

PLUS 667

Effective Engagement With Stakeholders

Summer 2022

Professor Katherine Perez
Syllabus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Course Description](#)

[Course Objectives](#)

[Textbooks & Materials](#)

[Grading](#)

[Policies](#)

[About the Instructor](#)

[Weekly Activities](#)

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

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

Course Description

This course provides an introduction to the history, rationales, processes, and general principles of stakeholder engagement. Through the use of synchronous and asynchronous discussions, case studies, group work, and other materials and activities, this course further examines and analyzes the wide range of methods and tools available to engage with stakeholders and the key skills and competencies needed to do so effectively.

Students have the opportunity to enhance their understanding of stakeholder engagement and their capacity to examine, design, and evaluate stakeholder engagement efforts.

Course Objectives

By the end of this course, you will have:

- Increased understanding of the history, goals, purposes, benefits and challenges, and measures of success for stakeholder engagement
- Broader understanding of the wide range of available methods and techniques used in practice
- Increased capacity to examine and analyze a wide range of engagement tools and techniques and determine their appropriateness in given circumstances
- Sharpened critical-thinking skills regarding what works and doesn't work under different contexts, situations, and purposes for engagement
- Practice planning and designing a process for public participation

Textbooks & Materials

Required Books

- Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2015). *Public participation for 21st century democracy*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass. [This book is available online via the USC Library system.](#)

Articles

- Additional required articles and materials are listed in the weekly overview pages at the end of this syllabus. Copies of these articles can be accessed using the USC Library's E-Reserves system at: <https://reserves.usc.edu/ares/>

These materials are provided in the "Files" link on our 2U Course Site.

Grading and Assignments

This course uses an overall percent-based grading schema for assignment categories, as shown below.

Evaluation Categories	Weighting
Individual Assignments See breakdowns below	50%
Group Assignments See breakdowns below	40%
Overall Participation See breakdown below	10%
TOTAL	100%

Grade Ranges

Grade	Range
A	93.0% or higher
A-	90.0%-92.9%
B+	87.0%-89.9%
B	83.0%-86.9%
B-	80.0%-82.9%
C+	77.0%-79.9%
C	73.0%-76.9%
C-	70.0%-72.9%
D	60.0%-69.9%
F	59.9% or lower

Individual Assignments (50%)

What follows is a breakdown of the individual assignments and assessment rubrics.

Week 04 Assessing the Current State of Stakeholder Engagement in Your Community

Due: 05/25/22 (Before Live Session)

100 points/10% Individual Assignments

For this assignment, you will write a 5- to 7-page double-spaced paper analyzing and assessing the overall quality of stakeholder engagement and public participation in your community. The goal here is to provide an analysis and not just a summary of what is or is not taking place. You can use the questions found on p.172 in your Nabatchi and Leighninger text as a guide to help structure and focus your analysis and discussion. This should be treated as a formal writing assignment and should be formatted accordingly, including an introduction, body, and conclusion. You need to make sure to support your analysis and assessment with external research, available data, and course materials. It should be clear from your paper that you spent some time researching and analyzing the information available in your community.

Week 09 Public Meeting Observation and Improvement Plan Memo

Due: 06/29/22 (Before Live Session)

100 points/10% Individual Assignments

For this assignment you are required to attend and observe a public meeting held by a local city council or other official public body. To complete the written portion of this assignment, you will take on the role of a city staffer who has been charged with assessing and improving the city's current public meeting process.

Using course materials to support and ground your analysis (i.e., Baker et al., 2005, and Nabatchi and Leighninger, p.184), you are charged with writing a 2-page single-spaced memo to the council that outlines your assessment of the meeting you observed and your recommended plan for improvement.

Week 14 Peer Review of Final Projects

Due: 08/03/22

50 points/10% Individual Assignments

For the peer review, you will thoroughly review another group's submission and provide constructive feedback that will help them revise and resubmit their work for a final grade in Week 15. You will use the provided rubric and feedback guides to conduct your assessment and provide feedback and a grade based on the quality of the work you review. You will assign a grade out of 50 points to the group paper you review, and you will receive a grade (out of 50 points) from your instructor based on the quality of your review.

You are required to provide a 2-page double-spaced write-up that discusses and highlights the strengths and areas for improvement in their analysis and recommended participation plan. *What works well? What are the*

particular strengths of their analysis and proposal? Are there potential areas of concern? What hasn't been examined or addressed? What needs to be improved upon moving forward?

You will receive a grade from your instructor based on the quality and thoughtfulness of your review. Your peer review should be thorough and substantive and help the group improve upon their submission. Your instructor reserves the right to adjust/override submission grades if necessary.

Individual Assignments Assessment Rubrics

Although each individual assignment is unique, they will all be assessed according to a few core competencies: quality of analysis, integration of course materials, technical content, organization, clarity, and mechanics.

