israel works to accommodate children with disabilities and special needs, and services are free for parents of children of 3 to 21 years old. However, parents are responsible to fund therapeutic services that are not provided or funded by the government. A percentage of this money is refundable by different health plans with proper receipts from institutions or therapists. Some of the services and medical equipment are provided by the National Social Insurance, or the National Health Ministry.

A child's right of special treatment is decided by the Ministry of Education Special Education Placement Bureau [committees]; yet, many parents seek objective professional diagnostic opinion of mainstreaming experts regarding their children.

The Law of Special Education (1988, 2002) states that children should be educated in the least restrictive environment. It aims at regulating the services and creating procedural certainty and codifying guidelines for placement, and replaces informal negotiations between families and the department of education that had taken place in the system. Whenever a child can be "mainstreamed" into a regular school, the law states that he or she should be regulated.

According to the law, special education has the following goal:

> "to advance and develop the skills and abilities of the special needs child, to correct and enhance his or her physical, mental, emotional, and behavioural functioning, to impart to him or her knowledge, skills and habits, and to help him learn acceptable social behaviour with the goal to facilitate his or her integration into society and employment circles" (Section B.2; translation by Goldgraber, 1999)

C. LOCAL CONTEXT

C1. Regional Resource Centers

Innovation is transferred through learning and the distribution of knowledge. RRCs ["Matya" in abbreviated Hebrew] represent a restructured effort of a social service that provides intellectual and tangible resources, instruction and training for mainstream and special educational systems population.

There are 65 RRCs all over the country, each 'housing' professionals and resources that aim to demonstrate efficiency through students' clinical and academic protocols, newly structured hours and budget allocation.

RRCs have a director (and a deputy in large regions of over 800 classes), a supervisor and a team of coordinators, each responsible of a school, and mentors. Additionally, there are speech therapists, and an emotion therapeutic coordinator in most RRCs. The size of the RRC is determined by the size of the region, and by the number of classes that it serves (no fewer than 200), in compliance with the district and special education directors. The

number of hours allocated for management purposes is also determined by the size of the region and the number of classes that it serves.

RRCs are expected to work harmoniously with both schedules of the education system and the municipality; they aim at deepening and enhancing the professional knowledge and expertise of the staff and they are expected to demonstrate flexibility and speed in response of the changing needs of the education system.("Hozer Mankal", 2003).

The main functions expected of the RRCs as stated in the Ministry of Education general report "Hozer Mankal" (2003) are as follows:

- To provide supervision and act as the special education local or regional "executive arm",

- To exhibit flexibility and speed in response to changing needs,

- To stay close to the field and well acquainted with the educational institutions and their special characteristics

- To recruit and gather manpower and other resources from within the system, and to mobilize them as needed.

- To present a high level of organizational capacity

- To present an ability to professionalize with new methods and in a variety of special education domains

C2. Methodology

This case study follows the PUBLIN approach to studying innovation in the public sector. Following Yin (1989), data gathering and analysis is carried at two levels: (1) the case as a whole, by which the case is the first unit of analysis; (2) studying the sub-unit, which is found in specific patterns of action, as emerging through people's reports. The case study approach is the preferred method here because it allows the study of innovation within its context (Yin, 1989) for the development of new theory of innovation, which has been under-researched.

C3. Guiding Statements and Research Questions

We use the guiding statements and research questions adapted from Hertog (2003) with adaptations by Cunningham and Malinkova (2005, internal report) in order to define a common methodological framework within which to study innovation in the public sector. These guiding statements represent a '*problem driven view'* of innovation (see Table 1 below), as portrayed by the propositions examined in this study. As noted by Hertog, "while acknowledging that the innovation process is an iterative and complex process, the guiding statements ["hypotheses"] and related questions have been situated within a linear model ("life story") of the service innovation process and associated policy learning, as a way of unpacking the different issues of interest to study".

