

## PPD 500: Intersectoral Leadership

**Lead Instructor:** William D. Leach, Ph.D.

**Email:** [leachw@price.usc.edu](mailto:leachw@price.usc.edu)

**Office Hours:** Upon request

### Course Description

*In today's world of dynamic change and globalization, social challenges have become increasingly complex. Solving society's most pressing issues now requires innovation and collaboration. These issues call for leaders who are able to move beyond their areas of expertise and work across the public, private, and nonprofit sectors to find vital solutions.*

~ "About the Price School" <http://priceschool.usc.edu/about/>

*PPD 500 – Intersectoral Leadership: Roles of public, private, nonprofit, and civil society sectors in policy, planning, and development. Leadership skills in negotiation, conflict resolution, institutional design, problem solving.*

~ USC Course Catalogue

An important focus of the Price School of Public Policy is its recognition that problem solving and community building require the combined strengths of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. In turn, working across the various sectors requires an understanding of institutional complexity, and an ability to resolve conflict and seek collaborative solutions. This course provides a foundation in understanding institutional arrangements and developing the tools and skill base necessary for effective policy development, planning, and management across sectors. The course serves as part of a common core for the five core masters' degree programs in USC Price. In addition to providing a substantive link across these programs, the course serves as a forum for developing the different contributions made by our various professions and will offer an opportunity for common shared experiences among students from different programs.

In a variety of professional fields ranging from healthcare to planning to policy analysis to public administration, a shared characteristic is engagement across the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. This course is designed as an introduction to the emerging phenomena of collaborative governance and leadership, with an emphasis on the major conceptual issues, theories, and debates. It explores how and when collaborative strategies can improve public decisionmaking, public administration, and policy implementation. It also builds skills and knowledge to design, negotiate, manage, navigate, evaluate, and lead initiatives that have intersectoral dimensions. Of particular interest are the varied mechanisms in play across sectors and placed-based approaches, not only in the United States, but also globally. The case discussions throughout the course are placed-based examples.

## Learning Objectives

1. Appreciate the history and evolution of collaborative governance in the United States.
2. Define and discuss the main concepts and terminology of intersectoral leadership.
3. Understand how the goals and approaches differ for various types of intersectoral collaboration such as stakeholder partnerships, joint-fact finding, public-private partnerships, public participation, and participatory budgeting.
4. Understand when collaborative strategies are appropriate, and appreciate some of the arguments for and against collaboration.
5. Become familiar with several theoretical frameworks that can be used to organize our knowledge of collaborative processes and outcomes.
6. Grasp the main criteria that scholars have used to evaluate the outputs and outcomes of a collaborative process.
7. Build skills in negotiation, communication, facilitation, leadership, framing, systems thinking, stakeholder analysis, and group process design.
  - Discuss the key features of principled, interest-based negotiation for intersectoral leadership.
  - Understand the core principles of effective facilitation for intersectoral leadership.
  - Develop a working knowledge of the primary, state-of-the-art best practices for designing and implementing an effective collaborative process.
  - Critically examine one of the influential texts on public or intersectoral leadership.

## Textbooks and Supplemental Reading Materials

### Required Books:

- *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice*. Edited by Frank Dukes, Karen Firehock, and Juliana Birkhoff (University of Virginia Press, 2011). **ISBN-13:** 978-0813931531
- *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition or newer, Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton (Penguin, 2011). **ISBN-13:** 978-0143118756
- One additional book on leadership, of the student's choice, subject to instructor approval. For a list of pre-approved books, refer to the Week 12 summary below.

### Articles and e-books:

- Weekly readings available through ARES Course Reserves are listed in the learning activities table at the bottom of this syllabus, as well as the Readings page in the General section of the online course. All assigned materials for this course are available through the following link: <https://reserves.usc.edu>
- Selected chapters from the following text are available from the USC library as an e-book linked below.

Straus, David (2002) *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions*. Berrett Koehler Press.

<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440>

## Library Access

As a USC student, you have access to all the USC library resources. For details, see: <http://libguides.usc.edu/distancelearning>

## Live Sessions

Live sessions are hosted in Adobe Connect on Day 07 from 6:00-7:30 PM Pacific Time, during Weeks 1, 3, 7, 11, and 13.

Each live session may entail:

- Introduction of course material or assignments
- Guest lectures
- Student presentations
- Interactive Q&A with students and faculty.

Please refer to this guide on how to attend a live session: <http://goo.gl/3KJco9>

## Instructor Announcements

The Instructor Announcements forum in the General section of the course contains an archive of all announcements regarding section-specific information or other important news as the course progresses. Whenever the instructor posts an announcement, an email will be sent to each student on the roster. Be sure to look for these.

## Group Work

This course has two main group assignments:

- case study paper and presentation due Week 05
- applications paper and presentation due Week 14

Detailed instructions and grading rubrics for each assignment are included in this syllabus.