Individual Assignments Grading Rubric				
Objective/Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor and/or Incomplete
Quality of Analysis 30% (points vary per assignment)	Insightful and thorough analysis of the topic, establishes and maintains clear purpose, ideas developed in depth, and clear understanding of the assignment.	Work establishes a purpose, develops ideas, and shows understanding of the assignment.	Work attempts to establish purpose, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of the assignment.	No clear purpose, lacks clarity of ideas, minimal understanding of the assignment.
Integration of Course Materials, Concepts, and Outside Research 30%	Demonstrates mastery of course concepts and learning and excellent research into the topic. Supporting evidence (including citations and core concept references) is effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course and appropriately applies/integrates course material.	Contains application, understanding, and/or integration of course materials and good research into the topic. Supporting evidence is elaborated and pertinent to the course.	Limited research and minimal reference to or understanding of course materials. Supporting evidence lacks elaboration and is repetitious and/or tangential.	No reference to or demonstrated understanding of course materials. Supporting evidence is nonexistent, random, inappropriate, tangential, or barely apparent.

Organization, Structure, and Coherence 20%	Organized from beginning to end with a fluent, cohesive, and strong point of view.	Organized but may have minor lapses, transitions evident, usually has a clear focus and exhibits a point of view.	Poor transitions, inconsistencies in unity and/or coherence, lacking a point of view and perspective on the assignment.	Serious errors in organization, lacks introduction and/or conclusion, thought patterns difficult to follow.
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics 20%	Few, if any, grammatical or typographical errors are present. Sources are properly cited.	Minor errors are present. Sources are generally cited appropriately.	Contains multiple errors or patterns of errors. Problems are evident in citing sources.	Errors are frequent and severe. Sources are not properly cited or not utilized.

Graded Discussions- Fostering Engagement in a Virtual World (Weeks 02, 09, 12, and 14)

Complete/Incomplete/20% Individual Assignments

Four times during the semester, you are asked to participate in structured asynchronous discussions with your classmates on a range of topics related to stakeholder engagement. The specific discussions are as follows:

- 2.2 Discussion: Climbing Arnstein's Ladder
- 9.3 Discussion: Beyond the Public Meeting
- 12.3 Discussion: Participatory Budgeting Case Analysis
- 14.2 Discussion: Beyond Outputs and Vanity Metrics

These structured discussions are intended to demonstrate one way to create stakeholder dialogue and engaged discussion in a virtual environment. They are also intended to stretch your thinking and understanding of the course material and to provide you with the opportunity to demonstrate your ability to critically and thoughtfully reflect and apply course concepts to practice. You should use course materials throughout to support your observations and arguments (make sure to correctly cite materials where appropriate).

There are three parts to these discussions: (1) initial post; (2) follow up posts to two classmates; and (3) responses to all comments and questions received. In each forum, you will submit an original response in the specified format to the questions and/or assignments posted. In addition, you are required to submit at least two thoughtful follow-up comments with questions to posts from your classmates, and then respond to all questions posed to you by your peers. Please make sure to keep all of these posts on topic and related to the course material under consideration. Your follow-up posts should extend and move the conversation forward and demonstrate your ability to thoughtfully and critically engage with the material and issues being discussed (not just telling another student, "nice post" or "I agree").

Your overall discussion will be evaluated according to: (1) the quality of your analysis and comments/responses to the discussions and questions posed; (2) the extent to which your posts are thoughtful and demonstrate an understanding and utilization of the concepts and course materials addressed; (3) the extent to which you communicate your thoughts in well-constructed, grammatically correct sentences (all posts should be proofread for spelling and grammatical errors before being posted to the discussion board); and (4) the extent of your active and frequent involvement that demonstrates a commitment to learning about stakeholder engagement.

So that we have an equitable distribution of follow-up questions, please look for classmates who have not yet received two follow-up responses. Discussions are considered closed after their due dates and late submissions will not be accepted.

Initial posts: The initial post must be a minimum of 250 words and will be evaluated on how thoroughly it addresses the prompt(s), the depth of insight and analysis evident in the post, and how well it applies and incorporates concepts and ideas from the course material to offer a rational argument rather than a personal opinion.

Follow-up responses and questions: Initial response posts must be a minimum of 150 words (excluding phrases such as “great post” or “well done,” etc.) and must either add to the argument or present an alternate point of view. Follow-ups will be evaluated on whether the required number was posted (questions and responses to questions), the substance of the response, and the depth of insight included in the response.

Final Responses: You must reply to all questions and feedback received by the end of Sunday to close the loop on the discussion and receive full credit.

Graded Discussion Grading Rubric

Below is the rubric for Graded Discussions. Please note that your submissions and participation must fall within the Excellent or Good parameters to receive credit.

Graded Discussion Rubric				
Scoring	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor or Incomplete
Insight, Observation, and Analysis	Thoughtfully responds to the prompt or assignment clearly and directly and offers perspective not present in the readings.	Posts offer concepts worth thinking about, develop ideas in some depth, demonstrate general	Posts address concepts already highlighted, contain rudimentary development of ideas, demonstrate partial understanding	Only partially responds to the prompt, no clear concepts addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, minimal understanding of the

		understanding of the assignment, and generally answer the question effectively.	of the assignment, and minimally answer the question posed.	question, and fails to address the prompt question with substance.
Details and Evidence	Demonstrates mastery of course concepts and learning. Details and supporting evidence are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course and appropriately applies/integrates course material.	Contains application or integration of course materials. Details are elaborated and pertinent to the course.	Details lack elaboration, are repetitious and/or tangential. Minimally references or utilizes course materials.	Details are nonexistent, random, inappropriate, tangential, or barely apparent. Does not utilize or reference course materials.
Follow-Up Responses	Follow-up posts and questions are substantive and contribute to furthering the discussion.	Follow-up posts and questions are substantive and contribute to furthering the discussion.	Follow-up posts and questions may be partially missing or are brief, and lack substance.	Follow-up posts and questions are missing, lack substance, and do not demonstrate thoughtful engagement.
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics	Few, if any, errors are present. Sources are all properly cited.	Minor errors are present. Sources are generally cited appropriately.	Multiple errors or patterns of errors are evident. Problems are evident in citing sources.	Errors are frequent and severe. Sources are not properly cited.

