Learning from Abroad

A Center for the International Exchange of Policy Information

Douglas J. Besharov

January 2007

American Enterprise Institute
for Public Policy Research

Welfare Reform Academy
University of Maryland
American Enterprise Institute
1150 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
www.welfareacademy.org

University of Maryland 1856

Douglas J. Besharov is the Joseph J. and Violet Jacobs Scholar in Social Welfare Studies at the American Enterprise Institute, and a professor at the University of Maryland School of Public Policy.

Learning from Abroad
A Center for the International Exchange of Policy Information

Issue: Policy makers in the U.S. are facing significant challenges in areas as diverse as old-age pensions, health care, social welfare, immigration, energy, and the environment. While policy analysis in these fields has been dominated by U.S. researchers, universities, and think tanks, the rest of the world is quickly catching up. Non-U.S. researchers and policymakers have learned from U.S. policies and have raised standards for policy analysis. Moreover, in some areas, such as the reform of public pension systems, other countries have adopted more innovative policies. The purpose of this project is to examine what U.S. analysts and policymakers can learn from abroad.

In the past, information sharing has tended to be on technical or scientific topics, but public policy and governmental issues are an increasing part of this exchange. From immigration to pension reform, energy and environmental policy to crime control, family breakdown to land use planning, decentralization to performance management, and a host of other issues, nations around the world are grappling with many of the same questions that are vexing policymakers in the U.S. Immigration, for example, has made most European nations less ethnically homogeneous and the European Union's (EU) increased policy coordination and geographic expansion have led to a more continental (or at least multi-country) view of policy issues, making the American experience more relevant to Europeans—and vice versa.

Although many programs already seek to encourage the international sharing of information, they are not nearly as effective as they might be. Most are either limited bilateral exchanges or too narrowly focused on specific policy areas. Many tend to be ideologically tilted (to the Left or the Right); or are insufficiently attentive to cultural, demographic, and governmental differences. Those from non-U.S. sources are often not framed in a way that is easily accessible to American audiences. Most important, they tend to be program-specific summaries or studies that are not synthesized into a broader, more balanced public policy analysis.

Few doubt that the U.S. could learn much more from the policy experiences of other nations. The question is how best to do it.

Project: This project would be an exploratory demonstration of how to operate an on-going (and relatively low-cost) international exchange of policy information. It would have three interrelated but separate parts: (1) a systematic exploration of ways to identify topics, select authors (and other participants), and exchange policy information; (2) two or three demonstrations of specific and perhaps varying approaches to information exchanges; and (3) a final report that assesses the project's experiences and describes whether to proceed and, if so, how. For each information exchange, up to five papers would be commissioned, edited to maximize their accessibility to American audiences, and presented at one or more U.S. policy conferences. (Each set of papers would also be published as a book or a special issue of a scholarly or professional journal, and disseminated through the internet.)

Compared to many of the other programs and organizations involved in cross-national information exchanges, ours would be a relatively small project. We think our comparative advantage would be in what we hope will be the ability to select *high-value topics*, that is, topics for which a formal information exchange might advance understanding of an important and timely policy issue.

We also hope to demonstrate the utility of *low-cost approaches* to research synthesis and dissemination because of the long-term desire to cover many topics. The costs in this initial project include start-up research and development activities. Once institutionalized and with an infrastructure of cooperating organizations both here and abroad, the information exchanges should cost as much as a third less than in this planning phase.

To be decided in this planning period is whether the information exchange should be one-way or two-way. Although it would be easier to establish and conduct a one-way exchange, the contribution of the international authors might be enhanced by a substantive interaction with American experts, probably at the planned authors' meetings.

Policy Implications: A successful project could be the basis of a newly created Center for the International Exchange of Policy Information at the University of Maryland (operating in association with AEI). The center would institutionalize the successful aspects of the project, even while continuing to experiment with different formats and approaches.

We are particularly hopeful that the project's attention to formal policy analysis, based on rigorous evaluation and a full and fair presentation of the information on both sides of issues, could serve as a model for similar efforts. As such, it could lay the groundwork for a much broader flow of policy-relevant information and ideas from abroad.

Although the project's main purpose would be to develop more cost-effective methods of information exchange, the project's demonstration exchanges could enrich American research, policy and program management in their specific topic areas. For example, if we choose as a topic restraining health care costs (perhaps combined with expanding access), our project could increase understanding of how different countries seek to control medical spending, their success or lack of success in doing so, and the tradeoffs involved.

Contents

Learning from Abroad

A Center for the International Exchange of Policy Information

Issue

Policy makers in the U.S. are facing significant challenges in areas as diverse as old-age pensions, health care, social welfare, immigration, energy, and the environment. While policy analysis in these fields has been dominated by U.S. researchers, universities, and think tanks, the rest of the world is quickly catching up. Non-U.S. researchers and policymakers have learned from U.S. policies and have raised standards for policy analysis. Moreover, in some areas, such as the reform of public pension systems, other countries have adopted more innovative policies. The purpose of this project is to examine what U.S. analysts and policymakers can learn from abroad.

Throughout history, peoples have advanced by learning about—and borrowing—ideas and inventions from other societies. Whether it was the making of iron, or much later, gunpowder, or mathematics, geometry, or astronomy, and an uncounted host of other discoveries, the global diffusion of information has always been a key element in human progress. Learning from abroad has become even more important as the pace of economic and social change has increased, speeding the emergence of pressing policy and programmatic issues. And pervasive globalization and the concomitant industrial, economic, and social convergence of so many nations means that there is even more to learn from their successes (and failures).

In the past, information sharing has tended to be on technical or scientific topics, but public policy and governmental issues are an increasing part of this exchange. From immigration to pension reform, energy and environmental policy to crime control, family breakdown to land use planning, decentralization to performance management, and a host of other issues, nations around the world are grappling with many of the same questions that are vexing policymakers in the U.S. Immigration, for example, has made most European nations less ethnically homogeneous and the European Union's (EU) increased policy coordination and geographic expansion have led to a more continental (or at least multi-country) view of policy issues, making the American experience more relevant to Europeans—and vice versa.

Innovation in public policies directly relevant to the U.S. is not limited to Europe. Australia and New Zealand have been leaders in developing better intra-governmental contracting methods.[1] In its 2004 pension reform, Japan established an "automatic balancing mechanism" that modifies the CPI indexation of benefits (by subtracting from the CPI the rate of decline of the working population's contribution to pension funds and the yearly rate of increase in life expectancy at age sixty-five).[2] Hong Kong now has an employment-based, privately managed, defined-contribution

---

[1]See, for example, Jose Edgardo Campos and Sanjay Pradhan, "Evaluating Public Expenditure Management Systems: An Experimental Methodology with an Application to the Australia and New Zealand Reforms," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 16, issue 3 (1997): pp. 423–445.

[2]AARP, "Pension Issues in Japan: A Conversation with Noriyuki Takayama," *Global Aging Program: Events Calendar,* February 2006, http://www.aarp.org/research/international/events/sep12_05_takayama.html (accessed January 4, 2007); and Junichi Sakamoto, "Japan's Pension Reform,"*The World Bank Special Protection*

retirement savings scheme as part of its old-age pension system;[3] Chile now requires workers to invest in one of the various designated mutual fund–type plans;[4] and Argentina has a two-tier arrangement that combines a public defined-benefit plan with a second choice between a defined-benefit plan and a privately managed defined-contribution plan.[5]

Although many programs already seek to encourage the international sharing of information, they are not nearly as effective as they might be. Most are either limited bilateral exchanges or too narrowly focused on specific policy areas. Many tend to be ideologically tilted (to the Left or the Right); or are insufficiently attentive to cultural, demographic, and governmental differences. Those from non-U.S. sources are often not framed in a way that is easily accessible to American audiences. Most important, they tend to be program-specific summaries or studies that are not synthesized into a broader, more balanced public policy analysis.

Few doubt that the U.S. could learn much more from the policy experiences of other nations. The question is how best to do it.

Background

Comparative policy research and analysis has a long and rich history. Recently, its pace and scope have increased in many areas of interest to U.S. researchers and policymakers. The German Marshall Fund, for example, established in 1972, promotes the transatlantic exchange of ideas on a wide range of issues, including strengthening democracy, international security, trade and development, comparative domestic policy, public opinion, and migration.[6] It does so by supporting research scholars, sponsoring conferences, and bringing policymakers together in a variety of ways.

Many other programs, too numerous to even list here, seek to enhance cross-national learning, including the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University

---

Discussion Paper, No. 0541 (Washington, DC: The World Bank, December 2005), also available online at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Pensions-DP/0541.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

[3]Hong Kong Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority, "About the MFP System," http://www.mpfahk.org/english/abt_mpfs/abt_mpfs_bgd/abt_mpfs_bgd.html#2 (accessed January 3, 2007).

[4]Congressional Budget Office, *Social Security Privatization: Experiences Abroad* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Budget Office, January 1999), pp. 12–15, http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/10xx/doc1065/ssabroad.pdf (accessed January 3, 2007).

[5]Congressional Budget Office, *Social Security Privatization: Experiences Abroad* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Budget Office, January 1999), pp. 73–77, http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/10xx/doc1065/ssabroad.pdf (accessed January 3, 2007).

[6]German Marshall Fund, "Policy Initiatives," http://www.gmfus.org/policy/index.cfm (accessed January 2, 2007).

Institute, Florence;[7] the Network of European Centers of Excellence in U.S. universities and funded by the EU (the University of Maryland is a program affiliate);[8] the United Nations University in Tokyo, Japan;[9] Wilton Park Conferences in West Sussex, UK;[10] and, in a very broad way, the World Economic Forum.[11] In addition, many free-standing projects, papers, and books seek to cull policy lessons from abroad. (See Appendix A for an illustrative listing of cross-national materials.)

Despite these and many other activities, we think that the proposed project could make an important contribution to American policy-making and program implementation.

First, a large proportion of existing programs are concerned with foreign policy, national security, and international affairs. Others emphasize bilateral or nation-to-nation exchanges, and are more concerned with building better understanding between nations (often through bilateral exchanges of visitors/scholars) than in sharing specific policy information. The Commonwealth Fund, for example, supports various programs that send American professionals abroad to study policies in Australia and New Zealand. One of its programs sends American health policy researchers and practitioners to Australia for ten months;[12] another sends American public policy professionals to New Zealand for six months.[13]

Second, many of these activities have a specific programmatic or subject-matter focus—largely because of the interests of their sponsors. For example, between 1997 and 2004, six of the ten programs offered by the French-American Foundation concerned universal child care or some variant thereof. Its website boasts of the political and programmatic influence it has had in the U.S.[14]

[7]European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/ (accessed January 7, 2007).

[8]Network of European Union Centers of Excellence, http://www.unc.edu/euce/ (accessed January 7, 2007).

[9]United Nations University, "Advancing Knowledge for Human Security, Peace, and Development," http://www.unu.edu (accessed January 7, 2007).