In Week 01, the instructor will place students in groups of 4 to work on the case study assignment, due at the end of Week 05. In Week 10, the membership of each group will be shuffled for the second group assignment due at the end of Week 14. Once the groups are established, you can find your group by clicking on the 'Roster' link in the right bar of the main course page.

Each member of the group will receive the same grade for the final graded paper and presentation. Students will also be graded on their individual contribution to group assignments as part of the Team Participation component of the course grade. This contribution will be informed by a peer-evaluation survey conducted in CATME during weeks 06 and 15.

## Academic Conduct

- Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in *SCampus* in Section 11, *Behavior Violating University Standards* <https://scampus.usc.edu/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions>.
- Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in *SCampus* and university policies on scientific misconduct, <http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct/>.
- Discrimination, sexual assault, and harassment are not tolerated by the university. You are encouraged to report any incidents to the *Office of Equity and Diversity* <http://equity.usc.edu/> or to the *Department of Public Safety* <http://capsnet.usc.edu/department/department-public-safety/online-forms/contact-us>. This is important for the safety whole USC community. Another member of the university community – such as a friend, classmate, advisor, or faculty member – can help initiate the report, or can initiate the report on behalf of another person. *The Center for Women and Men* <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/> provides 24/7 confidential support, and the sexual assault resource center webpage <https://sarc.usc.edu/> describes reporting options and other resources.

## Student Support Systems

- A number of USC’s schools provide support for students who need help with scholarly writing. Check with your advisor or program staff to find out more. Students whose primary language is not English should check with the *American Language Institute* <http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali>, which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students.
- *The Office of Disability Services and Programs* [http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home\\_index.html](http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html) provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations.
- In case of an officially declared emergency, *USC Emergency Information* <http://emergency.usc.edu/> will provide safety and other updates.

## Grading Policies

### *Late policy*

Because the asynchronous online framework allows considerable flexibility for completing the work required in this course, and all syllabus requirements and assignments are available at the beginning of this course for students who wish to work ahead of schedule, no assignments are accepted after their due dates without prior permission from faculty. At their discretion, faculty may grant extensions for extenuating circumstances.

### *Numeric Ranges for Final Course Grades*

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Range</i>
A	≥ 93%
A-	≥ 90% < 93%
B+	≥ 87% < 90%
B	≥ 83%, < 87%
B-	≥ 80%, < 83%

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Range</i>
C+	≥ 77%, < 80%
C	≥ 73%, < 77%
C-	≥ 70%, < 73%
D	≥ 60%, < 70%
F	< 60%

### *Course components*

<b>Component</b>	<b>Percentage of Final Grade</b>
Discussions (13 @ 2%, drop 3 lowest of 16)	26%
Team Participation (2 @ 5%)	10%
Case Study Paper (Group)	16%
Topic Submission, 1%	
Paper, 10%	
Presentation, 5%	
Topic or Technique Paper (Individual)	16%
Topic Submission, 1%	
Paper, 15%	
Applications Paper (Group)	16%
Topic Submission, 1%	
Paper, 10%	
Presentation, 5%	
Exam, Week 15 (Individual)	16%
<b>Total Percentage</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Discussions (26% — best 13 out of 16 @ 2% each)**

In response to prompts that address the weekly reading assignments, students are expected to write thoughtful responses that demonstrate knowledge of the concepts and ideas pertaining to the topic, and use rational argument or evidence to support all claims. Students will post their initial responses to the discussion board prompts by Day 4 of each week. Students will pose follow-up questions or comments to two of their classmates' initial posts by Day 5. Finally, by Day 7 students will post responses to all follow-up questions they received. Up to 5 points (out of 10) will be deducted if a student does not post the required number of follow-ups and replies.

<b>Weekly Discussion Rubric</b>				
<i>Objective/ Criteria</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Partially Proficient</i>	<i>Incomplete</i>
Relevance, Application, Originality <b>___ / 3 points</b>	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the text, unique perspective, clear focus, fluent, cohesive (3)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the text, adds some content, usually has clear focus (2)	Addresses the question little substance added; inconsistencies in coherence (1)	Fails to address the question posed, or incoherent (0)
Insight, Observation, Analysis <b>___ / 3 points</b>	Offers significant concept or idea, developed in depth, with clear understanding of the assignment (3)	Offers a concept worth thinking about, develops ideas, understanding of assignment (2)	Addresses concepts already highlighted; rudimentary understanding of the assignment (1)	No clear concept addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, minimal understanding of the assignment (0)
Details/ Evidence <b>___ / 2 points</b>	Details are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course (2)	Details are elaborated and pertinent to the course (1)	Details lack elaboration or are repetitious; postings incomplete or not submitted (0)	Details are random, inappropriate, or barely apparent; postings incomplete or not submitted (0)
Grammar, usage, mechanics <b>___ / 2 points</b>	Few, if any, errors are present; all postings completed (2)	Some errors are present; some postings not completed (1)	Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident; postings incomplete or not submitted (0)	Errors are frequent and severe; postings incomplete or not submitted (0)

**Team participation (10% — 2 @ 5% each)**

Participation grades will be based on the following two items:

- Responding to a peer evaluation survey administered through CATME in weeks 06 and 15 to provide thoughtful feedback on your teammates' contributions to group work.
- Your teammates' evaluations of your contributions to group assignments, as recorded in their responses to the CATME peer evaluation surveys.