Group Assignments (40%)

Working with stakeholders inevitably means working with various groups and teams in order to accomplish your goals. In order to build your skills and capacities related to working in groups and teams, this course will provide you with multiple opportunities to practice effective teamwork through a semester-long group project. The majority of your work for the course centers on this project and involves identifying, researching, and designing a large-scale stakeholder engagement process with your group. This project is an opportunity for you to apply the course material to locations, institutions, planning processes, or policy areas that are of interest to the class.

Key aspects of this project are completed throughout the semester and will result in a cumulative project paper submitted at the end of the semester. See below for specific deliverables associated with this project.

Week 02/03 Project Group Ideation (05/11/22 and 05/18/22)**Credit/No-credit Group Assignments**

In order to determine project groups for the semester, you are first asked to complete the asynch discussion on the LMS (2.3 Discussion: Identification of Project Interest Areas). To complete this assignment, you need to identify an area, project, or issue in your community that you think would benefit from a thorough stakeholder engagement process. Make sure you have looked through all of the project components to ensure your idea would be a good fit. There are several steps to this assignment:

1. For your initial post, you'll write up a short pitch to be one of the projects used for the semester-long group assignment. Be sure to include enough description and rationale for your choice so it is clear why this would be a good fit for the assignment.
2. The second step involves you reading and reviewing your classmates' suggestions and posting two follow-up questions to your peers.
3. The third step involves replying and answering all questions you received prior to our live session.
4. Before the live session, review your classmates' responses and come to the session with your top three choices. We will discuss the top choices during our live session.

Week 04 Group Project Selection and Process Memo**Due Date: EOD, Thursday, 05/26/22****50 points/5% Group Assignments**

To facilitate a successful project start, this week your group will need to find at least one hour to hold a discussion in real time and write up a team memo outlining your approach and plan for group work this semester. You will need to use Zoom, Google Hangouts, or another third-party collaborative tool that allows you to simultaneously communicate. Try to schedule this as soon as possible so you can accommodate everyone's schedules.

By the end of the week, please have one member of your group submit your team memo (2 pages single-spaced) on behalf of your team that includes the following:

- *Names and Contact Information:* Include a list of team members' names and two forms of contact, indicating which is the preferred method of communication.
- *Project Focus/Topic and Common Purpose:* Provide a brief description of the project your group will be working on with a short rationale for your choice (it should be clear why this would be a good fit for the assignment). What are you being asked to do as a group this semester? To what extent do you have a clear understanding of the goals of the team and have you identified a strategic approach to the tasks at hand?
- *Resource inventory:* What are the strengths and potential challenges of each of your team members? What needs might the team have? Who can do what well?
- *Team norms:* How will you operate as a team? How will you communicate? What will be the standards for expected behavior?

- *Performance strategy*: Who is doing what, how, and by when? What are your fundamental operating principles and expectations for each other? What is your process or system for calling out violations and enforcing boundaries?
- *Action Plan*: Include a detailed timeline and action plan for the semester as a whole.

Week 05 Discussion and Live Session Presentation: Workshopping Core Considerations (Group)

Due Date: Wednesday, 06/01/22

Credit/No-credit Group Assignments

Discussion Post: This week you will work with your project group to think through and discuss how the core process considerations apply to your specific project. This discussion and analysis will help shape and form the basis for your Week 06 Scope of the Project, Level of Impact, and Level of Engagement written assignment. Your team is asked to use the IAP2 spectrum of participation as a guide, and write up a response post that includes the following:

1. A short intro to your topic/issue area
2. *Purpose*: How would you characterize the overall purpose of engaging stakeholders in this particular scenario/project area? What would be the promise to the public?
3. *Process*: What level on the IAP2 spectrum would you recommend for this scenario? Why?

Your team's post should be submitted **24 hours prior to your live session** so that the rest of the class can review prior.

Live Session Presentation: Your team should come to the live session prepared to talk about your answers to the above questions. Each team will get 10-15 minutes to workshop their projects and get feedback from the class. As a team, you may want to think about any questions you have about your project so far that you think others in the class might be able to help with. As individuals, please make sure to read/review the other teams' posts and be prepared with questions, feedback, etc.

Week 06 Scope of the Project, Level of Impact, and Level of Engagement (Group)

Due Date: Wednesday, 06/08/22

50 points/5% Group Assignments

This Scoping assignment gives you an opportunity to really think about the foundational aspects of planning for participation as you think through and determine the context, purpose, and desired impact/outcomes for your engagement. At this point, you will also be determining which level of engagement is most appropriate and providing rationale and justification for your decision. Refer to the W5 Community Engagement Guide found in your readings this week to help guide your thinking on Level of Impact and Level of Engagement required.

