

UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS – UNICAMP  
NÚCLEO DE ESTUDOS DE POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS – NEPP  
2005

Marta Ferreira Santos Farah<sup>1</sup>  
Pedro Luiz Barros Silva<sup>2</sup>  
Peter Spink<sup>3</sup>  
Robert H. Wilson<sup>4</sup>

Prepared for the  
Fifth Annual FIPSE-CAPES Directors Meeting

Washington, DC  
October 12-15, 2005



---

1 Getulio Vargas Foundation-São Paulo.  
2 State University of Campinas.  
3 Getulio Vargas Foundation-São Paulo.  
4 University of Texas at Austin.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Bilateral Consortium from Social Science and Public Policy (BCSP) was created with the goal of integrating teaching and research programs through a comparative public policy framework across member universities. The results in student learning, curriculum development and policy-related research are encouraging and have resulted in an innovative approach to applied comparative research.

The BCSP was created in 2001 with support from a grant under the US-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program, a binational program that is administered in the US by the Fund for the Improvement of Post secondary Education (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento do Pessoal do Ensino Superior (CAPES), Brazilian Ministry of Education. The objectives of the overall FIPSE-CAPES program include the development of institutional linkages among consortium members and promotion of student mobility. Building upon this initial four-year grant, the BCSP was awarded a complementary activities grant by FIPSE-CAPES in 2005 and extended its program development to the creation of public policy field stations in Texas and São Paulo with the purpose of developing research on comparative perspectives of public policy in collaboration with local governments.

The academic integration desired by the FIPSE and CAPES program has been pursued in the BCSP through incorporating the values of mutual respect, equal treatment and reciprocity among the university partners in its activities. While the different universities involved have shared intellectual objectives from the beginning, an important part of the work of the BCSP has been to learn how to adapt to, and build bridges between, the different university and local cultures.

The principal achievements of the consortium have been (a) to consolidate a degree of undergraduate and graduate student exchange between the different universities that has strengthened existing links and institutionalized future relations; (b) to consolidate and strengthen research relations between faculty members of the different universities involved; and (c) to create an innovative basis for public policy research through the use of comparative field stations, the first two of which are currently being established in Texas and São Paulo State. It is hoped that the comparative policy field stations will provide a mid-range action-research approach to collaborative public interest studies.

Key to the success of the Bilateral Consortium has been its ability to take the basic framework of staff, student and course exchange and place it within a coherent interdisciplinary approach to applied social science. Comparative public policy is a growing analytical trend in the fields of social and political sciences, public administration and economics, taking over from earlier comparative public administration approaches and providing a more finely tuned focus on specific areas of government action. Grounding the cooperation within this emerging interdisciplinary approach has given all the participants much to discuss and think about and has provided students of both countries with a broader perspective on policy possibilities and concerns.

This paper will begin by introducing the partner institutions and the consortium's antecedents. It will then go on to present the framework for comparative public policy analysis being used and discuss the particular circumstances in Brazil and the US. Following this, it will show how these ideas have been adapted in teaching and curriculum development before going on to discuss the growing research agenda and the comparative field stations.

#### *The University Partners: Institutional Foundations*

The universities participating in the BCSP, University of Texas at Austin (UT-Austin) and the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), the State University of São Paulo in Campinas (UNICAMP), the Federal University in Pernambuco (UFPe), and the Getulio Vargas Foundation in São Paulo (EAESP/FGV), represent a diverse set of institutions. Although all can be characterized as research universities, the specific institutional legacies of the five are varied. This variation created challenges in establishing the collaborative links, but also provided fertile ground for considering a range of collaborative models. For example, the explicit outreach obligations of the US universities was a new experience for the Brazilian partners, for whom such actions are more voluntary and individual. At the same time, the more explicit and forceful federal higher education policy in Brazil, implemented by CAPES, created a greater unity of purpose among the Brazilian partners.

As large public universities, UT-Austin and UCLA have longstanding and deep commitments to international education and to outreach to local and regional communities. The international education mission involves introducing students to other cultures and history, preparing graduates in a wide range of professions that operate in international contexts,

contributing to knowledge on issues and phenomena that are not necessarily tied to political boundaries, and creating educational opportunities for foreign nationals. The outreach mission, consistent with that of the traditional land grant colleges, is to transfer new ideas and technologies into service for the broader society.