[10]Wilton Park Conferences, "About Wilton Park," http://www.wiltonpark.org.uk/about/index.aspx (accessed January 7, 2007).

[11]World Economic Forum, "About the World Economic Forum: Entrepreneurship in the Global Public Interest," http://www.weforum.org/en/about/index.htm (accessed January 7, 2007).

[12]Commonwealth Fund, "Fellowships," http://www.cmwf.org/fellowships/fellowships.htm (accessed January 2, 2007).

[13]Commonwealth Fund, "Fellowships," http://www.cmwf.org/fellowships/fellowships.htm (accessed January 2, 2007).

[14]See, for example, French-American Foundation, "Early Education Program—Preschool/Ecole Maternelle," http://www.frenchamerican.org/cgi-bin/programs.cgi?f=ShowDesc&dbid=17 (accessed January 3, 2007).

Although such specialization builds expertise, in any particular planning cycle there may not be a prime topic in an organization's particular area, forcing it to choose a secondary topic. Our proposed project's wide ambit will give it a much broader choice of possible topics, increasing the likelihood that it will address ones of high-value (that is, topics for which a formal information exchange might advance understanding of an important policy issue). For example, in the same year our project might conduct one exchange on efforts to reduce child poverty and another on efforts to control greenhouse gases.

Third, many international programs seem to be ideologically tilted—to the Left or the Right—making it difficult for an outsider to gauge the accuracy or completeness of the information presented. It is not that these projects misrepresent the facts, just that they tend to present a selective or one-sided view by not critiquing the data being presented and by not presenting opposing data. In some respects, this kind of tilting should be expected, given the origins of many of these programs and the ideological preferences of their funders.

Thus, we hear how Sweden's "use it or lose it" parental leave law creates an incentive for new fathers to take two months of paid time off (or lose it) after a child's birth,[15] but we rarely hear that the fathers most likely to take advantage of this benefit are highly educated public sector employees. And we seldom hear about Swedish school vouchers, which pay for almost the entire cost of public education[16] and currently cover independent schools with thousands of students.[17] Nor do we hear much about Sweden's 1990s reform of public pension benefits, which privatized 13.5 percent of an individual's total contributions and changed the public program from a defined-benefit to a defined-contribution scheme.[18]

Conservatives also use facts selectively, for example in some discussions of various forms of privatized pension systems.[19]

---

[15]Richard Eriksson, "Parental Leave in Sweden: The Effects of the Second Daddy Month" (working paper, Swedish Institute for Social Research, Stockholm University, 2005), http://www.sofi.su.se/wp/WP05-9.pdf (accessed January 3, 2007).

[16]Claudia Rebanks Hepburn, *The Case for School Choice: Models from the United States, New Zealand, Denmark, and Sweden* (Canada: The Fraser Institute, 1999), p. 26, http://www.fraserinstitute.ca/admin/books/files/CaseforSchoolChoice.pdf (accessed January 3, 2007).

[17]Mauricio Rojas, *Sweden after the Swedish Model: From Tutorial State to Enabling State*, (Stockholm, Sweden: Timbro, 2005), p. 67, http://www.timbro.se/bokhandel/pdf/9175665891.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

[18]Joakim Palme, "Features of the Swedish Pension Reform," *The Japanese Journal of Social Security Policy* 4, no.1 (2005): p. 44, http://www.ipss.go.jp/webj-ad/WebJournal.files/SocialSecurity/2005/July/palme.pdf (accessed January 3, 2007).

[19]See, for example, Michael Tanner, "The 6.2 Percent Solution: A Plan for Reforming Social Security," *Cato Project on Social Security Choice*, no. 32 (2004), http://www.socialsecurity.org/pubs/ssps/ssp32.pdf (accessed January 5, 2007).

Our project would strive to provide a full and fair presentation of the information on both sides of an issue—based on rigorous evaluation and a clear-eyed expectation that many attractive policies and programs fail to achieve their objectives. In fact, sometimes there is as much, or more, to learn from apparent policy failures as from apparent successes. Explicating the causes of failure often can illuminate the unappreciated weaknesses of a particular policy idea and the obstacles to its successful implementation. Thus, the project may also select topics that exemplify what did not seem to work abroad.

Fourth, many programs do not sufficiently consider the impact of local or national factors such as culture, demographics, and governmental systems. Until recently, for example, European nations were much more culturally and ethnically homogeneous than the U.S. Thus, in Sweden the welfare state is often referred to as the "people's home."[20] This is one reason why the idea of "social solidarity" as a justification for generous (and universal) social welfare benefits has not taken root in the U.S., with its more diverse and much larger population.

Conversely, for years, many American analysts pointed to the severely disadvantaged minorities in this country as a reason why European social welfare policies would not work here. Now, as immigration seems to be creating a new form of European poverty, Americans have even more to learn from European anti-poverty programs—and Europeans are much more interested in American welfare reform.

Likewise, before the recent increases in policy coordination within the European Union, most domestic policy-making was at the national level and, given the small populations of many European nations, also not easily transplanted to the U.S., with its heterogeneous population of over 300 million. But this is changing. In anticipation of pressures to converge in the coverage of social welfare programs, EU member nations have recently taken considerable interest in comparative social policy study and begun joint agenda-setting and planning processes. (Several joint graduate programs in social policy have developed involving cooperation between universities in different countries.)

And, of course, compared to the U.S., centralized, parliamentary governments often have an easier time adopting new policies, even ones that are radical departures from the past. A small example is the ability of the German government to control the distribution to hospitals of advanced medical technology, such as MRI machines, based on its estimates of need across entire states (such as Bavaria). The commanding position of the federal and state governments enables them to transcend local politics in ways not possible under the U.S. certificate of need process.

Governmental systems also differ in many more subtle ways, further complicating comparisons. More than many other nations, the U.S. uses tax deductions and tax credits to meet

[20]Nicole Faher, "Country Case Studies and Links: Sweden," European Welfare States: Information and Resources, University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown, http://www.pitt.edu/~heinisch/ca_swed.html (accessed January 3, 2007).

social objectives (for example, tax deductions for employer-provided health insurance and retirement plans and tax credits such as the Earned Income Tax Credit), making comparisons of spending based only on appropriated funds misleading. And, in other countries, the high rates of direct taxation on benefit income and indirect taxation on consumption (such as value-added taxes) can reduce disposable income in ways not appreciated in the U.S.

In Denmark, for example, direct taxes on unemployment benefits are more than 26 percent and indirect taxes on consumption almost 26 percent, so that about half the benefit would be taxed away.[21] By contrast, U.S. direct taxes are about 7 percent and indirect taxes about 5 percent, for a total of only about 12 percent.[22] According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), accounting for the impact of tax systems and private social benefits tends to narrow the differences in the social welfare efforts of the eighteen countries considered, and reveals that the proportion of domestic production devoted to social benefits in the U.S. is about the same as in many other countries, including Austria, Canada, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and the United Kingdom.[23]

The most intangible but perhaps most powerful differences involve values and attitudes. Americans are more individualistic, more open to the forces of competition, and less willing to operate under bureaucratic restrictions than are the citizens of many other countries. And they are certainly more religious and more committed to traditional family structures. According to the World Values Survey, for example, in 1999, Americans were almost eight times more likely to say that "God was very important in their lives," compared to French and German respondents (58 percent vs. 8 percent and 7 percent, respectively).[24] About 60 percent of the French and about 39 percent of Germans "never or practically never attend religious services," compared to only about 15 percent of Americans.[25]

---

[21]Willem Adema, "Net Social Expenditure: 2nd Edition," *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers*, No. 52, OECD Publishing, Tables 3 and 4, http://miranda.sourceoecd.org/vl=2657371/cl=12/nw=1/rpsv/cgi-bin/wppdf?file=5lgsjhvj7rg5.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

[22]Willem Adema, "Net Social Expenditure: 2nd Edition," *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers*, No. 52, OECD Publishing, Tables 3 and 4, http://miranda.sourceoecd.org/vl=2657371/cl=12/nw=1/rpsv/cgi-bin/wppdf?file=5lgsjhvj7rg5.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

[23]Willem Adema, "Net Social Expenditure: 2nd Edition," *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers*, No. 52, OECD Publishing, http://miranda.sourceoecd.org/vl=2657371/cl=12/nw=1/rpsv/cgi-bin/wppdf?file=5lgsjhvj7rg5.pdf (accessed January 3, 2007).

[24]World Values Survey, "Values Surveys: How Important Is God in Your Life: United States [1999]," Online Data Analysis, available through http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org (accessed January 4, 2007).

[25]World Values Survey, "Values Surveys: How Often Do You Attend Religious Services: United States [1999]," Online Data Analysis, available through http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org (accessed January 4, 2007).

Such underlying cultural differences, which go far beyond just religion, sometimes prevent even the consideration of certain policies. Switzerland now offers heroin maintenance to long-term addicts, a policy that is also beginning in the Netherlands and is being expanded in Britain.[26] In the U.S., the idea has attracted almost universal condemnation.[27]

Many information exchanges suffer because they are not communicated in a way that is accessible to American audiences. Sometimes this is as simple as being careful about word usage. “Social exclusion” (and “inclusion”), “activating the unemployed” or simply “activation,” “social solidarity,” “passive benefits,” “decommodification,” and most recently “defamilialization” (the state taking over responsibility for family functions) are all terms that can confuse the uninitiated. Care must be taken to explain to Americans the meaning of many words, phrases, and even policy concepts.

Unfamiliar vocabulary is not the only obstacle to cross-national learning. Too often, a topic is presented in a way that does not resonate with current American policy concerns, and data and conclusions are not explained in the context in which they were developed (preventing a judgment of their applicability to the U.S.), or the narrative sounds smugly superior.

Finally, and most challenging, current efforts tend to be descriptions of specific studies or programs that do not synthesize information into a broader, more balanced public policy analysis. Too many, in effect, say: “and, therefore, we should do it!” rather than illuminating the specific things that can be learned and applied to the U.S. policy environment.

[26]See, for example, Robert J. MacCoun and Peter Reuter, “Does Europe do It Better? Lessons from Holland, Britain and Switzerland,” *The Nation*, September 20, 1999, http://www.publicpolicy.umd.edu/faculty/reuter/europe.htm (accessed January 5, 2007).

[27]Peter Reuter and Robert MacCoun, “Heroin Maintenance: Is a U.S. Experiment Needed?” (conference paper, Yale Medical School, New Haven, CT, September 1998), http://www.publicpolicy.umd.edu/faculty/reuter/heroin%20maintenance.pdf (accessed January 5, 2007).

Project

The project would be operated under the auspices of the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy in association with the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI).

