

USC Price

Sol Price School of Public Policy



USC University of
Southern California

PLUS 671: Leading a Collaborative City
Frank V. Zerunyan, JD LLD (hc)
Professor of the Practice of Governance

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Twenty-first-century cities are not islands. They are expected to house more than 70% of the world's population by 2030. Tomorrow's successful urban professionals will work in a world that is at once both more local and more global. The local character of urban development has never been more pronounced. Citizen groups, stakeholders, clients, and customers are all keenly aware of the ways that the built environment shapes the quality of the lived experience, and a wealth of data and technology allows markets, products, policies, and plans to be targeted to specific places and market niches like never before. Yet those projects must necessarily weave into the urban fabric of metropolitan areas and international networks of mega-cities and sectors. This requires new skills and new modes of education.

This course considers how to foster thriving communities in a context where social problem-solving and innovation involve cross-sectoral decision-making and governance. Governance refers to the institutional rules and processes for making collective decisions and delivering public services. This course investigates the problems and issues confronting metropolitan communities and discusses how the actions of public, private, and nonprofit entities can support economic well-being, community health, civic life, and a quality-built environment. The purpose is to interrogate the underpinnings of contemporary issues in policy, planning, and development and to develop theoretical and practical frameworks that may be employed in crafting solutions.

This course focuses on governance as forms of interactions across public, nonprofit, and for-profit sectors, with analysis and applications. An important focus of the USC Sol Price School of Public Policy is the recognition that effective dialogue on various complex social and planning challenges and opportunities requires the combined strengths of the public, for-profit, philanthropic, and nonprofit sectors. 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 are place-based examples.

This course will converge on a set of leadership, ethics, and negotiation skills tailored to a cross-sectoral group of professionals in planning and development. Instruction will focus on the collaborative approaches necessary to bridging the needs of stakeholders in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. As a secondary objective, the course may introduce metrics for performance assessment, project management, methods of writing requests for proposals and responding to such requests, and team-building within and across organizations.

We will collectively deliver this course in eight distinct but relevant topics and several subtopics.

- 1) The city as a place
 - a. The history of the municipal corporation
 - b. Charter as opposed to general law cities
 - c. Full-service or contract cities (Lakewood plan)
 - d. Council/manager form of governance
 - e. Comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR); city revenues and expenses
- 2) Collaborative governance
- 3) Collective impact
 - a. Collaborative networks
 - b. Relevance of stakeholders
 - c. The role of social capital
- 4) Public-private partnerships
 - a. Economic infrastructures
 - b. Social infrastructures
 - c. Requests for qualifications and proposals
- 5) Public finance mechanisms
 - a. Tax increment financing
 - b. Infrastructure finance districts
 - c. Enhanced infrastructure finance districts
 - d. Opportunity zones
 - e. Business improvement districts
- 6) “Newgotiation” for public service professionals
- 7) The role of ethics in the public context
- 8) Leadership as the “glue” of this all

As we meet and discuss the readings, track the mechanisms, and have in-class case studies and simulation exercises, you will develop an increasing understanding of what initially may come across as ambiguous or unclear. This experiential learning models the similar experience of professionals who develop actual intersectoral arrangements: the movement from ambiguity to shared understandings and then to agreement.

Please complete all readings for each module prior to the start of class times. In the class seminar format, the assigned readings are the foundation for all class discussion and activities.

The readings deliberately draw from a wide range of sources, across many disciplines and professional fields such as planning, community development, public administration, policy analysis, journalism, and international development. As you read the articles, please note the varied journals, research methods, and evidence in support for the findings, conclusions, and speculation.

Your prior preparation will increase your contributions to group presentations on the articles and class discussions, as well as provide a way to compare your insights to those of your classmates.

Additional handouts and case studies, as well as guest lecturers, will be provided during the class. As with any graduate class, in response to questions and discussion in class, the schedule may be modified.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

1. Increase skills in leadership, design, management, and evaluation of intersectoral arrangements
2. Increase understanding of local, neighborhood, city, and regional contexts of projects
3. Connect different mechanisms for intersectoral governance with varied outcomes to get the deal done
4. Develop skills for consensus-building, negotiation, and leadership in intersectoral contexts
5. Improve analytical and presentation skills to have impact with your written and verbal work
6. Increase capacity to work through ambiguity, complex problem-solving, and effective inquiry
7. Improve knowledge and skills to effectuate positive change in planning and policy
8. Enrich project experience, with attention to matters of politics and implementation: project definition, collaboration and participation among diverse and often competing actors, and ethical considerations in a real-world setting guided by well-known academics and established professionals