The Brazilian universities have very different institutional backgrounds. The São Paulo State University at Campinas (UNICAMP) is a leading public sector university with strengths in a number of fields. The Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPe) has a long history of development studies and concerns with the Northeast region of the country. The Getulio Vargas Foundation is a private non-profit institution that was set up in the 1940s to provide postgraduate training in the public sector and went on to develop undergraduate, graduate and advanced programs in economics, business administration and public administration.

The interest in developing and implementing the BCSP among the three Brazilian universities was based on two linked concerns:

1. The importance of improving the quality of higher education as a core element in Brazilian national development, especially its role in developing an understanding among students of Brazilian history in the international, principally the American and European, context.
2. A prevailing preoccupation with training students, professors and researchers to formulate alternative development strategies for Brazil that adequately incorporate the country into the international context, but also maximize the opportunities for socioeconomic development of a complex and heterogeneous country.

Linkages to national and regional challenges are part of the core mission of the three Brazilian universities, oriented to education and to the production of knowledge which contribute to the development of the country. They also share a commitment to the establishment of links with universities in other countries as a means of creating a dialogue between researchers and professors and a permanent exchange of knowledge and “teaching methods.” The exchange of students is seen as an important part of this international commitment.

*Antecedents of the BCSP*

The formation of the BCSP represented an extension of previous collaboration. UT-Austin's LBJ School of Public Affairs and FUNDAP, an agency in the São Paulo state government, engaged in a training program for several years in the 1980s through which links were made to FGV and UNICAMP. The LBJ School also conducted three summer programs on US public policy for groups of Brazilian academics under Fulbright funding in the 1980s. The policy training of Brazilian non-degree exchange students at LBJ School of Public Affairs was conducted in the mid-1990s, with support from the Ford Foundation and in collaboration with CEBRAP, a non-profit think tank in São Paulo. This effort was motivated by a concern with policymaking during the period of redemocratization in Brazil<sup>5</sup>. Several UT-Austin students served internships in Brazil, organized by FGV and FGV students began to attend courses on a non-degree basis at UT-Austin. This experience proved to be a quite rich experience for both Brazilian and US students. Beyond the programmed learning found in the syllabus and class activities, an intense interaction between the Brazilian and US students was achieved. The Brazilian students were able to share their own understanding of Brazil with the UT students and the UT students performed the same role of explaining US public policy to the Brazilians, creating "out of the classroom" learning opportunities.

In the mid 1990s, the Public Management and Citizenship Program was set up within FGV to study innovation in sub-national government using as its main approach an annual open entry awards program. This provided additional opportunities for students and staff and in the late 1990s, the first comparative research project took place on public participation in local budgeting by Wilson, Spink and Sugiyama. The study found that the structure of local government in the two countries varied significantly, with the US system being highly fragmented in contrast to the highly standardized system in Brazil. The study found quite interesting differences in the level of citizen participation. In Brazil, redemocratization led to excitement among local populations in local policy. This interest was institutionalized in several municipalities through an innovative policy of participatory budgeting. In the US, local

---

5 Policymaking in a Redemocratized Brazil: Decentralization and Social Policy (vol. 1) and Policymaking in a Redemocratized Brazil: Public Policy and Social Exclusion (vol. 2) co-directed Vilmar Faria, Lawrence Graham, and Robert H. Wilson, Policy Research Project Report #119, LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, 1997; The Political Economy of Brazil: Public Policies in an Era of Transition, Lawrence Graham, and Robert H. Wilson (eds.) (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1990); Policy-Making in a Newly Industrialized Nation: Foreign and Domestic Policy Issues in Brazil, co-directed Lawrence Graham and Robert H. Wilson Policy Research Project Report #83, LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, 1988.

budgeting was found to have become routinized and the intensive involvement of the public occurred only at time of crisis. This initial research activity, in which graduate students for FGV and the LBJ School participated, was developed on an ad hoc basis, but the experience led to a commitment to a comparative public policy perspective that became the basis for the BCSP.