***Personnel*:** The director of this project would be **Douglas J. Besharov**, J.D., LL.M., a tenured professor at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy and a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. Professor Besharov writes widely on welfare reform and other social issues. He has written or edited thirteen other books, including: *Family and Child Well-Being after Welfare Reform* (Transaction Publishers, 2003), *America's Disconnected Youth: Toward a Preventive Strategy* (Child Welfare League of America, 1999), *Enhancing Early Childhood Programs: Burdens and Opportunities* (Child Welfare League of America, 1996), *When Drug Addicts Have Children: Reorienting Child Welfare's Response* (Child Welfare League of America, 1994), *Recognizing Child Abuse: A Guide for the Concerned* (The Free Press, 1990), *Legal Services for the Poor: Time for Reform* (AEI Press, 1990), *The Vulnerable Social Worker: Liability for Serving Children and Families* (National Association of Social Workers, 1985), and *Juvenile Justice Advocacy: Practice in a Unique Court* (New York: Practising Law Institute, 1974). He has written over 200 articles, and has contributed to the *Washington Post, Wall Street Journal*, *New York Times*, and *Los Angeles Times*.

Professor Besharov has participated in many international conferences whose purpose was to share U.S. developments with researchers and policymakers from around the world. Of special note is his work with the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM), the foremost American organization for public policy practitioners (with 2,000 individual members, 102 institutional members, and an annual operating budget of approximately $700,000). For the past two years, Besharov was APPAM's vice president, and helped to organize six panels of international experts to discuss various policy questions. Now, as APPAM's president-elect, he will have overall responsibility for the association's 2007 Annual Meeting, which is expected to have as many as 2,000 attendees. (Many non-members attend.)

Professor Besharov is the editor of the "Policy Retrospectives" section of APPAM's *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* (JPAM). In that role, he solicits and reviews manuscripts on a wide range of policy and management topics. These articles review and synthesize the relevant literature in a given area, explain what is known about the subject, and also highlight any unresolved questions. Forty to sixty pages long, they are meant to be accessible to JPAM's diverse readership, including people who are unfamiliar with the topic at hand. The author's voice is an important element in the articles, guiding readers through the literature and perhaps reaching a conclusion. Nevertheless, the articles are expected to raise and address opposing points of view fully and fairly. In many ways, these policy retrospectives are a domestic version of the papers that would be commissioned for this project.

Topic coordinators. In addition to Professor Besharov, the project team would include topic coordinators for each of the selected topics. The coordinators would be senior U.S. scholars or researchers in the particular area. They would be responsible for recommending paper authors, helping the authors shape their papers, convening the authors' conference, and working with the authors to insure that their papers reflect the needs of the project. The coordinators would also prepare an introductory essay for their particular volume, summarizing and synthesizing the papers and suggesting policy lessons for the U.S.

Subject to the selection of topics, some of the scholars who have agreed in principal to be topic coordinators are:

- *Richard Berk* is a professor of criminology and statistics at the University of Pennsylvania; the editor of *Evaluation Review*; and the author of numerous books and articles, including *Thinking about Program Evaluation* (with Peter H. Rossi, Sage Publications, 1990), *Just Punishment: An Empirical Study of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines* (with Peter H. Rossi, Aldine de Gruyter, 1997), and *Regression Analysis: A Constructive Critique* (Sage Publications, 2003). Among other international projects, he works with a climate impacts group based in Paris and leads an international study on climate change and water resources with funding from the Asia Pacific Network, an NGO based in Japan. In 2004, he was a visiting chair at both Plateforme Environnement, Departement, Terre-Atmosphere-Ocean, Ecole Normale Superieure and Laboratoire d'Econometrie, Ecole Polytechnique, both in Paris. As editor of *Evaluation Review*, he routinely interacts with program evaluators from around the world when they submit or review manuscripts.

- *Steve Fetter* is dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland. His research interests include arms control and nonproliferation, nuclear energy and releases of radiation, and climate change and carbon-free energy supply. His published writings include *Climate Change and the Transformation of World Energy Supply* (a Stanford University report, 1999), "Preventing Climate Change: The Role of Nuclear Energy" (World Scientific Publishing Co., 1999), and "Climate Change and the Future of Nuclear Energy" (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 1998). He has been an advisor to many government agencies (such as the U.S. Departments of State, Defense, and Energy), NGOs, and scientific organizations. He has lectured internationally on various energy topics, including nuclear power and climate change, in such places as England, France, Italy, India, and Japan.

- *Neil Gilbert* is a professor of social welfare at the University of California (Berkeley), director of the Center for Comparative Family Welfare and Poverty Research, and co-director of the Center for Child and Youth. He served as senior research fellow at the U.N. Research Institute for Social Development and was twice awarded Senior Fulbright Research Fellowships to study European social policy as a visiting scholar at the London School of Economics and the University of Stockholm. In 1993, 1997, and 1999 he was a visiting scholar at the International Social Security Association (ISSA) and is currently a member of their Research Advisory Board and editor of the ISSA series on International

Social Security. Gilbert has directed several comparative research projects. In 1985, he was co-organizer of the International Study Group on Modern Welfare States in Transition, whose research activities resulted in the publication of two books. In 1995, he organized a research team for a comparative investigation of child abuse reporting systems in nine countries, the results of which were published in *Combating Child Abuse: International Perspectives and Trends* (Oxford University Press, 1997), which he edited. In 1998 he led a large-scale comparative project on the changing landscape of welfare states, which resulted in the publications of four books, three edited volumes, and *Transformation of the Welfare State: The Silent Surrender of Public Responsibility* (Oxford University Press, 2002). This three-year project involved a number of research team meetings, public presentations at an international research conference in Jerusalem, and concluded with a five day conference at the Rockefeller Foundation Conference Center in Bellagio, Italy.

- *Jack Meyer* is a principal with Health Management Associates, a national research and consulting organization; and a visiting professor at the Maryland School of Public Policy. He recently directed a four-year project, "Covering America: Real Remedies for the Uninsured," sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Among his many publications are *Building Blocks for Change: How Health Care Reform Affects Our Future* (co-editor, Reston, VA: Economic and Social Research Institute, 1993), *Demographic Change and the American Future* (coauthor, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1990), *Passing the Health Care Buck: Who Pays the Hidden Cost?* (coauthor, AEI Press, 1983); *Incentives versus Controls in Health Care: Broadening the Debate* (coauthor, AEI Press, 1985); and *Market Reforms in Health Care: Current Issues, New Directions, Strategic Decisions* (coauthor, AEI Press, 1983). Mr. Meyer was a visiting scholar at the OECD in Paris, working on wage and health policy issues (summer 1975 and summer 1984). He has also represented the U.S. government at several international conferences in Europe, and served on the board of the Luxembourg Income Study.

- *Peter Reuter* is a professor of public policy and criminology at the University of Maryland School of Public Policy and a founder and former director of RAND's Drug Policy Research Center (1989–1993). Among his numerous publications are *Drug War Heresies: Learning from Other Vices, Times and Places* (Cambridge University Press, 2001) and *Disorganized Crime: The Economics of the Visible Hand* (MIT Press, 1983). He has been involved in cross-national research on drug policy for ten years, having just completed a monograph on British drug policy that is a replication of the Smith Richardson Foundation-funded monograph *An Analytic Assessment of U.S. Drug Policy* (AEI Press, 2005). He is currently the interim chair of a new cross-national research organization, the International Society for the Study of Drug Policy, and is organizing its first conference for Oslo in March 2007.

- *Jeffrey Smith* is a professor of economics at the University of Michigan; a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER); a research fellow of the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn and the Center for European Economic Studies (ZEW) in Mannheim; an international research associate of the Institute for Fiscal Studies; and a visiting research fellow of the Policy Studies Institute, both in the United Kingdom. His research focuses on methods for the evaluation of social programs such as job training for the disadvantaged, as well as systems of performance management for active labor market policies and the economics of education. He is the author, with James Heckman and Robert LaLonde, of “The Economics and Econometrics of Active Labor Market Programs” (published in the *Handbook of Labor Economics, Volume 3A*, Orley Ashenfelter and David Card [eds.], 1999). His research includes an evaluation of the New Deal for Young People in the U.K. (coauthored with Peter Dolton and Joao Pedro de Azevedo) and a study of the performance of caseworkers in Swiss active labor market programs (coauthored with Michael Lechner). He has consulted to governments in the U.S., Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia on evaluation issues related to employment and training programs and educational interventions; given courses in evaluation methods (with Michael Lechner) in Australia, Denmark, Germany, and Sweden; and presented papers or given invited lectures (or both) in Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

Other scholars we would consider for other topics include: Denis Doyle, SchoolNet Inc.; Robert Lerman, American University and Urban Institute; Demetra Nightingale, Johns Hopkins University and Urban Institute; Diane Ravitch, New York University Steinhardt School of Education and Brookings Institution; Isabel Sawhill, Brookings Institution; Eugene Steuerle, Urban Institute; and Robert Walker, Department of Social Policy and Social Work at the University of Oxford.

Series editor. We believe that a core strength of the project would be its ability to use international materials to speak to an American audience about common policy concerns. For both the papers and the edited volume, we hope to establish a relatively uniform voice or tone and a style that emphasizes information synthesis and analysis. Our tentative plan is to engage the services of a senior editor. We have explored the possibility of such an arrangement with a number of potential candidates. Without having made a commitment, we think that someone like David Whitman would provide just the right combination of broad substantive knowledge, quick research and learning ability, and writing skills. He has expressed his willingness to participate.

Until recently, Whitman was a senior writer at *U.S. News & World Report*, where he worked for many years. His books include: *The Mad, Mad World of Textbook Adoption* (Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2004); *The Optimism Gap: The I’m OK—They’re Not Syndrome and the Myth of American Decline* (Walker & Company, 1998); and *President as Policymaker: Jimmy Carter and Welfare Reform* (Temple University Press, 1981). He has also written for the *New York Times*, *New Republic*, *Wall Street Journal*, and *Atlantic Monthly*, among others. He lives in Washington, D.C.

Methods/Analytical Approach**:** This project would be an exploratory demonstration of how to operate an on-going (and relatively low-cost) international exchange of policy information. It would have three interrelated but separate parts: (1) a systematic exploration of ways to identify topics, select authors (and other participants), and exchange policy information; (2) two or three demonstrations of specific and perhaps varying approaches to information exchanges; and (3) a final report that assesses the project's experiences and describes whether to proceed and, if so, how. For each information exchange, up to five papers would be commissioned, edited to maximize their accessibility to American audiences, and presented at one or more U.S. policy conferences. (Each set of papers would also be published as a book or a special issue of a scholarly or professional journal, and disseminated through the internet.)

Compared to many of the other programs and organizations involved in cross-national information exchanges, ours would be a relatively small project. We think our comparative advantage would be in what we hope will be the ability to select *high-value topics*, that is, topics for which a formal information exchange might advance understanding of an important and timely policy issue.

We also hope to demonstrate the utility of *low-cost approaches* to research synthesis and dissemination because of the long-term desire to cover many topics. The costs in this initial project include start-up research and development activities. Once institutionalized and with an infrastructure of cooperating organizations both here and abroad, the information exchanges should cost as much as a third less than in this planning phase.

