

PPD 672

Collaborative Governance

4 Units

Term

Fall 2022

Instructor

William D. Leach, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

1. [Course Description](#)
2. [Course Objectives](#)
3. [Textbook and Materials](#)
4. [Grading Policies](#)
5. [Graded Activity Categories](#)
6. [Grading Rubrics](#)
7. [Other Policies](#)
8. [Live Sessions](#)
9. [Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems](#)
10. [Weekly Activity Schedule](#)

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

Course Description

PPD 672 - Collaborative Governance

"Theory and practice of collaborative policy and planning processes involving stakeholders from public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Leadership skills in the design and facilitation of multi-party negotiations and consensus-building." USC Catalogue

A defining focus of the Price School of Public Policy is its recognition that solving society's most difficult and important problems requires the combined strengths of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Working across sectors requires an understanding of institutional complexity, and an ability to resolve conflict and seek collaborative solutions. This course provides a foundation in understanding institutional arrangements and developing the skills necessary for effective intersectoral policy development, planning, and management. This course provides knowledge and tools to design, lead, negotiate, and evaluate programs and policies that have intersectoral dimensions. The case discussions throughout the course are place-based examples primarily in the United States.

Course Objectives

By the end of this course, students should be able to:

1. Analyze the institutional and stakeholder context of public issues.
2. Compare the structure, procedures, and goals of various types of intersectoral collaboration such as advisory committees and public-private partnerships.
3. Evaluate whether collaborative strategies are appropriate in a given context, and argue for and against using collaborative versus conventional approaches.
4. Practice principled, interest-based negotiation in intersectoral contexts.
5. Design and facilitate intersectoral consensus-building processes.
6. Describe challenges in cross-cultural communication, and strategies to overcome them.
7. Communicate about collaborative governance through written and verbal presentations.

Textbooks and Materials

Required books to purchase:

- *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management*, Edited by Jack Wayne Meek (Edward Elgar, 2021) ISBN: 978 1 78990 190 0
 - e-Book available for \$65 on [eBooks.com](https://www.ebooks.com). Recommended free e-reader: Adobe Digital Editions, which permits search, annotations, and copy-and-paste.
 - Also available on Google Play but the Google Play Books e-reader has limited functionality and I do not recommend it.
 - A limited number of digital copies may be available from the USC Library.
https://uosc.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01USC_INST/hs9vaa/alma991043448694903731
- *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, 2nd edition or newer, Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton (Penguin, 2011). Example ISBN: 978-0143118756
 - Widely available from [online booksellers](#).
- One additional book on leadership, of the student's choice, subject to instructor approval. For a list of pre-approved books, refer to the Week 15 Discussion in Blackboard.

Negotiation simulation - license and software to purchase:

- By the end of Week 3, students need to register for a personal account with iDecisionGames. The total cost of the registration and license fees is about \$45.
- Detailed registration instructions will be provided within Blackboard under "Homepage for PPD 672."

Other articles and e-books:

- Weekly readings provided in the Readings Folder within Blackboard.

Grading Policies

Grading Ranges for Final Course Grades

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

Course Grade of Incomplete

Only when work is not completed because of documented illness or other "emergency" occurring after the 12th week of the semester (or 12th week equivalent for any course scheduled for fewer than 15 weeks) may the professor assign a course grade of Incomplete (IN). An "emergency" constitutes a situation or event that could not be foreseen, and which is beyond the student's control and which prevents the student from taking any final paper or exam or completing other work during the final weeks of class. A student may not request an Incomplete (IN) before the end of the 12th week (or 12th week equivalent for any course scheduled for fewer than 15 weeks).

Course Grade Components

Graded Activity Categories	Grading Scale (points possible)	Number of items in the category	Weight of each item in Course Grade	Category Weight in Course Grade
Short Essays (Choose 8 of 9 opportunities)	20	8	3%	24%
Discussions (Choose 8 of 9 opportunities)	20	8	1.5%	12%
Group Case Study Presentation				
• Video Presentation	100	1	10%	10%
• Individual contributions to project	20	1	4%	4%
Negotiation Simulation Roleplays				
• Pre-negotiation notes	20	1	2%	2%
• Post-negotiation reflection	20	2	2%	4%
• Negotiation participation	20	2	4%	8%
Papers	100	2	18%	36%
TOTAL				100%

Graded Activity Categories

Individual Work (72%)

Short Essays (24%). Nine weeks include one short essay assignment (500+ words) that involves applying and integrating material from the assigned readings for the week. Students are expected to write thoughtful responses that demonstrate detailed knowledge of the readings, and that use rational argument or evidence to support all claims. Short essays are uploaded to Turnitin by Day 7. Eight of the nine short-essay opportunities must be submitted for a grade.