Table 1 Guiding Statements for Service Innovation and policy learning

Service Innovation		Policy Learning	
Statements	**Questions**	**Statements**	**Questions**
Initiation		**Initiation**	
Public sector innovation at the service level is problem driven	What was the primary rationale for the innovation under study? Were there supporting rationales? Was the innovation developed proactively or reactively? Where did (recognition of) the need for the innovation originate?	Public policy learning innovation is problem driven.	How can specific problem-orientated policy innovations be transformed into more general forms of policy learning? Is policy learning largely a reactive or proactive process?
Performance targets are a driver for innovation. Performance targets are a facilitator for innovation.	What are the most appropriate incentives and drivers for innovation in the public sector system under study? Be aware that it may be a driver and not a facilitator	Policies directed at performance measurement are a driver for policy innovation Policies directed at performance measurement are a facilitator of policy innovation	What are the most appropriate incentives and drivers for innovation in the public sector system under study? Be aware that it may be a driver and not a facilitator
This innovation is "top-down" (i.e. policy-led) as opposed to "bottom-up" (i.e. practice-led).	Does the location of the pressure for the introduction of an innovation impact its diffusion and development? Each country case should describe to what extent it is a top-down or a bottom-up innovation	This innovation is "top-down" (i.e. policy-led) as opposed to "bottom-up" (i.e. practice-led).	Does the location of the pressure for the introduction of an innovation impact its diffusion and development? Each country case should describe to what extent it is a top-down or a bottom-up innovation
Design and Development		**Design and Development**	

This innovation is developed through imitation of private sector practice.	Where did the innovation arise? Does it have models outside or inside the public sector?	This innovation is developed through imitation of private sector practice.	Where did the innovation arise? Does it have models outside or inside the public sector?
The choices and features of this innovation is influenced by underlying organisational politics, dominant values and belief systems	To what extent have the choices and features been driven by conflicts (specify: power, funding, belief systems … etc) between different stakeholders? How did the introduction of the innovation overcome the resistance to change at the service level?	The choices and features of this innovation is ° influenced by underlying politics, dominant values and belief systems	To what extent have the choices and features been driven by conflicts (specify: power, funding, belief systems … etc) between different stakeholders? How did the introduction of innovations overcome the resistance to change at the policy level?
The end user was involved in the innovation process	What was the role of the end user? Were they involved in order to improve the design features or to increase acceptance of the innovation and/or for other reasons? If they were not involved, explain why.	The end user organization was involved in the innovation process	What was the role of the end user organisation? Were they involved in order to improve the design features or to increase acceptance of the innovation and/or for other reasons? If they were not involved, explain why.
Selection, Diffusion and Utilisation		**Selection and Deployment**	
The diffusion of the innovation required effective 1. networking, 2. competence building and 3. alternative thinking		The selection and deployment of the innovation required an environment that encouraged effective 1. networking, 2. competence building and 3. alternative thinking	
The diffusion of this innovation required co-	How can inter-governmental roadblocks	The most challenging public policy	How can inter-governmental roadblocks

ordination between different governmental institutions and/or departments	be by-passed? To what extent does intra-governmental co-ordination depend on direct political interaction? To what extent does intra-governmental co-ordination depend on stimulus from a crisis situation? Does fragmentation of government create a barrier?	innovation takes place at the intra-governmental (inter-functional) level.	be by-passed? To what extent does intra-governmental co-ordination depend on direct political interaction? To what extent does intra-governmental co-ordination depend on stimulus from a crisis situation? Does fragmentation of government create a barrier?
Evaluation and Learning		**Evaluation and Learning**	
Evaluation played a critical role in the innovation process Research institutions played a critical role in the innovation process Interaction with other institutions/firms played a critical role in the innovation process	Did the innovation meet the expectation of the stakeholders at various stages of the innovation process? Did the innovation have unintended consequences (e.g shifting bottlenecks)? Did the innovation induce other innovations? Is there evidence of policy learning and any associated structure? Had lessons been drawn from earlier innovation processes?	Evaluation played a critical role in the innovation process Research institutions played a critical role in the innovation process Interaction with other institutions/firms played a critical role in the innovation process	Did the innovation meet the expectation of the stakeholders at various stages of the innovation process? Did the innovation have unintended consequences (e.g shifting bottlenecks)? Did the innovation induce other innovations? Is there evidence of policy learning and any associated structure? Had lessons been drawn from earlier innovation processes?

In-depth interviews were conducted with 12 policy and service personnel; documents represent legal and office information, as follows:

1.	Policy-level interviewees (6) consist of top and middle managers, and policy-makers, i.e., head of the Ministry of Education and her deputy, department heads and special education supervisors.

2.	Service-level interviewees (6) consist of frontline service personnel, whose task involves an ongoing direct interaction with the clients. Service-level interviewees consist of the regional resource centres' trainers, school principals, program coordinators and teachers.

Documents represent formal and informal information, such as the Laws of Special Education (1988, 2002), the report of the committee for the study of the implementation of the Law of Special Education (2000), different lawsuits related to the case (i.e., Yated v. Minister of Education, 2000; Marsiano v. Minister of Finance, 2003; Minister of Finance v. Marsiano, 2004). Additional documents consist of media documents, Ministry of Education and Special education reports and circulars, and different forms related to the case. Field-notes taking were started in November during PUBLIN workshop in Haifa, Israel. The merge of methods reassures triangulation in order to increase the reliability and validation of data. Further validation has been gained through on-going evaluated with special education professionals.