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

1. Each student has one short writing assignment in a memorandum format (10 pages, double-spaced, not to exceed 12 pages, analyzing an intersectoral arrangement). Please see Appendix A for required questions to answer. Due on Week 6 by the end of that week's live session.
2. Case studies: Cases provide context for our discussions. Each case will be analyzed and presented by groups of three to five students selected ahead of time by the instructor. Groups should communicate prior to the session 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 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 case studies on the course wall.
3. Team project: Each team project is a writing assignment of 10–15 pages with an accompanying presentation, analyzing a particular policy issue that involves some aspect of public dispute resolution in a country of your choosing. Please see Appendix A for further details.
4. Each student will have one short reflection paper due on the last day of class.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

- Intersectoral analysis writing assignment. **Due by the end of the Week 6 live session.**
- Participation; succinct and to-the-point discussion on case studies as well as online class presentations. **Due throughout the semester as assigned.**
- Team project: One paper per team and one presentation per team: one grade to each team. You are encouraged to work as a team to achieve the best grade possible for the team. **Due the end of the Week 14 live session.**
- Reflection paper. **Due on final exam day.**
- Note: USC requires a final examination or other final summative experience to be completed on the published final examination schedule.

GRADING BREAKDOWN

<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Weight in Course Grade</u>
Presentations and case study discussion	15%
Intersectoral analysis paper (individual)	30%
Team project, written analysis	20%
Team project, presentation	20%
Lessons Learned Paper	15%

ASSIGNMENT SUBMISSION POLICY

Please submit your written assignments to me via e-mail. Your written assignment must be attached to the e-mail in PDF format. Please name your paper with your last name and assignment number (e.g., zerunyanpaper1.doc). All written assignments are due on Sunday of the week for which they are due by 5:00 p.m.

REQUIRED TEXTS

All readings can be found on the USC Library website ARES: reserves.usc.edu/ares

Tyrus, R. C. (2013). *Leading collaborative organizations: Insights into guiding horizontal organizations*. iUniverse. (USC Bookstore and Amazon)

Duzert, Y., & Zerunyan, F. (2019). *Newgotiation for public administration professionals*. Vandepas Publishing. ISBN 978-1-60042-500-4. (USC Bookstore, Vandepas Publishing website, and Amazon)

Hill, V. D. (2015). *Choose to LEAD*. Cognella Academic Publishing. (Amazon)

Supplemental readings and cases will be posted on Blackboard.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bult-Spiering, M., & Dewulf, G. (2007). *Strategic issues in public private partnerships*. Blackwell Publishing.

Sample, S. B. (2002). *The contrarian's guide to leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Welch, J. (2005). *Winning*. Harper Business.

Brinckerhoff, P. C. (2000). *Social entrepreneurship: The art of mission-based venture development*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Frumkin, H., Frank, L., & Jackson, R. (2004). *Urban sprawl and public health*. Island Press.

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>.

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://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 web page 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>.

Class 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 in print) on the course wall. All lectures slides will be available for download in the course Toolbox.

Week 1: City as a Place

- From Federal Constitutions to State Constitutions
- City Organization and Engagement
- Typical California City Governance Structure
- City Manager Interview (Doug Prichard)
- Fiscal Matters
- Finance Director Interview (Mike Whitehead)

INTRODUCTION AND THE PUBLIC SECTOR: LOCAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES AND GOVERNANCE

Instruction and student introductions. Course and syllabus overview. Selection of individual and group assignment topic areas. Overview and discussion of course structure. Overview of our system of government.

READING:

Zerunyan, F. V. (2016). The evolution of the municipal corporation: The innovations of local governance in California and the preservation of home rule. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 44(1).

Week 2: Collaborative Governance

- Introduction to Collaboration and Collective Impact
- Collaboration Historically and as a New Paradigm
- Continuum of Public Administration and Importance of Governance
- Good Governance and the Benefits of Collaboration
- Collective Impact
- Interview With Kome Ajise

GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC POLICY: COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE INTRODUCTION

READING:

Milward, H. B., & Provan, K. G. (2000). Governing the hollow state. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 359–379.

Zerunyan, F. V., & Pirnejad, P. (2014). From contract cities to mass collaborative governance. *American City and County*.

Tapscott, D., Williams, A. D., & Herman, D. (2008). Government 2.0: Transforming government and governance for the twenty-first century. *New Paradigm*.

