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| **SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL AND ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE** |
| Dr. Thomas McWeeney is a political scientist, strategic planner, management consultant, and professor of government and public administration. He currently serves as a member of the pubic administration faculty at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), where he teaches a full load of undergraduate and graduate courses, including “Business and Government”, “Strategic Planning for Government”, “Intergovernmental Administration”, and “Public Management Information Systems”. After receiving his Ph.D. in Government from Georgetown University (*with distinction*) in 1982, Dr. McWeeney designed, developed, and led innovative projects that have successfully transformed federal agencies and greatly expanded the reach of university programs.  Dr. McWeeney comes to CSUSB after a 30 year career in which he combined progressively high level experience in the management of federal agencies and a continual affiliation with academia. Between 1986 and 2014, Dr. McWeeney served as an adjunct professor of government and public administration at the University of Maryland, University College (UMUC), Central Michigan University (CMU), and George Mason University (GMU). In these positions, he received widespread acclaim for developing and effectively teaching over 30 courses in political science, international relations, and public administration and played an instrumental role in developing new initiatives and courses that added great value and benefit to these universities and contributed to significant enrollment increases in a very short periods of time.  Dr. McWeeney served in the US government for over 30 years -- first as a senior management official and then as consultant to senior federal executives. From 1974 to 1992, Dr. McWeeney worked in the US Department of Justice working with executive leadership to develop and implement many of the most well know programs of the era. He held a number of senior-level positions in the US Department of Justice, including Planning Director and Budget Officer and he played a critical role was involved in the development and transformation of many high-impact programs, serving as a key actor in the development of the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, the Seized Assets Program, the State and Local Task Force Program, and the South American drug trafficking imitative. He also led the first comprehensive strategy for the Drug Enforcement Administration and played a leadership role of the first joint DOJ/DOD interagency counter-drug strategy.  In 1992, Dr. McWeeney left the Federal government to establish the *Center for Strategic Management (CSM)* - a small business-consulting firm that has provided a wide array of consulting, training, and advisory services to federal executives that greatly contributed to the success of their agencies. Dr. McWeeney served as the principal consultant to key executives in several federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies. In these efforts, he worked on behalf of agency senior executives and led comprehensive projects that provided innovative thinking, new direction, and organizational transformation to high profile agencies facing challenges from a changing external environment and diminishing internal capacity.  In 2009, he established the *CSM-Public Leadership Institute (CSM-PLI),* a non-profit organization that emphasizes the critical role of leadership in improving government performance. In these positions, Dr. McWeeney has sought and received several hundred thousand dollars in Federal grants from the US Department of Justice and the US Department of Labor for leading innovative leadership projects.  Finally, in addition to carrying a full-time course load, Dr. McWeeney was named Associate Director of the Leonard Transportation Center (LTC) in January 2017. In this position, he was instrumental in encouraging the US Secretary of Transportation to visit the CSUSB Campus in October, 2017 – which in turn led to DOT designating CSUSB as on of 11”transportation innovation centers” in the United States. . Current efforts are focused on developing a transportation strategic plan for the Region. |
| **EDUCATION** |
| * Ph.D., *Georgetown University*, 1982. Specialization: Government; Major Area of Concentration: American Government; Dissertation: *The Unintended Consequences of Political Reform: A Case Study of the Freedom of Information Act. (Awarded Distinction)* * M.A., *Georgetown University*, 1977. Specialization: Government; Major Area of Concentration: American Government; Minor Area: Political Theory. * B.A., *San Diego State University*, 1973. Major: Political Science; Minor: Philosophy; Senior Thesis: *Charisma and the Kennedy Experience.* |
| **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE** |