To complete this assignment, your team will need to meet and discuss the following aspects of your project. From there you will research and develop a 5- to 7-page double-spaced paper that includes:

1. *Introduction and Overview*: Brief introduction to your area of focus and rationale for why it is a relevant topic/issue for stakeholder engagement.
2. *Context, Background, and Key Issues*: Brief discussion of general background and context for your area of focus. Identify and discuss any relevant key issues (including any current or historical issues) that might have an impact on the project. This is especially important if there are contentious issues that will need to be considered and addressed.
3. *Purpose, Promise, and Desired Outcomes*: Discussion and analysis of your purpose for engaging the stakeholders and the community and what you can promise them in terms of how their involvement and engagement will be used. What is your overall goal and reason for using stakeholder engagement to address this issue? Make sure to answer the following questions: what information do you need from stakeholders; what will you do with it; and what outcomes do you hope to achieve through the engagement?
4. *Level of Impact*: Determine where your project issue falls in terms of impact and discuss your rationale for this assessment.
5. *Level of Engagement*: Drawing from your analysis of your project's purpose, impact, and complexity, determine the level of engagement (IAP2 Spectrum) that is required. Discuss and support your rationale for selecting this level of engagement.

This should be treated as a formal writing assignment and should be formatted accordingly, including an introduction, body, and conclusion. Your analysis and discussion should also be grounded in external research and supported by course materials. All materials should be cited and referenced correctly.

Week 07 Stakeholder Analysis (Group)

Due Date: Wednesday, 06/15/22

50 points/5% Group Assignments

This week, your team will work on completing the formal stakeholder analysis portion of your project. For this assignment, you and your group will need to work together to identify and analyze all of your relevant stakeholders. Your analysis and discussion should be grounded in external research and supported by course materials. One member of your group will need to submit a 5- to 7- double-spaced page paper on behalf of your group that includes a discussion and analysis of the following:

1. Identification and breakdown of key stakeholders, including an analysis and discussion of each stakeholder group's levels of influence and interests. As you begin identifying stakeholders and stakeholder groups, make sure to consider and include the following along with a rationale for your analysis and categorization:

- a. Groups that may be affected by the issue
 - b. Groups that may care or have concerns about the issue
 - c. Groups that have legitimacy or expertise to make decisions on the issue
 - d. Advocates for the issue
 - e. Adversaries of the issue
2. An analysis and discussion of possible barriers to participation and how those might be mitigated
 3. A stakeholder analysis matrix that visually represents your analysis using this table:

Stakeholder group	Level of impact	Level of influence	What is important to the stakeholder	Potential value contribution to issue	Potential threat to issue	Strategy for engaging the stakeholder	

This should be treated as a formal writing assignment and should be formatted accordingly, including an introduction, body, and conclusion. Your analysis and discussion should also be grounded in external research and supported by course materials. All materials should be cited and referenced correctly.

Week 10 Methods, Resource Map, Communications Strategies, Proposed Budget (Group)

Due Date: Wednesday, 07/06/22

50 points/5% Group Assignments

For this assignment, your group will need to meet to discuss, evaluate, and determine the most appropriate methods (tools and techniques) and communications strategies for your project. You will also need to discuss and analyze what resources will be needed for the project in order to develop a proposed budget. From your research and discussions, your group will submit a 5- to 7-page paper that includes the following:

1. An analysis and discussion of the key considerations and constraints shaping your selection of engagement methods and tools. Be sure to analyze and think about things such as what legislative requirements, professional skills, timing and duration, budget, and political significance need to be considered/addressed when choosing an engagement approach.
2. An identification, analysis, and determination of the most appropriate engagement tools and techniques and communication plans for each of the different phases of engagement (you should first identify and discuss the methods recommended and then examine the necessary communication strategies). Based on your analysis, what methods and tools do you recommend for each of these areas and why? Phases and questions to consider include:

- a. *Pre-engagement phase* – What methods and communication strategies are needed up front? What needs to occur prior to engaging with stakeholders?
 - b. *Active Engagement phase*- What are the main engagement methods and communication strategies you're recommending? How do you plan to engage stakeholders and what communication tools will be needed?
 - c. *Post-engagement phase*- What engagement methods and communications strategies will you use after the main engagement efforts have been completed? How will you report back to stakeholders and keep them involved in the process?
3. Given the methods and approaches you have identified, include an analysis of what your project needs in terms of overall resources: time, finances, human resources, etc.
 4. 1-page budget that includes these key elements and required resources.

Week 13 Draft of Final Project for Peer Review (Group)

Due Date: Wednesday, 07/27/22

50 points/5% Group Assignments

This week your group is responsible for preparing, completing, and submitting your project's community engagement plan/proposal for peer review. This is your final document, which brings together all of the work you have done over the semester into a comprehensive and synthesized road map for your participation plan. Your papers should be approximately 15-20 double-spaced pages long and should be a professional and polished product appropriate to submit to a city council or other agency soliciting your consulting services on stakeholder engagement. One member of your team will need to use the link in Week 13 to submit your paper for review. The grade you receive for this assignment will be the average of grades you receive from your peer reviews.

Week 14 Final Project Presentation (Group)

Due Date: Wednesday, 08/03/22

50 points/5% Group Assignments

Your team is required to make a 10-minute presentation during our Week 14 live session. This presentation should provide a basic overview of the project and your participation plan but should also emphasize key insights and lessons learned about designing for stakeholder engagement more broadly. You will need to create and submit a 1-page handout/slide that visualizes your project and engagement plan. Your 1 pager should be posted to the Course Wall prior to the live session.

