Public Service for the Future

The Jasper Statecraft Studio

STRONG IN BODY. FREE IN MIND.

A university for the world. Rooted in Jasper.

Our vision, brought into public service

University of Jasper envisions people of physical strength, depth of knowledge, independent minds and integrity: a lifelong community that defends freedom, pursues truth, creates with courage and accepts public responsibility. Its purpose reaches beyond personal achievement to human flourishing through growth, example and contribution to others.

Our mission brings physical practice, humanistic learning across civilizations and fundamental inquiry together. This five-day studio carries that spirit into public service through nature, close reading, dialogue, evidence and shared work - developing courage, independent judgment, initiative, self-discipline and a commitment to justice.

1. Experience Jasper. Recover attention.

Among mountains, forests and open sky, rediscover the beauty of the world you serve. Through attentive movement and observation, restore the space to listen, question and think.

2. Clear the inner dust. Renew your purpose.

Step back from fatigue and habitual thinking. Let nature, humanistic inquiry and honest reflection bring you back to what matters: truth, integrity, freedom of mind and care for others.

3. Renew responsibility. Put potential into action.

Remember why you serve. Find the courage to initiate, the imagination to create and the resolve to follow through. Turn greater capability into deeper responsibility - for Canada, for the people you serve and for generations to come.

Let knowledge enter life. Let courage be guided by reason. Let excellence become visible in what we contribute to others.

FIVE DAYS / TWO SEPARATE WEEKENDS / ENGLISH

Friday-Sunday, then Saturday-Sunday. Offline residential study at the planned camping campus.

Proposed non-degree course; enrolment is not open. Dates, campus arrangements, instructors and fees remain to be confirmed.

01 / What this education develops

Six capacities expressed through consequential work

Capacity	A meaningful change	Evidence of development
Public purpose	From completing a task to understanding whose life it affects.	Name a worthwhile outcome, an excluded perspective and a responsibility you accept.
Independent judgment	From accepting the first answer to weighing evidence and competing duties.	Explain and revise a decision when challenged.
Imagination and foresight	From treating present arrangements as inevitable to creating credible alternatives.	Develop three distinct designs and test them against different futures.
Courage and initiative	From waiting for a complete instruction to beginning justified action.	Raise a difficult issue and propose an authorized, useful next step.
Determination and craft	From defending an idea to learning how to make it work.	Build, test, repair and finish a usable iteration.
Generous leadership	From personal achievement to enabling collective capability.	Help a colleague improve, share ownership and leave a workable handover.

These are habits to practise, not personality types to select. Quiet leadership, careful dissent and a well-reasoned decision to stop can demonstrate as much agency as a bold proposal.

The course judges observable work. It does not grade political agreement, personal disclosure, charisma or loyalty to an institution. High expectations are matched by clear authority, support, time and a fair opportunity to improve.

02 / The Jasper formation practice

Attention, inquiry, action, reflection and contribution

Jasper brings humanistic inquiry, independent judgment, courage, justice and disciplined capability into professional education. In this studio, intellectual and personal development happen through the work of serving others. [J1]

A recurring practice, within the scheduled hours

- Attend: examine a service journey carefully. Notice a burden that a dashboard may conceal. Use the supplied fictional journey or public information; no interviews or personal records are required.
- Inquire: compare interpretations and ask what could make your preferred explanation wrong.
- Initiate: choose one useful next action and identify the permission and support it requires.
- Reflect: record what changed in your judgment, not merely what you completed.
- Contribute: improve a peer's work and leave them more capable of continuing it.

Three moments of personal development

Day 1: choose a professional habit to strengthen, such as speaking up with evidence, following through or listening before designing. Day 3: bring a concrete example of progress and a persistent obstacle to feedback. Day 5: compare entry and exit work and identify your next practice. Private reflections remain private; submit only the professional evidence you choose to use.

Attention has a physical dimension

Before difficult exercises, practise a brief pause, deliberate observation and composure. A seated, paper-based or other accessible equivalent is always available. Physical endurance and emotional disclosure are not assessed. This short studio contributes to Jasper's larger educational vision without claiming to replace its broader physical or disciplinary education.