| ***Collegiate***   * Lecturer, *California State University at San Bernardino*, [2015 – Present]   Department of Public Administration. Courses: Business and Government, Strategic Planning Government, Intergovernmental Relations, and Public Management Information Systems.   * Adjunct Professor, *California State University at San Bernardino*, [2013 – 2015].   Department of Public Administration. Course: Business and Government  Department of Political Science. Course: American Government.   * Adjunct Professor, *University of Maryland, University College*, International Management Program. [2013 – 2014]. Course: Strategic Management. [The Graduate School. Area of Concentration:. * Adjunct Professor, *University of Maryland, University College*, The Graduate School. Area of Concentration: Intelligence Management Studies Program. [2010 – 2014]. Courses: Intelligence Management, Leadership Seminar. * Associate Graduate Professor, *Central Michigan University*, Master of Science in Administration Program. [1986 - 2001]. Area of Concentration: Public Administration. Courses: American Public Policy Making, Intergovernmental Relations, Strategic Planning, Public Budgeting, Program Evaluation, Research Methods. * Adjunct Professor, *Anne Arundel Community College*, Political Science Department, [1985 – 1988]. Course: International Relations. |
| ***Consultant***   * Executive Director, *The Public Leadership Institute* (PLI), [2009 – 2016].   Dr. McWeeney established the Public Leadership Institute (PLI) in 2009 as a 501 (C) (3) not-for-profit organization by transferring the education-related functions of the Center for Strategic Management (CSM) to the new organization. In approving the establishment of PLI, the IRS specifically recognized PLI’s innovative educational purpose, its focus on leadership, its training, evaluation, and advisory mission, and its commitment to work on multi-jurisdictional and multi-agency projects.  As Executive Director, Dr. McWeeney led the development of the *performance ethics* concept, which lies at the intersection of traditional leadership, performance, and ethics training. PLI programs emphasize the ethical dimension of pubic performance, which is obtained from engaged and committed leadership and is distinguished from traditional management. PLI’s primary objective is to facilitate a change in the dialogue associated with contemporary leadership training while influencing the next generation of public sector leaders. PLI played a major role in institutionalizing leadership standards and assisting organizations in creating a culture that acknowledges and awards ethical leadership.  *Principal Accomplishments*:   * US Department of State (2014-2016): Dr. McWeeney prepared a report on improving the administration of justice in Palestine. After reviewing conditions on site, McWeeney recommended a “model city” approach to develop “Centers of Excellence” in the region, to include the development of a comprehensive information sharing system. Dr. McWeeney is currently serving as a senior advisor on the project, which is expected to continue for 5 years.      * Department of Labor Grants (2013-present): Dr. McWeeney and the Public Leadership Institute were awarded two successive grants in the amount of $250,000, to develop and implement a comprehensive program of education and training that will better identify, avoid, and prevent unsafe working conditions in and around the nation’s coal mines. The training and education initiative includes (a) continued face-to-face risk assessments, (b) training on performance management and risk management processes, (c) an institutionalized training program, (d) the development of a performance monitoring and tracking system, and (e) the design of a national governance model for the industry to provide authoritative long term oversight and guidance to the program. * Region IX Information Sharing Project (2010-12): Dr. McWeeney developed, designed, and managed an innovative leadership project involving nine Sheriffs and Police Chiefs from the major jurisdictions in the four Western States that comprise FEMA Region IX. Included was a unique *governance process* that provided authoritative decision-making for the project, strategic and tactical plans, performance measurement, and an evaluation of various competing technologies. He facilitated a decision among the Sheriffs/Chiefs to import technology being used to fuse IED-related data in Afghanistan. * Leadership Training: Developed and conducted several leadership training seminars for use in leadership conferences and training sessions. The training, which makes extensive use of video and distance learning applications, integrates the performance ethics concept with actual *case studies that assess the actions of contemporary leaders* that have demonstrated great success in transforming their organizations. Training is currently being offered *pro bono* to interested organizations. |