Discussions (12%). Nine weeks include one discussion assignment. Similar to short-essays but somewhat less formal and detailed (300+ words for the initial post), discussions involve applying material from the week's assigned readings. The initial post is due Day 5. Students must then reply by Day 7 to at least two of their classmates' posts by providing additional insight or evidence. Eight of the nine discussion opportunities must be submitted for a grade.

Papers (36%). The course includes two major writing assignment (each approximately 2,500 words). These assignments are designed to allow students to explore specific subtopics in depth, focusing on the student's areas of interest. For each paper, students choose from three flexible paper prompt formats (1) Case Study Paper, (2) Topic-or-Technique Paper, and (3) Applications Paper. No more than one of the submitted papers should follow the Case Study format.

Paper #1 can be submitted at any time during Weeks 7 to 10.

Paper #2 can be submitted at any time during Weeks 11 to 14.

At least three weeks before each paper is submitted, students should submit to the instructor a brief written description of their proposed topic, and the instructor will then provide guidance and/or approval to proceed. Students are encouraged to informally discuss topic ideas with the instructor at any time.

Group Work (28%)

Case Study Presentation (10%). In Week 02, the instructor will place students in groups of 3 to 5 students to work on the case study presentation, due at the end of Week 04.

Individual Contribution to Case Study Presentation (4%). This grade is to be based on the following two items:

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

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

Negotiation Simulations (14%)

- Two-player negotiation simulation. In Week 06, students will be grouped in pairs, and will participate in a two-player online negotiation role-play exercise. The exercise will take place during the scheduled live session. Required preparation for the role-play will include reading the role-play instructions and completing the Week 05 "Pre-negotiation Notes" and Week 06 "Post-negotiation Debrief."
- Six-player negotiation simulation. In Week 08, students will be placed in groups of six, and will participate in a six-player online negotiation role-play exercise. The exercise will take place during a special two-hour scheduled live session. Required preparation for the role-play will include reading the role-play instructions, preparing a negotiation strategy, and completing the Week 08 "Post-negotiation Debrief."

Grading Rubrics

Grading Rubric for Short Essays and Discussions (20 points maximum)				
Criteria	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Relevance, Application, Originality (6 points)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the readings, and provides a unique perspective (6)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the readings, usually has clear focus (5)	Addresses the question but with little substance, inconsistencies, or partial incoherence (3)	Fails to address the question posed, or incoherent (0)
Insight, Observation, Analysis (6 points)	Offers significant analysis and insight with clear understanding of the question (6)	Offers some analysis or insight with clear understanding of the question (5)	Addresses concepts already highlighted; rudimentary understanding of the question (3)	No clear concept addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, or shows minimal understanding of the question (0)
Details & Evidence (4 points)	Details and evidence are effective, illuminating, and pertinent to the question (4)	Details and evidence are elaborated and pertinent to the question (3)	Details and evidence are scant or repetitious (2)	Details are absent or tangential to the question (0)
Writing Style & Mechanics (4 points)	Writing style is clear, concise, inviting, and free of mechanical errors (4)	Some stylistic problems or mechanical errors (3)	Multiple errors or patterns of errors (2)	Errors are frequent and severe (0)

Grading Rubric for the Case Study Group Presentation Video (100 points max)

Criteria	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Content (40 points)	Coherent and well-organized presentation responsive to the assignment (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 (16 points)	Engaging visuals help tell the story (Need not be elaborate if a minimalist theme is more appropriate) (16)	Appropriate visuals help tell the story, with few exceptions (11)	Visual elements lack clarity or distract from the presentation (6)	None or inappropriate (0)
Delivery (16 points)	Team members spoke <i>on video</i> with appropriate confidence, clarity, and enthusiasm, without exception (16)	Team members spoke <i>off camera</i> with appropriate confidence, clarity, and enthusiasm, with few exceptions (11)	A lack of confidence, clarity, or enthusiasm detracted from the presentation (6)	Delivery far below expectations for graduate work (0)
Collaborative Presentation (16 points)	Each teammate has a significant speaking role (16)	One teammate lacks a significant speaking role (11)	Two teammates lack a significant speaking role (6)	Only one teammate narrates the presentation (0)
Duration (10 points)	10-15 minutes for 4 or 5-person group; 8-12 minutes for 3-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)
VoiceThread Settings (2 points)	Advance slides automatically (1 pt) Add your instructor as an author of the presentation (1 pt)			