Agency and motivation research inform the emphasis on choice, developing competence and reliable relationships. These are design principles to test in teaching, not guarantees of personal transformation. [N7][N8]

03 / Values with the courage to act

Four foundations; demanding judgment

Foundation	A decision that makes it visible
Impartiality	Treat comparable cases on relevant grounds; resist favouritism and examine whose interests have been overlooked.
Objectivity	Compare explanations and alternatives; distinguish evidence from preference; change your conclusion when warranted.
Honesty	Tell people what is known, uncertain and wrong. Correct an attractive claim when the evidence does not support it.
Integrity	Use entrusted authority for its public purpose; disclose conflicts; keep commitments and repair failures.

These four values anchor the UK Civil Service Code. Canadian federal public-sector values include respect for democracy, respect for people, integrity, stewardship and excellence. We study both while identifying the obligations that actually govern a particular role. [N1][P1]

Our standard for legitimate service

Effectiveness matters deeply. It does not, by itself, make public power legitimate. Worthwhile results must be pursued through lawful authority, fair treatment, respect for rights, democratic accountability and meaningful opportunities to question and correct decisions.

A difficult moment

Your sponsor wants to announce a 30 percent improvement before the test is complete. Your team has made real progress, but an accessible service channel performs worse. Prepare a truthful account that protects the public, preserves useful progress and gives the sponsor a credible next decision.

The task is to combine candour with action. Simply refusing, complying or quoting a code is insufficient. Show a route forward.

04 / Five challenges, one mission

A connected view of future public service

Challenge	The proactive question	The studio response
AI capability	What becomes possible, and what must remain a human responsibility?	Design a human-AI operating model and test its permission boundaries.
Cascading threats	Which external change could break our service?	Map dependencies, alternative futures and continuity decisions.
Public trust	How does the institution become worthy of confidence?	Give reasons, enable challenge and demonstrate repair.
Productivity	How can we improve valid outcomes while reducing public and staff burden?	Compare whole workflows, costs, quality and access.
Distributed authority	Where should decisions, knowledge and resources meet?	Negotiate a decision-rights and capacity agreement.

Romeo's lecture prompts these questions; Jasper develops its own answer. Britain's political programme is not a Canadian constitutional template. Neither current Canadian practice nor any foreign model is the final horizon of our imagination. [P11]

Institutional craft

An institution becomes capable through its purposes, incentives, decision rights, people, information and routines. Your proposal must change at least one of these arrangements, then show how that change improves the service. A faster form or impressive AI demonstration alone does not meet the standard.

The course asks you to imagine a better institution while doing the patient work needed to make one part of it credible.

05 / Diagnose incentives

Change the conditions that make unhelpful behaviour rational

A team praised for closing files may close them too early. A supplier paid by message volume may benefit from repeat contacts. A manager held responsible for every visible failure may discourage experiments. Diagnose these arrangements before attributing every problem to attitude.

Holmstrom and Milgrom's multitask analysis examines how incentives interact across tasks, including job design and activities that are difficult to measure. The lesson here is to examine what a reward draws effort away from, as well as what it encourages. [V5-1]

The incentive diagnosis

- Identify the actors, objectives, discretion and information each holds.
- Map formal and informal rewards: promotion, pay, workload, reputation, budget retention, procurement terms and exposure to blame.
- Identify a predictable unintended response and the people who bear its cost.
- Change one rule, responsibility or information flow. Explain who can authorize it.
- Ask how the new arrangement could be gamed, and propose an observable warning sign.

A classroom decision experiment

A fictional unit has ten cases: six simple and four complex. It can close all ten with two serious errors, or correctly complete eight and retain two complex cases with named next steps. Under a raw closure target, the first option scores ten and the second eight. Design a better review that notices correct outcomes, errors, case difficulty and unresolved need. Do not turn honest case recording into a reward for hiding difficult work.

Run the exercise again after changing the rule. Explain which behaviour became more attractive, what new distortion emerged and whether the manager supplied enough capacity. This is an introduction to incentive design, not a full mathematical course in mechanism design.

06 / Think beyond today

Foresight that changes a present decision

Use 2035 as an imaginative horizon. Test the mission against four constructed worlds: rapid AI progress with strong public trust; rapid progress with fragile trust; uneven progress with strong trust; and uneven progress with fragmented trust. They are scenarios, not forecasts. [N3][N6]

The foresight worksheet

- Describe the public outcome that should endure across the four worlds.
- Identify the assumption on which your preferred design most depends.
- Trace a cascade: external shock, operational disruption, public consequence, recovery dependency.
- Choose one action useful in several worlds and one alternative worth preparing.
- Define a signal, a threshold, a decision owner and a review point. Explain why that threshold is appropriate in the case.