| * Executive Director, *Center for Strategic Management (CSM), [*1992 – 2014].   Dr. McWeeney established the *Center for Strategic Management (CSM)* in 1992 as a consulting and training company, focusing on assisting federal agencies in all facets of strategic and performance management. Initially, CSM concentrated on innovative training seminars and conferences designed to better equip federal agencies to adapt to the reinventing government agenda of the 1990’s.  In 1996, CSM underwent a significant transformation in its primary business lines as Dr. McWeeney was asked by the FBI and a number of federal agencies to assist in the development of their strategic and performance plans and performance budgets. In 1997, the FBI Deputy Director asked Dr. McWeeney to lead the development and implementation of a Bureau-wide transformation in several highly visible programs.  This ushered in a protracted period in which Dr. McWeeney and the CSM staff functioned as extended staff with the FBI and other law enforcement agencies seeking complete transformation of their major programs.  *Principal Accomplishments*:  Dr. McWeeney worked with the leaders of over 25 federal agencies to develop highly specialized strategic plans and operational plans and played a key role in improving the performance of those organizations. His *Logic Model Approach* to Strategic Management, which links high level mission priorities with critical priority actions at the tactical level and provides for effective evaluations and performance measurement, has been widely acclaimed as a major contribution to agency transformation. Among the most significant applications of Dr. McWeeney’s approach are the following:   * Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI): Dr. McWeeney developed the first *Bureau-wide Strategic Plan* for the FBI, as well as its first *Counterterrorism, Counterintelligence, and Intelligence Program Strategies*. These efforts provided a new perspective, new priorities, and new initiatives to each of the FBI’s national security programs and led to significant performance improvements. (1994-2010) * Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS): Dr. McWeeney developed the first Strategic Plan for NCIS, and was subsequently asked to lead an *agency-wide modernization project in the aftermath of 9/11*. Dr. McWeeney facilitated a three-year project that transformed the NCIS mission, operational priorities, its organization and management structure, and its relationship with the federal law enforcement community. (2001-2010) |
|  |
| * *Law Enforcement Information Exchange (LInX)*: Dr. McWeeney designed, developed, and led the first integrated law enforcement information sharing initiative that combined the investigative records from all federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies in a region into one database, was accessible by all participants, and produced a composite record that would reflect the information in the collective possession of the participating agencies*.* He developed a new governance approach, facilitated the development of new technology, and managed the implementation of this effort on behalf of the *NCIS Director and the United States Attorneys* in nine separate jurisdictions throughout the United States. He served as the principal advisor to NCIS leadership and to U.S. Attorneys individually throughout the implementation process, and contributed to the information sharing policy development of DOJ, DHS, DOD, and the FBI during this period. (2004-2010) * *United States Attorney, Western District of Washington*: Dr. McWeeney developed an innovative crime strategy on behalf of the U.S. Attorney that reflected the collaboration of the various law enforcement entities in the District. The strategy identified emerging crime that was previously unknown, created District-wide priorities that had never been attempted, and introduced new collaborative programs, including the LInX information sharing system. (2004-2005) * *Central Michigan University:* In 1994, Dr. McWeeney was named Program Manager of Central Michigan University’s Extended Degree Programs in the Washington DC Region. The project sought to adapt CMU’s traditional public administration curriculum to the “reinventing government” initiative in an effort to provide training that was more relevant to the federal workforce. During the next seven years, he conducted over *125 performance-related training seminars, attended by more than 4,500 federal employees from over 75 different agencies.* These training courses, which proved to be a significant marketing initiative for CMU, were also provided to GAO, Congressional Committees, and dozens of federal agencies and private organizations that requested on-site training.   In addition, Dr. McWeeney marketed, designed, and conducted *on-site corporate graduate programs* which were provided for emerging leaders in the *National Security Agency, the General Services Administration, and Motorola*, Inc. A critical component of this initiative was the ability of the program and the curriculum to address the primary concerns of the clients. Student projects often involved agency matters, and agency executives participated in the classes to facilitate discussions and research. The *capstone projects* addressed a protracted organization issue selected by top management. (1994 – 2001) |