To be decided in this planning period is whether the information exchange should be one-way or two-way. Although it would be easier to establish and conduct a one-way exchange, the contribution of the international authors might be enhanced by a substantive interaction with American experts, probably at the planned authors' meetings. We have raised this possibility with Wade Horn, assistant secretary for children and families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and he has expressed tentative interest in collaborating. If the project is funded, we would also reach out to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), as well as some of the other multi-national organizations mentioned above.

Additional research. An early priority will be to learn more about current cross-national information sharing efforts—both to avoid duplication and to identify organizations and individuals that might aid the project. As described above, many organizations and individuals already conduct programs designed to transfer policy information. Although we think our approach would fill an important gap in such efforts, an initial step would be to identify as many of these programs as possible to see what lessons can be drawn from them and, as appropriate, to see whether they might cooperate and even collaborate with the project.

We would also seek to identify organizations or individuals in other countries that might aid the project. These would include think tanks, university research centers, and research and policy networks. We might, for example, seek a logistical partnership with a group such as the OECD or the International Social Security Association (ISSA). And, as mentioned below, these international partners would be even more important if we decide to attempt a two-way information exchange.

The project would also reach out to various non-U.S. think tanks, research institutions, and other organizations interested in the international exchange of policy information. Examples include: Ecologic—Institute for International and European Environmental Policy (Berlin/Brussels),[28] the European Association of Labor Economists (Maastricht),[29] the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) (Bonn),[30] the International and Comparative Social Policy Group (ICSP) (Sheffield),[31] the International Comparative Policy Analysis Forum (ICPA-Forum),[32] and the International Network Health Policy and Reform (Westphalia).[33]

We would also turn to policy journals such as the *Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal* (U.S.), *European Journal of Housing Policy* (UK), *International Criminal Justice Review* (U.S.), *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership* (U.S.), *International Journal of Health Care Finance and Economics* (U.S.), *International Journal of Health Planning and Management* (U.S.), *International Journal of Law, Policy, and the Family* (UK), *International Journal of Social Welfare* (Sweden), *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* (UK), *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* (UK), *Journal of European Public Policy* (UK), *Journal of European Social Policy* (UK), and *Policy Studies* (UK).

[28]Ecologic—Institute for International and European Environmental Policy, http://www.ecologic.de/ (accessed January 7, 2007).

[29]European Association of Labor Economists, http://www.eale.nl/ (accessed January 7, 2007).

[30]Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), http://www.iza.org/ (accessed January 7, 2007).

[31]International and Comparative Social Policy Group (ICSP), http://www.globalwelfare.net/index.html (accessed January 7, 2007).

[32]International Comparative Policy Analysis Forum, http://www.jcpa.ca/icpa/ (accessed January 7, 2007).

[33]Bertelsmann Stiftung, Health Policy Monitor, "International Network Health Policy and Reform," http://www.hpm.org/en/index.html (accessed January 7, 2007).

Besides the personal contacts of those associated with the project, we expect that a prime source of help will be the developing networks of think tanks:

- *The European Ideas Network*, a network of about forty-five "centre-right think tanks and political foundations from across the EU."[34]

- *The European Policy Institutes Network*, "a network of dynamic think tanks and policy institutes focusing on current EU and European political and policy debates." It has more than twenty-five member think tanks in twenty-one countries, "including almost all the EU member states and accession and candidate countries."[35]

- *The South-East European Network*, made up of seven independent think tanks, is a "partnership of equal institutions" that aims to "establish a universal think-tank related to mainly economic issues in the [Southeast European] region."[36]

- *The Stockholm Network*, which describes itself as bringing "together more than 110 market-oriented think tanks from across Europe."[37]

In addition to the networks, we would consult a number of listings of think tanks, including the European Centre for Public Affairs, which lists twenty-seven European think tanks;[38] the National Institute for Research Advancement, which lists about 500 think tanks from about 100 countries around the world;[39] *The Think Tank Directory Europe*, which lists thirty-six of what it considers the "most important think tanks in the European Union";[40] and *Worldpress.org*, which

[34]European Ideas Network, "Think Tanks and Political Foundations," http://www.europeanideasnetwork.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=5&Itemid=9 (accessed January 3, 2007). The names of its member organizations is available at http://tt.europeanideasnetwork.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10&Itemid=16.

[35]European Policy Institutes Network, "Networking the Future of Europe," http://www.epin.org/index.php (accessed January 3, 2007).

[36]South-East European Network, "South-East European Network," http://icegec.hu/seen/index.htm (accessed January 3, 2007).

[37]Stockholm Network, "Stockholm Network," http://www.stockholm-network.org/about.php (accessed January 3, 2007).

[38]EurActiv.com, "Think Tanks & EU Policy-Making," http://www.euractiv.com/en/pa/think-tanks-eu-policy-making/article-142652 (accessed January 5, 2007).

[39]NIRA's World Directory of Think Tanks, "Index," http://www.nira.go.jp/ice/nwdtt/2005/index.html (accessed January 5, 2007).

[40]Think Tank Directory, "Think Tank Directory Europe," http://www.thinktankdirectory.org/europe/index.html (accessed January 5, 2007).

lists about 350 international think tanks and research organizations worldwide.[41]

In our initial research, we have not found a comprehensive listing of groups that are actually engaged in the dissemination or exchange of cross-national public policy information. Hence, when our listing is completed, we would post it on our website for the benefit of other interested parties. We hope that this summary would also be of use to the Smith Richardson Foundation in its other activities.

Selecting topics. To emphasize the project's broad ambit, especially if it is institutionalized, the accompanying box provides a long list of possible topics. As the list suggests, most of the topics the project would consider involve specific policy areas. The project would also consider topics that involve the tools of public policy analysis, such as the collection and use of government statistics, public management techniques, and innovations in program evaluation. Recent non-U.S. evaluations have contained novel and potentially useful features.[42]

Although choosing related topics might build a larger area-specific audience, our initial conclusion is that such a narrowing of topic areas would be unwise given the project's exploratory nature. We will, however, make a final decision when topics are selected.

In deciding which topics would be the most valuable targets of opportunity, we would use a three-part test: (1) Is there sufficient research or other rigorous policy information to share? (2) Are authors available who could prepare the appropriate policy-analytical papers? and (3) Is the issue—and how it is approached—of likely interest to U.S. audiences?

---

[41]Worldpress.org, "Think Tanks and N.G.O.s: Alphabetical Index," http://www.worldpress.org/library/ngo.cfm (accessed January 5, 2007).

[42]Some recent examples published in the *Evaluation Review* include a study in Norway of medical school education in which qualitative, observational data were used to better interpret the results of a randomized experiment; a study in Peru of a family planning counseling intervention in which confederates posing as clients were used to study how the intervention was implemented; a study in Egypt on factors that support or undermine teachers' readiness to use personal computers in schools; a study in the United Kingdom where a "communication audit" was developed as a tool for evaluating the transmission of information within organizations; and a study in South Africa of whether active participation in group settings improves the effectiveness of interventions designed to reduce the spread of HIV/AIDS among young adults.

Possible Cross-National Topics

- *Child poverty* (including income transfers vs. work incentives/earnings supplements, and efforts to reduce the number of single-mother families);
- *Crime control and corrections* (including recent European efforts to combat rising levels of street and property crime);
- *Disability and unemployment insurance* (including efforts to balance assistance against work disincentives);
- *Drug policy* (including various "harm reduction" approaches and such policies as needle exchange programs and lower penalties for possession of cannabis);
- *Education policy* (including efforts to reduce achievement gaps among groups, especially educational approaches to immigrants; the use of vouchers; and expanding higher education and post-secondary education generally);
- *Energy policy* (including efforts to reduce greenhouse gases, including cap and trade policies for carbon dioxide emissions and increased use of nuclear power and renewable sources of energy);
- *Family policy* (including parental leave, child care subsidies, and family income supplements);
- *Health policy* (including expanding access to medical care, efforts to restrain health care spending, and the tradeoffs involved);
- *Immigration policy* (including admissions policies and asylum, efforts to limit illegal entry and decisions about those who have entered illegally, and efforts to increase assimilation);
- *Job training* (including programs for the long-term unemployed and displaced workers);
- *Labor policy* (including nationwide wage policies and relaxation of hiring and firing restrictions);
- *Privatization of government services* (including services that have been privatized, modes of contractor selection, and performance monitoring);
- *Old-age pension reform* (including retirement ages, privatization, and defined-contribution plans);
- *Tax and fiscal policy* (including the use of value-added taxes and flat taxes and reductions in top rates and corporate rates);
- *Transport policy* (including private toll roads, toll rings, and congestion pricing; and privatization of, and investment in, railroad facilities and other mass transport);
- *Vouchers for social welfare services* (including services that have been voucherized, and impacts on the quality of services and on total spending); and
- *Welfare entitlements and dependency* (including efforts to impose work, time-limits, and other requirements on recipients).

Three illustrations (in ascending levels of breadth and complexity) of how we would apply this three-part test might be helpful:

- *Needle exchanges.* Injection drug use continues to be a major vector for HIV transmission in the U.S., accounting for almost half of new infections in recent years. The evaluation literature in Western Europe is very large and there are now numerous good quality reviews—some quite skeptical of the claims made for major reductions in HIV. Although efforts to permit needle exchange programs to be funded by the federal government have failed to date, there continues to be active interest, except at the highest levels of the executive branch (in the Clinton as well as Bush administrations). With the Democrats in control of the Congress and more state legislatures, a first-rate synthesis of non-U.S. experiences with needle exchanges has some chance of being influential in a debate that is likely to continue for the foreseeable future.

- *Old-age pensions.* Much has changed since the U.S. Social Security system of old age pensions was designed in 1935. At that time, most women did not work and life expectancy at birth was 61.7 years. Today, most women work and life expectancy is 77.9 years. Although minor adjustments have been made to retirement age and benefit calculations, the fundamental structure—publicly financed, pay-as-you-go, defined benefit, and the family as a benefit unit—of the U.S. program has not changed since 1935. Over the last decade, pressure has mounted to reform Social Security in light of the aging of the population and the increasing inequities of dependents' benefits. In contrast, European countries have initiated major social security reforms. For example, Sweden partially privatized its system, changed it from a defined-benefit to a defined-contribution program through the introduction of notional accounts, and eliminated dependents' benefits. A number of other countries have introduced varying types and degrees of privatization along with measures to discourage early retirement.

  This project would examine the current design of social security systems in various countries to gain a detailed understanding of the adjustments that have been made regarding dependents' benefits; the definition of retirement; the extent to which pension credits are awarded for unpaid labor; the relationship between public and private responsibility for retirement income; innovative policies and practices designed to promote active aging (that is, employment); the relationship between defined benefits and defined contributions; and the use of notional accounts in transitions from defined-benefit to defined-contribution systems.