## **II. COMPARATIVE PUBLIC POLICY-THE FRAMEWORK**

In establishing a consortium comprised of major institutions of higher education with significant institutional histories, the BCSP partners were very aware that education and training in social science and public policy analysis in the two countries have quite different disciplinary strengths and legacies. In both countries, public administration, political science and policy studies have followed very different and specific trails. At the same time, each of the countries faces its own internal challenge in building an effective dialogue between scholars of public administration and public policy, and scholarly traditions of research and the more applied and pragmatic types of research needed by the policy communities. Policy studies have yet to achieve its analytical potential as an aggregating and interdisciplinary term in both countries. The BCSP, in assuming the policy studies banner in a comparative perspective, sought to contribute to this dialogue.

The approach taken by the BCSP was possible since the participating universities have traditions of research and teaching that are multidisciplinary and share a commitment to innovative interpretations of complex, unequal and heterogeneous societies. During the design phase of the BCSP and the first years of its implementation, the differences in focus and interpretation of historical events among the faculty members, with various scholarly perspectives generated contrasts that frequently led to a fuller understanding of public policy and its impact in the two countries. As a result, a pragmatic approach to establishing common understandings and developing a common framework evolved in the work of the BCSP.

*The Policy Making Context in Brazil and the US*

Brazil and the US are the two largest countries in the Americas in terms of population (180 million and 280 million, respectively) and the second and third largest in area (8.5 million and 9.6 million square kilometers, respectively). The countries each have a federalist governmental structure and considerable socioeconomic and cultural diversity across regions. This diversity presents challenges to policymaking and implementation in both countries. At the same time, the nature of their specific federal arrangements is considerably different. Brazil is built institutionally within a nesting model of municipalities, states and the union in which each institutional part is constitutionally homogeneous (municipalities with municipalities, states with states). Brazil's over 5,500 municipalities are federal entities, a distinction which is not made in the US, where individual states can be very different from each other and where the sub-state government arena is currently made up of some 3,000 counties, 19,000 municipalities, 16,500 towns and townships, 13,500 school districts and 35,000 special districts.

The US and Brazil have both engaged in recent decades in considerable decentralization of the public sector. But this trend, its different institutional arrangements and the challenges presented by regional diversity in the two countries have yet to be fully recognized by researchers and policy professionals. Until recently, the political and public administration systems in the US were generally considered separately from those of Central and South American countries and often as a federalist template against which others could be measured. Today, countries in the hemisphere, despite their cultural differences, are recognizing common legacies and challenges in public policy and administration. The multilateral institutions in the region, such as the InterAmerican Development Bank and the Organization of American States, as well as regional programs of the World Bank, are reinforcing perceptions concerning common interests in the Americas. Today, the export of the US model for implementation abroad, as pursued in the past, is neither acceptable nor adequate. Rather, the contrasting, comparing, and sharing of public policy approaches and evaluation should be the common agenda (Wilson, Ward, Spink & Rodriguez [in press]).

The BCSP activities address multiple dimensions of the policymaking context as well as a range of specific policy issues. Special attention is devoted to issues of subnational policymaking. The desire for more effective and democratic governance systems has been manifested through the recent reform and decentralization of governmental structures in

many countries around the world. Indeed, decentralization has been actively promoted by international agencies and national governments alike (Campbell, 2003) and has enhanced the importance of subnational jurisdictions as venues for the formulation and implementation of public policy. Although the specific set of factors generating these changes varies in individual countries, sufficient time has now passed to allow for a detailed examination of them and their impacts on governance in the two countries.

The consideration of the subnational level of government is especially important in Brazil, where scholars have until recently been almost exclusively concerned with policy formulation at the national level, neglecting governance and policy formation by the other governmental units. While there is no doubt that this in part reflected the very centralized structure of policymaking in this country and some major questions around health and education, it is a marked contrast to policy research in Europe and the US, where the subnational government has always been an important feature. Fortunately this picture is now changing and a number of highly innovative practices in public policies and public administration are emerging, stimulated both by decentralization, by civil society action and the increasing openness of local government to citizen involvement. In both Brazil and the US, democracy is far from being a finished product and the study of policy processes provides a very useful vantage point from which to follow the changes in course and through which to provide educational opportunities for future young professionals and applied researchers.

