

PPD 500

Intersectoral Leadership

Summer 2018

William D. Leach
leachw@price.usc.edu

24/7 Technical Support
(877) 646-1885
<http://usc.echelp.org/>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Course Description](#)

[Course Objectives](#)

[Textbooks & Materials](#)

[Communication](#)

[Grading Policies](#)

[Assessment Methods](#)

[Live Session Schedule](#)

[Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems](#)

[About the Instructor](#)

15 Weekly Activities

[1](#) | [2](#) | [3](#) | [4](#) | [5](#) | [6](#) | [7](#) | [8](#) | [9](#) | [10](#) | [11](#) | [12](#) | [13](#) | [14](#) | [15](#)

Course Description

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.

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/>

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 decision making, 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 place-based approaches, not only in the United States, but also globally. The case discussions throughout the course are place-based examples.

Course Objectives

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

1. Discuss the history and evolution of collaborative governance in the United States.
2. Analyze the institutional and stakeholder context of public problems.
3. Compare the structure, procedures, and goals of various types of intersectoral collaboration such as advisory committees and public-private partnerships.
4. Evaluate whether collaborative strategies are appropriate in a given context, and argue for or against using collaborative versus agonistic approaches to improve public administration or policy outcomes.
5. Articulate the key features of principled, interest-based negotiation for intersectoral leadership.
6. Participate successfully as a stakeholder in collaborative intersectoral processes.
7. Consult with professional mediators to design, lead, manage, and facilitate intersectoral consensus-building processes.
8. Collaborate effectively across cultures.
9. Communicate about intersectoral issues through written and verbal presentations.

Textbooks & Materials

Required Books:

- *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, 2nd edition or newer, Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton (Penguin, 2011). **ISBN-13:** 978-0143118756
- *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice*. Edited by Frank Dukes, Karen Firehock, and Juliana Birkhoff (University of Virginia Press). Available in hardcopy (2011), paperback (2016), Kindle, or online through the USC library. **ISBN-13:** 978-0813938752 <https://muse-jhu-edu.libproxy1.usc.edu/book/16283>
- 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 15 Discussion in Moodle.

Negotiation Simulation - License and Software:

- By the end of Week 3, students need to register for a personal account with iDecisionGames. The total cost of the registration and license fees is \$33.00.
- Sign-up here: <https://idecisiongames.com/promo-home?code=PPD500-Summer-2018>
- If the above link does not work, register at <https://idecisiongames.com> using access code: PPD500-Summer-2018

- Please contact support@idecisiongames.com if you have any registration issues.
- Note: iDecisionGames requires the free Chrome internet browser available at: <https://www.google.com/chrome/>

Articles and e-books:

- Straus, David (2002) *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions*. Berrett Koehler Press. Available through the USC library: <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440>
- Weekly readings provided through a Google Drive folder in the General section of the course in Moodle.

Library Access

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

Communication

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 an instructor posts an announcement, an email will be sent to each student on the roster.

Yammer

Yammer is tool for informal communication among the students and the instructors, and can be accessed via an embedded module in the course or through the Yammer smartphone app. Via email, students will receive an invitation to join the Yammer group for PPD 500.

Office Hours

Students are always welcome to arrange to speak with the instructors by appointment via phone or video conference. Email is usually the best way to schedule a time to talk.

Grading Policies

Numeric Ranges for Final Course Grades

| Grade | Range | Grade | Range |
|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|
| A | ≥ 93% | C+ | ≥ 77%, < 80% |
| A- | ≥ 90% < 93% | C | ≥ 73%, < 77% |
| B+ | ≥ 87% < 90% | C- | ≥ 70%, < 73% |
| B | ≥ 83%, < 87% | D | ≥ 60%, < 70% |
| B- | ≥ 80%, < 83% | F | < 60% |

Note: [Minimum grade for graduate credit: C](#)

This course uses a percent based grading schema, depicted below in two different formats.

| Graded Components (grouped by project) | Percentage of Final Grade |
|--|---------------------------|
| Discussions (16 @ 3%; drop 2 lowest of 18) | 48% |
| Negotiation Simulation Roleplays (2 @ 6%) | 12% |
| Group Case Study Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation, 10% • Individual contributions to group project, 5% | 15% |
| Individual Paper <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic Submission, 1% • Paper, 24% | 25% |
| TOTAL | 100% |

Late Assignments

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.