Note: students who do not contribute appropriately to group assignments may receive zero or partial credit for the assignment, at the discretion of the instructor.

**Exam (16%) (individual work)**

The exam will use multiple-choice and short-answer questions to test your mastery of the concepts and terminology introduced through the readings, instructional materials, and live sessions. This open book exam will be distributed via Instructor Announcement on Day 1 of Week 15, and is due on Day 7.

**Case Study Paper (10%) and Presentation (5%) (group assignment)**

To get a good feel for what collaborative governance means, there's nothing better than delving into the details of a particular case. Each student will work in a group with 3 other classmates and will collectively select their own case to study, subject to faculty assistance and approval.

Cases should fit Ansell and Gash's (2008) definition of collaborative governance.

A governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative, and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets. This definition stresses six important criteria: (1) the forum is initiated by public agencies or institutions, (2) participants in the forum include non-state actors, (3) participants engage directly in decision making and are not merely "consulted" by public agencies, (4) the forum is formally organized and meets collectively, (5) the forum aims to make decisions by consensus (even if consensus is not achieved in practice), and (6) the focus of collaboration is on public policy or public management.

*Ansell, Chris and Alison Gash (2008) "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice." Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 18: 544-545*

Learning objectives:

- Become highly familiar with the details of one actual example of collaborative governance, broadly defined.
- Practice using concepts presented in the readings, guest lectures, and class discussion to analyze the structure, process, and outcomes of the selected case study.

## Parameters:

- Approximately 5-8 single-spaced pages, plus references, figures, etc.
- 10-minute group presentation recorded in VoiceThread.

## Source material:

- Data/information for the paper must be gleaned from at least two (preferably more) independent sources. One of these should be a published article, report, or book chapter. See your instructor if you want an exception to this rule to work on a case that hasn't been studied before. Examples of other sources include online information about the case (e.g. meeting minutes), and/or original interviews. Some of these groups get inundated with requests for information and surveys, so please check with Professor Leach before contacting groups directly.

## Finding a case to study:

- Students should speak with the section instructor early and often about their case study ideas or lack thereof. To prevent duplication, and get you started on the right track, section instructors will review and approve all case studies. In addition to talking with your classmates and instructor for ideas, consider perusing the following resources:
  - Policy Consensus Initiative, *Case Study Database*  
<http://www.policyconsensus.org/casestudies/>
  - Center for Collaborative Policy, *Selected Projects*  
<http://www.csus.edu/ccp/selectproj/selectprojects.html>
  - Google Scholar: <http://scholar.google.com/>

Example search parameters

Collaborative democracy	Public participation	Deliberative democracy
Collaborative governance	Collaborative policy	Collaborative planning
Network governance	Dispute resolution	Collaborative Learning
Public involvement	Watershed council	Public deliberation
Public engagement	Citizens jury	Negotiated rulemaking
Policy Dialogue	Joint fact-finding	Community-based
Negotiated rulemaking	Fire-safe council	Watershed partnership
Cooperative Conservation	Advisory committee	Participatory budgeting



## Case Study Paper Rubric

*Superior (S)*: Raises especially insightful questions, with or without solutions. Integrates material from readings, lectures, or outside materials. Suggests novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic, and supports these ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or explanations.

*Proficient (P)*: Fully addresses each required component. Provides insightful analysis evidencing knowledge of key concepts or facts.

*Not Proficient (NP)*: Minimally addresses the required components or fails to address some components. Offers straightforward or obvious analysis. Betrays a misunderstanding of key concepts or facts. Summarizes information without elaboration, analysis, or critique.

*Incomplete (I)*: Fails to address required components, or incoherent.

Criteria:

S P NP I

### I. Collaborative History and Purpose

15 12 10 0

*To the extent feasible based on available sources, address as many numbered topics as you can.*

1. How did the Collaborative get started?
2. What policy problem or catalyzing event was the collaborative formed to address?
3. What was the political landscape like at the inception of the partnership (e.g., hurting stalemate)?
4. Was there a formal convening agency?
5. Were there individual people who played a key entrepreneurial role to initiate the Collaborative?