D. INNOVATION in RRCs / FINDINGS

This section presents findings at the policy and the service levels at four phases of the innovation process: (1) design and development, (2) organizational learning, (3) selection, diffusion and utilization, (4) evaluation and learning. The paper concludes with a discussion of main issues that emerge of the data and with implications for public managers, followed by a table of guiding statements and supportive arguments.

D1. Design and Development

### 1.1	Innovation—towards new ways of engagement

Innovation of RRCs characterizes a shift of philosophy and conceptual thinking, as well as of the organizational applications. This section focuses on how innovation affected Special Education, and on the resulting changes that occurred from past to present.

Change has been identified in four main areas:

a. A Philosophical paradigmatic change, which accounts, for example, for the belief that students with special needs, who are integrated into the main system, deserve the same education and treatment as their mainstream peers

b. Placing the client in the centre, which requires, for example, an individualistic treatment for students,

c. Management efficiency: Hours and resource allocation; *transparency*, such as, the expansion of services, study hours, the provision of services to the family and siblings, a different hour allocation and transparency.

d. Staff professionalism refers to the raise in level of staff's professionalism. Examples are clear requirements and training for staff on a regular basis.

1.2   Initiation and entrepreneurship of Innovation

Innovation in this social service has been accounted for top-down, bottom-up and mixed direction initiatives, with the former being more frequently mentioned by both policy and service personnel.

Top-down innovation: RRCs are initiated top-down by the Ministry of Education

Bottom-up innovation represents internal and external organizational entrepreneurship.

Top-down and bottom-up recursively Innovation and entrepreneurship occur recursively: Innovative ideas are initiated top-down at the management level and are transferred to the staff for discussion and agreement. Ideas "travel" back and forth between service and policy level personnel, and when formalized, they appear as a top-down innovation.

1.3   Entrepreneurs' roles:

Interviews yielded different roles mentioned by policy level and service level interviewees.

The roles mentioned by **policy level** interviewees represent different stages of the generation and the planning of the innovation process. The roles mentioned by **service level** interviewees represent the practical aspects of innovation.

1.4   Driving and hindering forces of innovation

Innovation involves pressure groups' politics and resistance to change at all levels of the organization. Focusing on driving and hindering forces, both policy and service level interviewees agreed that people are the major 'factor' that affects innovation, rather than non-human, external forces. People who support the innovation idea seem also willing to take the extra step. Those who oppose it are likely to raise obstacles and barriers.

a.   Driving forces:

Among the driving forces mentioned by **policy level** interviewees are teachers and collaborative staff that understand that the innovation empowers them, the Ministry of Education management, and Special education supervisory. At the **Service level,** driving forces are additionally intrinsic needs. Examples of intrinsic needs are knowledge seeking, the need to invent and innovate and staff's own ability as academics.

b.   Hindering forces:

Resistance to the RRCs originated over budget use, role functions and position losses. The restructuring of the special education system caused redundancy of some role functions and resulted in some tension between former supervisors and the new management. The former resisted the innovation. Furthermore, fiercest resistance came from the professional [teachers'] unions that feared losing their grasp of the teachers, once they professionally 'belonged' to an outside institution as originally planned [meaning, the RRCs].

1.5 Overcoming resistance to change

An analysis of the strategies stated by interviewees for overcoming resistance to change emphasize the difference between the policy and service-level innovation management; the former, focusing on the macro and the latter, on the micro. Furthermore, suggestions have been proposed regarding the innovation leaders and regarding the group.

D2. Organizational Learning

Infrastructure that facilitates learning and training accompany any innovation and exists in RRCs too. It is this infrastructure that enables the interaction and exchange of ideas internally and externally to the organization, and thus enabling the construction of new knowledge. Following we report of the infrastructure that facilitated learning and networking practices in Special Education. Such infrastructure can facilitate international imitation of ideas and different new ways of implementing the innovation, i.e., following philosophical paradigmatic shifts of beliefs and values that support the need of equality for people with special needs, as well as in the innovation implementation.

2.1 Networking for innovation

Networking with other organizations, as reported by **policy-level** interviewees brings to light two purposes: (1) to improve the ongoing management of the organization; (2) to improve service provision; each directed inwardly and outwardly.

2.3 Encouraging organizational learning

Once the learning infrastructure is in place, employees are encouraged to take part in inter and intra organizational networking, some of which are mandatory, and some, optional.