The BCSP's concern with comparative public policy is shared by other scholars. Within Latin America, this growing interest is in part due to the widespread and previously mentioned decentralization of governmental structures, a policy promoted under the influence of multilateral institutions, including the United Nations, InterAmerican Development Bank and World Bank, as well as the impact of internal political processes and the increasing consolidation of democracy as the regional option for government. Unfortunately, as yet there has been relatively little formal study of the effectiveness and consequences of these processes<sup>6</sup>. In Brazil, a significant number of studies on subnational policies and innovations

---

6 Policy and Politics in Six Nations, A Comparative Perspective on Policy Making, Stella Z. Theodoulou, Prentice Hall, 2002; The World Bank's Annual Development Reports, 1997; The State in a Changing World; Fiscal Federalism in Latin America, Eduardo Wiesner, BID/John Hopkins University Press, 2003; Decentralization and Democracy in Latin America, Alfred P. Montero and David J. Samuels, eds, University of Notre Dame Press, 2004; Federalism and Democracy in Latin America, Edward L. Gibson, ed., The John Hopkins University Press, 2004; Politics Beyond the Capital: The Design of Subnational Institutions in South America, Kent Eaton, Stanford University Press, 2004; The Quiet Revolution: Decentralization and the Rise of Political Participation in Latin American Cities, Tim Campbell, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003; and Leadership and Innovation in Subnational Government: Case Studies from Latin America, Tim Campbell and Harald Fuhr, eds., Washington, DC: The World Bank, 2004.



in public administration exist, but most of this literature has until recently been fragmented in sectoral analyses and the lack of a more comprehensive analysis has not been helped by the fact that most of it is in Portuguese, thus creating a barrier to comparative work. Again, this is an area where the BCSP is able to make a contribution through bridging the gap in a supportive manner.

Perhaps the most important contribution that the BCSP has brought has been to show that the two countries are facing a range of similar issues. It is no longer the case that the US is a singular model or exemplar for federalism and that even as a mature democracy it should not necessarily be seen as a benchmark for public policy. Both have much to learn from the other and scholars have much to contribute to this process. Comparative studies can help diffuse research methods as well as disseminate assessments of policy practices of particular interest to policy communities. In addition, comparative public policy can help inform our understanding of policy issues in a particular context. The contrast of race relations and race policy in the two countries helps clarify the importance of particular historical legacies and culture on public policy agenda setting and on policy choice. In addition, the pace of change in governmental structures is higher in Brazil than in the US at present. For areas of policy common challenges, the lack of long-consolidated policy systems creates greater opportunities for policy innovation in Brazil than in the US, as in the example of citizen participation in local budgeting, discussed above.

### **III. TEACHING**

Student mobility and curriculum development are two of the principal elements of the FIPSE-CAPES program. CAPES held a commitment to undergraduate student mobility whereas FIPSE deferred to the US universities to define their own priorities. For the BCSP, the primary concern with public policy extended to the broader field of social science. This permitted the incorporation of undergraduate students from the core social science disciplines with interests in policy, along with graduate students engaged in professional education. Although the BCSP teaching effort would have been designed differently if focused entirely on professional programs, the incorporation of social sciences allowed for greater numbers of students and faculty members to become engaged, which is believed to be significant for the long-term sustainability of the BCSP in member universities.

### *Curriculum development*

The FIPSE-CAPES program considers student mobility, that is students attending courses on a for-credit basis, as a critical objective. The BCSP has fully endorsed this objective, but chose also to focus on curriculum development as a means to achieve exemplary student learning. An innovative course, *Public Policy of Brazil and the United States: A Comparative Perspective*, was developed at UT-Austin.

The UT-Austin course had three principal sections. First, policymaking context is examined, including the federalist system, organization and roles of the three branches, and recent decentralization. The second section of the course addresses the historical development of the governmental systems by contrasting colonial legacies and the reform and modernization of the national governments in the 1930s. The final section of the course addresses specific policies, including race, elementary and higher education, social security, and health. Each country received equal treatment on each topic.