Week 15 Final Project Submission

Due Date: Wednesday, 08/10/22

100 points/10% Group Assignments

Using the feedback you received from your peer review, you will revise and resubmit your project's community engagement plan/proposal paper to your instructor for grading. This 15- to 20-page paper is the culmination of

the work you have done all semester and should tie everything together into a comprehensive and synthesized road map for your participation plan. This should be a professional and polished product appropriate to submit to a city council or other agency soliciting your consulting services on stakeholder engagement. Your analysis, discussion, and recommendations should be clearly drawn from and grounded in the literature and course materials.

Group Process Evaluations

Credit/No-credit Group Assignments

Twice during the semester, you will be provided an opportunity to evaluate and assess the efforts and contributions made by you and your group members. For all group work, each group member will receive a grade based on the quality of the assignment submitted as well as the results of the Group Process Evaluation surveys that are completed. Your instructor reserves the right to change individuals' grades on assignments and overall participation based on the feedback and grades received in these evaluations. Use this link to complete these evaluations:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSciJ59hYK0Y_QtOTtNig7FLiNsO6wFoLDchEY8iMRmvM0Lk6Q/vi ewform?usp=sf_link

Group Assignment Grading Rubric

For all group work, each group member will receive a grade based on the quality of the assignment submitted as well as the results of the Group Process Evaluations that are completed throughout the semester. Your instructor reserves the right to change individuals' grades on assignments and overall participation based on the feedback and grades received in the evaluations.

Group Assignments Grading Rubric				
Objective/Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor and/or Incomplete
Quality of Analysis 40%	Insightful and thorough analysis of the context, issues, and rationales for stakeholder engagement. Establishes, maintains, and supports a clear purpose and plan. Ideas developed in depth and demonstrates impressive effort and ability to integrate and synthesize work completed over the semester.	Paper includes moderate analysis of context, issues, and rationales for stakeholder engagement. Work establishes and supports a purpose and plan. Ideas are well-developed and there is moderate effort made to integrate and	Paper includes limited analysis of context, issues, and rationales for stakeholder engagement. Work attempts to establish purpose and plan, rudimentary development of ideas, some effort made to integrate and synthesize work	Paper contains minimal analysis of context, issues, and rationales for stakeholder engagement. No clear purpose and plan, lacks clarity of ideas, minimal effort made to integrate and synthesize work completed over the semester.

		synthesize work completed over the semester.	completed over the semester.	
Integration of Course Materials, Concepts, and Outside Research 30%	<p>Demonstrates mastery of course concepts and learning and ability to apply them in the design and development of a stakeholder engagement plan.</p> <p>Details, outside research, and supporting evidence are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course and appropriately apply/integrate course material.</p>	<p>Contains application or demonstrates moderate understanding of course materials and ability to apply them in the design and development of a stakeholder engagement plan.</p> <p>Details, outside research, and supporting evidence are elaborated and pertinent to the course.</p>	<p>Demonstrates minimal integration, application, and understanding of course materials.</p> <p>Minimal use details, outside research, and/or supporting evidence. Details lack elaboration, are repetitious and/or tangential.</p>	<p>Lacks integration, application, and understanding of course materials.</p> <p>Details, outside research, and supporting evidence are nonexistent, random, inappropriate, tangential, or barely apparent.</p>
Assignment Completion 10%	Effectively and compellingly addresses and includes all components of the assignment.	Addresses and includes all components of the assignment.	Missing certain components of the assignment.	Missing significant portions of the assignment.
Organization and Coherence 10%	Organized from beginning to end with a fluent, cohesive, and strong point of view.	Organized but may have minor lapses, transitions evident, usually has a clear focus and exhibits a point of view.	Poor transitions, inconsistencies in unity and/or coherence, lacking a point of view and perspective on the assignment.	Serious errors in organization, lacks introduction and/or conclusion, thought patterns difficult to follow.
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics 10%	<p>Few, if any, grammatical or typographical errors are present.</p> <p>Sources are properly cited.</p>	<p>Minor grammatical or typographical errors are present.</p> <p>Sources are generally cited appropriately.</p>	<p>Multiple grammatical or typographical errors/ patterns of errors are evident.</p> <p>Problems are evident in citing sources.</p>	<p>Grammatical or typographical errors are frequent and severe.</p> <p>Sources are not properly cited.</p>

Overall Participation (10%)

Finally, you will be graded on your active preparation and participation in all aspects of the class. You are responsible for completing all reading and homework assignments and expected to actively and constructively participate in weekly discussions, live sessions, asynchronous activities, and exercises. It is expected that you will be fully engaged in what we are doing, that you will make extensive and positive contributions to your own learning and that of others, and that you will be fully supportive of the work of your fellow students. **Your participation grade will be calculated based on your live session engagement and overall engagement in the course as determined by your professor.** You will earn up to 65 points for your participation during the live sessions and up to 35 points for your overall engagement with- and completion of- the asynchronous materials and activities as assessed by your instructor.

Live Session Participation

This course has weekly required live sessions. Participation in these live sessions is required and is a key component of your overall participation grade. You may fulfill this requirement in one of two ways:

Option A: Attend the live session in real time and actively participate by asking questions, engaging in the discussion, and contributing thoughtful and constructive comments and observations. Simply logging in to the session and attending is not considered active participation and will count *against* your overall grade.