Grading Rubric for the Case Study Paper

- ▣ **Superior (S):** Raises especially insightful questions, with or without solutions. Integrates material from readings, lectures, or outside materials. Suggests novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic, and supports these ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or explanations.
- ▣ **Proficient (P):** Fully addresses each required component. Provides insightful analysis evidencing knowledge of key concepts or facts.
- ▣ **Not Proficient (NP):** Minimally addresses the required components or fails to address some components. Offers straightforward or obvious analysis. Betrays a misunderstanding of key concepts or facts. Summarizes information without elaboration, analysis, or critique.
- ▣ **Incomplete (I):** Fails to address required components, or incoherent.

Criteria or Paper Sections	S	P	NP	I
Overview Section I. Collaborative History and Purpose Section II. Collaborative Structure and Process	30	25	15	0
Analysis Section III. Collaborative Outputs and Outcomes Section IV. Analysis of the Case 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 & ideas? • Is there a list of references in APA format? 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

Grading Rubric for the Applications Paper & Topic-or-Technique Paper

- ▣ **Superior (S):** Raises especially insightful questions, with or without solutions. Integrates material from readings, lectures, or outside materials. Suggests novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic, and supports these ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or explanations.
- ▣ **Proficient (P):** Fully addresses each required component. Provides insightful analysis evidencing knowledge of key concepts or facts.
- ▣ **Not Proficient (NP):** Minimally addresses the required components or fails to address some components. Offers straightforward or obvious analysis. Betrays a misunderstanding of key concepts or facts. Summarizes information without elaboration, analysis, or critique.
- ▣ **Incomplete (I):** Fails to address required components, or incoherent.

Criteria	S	P	NP	I
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 & ideas? • Is there a list of references in APA format? 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

Other Policies

Weekly Structure

The course is organized into 15 week-long units. Each day of the week is numbered 1 through 7. Wednesday is always the first day of the week:

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

Due dates for all assignments are stated in day numbers. **Assignments are due no later than 11:59 p.m.** in the Pacific Time zone on the day that is stated within the assignment page and the weekly activity table.

File Submission Protocol

All file submissions will be handled electronically through Blackboard. In the event of electronic submission problems via Blackboard, you may provide duplicate submissions via e-mail to the instructor as a record of your timely submission.

Unless otherwise noted by your instructor, all written assignments and submissions should be single-spaced and submitted as a Microsoft Word document.

Please label all submitted files with your last name followed by the name of the assignment (e.g., Lastname_Week7Paper1.doc).

Late Assignments

No assignments are accepted after their due dates without prior permission. At their discretion, faculty may grant extensions for extenuating circumstances, as defined in the USC student handbook. If you are unable to complete an assignment on time, please notify your instructor as soon as feasible. Please communicate with your instructor if you find yourself falling behind or if you need any assistance with an assignment.

Form and Style for All Written Work

Write in plain, concise prose (such as described in Strunk and White's classic *Elements of Style*). Provide in-text author-date citations for all ideas, phrasing, or facts you borrow from other sources. Include page numbers in citations wherever feasible; if your citation is especially insightful, novel, or contentious, your instructor or classmates may wish to look it up. Provide a list of cited references in APA format. Err on the side of being too inclusive in your citations of facts and ideas included in your work. It is good professional practice to guide your readers to your source materials, and liberal citations helps avoid plagiarism issues.

If addressing a topic that is highly contested, one way to strengthen your response is to clearly and fairly articulate both sides of the controversy. Analytical arguments that come down on one side or the other are welcome, especially if they critique the opposing perspective through theoretical or empirical arguments that reference the assigned readings, videos, lectures, or

other sources. In addition to demonstrating your knowledge of the assigned readings, feel free to cite sources beyond the required materials. This helps you integrate your new knowledge from this course with ideas you have gleaned from your other courses or experiences.