### II. Collaborative Structure and Process

20 16 12 0

*To the extent feasible based on available sources, address as many numbered topics as you can.*

1. What's the geographic scope of the Collaborative?
2. What's the meeting frequency? How do you meet (e.g., in-person)?
3. About how many people attend a typical meeting?
4. Who participates?
5. How do people become members of the collaborative?
6. Has there been any turnover in participants? If so, why? Did anyone join the process late? Did anyone leave early?
7. Are any important parties NOT involved? If so, why?
8. How has the Collaborative been funded? Is there a sponsor (who pays for facilitation or meeting expenses)? How much funding since inception?
9. What is the organizational structure of the Collaborative? Are there formal positions? What's the relationship between governmental and non-governmental participants?
10. Is there a facilitator or a coordinator? What does each do?
11. Is there an MOU, bylaws, or other sort of organizational charter?
12. How are decisions made within the group? If consensus, how is it defined?
13. Are there major issues the collaborative has chosen not to address? Why?

<p><b>III. Outputs and Outcomes</b></p> <p><i>To the extent feasible based on available sources, address as many numbered topics as you can.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the Collaborative produced any policy statements or recommendations?</li> <li>2. If so, was the policy adopted by the target audience? Was the policy implemented? Would this have happened without the Collaborative?</li> <li>3. Has the Collaborative produced any research products? For example, have the members agreed upon data or knowledge gaps likely to affect the group's ability to achieve its objectives? Have the members agreed upon a study or research design to answer questions identified by the members? Have the members implemented a study commissioned by the group?</li> <li>4. Has the Collaborative produced any changes in social capital, trust, working relationships, culture, etc?</li> <li>5. Has the Collaborative had a positive (or negative) effect on the policy issues it seeks to address? Has it worked? Is it successful?</li> <li>6. Any other tangible or intangible outputs or outcomes?</li> </ol>	20	16	12	0
<p><b>IV. Analysis</b></p> <p><i>Address <u>all five</u> questions, drawing upon the readings, guest lectures, and/or class discussion.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How is this collaborative similar to or different from the definitions in the literature? What core aspects of collaborative policy are present or absent in this case?</li> <li>2. What would you say have been the Collaborative's greatest accomplishments to date?</li> <li>3. What appear to be the most important reasons for the Collaborative's successes to date?</li> <li>4. What would you say have been the Collaborative's greatest shortcomings to date?</li> <li>5. What have been the greatest obstacles to success?</li> </ol>	20	16	12	0
<p><b>V. Source Material</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the paper cite data/information from at least two (preferably three or more) independent sources? (Examples include a published article, report, book chapter, case website, meeting minutes, original interview.) See the instructor if you need an exemption from this requirement.</li> <li>2. Does it cite other works appropriately, and include a list of references in APA or MLA style?</li> </ol>	10	8	6	0
<p><b>VI. Writing Quality</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the writing clear and concise?</li> <li>2. Are the style, structure, grammar, spelling, and organization of your paper appropriate, and written in a manner that a college-educated layperson can follow?</li> </ol>	15	12	10	0

**Rubric for Presentations:**

- Case Study Paper Presentation
- Applications Paper Presentation

<i>Criteria:</i>	<i>Superior</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Not Proficient</i>	<i>Not Complete</i>
<b>Content (40 points)</b>	Coherent and well-organized presentation responsive to the assignment prompt (40)	Coherent, with minor flaws in organization or responsiveness to the assignment. (30 or 35)	Presentation lacked clarity or credibility, or contained significant errors. (20 or 25)	Far below expectations for graduate work. (0)
<b>Visuals (20 points)</b>	Engaging visuals help tell the story. (need not be elaborate if a minimalist theme is more appropriate). (20)	Appropriate visuals help tell the story, with few exceptions. (15)	Visual elements lack clarity or distract from the presentation. (10)	None or inappropriate. (0)
<b>Delivery (20 points)</b>	Team members spoke <i>on video</i> with appropriate confidence, clarity, and enthusiasm, without exception. (20)	Team members spoke with appropriate confidence, clarity, and enthusiasm, with few exceptions. (15)	A lack of confidence, clarity, or enthusiasm detracted from the presentation. (10)	Delivery far below expectations for graduate work. (0)
<b>Presentation (10 points)</b>	Each teammate has a significant speaking role. (10)	One teammate lacks a significant speaking role. (7)	Two teammates lack a significant speaking role. (4)	Only one teammate narrates the presentation.(0)
<b>Duration (10 points)</b>	8-10 minutes for 3-person groups; 9-11 minutes for 4-person groups (10)	<1 minute too short or too long. (7)	1-2 minutes too short or too long. (4)	>2 minutes too short or too long. (0)

### *Topic or Technique Paper (15%) (individual work)*

This is your opportunity to dive deeply into a conceptual topic or collaboration technique that interests you. The assignment is somewhat flexible, and all paper topics must be approved by the instructor in advance. Students should speak with the section instructor about their topic paper ideas or lack thereof. Most papers will fall within one of the following two categories:

- a. Conceptual treatment of a particular subtopic. For example, “Can under-represented communities participate meaningfully in collaborative processes?”
- b. Discussion of a particular collaboration technique such as study circles, visioning, citizen juries, online deliberation, etc.