Assessment Methods

Discussions (48% — best 16 out of 18 @ 3% each)

Each week includes one discussion assignment that addresses the assigned readings for the week. Students are expected to write thoughtful responses that demonstrate detailed knowledge of the readings, and that use rational argument or evidence to support all claims. Students will post their initial responses to the discussion prompts by Day 5 of each week, and will pose follow-up questions or comments to two of their classmates by Day 7. Up to 10 points (out of 20) will be deducted if a student does not post the required number of follow-ups.

Week 5 also includes a discussion of the prior week’s group presentations, plus a discussion assignment designed to prepare students for the negotiation simulation the following week. Week 6 includes a post-negotiation debrief discussion..

| Weekly Discussion Rubric | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Criteria | Superior | Proficient | Partially Proficient | Incomplete |
| Relevance, Application, Originality __ / 6 points | Addresses the question; uses ideas from the readings; unique perspective; clear focus. (6) | Addresses the question; uses ideas from the readings; usually has clear focus. (4) | Addresses the question but little substance added; inconsistencies in coherence. (2) | Fails to address the question posed, or incoherent. (0) |
| Insight, Observation, Analysis __ / 6 points | Offers significant concept or idea, developed in depth, with clear understanding of the assignment. (6) | Offers a valuable perspective; develops ideas; evidences understanding of assignment. (4) | Addresses concepts already highlighted; rudimentary understanding of the assignment. (2) | No clear concept addressed, or serious lack of clarity. (0) |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Details/ Evidence __ / 4 points | Details are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course. (4) | Details are elaborated and pertinent to the course. (3) | Details lack elaboration or are repetitious. (2) | Details are absent or unrelated. (0) |
| Grammar, usage, mechanics __ / 4 points | Few or no errors. (4) | Several minor errors. (3) | Multiple significant errors. (2) | Errors are frequent and severe. (0) |

Group Presentation (10%) and Negotiation Simulations (2 @ 6% each)

This course has three group assignments:

- Case study presentation due Week 04
- Two-player negotiation simulation during Week 06
- Six-player negotiation simulation during Week 08

In Week 02, the instructor will place students in groups of 3 to 5 students to work on the case study presentation, due at the end of Week 04.

In Week 06, students will be grouped in pairs, and will need to arrange a mutually agreeable hour during the week to participate in a two-player online negotiation role-play exercise.

In Week 08, students will be placed in groups of six, and will need to arrange a mutually agreeable 2-hour block to participate in a six-player online negotiation role-play exercise.

Detailed instructions and grading rubrics for each assignment are provided in Moodle. 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 contributing member of the group will generally receive the same grade for group assignments. Students will also be graded on their individual contribution to group assignments as discussed below.

Individual Contribution to Group Presentation (5%)

This grade is based on the following two items:

- Responding to a peer evaluation survey administered through CATME in weeks 05 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.

Individual Paper (25%)

The major summative assignment for the course is an individual term paper due Week 13. Students submit a proposed topic for the paper during Week 9, and then proceed with the consent and advice of the instructor.

Weekly Structure

Each day of the week is numbered according to the table below. Day 1 is Wednesday, the first day of the beginning of each weekly session. Deadlines for all assignments are stated in day numbers. Assignments are due no later than 11:55 pm. in the Pacific Time zone on the day that is stated within the assignment page and the weekly activity table.

| Day 1 | Day 2 | Day 3 | Day 4 | Day 5 | Day 6 | Day 7 |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------|---------|
| Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Monday | Tuesday |

Live Session Schedule

Live sessions will be held on **Day 02 from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. Pacific Time** during the following weeks:

- Week 02 - Thursday, May 17
- Week 04 - Thursday, May 31
- Week 06 - Thursday, June 14
- Week 08 - Thursday, June 28, 2-hour session **6:00 to 8:00 p.m**
- Week 10 - Thursday, July 12
- Week 14 - Thursday, August 9

Each live session may entail:

- Lectures on course material
- Interactive Q&A with students and faculty
- Negotiation role play exercises or debriefs of prior exercises

To attend live sessions:

- Open the meeting room at <https://zoom.us/j/416966906>
- The Zoom app will launch automatically (or if it's not yet installed, it will guide you through installation).
- In the Zoom app, connect your audio by computer or by phone (use phone for best audio quality).
- Use headphones with a built-in microphone to eliminate echo and feedback noise.

