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**PPD 500: Collaborative Governance**

**(formerly Intersectoral Leadership)**

**Frank V. Zerunyan, J.D.**

**Professor of the Practice of Governance**

**Term:** Spring 2018

**Day and Time:** Thursdays 6:00 p.m. to 7:50 p.m. weekly class sessions (51211)

**Location:** TBA

**Instructor:** Frank V. Zerunyan, J.D.

**Office:** RGL 200

**Office Hours:** By Appointment

**Contact Info:** frank.zerunyan@usc.edu (213) 740-0036

**Course Description**

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

A defining focus of the Price School of Public Policy is its recognition that solving society’s most difficult and important problems requires the combined strengths of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Working across 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 skills necessary for effective intersectoral policy development, planning, and management. This course provides knowledge and tools to design, lead, negotiate, and evaluate programs and policies that have intersectoral dimensions. The case discussions throughout the course are place-based examples in the United States and abroad.

**Learning Objectives**

1. Analyze the institutional and stakeholder context of public problems.
2. Compare the structure, procedures, and goals of various types of intersectoral collaboration such as advisory committees and public-private partnerships.
3. Judge whether collaborative strategies are appropriate in a given context, and articulate arguments for and against using collaborative versus agonistic approaches to improve public administration or policy outcomes.
4. Develop skills for designing, leading, managing, facilitating, and evaluating collaborative intersectoral processes.
5. Develop skills for consensus building and negotiation in intersectoral contexts.
6. Increase capacity to work through ambiguity and complexity in public issues.
7. Practice and refine written and verbal presentation skills.

**Required Texts**

Tyrus Ross Clayton (2013). Leading Collaborative Organizations Insights into Guiding Horizontal Organizations (USC Bookstore and Amazon)

Duzert, Yann and Zerunyan, Frank (2015). Newgotiation for Public Leaders The Art of Negotiating for a Better Deal (Course Reader at the USC Bookstore)

**Suggested or Recommended Readings (not Mandatory for this Class)**

Mirjam Bult-Spiering, Geert Dewulf “Strategic Issues in Public Private Partnerships” Blackwell Publishing (2007)

Peter C. Brinckerhoff “Social Entrepreneurship; The Art of Mission-Based Venture Development” John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (2000)

Robert B. Denhardt, Janet V. Denhardt and Maria P. Aristigueta “Managing Human Behavior in Public and Nonprofit Organizations” 4th Edition, Sage Publications (2016)

**Other Required Readings**

Selected readings and other instructional materials will be distributed via Blackboard. To receive communications from the instructor, please ensure that Blackboard displays your preferred email address.

**Assignments**

1. In class article presentations and discussion of case studies (group): Articles will be analyzed and presented by groups of 3-5 students selected ahead of time by the instructor. Groups should communicate prior to the session in order to prepare to lead a class discussion about the case. A significant part of leadership in the intersectoral context is the ability to succinctly present materials (power point presentation OK) to a group and then lead a productive conversation that not only produces basic statements of facts for the case, but also encourages an exploratory conversation about how issues were handled, how they should/could have been handled, obstacles, and strategies for overcoming obstacles. I will post the Articles and the Case Studies on Blackboard. Each article or case study is assigned to a team or the entire class per this syllabus at various class sessions.
2. Individual writing assignment (Intersectoral Analysis Paper): Analyze in a memorandum format the structure, process, and outcomes of an actual case of collaborative governance (8 to 12 pages, double-spaced). See Appendix One for details. **Due Week 7 Friday by 6 p.m.**
3. Intersectoral Analysis Paper and Presentation (group): Team project: An analysis of a real intersectoral governing arrangement (10 to 12 pages, double-spaced; plus a 15-minute presentation to the class). See Appendix Two for details. **Due Week 11 Friday by 6 p.m..**
4. Take-home Lessons Learned Paper (8 to 12 pages, double-spaced).See Appendix Three for details. **Due on designated final exam day.**

Note: USC requires a final examination or other final summative experience to be completed on the published [final examination schedule](http://classes.usc.edu/term-20171/classes/ppd/).