Make imagination change the budget

If your plan assumes continuous access to one supplier, reserve time for a migration rehearsal. If a local channel becomes essential during outages, allocate staff and training to it now. If public trust is fragile, build a challenge route before a crisis rather than treating communication as the final step.

Compare a centralized service, a locally delivered model and a shared infrastructure with local discretion. Describe a strength and a failure mode of each. The best arrangement depends on the mission, capacity and authority; decentralization is a question to investigate, not a universal answer. [B5]

Your contribution

Bring one possibility that the team initially overlooked. Make it specific enough to alter a design choice. Imagination earns credit when it opens a worthwhile option and survives serious examination.

07 / One mission, shared evidence

Make depth possible within five days

One shared case; room for your experience

All teams use the supplied Cascadia 2035 case so that five days can focus on judgment and practice. Participants may connect the lessons to a public-service bottleneck they know, but do not undertake a separate workplace investigation, collect personal records or require employer access. The later transfer plan identifies an authorized next step; its implementation is outside this course.

The case is fictional. Its assistance rules and authority boundaries are teaching assumptions, not Canadian legal guidance. Printed case cards, source extracts, action traces and decision logs provide everything needed for the assessed exercises.

08 / Cascadia: the founding brief

Original fictional case for this studio

Three municipalities and a regional Recovery Office are struggling to coordinate temporary repair assistance after a wildfire. The proposed public outcome is a dependable route to a correct, explainable decision, with a usable review process and a separate municipal safety-permit pathway.

Starting condition	What your team must resolve
Fragmented intake	Web, telephone and counter requests lead to repeated evidence and disconnected status updates.
Conflicting incentives	The office counts files closed; municipalities protect scarce inspection time; the supplier sells automation volume.
AI proposal	A supplier offers document extraction, case preparation and automatic queue updates. Define which functions should exist and their permissions.
Unequal capacity	One municipality has fewer staff and unreliable connectivity. A shared standard needs a credible allocation of support.
Rights and relationships	The fictional service must explain decisions and allow reconsideration. Separate governance and data relationships require specific agreements.

The mandate for your team

Develop two competing service designs, run the common test cases, redesign one institutional arrangement and propose a 30/90/365-day implementation path. The sponsor must be able to understand the benefit, the trade-off, the resources and the next decision.

Your team can recommend a simpler non-AI design, bounded AI assistance, a changed arrangement between organizations, or a combination. The value of your work is determined by judgment and evidence, not the sophistication of its technology.

The dossier supplies the fictional charter, twelve cases, expected boundaries, workload assumptions and crisis script. Its rules are teaching material, not Canadian legislation.

09 / Build the human-AI service

Govern the action, not just the answer

Draw the entire journey: intake, evidence check, preparation, accountable human decision, explanation, review and correction. Mark the information, actor and permission at each transition. Canadian federal guidance distinguishes content generation from systems that can take actions and emphasizes accountable oversight. [P4][P6]

Your architecture must answer

- What may the system read, propose, write or send? Which permissions are denied?
- Which event requires a human decision before anything changes? Who has the time and evidence to make that decision?
- What record allows a reviewer to reconstruct the action and its authorization?
- What happens when the system repeats itself, misunderstands an instruction or receives hostile content?
- How can the service pause, recover or switch supplier while people still obtain help?

The studio boundary

Learners test a paper or isolated digital workflow with fictional records. The case allows automated draft preparation and simulated low-risk queue updates with logs; assistance awards, adverse decisions and permit authorizations belong to human roles. Disputed evidence is referred for review, not converted into an automatic accusation.

A real governance distinction

A human final decision does not automatically remove decision-support systems from the scope of the federal Directive on Automated Decision-Making. Applicability depends on its actual conditions. The classroom exercise is not a formal impact assessment. [P5]

The Cyber Centre recommends limiting agentic use to low-risk, non-sensitive tasks. The studio explores consequential governance through simulation; it does not recommend live autonomous adjudication. [P7]

10 / Test the system against resistance

Red-team the workflow and its incentives

Run twelve common case cards against a redesigned non-AI workflow and an AI-assisted workflow. The AI-assisted version is simulated with supplied printed action traces; no internet, live model or coding is used. Preserve results for both, including failures.