Learning objectives:

- Practice applying the concepts learned in the course to analyze the prospects and challenges for employing collaborative strategies to improve democratic practice or policy outcomes.
- Develop advanced knowledge of a specialized area of practice or theory in collaborative policy.

Parameters:

- Approximately 5 single-spaced pages, plus references, figures, etc.
- Please cite the source for all data and ideas you use in your paper.
  - MLA Style Guide: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/>
  - APA Style Guide: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

Examples of Topics and Techniques:

- a. Conceptual treatment of a particular subtopic. For example, “Can under-represented communities participate meaningfully in collaborative processes?”
  - Collaboration and democracy
  - Power issues in collaboration
  - The meaning of consensus in diverse groups
  - Environmental justice
  - Collaboration with Native American tribes
  - Can collaboration be scaled up to national issues?
  - Open-meeting laws as obstacles to collaboration (e.g. FACA, Brown Act, Bagley Keene Act)
  - Barriers to implementing voluntary agreements
  - How to evaluate the success of a collaborative process
  - The history of collaborative policy
  - The philosophical roots of collaboration in America
  - Comparative intersectoral leadership (e.g. collaborative policy in Denmark)
  - The roles and functions of facilitators and mediators
  - Use of online collaboration software in public policy; e-government
  - Collaboration and communication theory (network theory, complexity theory, social psychology, etc.)

b. Analysis of particular techniques or approaches to collaborative policy, such as:

- Public hearings
- study circles
- Deliberative polling
- Citizen juries
- World Café
- Appreciative Inquiry
- Collaborative budgeting
- National issues forums
- Consensus conferences and planning cells
- Learning democracy centers
- Victim-offender mediation & restorative justice
- Management of common property
- Joint fact finding
- Adaptive governance

**Applications Paper (10%) and Presentation (5%) (group assignment)**

This is your opportunity to dive deeply into a conceptual topic or collaboration technique that interests you. The assignment is somewhat flexible, and all paper topics must be approved by the instructor in advance. Students should speak with the section instructor about their topic paper ideas or lack thereof. Most papers will fall within one of the following three categories:

- a. Conflict assessment. Evaluate the potential for successfully applying collaborative strategies in a particular policy debate.
- b. Collaborative capacity of an agency or organization. Discuss what it might take to make collaborative strategies become more routine for a specific organization.
- c. Collaboration and conflict in popular culture. Analyze a depiction of conflict in cinema, television, literature or other media, and describe how proper application of collaborative strategies could have altered the outcome.

Learning objectives:

- Practice applying the concepts learned in the course to analyze the prospects and challenges for employing collaborative strategies to improve democratic practice or policy outcomes.
- Develop advanced knowledge of a specialized area of practice or theory in collaborative policy.

Parameters:

- Approximately 7-8 single-spaced pages, plus references, figures, etc.
- 15-minute group presentation recorded in VoiceThread or other medium.

Examples of Applications:

- a. Conflict assessment. Evaluate the potential for successfully applying collaborative strategies in a particular policy debate or law.
  - Collaboration and NEPA or CEQA, etc.
  - Assessment of the potential for collaborative approaches in the national debate over health insurance reform
  - Assessment of the potential for collaborative approaches in the siting or financing of professional sports stadiums
  - Assessment of the potential for collaborative approaches in the Israel-Palestine conflict
- b. Collaborative capacity of an agency or organization. Discuss what it might take to make collaborative strategies become more routine for a specific organization or type of organization.
  - Collaboration in the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Army, California state legislature, city councils, City of San Rafael, fire-safe councils, school district site councils
- c. Collaboration and conflict in popular culture. Analyze a depiction of conflict in cinema, television, literature or other media, and describe how proper application of collaborative strategies could have altered the outcome.
  - Television shows with collaboration themes such as *The Office*, season 2, episode 21. "Conflict Resolution."
  - Movies with collaboration and conflict themes such as *Pom Poko* (1994, Japanese animation); *The Fire Next Time* (2004, documentary).

**Rubric for:**

- **Topic-or-Technique Paper**
- **Applications Paper**

*Superior (S):* Raises especially insightful questions, with or without solutions. Integrates material from readings, lectures, or outside materials. Suggests novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic, and supports these ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or explanations.

*Proficient (P):* Fully addresses each required component. Provides insightful analysis evidencing knowledge of key concepts or facts.

*Not Proficient (NP):* Minimally addresses the required components or fails to address some components. Offers straightforward or obvious analysis. Betrays a misunderstanding of key concepts or facts. Summarizes information without elaboration, analysis, or critique.

*Incomplete (I):* Fails to address required components, or incoherent.