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 Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards” <https://policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b/>

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>

Support Systems

Student Counseling Services (SCS) - (213) 740-7711 – 24/7 on call

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

<https://engemannshc.usc.edu/counseling/>

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1-800-273-8255

Provides free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. <http://www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org>

Relationship & Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-4900 - 24/7 on call

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm. <https://engemannshc.usc.edu/rsvp/>

Sexual Assault Resource Center

For more information about how to get help or help a survivor, rights, reporting options, and additional resources, visit the website: <http://sarc.usc.edu/>

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED)/Title IX compliance – (213) 740-5086

Works with faculty, staff, visitors, applicants, and students around issues of protected class.

<https://equity.usc.edu/>

Bias Assessment Response and Support

Incidents of bias, hate crimes and microaggressions need to be reported allowing for appropriate investigation and response. <https://studentaffairs.usc.edu/bias-assessment-response-support/>

Student Support & Advocacy – (213) 821-4710

Assists students and families in resolving complex issues adversely affecting their success as a student EX: personal, financial, and academic. <https://studentaffairs.usc.edu/ssa/>

Diversity at USC

Tabs for Events, Programs and Training, Task Force (including representatives for each school), Chronology, Participate, Resources for Students. <https://diversity.usc.edu/>

About the Instructor

Bill Leach, Ph.D. is recognized internationally as an authority on collaborative approaches to policymaking and implementation. His studies of collaborative environmental management appear in the top journals in public administration, public policy, political science, and environmental management. 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 various federal and state agencies. 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 Activities

* Denotes Price School authors.

| Week 01: History and Evolution of Collaborative Governance | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Community-Based Collaboration</i>, Preface and Chapter 1. • *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> 66(s1):168-170. <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • Bardach, Eugene, and Eric M. Patashnik (2016) “Things governments do” (Appendix B) and “Understanding public and nonprofit institutions” (Appendix C) in <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition</i>. CQ Press. | ~ | ~ |
| Week 01 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 01 Assignment 1: Interest Survey | Day 5 | |

| Week 02: Collaborative Governance - Case Studies & Typologies | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| <p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> O'Leary, Rosemary (2013) "Collaboration Across Boundaries: Ten Compelling Ideas." Eldon Fields Lecture, presented to the International City/County Management Association. <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ansell, C., & 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>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *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." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 71(1):102–111. Kathi, Pradeep Chandra and *Terry L. Cooper (2005) "Democratizing the administrative state: Connecting neighborhood councils and city agencies." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 65(5):559-567. *Cooper, Terry L., Thomas A. Bryer, and Jack W. Meek (2006) "Citizen-centered collaborative public management." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 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." <i>International Review of Public Administration</i> 13(s1):1-11. | ~ | ~ |
| Week 02 Checkpoint: Case Study Groups | ~ | ~ |
| Week 02 Live Session | Day 2 | ~ |
| Week 02 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |

| Week 03: Effective Process | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Susskind, Lawrence and Jennifer Thomas-Larmer (1999) "Conducting a Conflict Assessment." Chapter 2 in <i>The Consensus Building Handbook</i> (Sage). http://web.mit.edu/publicdisputes/practice/cbh_ch2.html 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). http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440 "Collaborative Policy" Center for Collaborative Policy http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/policies.html "Five Stages of Collaborative Decisionmaking on Policy Issues" http://www.csus.edu/ccp/documents/publications/five_stages_dighram.pdf "Conditions Favorable to Initiate a Collaborative Process" http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/initiate.html "Conditions Needed to Sustain a Collaborative Policy Process" http://www.csus.edu/ccp/policymaking/sustain.html <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Varvarovszky, Z. and Brugha, R. (2000). "How to do (or not to do) a stakeholder analysis." <i>Health Policy and Planning</i> 15(3):338-345. | ~ | ~ |
| Week 03 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 04: Principled Negotiation: Interests vs. Positions | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| <p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video (18:45) William Ury (2010) "The walk from no to yes." Ted Talks. <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In.</i> Chapters 1-8. | ~ | ~ |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duzert, Yann and *Frank Zerunyan (2015) <i>Newgotiation for Public Leaders: The Art of Negotiating for a Better Deal</i>. Newgotiation Publishing. • 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 <i>Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition</i>. McGraw-Hill. | | |
| <p>Week 04 Live Session</p> | <p>Day 2</p> | <p>~</p> |
| <p>Week 04 Discussion 1</p> | <p>Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7</p> | <p>20 point scale; 3% of course grade</p> |
| <p>Week 04 Assignment 1: Case Study Presentation (Group)</p> | <p>Day 7</p> | <p>100 point scale 10% of course grade</p> |
| <p>Week 05: Facilitation Skills for Intersectoral Leadership</p> | | |
| <p>Learning Activity</p> | <p>Due Date</p> | <p>Scale</p> |
| <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, 3rd 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). http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisid/detail.action?docID=10315440 <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PON (Project on Negotiation) (2012) “BATNA Basics: Boost Your Power at the Bargaining Table.” Harvard Law School, Harvard University. | <p>~</p> | <p>~</p> |
| <p>Week 05 Discussion 1: Communication & Facilitation Forum</p> | <p>Day 5</p> | <p>20 point scale; 3% of course grade</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| Week 05 Discussion 2: Case Study Reviews | Day 5 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 05 Discussion 3: Pre-negotiation notes | Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 04 Assignment 1: CATME Peer Evaluations | Day 7 | 20 point scale; 5% of course grade |
| Week 06: Building Consensus on Science & Policy | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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. | ~ | ~ |
| Week 06 Live Session | Day 2 | ~ |
| Week 06 Discussion 1: Collaborative Learning | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 06 Discussion 2: Post-negotiation Debrief | After completing the two-player negotiation roleplay | |

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Week 06 Assignment 1: Negotiation Roleplay #1 | Day 2 | 20 point scale; 6% of course grade |
| Week 07: Effective Process Design - Pracademic Perspectives | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *<i>Community-Based Collaboration</i>, Chapters 4-6. Recommended Readings (optional): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, D.M.; and B. Barry (2009) <i>Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition.</i> McGraw-Hill. Reading 3.11 “Can’t Beat Them? Then Join a Coalition.” 3.12 “Building and Maintaining Coalitions and Allegiances throughout Negotiations.” 3.13 “The Surprising Benefits of Conflict in Negotiating Teams.” | ~ | ~ |
| Week 07 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 08: Public Participation & Civic Engagement | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| Instructional Material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video (3:38) Richard Harwood: Harnessing Civic Engagement. • Video (2:30) Deliberative Polling • IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creighton, James L. (2005) “Defining What Participation Is (and Is Not).” Chapter 1 in <i>The Public Participation Handbook</i> (John Wiley & Sons). • Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2004) “Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century.” <i>Planning Theory & Practice</i> 5(4): 419–436. • “Planning Public Engagement: Key Questions for Local Officials” (2012) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/key_questions_3.pdf • “A Local Official’s Guide to Online Public Engagement” (2012) | ~ | ~ |