The course has been offered four times at UT, cross-listed in the LBJ School of Public Affairs and the Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies, with enrollment of some 85 students including seventeen Brazilian BCSP students. Three professors at FGV have made presentations to the course by teleconference and a UNICAMP professor made a presentation at UT on health policy in each of the three courses. Six UT-Austin professors have been involved in teaching and making presentations to the class. Two professors from LBJ School made presentations by teleconference to a FGV class concerned with decentralization. Five of the UT students participating in exchanges in Brazil enrolled in the course before traveling to Brazil.

The UT course has been highly successful, creating a remarkable learning environment for students, as attested by the very high course evaluations (4.6-4.7 on a scale of 5.0). The course served the dual purpose of preparing UT students for the exchange in Brazil and of incorporating the Brazilian students into the academic life at UT.

At UNICAMP, two courses have been offered with the same approach used at UT. The first, "State, Government and Public Policy in Contemporary Brazil and the US," offered in 2004, was designed for undergraduate students in economics. The course largely adopted the same themes and bibliography as the UT course, but with important differences. First, the nature and importance of the scope and limits of state intervention in the two countries were

examined and similarities and differences articulated. Second a periodization of history in the two countries was adopted in order to identify comparable points of change, such as such as the 1930 revolution in Brazil and the New Deal, and moments of the interaction of the two countries, such as the US influence in the 1964 revolution. The course was undertaken in an experimental mode involving only students that had participated, or that would participate, in the BCSP in the US. The course was a substantial success and it will begin to be offered on a regular basis in 2006 as an elective course in the undergraduate economics program of UNICAMP, but open to students in political science, sociology, education and public health.

The second course, "The Welfare State in Comparative Perspective: Theory and History," has been a required course in the Masters in Economic Development at UNICAMP for many years. In 2004, one of the modules comparing social protection systems incorporated the examination of the US and Brazilian cases. The motivation of this innovative curriculum change was, in part, the result of a term project by a group of students examining social policies in the two countries. The paper addressed health policy with a focus on the role of the private sector in the provision of services and the regulatory framework applied to the system. This experiment in curriculum development was deemed successful and will become a permanent element of the course in 2006.

At FGV the adoption of the comparative perspective – including as a special case the US – did not occur through the introduction of new courses in the curriculum, but through the incorporation of this perspective in four existing courses. The first one, "Formulation and Evaluation of Public Policies," will have been offered four times at FGV between the creation of the BCSP and the end of 2005. In this course, the comparison between Brazil and the US is present in two ways. First, through the discussion of the constitution and the evolution of the field of public policies in both countries, trying to establish a relationship between this development and the political and social context of each country. The comparative perspective is also present through seminars given by the students about specific fields of public policy based on the experiences of the two countries. In this, US students work with their Brazilian colleagues providing insights on their own and each others policy settings.

The second course, "Decentralization and Social Policies," is also a traditional one and includes the analysis of the recent trend of decentralization in different countries, with an emphasis in the Brazilian case. Through the BCSP, this has also been extended to a comparative perspective, both in terms of the theoretical interpretation of the decentralization process and through the discussion of cases from different countries, especially from the US.

Again, the presence in the classroom of US students has proved to be a great stimulus to the debate. This course will have been offered four times by December 2005.

The third course, "Organizational Analysis and Comparative Public Administration," has drawn heavily on the work of the consortium members and the various joint projects underway. As part of the core curriculum for masters and doctoral students, it is regularly attended both by incoming and outgoing BCSP students. The course shows how organizational and interorganizational processes are key to understanding agenda setting and public policy formulation and to compare this within different institutional and cultural settings. Much of the material produced during the BCSP is used in this course, as are the hands-on experiences of students from different countries. Graduate students from this and other courses, including those from the BCSP, were also able to participate in the field research activities in subnational government innovation of the Public Management and Citizenship Program. This program, developed by FGV, with the support of Ford Foundation and BNDES, is designed to identify, give awards for, and disseminate innovative programs developed by subnational governments in Brazil.