**Grading Breakdown**

**Assignment Weight in Course Grade**

Presentations & Case Study discussion 15%

Intersectoral analysis paper (individual) 25%

Team project, written analysis 20%

Team project, presentation 20%

Final exam or paper 20%

**Assignment Submission Policy**

Please submit your written assignments to me via email. Your written assignment must be attached to the email in a PDF format. Please name your paper with your last name and assignment number (as in zerunyanpaper1.doc)

**Additional Policies**

This is a two unit course and very interactive. You are very important to the class. Your attendance is of utmost importance. Please no unexcused absences and certainly not more than 2 excused absences per student.

**Course Schedule**

All reading assignments should be completed for the day they are listed. I will assign readings to various groups (TEAMs) for class presentations (see below). I will post all readings (except the books or reader in print) on Blackboard under “Assignments.” All class lectures are on Power Point and will be posted on Blackboard under “Content” (subject to slight variations)

**Week 1: January 11- Introduction and Overview of the Sectors: Public, Private, Non-Profit**

**Readings**

Bardach, Eugene, and Eric M. Patashnik (2016) “Things governments do” (Appendix B) and “Understanding public and nonprofit institutions” (Appendix C) in *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition.* CQ Press.

Collaborative Democracy Network (2006) “A Call to scholars and teachers of public administration, public policy, planning, political science, and related fields.” *Public Administration Review* 66(s1):168-170.

*\*Clayton, Tyrus Ross* (2013) *Leading Collaborative Organizations Insights into Guiding Horizontal Organizations.* iUniverse LLC. (Chapters 1 and 2)

**Optional Readings**

*\*Mazmanian, Daniel A.* and Michael E. Kraft (2009) “The three epochs of the environmental movement.” Chapter One in *Toward Sustainable Communities: Transition and Transformations in Environmental Policy, Second Edition.* Edited by Daniel A. Mazmanian and Michael E. Kraft. MIT Press.

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 1 in *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century.* Edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine. Jossey-Bass.

**Week 2: January 18 - Collaborative Governance: Focus on Public Sector Institutions/Local Governance**

**Readings**

Ansell, Chris and Allison Gash (2008) “Collaborative governance in theory and practice.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Practice,* 18(4), 543-571.

*\*Zerunyan, Frank V. (*2016) “Evolution of the municipal corporation and the innovations of local governance in California to preserve home rule and local control.” Under review at *Fordham Urban Law Journal.*

**Optional Readings**

Firehock, Karen E. (2011) “An Overview of the community based-collaborative movement in the United States .” Chapter 1 in *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice.* Edited by Frank Dukes, Karen Firehock, and Juliana Birkhoff. University of Virginia Press. [https://library.usc.edu/uhtbin/cgisirsi/x/0/0/5?searchdata1=4906599{CKEY}](https://library.usc.edu/uhtbin/cgisirsi/x/0/0/5?searchdata1=4906599%7bCKEY%7d)

*\*Leach, William D.* (2006) “Collaborative public management and democracy: Evidence from Western Watershed partnerships.” *Public Administration Review* 66(s1): 100-110.

*\*Cooper, Terry L .,* Thomas A. Bryer, and Jack W . Meek (2006) “Citizen-centered collaborative public management.” *Public Administration Review* 66(s1):76-88.

Jung, Yong-Duck, \**Daniel Mazmanian & \*Shui-Yan Tang* (2009) “Collaborative governance in the United States and Korea: Cases in negotiated policymaking and service delivery.” *International Review of Public Administration* 13(s1):1-11.

**Week 3: January 25 - Case Study in Collaborative Governance “Eight Neighbors”**

**Readings**

Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2010) “Stories from the field.” Chapter 3 in *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy.* Routledge.