- *Greenhouse gases*. Despite the rejection of the Kyoto Protocol by the U.S. government, there is now widespread agreement across most of the American political spectrum that anthropogenic climate change is a problem that will have to be addressed in some form, and growing recognition that near-term policy action may be necessary. Under the Kyoto agreement, thirty-four countries have adopted a variety of approaches and policy instruments, including subsidies and tax credits for certain technologies, carbon taxes, emissions trading, and carbon sequestration projects in developing countries.

Evidence about the effectiveness of the various strategies is beginning to accumulate, and could be used to inform the formulation of cost-effective policies in the U.S. and the design of future international agreements to reduce emissions. So far, at least, the lessons from this experience are decidedly mixed. Certainly there are some cost-effective opportunities for modest reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, but there is mounting evidence that the Kyoto Protocol will not produce the significant global emissions reductions that are believed necessary to avert warming. Concern about the effectiveness of the Kyoto approach is not limited to conservative warming "skeptics." Scholars such as Lee Lane (former executive director of the Climate Policy Center) and scientists such as Jae Edmonds (University of Maryland) and Marty Hoffert (New York University) have written about the practical limitations and fundamental design flaws of the Kyoto approach, and of the need to encourage the development of new clean-energy and climate-related technologies.

These are exceptionally timely questions to examine. Regardless of whether the U.S. joins the Kyoto Protocol, it will certainly be part of discussions about its successor agreement (beginning in 2012). A project could valuably examine the available evidence we have from the Kyoto experience to date and consider our alternatives. (Of course, any action on this topic would be contingent on activities of the AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies.)

An advisory committee would be formed to help guide the project's selection of topics and authors (and other participants). The committee would also be consulted on other major issues, including the preparation of the project's final report, which it would review before completion. Possible members of the committee, most of whom have previously worked with Professor Besharov, include:

- Richard Berk, professor, Department of Criminology, University of Pennsylvania;
- Rebecca Blank, dean, Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan;
- William Butz, president and chief executive officer, Population Reference Bureau;
- Chester Finn, president, Thomas B. Fordham Institute;
- Neil Gilbert, professor, School of Social Welfare, University of California (Berkeley);
- Dalmer Hoskins, senior managing director of policy, AARP; and former secretary general, International Social Security Association (ISSA);
- Gregory K. Ingram, president and chief executive officer, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy;

- Craig Kennedy, president, German Marshall Fund;
- Robert E. Litan, vice president for research and policy, Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation; and senior fellow in economic studies, Brookings Institution;
- Rebecca Maynard, professor, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania;
- Mark McClellan, visiting senior fellow, AEI; former commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and former administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services;
- Alice Rivlin, senior fellow, Brookings Institution; and
- Thomas Schelling, professor, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland.

Because they may be reviewers of this proposal, we have *not contacted* the foregoing individuals about joining the committee (with the exceptions of Richard Berk and Neil Gilbert).

Selecting (and working with) authors. To make the project work within time and budgetary restraints, we will seek to recruit skilled and experienced authors who have *already written on the topics at hand*. We do not expect them to conduct substantial additional research, although we will ask that their papers be as up-to-date as possible. (Although we expect most authors to be from other nations, it is possible that some will be from the U.S.)

Our experience is that authors from other nations often do not write in a style that is easily accessible to an American readership. Part of it is simply different terminology; the idea of "social exclusion" being a good example. More fundamentally, there is a tendency to be somewhat less data-driven and somewhat more values-driven than the typical American policy paper. Except in the most unusual case, we expect all materials and discussions to be in English. We do not plan to translate materials or discussions.

Our starting point will be existing practices in the academic discourse on comparative policy analysis, including the choice of comparative method: quantitative or qualitative, analyses of randomized experiments, natural experiments or groups, case-studies, and one-to-one and one-to-small number comparisons. But we would then seek to "Americanize" the papers to force directed policy description, analysis, and learning in accordance with U.S. practices.[43]

One approach we will probably try is a more intense authors' conference. Instead of having

[43]See generally, Bardach, E., *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving* (CQ Press, 2004); Weimer, D. and A. Vining *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice* (4th edition) (Prentice-Hall, 2004).

only the authors gather and talk to each other, we may have the topic coordinators plus other American experts present who will react critically to the form as well as the content of the papers. We did this to good effect for a project funded by the Smith Richardson Foundation, “Rethinking Child Care Research,” published in *Evaluation Review*. Working more intensively with authors will raise project costs somewhat, but the result could be well worth it. (Based on preliminary discussions with various organizations, we expect that the non-U.S. authors’ meetings will be hosted by international organizations.)

Program Activities: To allow experimentation and to facilitate mid-course changes, we have divided the project into seven overlapping steps.

Step 1. Form advisory committee (months 1–4). Although we would begin to form the committee almost immediately after the project is funded, we would not complete the process until we felt reasonably sure that our additional research would not identify other appropriate members.

Step 2: Identify other groups or organizations engaged in similar efforts or that might be interested in collaborating with this project (months 1–6). To avoid duplication and to identify organizations and individuals that might aid the project, an early priority will be to learn more about current cross-national information sharing efforts. We would prepare a comprehensive yet selective listing of groups that are actually engaged in the dissemination or exchange of cross-national public policy information and post it on our website for the benefit of other interested parties.

Step 3: Identify promising topic areas that might fit into the project’s objectives (months 1–9). We have already identified some possible topic areas for a policy information exchange and we hope to identify others if the project is funded. With the help of the project’s advisory committee, we would select a more limited list of topics to explore systematically.

Step 4. Develop dissemination plan, including conferences and publishing arrangements (months 3–10). See section on dissemination below.

Step 5. Work with authors to shape their papers for an American audience (months 6–18). In addition to an author’s conference for each topic, we expect an on-going interchange among the authors, the topics coordinators, and project staff.

Step 6. Organize and hold two or three international policy exchanges and conduct other dissemination activities (months 9–22). At present, we fully expect to hold three policy exchanges, but there is a small chance that unexpected start-up costs could force us to hold only two exchanges during this planning period. (The section on dissemination below has more information about methods and target audiences.)

Step 7. Prepare final report (months 21–24). Because one of the project’s main purposes is to test the desirability of the systematic international exchange of policy information and the validity of approaches tried, the project’s final report would document what was learned about transferring policy information between nations and cultures. The report would describe and assess: (1) the selection of topics and authors, (2) the shaping and editing of commissioned papers, (3) the degree to which important information was exchanged, and (4) the possible impact on policy.

Products: As described above, the project's major products would be (1) a broad summary of existing international policy information exchanges, (2) two or perhaps three demonstrations of international exchanges, (3) edited volumes on each of the exchanges, and (4) a detailed report describing the activities under the grant, whether they were successful enough to justify continuing the effort and, if so, how it should be done.

This project starts with a keen awareness of the need for all presentations and materials to be accessible to American audiences. Hence, for each topic, the project would be careful to identify differences in terminology, data and measurement, and political and social context—making changes to the text of the papers as needed. We also expect that our topic coordinators will prepare an explanatory essay for their particular volume, summarizing and synthesizing the papers and suggesting policy lessons for the U.S.

Edited volumes. We expect that the papers produced for this project would be of interest to a wide audience of analysts and informed laypersons. The papers might also be assigned as readings for courses in their respective areas. Hence, we hope to publish each set of papers as a free-standing book. We hope to brand the series by having the same subtitle ("Learning from Abroad") for each volume, so that a possible title would be: *Privatization of Government Services: Learning from Abroad.*

To help brand the project, conserve funds, and make for efficient editing, etc., we would seek a publisher willing to enter into a multi-book contract. (We may, however, decide that publication of one or more of the sets of papers should be as a special or symposium issue of a research or professional journal.) Although we do not have an agreement for publication at this stage, we have in mind several potential publishers such as Oxford University, Columbia, and Transaction, with whom we have past experiences and positive relations. Neil Gilbert, for example, edits a series with Transaction Publishers, which is sponsored by the International Social Security Association (ISSA). The books are identified as part of an ISSA series. Although ISSA promises to purchase around 700 copies of each book (to be distributed to its member organizations), this kind of purchase arrangement is often not necessary. Contracts for other series have been based solely on the quality of the editors, the chapter authors, and the potential market.

We would also seek to publish the papers in appropriate forums to reach a broader audience. Shorter versions might be prepared as op-eds for various newspapers. They would also be presented to appropriate policy-making and philanthropic groups at the national and local levels.

Dissemination: As described above, for each information exchange, we plan to hold one or more U.S. policy conferences and to publish the papers in dedicated books on the subject or as special issues of relevant policy or professional journals. To the extent possible, our dissemination plan would rely on preexisting and low-cost arrangements. For example, we hope to attract C-SPAN to the conferences and will explore making the conferences available as webcasts.

Conferences and consultations. A key question will be the nature and breadth of the project's potential audience. We expect that policy researchers and practitioners associated with organizations such as APPAM would be extremely receptive. Hence, we hope to hold one or more of the U.S. policy conferences in association with one of APPAM's regularly scheduled biannual conferences. (Doing so, of course, would substantially lower our costs.)

Some topics, at least, might also be of interest to congressional and executive staff. Hence, if appropriate, we would attempt to arrange consultations between the paper authors and relevant government officials or the staffs of public or private agencies. Professor Besharov and his staff have experience holding numerous briefing sessions for both. In 1999–2000, for example, Professor Besharov and Isabelle Sawhill of the Brookings Institution hosted a series of welfare policy seminars for congressional staffers. Between fifty and sixty staffers attended these monthly luncheon sessions. In addition, in 1990, Professor Besharov organized and chaired a three-day meeting for officials of the first Bush presidency. At the meeting, titled "Raising Children for the Twenty-First Century," about thirty senior government officials discussed a range of social welfare programs and issues with about thirty outside experts.

Journalists might also be an interested audience. The University of Maryland regularly organizes briefing sessions for reporters covering particular topics. These sessions are often on the College Park campus, but they are sometimes held in downtown Washington, D.C.

Outreach to think tanks and other groups. The project would also distribute information about the papers and edited volumes to relevant U.S. think tanks, university research centers, and advocacy groups through its website and targeted e-mails. There are, for example, a number of *networks* of state and local think tanks:

- *The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)*, which describes itself as a "bipartisan membership association for conservative state lawmakers who [share] a common belief in limited government, free markets, federalism, and individual liberty";[44]

- *The Economic Analysis and Research Network (EARN)*, which describes itself as linking "local, state and national groups that conduct and disseminate research, develop policy and advocate on a range of issues";[45]

[44]American Legislative Exchange Council, "Background about ALEC," http://www.alec.org/index.php?id=300 (accessed January 3, 2007).

[45]Economic Analysis and Research Network, "About the Economic Analysis and Research Network (EARN)," http://www.earncentral.org/about.htm (accessed January 3, 2007).