Six challenge families

- Untrusted instruction: a document asks the assistant to bypass approval or disclose a file.
- Authority drift: a draft recommendation becomes an award or denial without the required human action.
- Evidence failure: outdated rules, contradictory documents or an ambiguous duplicate lead to an unjustified conclusion.
- Demand surge: a surge of valid submissions mixed with repeated AI-assisted submissions overwhelms the queue.
- Operational failure: the supplier is unavailable, an owner leaves or review staff cannot keep up.
- Access and repair: a telephone user, language request or contested decision disappears from the apparent success rate.

Measure what the test can establish

For each run, record the expected route, actual actions, human interventions, unresolved defects and repair. Select one design for revision and retest all twelve cards. The result is 36 case runs per team, not a deployment approval or a reliable estimate of rare failure rates.

Learn to choose restraint intelligently

A strong team may reject an agentic component because a simpler rule performs better. It must still explain the action boundaries, detect a failed trace and propose useful innovation elsewhere. Technical ambition is the ability to choose and govern an appropriate system.

11 / Make productivity meaningful

Better outcomes, lower burden, sustained capability

Measure	What belongs in it
Valid outcomes	Correct, sufficiently explained completed cases. Pending cases remain visible; serious unresolved defects exclude a completion.
Whole staff effort	Preparation, review, exceptions, correction and coordination, not only model response time.
Public effort	Repeated contacts, evidence requests, time, uncertainty and ability to obtain human help.
Fair access	Differences across the supplied case types; retain difficult cases in the denominator.
Cost and resilience	Transition, operation, monitoring, supplier exit, training and continuity capacity.

A numerical challenge

Illustrative data: an existing service correctly completes 80 of 100 requests using 600 staff minutes, or 8 valid completions per hour. A redesigned service completes 92 using 500 minutes, or 11.04 per hour. That is a 38 percent increase in this ratio and a 16.7 percent fall in staff time. It is not automatically a cash saving. These figures are invented for reasoning, not course results.

Your classroom runs produce evidence about a prototype. Use observed errors and action traces; distinguish short exercise timings from real operational estimates. State what a later authorized trial would need to measure.

Put the released capacity to work

Specify whether capacity would reduce delay, improve difficult-case support, strengthen assurance or meet rising demand. Identify who makes that allocation. A benefit that nobody can realize is not yet a credible implementation plan.

Selected research on generative assistance shows that effects vary across workers and settings. It informs a testable question, not a transferable public-sector savings promise. [B8]

12 / Put authority where it can work

Resources, knowledge and accountability together

Design a decision-rights and capacity agreement. Name each decision, its authorized owner, the resources needed, the permitted local variation, the information shared and the route for challenge. Compare who benefits and who carries the burden.

The Cascadia negotiation

- The Recovery Office retains assistance decisions under the fictional charter.
- Municipal roles retain their separate permit decisions. An assistance award must never be presented as safety clearance.
- Local intake teams need sufficient staff, accessible channels and shared information standards.
- Any shared data arrangement needs a defined purpose, authorized participants, minimum information, correction and an exit route.

Canadian specificity

Federal, provincial, municipal and Indigenous governance are not interchangeable levels of a single hierarchy. A proposal must identify whose authority is engaged and what agreement or legal work remains necessary. A classroom negotiation cannot supply the consent of an absent rights holder.

OCAP® expresses specifically First Nations principles and allows community-specific interpretation; it is not a universal protocol for every Indigenous people. The case leaves any relevant data-sharing relationship unresolved until the appropriate parties and process are identified. [P9]

A meaningful institutional change

Examples include shared case-status infrastructure with separate decision owners, a funded local intake arrangement, or a quality review that rewards valid completion and learning rather than raw closure. Show the change operating in at least one test case.

OCAP® is a registered trademark of the First Nations Information Governance Centre (FNIGC). See source P9 in the dossier.

13 / Lead so others become capable

Visible responsibility and generous standards

A leader gives people a purpose they can understand, space in which to act, the resources to do the work and a fair response to unwelcome evidence. A team member prepares, contributes, follows through and raises obstacles early. The obligations are reciprocal.

Create a mission team charter

- State the outcome, sponsor decision and limits of delegated authority.
- Allocate delivery, evidence and public-experience responsibilities; rotate them so each learner leads.
- Reserve review and learning time. Specify the specialist support needed.
- Agree how to report mistakes, resolve disagreement and assess performance fairly.
- Name the receiving owner and the conditions for continuing, transferring or stopping the work.