D3. Selection, Diffusion and Utilization

Selection, diffusion and utilization represent the praxis of innovation. The following section focuses on innovation management in means of monitoring and directing the innovation and coping with political pressures and resistance.

3.1 Innovation monitoring and diffusion

Innovation is monitored and diffused both at the policy and the service levels, aiming at getting the word out and generating agreement and acceptance.

3.2 Overcoming and "bypassing" intergovernmental obstacles

Legal documents have emphasized the conflict regarding the innovation funding, which led to a serried of lawsuits at the Supreme Court. Accordingly, lobbying on the one hand and lawsuits on the other emerged as means of by-passing intra-governmental roadblocks.

3.3 Innovation diffusion and utilization

Interviewees suggested strategies for innovation diffusion.

At the policy level, examples are: diffusion through Instructions, internet, training, lectures, meeting and visits; Start with a pilot project then expand; market innovation; show success in a way that will not endanger envy and make innovation part of the perceptual school system.

At the service level: Have a forum for meetings, plan conferences, publish articles and schedule meetings with trainers, principals and clients; use internet web-pages and a surfing community to diffuse the innovation

D4.   Evaluation and Learning:

Innovation calls for further openness and attentiveness to new ideas from new and old staff members and of the clients, flexibility and gradual change, needs assessment before the innovation inception, cooperation at all levels of the organization, clear definitions of the goals and objectives in terms of the innovation efficiency and effectiveness, belief in the idea of the innovation, and lobbying and involving people toward a perceptual attitudinal and behavioral change.

E. DISCUSSION

Innovation in the public sector aims at improving the service provision and the management practices. Focusing on the guiding statements and research questions, we provide a discussion of the main areas that emerged in the study (See a detailed summary table no. 1)

E1. Design and Development

An analysis of the findings following the study guiding statements indicates that innovation was initiated predominantly top-down out of the need to solve specific problems that arose from the field, such as, the need to ensure an equal treatment to children with special needs in response of global social beliefs, or the need to fight lawsuits and respond to legal claims. At the service-level too, innovation arose of a need to solve specific problems or needs, such as the need to prepare the specialized tailored curriculum as required by law, or of the need to submit reports for transparency. Staff has collaborated with teachers and special education personnel out of the need to find solutions to problems that arose.

Initiation has originated predominantly of top-down initiatives and has been fueled and influenced by ideas and initiatives from the field. Innovation thus represents a cross-divisional, policy-service level interaction in which policy-level personnel set the tone, and service-level personnel contribute with ideas, and later "translate" the innovation to match with their beliefs, their work norms and expectations. Innovation is thus also driven by performance targets that represent these needs, with service-level personnel perceiving the innovation as a "vision".   As it appears, service-level staff perceives innovation policy as guidelines, and while implementing it, initiates small scale innovations, and adopted change that aim at matching between the innovation requirements and the in the field. This also means finding creative solutions, even if they require bending some rules.

Underlying organizational politics plays an important role in the innovation process exhibited through individual and group pressures, some driving the innovation and others hindering it.

Driving and hindering forces illustrate the importance of performance targets that join to drive or resist the innovation. RRCs in themselves are an example of an innovation that arose at the policy level in response of best inclusion practices. Driving forces work at the service level too. Service-level personnel are expected to implement the innovation and respond to students' needs. Similar to policy-level service level personnel aspire to have satisfied customers (the students). They are driven by immediate needs of students, and by

their desire to do the things the 'right way' in benefit of the students even if this means to bend some rules or regulations that have been prescribed by policy level people who lead the innovation. Suggestions to overcome resistance to change call for openness and collaboration, lobbying, persuading and being well connected to the field.

Innovation is influenced by underlying organizational politics, dominant values and belief systems. These values and beliefs are driven by the support or resistance of pressure groups, who pull the innovation in their direction of fear to lose control, status or merely their position at both the policy and the service levels.

Innovation often follows and adopts organizational trends that have been developed externally in for-profit or other non-for-profit organizations, adopted to fit within the local public environment. Examples are the global trend of openness to multi-culturism and social differences, which also affected Israel in the quest of social equality for children with special needs, and the recognition of the need to accept them as different but equal. This impact also reached the service level that following similar global trends place the client at the centre and open itself through transparency and accountability measures.

Innovation in social services through the kaleidoscope of RRCs characterizes a philosophical, structural and administrative change that lead to a shift in behaviour in special education. Through administrative restructuring a change in resource allocation and staff professionalism, leads to a different service provision in the way they provide staff provides the service and reports to the management for accountability. While the advantage of the innovation is a feeling of professionalism and academization of the service provision, the down-side of it is the larger amount of work that it demands in meetings, in creating individual curricula and the growing amount of paperwork.