**Optional Readings**

*\*Musso, Juliet, \*Christopher Weare,* Thomas Bryer, and *\*Terry L. Cooper* (2011), “Toward ‘strong democracy’ in global cities? Social capital building, theory-driven reform, and the Los Angeles neighborhood council experience.” *Public Administration Review* 71(1):102–111.

Kathi, Pradeep Chandra and \**Terry L. Cooper* (2005) “Democratizing the administrative state: Connecting neighborhood councils and city agencies.” *Public Administration Review* 65(5):559-567.

**Assignments**

Case study discussions (group). Please read the case study before coming to class.
Rios, Katherine Drew and Steven Rathgeb Smith (2013) “The Eight Neighbors Partnership: A Case Study in Collaboration.” Electronic Hallway, Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.

**Week 4: February 1 – Examples of Collaboration in Governance (Part II) MPO Models**

**Assignments**

Case study discussions (group) or Guest Speaker

Southern California Association of Governments.

**Week 5: February 8 – Collaborative Governance: Focus on Private Sector Institutions – Class Presentation of the Powell Article**

**Readings**

Millward, H. Briton and Keith Provan (2006) “A manager’s guide to choosing and using collaborative networks.” IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Powell, Walter W. (1990) “Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization.” *Research in Organizational Behavior* 12:295-336. **TEAM Rolling Hills Estates**

**Assignments**

Case study discussions (group) Please read before class the case study.
*\*Zerunyan, Frank V.* “Trojan Hills Resort Company.”

**Week 6: February 15 - Collaborative Governance: Focus on Nonprofit/NGO Institutions – Class Presentation of the Ferris Article**

**Readings**

*\*Ferris, James M. and \*Williams, Nicholas P. O.* (2013) "Offices of strategic partnerships: helping philanthropy and government work better together." *The Foundation Review* 5(4):24-36. **TEAM Redondo Beach**

Chen, Bin and *\*Elizabeth A. Graddy* (2010) “The effectiveness of nonprofit lead‐organization networks for social service delivery.” *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 20(4):405-422.

**Optional Readings**

*\*Ferris, James M. et al. “Bold Leadership and Future of American Cities: Drawing on Detroit. The USC Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy in partnership with The Kresge Foundation. Stanford Social Innovation Review*

**Assignments**

Your Individual paper is due today.

**Week 7: February 22 - Networks and Social Capital – Class Presentations of Provan and Coleman Articles**

**Readings**

Provan, Keith G. and Milward, H. Brinton (2001) “Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public-sector organizational networks.” *Public Administration Review* 61(4): 414-423. **TEAM Palos Verdes Estates**

Coleman, James (1988) “Social capital in the creation of human capital.” *American Journal of Sociology* 94:s95-s120. **TEAM Rancho Palos Verdes**

**Optional Readings**

Lee, Hyung-Woo, *\*Peter J. Robertson, \*LaVonna Lewis, \*David Sloane,* Lark Galloway-Gilliam, and Jonathan Nomachi (2012) “Trust in a cross-sectoral interorganizational network: An empirical investigation of antecedents.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(4):609-631.

*\*Leach, William D.* and Paul A. Sabatier. 2005. "To trust an adversary: Integrating rational and psychological models of collaborative policymaking." American Political Science Review 99(4): 491-503.

*\*Leach, William D.* and Paul A. Sabatier (2005) "Are trust and social capital the keys to success?" In Paul A. Sabatier, et al. (eds.) *Swimming Upstream: Collaborative Approaches to Watershed Management.* MIT Press, pp. 233-258.

Sabatier, Paul, *\*William Leach,* Mark Lubell, and Neil Pelkey (2005) "Theoretical frameworks explaining partnership success." In Paul A. Sabatier, et al. (eds.) *Swimming Upstream: Collaborative Approaches to Watershed Management.* MIT Press, pp. 173-200.

**Week 8: March 1 - Public Private Partnerships**

**Readings**

*\*Zerunyan, Frank V.* and Peter Pirnejad (2014) “From contract cities to mass collaborative governance.” *American City & County* April 2, 2014.