Option B: If you cannot attend a session, it will be recorded and archived for you to view later. In order to receive participation credit for the week, you will need to watch the live session recording and then post a 300- to 500-word response that includes your own answers to the questions posed during the live session (as if you were attending the session and those questions were posed to you), an analysis of what you find to be the key insights or lessons learned from the session, and any follow-up questions you may have. This should NOT just be a summary of the slides and materials presented. You should integrate course materials as appropriate. *To receive credit, you must submit your response to the Live Session Archive by the end of the following week.*

Participation Grading Rubric				
Objective/Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor and/or Incomplete
Live Session Engagement ____/65 points	Actively and constructively participates in all weekly live sessions or posts required make-up assignment. (65)	Constructively participates in most live sessions and make-up assignments. (57)	Modestly or infrequently participates in live sessions and doesn't complete make-up assignments. (50)	Minimal to no weekly participation in live sessions or make-up posts. (35 or below)

Overall Participation ____/35 points	Actively and constructively participates in discussions and asynchronous exercises and activities. Makes extensive and positive contributions to the learning environment. (35)	Constructively participates in most discussions and asynchronous class exercises and activities. Makes contributions to a positive and productive learning environment. (30)	Modestly or infrequently participates in discussions and asynchronous class exercises and activities. Cursory contributions to the learning environment. (25)	Minimal to no weekly participation in discussions and asynchronous class exercises and activities. Unengaged or disruptive of the learning environment. (24 and below)
-----------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Policies

Late Assignments

As mentioned above, unless otherwise noted, all assignments are due by 11:55 p.m. PST on the date to which they are assigned. Anything submitted after that point is considered late. All assignments must be completed and turned in on time for full credit. *The instructor must approve any late work/extensions before the original due date in question to receive credit.* Computer-related problems (e.g., “my computer wasn’t working” or “I wasn’t near my computer”) are not acceptable excuses for late assignments. Late assignments will have 10% of the grade deducted for each day they are late. No assignments will be accepted after the last day of class.

Any asynchronous work and discussion board posts must be submitted on time in order to receive full credit. *Discussion boards and asynch work is considered closed after their due date and nothing submitted after that time will be accepted or graded.*

Writing Expectations

All assignments and written work are expected to be of high quality. All assignments for this course will be graded on the soundness and inclusiveness of your ideas, on your ability to present a persuasive and logical argument on behalf of those ideas, and on your capacity to organize your work sensibly. In other words, your writing should be thoughtful, grounded in the academic literature, logically organized, complete, and lead the reader to a conclusion.

- All documents should be in Microsoft Word format.
- Unless explicitly stated otherwise in the course, all page-length requirements are for double-spaced pages, with 1-inch margins, in 12-point Times New Roman font.
- Make sure you keep a copy of all submitted papers.
- Each paper must be written in APA style. Refer to the APA manual. (6th edition)

Spelling, grammar, punctuation, proper referencing, organization, content, and overall presentation will be graded.

Instructor Announcements & Course Wall

Each week, your instructor will post Instructor Announcements to notify you of weekly expectations and assignments, as well as any other important news as the course progresses. Be sure to look for these as this is where the most up-to-date and critical information about the course is disseminated.

Students are responsible for reading and being aware of the information contained in these announcements. These announcements are considered the first line of communication with everyone in the course. When in doubt about a particular upcoming assignment, be sure to check the Instructor Announcements for information. These are generally posted every so that everyone is on the same page about any changes or updates to the course for that week.

This course will also utilize the course wall as a means of carrying out “real time” communication. You are expected to stay up to date on messages and links posted to the course wall.

Group Work

As discussed above, this course has group work. Working in urban planning and with stakeholders means you will often be working in teams. To help prepare you for this, throughout the semester, you will be working with a group to complete several assignments in this course. For all group work, each group member will receive a grade based on a combination of the quality of the assignment submitted as well as the feedback received on the Group Process Evaluations. Your instructor reserves the right to change individuals' grades based on the feedback and grades received from your group members.

Library Access

As a USC student, you have access to all the USC library resources. Please find out more at the link: <https://libraries.usc.edu/libraries-overview>.

Weekly Activities

Week 01: Introductions and Overviews (5/04/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nabatchi and Leighninger, Chapters 1 and 2 ■ Leyden et al. (2017). Public and stakeholder engagement and the built environment: A review. <i>Current Environmental Health Report</i> (4), 267–277. 	Prior to Live Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	5/04/22
Week 02: History and Basics of Stakeholder Engagement (5/11/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nabatchi and Leighninger, Chapters 3 and 6 ■ Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. <i>Journal of the American Institute of Planners</i> (35)4, 216-22. 	Prior to Live Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities (please note specific expectations and due dates) Week 02 Discussion: <i>Ideation of Project Interest Areas</i> Week 02 Graded Discussion: <i>Climbing Arnstein's Ladder</i>	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	5/11/22
Week 03: Rationales for Engagement (5/18/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading	Prior to Live