E2. Organizational Learning

Organizational learning plays an important and an integral role at all stages of the innovation process, such as in information generation and dissemination, design and implementation. Organizational learning, here in the form of policy learning has been defined as the learning processes that accompany organizational innovation and affects policy decisions.

Learning takes an internal and external form, both at the individual and the team levels. The RRC innovation has impacted service-level personnel thrive to learning, knowledge acquisition and professionalism. It has been stressed several times that no matter the extent of the innovation, but personnel now feel that they have the tools for delivering and using it.

Innovation and policy learning support one another and move in parallel paths along the innovation process. Appropriate infrastructure should, therefore accommodate the innovation process. Since collaborative discussion and idea generation are most important, managers and developers of training sessions and conventions ought to plan for collaborative sessions to take place.

Networking patterns have developed in two purposes: Service improvement and management efficiency improvement. (1) Networking for improvement of service-provision internally and externally to the organization aim at promoting the innovation objectives, i.e., reaching professional agreements and settlements regarding innovation-related improvements and staff's work conditions. (2) Networking for management efficiency improvement at the policy-level involves all stakeholders and aims at generating

and exchanging new ideas that would lead to new programs and management initiatives and reports.

Networking at the service level is important too as conferences, conventions or meetings, mandatory or optional, yield sight to further learning and collaboration in benefit of the service provision.

E3. Resistance and overcoming intra-governmental roadblocks

Resistance and politics are profound to innovation implementation and emerge internally and externally to the organization. Likewise, intra-governmental roadblocks must be overcome, as their impact innovation profoundly, especially in regard of funding the innovation. The Innovation in Special Education followed the law of 1988 and originated by parents' lawsuit of Yated (a Non-profit organization) v. Minister of Education (2000). The implementation of the Law was studied by "Margalit committee" of 2000, which made recommendations that pointed at the need of funding. This led to the 2003 claim at the Supreme Court by parents and two parliament members who demanded the funding transference to the Ministry of education in order to meet the needs of the innovative reform. This was approved by Supreme Court Judge Dorner (Marsiano v. Minister of Finance, 2003). A response claim by the Ministry of Finance who tried to lower the funding was rejected by Supreme Court Judge Matza. (Minister of Finance v. Marsiano, 2004). Although the Ministry of Education did not file claims or petitions against the Ministry of Finance, it supported the plaintiff realizing that the success of the case would grant the office with the desired funding.

The innovation process called for an attentive yet firm approach in overcoming resistance or bypassing intergovernmental roadblocks. Listening to others has been a major recommendation in order to open communication channels that would lead to understandings and agreements.

E4. Evaluation and Learning

Innovation is a growing phenomenon in the public sector, even though there is no extrinsic reward involved. It has been broadly agreed by all participants of this study, beyond any doubt, that innovation is part of the public sector organization existence and progress. Both policy and service personnel provided examples of innovation. They viewed innovation in the public sector as non-profit oriented, which allows it to focus on research and development more than in the private sector. However, innovation originates of the need in the field rather than of research and development. As portrayed from the findings, innovation in the public sector takes place in a system that is complex, traditional, bureaucratic and non-autonomous that suffers of lack of funding and renewal difficulties in spite of the ongoing research and learning, comes to solve problems or needs an is highly

As it emerges from the private case of special education, innovation and policy learning are crucial for public service improvement.

F. BIBLIOGRAPHY

-- (1999). Looking at Israel: Social services in Israel. *The State of Israel*:
http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/go.asp?MFAH0hg00

-- (1999). Looking at Israel: Education. *The State of Israel*:
http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/go.asp?MFAH0hfy0

Argyris, C. (1977). September/October). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review 55*, 115-25.

Argyris, C. (1995). Action science and organizational learning, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 10(6), 20-26.

"Free Special Education", legal issues and others related to the Special Education Law and Inclusion [in Hebrew] http://www.pigur.co.il/court/cyatedcont.htm

Fiorino, D. J. (2001). Environmental policy as learning: A view of an old landscape. *Public Administration Review, 61*(3): 322-335.

Glynn, M. (1996, October). Innovative genius: A framework for relating individual and organizational intelligences to innovation. *The Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 1081-1102.