Practise a difficult conversation

A colleague repeatedly misses checks. Establish what happened, clarify the standard, listen for a capacity or instruction problem, agree support and a review point, and record the next decision. Neither public humiliation nor ignoring the problem counts as leadership.

Develop talent through delivery

Use role-relevant demonstrations of capability, pairing, feedback and accessible routes to contribution. Proposals for recruitment, pay or procurement must name the lawful decision-maker and implementation conditions. Innovation does not grant a general exemption from fair process.

The studio combines research on team learning, public capability and problem-driven adaptation with a concrete expectation: leave another person better able to act. [B7][N4][N9]

14 / Lead through a compound disruption

A three-hour crisis studio, followed by a learning review

Cascadia receives a sequence of fictional shocks: a supplier outage, an AI-assisted demand surge, a false public claim about automatic denials, and pressure for a premature savings announcement. Your mission is to maintain service, explain decisions and revise the operating plan.

Responsibilities rotate

In each team of three, rotate the accountable lead, evidence-and-operations lead and public-service lead across three rounds. Every learner must make a consequential decision, challenge an assumption and support a colleague. The dossier provides timings, prompts and observation criteria.

Produce four things

- A continuity decision: what continues, what pauses and who owns the next review.
- A public explanation that separates verified information from uncertainty and gives a usable help route.
- A repair action for a person affected by an error, including who will follow through.
- An updated resource and authority plan, with one assumption that has changed.

Composure is a practice, not a performance style

Use structured turn-taking, short written decisions and a deliberate pause before acting. Assess evidence, inclusion, judgment and follow-through, not speed of speech or theatrical confidence. Equivalent access arrangements preserve the same decision challenge.

The debrief asks what the institution made easy or difficult, as well as what each person did. An error honestly identified and repaired is a learning opportunity; concealing it undermines the work.

15 / Two weekends, five days

Offline, residential and demanding

Weekend One runs Friday to Sunday. Weekend Two runs Saturday to Sunday. The programme is designed for residential study at the planned camping campus, without internet access for learning. The gap between blocks and exact dates remain to be confirmed.

Day	Central challenge	Evidence produced
1 / Friday	Find the public purpose. Diagnose incentives and compare futures.	Entry decision; shared system map; three alternatives; Assessment A.
2 / Saturday	Redesign a service and challenge its AI-assisted version on paper.	Two workflows; 36 case-run records; findings and Assessment B.
3 / Sunday	Place authority responsibly. Build a team that can act.	Decision-rights agreement; continuity sheet; peer critique and handover.
4 / Saturday	Lead through disruption and account for consequences.	Three-hour crisis exercise; one-hour debrief; repaired plan and Assessment C.
5 / Sunday	Defend the proposal. Make responsibility transferable.	Three-page blueprint; individual defence; transfer card and Assessment D.

A practical proposed daily rhythm

09:00-10:45 and 11:00-12:45; 13:45-15:30 and 15:45-17:30. These four blocks provide seven learning hours per day, 35 hours in total. Meals and breaks are additional. Reading, writing, testing and assessment all fit inside these blocks. Evenings are for meals, rest and optional conversation; there is no mandatory evening class.

Between weekends: retain the printed learning pack and let the first block settle. No required homework, online contact or extra study day. Weekend Two begins with an in-class re-entry briefing.

16 / Pressure with purpose

Concentrated responsibility, not a test of exhaustion

The pressure comes from the work

Time-limited decisions, competing duties, incomplete evidence, role rotation and pointed questioning require learners to act and explain themselves. Teams must produce a usable response, test it, admit defects and improve it. A confident presentation without evidence does not pass.

The camping campus is part of the method

Begin with deliberate observation and attentive listening. Use a short campus observation walk or equivalent seated exercise; bring observations back to the public-service case. Shared residential life supports attention, cooperation and follow-through. Outdoor activity is adapted to weather, mobility and individual needs; camping skill and physical endurance are not graded.

An offline AI laboratory

Learners examine prepared outputs and tool-action records, including misleading instructions and unauthorized actions. They compare a human procedure with a simulated assisted procedure and decide where human authority is indispensable. This assesses governance and judgment, not hands-on proficiency with a current model. All study materials are supplied in print or accessible offline formats.

The final proposal

Use no more than three pages: public purpose, one institutional change, evidence and limitations, responsible roles, resource assumptions and a proposed 30/90/365-day decision path. Reference earlier worksheets instead of rewriting them. Those milestones describe a possible later implementation; they do not extend the five-day course.