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Gustafson & Hertting. (2016). Understanding participatory governance: An analysis of participants' motives for participation. <i>American Review of Public Administration</i> 47(5), 538-549. ■ Selin et al. (2016). Experiments in engagement: Designing public engagement with science and technology for capacity building. <i>Public Understanding of Science</i> 26(6), 634-639. 	Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	5/18/22
Week 04: Understanding Stakeholders and Stakeholder Analysis (05/25/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reed et al. (2009). Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> (90), 1933-1949. ■ Brugha and Varvasovszky (2000). Stakeholder analysis: A review. <i>Health Policy and Planning</i> 15(3), 239-246. <p>Supplemental Reading and Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Schmeer, K. (n.d.). <i>Stakeholder Analysis Guidelines</i>. Partnerships for Health Reform. 	Prior to Live Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities Please note: HIV/AIDS Case Study NOT Required	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	05/25/22
Week 04 Individual Assignment: Assessing the Current State of Stakeholder Engagement	05/25/22 Prior to Live Session
Week 04 Group Project Selection and Process Memo	05/26/22 EOD
Week 05: Planning and Process Considerations (06/01/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nabatchi & Leighninger, Part 3 (pages 239-286) 	Prior to Live Session

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Webler, T., Tuler, S., & Krueger, R. (2001). What is a good public participation process? Five perspectives from the public. <i>Environmental Management</i> 27(3), 435-450. ■ Bingham, L.B., O'Leary, R., & Nbatchi, T. (2005). Legal frameworks for new governance: Processes for citizen participation in the work of government. <i>National Civic Review</i> (Spring), 54-61. ■ Glenorchy City Council. (2017). <i>Community Engagement Procedure</i>. Community Planning and Inclusion Department. <p>Supplemental Material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Vitalyst Health Foundation. (2019). <i>Pre-community engagement: Setting the stage for authentic community engagement</i>. ■ National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation. (2014). <i>Engagement streams framework</i>. 	
<p>Asynchronous Materials and Activities</p> <p>Week 05 Discussion and Live Session Presentation: <i>Workshopping Core Considerations (Group)</i></p>	<p>Group Post: 05/31/22 Presentations: During Live Session 06/01/22</p>
<p>Live Session</p>	<p>06/01/22</p>
<p>Week 06: Cultural Competence, Diversity, and Inclusion (06/08/22)</p>	
<p>Learning Activity</p>	<p>Due Date</p>
<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pyles, L. (2016). Participation and other ethical considerations in participatory action research in post-earthquake rural Haiti. <i>International Social Work</i> 58(5), 628-645. ■ Quick, K.S. and Feldman, M.S. (2011). Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion. <i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i> 31(3), 272-290. ■ Cursue, P.L. and Schrujier, S. (2017). Stakeholder diversity and the comprehensiveness of sustainability decisions: the role of collaboration and conflict. <i>Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability</i> 28, 114-120. ■ Race and Social Justice Initiative. (2012). <i>Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement Guide</i>. Seattle, WA: Seattle Office for Civil Rights 	<p>Prior to live session</p>
<p>Asynchronous Materials and Activities</p>	<p>Prior to livesession</p>
<p>No Live Session- <i>Work in teams to finalize Scope of Project</i></p>	
<p>Week 06 Group Paper: Scope of the Project, Level of Impact, and Level of Engagement (Group)</p>	<p>06/08/22</p>

Week 07: Communication and Facilitation Skills (06/15/22)

Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2010). <i>Social science tools for coastal programs: Introduction to planning and facilitating effective meetings</i>. Charleston, SC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office for Coastal Management. ■ HBS Coursepack articles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Davis & Droppers. (1999). How effective a facilitator are you? ○ Rogelberg. (2018). Why your meetings stink - and what to do about it. 	Prior to Live Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	06/15/22
Week 07 Group Paper: Stakeholder Analysis (Group)	06/15/22
Week 07 Group Process Evaluation I https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSciJ59hYK0Y_QtOTtNjg7FLiNsO6wFoLDchEY8iMRmvM0Lk6Q/viewform?usp=sf_link	06/16/22

Week 08: Handling Challenges: Conflict, Resistance, and Outrage (06/22/22)

Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Suskind, L. & Thomas-Larmer, J. (1999). <i>The consensus building handbook: Conducting a conflict assessment</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 	Prior to Live Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	06/22/22

Week 09: Tools and Techniques to Inform and Consult (06/29/22)

Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Leighninger, M. (2018). <i>Infogagement. Citizenship and democracy in the age of connection</i>. Washington, DC: Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement (PACE). 	06/29/22

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Baker et al. (2005). Critical factors for enhancing municipal public hearings. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 65(4):490-499. 	
Asynchronous Materials and Activities Week 09 Graded Discussion: <i>Beyond the Public Meeting</i>	06/29/22
No Live Session <i>Work on own to complete Public Meeting Observation and/or with groups to prepare for Week 10 deliverable</i>	No Live Session
Week 09 Individual Assignment: Public Meeting Observation and Improvement Plan	06/29/22
Week 10: Tools and Techniques to Explore and Understand (07/06/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Laurian, L. (2007). Deliberative planning through citizen advisory boards. <i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i> 26, 415-434. ■ Sutton, S.E. & Kemp, S.P. (2006). Integrating social science and design inquiry through interdisciplinary design charrettes: An approach to participatory community problem solving. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> 38, 125-139. ■ Ferrero et al. (2018). Experiential learning through role-playing: Enhancing stakeholder collaboration in water safety plans. <i>Water</i> 10, 277. 	Prior to Live Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	07/06/22
Week 10 Group Project Paper: Methods, Resource Map, Communications Strategies, and Proposed Budget (Group)	07/06/22
Week 11: Tools and Techniques to Imagine and Design (07/13/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date