Goldberg, Yechezkel (1998) Frequently asked questions about special education and inclusion in Israel. Department of WZO.
http://www.wzo.org.il/en/resources/expand_author.asp?lastname=Goldberg&firstname=Yechezkel

Goldgraber, Yaacov (1997). *Special Education in Israel*. Gordon College of Education:
http://www.kinneret.co.il/benzev/yacov/spedartc.htm

Goldgraber, Yaacov (translation). (1999). *Israel's Special Education Law of 1988*:
http://www.kinneret.co.il/benzev/yacov/spedlaw.htm

Green L, Howells J, Miles I, *Services and Innovation: Dynamics of Service Innovation in the European Union*, Final Report December 2001 PREST and CRIC University of Manchester

"Ha'Aretz" new release, http://www.aisrael.org/hebrew/News.asp?ID=177# [in Hebrew]

Hertog, Friso den. (2003). *Doing case studies in PUBLIN. PUBLIN papers*.

"Hozer Mankal" [General Management Official Circular] (2003). Special Education, the Minisry of Education [in Hebrew] http://www.education.gov.il/mankal/indux/sc10bk1_2_32.htm

Inclusion in Mainstream Education – Updating Management Report, 32- 1.2 (2003)b

Kemp, René and Rifka Weehuizen. 2003. "Policy Learning: what does it mean and how should we analyze it?" *PUBLIN papers.*

Koch P, Hauknes J and Roste R et al (2002) *Rationalities and Innovation Policy Learning* http://www.step.no/goodnip

Marsiano v. Miniser of Finance, SC 6973/03, Israel (2003). http://www.justice.gov.il/NR/rdonlyres/E0C42F44-9540-4FB1-9644-66C8CDFE296B/0/liat697303.doc.

Meadan, Hedda and Gumpel Thomas P. (2002, June). *Teaching Exceptional Children: http://journals.cec.sped.org/EC/Archive_Articles/VOL.34NO.5MAYJUNE2002_TEC_Article-3.pdf*

Minister of Finance v. Marsiano, SC 247/04, Israel (2004, May).

PUBLIN. 2002. "Innovation in the Public Sector, proposal description." *PUBLIN Papers.*

PUBLIN. 2003. "PUBLIN Guideline Report for Work Package 4 and Work Package 5."

Report of the Committee of the Study of the Implementation of Special Education Law ("Margalit committee") (2000, July) [in Hebrew].

Schön, D. A. (1973) *Beyond the stable state*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Special Education Department, State of Israel Education. http://www.education.gov.il/special/english.htm#1

Special Education Law of 1988, (including correction 7, 2002). http://cms.education.gov.il/EducationCMS/Units/Special/HukimUnehalim/HokHinuchMeyuhad/

Yated v. Mnister of Education, SC 2599/00, Israel (2002, August).

The State Comptroller and Ombudsman Annual Report 52b (2002) for the year 2001 and finances of 2000 [in Hebrew]. http://www.mevaker.gov.il/serve/folderAdmin.asp?id=153&opentree=,11,2

Yin R (1989) *Case study research: Design and Methods.* Newbury, Sage.

G. Table: Problem-Driven Innovation in the Social Service: Guiding Statements and Discussion

Service Innovation		Policy Learning	
Statements	**Questions**	**Statements**	**Questions**
Initiation		**Initiation**	
Public sector innovation at the service level is problem driven	Confirmed. Service innovation is problem-driven and has been developed reactively out of the need to "deal" with the lawsuit of parents. By these lawsuits, the parents demanded equal treatment for special education students, the need to apply philosophical paradigmatic changes, or the need to restructure the system for further efficiency. Furthermore, a tailored curriculum to fit the needs of the individual student was born out of the need to improve the service and make it more efficient.	Public policy learning innovation is problem driven.	Confirmed. Policy learning is problem-driven and has been predominantly initiated top-down, but also infused by bottom-up ideas, initiatives and innovations. Special Ed staff worked collaboratively with teachers and health-care personnel in order to find the best response to students' needs.
Performance targets are a driver for innovation. Performance targets are a facilitator for innovation.	Partially confirmed. Performance targets along with intrinsic needs drive service innovations. Aiming at serving the client, service innovation is also driven by staff members' intrinsic need for learning and their desire to provide the best service the 'right' way, even if this means bending some rules, however, ultimate performance targets become their "vision" to comply with, and therefore, both drivers and facilitators of innovation.	Policies directed at performance measurement are a driver for policy innovation Policies directed at performance measurement are a facilitator of policy innovation	Confirmed. Policy learning is driven by performance targets, which also serve facilitators of innovation. Performance targets stimulate the provision of better service to clients or the restructuring the system for economy and efficiency. Facilitating and hindering forces of innovation both serve drivers of innovation and policy learning. Additionally, intrinsic motives of innovation leaders also drive the policy learning.
This innovation is "top-down" (i.e. policy-led) as opposed to "bottom-up" (i.e. practice-led).	Confirmed. Differences exist between top-down and bottom-up service innovation. Bottom-up innovation derives of staff members' needs to change in response of a problem in the micro, a functional level, or due	This innovation is "top-down" (i.e. policy-led) as opposed to "bottom-up" (i.e. practice-led).	Confirmed. Top-down policy learning derives of both internal and external organizational forces that view innovation from a macro perspective, fuelled by information from the field.