What demanding learning requires

Protect meals, sleep, breaks, dignity and access. Learners can ask for a pause or an accessible equivalent without being judged weak. Emergency communications and site supervision remain operational even though teaching is offline. The campus plan must specify them before delivery.

17 / Four assessments, one body of work

Clear standards with individual accountability

Assessment	Weight	Evidence and submission
A / Purpose and foresight	25%	Day 1. Two-page team map and options sheet; each learner adds a 150-word decision card.
B / Service and AI judgment	30%	Day 2. Two workflow sheets, 36-row team log, one-page findings and each learner's 150-word interpretation.
C / Authority and leadership	20%	Day 4. Two-page agreement/continuity sheet developed on Day 3 and revised after the crisis; observed leadership and a 150-word decision card.
D / Proposal and defence	25%	Day 5. Three-page team blueprint, individual eight-minute defence and 150-word transfer card.

Team artifacts supply common evidence; grades are individual. A and B each combine equal marks for the shared artifact and individual reasoning. C combines equal marks for the shared plan and individually observed/explained leadership. D combines equal marks for the shared blueprint and individual defence/transfer plan. The dossier defines scoring and review.

Completion standard

At least 70/100 overall and at least 2/4 on each final mastery gate: public integrity and authority; institutional redesign; evidence and AI judgment; independent judgment and enabling leadership. A high average cannot compensate for a missing gate.

An honest unsuccessful experiment can earn strong marks for diagnosis, evidence and intelligent revision. A claim of success without evidence cannot. The instructor provides a specific route to reassessment where required.

18 / What excellent work looks like

Ambition that can survive scrutiny

Mastery gate	Competent: 2/4	Excellent: 4/4
Integrity and authority	Distinguishes roles, permissions, fair treatment and challenge routes; corrects a material error.	Anticipates conflicts, preserves a useful route forward and makes responsibility clear under pressure.
Institutional redesign	Changes an incentive, decision right or operating arrangement; demonstrates it in a case.	Shows how people and institutions become more capable; tests alternative arrangements and gaming risks.
Evidence and AI judgment	Runs and explains comparisons; detects a serious action-boundary failure; recognizes limits.	Connects defects, burden, resources and uncertainty to an improved design and a credible next test.
Judgment and leadership	Explains a choice independently, adapts to contrary evidence and enables a colleague.	Reconciles competing duties, improves collective judgment and leaves a durable handover.

Scores 0, 1 and 3 mean absent or materially harmful evidence; incomplete evidence needing substantial repair; and strong evidence beyond the competent standard, respectively. Each judgment must cite the learner's work.

A graduate should be able to say

I can recognize a public need, investigate the system behind it, imagine alternatives, initiate a responsible response, work with others, test what happens and account for what I have done.

That capability is the educational ambition. The pilot must establish how far this course actually helps learners develop it.

19 / Read deeply; decide differently

A compact intellectual foundation

Selected work	The question it changes
Confucius; Weber [B4][B1]	How do example, public duty and responsibility for consequences shape a difficult decision?
Dewey; Lipsky [B3][B2]	How does experience become inquiry, and how do frontline constraints alter actual service?
Ostrom [B5]	Which combination of shared rules and local authority fits this problem?
Holmstrom and Milgrom [V5-1]	What will people rationally do under the proposed incentive arrangement?
Mazzucato; Kattel; Andrews, Pritchett and Woolcock [B6][N4][N9]	What capabilities turn an ambitious mission into useful action?
Bandura; Ryan and Deci; Edmondson [N7][N8][B7]	What helps people exercise agency, develop mastery and learn together?
OECD; Policy Horizons; Canadian AI guidance [N3][N5][N6][P4-P7]	How do anticipation, trust and accountable technology change the operating model?

Read selected passages closely and bring one disagreement into the work. Complete books are further reading, not a required reading burden outside the five days. The dossier records actual research scope and provides the five-day reading map.

Our invitation

Bring an ambition worth testing. Be prepared to change your mind, do careful work and help others become capable. Public service deserves imagination and courage, joined to honesty about consequences. That is the practice this studio asks you to begin.

Course status: five-day residential design for review and pilot planning, not yet validated in delivery. The accompanying dossier supplies the teaching schedule and operational conditions. Extended readings and reference chapters are resources, not additional mandatory assignments.