The fourth course that has drawn on the BCSP experience has been the senior year undergraduate seminar on local government and municipal administration. In this course, each group of students selects a small municipality in the state of São Paulo (less than 30,000 inhabitants) and "shadows" its municipal government. Using national and state official databases, information from the State Accounting Tribunal, and information from the municipality itself, students identify the key challenges that the municipality is facing in social and economic terms, examine the resources that are available to resolve these questions, discuss possible trajectories of development, and build up a public agenda of actions. Building on this, the course also examines how these same questions are dealt with in other parts of the world where municipal arrangements are different and here the BCSP work has been very useful. Additionally, the experience with this course has been an important testing ground in developing ideas for the comparative policy field stations and, in its current version, several of the groups are "shadowing" municipalities that will fall within the projected scope of the Campinas area station.

*Student mobility and outcomes*

As of August 2005, 63 students have participated in the BCSP program (Table 1). On the US side, student interest in the program started slowly, but grew substantially. The Brazil-US comparative public policy course was helpful in diffusing information about the BCSP at UT. Almost all students reported initial difficulty with Portuguese in the classroom, but after about one month, adequately adapted. On the Brazil side, extensive student interest existed from the original announcement of the program. Unfortunately, the level of interest of Brazilian students declined precipitously following the end of CAPES funding for the Brazilian partners in the BCSP. We have concluded that the Brazilian students are much less able to self-fund the exchange than are the US students.

The effects on students of participation in the BCSP were very significant and wide ranging. Everyone developed better language skills, as one would expect of students having to attend classes conducted in a language not one's mother tongue. Among the undergraduates, a form of intellectual maturing can be observed. While some students may have been interested in the exotic dimension of study abroad, most reported becoming much more serious about their academic and intellectual development as a result of the exchange and more self-sufficient in terms of personal development. Several reported clarifying their interest in graduate study as a result of the experience. Among the graduate students, many used the exchange to develop topics for theses or dissertations. The US students conducting research on a Brazilian topic found their participation in Brazilian academic life was extraordinarily productive.

In the BCSP exchange, students receive a fellowship for one semester of study. Twelve students (four from Brazilian universities and eight from UT) stayed for a second semester. Three of the Brazilian students obtained internships for an additional semester at UT-Austin, without FIPSE-CAPES funds, in the Brazilian Demography program of the Population Research Center (PRC) and extending their stay at UT-Austin by a semester. A fourth Brazilian Ph.D. student extended his stay at UT-Austin by successfully competing for a fellowship in the prestigious Vilmar Faria Program in Quantitative Methods, also run through the PRC with funding from CAPES.

One of the first UT-Austin students to participate in the exchange now works for the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). As the EPA representative negotiating with

counterparts in the Mexican government, he reported that the multicultural skills developed in São Paulo substantially enhanced his effectiveness in the negotiations. Four UT graduate students extended their stay at FGV and UNICAMP, without FIPSE funds, by one semester after determining that the experience abroad made critical contributions to their academic programs. One of them defined as the focus of his thesis the dissemination of innovation, having as empirical data Brazilian subnational programs identified by the Public Management and Citizenship Program. Another graduate student extended her stay with a Fulbright grant for her thesis field research on MERCOSUL. Another UT student will write her dissertation on socioeconomic segregation in Campinas, a topic developed while on the FIPSE fellowship at UNICAMP.

The student exchange in BCSP has created special opportunities upon the return to home universities. At 2004 Latin American Studies Association Conference one panel devoted to the diffusion of public policies in Brazil incorporated as panelists two former BCSP students at FGV from UT and two masters students from FGV, one of which is currently in a Ph. D. program at UT, and a number of proposals have been made for the 2006 conference. The relationships established through the BCSP activities have continued in a variety of forms, especially in graduate and faculty research, furthering consolidating the institutional linkages among member universities.

#### **IV. RESEARCH**

Under the FISPE-CAPES Complementary Activities Program, a two-year grant to extend the efforts for the initial four-year grant, the BCSP is creating public policy field stations in São Paulo and Texas. The concept was derived from the earlier study of participatory budgeting described above. The field stations, based on a network concept, are expected to provide a flexible framework for incorporating relevant organizations as appropriate for particular projects while avoiding the administrative overhead as well as hierarchical structure that these universities cannot sustain. It should be noted, however, that the success of such networks depends to a considerable extent on project leaders to mobilize professional and institutional resources for projects of mutual interest. In addition, both sites have experience in collaboration between local and state government officials and universities. The BCSP field station initiative will integrate the teaching and research missions of the BCSP members

in a highly original way. Exchange students will have the opportunity to complete service learning internships in projects that the São Paulo field station will be conducting with local governments and policy communities and the Brazilian students will have similar opportunities in Texas.