	to a new insight or learning that is influenced by external information. Service innovation is top-down, but bottom-up supported as it emerges of the need in the field.		Policy learning and service innovation differ based on their inherent functions, when responding to different scopes of demands. Policy learning is top-down, but bottom-up supported as it emerges from the need in the field.

Design and Development		**Design and Development**	
This innovation is developed through imitation of private sector practice.	Partially confirmed – similar to policy-level, service innovation (in a form of, i.e., paradigmatic shift, team work as a new model, specialized curriculum) adopts organizational trends that have developed externally and are imitated internally.	This innovation is developed through imitation of private sector practice.	Confirmed. RRCs as an example of innovation has been 'imported' to the system and influenced by global forces. Findings indicate that policy learning is not a result of innovation, but rather serves as impetus to learning.
The choices and features of this innovation is influenced by underlying organizational politics, dominant values and belief systems	Confirmed [implied]. An analysis of hindering forces to innovation yields sight to internal conflicts of role and status. Staff feared losing their positions and space at the school. An example is of key people in the system that feared losing control.	The choices and features of this innovation are influenced by underlying politics, dominant values and belief systems	Confirmed. An examination of the facilitating and hindering forces to innovation indicates that policy learning is influenced by underlying organizational politics, and responds to pressures of individuals and groups, of the fear of losing control. Long months of debate and negotiation between the Ministry and employee organizations have led to a middle ground agreement as to the implementation of the innovation.
The end user was involved in the innovation process	Confirmed– End users are divided into two categories: directs and indirect end users. Direct end users, the children who are recipients of the service were not involved directly in the innovation process. Their parents, however, as secondary or indirect end users initiated and created the impetus for the	The end user organization was involved in the innovation process	Indirect, or secondary end users, being parents of those who received the service were very much involved in the policy development and affected the design of the policy, also affecting service providers' discourse and views regarding the need of the innovation. Involvement with legal actions has been

	service innovation in means of law suits, involving the media, etc.		crucial through legal claims and lawsuits initiated by parents and parliament members.
Selection, Diffusion and Utilisation		**Selection and Deployment**	
The diffusion of the innovation required effective - networking, - competence building and - alternative thinking	Confirmed. Definitely so. Service-level innovation requires effective networking, competence building and alternative thinking which are inter-organizational, inter-divisional, and intra-divisional, among RRC's care giver group within their centres, and externally with other care givers, professionals, and the school staff. Diffusion of the innovation occurs everywhere and can be formal or informal, mandatory or optional, in means of conferences, conventions or work meetings, , yield sight to further networking and collaborative learning in benefit of the service innovation and service provision.	The selection and deployment of the innovation required an environment that encouraged effective - networking, - competence building and - alternative thinking	Confirmed. Two networking patterns emerged as part of the policy learning: (1) service improvement and (2) management efficiency improvement. (1)) Networking for improvement of service-provision of internal and external groups aim at promoting the innovation objectives, i.e., reaching professional agreements and settlements regarding innovation-related improvements and staff's work conditions. (2 Networking for management efficiency improvement at the policy-level involves all stakeholders and aims at generating and exchanging new ideas that would lead to new programs and management initiatives and reports.

The diffusion of this innovation required co-ordination between different governmental institutions and/or departments	Not supported by this case study.	The most challenging public policy innovation takes place at the intra-governmental (inter-functional) level.	Confirmed. Innovation has been found to take place at the inter-functional governmental level, while being affected by interest groups. Pressure groups play a crucial role in the innovation diffusion and funding reception. It so happened that Ministers of one office might even support claims against the Ministry of finance in order of gain governmental support and funding for the innovation, both being Ministries of the government.

Evaluation and Learning		Evaluation and Learning	
Evaluation played a critical role in the innovation process

Research institutions played a critical role in the innovation process

Interaction with other institutions/firms played a critical role in the innovation process | Interaction with other institutions/firms played a critical role in the innovation process. Innovation is initiated top-down, is affected by the field, and involves a considerable struggle with interest groups. Interaction with different departments and care gives play a critical role in the innovation process, however, interaction with external institutions or firms has only little been mentioned.