Week 3: Case Study: Eight Neighbors

- Case Study: Eight Neighbors Introduction
- Case Study: Eight Neighbors
- Case Study: Eight Neighbors Discussion Forum

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE

CASE STUDY AND CLASS DISCUSSION: The Eight Neighbors: A Case Study in Collaboration and Formalization (See Blackboard under Assignments.)

READING:

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.

Tyrus, R. C. (2013). *Leading collaborative organizations: Insights into guiding horizontal organizations*. iUniverse.

Week 4: The Writing

- Plain Language
- Writing Exercises: Shall
- Use the Active Voice
- Use the Present Tense!
- Use the Past Tense!
- Use Fewer Words
- Use Action Verbs
- Don't Sound Like a Bureaucrat
- Write in Short Sentences and Design

THE BENEFITS OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND “ADDING VALUE” TO PROJECT DELIVERY

CASE STUDY AND CLASS DISCUSSION: Trojan Hills Resort Company—an intersectoral exercise in stakeholder and community consensus-building and adding value. The fact pattern will be posted on Blackboard.

The City of Trojan Hills on the California coast is a community of 70,000 residents. It has a small downtown with a variety of retail uses in two major shopping centers. However, Trojan Hills is known for its beautiful coastline, nature, and equestrian trails. Trojan Hills is relatively affluent and proud of its history and tradition. It is home to one of the best school districts in the state as well as various service organizations. The spirit of volunteerism is quite high in Trojan Hills. A group of investors wishes to form a 21st-century “company” to develop and operate a resort in Trojan Hills.

SOUTH COAST COUNTY GOLF COURSE/PV LANDFILL

South Coast County Golf Course: Proposed Los Angeles County South Coast Golf Course at the closed Palos Verdes landfill site in the city of Rolling Hills Estates. The landfill memorandum will be posted on Blackboard under Assignments.

READING:

Perry, N., Greenhalgh, H., Cong, M. H., Liu, H., & Zhang, Y. (2014). An exploration of the implementation and sustainability of urban area policies aimed at Millennium Development Goals #1 and #7. Prepared for the United Nations Division for Public Administration and Development Management.

Week 5: Public Finance Mechanisms Guest Lecture (Larry Kosmont)

- Interview with Larry Kosmont
- Introduction
- Retail Reimagined, Space Redefined
- The State's Direction on Economic Development
- Opportunity Zones
- Successful Post-RDA Projects: Public-Private Transactions
- Successful Post-RDA Projects: Sustainability and Housing Districts
- Successful Post-RDA Projects: Zoning as an Economic Development Tool
- New World of Economic Development Think Green: What's in Your Wallet?

READING:

Zerunyan, F. V. (2015). The demise of California redevelopment law and the repackaging of tax increments for California municipalities. *Public CEO*. March 24.

Weeks 6, 7, and 8

Week 6: Newgotiation, Part 1

- The Collaborative Frame
- The Why
- Apple Product Launch
- The Prisoner's Dilemma
- Individual Risk Assessment

Week 7: Newgotiation, Part 2

- Newgotiation: Four Steps and Ten Elements
- Common Mistakes in Negotiation
- Reducing the Cognitive Gap
- Implementation and Indicators of Negotiation
- Case Study: Mammoth Motors

Week 8: Case Study: Mammoth Motors Group Preparation

- Case Study: Mammoth Motors Group Preparation

NEGOTIATION AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION; LOOKING FOR THE WIN/WIN OPPORTUNITY

Negotiations and conflict resolution strategies are critical to reaching consensus and enabling a positive policy outcome.

READINGS:

Duzert, Y., & Zerunyan, F. (2019). *Newgotiation for public administration professionals*. Vandepas Publishing. ISBN 978-1-60042-500-4. (USC Bookstore, Vandepas Publishing website, and Amazon)

Davis, A. M. (1989). In theory: An interview with Mary Parker Follett. *Negotiation Journal*, 5(3), 223–235.

CASE STUDY: Mammoth Motors, Part 1—role-playing exercise

Week 9: The Role of Ethics in Public Context

- Human Capital Development
- How Do We Promote Ethics?
- Ethical Dilemma
- Public Conflicts
- Potential Economic Interests
- Transparency Laws: Brown Act

ETHICAL MIND-SET AND AVOIDENCE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

We will evaluate the UN Convention against Corruption UNCAC as evaluated by Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index.

Compare California's Advanced Political Reform Act of 1974 and California Government Code Sections 81000 et seq.

READINGS:

Sargsyan, T., & Zerunyan, F. V. (2016). Analysis of select ethical regulations in the Armenian public service system for the Republic of Armenia and benchmarking the system to California's experience in the United States. *Public Administration Scientific Journal*, Republic of Armenia.