Contacting the Instructor

Email is the most reliable way to contact me. I typically respond within a few hours, and rarely more than 24. Email is also the best way to schedule a time for a phone or video call. You may text me if you need my immediate attention.

Live Sessions

Day 1 (Wednesday) of Weeks 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 14.

6-7pm Trojan Time (except Week 8 which is a two-hour session, 6-8pm)

Zoom link available in Blackboard.

Please note: The Week 6 session coincides with Yom Kippur, October 5. This session is devoted entirely to a two-player roleplay exercise, and the exercise can be rescheduled for later in the week. Please let your instructor know if you would like to reschedule.

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Academic Conduct:

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards”_ policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on [Research and Scholarship Misconduct](#).

Students and Disability Accommodations:

USC welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University’s educational programs. The Office of Student Accessibility Services (OSAS) is responsible for the determination of appropriate accommodations for students who encounter disability-related barriers. Once a student has completed the OSAS process (registration, initial appointment, and submitted documentation) and accommodations are determined to be reasonable and appropriate, a Letter of Accommodation (LOA) will be available to generate for each course. The LOA must be given to each course instructor by the student and followed up with a discussion. This should be done as early in the semester as possible as accommodations are not retroactive. More information can be found at osas.usc.edu. You may contact OSAS at (213) 740-0776 or via email at osasfrontdesk@usc.edu.

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 for Equity, Equal Opportunity, and Title IX (EEO-TIX) - (213) 740-5086

eetix.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 for Equity, Equal Opportunity, and Title for appropriate investigation, supportive measures, and response.

The Office of Student Accessibility Services (OSAS) - (213) 740-0776

osas.usc.edu

OSAS ensures equal access for students with disabilities through providing academic accommodations and auxiliary aids in accordance with federal laws and university policy.

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, Equity and Inclusion - (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.

Office of the Ombuds - (213) 821-9556 (UPC) / (323-442-0382 (HSC)

ombuds.usc.edu

A safe and confidential place to share your USC-related issues with a University Ombuds who will work with you to explore options or paths to manage your concern.

Occupational Therapy Faculty Practice - (323) 442-3340 or otfp@med.usc.edu

chan.usc.edu/otfp

Confidential Lifestyle Redesign services for USC students to support health promoting habits and routines that enhance quality of life and academic performance.

Copyrighted material:

"The uploading to other websites or distribution of class materials outside the learning environment is explicitly prohibited per university policy." (SCampus Part B § 11).

University policy prohibits: "Distribution or use of notes, recordings, exams, or other intellectual property, based on university classes or lectures without the express permission of the instructor for purposes other than individual or group study. This includes, but is not limited to, providing materials for distribution by services publishing course materials. This restriction on unauthorized use also applies to all information, which had been distributed to students or in any way had been displayed for use in relationship to the class, whether obtained in class, via email, on the Internet or via any other media." ((SCampus Part B § 11:12(B)))."

Other Resources Available to USC Price Students

<https://priceschool.usc.edu/students/resources/>

Weekly Activity Schedule

* Denotes Price School authors.

Week 01: History and Evolution of Collaborative Governance	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Handbook of Collaborative Public Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preface ○ Introduction: collaborative public management as an emergent field." Jack Wayne Meek, pp. 1-15. ○ Ch. 1 "Collaboration: What does it really mean?" Margaret Stout and Robyn Keast, pp. 17-31. • Firehock, Karen (2011) "The Community-Based Collaborative Movement in the United States." Chapter 1 in <i>Community-Based Collaboration</i>. • * Collaborative Democracy Network (2006) "A Call to Scholars and Teachers of Public Administration, Public Policy, Planning, Political Science, and Related Fields." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(s1):168-170. <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gastil, John and William M. Keith (2005) "A Nation that(Sometimes) Likes to Talk: A Brief History of Public Deliberation in the United States." Chapter One in <i>The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century</i>. Edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine, (Jossey-Bass). • * Mazmanian, Daniel A. and Michael E. Kraft (2009) "The Three Epochs of the Environmental Movement." Chapter One in <i>Toward Sustainable Communities: Transition and Transformations in Environmental Policy, Second Edition</i>. Edited by Daniel A. Mazmanian and Michael E. Kraft, (MIT Press). • Bardach, Eugene, and Eric M. Patashnik (2016) "Things governments do" (Appendix B) and "Understanding public and nonprofit institutions" (Appendix C) in <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition</i>. CQ Press. 	~
Week 01 Live Session	Day 1
Week 01 Assignment: Interests Survey	Day 5
Week 01 Short Essay	Day 7
Week 01 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7