- *The Moving Ideas: The Electronic Policy Network*, which describes itself as a "network of over 250 nonprofit organizations at the forefront of progressive policy and advocacy work";[46]

- *The State Fiscal Analysis Initiative (SFAI)*, which describes itself as "[bringing] together nonpartisan, independent, nonprofit organizations" that have "diverse backgrounds and missions, but . . . share a commitment to rigorous policy analysis, responsible budget and tax policies, a particular focus on the needs of low- and moderate-income families";[47] and,

- *The State Policy Network (SPN)*, which describes itself as a "leadership training center and resource clearinghouse for the state-based, free market think tank industry."[48]

We would also try to reach individual think tanks. For example, the Earth's Common Sense Think Tank lists 128 U.S. think tanks,[49] Moving Ideas: The Electronic Policy Network lists about 250 liberal U.S. think tanks,[50] The Heritage Foundation lists 568 conservative U.S. think tanks,[51] The National Institute for Research Advancement lists about 120 U.S. think tanks,[52] and *The Think Tank Directory* profiles over 1,100 U.S. think tanks.[53]

Institutional capabilities. The University of Maryland is a public research university of national stature, highly regarded for its broad base of excellence in teaching and research. The institution has a broad array of distribution resources that it can muster for projects, as assigned. The University Office of Communications offers a full-range of professional media relations services directed to the local, national, and international press. The office regularly arranges media

---

[46]Moving Ideas: The Electronic Policy Network, "About Moving Ideas," http://www2.movingideas.org/content/en/about.htm (accessed January 3, 2007).

[47]State Fiscal Analysis Initiative, "About SFAI," http://www.statefiscal.org/#bot2 (accessed January 3, 2007).

[48]State Policy Network, "About SPN," http://www.spn.org/about/ (accessed January 3, 2007).

[49]Earth's Common Sense Think Tank, "United States Think Tanks List," http://www.venusproject.com/ecs/world_news/think_tank_list.html (accessed January 5, 2007).

[50]Moving Ideas: The Electronic Policy Network, "Members," http://www.movingideas.org/content/en/member_organizations.htm (accessed January 5, 2007).

[51]Heritage Foundation, "Policy Experts: The Insider Guide to Public Policy Experts and Organizations," http://www.policyexperts.org/organizations/organizations_results.cfm (accessed January 5, 2007).

[52]NIRA's World Directory of Think Tanks, "Index by Country: United States," http://www.nira.go.jp/ice/nwdtt/2005/IDX2/index8.html#UnitedStates (accessed January 5, 2007).

[53]Government Research Service, "Think Tank Directory: A Guide to Independent Nonprofit Public Policy Research Organizations," http://www.thinktankdirectory.com/index.html (accessed January 5, 2007).

events and briefings and collaborates on official Capitol Hill briefings. It also secures media coverage of newsworthy events in trade journals and the wider national press. In addition, University Publications maintains the University's award-winning website. This main university online portal has the capacity to transmit a full range of audio, video and print materials, and also hosts live webcasts. It can also highlight and link to online publications at various University websites. It regularly features University research highlights. The University's federal relations staff maintains excellent contacts on Capitol Hill and has frequently hosted events on the Hill for members of Congress and their staff. It also works closely with a variety of federal agencies. Many elements of the University, including the School of Public Policy, publish their own newsletters and maintain active national and international contact with public policy professionals and academics. They regularly uses direct mail, e-mail listservs, and other forms of contact to disseminate the University's research activities.

In addition to the substantial dissemination capabilities of the University of Maryland, the project will also work closely with AEI, where Professor Besharov is a resident scholar. AEI scholars work closely with the Institute's marketing, communications, publications, media, and conference departments to disseminate their research broadly to a general audience, as well as more strategically to those in government, business, academia, the press, and other policy organizations who are best placed to advance well-reasoned policy reform.

AEI also relies on the internet to distribute its publications and promote its ideas. AEI's main website (www.aei.org) and related program-area sites, receive almost ten million visits a year. It offers the full texts of current articles, research reports and working papers, and many books and monographs, as well as streaming videos of AEI conferences. In its dissemination efforts, AEI relies heavily on e-mail, particularly for its two e-newsletters, the biweekly "AEI in an Instant" and the daily "AEI Today." These regular updates provide links to recent articles, brief summaries of AEI research initiatives and media activity by our scholars, and a reminder of upcoming AEI events.

Policy Implications

A successful project could be the basis of a newly created Center for the International Exchange of Policy Information at the University of Maryland (operating in association with AEI). The center would institutionalize the successful aspects of the project, even while continuing to experiment with different formats and approaches.

We are particularly hopeful that the project's attention to formal policy analysis, based on rigorous evaluation and a full and fair presentation of the information on both sides of issues, could serve as a model for similar efforts. As such, it could lay the groundwork for a much broader flow of policy-relevant information and ideas from abroad.

Although the project's main purpose would be to develop more cost-effective methods of information exchange, the project's demonstration exchanges could enrich American research, policy, and program management in their specific topic areas. For example, if we choose as a topic restraining health care costs (perhaps combined with expanding access), our project could increase understanding of how different countries seek to control medical spending, their success or lack of success in doing so, and the tradeoffs involved.

APPENDIX A

Illustrative Listing of Cross-National Materials for American Audiences

The following is an illustrative listing of cross-national papers on policy research and analysis written for American audiences. Although considerable effort was extended, no attempt was made to be either comprehensive or representative. Nevertheless, we believe that the list demonstrates that feasibility of such studies and the great need for more studies along the lines described in this proposal.

Child poverty

Loke, Vernon, and Michael Sherraden. 2006. Building Assets from Birth: A Comparison of the Policies and Proposals on Children Savings Accounts in Singapore, the United Kingdom, Canada, Korea, and the United States. Working Paper 06-14, Center for Social Development, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University in St. Louis. Also available online at http://gwbweb.wustl.edu/csd/Publications/2006/WP06-14.pdf (accessed January 8, 2007).

This paper "provides an overview of the Children Savings Account policies and proposals" in Singapore, the UK, Canada, Korea, and the U.S. (p. 1).

Plotnick, Robert D. 1997. "Child Poverty Can Be Reduced." *The Future of Children* 7, no. 2 (Summer/Fall): 72–87. Also available online at http://www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/vol7no2ART5.pdf (accessed January 8, 2007).

This article reviews recent U.S. experience with attempts to supplement earned income with cash to reduce child poverty and discusses "lessons from abroad for U.S. policymakers" (p. 72). It suggests that "although policies to increase earned incomes among low-wage workers can help, these earnings gains will not be sufficient to reduce child poverty substantially. . . . Government income support programs, tax policy, and child support payments from absent parents can be used to supplement earned incomes of poor families with children" (p. 72).

Drug policy

MacCoun, Robert J., and Peter Reuter. 1999. "Does Europe Do It Better? Lessons from Holland, Britain, and Switzerland." *The Nation* (September 20). Also available online at http://www.puaf.umd.edu/faculty/reuter/europe.htm (accessed January 4, 2007).

This article describes approaches to drug law reform (decriminalization, legalization, and addiction maintenance) as experienced by Holland, Britain, and Switzerland, and suggests consideration and examination of these policies by the U.S.

Nadelmann, Ethan. 1996. "Doing Methadone Right." *Public Interest* 123: 83–93. Also available

online at http://www.drugpolicy.org/library/tlcen_jm.cfm (accessed January 8, 2007).

This article examines U.S. drug addiction treatment programs for heroin users, and suggests that “more could be gained by . . . adopting the methadone policies that have spread in recent years throughout Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and even Hong Kong” (p. 89), such as “retain[ing] a higher proportion of illicit drugs users in treatment by making methadone . . . easily available” (p. 89).

Education policy

Hill, Paul T. 2005. “Lessons from Blair’s School Reforms.” *Policy Review* (June/July). Also available online at http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/2932961.html (accessed January 4, 2007).

This article examines the “profound change[s] in British elementary and secondary education” under Tony Blair, and suggests that the U.S. could learn from several of the initiatives, such as the “specialist schools program,” whereby a school receives supplemental government funds if it specializes in a particular area (such as foreign languages, science, or mathematics).

McAdams, Richard P. 1993. *Lessons from Abroad: How Other Countries Educate Their Children.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.

This book surveys education in Canada, Denmark, England, Germany, Japan, and the U.S., covering each nation’s historical educational development, all levels of education (elementary, secondary, and higher education), the teaching profession; the principal’s role; school finance and governance; and the influence of culture on each of the above mentioned countries’ educational systems.

Sacks, Lynne, and Betsy Brown Ruzzi. 2005. *Early Childhood Education: Lessons from the States and Abroad: 2005.* Paper prepared for the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy. Also available online at http://www.skillscommission.org/pdf/Staff%20Papers/Early%20Childhood%20Education.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This paper surveys early childhood education practices in both the U.S. and abroad, discusses research findings on program impacts, and summarizes recommendations from recent reports, nearly all of which support increased public financing of early childhood education.

Sclafani, Susan, and Marc S. Tucker. 2006. *Teacher and Principal Compensation: An International Review.* Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy. Also available online at http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2006/10/teacher_compensation.html/pdf/education_report.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This paper examines teachers' compensation "from the perspective of the way policies on that topic are evolving in a variety of countries and, as well, what researchers are reporting about both the problems and the effects of the policy approaches that other nations have been trying" (p. 4), and concludes that "teachers and principals respond to the same incentives that all other professionals respond to" and "the United States has a lot to learn from their reform experiments" (p. 5).

Sporn, Barbara. 2003. *Convergence or Divergence in International Higher Education Policy: Lessons from Europe.* Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration. http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ffpfp0305.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This paper presents "a summary of the major [higher education policy] reforms and trends in Europe, including institutional responses" (p. 31), but only suggests that "[i]mportant insights and ideas for improvement could be gained and communicated internationally so that higher education institutions can grow and change without reinventing the wheel every time around" (p. 42).

Energy policy

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). 2006. "International Conference on Lessons Learned from Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities and the Safe Termination of Nuclear Activities." Athens, Greece: December 13–15. http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Meetings/Announcements.asp?ConfID=143 (accessed January 4, 2007).

This conference served as an "extensive information exchange among decision makers, regulators, radiation and waste safety specialists, and the nuclear industry on lessons that have been learned during the planning and implementation of past decommissioning projects," and suggested that "lessons learned from one organization can have a significant beneficial impact on organizations starting the decommissioning process for the first time."

Sandalow, David B. 2006. "Ethanol: Lessons from Brazil." In David W. Monsma and John A. Riggs, *A High Growth Strategy for Ethanol: The Report of an Aspen Institute Policy Dialogue,* pp. 67–74. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute. Also available online at http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/EEEethanol7.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This paper "summarizes the history of the Brazilian ethanol program, describes the program's current status, and considers lessons for the United States from the Brazilian

experience” (p. 67).