*\*Zerunyan, Frank V.* and Steven R. Meyers (2010) “The use of public private partnerships for special districts and all levels of government.” *California Special District* 5(3):28,47-50.

*\*Clayton, Tyrus Ross* (2013). “Appendix: Use of public private partnerships.” In *Leading Collaborative Organizations.* iUniverse Press.

Little, Richard G. (2010) “Beyond privatization: Rethinking private sector involvement in the provision of civil infrastructure.” Chapter 3 in Ascher, W., Krupp, C. (Eds.) *Physical Infrastructure Development: Balancing the Growth, Equity, and Environmental Imperatives.* Palgrave

Pagdadis, Sotiris A. et al. (2008) “A road map to success for public private partnerships of public infrastructure initiatives.” *The Journal of Private Equity* 11(2):8-18

**Week 9: March 8 - Stakeholder Analysis**

**Readings**

Varvarovszky, Z. and Brugha, R. (2000). “How to do (or not to do) a stakeholder analysis.” *Health Policy and Planning* 15(3):338-345.

Straus, David (2002) “Involve the relevant stakeholders.” Chapter 2 in *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions.* Berrett Koehler.<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440>

**Optional Readings**

Susskind, Lawrence and Jennifer Thomas-Larmer (1999) “Conducting a conflict assessment.” Chapter 2 in *The Consensus Building Handbook.* Sage. <http://web.mit.edu/publicdisputes/practice/cbh_ch2.html>

**Assignments**

Case study discussions (group). Please read the report before class.
Rolling Hills Estates (2003) Summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed South Coast Golf Course at the closed Palos Verdes Landfill.

**SPRING BREAK**

**Week 10: March 22 - Public Participation and Civic Engagement – Class Presentations of the Fung and Innes Articles**

**Readings**

Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2004) “Reframing public participation: strategies for the 21st Century.” *Planning Theory & Practice* 5(4): 419–436. **TEAM Los Angeles**

Fung, Archon (2006) “Varieties of participation in complex governance.” *Public Administration Review* 66(s1):66-75. **TEAM Long Beach**

Institute for Local Government (2012) “Planning public engagement: Key questions for local officials.” <http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/key_questions_3.pdf>

Institute for Local Government (2012) “A local official’s guide to online public engagement.” <http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/a_local_officials_guide_cp_2-27.pdf>

**Optional Readings**

Institute for Local Government (2012) “Online engagement guide.”
<http://www.ca-ilg.org/online-engagement-guide>

Creighton, James L. (2005) “Defining what participation is (and is not).” Chapter 1 in *The Public Participation Handbook.* John Wiley & Sons.

International Association for Public Participation. (2007) “IAP2 spectrum of public participation.” <http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/imported/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf>

Carlson, Chris (2008). “Understanding the spectrum of collaborative governance processes” in *A Practical Guide to Collaborative Governance.* Policy Consensus Initiative.
<http://www.policyconsensus.org/publications/practicalguide/collaborative_spectrum.pdf>

**Week 11: March 29 - Student team presentations in class**

**Week 12: April 5 – Student team presentations in class**

**Week 13: April 12: Negotiation and Consensus Building**

**Readings**

Ury, William, Roger Fisher, and Bruce Patton (2011). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In.* 2nd edition or newer.

Duzert, Yann and \**Frank* *Zerunyan* (2015). *Newgotiation for Public Leaders: The Art of Negotiating for a Better Deal.* Newgotiation Publishing.

**Optional Readings**

Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, D.M.; and B. Barry (2009) “Selecting a strategy” and “Resolving differences.” Readings 1.2 and 6.1 in *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition.* McGraw-Hill.

Davis, Albie M. (1989) “In theory: An interview with Mary Parker Follett,” *Negotiation Journal* July:223-235.