| * *U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations*. Dr. McWeeney participated in Congressionally-mandated evaluations of selected federal programs for the House Appropriations Committee. Evaluations included a thorough review of the IRS Modernization project, the State Department’s migration from proprietary information systems, and the Army’s system for calling reserves into active duty. These evaluations, which required interaction with senior agency and Congressional officials, high-level briefings, and travel to U.S. Embassies, were each accepted by the Committee Chairman and produced significant cost savings. [1992 – 1994] * *Other Agency Consulting*: U.S. Department of Education (1996); U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1996 – 1998); U.S. Capitol Police (1998 – 1999); Drug Enforcement Administration (1998 – 2000); U.S. Postal Inspection Service (1998 – 2000); Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Program (1998 - 2001); Legal Services Corporation (1998 – 2001); Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (1998 – 2001); Department of Veteran Affairs (1999); U.S. Customs Service (1999 – 2000); Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys/USDOJ (2001 – 2004); National Counterintelligence Executive (2002 – 2003); Transportation Security Agency (2004 – 2005); Department of Energy/Counterintelligence Program (2004 – 2005). Civil Rights Division/USDOJ (2010 – 2011)   ***Federal Government***   * Dr. McWeeney was employed for nearly 20 years with the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) of the U.S. Department of Justice. [1974 –1992] * During this time he served as Budget Officer, Assistant Controller, and led DEA’s strategic planning, evaluation, and management analysis programs. He led the first agency-wide strategic plan for DEA in 1986 that led to the initiation of the South American Counternarcotics campaign; he conducted an evaluation of DEA’s Intelligence Program that led to its comprehensive restructure; and he provided a new “business approach” to budgeting that tripled the size of DEA over a five-year period. In these positions he designed and facilitated the implementation of many innovative programs for the agency. * While working in the US Department of Justice in the 1970’s, Dr. McWeeney participated in development of guidelines for the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act. He worked on several interagency working groups, worked with congressional staff, and assessed the impact of the law both as a DOJ employee and as part of his Doctoral Dissertation. His reports were incorporated in the legislative hearing record and published. |
| **RESEARCH, STUDIES, EVALUATIONS** |
| **Research Agenda**  1.  The increasing role of regional governance in addressing problems of public administration.  I have been working on this for over a decade and have brought it into the transportaion issue here.  It has been very well received.  (my courses:  PA 315, PA 628, PA 650  and work with the LTC)    2.  The need for strategic planning, budgeting, and performance measurement/program evaluation to be seen as an integrated academic construct.  Currently - both in academia and in practice, they are treated as separate  programs permitting separate and diverse approaches - even within a single organization.  This greatly limits effectiveness and utility.  (my courses: the new strategic planning course (now PA 690)    3.   The relationship between the increasing lack of political cohesion and the effectiveness of government at all levels.  The lack of dispute resolution frameworks for issues ranging from santuary cities to the procedures for confirming supreme court nominees has reopened debate on the meaning of the 9th and 10th amendments - which is certain to have a significant impact on the futuer of intergovernmental relations (PA 628)    **Current Research**  ASSESSING THE CAPACITY FOR PUBLIC VALUE CREATION WITHIN LEADERSHIP THEORIES: RAISING THE ARGUMENT, Alexandru V. Roman and Thomas McWeeney. Accepted for publication, 2018\*  ATTRIBUTES OF REGIONAL GOVERNANCE IN THE US FEDERAL SYSTEM. Thomas McWeeney. (in progress  **Authored On Behalf of Sponsoring Organizations**  Dr. McWeeney led and was the author of several studies and evaluations over a 30-year career as a federal employee and consultant. Below is an annotated listing of those documents that produced significant policy and management impact and the agencies and organizations that sponsored them:   * *“Crime Strategy for the Western District of Washington” Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys and the .U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Washington. (2004)*   Upon assuming office in 2003, the United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington determined that the fragmentation of the law enforcement components -- federal, state, and local -- throughout the state reflected an inefficient use of law enforcement resources and left the region highly vulnerable to terrorist attack. The ensuing strategic plan included an in-depth review of over 500 investigations that revealed the existence of previously unknown organized criminal enterprises migrating into the region from Asia and Latin America. The document formally created a governance process that enabled the U.S. Attorney to coordinate law enforcement and counterterrorism activity throughout the State, established new statewide priorities, and greatly enhanced the level of performance of virtually all agencies in the State. The plan was presented to USDOJ as a model to be used by the other 93 Judicial Districts in the United States*.