*Criteria:*

	S	P	NP	I
<b>I. Overview of the Application</b> How well does the paper describe and explain the core topic/issue of the paper, and why it's important or interesting?	30	25	15	0
<b>II. Analysis</b> To what extent does the paper <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. make a compelling argument rather than being purely descriptive?</li> <li>2. raise especially insightful questions?</li> <li>3. suggest novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic?</li> <li>4. suggest original solutions?</li> <li>5. support its ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or coherent explanations?</li> <li>6. cite credible sources of information or analysis?</li> <li>7. integrate material from readings, lectures, or outside materials?</li> <li>8. specify clear conclusions? (even if the conclusion is fuzzy like, "we can't draw a conclusion without more information." If the latter, what information is needed?)</li> <li>9. suggest directions for future research?</li> </ol>	40	35	25	0
<b>III. Source Material</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are sources cited for all data/information &amp; ideas?</li> <li>2. Is there a list of references in APA or MLA format?</li> </ol>	15	12	10	0
<b>IV. Writing Quality</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the paper begin with a descriptive and inviting title?</li> <li>2. Is the writing clear and concise?</li> <li>3. Are the style, structure, grammar, spelling, and organization of your paper appropriate, and written in a manner that a college-educated layperson can follow?</li> </ol>	15	12	10	0

## Lead Instructor



**Bill Leach, Ph.D.** is recognized internationally as an authority on collaborative approaches to policymaking and implementation. His studies of collaborative environmental management have been cited over 1,500 times, and appear in the top journals in public administration, public policy, and political science. Dr. Leach has directed over \$1 million of research sponsored by the National Science Foundation, U.S. EPA, and private philanthropies, and has provided scientific and policy advice to federal and state agencies such as the U.S. Government Accountability Office,

National Research Council, and the California Children & Families Commission. Prior to joining USC, he served as Research Director for the Center for Collaborative Policy at California State University, Sacramento, and Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Policy and Administration.

## Weekly Summary

<p><b>Week 1</b> History and Evolution of Collaborative Governance</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b> Appreciate the history and evolution of collaborative governance in the United States. Define and discuss some of the main concepts and terminology of intersectoral leadership</p> <p><b>Readings</b> Gastil, John and William M. Keith (2005) "A Nation that (Sometimes) Likes to Talk: A Brief History of Public Deliberation in the United States." Chapter One in <i>The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century</i>. Edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, (Jossey-Bass). Mazmanian, Daniel A. and Michael E. Kraft (2009) "The Three Epochs of the Environmental Movement." Chapter One in <i>Toward Sustainable Communities: Transition and Transformations in Environmental Policy, Second Edition</i>. Edited by Daniel A. Mazmanian and Michael E. Kraft, (MIT Press). Collaborative Democracy Network (2006) "A Call to Scholars and Teachers of Public Administration, Public Policy, Planning, Political Science, and Related Fields." <i>Public Administration Review</i>, December, Special Issue.</p> <p><b>Assignments</b> Discussion Live session</p>
--	---



<p><b>Week 2</b> Week 02 - Collaborative Governance – Case Studies &amp; Typologies</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b> Define collaborative governance and discuss several examples. Grasp the main criteria that scholars have used to evaluate the outputs and outcomes of a collaborative process.</p> <p><b>Instructional Materials</b> O’Leary, Rosemary (2013) "Collaboration Across Boundaries: Ten Compelling Ideas." Eldon Fields Lecture, presented to the International City/County Management Association.</p> <p><b>Readings</b> <i>Community-Based Collaboration</i>, Preface and Chapter 1. Ansell, C., &amp; Gash, A. (2008) Collaborative governance in theory and practice. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Practice</i>, 18(4), 543-571. Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2010) “Stories from the Field.” Chapter 3 in <i>Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy</i> (Routledge).</p> <p><b>Assignments</b> Discussion Topic submission for case study paper (group)</p>
<p><b>Week 3</b> Effective Process Design – Practitioners’ Perspectives</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b> Understand when collaborative strategies are appropriate, and appreciate some of the arguments for and against collaboration. Develop a working knowledge of the primary, state-of-the-art best practices for designing and implementing an effective collaborative process.</p> <p><b>Readings</b> Susskind, Lawrence and Jennifer Thomas-Larmer (1999) “Conducting a Conflict Assessment.” Chapter 2 in <i>The Consensus Building Handbook</i> (Sage). <a href="http://web.mit.edu/publicdisputes/practice/cbh_ch2.html">http://web.mit.edu/publicdisputes/practice/cbh_ch2.html</a> Straus, David (2002) “Involve the Relevant Stakeholders.” Chapter 2 in <i>How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions</i> (Berrett Koehler). <a href="http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440">http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440</a> “Collaborative Policy” Center for Collaborative Policy <a href="http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/policies.html">http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/policies.html</a> “Five Stages of Collaborative Decisionmaking on Policy Issues” <a href="http://www.csus.edu/ccp/documents/publications/five_stages_diagram.pdf">http://www.csus.edu/ccp/documents/publications/five_stages_diagram.pdf</a> “Conditions Favorable to Initiate a Collaborative Process” <a href="http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/initiate.html">http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/initiate.html</a></p>