Conflict of interest and ethics policy of Free Law Project, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation. http://freelawproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/005-COI_and_Ethics_policy.pdf

Davis, M., & Johnston, J. (2012). *Conflict of interest in four professions: A comparative analysis*. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK22946/>

Lackey, M.E. Jr., & Minta, J. P. (2012). *Lawyers and social media: The legal ethics of tweeting, Facebooking and blogging*. <http://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1138&context=lawreview>

Suggested outside resource: ABA Model of Code of Professional Responsibility. <http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mrpc/mcpr.authcheckdam.pdf>

Week 10: Effective Public Institutions

- The UN Project for Applied Conceptual Framework, Part 1
- The UN Project for Applied Conceptual Framework, Part 2
- The UN Project for Applied Conceptual Framework, Part 3
- Assignment Work TBD

Week 11: Strategic Planning

- Strategic Planning Introduction
- Vision
- Mission
- Values
- Strategic vs. Tactical
- Developing an Effective Strategic Plan
- Implementing the Strategic Plan

Week 12: Public–Private Partnerships

- Collaboration Leading to Public–Private Partnerships
- Public–Private Delivery Methodologies and Lease-Leaseback
- Public–Private Partnership: The Concession Model
- Other Tools for Public-Private Partnerships
- Professional Piece Interview

EVALUATING GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS. Public–private partnership methodologies for social infrastructures and public structures and finance. Organizational structures in the interaction between sectors.

READING:

Zerunyan, F. V. (Book chapter on PPP)

Zerunyan, F. V. (2016). Building public spaces two leases at a time. *Public CEO*.

Zerunyan, F. V., & Meyers, S. R. (2010). The use of public–private partnerships for special districts and all levels of government. *California Special District*, May-June.

Pagdadis, S. 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 13: Leadership

- Leadership: A Human Endeavor
- Management Compared to Leadership
- Leadership Beyond Authority
- Modern Qualities of Leaders
- Teaching Leadership Skills to Develop Leaders
- Interview With Blanca Pacheco and Claudia M. Frometa
- Leadership Piece Interview
- Evaluation of Your Organization’s Leadership: Case Study TBA

THE LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE

Leadership in today’s complex world of public, nonprofit, and for-profit interest groups is challenging. The intersectoral understanding coupled with the tremendous public policy issues facing leaders’ today range from the economy to housing, education to health care.

The Role of Leadership in Collaboration and Consensus-Building: What Have We learned?

Leaders establish **principles** concerning the way people (constituents, peers, colleagues, and customers alike) should be treated and the way **goals** should be pursued. They **create standards of excellence** and then **set an example** for others to follow. They unravel bureaucracy when it impedes action; they put up signposts when people are unsure of where to go or how to get there; and they **create opportunities for the win/win**.

READINGS:

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95–S120.

Duzert, Y., & Zerunyan, F. (2019). *Newgotiation for public administration professionals*. Vandeplas Publishing. ISBN 978-1-60042-500-4. (USC Bookstore, Vandeplas Publishing web site, and Amazon)

Hill, V. D. (2015). *Choose to LEAD*. Cognella Academic Publishing. (Amazon)

Week 14: Team Project

- Team Project Preparation

Week 15: Team Project

- Team Project Preparation

THANK YOU!

Appendix A

Individual Memorandum Paper (Intersectoral Analysis)

In this paper, each student selects and analyzes an actual case of collaborative governance in the “city.”

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, C., & Gash, A. (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, and so on.
- 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.

Criteria:	Superior	Proficient	Not Proficient	Not Complete
<p><i>I. Collaborative History and Purpose</i></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"> 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
<p><i>II. Collaborative Structure and Process</i></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"> 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 there formal positions? What's the relationship between governmental and nongovernmental participants? 10. Is there a facilitator or a coordinator? What does he or she 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

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>III. Outputs and Outcomes</i></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"> 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, and so on? 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
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>IV. Analysis</i></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"> 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
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>V. References</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2. Does it cite other works appropriately and include a list of references in APA or MLA style? 	10	8	5	0
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>VI. Writing Quality</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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 B

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 10–15 pages, double-spaced, plus references, figures, and so on.*
- 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 a 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are sources cited for all data/information and ideas? • Is there a list of references in APA or MLA format? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 C

Lessons Learned Paper

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

Lessons Learned:

Please select four 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, and so on.
- 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, stakeholderism, engagement, participation negotiation, and leadership.