*   * *“NCIS Strategic Direction”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Director, Naval Criminal Investigative Service. (2003)*   In the aftermath of the bombing of the USS Cole, the Navy realized that it had not placed clear responsibility on any single entity to lead and coordinate its protective programs. In response, the NCIS Director directed the production of a strategic plan that would clarify the agency’s role in protecting Navy interests against terrorism, counterintelligence, and criminal threats. The ensuing strategic plan asserted NCIS’ responsibility to engage in a five-year modernization program that dramatically changed the size, scope of activity, and culture of the agency. The document was widely seen as a seminal event in the history of NCIS, providing the foundation for virtually all its contemporary programs and activities.   * *“FBI Counterintelligence Strategic Plan”. Conducted under the auspices of the Office of the FBI Executive Assistant Director. (2003)*   As the lead counterintelligence agency for Federal Government, the FBI followed the framework established by the NCIX strategy by creating a strategic plan for its counterintelligence program that re-directed the program from its traditional focus on espionage investigations to a new approach that sought to identify intentions and objectives of adversaries seeking to obtain sensitive and classified information pertaining to U.S. critical national assets, whether maintained by the government or the private sector. The strategy included a candid diagnosis and assessment of current vulnerabilities and identified new performance imperatives in virtually every aspect of the CI program. The document introduced the “domain” concept as the primary strategy to address the growing asymmetrical threat. The core elements of the strategy remain in place today.   * *“NCIX Strategic Plan”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Office of the National Counter Intelligence Executive. (2001)*   The end of the Cold War ushered in a period in which the U.S., as the lone superpower, was threatened by a dramatic increase in intelligence activities by both allies and adversaries seeking technical advantage. Given the fragmented and undisciplined state of counterintelligence programs in the Federal Government, the Director of the CIA, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the FBI proposed an interagency coordinating entity that would provide overall direction, set priorities, and work towards integration of the agencies with a counterintelligence mission. The organization (NCIX) was created by Executive Order in 2001, and the ensuing strategic plan provided the rationale and created the infrastructure for the new organization. The plan continues in force today, as the organization has been elevated to a senior role in the U.S. Intelligence Community.   * *“FBI Counterterrorism Strategic Plan”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Office of the Executive Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2000)*   While the FBI strategic plan created a new Counterterrorism Division, the new program had no central focus, no priorities, and no centralized management. The strategy sought to create “maximum feasible capacity” in every FBI field office and at FBI Headquarters to minimize the likelihood that FBI vulnerabilities would contribute to a terrorist event by creating definitive standards in every FBI field office, an assessment mechanism for ensuring that the standards were being adequately addressed, reporting to the FBI Director on the state of the counterterrorism program, and greatly expanded initiatives overseas and domestically. The strategy was cited favorably by the 9/11 Commission.   * *“Court Services and Offender Supervision Strategy”.* *Conducted, published and distributed* under the auspices of the Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA). (1999)   With the creation of a new agency that consolidated the various parole functions in the District of Columbia, this document created an overarching strategy and a performance theory for the new organization. Top priority was given to contributing to a reduction in crime in the District of Columbia by affecting a substantial reduction in the rate of recidivism – the central mission requirement of the new agency. Based on a review of the literature and best practices, the strategy identified five critical success factors which, if implemented, have produced a reduction in recidivism by as much as 50%. Though the plan was never fully funded, it was considered successful and remains in place today.   * *“Demonstrating Results: An Introduction to the Government Performance and Results Act”. Conducted, published and distributed* under the auspices of *the Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education (1998).