Evaluation is important in the innovation process, but does not occur regularly or scientifically enough, and is mostly done internally within the Ministry of Ed. Research, thus does not play a critical role in the innovation process. Evaluation is mainly done through detailed paperwork of documentations and reports handed to supervisors. There is a need for a more scientific and on-going impartial research effort. | Evaluation played a critical role in the innovation process

Research institutions played a critical role in the innovation process

Interaction with other institutions/firms played a critical role in the innovation process | [comment appears in a different order than the question:] Innovation and policy learning in the public sector is a result of ongoing fierce struggles and debates of internal and external pressure groups and pressures of intra-governmental forces. It is monitored through lobbying and legal actions; it is not a result of a passive process adaptation of R&D.

Evaluation has been recognized as a critical feature of the policy learning, however, needs to be more scientific and more routine, and needs to measure the success beyond quantitative measures of obvious measures, such as numbers of service recipients, but also deeper and covert gains, such as the underlying forces that shape the innovation and policy learning. There was not much indication to the involvement of research institutions in the evaluation, except for the local governmental Research and development office. |

On the PUBLIN case studies

The following general presentation is based on the PUBLIN guideline report for case study researchers. See also the introduction to the case study summary report.

The overall aim of this PUBLIN study has been to gain insights into the processes of innovation and the associated policy learning in the public sector. These should contribute to the development of a theory (or theories) of innovation in the public sector, and contribute usefully to policy analysis. Within this study framework, the aims of Work Packages 4 and 5 (the case studies) have been *to understand the interplay between policy learning and innovation at the policy level, and innovation at the service level within the public sectors under study.*

More specifically, the objectives of each Work Package are:

1. To understand the innovation processes present within national public health systems/social service systems.

2. To understand the learning processes underlying policy development in publicly regulated health/social service sectors.

Innovation

Green, Howells and Miles (2001), in their investigation of service innovation in the European Union, provide a suitable definition of the term innovation which denotes a process where organisations are

> "doing something new i.e. introducing a new practice or process, creating a new product (good or service), or adopting a new pattern of intra – or inter-organisational relationships (including the delivery of goods and services)".

What is clear from Green, Howells and Miles' definition of innovation is that the emphasis is on *novelty*. As they go on to say,

> "innovation is not merely synonymous with change. Ongoing change is a feature of most… organisations. For example the recruitment of new workers constitutes change but is an innovative step only where such workers are introduced in order to import new knowledge or carry out novel tasks".

Change then, is endemic: organisations grow or decline in size, the communities served, the incumbents of specific positions, and so on. Innovation is also a common phenomenon, and is even more prominent as we enter the "knowledge-based economy".

An innovation can contain a combination of some or all of the following elements:

- New characteristics or design of service products and production processes *(Technological element)*

- New or altered ways of delivering services or interacting with clients or solving tasks *(Delivery element)*

- New or altered ways in organising or administrating activities within supplier organisations *(Organisational element)*

- New or improved ways of interacting with other organisations and knowledge bases *(System interaction element)*

- *New world views, rationalities and missions and strategies. (Conceptual element)*

Case study statements

In an effort to define a common methodological framework within which to study innovation in the public sector, several research orientation statements were put forward and related policy questions suggested.

These give a '*problem driven view*' of the issue under study. It should be strongly emphasised that this list was only intended to be indicative of what propositions might be tested and it was revised during the course of the PUBLIN study.

For instance, the following statements were added to the ones listed in the table below:

Entrepreneurs played a central role in the innovation process

- Was there a single identifiable entrepreneur or champion?

- Was the entrepreneurs assigned to the task?

- Had the entrepreneurs control of the project?

- What was the key quality of the entrepreneurs? (management, an establish figure, position, technical competence, access to policy makers, media etc)

- Incentives

There was no interaction between policy and service level (feedback)

- To what extent was the policy learning a result of local innovation?

- Are local variations accepted, promoted or suppressed?

- To what extent does the innovation reflect power struggles at the local and central level?

- Was there dissemination of the lessons learned, and was this facilitated by specific policy instruments?

- Where there evaluation criteria? (When?)

- Who were the stakeholders that defined the selection criteria? Did problems arise due to the composition of this group of stakeholders?

- How did the interaction and/or the interests of the stakeholders influence the selection of the indicators used?

Policy recommendations

Based on your experience from case studies, give concrete policy recommendations.

1. Present also policy recommendations given by the respondents

2. Are there any examples of "good practice"?

The case study reports all try to comment upon these statements.

Moreover, all participants were also asked to use a comparable design for the case study itself and for the case study report