Ury, William (2010) "The walk from no to yes" Ted Talks. (video 18:45) <https://www.ted.com/talks/william_ury?language=en>

**Week 14: April 19 – Multi-party Negotiation Role Play**

**Assignments**

Howitt, Arnold and Gerald Cormick (1996) “Mammoth Motors' New Paint Shop.” Kennedy School of Government Case Program, Harvard University.

**Week 15: April 26 - The Role of Facilitation and Leadership in Governance – Guest Speaker?**

**Readings**

Kaner, Sam (2014) “Introduction to the role of facilitator” and “Facilitative listening skills.” Chapters 3 and 4 in *Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making, 3rd Edition.* Community at Work, Jossey-Bass.

Straus, David (2002) “Designate a process facilitator” and “Facilitative leadership.” Chapters 5 and 7 in *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions.* Berrett Koehler. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440>

**Optional Readings**

*\*Sample, Steven B.* (2002) *The Contrarian's Guide to Leadership.* Jossey-Bass.

*\*Van Gorder, Chris* (2014) *The Front-Line Leader: Building a High-Performance Organization from the Ground Up.* John Wiley & Sons.

***\*****Leach, William D.* “Building a theory of collaboration.” Chapter 6 in *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice.* Edited by Frank Dukes, Karen Firehock, and Juliana Birkhoff. University of Virginia Press. [https://library.usc.edu/uhtbin/cgisirsi/x/0/0/5?searchdata1=4906599{CKEY](https://library.usc.edu/uhtbin/cgisirsi/x/0/0/5?searchdata1=4906599%7BCKEY)}

 “Conditions needed to sustain a collaborative policy process” Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/sustain.html

**Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems**

**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](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](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://adminopsnet.usc.edu/department/department-public-safety>.  This is important for the safety of the 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* provides 24/7 confidential support. <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/>

The *Sexual Assault Resource Center* webpage describes reporting options and other resources. <http://sarc.usc.edu>

## **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*, which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students.  <http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali>

*The Office of Disability Services and Programs* provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations.
<http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html>

If an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible, *USC Emergency Information* will provide safety and other updates, including ways in which instruction will be continued by means of blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technology. <http://emergency.usc.edu>

Appendix One **Individual Memorandum Paper**

**(Intersectoral Analysis)**

In this paper, each student selects and analyzes an actual case of collaborative governance.

Learning objectives:

* Analyze the institutional and stakeholder context of public problems.
* Analyze the structure, process, and outcomes of an actual case of collaborative governance, using concepts from the readings, lectures, and class discussion.
* Practice and refine written presentation skills.

Cases should conform to the Ansell and Gash (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

Structure:

* Approximately 10-12 pages, double-spaced, plus references, figures, etc.
* The paper should use headings I through V specified in the grading rubric
* Refer to grading rubric on following pages

Source material:

Information for the case must be gleaned from at least two independent sources. Ideally, 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 the instructor before contacting groups directly.

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Individual memorandum Paper** |
| *Superior:* 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:* Fully addresses each required component. Provides insightful analysis evidencing knowledge of key concepts or facts. *Not Proficient:* 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:* Fails to address required components, or incoherent. |
| ***Criteri*a:** | ***Superior*** | ***Proficient*** | ***Not Proficient*** | ***NotComplete*** |
| I. Collaborative History and Purpose*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?
 | 15  | 13 | 10 | 0 |
| II. Collaborative Structure and Process*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, phone)?
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 is the Collaborative 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 their 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?
 | 20 | 18 | 15 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| III. Outputs and Outcomes*To the extent feasible based on available sources, address as many numbered topics as you can.*1. Has the Collaborative produced any policy statements or recommendations?
2. If so, was the policy adopted by the target audience? Was the policy implemented? Would this have happened without the Collaborative?
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?
4. Has the Collaborative produced any changes in social capital, trust, working relationships, culture, etc?
5. Has the Collaborative had a positive (or negative) effect on the policy issues it seeks to address? Is it successful?
6. Any other tangible or intangible outputs or outcomes?
 | 20 | 18 | 15 | 0 |
| IV. Analysis*Address all five questions, drawing upon the readings, guest lectures, and/or class discussion.*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?
2. What would you say have been the Collaborative’s greatest accomplishments to date?
3. What appear to be the most important reasons for the Collaborative’s successes to date?
4. What would you say have been the Collaborative’s greatest shortcomings to date?
5. What have been the greatest obstacles to success?
 | 20 | 18 | 15 | 0 |
| V. ReferencesDoes 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. 1. Does it cite other works appropriately, and include a list of references in APA or MLA style?
 | 10  | 8 | 5 | 0 |
| VI. Writing Quality1. Is the writing clear and concise?
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?
 | 15  | 13 | 10 | 0 |