Family policy

Meyers, Marcia K., and Janet C. Gornick. 2004. “Work/Family Reconciliation Policies for the United States: Lessons from Abroad.” http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Meyers_Gornick_Princeton_chapter1.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This paper “draw[s] on European examples to consider models of work/family reconciliation policy that would support U.S. families who choose dual-earner/dual-carer arrangements” (p. 11), and “argue[s] that government can help promote solutions to work/family conflicts without tradeoffs through policies that support equal caregiving by mothers and fathers and that distribute the costs of childrearing more broadly” (p. 1).

Levin-Epstein, Jodie. 2004. “High-Wire Act: Balancing Families and Jobs at Precarious Points—the Role of Work-Leave in New Zealand and the United States.” *Fulbright Voices* (June). Also available online at http://www.clasp.org/publications/high_wire.pdf (accessed January 8, 2007).

This article examines parental leave and sick leave in New Zealand and the United States, and suggests that “[c]onsideration should be given in the United States to lessons from New Zealand’s experience, including . . . “[g]eneral revenue financing of parental leave [that could] eliminate a business objection [to a national parental leave law] and foster legislation” and “[g]eneral revenue financing of parental leave could enhance the likelihood of a longer period of leave” (p. v).

Health Policy

Detmer, Don, and Elaine Steen. 2006. *Learning from Abroad: Lessons and Questions on Personal Health Records for National Policy*. Washington, DC: AARP. Also available online at http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/health/2006_10_phr_abroad.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This paper “identif[ies] experiences [with health information technology] in the international arena that might inform policies in the U.S.” (p. iii), and concludes that “the underlying cultural differences among the U.S. and the countries studied (that are attributable to their different delivery systems, financing approaches, and national health information infrastructures) account for a disparity in interest in [personal health records] and divergent approaches to [health information technology]” (p. iii). The paper notes that, “[w]hile the AARP does not necessarily endorse all of the authors’ recommendations, we are eager to stimulate discussion about personal health technology and hope that this study will contribute to that discussion” [p. iii].)

Heartland Institute. 2006. "The Dangers of Undermining Patient Choice: Lessons from Europe and Canada on September 19th." Washington, DC: September 18. http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=19634 (accessed January 4, 2007).

This conference "featur[ed] international experts who . . . provide[d] insights into their countries' health care systems, including their governments' role in regulating physicians and hospitals and imposing price controls and restrictions on access to medicines" in an attempt to "[l]earn what this could mean for access to modern, innovative quality health care in the U.S."

Lieberman, Samuel S., Joseph J. Capuno, and Hoang Van Minh. 2005. "Decentralizing Health: Lessons from Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam." In *East Asia Decentralizes: Making Local Government Work*, 155–178. Washington, DC: The World Bank. Also available online at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEAPDECEN/Resources/Chapter-8.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This chapter "examines the decentralization experience of three East Asian countries from the perspective of how well they have addressed the special features and requirements of the health sector," and "points to areas where reforms may facilitate more effective health care delivery" (p. 155).

Immigration policy

Krikorian, Mark, Frank Gaffney, and Steven Steinlight. 2005. "The French Riots and U.S. Immigration Policy." Panel discussion transcript, meeting at the Rayburn House Office Building (November 14). Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies. Also available online at http://www.cis.org/articles/2005/frenchriotstranscript.html (accessed January 8, 2007).

This panel discussed the French riots of 2005 and the implications for U.S. immigration policy, and suggests that "the real challenge in immigration facing receiving societies is assimilating the children of immigrants and integrating them into the new society as opposed to the immigrants themselves."

The Urban Institute. 2006. "Immigrant Student Success: Lessons from Abroad for U.S. Policy." Washington, DC: June 6. http://www.urban.org/Pressroom/firsttuesdays/june2006.cfm (accessed January 4, 2007).

This panel examined ways that education and training could increase the integration of immigrant students.

Job training

Kletzer, Lori G., and William L. Koch. Revised 2003. International Experience with Job Training: Lessons for the U.S. Paper presented at the conference on Job Training and Labor Exchange in the U.S. sponsored by the W.E. Upjohn Institute and the U.S. Department of Labor, September 19–21, 2002, in Augusta, Michigan. Also available online at http://econ.ucsc.edu/~lkletzer/kletzer&koch_international_training1.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This paper reviews "evidence on training programs for a small group of mostly industrialized countries, and [tries] to distill some lessons for the U.S. in its employment and training policy" (p. 2), and concludes that "[t]he failure of the basic educational system following by employer-provided training to provide skills to ['workers tenuously connected to the labor market'] stands as a 'market failure' justification for publicly funded training" (p. 36).

Turbin, Jill. 2001. "Policy Borrowing: Lessons from European Attempts To Transfer Training Practices." *International Journal of Training and Development* 5, no. 2 (June): 96–111. Also available online at http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1468-2419.00125 (accessed January 8, 2007).

This paper explores how policies are can be borrowed from the field of "Continual Vocational Training," and suggests that transferring training principles and practices often has only limited success because it ignores cultural differences.

Old-age pension reform

Norman, Goran, and Daniel J. Mitchell. 2000. "Pension Reform in Sweden: Lessons for American Policymakers." *The Heritage Foundation Backgrounder* 1381 (June). http://www.heritage.org/Research/SocialSecurity/bg1381.cfm (accessed January 4, 2007).

This article describes Sweden's experience with partially privatizing its pension program in the 1990s, and advocates that the U.S. adopt a similar regime.

Orszag, J. Michael, and Peter R. Orszag. 2005. "Individual Accounts: Lessons from International Experience." *Science* 309, no. 5732 (July 8): 250–251. http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/summary/309/5732/250 (accessed January 4, 2007).

This article examines problems that arose when individual retirement accounts were adopted in other countries, and suggests that "more work is needed both in practice, to make accounts work better, and in research, to achieve better alignment between economic theory and observed behavior."

Weaver, R. Kent. 2000. *The Politics of Pension Reform: Lessons from Abroad*. Paper prepared for presentation at the Second Annual Joint Conference for the Retirement Research Consortium, Washington, DC. Also available at http://www.bc.edu/centers/crr/papers/SVII-1%20Weaver.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

Ths paper "combines an overview of trends [of pension reform politics] across countries with case studies of six countries: Australia, Canada, Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom and New Zealand" (p. 2), and suggests that a "partial move toward a system of individual accounts is unlikely to make [the high poverty rate of U.S. seniors] better, and to the extent that it supplants a portion of current Social Security benefits, it is likely to make it worse" (p. 6).

Tax and fiscal policy

Schick, Allen. 2005. "Can the U.S. Government Live Within Its Means? Lessons From Abroad." *The Brookings Institution Policy Brief* 141 (June). Also available online at http://www.brook.edu/comm/policybriefs/pb141.pdf (accessed January 8, 2007).

This article compares the lack fiscal constraints and commitments in the U.S. with alternative approaches to fiscal responsibility from New Zealand, and suggests that the U.S. "can learn from the experiences of other countries, including New Zealand, that have successfully implemented fiscal rules by assuring that fiscal restraint laws are supported politically" (p. 1).

De Rugy, Veronique. 2005. "Economic Kiwi Fruit." *TCS Daily* (February 18), http://www.techcentralstation.com/021805C.html (accessed January 8, 2007).

This article discusses the U.S. tax code in the context of New Zealand's tax reform in the 1980s, and suggests that New Zealand's experience "provides a good role model for the [U.S.] to follow."

Other

Hambleton, Robin. 2006. *U.S. Public Policy for Cities—Insights from Abroad: Report to the Joyce Foundation.* Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago. Also available online at http://www.uic.edu/cuppa/cityfutures/joycereport.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This report “identifies ‘insights’ from the large array of scholarship presented at the [2004 International Conference on City Futures] . . . that could be helpful to those concerned with [U.S.] public policy for cities” (p. 1).

Hokenstad, Merl C., and James Midgley, eds. 2004. *Lessons From Abroad: Adapting International Social Welfare Innovations.* Annapolis Jct, MD: NASW Press.

This edited volume examines how U.S. social policy could be enhanced by rigorously considering social policy practices abroad. Among the areas discussed are child welfare, individual retirement accounts, and welfare, poverty, and social services.

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). 2004. “International Conference—The New Approaches to Rural Policy: Lessons from Around the World.” Washington, DC: March 25–26. http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/28/16/31371098.pdf (accessed January 4, 2007).

This conference convened “[m]ore than 120 senior policy officials and experts from 15 countries (including all G7 countries) . . . to discuss the future of rural policy” (p. 1), and concluded that it would be beneficial to “shift away from past reliance on subsidies focused on a single sector (agriculture) towards an integrated place-based policy for rural development” (p. 1).

APPENDIX B

Organizational Background

School of Public Policy
University of Maryland

This will be a project of the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy in association with the American Enterprise Institute (AEI).

University of Maryland

The University of Maryland, College Park, is a national public research university located on a campus of 1,500 acres along the Baltimore-Washington, D.C., high-tech corridor. The flagship of the University of Maryland system, it is a Carnegie Research-I University and one of thirty-two public research universities in the prestigious sixty-one-member Association of American Universities. The University's thirteen colleges and schools offer degrees in more than 100 disciplines. There are approximately 32,000 students and 2,500 faculty.

The University is an affiliate of the American Consortium on EU Studies (ACES), which is a group of universities in the Washington, D.C., area funded as part of the Network of European Centers of Excellence by the EU.[54] ACES develops special graduate certificate programs in EU studies, sponsors a Young Scholars Network of graduate students, conducts regular seminars among senior scholars, offers pre-dissertation fellowships and research seed grants, supports academic conferences, symposia, and workshops on EU and EU–U.S. issues, and publishes papers on important transatlantic policy issues.

Over the past ten years, the University has enjoyed a well-deserved rise in its reputation. The number of programs ranked in the top twenty-five nationally increased from none to fifty-two, the amount of contract and grant awards to the University jumped from $81 million to $203 million; private giving rose from $14 million to $81 million; and the quality of students rose steadily, with the average high school grade point average rising from 2.98 to 3.61. Over the last five years, the University's number of faculty in national academies has doubled and research expenditures increased by 54.2 percent, with significant growth realized in every college. Many departments related to social and economic policy are highly ranked: Sociology, ranked among the top twenty-five graduate departments in the country; Economics, ranked seventh among public universities and twentieth overall; Criminology and Criminal Justice, ranked number one in the country.

[54]Network of European Union Centers of Excellence, http://www.unc.edu/euce/ (accessed January 7, 2007).

International Programs. Through its Office on International Programs and other programs, the University undertakes a variety of programs to facilitate international activities of faculty and students. It provides faculty grants for travel abroad—for international conferences, seminars, and workshops, and to support overseas research. Each year, the University regularly hosts approximately 1,100 international faculty and scholars from more than eighty different countries. Examples of its many programs include the Institute for Global Chinese Affairs, which studies the world's Chinese-speaking population and brings current and emerging Chinese leaders to the University for training related to economic development, management, and policy implementation. It promotes the study of Chinese through the Confucius Institute, which is sponsored in part by the government of China. The University's College of Agriculture and Natural Resources has agricultural and natural resource partnerships in Russia, Central Asia, and China, and has a Student Transfer Agreement with the China Agriculture University in Beijing. Finally, the University encourages its students to take part in its study-abroad programs, for which the University has international exchange agreements with more than 200 universities and government and private research institutions worldwide.