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/a_local_officials_guide_cp_2-27.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Online Engagement Guide” (2014) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/online-engagement-guide <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fung, Archon (2006) “Varieties of participation in complex governance.” <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(s1):66-75. • Carlson, Chris (2008). “Understanding the spectrum of collaborative governance processes” in <i>A Practical Guide to Collaborative Governance</i>. Policy Consensus Initiative. http://www.policyconsensus.org/publications/practicalguide/collaborative_spectrum.pdf | | |
| Week 08 Live Session | Day 2 | ~ |
| Week 08 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 08 Assignment 1: Negotiation Roleplay #2 | Day 2 | 20 points; 6% of course grade |
| Week 09: Public/Private Partnerships & Contracting | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Zerunyan, Frank V. and Peter Pirnejad (4/2014). “From Contract Cities to Mass Collaborative Governance.” <i>American City and County</i> • Milward & 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>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Zerunyan, Frank V. and Steven R. Meyers (2010) “The use of public private partnerships for special districts and all levels of | ~ | ~ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>government.” <i>California Special District</i> 5(3):28,47-50.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Little, Richard G. (2010) “Beyond privatization: Rethinking private sector involvement in the provision of civil infrastructure.” Chapter 3 in Ascher, W., Krupp, C. (Eds.) <i>Physical Infrastructure Development: Balancing the Growth, Equity, and Environmental Imperatives</i>. Palgrave. ● Pagdadis, Sotiris A. et al. (2008) “A road map to success for public private partnerships of public infrastructure initiatives.” <i>The Journal of Private Equity</i> 11(2):8-18. | | |
| <p>Week 09 Discussion 1</p> | <p>Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7</p> | <p>20 point scale; 3% of course grade</p> |
| <p>Week 09 Assignment 1: Topic Submission for individual Paper</p> | <p>Day 7</p> | <p>20 point scale; 1% of course grade</p> |
| <p>Week 10: Participatory Budgeting</p> | | |
| <p>Learning Activity</p> | <p>Due Date</p> | <p>Scale</p> |
| <p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Video (1:36) What is Participatory Budgeting, Councilmember? ● Video (4:18) Real Money, Real Power: Participatory Budgeting ● Video (4:14) Deliberative Polling®: It's Not A Come-On From A Cult. It's A New Kind Of Poll! <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lerner, Josh and Secondo, Donata (2012) "By the People, For the People: Participatory Budgeting from the Bottom Up in North America." <i>Journal of Public Deliberation</i> 8(2), Article 2. http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art2 ● “Public Engagement in Budgeting” (2013) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/community_budget_5.5.14.pdf ● “A Local Official’s Guide to Public Engagement in Budgeting.” (2010) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/gf103_peb.pdf <p>Recommended:</p> | <p>~</p> | <p>~</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gordon, Victoria, Jeffery L. Osgood, Jr., and Daniel Boden (2017) <i>Participatory Budgeting in the United States: A Guide for Local Governments</i>. Routledge Press. ● Gilman, H. R. (2016). <i>Democracy reinvented: Participatory budgeting and civic innovation in America</i>. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. ● Pape, Madeleine and Lerner, Josh (2016) "Budgeting for Equity: How Can Participatory Budgeting Advance Equity in the United States?" <i>Journal of Public Deliberation</i> 12(2). http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol12/iss2/art9 ● Lerner, J. (2014). <i>Everyone counts: Could participatory budgeting change democracy?</i> Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. | | |
| Week 10 Live Session | Day 2 | ~ |
| Week 10 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 11: Collaborative Governance & Democracy | | |
| Learning Activity | | |
| Due Date | | |
| Scale | | |
| Instructional Material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Video (5:36) "Organizations and Democracy" Charles Leadbeater, 2008. Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● *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. | ~ | ~ |
| Week 11 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 | 20 point scale; |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Replies: Day 7 | 3% of course grade |
| Week 12: Cross-Cultural Collaboration | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| <p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video (4:40) "Managing Conflict Across Cultures." Jeanne Brett, Dispute Resolution Research Center, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University. • Video (2:34) "Negotiating Across Cultures." Harvard Business Review, February 25, 2016. • Video (2:17) "Getting to Yes Across Cultures." Harvard Business Review, November 25, 2015. <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adler, Peter S. and Juliana E. Birkhoff (2002) "Talking with Native Americans" in Building Trust: When Knowledge From "Here" Meets Knowledge From "Away" (Portland, OR: National Policy Consensus Center), pp. 14-15 only. • Sherman, Marlon (2007) "The promise and the challenge of cooperative conservation." <i>Frontiers in Ecology</i> 5(2), pp. 98-99 only. • Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, and B. Barry (2009) "Negotiation across Cultures." Section 5 in <i>Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition.</i> McGraw-Hill, pp. 321-361. | ~ | ~ |
| Week 12 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 13: Individual Paper | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As needed to inform individual paper | | |
| Week 13 Assignment 1: Individual Paper | Day 7 | 100 point scale; 24% of course grade |

| Week 14: Framing & Systems Thinking | | |
|---|---|---|
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal (2008) "The Power of Reframing." Chapter 1 in <i>Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership</i> | ~ | ~ |
| Week 14 Live Session | Day 2 | ~ |
| Week 14 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 15: Collaborative Leadership | | |
| Learning Activity | Due Date | Scale |
| Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One book on leadership (For details, see Discussion 1) | ~ | ~ |
| Week 15 Checkpoint: Course Evaluation | Day 7 | ~ |
| Week 15 Discussion 1 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |
| Week 13 Discussion 2 | Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7 | 20 point scale; 3% of course grade |