Appendix Two **Intersectoral Memorandum and Presentation**

In this group assignment, students analyze a particular type of intersectoral collaboration, with reference to relevant theory and one or more actual cases.

Learning objectives:

* Analyze the structure, procedures, and goals of a specific type of intersectoral collaboration.
* Practice and refine written and verbal presentation skills.

Structure:

* Approximately 10-12 pages, double-spaced, plus references, figures, etc.
* Plus a 15-minute presentation to the class
* I recommend <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/590/1/>
* This memo is to support your presentation in class (in the real world I call this the “leave behind”)
* Refer to grading rubrics on following pages

Student groups select one of the following types of intersectoral collaboration:

 The topic of one of your team member’s individual paper; or

 Any other intersectoral collaboration

Please let me know your selected topic. Also select the audience to which you wish to present and address your writing. I will make sure that we do not have duplications in class. Thanks.

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Intersectoral Group Memorandum**  |
| * **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 |
| **Overview of the Topic Application**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 |
| **Analysis**To what extent does the paper:* make a compelling argument rather than being purely descriptive?
* raise especially insightful questions?
* suggest novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic?
* suggest original solutions?
* support its ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or coherent explanations?
* integrate material from readings, lectures, or outside materials?
* 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?)
* suggest directions for future research?
 | 40 | 35 | 25 | 0 |
| **Source Material*** Are sources cited for all data/information & ideas?
* Is there a list of references in APA or MLA format?
	+ MLA Style Guide: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/>
	+ APA Style Guide: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>
 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 0 |
| **Writing Quality*** Does the paper begin with a descriptive and inviting title?
* Is the writing clear and concise?
* Are the style, structure, grammar, spelling, and organization of your paper appropriate, and written in a manner that a college-educated layperson can follow?
 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 0 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Group Presentations** |
| **Criteria:** | **Superior** | **Proficient** | **Not Proficient** | **Not Complete** |
| Content\_\_/ 40 points | 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) |
| Visuals\_\_/ 20 points | Engaging visuals help tell the story. (need not be elaborate if a minimalist theme is 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) |
| Delivery\_\_/ 20 points | Team members spoke 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) |
| Participation\_\_/ 10 points | 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) |
| Duration\_\_/ 10 points | 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) |

Appendix Three **Lessons Learned Paper**

In this paper, students apply concepts from throughout the course. Lessons Learned.

Please select 4 core principals or lessons that you learned in this course that you prefer over others. Provide a brief analysis and apply these lessons to real problems that you know or anticipate.

Learning objectives:

* Analyze lessons learned.
* Judge whether collaborative strategies are appropriate in a given real context, and articulate arguments for and against using collaborative versus agonistic approaches to improve democratic practice or policy outcomes.
* Practice and refine written communication skills.

Structure:

* Approximately 8-12 pages, double-spaced, plus references, figures, etc.
* Refer to the grading rubric for Intersectoral Group Memorandum.

The assignment is somewhat flexible but most papers will fall within categories such as governance, intersectoral collaboration, public private partnerships, Stakeholdership, engagement, participation negotiation, leadership etc.