*   The enactment of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) in 1993 required agencies to dramatically reform the way they managed their programs––requiring strategic planning, performance budgeting, and performance measurement as a matter of law. However the Federal Government did not provide guidance to agencies for implementing statute. Rather, it was left to each Department and Agency to work through implementation consistent with specialized needs and requirements. The U.S. Department of Education requested a manuscript that provided such guidance This document summarizes the GPRA and provides practical advice on methods and approaches for successfully fulfilling its requirements.   * *“FBI Strategic Plan: 1998 – 2002”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Office of the Deputy Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1997)*   This was a seminal document in the history of the FBI which changed the Bureau’s investigative posture and created Bureau-wide priorities for the first time. The document was prepared in the wake of the Cold War, during a time in which FBI investigations had become totally decentralized and lacking central management direction. The strategic plan focused the FBI on its national security priorities and designated the vast majority of its current efforts as discretionary. It created the new counterterrorism and intelligence programs, which were to become the foundation of the FBI’s post-9/11 environment   * *“Assessment of IRS Modernization”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Surveys and Investigative Staff, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives. (1994)*   In the early 1990s, the IRS embarked on an ambitious initiative to provide an integrated information system that would modernize the filing of tax returns and the collection of payments for all taxpayers in the United States. The project, which at $49 billion was the largest single domestic initiative undertaken to date, suffered from the onset with management and organizational problems that threatened to extend the timeframe and greatly increase the cost. The study identified the most significant management deficiencies associated with the project and recommended a variety of measures that were simultaneously recommended by GAO. These measures were ultimately accepted and put in place by IRS management. Among these was the establishment of a stakeholders group of industry experts that would work closely with IRS management and provide ongoing and candid assessments to IRS executive management.   * *“Migration of the State Department’s Information Systems”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Surveys and Investigative Staff, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives. (1993)*   The Department of State was one of the first federal agencies to deploy an enterprise-wide proprietary information system in the late 1970s. However, by the early 1990s the system had become antiquated, had reached capacity, and was increasingly experiencing problems that affected the timely worldwide communication of vital diplomatic information. This study systematically documented the problems and critiqued the process, or lack thereof, for affecting the migration to an integrated, open system that would permit constant updates and evolution. The recommendations were accepted by the Appropriations Committee Chairman and the State Department was directed to begin the migration.   * *“The Effectiveness of DEA's Intelligence Program”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Office of Planning and Evaluation, Drug Enforcement Administration. (1984)*   With the shift in emphasis among law enforcement agencies from the pursuit of individual cases to complex, multi-organizational criminal enterprises, enhancing the capabilities of agency intelligence programs became a priority. This study sought to establish a baseline assessment of the extent to which DEA’s Intelligence Program contributed to the agency’s major investigations. Using content analysis methodology the study team reviewed 100 of the most significant DEA investigations completed during 1982-83. The assessment found that the Intelligence Program contributed to only one of the agency’s most significant investigations during the timeframe under review. The majority of the work conducted by the Intelligence Program consisted of low-level tactical assistance and preparation of summary reporting. Recommendations to dramatically overhaul the structure of the Intelligence Program were accepted and implemented*.*   * *“DEA's Seized Asset and Forfeiture Program”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Office of Planning and Evaluation, Drug Enforcement Administration. (1983)*   In the early 1980s, federal law enforcement agencies were given greatly expanded power to seize property that was associated with drug traffickers and their organizations. The result was a significant increase in the seizure of high-value property, which ultimately was placed in the custody of the law-enforcement agencies that seized the property while final disposition was pending. The research documented the extent to which the accumulation of property overwhelmed the ability of the DEA to serve as a trusted custodian of the seized property and the substantial loss in value of neglected real property, businesses, racehorses, vessels, aircraft, and vehicles -- for which the government was liable. The study recommended a new, technology-based, centralized system for processing seized property within a 90-day timeframe. The study’s recommendations were implemented and substantial savings were realized. Moreover, the recommendations became the basis for system-wide reforms throughout the Federal Government.   * *“The Effect of the FOIA on DEA Investigations”. Conducted, published and distributed under the auspices of the Office of Planning and Evaluation, Drug Enforcement Administration. (1982*)   Among the Watergate-related reforms of the 1970’s was the effort by Congress to reduce government secrecy. In 1974, it amended the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) with a series of procedures intended to require federal agencies to make substantially more agency records available to reporters, researchers, and publiv interest group. Almost immediately, however, agencies were overwhelmed as the FOIA was used for private interests – businesses, foreign governments, and prisoners and others contesting government action. This study used content analysis to assess the extent to which the unanticipated use of the FOIA was hving an impact on the conduct of federal drug investigations. The study concluded that the effect was marginal – it caused some diminution of reporting and a reluctance of some to cooperative with the government, but the primary effect was a 10 fold increase in the cost of compliance with the law’s requirements. The study was presented to Congressional Committees considering further reform of the statute, was the subject of executive and legislative branch briefings, and made part of the House and Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing record.  **Authored as an Independent Practitioner**   * *“Leadership Seminar” twelve weekly lectures, complete with bibliography, provided in written form for on-line graduate class. (2012)*.   The document, which was developed for online graduate instruction at the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) consist of 12 weekly topics pertaining to the leadership issues facing the U.S. Intelligence Community. The lectures reviewed both contemporary and traditional theories of leadership, leadership issues confronting the IC and provide case studies of individuals confronting important contemporary issues involving information sharing, fusion centers, and IC integration. Lectures are published online and made available to UMUC students and faculty, but are also available for distribution and use by Dr. McWeeney.   * *“Leadership And Performance Ethics: A Different Approach To Government”. Manuscript posted on CSM-PLI Website (2010)*   This seminal work provided the foundation for the establishment of the Public Leadership Institute as a nonprofit organization. The article posits a new field of inquiry, referred to as “performance ethics”, that lies in the intersection of traditional leadership training, ethics training, and performance training. The overriding construct of the performance ethics is that public leaders have a moral imperative to ensure the maximum feasible performance of those public sector organizations that have a responsibility to provide for the health, safety, and security of citizens. Leadership is required to establish the agenda, performance management is required to ensure clarity of direction, purpose, and accountability, and ethics must be demonstrated because a commitment to high value objectives requires a commitment on the part of leaders to ”to do he right thing” and the “moral courage” to act on it.   * *“Law Enforcement Information Sharing: An Elusive Vision”. Manuscript posted on CSM-PLI Website (2010).*   Despite the high rhetoric of government officials at all levels, the decade following the 9/11 attacks produced little progress in overcoming the 9/11 Commission’s principal finding - that our intelligence and law enforcement communities were structurally incapable of sharing information. This article describes the situation in 2010 as one in which a tremendous amount of money was paid to technology companies to devise creative solutions, but serious structural limitations in the ability of governments to overcome traditional approaches, obstacles, laws and policies, culture, and special interests continued to minimize the effectiveness of these systems and continued the public safety vulnerability.   * *KEEPING FOCUSED: Law Enforcement Information Sharing - Why It’s Needed, What it Should Look Like, Why We Struggle”. Manuscript posted on CSM-PLI Website (2009)*   For a variety reasons, despite the commitment from policy officials at all levels of government, no definitive national plan had been established by 2009 that provided a basic understanding of requirements of information sharing or an approach towards making it systematically available to law-enforcement and intelligence agencies. No definition or policy level standards for information sharing exists; no guidance concerning the type of data to be shared has been developed; no requirements of the technical capabilities has been set forth; and no evaluation criteria has been developed to determine or measure success, Each of these attributes, which is of critical importance for the successful deployment of any system, is lacking because no clear leadership has emerged to accept responsibility to definitively address these issues. Until engaged leadership emerges, information sharing will remain unfocused, and there will be no agreement or common understanding concerning what it looks like or how it should be developed.   * *“Information Sharing National Plan”. Prepared as a White Paper for consideration by the U.S. Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security and law enforcement associations. (2009)*   The 9/11 Commission’s mandate to improve information sharing among law enforcement and intelligence agencies created a flurry of activity that resulted in the development and appointment of many information sharing systems throughout the country between 2004 and 2009. Most of these systems were developed and deployed in small communities by technology companies that provided highly proprietary systems. As a result, information sharing in the U.S. can be described as fragmented, incomplete, and ineffective. This document describes the problem and suggests a comprehensive, regional approach to national information sharing that would be regionally based and include interstate regional governance authorities. The plan was presented to the Federal Government, to national law enforcement associations, and became the basis for a USDOJ grant.   * *“Information Sharing Governance Manual”. Unpublished manuscript provided to*   *Federal agencies, 2008.*  A critical requirement for cross-jurisdictional projects such as information sharing is for an authoritative coordinating and decision-making entity that can set clear direction, resolve disputes, and accept accountability for the performance of the project. By its very nature, information sharing is a process that requires integration of records, fusion of technology, and policy that rises above the interests of individual jurisdictions. The Information Sharing Governance Manual provides agency practitioners with detailed guidance and instruction on establishing governance boards, developing Memorandua of Understanding (MOU), administering a multijurisdictional project, managing meetings, and resolving disputes. The manual was derived from the experience in establishing a Governance Board consisting of the United States Attorney and the heads of federal, state, and local, law enforcement agencies in the Seattle area . The Manual has been used as a model for information sharing projects throughout the country.   * *Performance Management Monograph Series: Center for Strategic Management, 1999. Unpublished Monograph Series.*   The Performance Management Monograph Series consisted of five individual monographs that built upon the training that was offered to the federal workforce in support of the GPRA. Each monograph included a discussion of the problem, previous efforts to address the problem, and a detailed description of an approach that was intended to comply with the statute and produce results. Although they were unpublished, they received widespread circulation by being distributed to the 4,500 federal employees attending Dr. McWeeney’s training seminars. Several federal agencies were provided copies and encouraged to distribute them among the workforce. Individual monographs include the follo*wing:*   * *Performance Monograph No 1*: “Performance Management: A Primer” * *Performance Monograph No 2*: “Strategic Planning and the GPRA * *Performance Monograph No 3*: “Dynamic Budgeting * *Performance Monograph No 4*: “Developing Performance Logic Models * *Performance Monograph No 5*: “Performance Measurement * *“Moving from GPRA Outputs to GPRA Outcomes”, The Public Manager, Fall 1998, vol. 27, no 3., p. 20*   With the enactment of the GPRA, government agencies were required to present their programs in terms of the results, or “outcomes” of their programmatic activity. This requirement caused a tremendous change in the culture of the federal workforce, which had traditionally accounted for and justified programs in terms of its workload. Increasing the number of grants by 10% per year was considered a measure of success. The GPRA required agencies to report on the extent to which those grants improved social and political problems, ie a reduction in crime, conservation of energy, or more effective small businesses. The article discusses the difference between “outputs” and “outcomes” and provides a model framework for agencies to follow in complying with the statute.   * *“Linking Resources to Planning and Performance Measurement”, The Public Manager, Fall 1997, vol 26, no 1., p. 13*   A critical requirement of the GPRA was that the its three principal components –– planning, budgeting, and measurement –– must be viewed as an integrated system. Strategic plans were to provide direction and form the basis for new initiatives; agency budgets were to be derivative of the strategic plans; and performance measurements were intended to reflect the extent to which the plans were successful and were achieved within the budget estimates. The article elaborates on five dimensions of “performance budgeting” which, if followed, will provide both a methodology and a model for effective implementation of the statute. |
| **PRESENTATIONS/PUBLIC APPEARANCES** |
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