Week 02: Collaborative Governance - Case Studies and Typologies	Due Date
<p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O'Leary, Rosemary (2013) "Collaboration Across Boundaries: Ten Compelling Ideas." Eldon Fields Lecture, presented to the International City/County Management Association. <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008) Collaborative governance in theory and practice. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Practice</i>, 18(4), 543-571. • Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2010) "Stories from the Field." Chapter 3 in <i>Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy</i> (Routledge). <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • * Musso, Juliet, *Christopher Weare, Thomas Bryer, and *Terry L. Cooper (2011), "Toward 'strong democracy' in global cities? Social capital building, theory-driven reform, and the Los Angeles neighborhood council experience." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 71(1):102-111. • Kathi, Pradeep Chandra and *Terry L. Cooper (2005) "Democratizing the administrative state: Connecting neighborhood councils and city agencies." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 65(5):559-567. • * Cooper, Terry L., Thomas A. Bryer, and Jack W. Meek (2006) "Citizen-centered collaborative public management." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(s1):76-88. • Jung, Yong-Duck, *Daniel Mazmanian & *Shui-Yan Tang (2009) "Collaborative governance in the United States and Korea: Cases in negotiated policymaking and service delivery." <i>International Review of Public Administration</i> 13(s1):1-11. 	~
Week 02 Checkpoint: Case Study Groups	~
Week 02 Short Essay	Day 7

Week 03: Conflict Assessment & Stakeholder Analysis	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susskind, Lawrence and Jennifer Thomas-Larmer (1999) "Conducting a Conflict Assessment." Chapter 2 in <i>The Consensus Building Handbook</i> (Sage). http://web.mit.edu/publicdisputes/practice/cbh_ch2.html • Straus, David (2002) "Involve the Relevant Stakeholders." Chapter 2 in <i>How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions</i> (Berrett Koehler). http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440 • CCP. "Five Stages of Collaborative Decisionmaking on Policy Issues." Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento. • Weber, Gregory S. (2006) "Initial Steps towards an Assessment of the Potential for a Collaborative Approach to Colorado Delta Ecosystem Restoration, 19(1) <i>Global Business & Development Law Journal</i>. Focus on pp. 82-94, esp. Section II. C. "Conditions Favorable to Initiate a Collaborative Process." <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Varvarovszky, Z. and Brugha, R. (2000). "How to do (or not to do) a stakeholder analysis." <i>Health Policy and Planning</i> 15(3):338-345. 	~
Week 03 Live Session	Day 1
Week 03 Short Essay	Day 7

Week 04: Principled Negotiation - Interests vs. Positions	Due Date
<p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video (18:45) William Ury (2010) "The walk from no to yes." Ted Talks. <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In</i>. Chapters 1-8. • <i>Handbook of Collaborative Public Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Ch. 3 "Negotiation within collaborative networks" Elise Boruvka and Lisa Blomgren Amsler, pp. 50-66. <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duzert, Yann and *Frank Zerunyan (2015) <i>Newgotiation for Public Leaders: The Art of Negotiating for a Better Deal</i>. Newgotiation Publishing. • Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, D.M.; and B. Barry (2009) "Selecting a strategy" and "Resolving differences." Readings 1.2 and 6.1 in <i>Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition</i>. McGraw-Hill. 	~
Week 04 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 04 Case Study Presentation (Group)	Day 7
Submission window opens for Paper #1 case or topic proposal	Week 7

Week 05: Facilitation Skills for Intersectoral Leadership	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaner, Sam (2014) "Introduction to the Role of Facilitator" and "Facilitative Listening Skills." Chapters 3 and 4 in <i>Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making, 3rd Edition</i> (Community at Work, Jossey-Bass). • Straus, David (2002) "Designate a Process Facilitator" and "Facilitative Leadership." Chapters 5 and 7 in <i>How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions</i> (Berrett Koehler). http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440 <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PON (Project on Negotiation) (2012) "BATNA Basics: Boost Your Power at the Bargaining Table." Harvard Law School, Harvard University. 	~
Week 05 Discussion: Case Study Reviews	Day 5
Week 05 Short Essay	Day 7
Week 05 Pre-negotiation Notes	Day 7
Week 05 CATME Peer Evaluations	Day 7