	<p>“Conditions Needed to Sustain a Collaborative Policy Process”  <a href="http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/sustain.html">http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/sustain.html</a></p> <p><b>Assignments</b>  Discussion  Live session</p>
<p><b>Week 4</b>  Principled  Negotiation:  Interests vs.  Positions</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>  Discuss the key features of principled, interest-based negotiation for intersectoral leadership.</p> <p><b>Instructional Materials</b>  Ury, William (2010) "The Walk from No to Yes" Ted Talks. (video 18:45)</p> <p><b>Readings</b>  <i>Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In</i>. Chapters 1-8.</p> <p><b>Assignments</b>  Discussion</p>
<p><b>Week 5</b>  Facilitation  Skills for  Intersectoral  Leadership</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>  Understand the core principles of effective facilitation for intersectoral leadership.</p> <p><b>Readings</b>  Kaner, Sam (2014) “Introduction to the Role of Facilitator” and “Facilitative Listening Skills.” Chapters 3 and 4 in <i>Facilitator’s Guide to Participatory Decision-Making, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition</i> (Community at Work, Jossey-Bass).  Straus, David (2002) “Designate a Process Facilitator” and “Facilitative Leadership.” Chapters 5 and 7 in <i>How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions</i> (Berrett Koehler).  <a href="http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440">http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440</a></p> <p><b>Assignments</b>  Discussion  Case study paper (group work)  Case study presentation (group work)</p>
<p><b>Week 6</b>  Public  Participation &amp;  Civic  Engagement</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>  Understand how the goals and approaches differ for various types of intersectoral collaboration such public participation and civic engagement.  Discuss the special challenges and opportunities of online deliberation.</p> <p><b>Instructional Materials</b>  Harwood, Richard (2007) “Harnessing Civic Engagement” (video 3:38)</p> <p><b>Readings</b>  Creighton, James L. (2005) “Defining What Participation Is (and Is Not).” Chapter 1 in <i>The Public Participation Handbook</i>. (John Wiley &amp; Sons).</p>

	<p>Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2004) "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century." <i>Planning Theory &amp; Practice</i> 5(4): 419–436.</p> <p>"Planning Public Engagement: Key Questions for Local Officials" (2012) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. <a href="http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/key_questions_3.pdf">http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/key_questions_3.pdf</a></p> <p>"A Local Official's Guide to Online Public Engagement" (2012) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. <a href="http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/a_local_officials_guide_cp_2-27.pdf">http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/a_local_officials_guide_cp_2-27.pdf</a></p> <p>"Online Engagement Guide" (2014) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. <a href="http://www.ca-ilg.org/online-engagement-guide">http://www.ca-ilg.org/online-engagement-guide</a></p> <p><b>Assignments</b>          Discussion 01          Discussion 02          Topic submission for topic-or-technique paper (individual)          CATME peer evaluation</p>
<p><b>Week 7</b>          Public/Private Partnerships &amp; Contracting</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>          Understand how the goals and approaches differ for various types of intersectoral collaboration such as public-private partnerships and contracting arrangements.          Discuss Milward &amp; Provan's concept of "the hollow state."</p> <p><b>Readings</b>          Zerunyan, Frank V. and Peter Pirnejad (4/2014). "From Contract Cities to Mass Collaborative Governance." <i>American City and County</i>          Milward &amp; Provan, K.G. (2000). Governing the hollow state. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Practice</i>, 10(2), 359-379.          Clayton, Tyrus Ross (2013). "Appendix: Use of Public Private Partnerships." In <i>Leading Collaborative Organizations</i>. iUniverse Press.</p> <p><b>Assignments</b>          Discussion          Live session</p>
<p><b>Week 8</b>          Participatory Budgeting</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>          Understand how the goals and approaches differ for various types of intersectoral collaboration such as participatory budgeting.          Grasp some of the main criteria that scholars have used to evaluate the outputs and outcomes of a collaborative process.</p> <p><b>Instructional Materials</b>          What is Participatory Budgeting, Councilmember? (video 1:36)          Real Money, Real Power: Participatory Budgeting (video 4:18)</p> <p><b>Readings</b>          Lerner, Josh and Secondo, Donata (2012) "By the People, For the People: Participatory Budgeting from the Bottom Up in North America,"</p>