### *Organizational Architecture of Policy Field Stations*

The field stations are networks of programs and organizations within the host universities, local governments and broader policy communities. The US field station will focus on central Texas and the wider Austin conurbation and the Brazil station will focus on central São Paulo State and the wider Campinas conurbation. Both have similarities and dissimilarities in sufficient number and shape to promote a healthy dialogue. In developing the ideas behind the stations, BCSP members have drawn on the rich tradition of territorially based research activities in which outreach to local communities is made an integrative part of the research design, both in providing information and in debating results and directions. In the US, the University of California, and specifically UC Davis, has been particularly active in a number of areas (Summer 1990<sup>7</sup>).

At UT-Austin, the field station will be centered at the LBJ School and the Brazil Center of LLILAS will provide administrative support. Affiliated programs will include the Policy Research Institute and Center for Health and Social Policy (CHASP-LBJ School), the Center for Sustainable Development (School of Architecture), and the Population Research Center (College of Liberal Arts). These units undertake activities concerned with Brazil or policy issues to be examined in comparative projects. The Texas field station will also establish relations with relevant government agencies and related NGOs, such as Envision Central Texas, the Austin Sustainability Indicators Project and the Center for Public Policy Priorities.

In São Paulo, primary leadership for the field station will be held by UNICAMP in the Center for the Study of Public Policy (NEPP) with the Population Studies Center (NEPO) and the Center for the Study of Metropolitan Governance (NESUR) participating in the network. The Gestão Pública Program at the Getulio Vargas Foundation in São Paulo will also participate in the field station, where its focus will be on the overall question of metropolitan governance as such and the specific issues surrounding the smaller or micro municipalities within the

---

7 Robert Sommer. 1990. "Local Research". *Journal of Social Issues*, 46, 1, 203-214.

region. Initial studies of metropolitan governance and of small-scale municipal administration have already begun with the involvement of undergraduate and postgraduate students, as well as members of the Public Management and Citizenship research team. In addition, relationships will be established with local governments and NGOs at both sites.

Three areas of research will be given priority in the initial phase of the field research stations: metropolitan governance, dissemination of public policies and innovations at the subnational level of government, and health policy. These fields were chosen as a result of research priorities of faculty members in BCSP, of the salience of the issues in the two countries and the expectation that comparative studies will be particularly productive.

#### (a) Metropolitan Governance

Brazil and the US have federalist governmental structures. Such structures are particularly appropriate in countries possessing great socioeconomic and cultural diversity across regions. A federalist structure, however, often leads to complex policymaking systems, with roles shared by the central and subnational governments. This complexity is accentuated in metropolitan areas due to their relatively large size and importance within individual countries and their tendency to grow beyond the original administrative boundaries of individual municipal jurisdictions. Furthermore, their importance as national economic centers is often an overarching one, albeit declining as foci of industrial production and consumption, and becoming more the hubs of domestic (and sometimes international) service provision. Decentralized governance structures and the relative autonomy of municipalities can impede effective coordination of public policy across jurisdictions within the metropolis.

The Austin metropolitan area and the Campinas metropolitan area have a number of similarities: roughly equal size, rapid population growth in recent decades, home to large state universities, and growing centers of high technology. Neither, however, have effective metropolitan governance systems. Three comparative studies will be undertaken:

1. Socioeconomic profile and service indicators (health, education, transportation, infrastructure, housing, income transfer, environmental) and governmental structure in the two regions.



2. Patterns of socioeconomic segregation in the Austin and Campinas metropolitan areas and implications for urban policy.
3. Challenges of “tiny towns” in metropolitan areas. How do the small and originally independent urban groupings deal with their larger metropolitan insertion.