<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Davies, S. R. (2012). Citizen engagement and urban change: Three case studies of material deliberation. <i>Cities</i> 29(6), 351-357. ■ U.S. Department of Transportation. (2016). <i>Supporting performance-based planning and programming through scenario planning</i>. Washington DC: Office of Planning, Environment, & Realty. 	Prior to Live Session
Asynchronous Materials and Activities	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	07/13/22
Week 12: Tools to Deliberate and Decide (07/20/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Benham, C. F., & Hussey, K. E. (2018). Mainstreaming deliberative principles in environmental impact assessment: Current practice and future prospects in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. <i>Environmental Science and Policy</i> 89, 176-183. ■ Street, J. et al. (2014). The use of citizens' juries in health policy decision-making: A systematic review. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i> 109, 1-9. 	Prior to live session
<p>Asynchronous Materials and Activities</p> <p>Week 12 Graded Discussion: <i>Participatory Budgeting Case Analysis</i></p>	Prior to live session
Live Session	07/20/22
Week 13: Emerging Tools and Technologies (07/27/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Poplin, A. (2012). Playful public participation in urban planning: A case study for online serious games. <i>Computers, Environment and Urban Systems</i> 36, 195-206. ■ Seltzer, E. and Mahmoudi, D. (2013). Citizen participation, open innovation, and crowdsourcing: Challenges and opportunities for planning. <i>Journal of Planning Literature</i> 28(1), 3-18. ■ Medima, W. et al. (2016). Exploring the potential impact of serious games on social learning and stakeholder collaborations for transboundary watershed management of the St. Lawrence River Basin. <i>Water</i> 8, 175. 	Prior to Live Session

Asynchronous Materials and Activities	Prior to Live Session
Live Session	07/27/22
Week 13 Draft of Final Project for Peer Review (Group)	07/27/22
Week 14: Evaluation and Outcomes (08/03/22)	
Learning Activity	Due Date
<p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Goodspeed, R. (2017). <i>An evaluation framework for the use of scenarios in urban planning</i>. Lincoln Institute of Land Planning. ■ Reed, M. S. et al. (2018). A common standard for the evaluation of public engagement with research. <i>Research for All</i> 2(1), 143–162. ■ McEvoy, S. et al. (2018). Planning support tools and their effects in participatory urban adaptation workshops. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> 207, 319-333. ■ McTague, C. & Jakubowski, S. (2013). Marching to the beat of a silent drum: Wasted consensus-building and failed neighborhood participatory planning. <i>Applied Geography</i> 44, 182-191. <p>Supplemental Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Salem-Schatz, S. et al. (2010). <i>Guide to the after action review. Using evaluation to improve our work: A resource guide</i>. 	Prior to Live Session
<p>Asynchronous Materials and Activities</p> <p>Week 14 Graded Discussion: <i>Beyond Outputs and Vanity Metric</i></p>	<p>Initial post: 07/30</p> <p>Feedback/ Questions to Peers: 8/01</p> <p>Final Responses: 8/03</p>
Live Session	08/03/22
Week 14 Peer Review of Final Project	08/03/22
Week 14 Draft Project Presentations (option for Final Presentations)	During Live Session

Week 15: Building the Engagement Infrastructure (08/10/22)

Learning Activity	Due Date
Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nabatchi & Leighninger, Chapters 9-10 ■ Leighninger, M. & Moore-Vissing, Q. (2019). <i>Rewiring democracy: Subconscious technologies, conscious engagement, and the future of politics</i>. San Francisco, CA: Public Agenda. 	Prior to 08/10/22
Asynchronous Materials and Activities	08/10/22
Live Session	08/10/22
Week 15 Final Project Submission (Group) Optional to have Final Presentations	08/10/22
Week 15 Group Process Evaluations II https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSciJ59hYK0Y_QtOTtNjg7FLiNsO6wFoLDchEY8iMRmvM0Lk6Q/viewform?usp=sf_link	08/12/22 Optional

Statements 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” 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, policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct.

Support Systems

Counseling and Mental Health - (213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call

studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling

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

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1 (800) 273-8255 – 24/7 on call

suicidepreventionlifeline.org

Free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-9355(WELL), press “0” after hours – 24/7 on call

studenthealth.usc.edu/sexual-assault

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm.

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED) - (213) 740-5086 | Title IX – (213) 821-8298

equity.usc.edu, titleix.usc.edu

Information about how to get help or help someone affected by harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and additional resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants.

Reporting Incidents of Bias or Harassment - (213) 740-5086 or (213) 821-8298

usc-advocate.symplicity.com/care_report

Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions to the Office of Equity and Diversity | Title IX for appropriate investigation, supportive measures, and response.

The Office of Disability Services and Programs - (213) 740-0776

dsp.usc.edu

Support and accommodations for students with disabilities. Services include assistance in providing readers/notetakers/interpreters, special accommodations for test taking needs, assistance with architectural barriers, assistive technology, and support for individual needs.

USC Campus Support and Intervention - (213) 821-4710

campussupport.usc.edu

Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

Diversity at USC - (213) 740-2101

diversity.usc.edu

Information on events, programs and training, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

USC Emergency - UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu, emergency.usc.edu

Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

USC Department of Public Safety - UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-120 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu

Non-emergency assistance or information.