	<p><i>Journal of Public Deliberation</i>: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 2.  <a href="http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art2">http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art2</a></p> <p>“Public Engagement in Budgeting” (2013) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA.  <a href="http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/community_budget_5.5.14.pdf">http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/community_budget_5.5.14.pdf</a></p> <p>“A Local Official’s Guide to Public Engagement in Budgeting.” (2010) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA.  <a href="http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/gf103_peb.pdf">http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/gf103_peb.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Assignments</b>                  Discussion</p>
<p><b>Week 9</b>                  Building Consensus on Science &amp; Policy</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>                  Understand how the goals and approaches differ for various types of intersectoral collaboration such as adaptive management and joint-fact-finding.                  Grasp some of the main criteria that scholars have used to evaluate the outputs and outcomes of a collaborative process.</p> <p><b>Readings</b>  <i>Community-Based Collaboration</i>, Chapters 2-3.                  Karl, Herman A., Lawrence E. Susskind, and Katherine H. Wallace (2007) “A Dialogue, Not a Diatribe: Effective Integration of Science and Policy through Joint Fact Finding.” <i>Environment</i> 49(1): 20-34.                  Leach, William D., Christopher M. Weible, Scott R. Vince, Saba N. Siddiki, John Calanni. 2014. "Fostering learning through collaboration: Knowledge acquisition and belief change in marine aquaculture partnerships." <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 24(3): 591–622</p> <p><b>Assignments</b>                  Discussion                  Topic-or-technique paper (individual work)</p>
<p><b>Week 10</b>                  Effective Process Design – “Pracademic” Perspectives</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>                  Become familiar with several theoretical frameworks that can be used to organize our knowledge of collaborative processes and outcomes.                  Develop a working knowledge of the primary, state-of-the-art best practices for designing and implementing an effective collaborative process.</p> <p><b>Readings</b>  <i>Community-Based Collaboration</i>, Chapters 4-6.</p> <p><b>Assignments</b>                  Discussion                  Topic submission for applications paper and presentation (group)</p>

<p><b>Week 11</b>  <b>Collaborative Governance &amp; Democracy</b></p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>  Understand when collaborative strategies are appropriate, and appreciate some of the arguments for and against collaboration.</p> <p><b>Instructional Materials</b>  Leadbeater, Charles (2008) "Organizations and Democracy" (video 5:36)</p> <p><b>Readings</b>  Leach, William D. (2006) "Collaborative Public Management and Democracy: Evidence from Western Watershed Partnerships." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(s1): 100-110.  Peterson, M. Nils, Markus J. Peterson, and Tarla Rai Peterson (2005) "Conservation and the Myth of Consensus." <i>Conservation Biology</i> 19(3): 576–578.  Leach, William D. (2006) "Theories about Consensus-Based Conservation." <i>Conservation Biology</i> 20(2): 573–575.  Peterson, M. Nils, Markus J. Peterson, and Tarla Rai Peterson (2006) "Why Conservation Needs Dissent." <i>Conservation Biology</i> 20(2): 576–578.</p> <p><b>Assignments</b>  Discussion  Live session</p>
<p><b>Week 12</b>  <b>Collaborative Leadership</b></p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b>  Critically examine one of the influential texts on public or intersectoral leadership.</p> <p><b>Readings</b>  One book on leadership, from the following list, or with instructor approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Donald A. Schon (1984) <i>The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think In Action.</i></li> <li>· Warren Bennis (1989) <i>On Becoming a Leader.</i></li> <li>· John Gardner (1990) <i>On Leadership.</i></li> <li>· Steven B. Sample (2003) <i>The Contrarian's Guide to Leadership.</i></li> <li>· Barbara Crosby and John M. Bryson (2007) <i>Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared Power World.</i></li> <li>· Robert B. Denhardt and Janet V. Denhardt (2011) <i>The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering.</i></li> <li>· Warren Bennis and Patricia Ward Biederman (2009) <i>The Essential Bennis</i></li> <li>· Sheryl Sandberg (2013) <i>Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead.</i></li> <li>· Robert B. Denhardt and Janet V. Denhardt (2014) <i>The Dance of Leadership: The Art of Leading in Business, Government, and Society.</i></li> <li>· Chris Van Gorder (2014) <i>The Front-Line Leader: Building a High-Performance Organization from the Ground Up.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Assignments</b>  Discussion</p>

<p><b>Week 13</b> Framing &amp; Systems Thinking</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b> Understand how framing can be used to devise innovative consensus-based policy solutions.</p> <p><b>Readings</b> Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal (2008) "The Power of Reframing." Chapter 1 in <i>Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership</i></p> <p><b>Assignments</b> Discussion Live Session</p>
<p><b>Week 14</b> Course Synthesis</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b> Become familiar with several theoretical frameworks that can be used to organize our knowledge of collaborative processes and outcomes.</p> <p><b>Assignments</b> Discussion Applications paper (group work) Applications presentation (group work)</p>
<p><b>Week 15</b> Exam, Peer Evaluation, Course Evaluation</p>	<p><b>Learning Objectives</b> Be able to define and discuss the main concepts and terminology of intersectoral leadership.</p> <p><b>Assignments</b> Discussion CATME peer evaluation Exam Course evaluation</p>