Academic resources. The College Park campus offers a rich environment for research and professional growth. The campus contains thirteen schools and colleges. The Graduate School is the ninth largest in the nation. Of all 32,000 students, approximately 8,500 are graduate students who come from almost every state in the Union and fifty-eight foreign nations.

Library resources on the College Park campus consist of the main library, the Theodore H. McKeldin Library, plus seven other branch libraries, all members of the Association of Research Libraries. The libraries' collections contain over 2.85 million volumes and they subscribe to about 32,000 periodicals and newspapers. Additional collections of research materials are available in electronic format (subscriptions to over 300 databases), on microform, CD-ROM, phonograph record, tape, and film. Extensive inter-library loan services are available to obtain loans or photocopies of materials not available at College Park from other libraries. The libraries' special collections and archives are also a vital resource.

Federal depositories and linkages. The College Park campus is a regional federal depository for government documents, a collection of more than 1 million government publications. Researchers and students have relatively easy access to special libraries in the Washington Metropolitan area, including the demographic collections at the Census Bureau and the holdings of the Population Reference Bureau (PRB), an extensive collection of demographic information and materials, as well as the research and reading rooms of the Library of Congress. College Park is also the home of National Archives II, the largest federal archival collection in the world with the most complete set of records about U.S. history.

Departments and projects at the University of Maryland have established collaborative relationships and linkages with a variety of federal agencies related to research on poverty. For example, the Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality has partnerships with the Census Bureau (Population Division), the Center for Economic Studies, and the National Center for Health Statistics.

School of Public Policy

The Maryland School of Public Policy (MSPP) is one of the nation's leading graduate programs devoted to the study of public policy, management, and international affairs. MSPP offers masters and doctoral programs both to those just embarking on their careers and to mid-career professionals seeking to upgrade their skills. A nationally recognized faculty offers these degree programs at a cost lower than many of the other top twenty programs in the country. The School's educational mission is to prepare leaders in their chosen area of specialization, whether it be the environment, social welfare, economic development, international peace, or more effective government. Serving both traditional academics and public administration professionals, the School works closely with numerous local, state, federal, and international agencies and organizations to provide educational programs that build the abilities of policy and management professionals.

MSPP's senior faculty is composed of leading scholars and scholar-practitioners who understand and influence both the theory of policy-making and its real-world applications. Senior faculty members include Allen Schick, the nation's foremost expert on federal budgeting; Herman Daly, a founder of the field of ecological economics; Thomas Schelling, Nobel laureate, former president of the American Economics Association, and world-renowned scholar; John Steinbruner, director of the School's Center for International and Security Studies; I.M. (Mac) Destler, a leading expert on U.S. trade politics and other international issues; Douglas Besharov, a national spokesman on welfare reform, child abuse, and other social dilemmas; Peter Reuter, one of the most frequently quoted analysts of crime and drug policy; Robert Nelson, a prolific writer on environmental issues; and Carmen Reinhart, a leading scholar on international finance matters.

APPENDIX C

Curriculum Vitae

DOUGLAS J. BESHAROV

EDUCATION

Master of Laws, 1971
New York University

Juris Doctor, 1968
New York University

Bachelor of Arts, 1965
Queens College

EMPLOYMENT

1983–Present **Joseph J. and Violet Jacobs Scholar in Social Welfare Studies, The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research**. Conducting research on social welfare and the legal process.

1979–1982 **Visiting Scholar, The Brookings Institution.** Conducted a study of legal standards for state intervention in cases of child abuse and neglect.

1975–1979 **Director, U.S. National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect.** First director of the National Center, which had a $19 million annual appropriation and a professional staff of thirty, with a representative in each of the ten Federal Regions. The Center supported over 250 research, demonstration, training, technical assistance, and on-going service projects in all parts of the country.

1971–1975 **Executive Director, New York State Assembly Select Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect; Counsel, New York State Assembly Subcommittee on the Family Court.** Developed legislative and administrative reforms of agency and court handling of child abuse and neglect, juvenile delinquency, and non-support cases.

1969–1971 **Assistant Corporation Counsel In-Charge-Of Family Court Planning and Programming,** New York City. Supervised a staff of thirty-seven attorneys assigned to juvenile delinquency, ungovernability, child protective, non-support, and spouse abuse cases.

1968–1969 **Staff Associate, NYC Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.** Wrote the legislation creating the NYC Parking Violations Bureau, which was later adopted by many other states.

1967 **Law Student's Civil Rights Research Council.** Summer intern assigned first to the NAACP in Clarksdale, Mississippi, and later to the New York Civil Liberties Union.

TEACHING

1992–Present **Professor, University of Maryland School of Public Policy.** Teaching graduate courses on family policy, welfare reform, program evaluation, and the implementation of social welfare programs. (Visiting professor, 1992–1997)

1985–1992 **Adjunct Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center.** Taught Family Law and Policy Seminar.

1990 **Adjunct Professor, University of Maryland School of Public Affairs.** Taught a graduate course on family policy.

1986 **Adjunct Professor of Law, American University Law Center.** Taught Advanced Family Law Seminar.

1984–1985 **Visiting Associate Professor of Law, College of William and Mary School of Law.** Taught torts, family law, and juvenile law.

1984 **Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Maryland School of Law**. Taught two family law courses.

1982–1983 **Visiting Professor of Law, Osgoode Hall Law School,** Toronto, Canada. Taught family law, as well as seminars on Social Science and the Law and Children and the Law.

1971–1975 **Adjunct Assistant Professor of Law, New York University School of Law.** Taught a four credit criminal law and procedure course, with a field placement component.

EDITORIAL BOARDS AND SERVICE

2005–Present Editor, "Policy Retrospectives," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management.*

2006 Symposium Editor, "Rethinking Child Care Research," *Evaluation Review*, with Jeffrey S. Morrow.

1990–Present Member, Editorial Board, *Children and Youth Services Review.*

2006 Guest Editor, Symposium on Child Care, *Evaluation Review.*

1997 Guest Editor, Symposium on Sex Education and Abstinence, *Children and Youth Services Review.*

1992 Guest Editor, Symposium on Child Welfare Reform, *Children and Youth Services Review*.

1986 Guest Editor, Symposium on Child Protection Policy, *ABA Family Law Quarterly.*

1981–1991 Reviewing Editor, *Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal.*

1980–1995 Reviewing Editor and Editorial Board, *ABA Family Law Quarterly*.

COMMUNITY, ACADEMIC, AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

2007 President-elect, Association for Public Policy and Management (APPAM).

2005–2006 Vice President, Association for Public Policy and Management.

2002–present Member, National Advisory Committee, National Poverty Center, University of Michigan (also Senior Research Associate).

1987–present Member, Fatality Review Panel, New York City Human Resources Administration.

2003–2004 Member, Advisory Board, Pew Hispanic Center.

1999–2002 Member, National Advisory Committee, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin.

1999–2002 Elected Member, Policy Council, Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management.

1995–2002 Member, Board of Governors, Smith Richardson Foundation.

1995–1996 Member, New York State Governor's Commission of Child Abuse.

1993–1998 Member, Board of Directors, Public Private Ventures.

1993–1996 Member, Research Advisory Board, Committee for Economic Development.

1993–1994 Member, Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion, U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services.

1992 Visiting Scholar, Washington and Lee School of Law.

1991–1992 Administrator, AEI/White House Working Seminar on Integrated Services for Children and Families.

1991–1992 Member, Advisory Board, National Health Policy Forum.

1989–1999 Member, Board of Directors, Mathematica Policy Research Corporation.

1989 Visiting Regents Lecturer, University of California at Berkeley.

1987 Program Chairman, "Defending Child Abuse and Neglect Cases," a Continuing Legal Education Program of the Georgetown University Law Center and the District of Columbia Bar.

1986–1987 Administrator, Working Seminar on the Family and American Welfare Policy.

1985–1995 Elected Councilman, Town of Somerset, Maryland.

1985 Participant in a three-week Economics Institute for Law Professors, sponsored by the Law and Economics Center of Emory University.

1979–1980 Program Chairman, Practising Law Institute Training Program.

1973 Law teacher scholarship to attend the National Institute on Trial Advocacy, a one-month, intensive training program for practicing lawyers and teachers of trial advocacy.

1972 Fellowship to participate in a one-month seminar entitled "Social Science Methodology in Legal Education," sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

BOOKS (authored)

Rethinking WIC: An Evaluation of the Women, Infants, and Children Program (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute Press, 2001), coauthored with Peter Germanis.

Recognizing Child Abuse: The Training Curriculum (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute/University of Maryland, 1999).

Recognizing Child Abuse: A Guide for the Concerned (New York: The Free Press, 1990).

Legal Services for the Poor: Time for Reform (Washington, DC: American Enterprise

Institute Press, 1990).

The Vulnerable Social Worker: Liability for Serving Children and Families (Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers, 1985).

The Abused and Neglected Child: Multidisciplinary Court Practice (New York: Practising Law Institute Course Handbook, 1978).

The Maltreated Child (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 3rd Ed., 1977) (4th Ed., 1979) (5th Ed., 1982) (5th Ed. 1995), coauthored with Vincent J. Fontana, M.D.

Juvenile Justice Advocacy (New York: Practising Law Institute, 1974).

Children, Parents, and the Courts (New York: Practising Law Institute, 1972), coauthored with Surrogate Millard L. Midonick.

BOOKS (edited)

Family and Child Well-Being after Welfare Reform (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2003), editor.

Disconnected Youth: Toward a Preventive Strategy (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute Press / Child Welfare League of America, 1999), editor.

Enhancing Early Childhood Programs: Burdens and Opportunities (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute Press / Child Welfare League of America, 1996), editor.

When Drug Addicts Have Children: Reorienting Child Welfare's Response (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute Press / Child Welfare League of America, 1994), editor.

Reforming Child Welfare through Demonstration and Evaluation, Special Double Issue, *Children and Youth Services Review* 14, no. 1/2 (1992), editor, assisted by Karen Baehler, Barton Clark, and Kelly Swanson.

Family Violence: Research and Public Policy Issues (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute Press, 1990), editor.

Protecting Children from Abuse and Neglect: Policy and Practice (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1988), editor.

Representing Parents Accused of Child Abuse and Neglect (Washington, DC: DC Superior Court, 1987).

Protecting Children from Abuse and Neglect: Where Are We Now? Special issue, *Family Law Quarterly* 20, no. 2 (1986), editor.

Child Abuse and Neglect Law: A Canadian Perspective (Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America, 1986), editor.

ARTICLES

Written over 200 articles, and has contributed to the *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*, *New York Times*, and *Los Angeles Times.*