#### (b) Dissemination of Policies and Innovations at the Subnational Level

Decentralization and innovation in public policies at the subnational level of government is a feature of both Brazil and the US, where the original work on local government innovations began with Ford Foundation support in the 1980s, based at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard. UT students at FGV, along with their Brazilian colleagues, have studied Brazilian innovation under the guidance of FGV researchers in the past. The diffusion of federal public policies has also been studied by researchers of both countries, with the participation of professors from Austin. In this part of the research we will build a bridge between these areas by using data available within the field stations. Some of the main questions that will be asked are: a) what are the factors that explain the process of diffusion or dissemination of an innovation in public policy? b) of what importance is local context in the success of an innovation? and, c) what are the limits of the idea of a model?

#### (c) Health Policy

US and Brazil have complex health systems of financing and providing medical care which leave substantial populations without significant coverage and which have developed patchwork safety net systems and mixed public and private delivery systems. Even so, it is possible to identify arrangements in each country for care for the poor, the elderly and workers and their families. Each of these has evolved as the delivery systems in each country have evolved. Private health insurance has played a major role in the US and increasingly in Brazil and in both countries has only been viable through continuing subsidies, direct and indirect.

This area of work will discuss these developments and seek to identify commonalities and differences in these two systems, using the two conurbations as a basis to look for emerging issues and initiatives which might signal where improvements can be made. In each country there is

concern that not only are the poorest finding limited access to care but also that many are falling through the cracks of the system. The current patchwork of service provisions is summarized below.

*Arrangements in Brazil and the United States for Health Coverage and Finance*

	Brazil	United States
Care for the Poor	Through the SUS there is a guarantee of basic care and clinic care for all, although clinic care is primarily consumed by low-income persons and specialized hospital care more broadly utilized.	Poor persons who are children, disabled or elderly and have legally immigrated more than 5 years ago have access to care through the Medicaid system. Many poor adults are not covered in many states.
Care for the Elderly	Attempts have been made to permit those with private coverage to keep it after age 65. Issues of cost of the premiums may emerge.	Medicare covers virtually the entire population over age 65 for hospital care and most pay a subsidized premium for coverage of physician and outpatient care. Coverage of pharmaceuticals and long-term care is still an issue and the huge expense of care for the elderly a growing concern
Care for Workers	Various private health insurance schemes developed for workers in the private and the public sectors.	Private health insurance amounts to \$549.6 billion out of total expenditures of \$1,553 billion. Many workers may have coverage but they cannot afford to pay the premium to include their dependents.
Uninsured Percentage and Services Available to the Uninsured	About 25 % not covered for intermediate care. SUS provides access to clinics if available	About 15% for the entire year ,but about one-third of those younger than 65 are uninsured at some point in a two- year period. There are public hospitals, community clinics and other services—many however are fairly aggressive in attempting to collect for services.

Source: Silva, P.L.B, Biasoto, G., Costa, N. & Warner, D., "A Comparative Overview of the Brazilian, Mexican, and US Health Systems" (mimeo).

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The BCSP has met its initial objectives with very satisfactory results. The adoption of a comparative policy framework in the design of its activities has proven to be productive. Its teaching activities are preparing superior policy professionals with a deep appreciation of political systems and policy objectives of a hemispheric neighbor for professional careers. Furthermore, the experience of this innovative approach to student learning and cross country collaboration will have broad interest to other universities engaged in public policy training in the two countries. The research efforts of the BCSP are now underway and the

initial results are also encouraging. In the process, the members of the consortium have also reached a number of conclusions about factors which have helped the work. These include:

- learning to build bridges between different traditions
- setting the exchanges within a mutually interesting and interdisciplinary research framework that is sufficiently elastic to accommodate differences, but consistent enough to provide focus
- the importance of building on links that have already been established
- adopting an incremental approach to program design and allowing for ideas to emerge as relationships strengthen
- taking care to set up joint publications that recognize key breakthroughs and give a sense of external identity to the work
- the influence on teaching and curriculum development can be explicit or implicit; it is important to give value to both
- comparative, interdisciplinary research has to allow for the unexpected. It needs to be field grounded and responsive, ready to say "why not look at this?"
- Building bridges, moving students, developing curriculum and creating new research opportunities has to be carried out in a caring, understanding and creative environment. On the bottom line, if the BCSP worked it was because those involved found it fun!