Week 06: Building Consensus on Science & Policy	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Handbook of Collaborative Public Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Ch. 20 "Improving the use of science in collaborative governance." Tomas M. Koontz and Craig W. Thomas, pp. 313-330. • Fernández-Giménez, María E. and Heidi L. Ballard (2011) "How CBCs Learn: Ecological Monitoring and Adaptive Management." Chapter 3 in <i>Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice</i>, edited by E. Franklin Dukes, et al. (Univ. of Virginia), pp. 45-80. • Karl, Herman A., Lawrence E. Susskind, and Katherine H. Wallace (2007) "A Dialogue, Not a Diatribe: Effective Integration of Science and Policy through Joint Fact Finding." <i>Environment</i> 49(1): 20-34. • * Leach, William D., Christopher M. Weible, Scott R. Vince, Saba N. Siddiki, John Calanni* (2014) "Fostering learning through collaboration: Knowledge acquisition and belief change in marine aquaculture partnerships." <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 24(3): 591-622. <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curtin, Charles (2011) "Integrating and Applying Knowledge from Community-Based Collaboratives Implications for Natural Resource Management." Chapter 2 in <i>Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice</i>, edited by E. Franklin Dukes, et al. (Univ. of Virginia), pp. 19-44. 	~

Week 06 Live Session	Day 1
Week 06 Negotiation Roleplay #1	Day 1
Week 06 Short Essay: Collaborative Learning	Day 7
Week 06 Post-negotiation Debrief	Day 7

Week 07: Effective Process Design	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McDermott, Melanie Hughes, Margaret Ann Moote, and Cecilia Danks (2011) "Effective Collaboration Overcoming External Obstacles." Chapter 4 in <i>Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice</i>, edited by E. Franklin Dukes, et al. (Univ. of Virginia), pp. 81-110. • Walker, Gregg B. and Susan L. Senecah (2011) "Collaborative Governance Integrating Institutions, Communities, and People." Chapter 5 in <i>Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio- Ecological Research and Practice</i>, edited by E. Franklin Dukes, et al. (Univ. of Virginia), pp. 111-145. • * Leach, William D. (2011) "Building a Theory of Collaboration." Chapter 6 in <i>Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio- Ecological Research and Practice</i>, edited by E. Franklin Dukes, et al. (Univ. of Virginia), pp. 146-188. <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, D.M.; and B. Barry (2009) <i>Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases</i>. 6th Edition. McGraw- Hill. Reading 3.11 "Can't Beat Them? Then Join a Coalition." 3.12 "Building and Maintaining Coalitions and Allegiances throughout Negotiations." 3.13 "The Surprising Benefits of Conflict in Negotiating Teams." 	~
Week 07 Paper #1 topic proposal deadline	Day 7
Week 07 Short Essay: Effective Process Design	Day 7

Week 08: Public Participation & Civic Engagement	Due Date
<p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video (3:38) Richard Harwood: Harnessing Civic Engagement. • Video (2:30) Deliberative Polling • IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creighton, James L. (2005) "Defining What Participation Is (and Is Not)." Chapter 1 in <i>The Public Participation Handbook</i> (John Wiley & Sons). • Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2004) "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century." <i>Planning Theory & Practice</i> 5(4): 419-436. • ILG (2012) "Planning Public Engagement: Key Questions for Local Officials." Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. • ILG (2012) "A Local Official's Guide to Online Public Engagement." Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. • ILG (2014) "Online Engagement Guide." Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fung, Archon (2006) "Varieties of participation in complex governance." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(s1):66-75. • Carlson, Chris (2008). "Understanding the spectrum of collaborative governance processes" in <i>A Practical Guide to Collaborative Governance</i>. Policy Consensus Initiative. 	~
Week 08 Live Session	Day 1
Week 08 Negotiation Roleplay #2	Day 1
Week 08 Discussion: Public Engagement	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 08 Post-negotiation Debrief	Day 7
Submission window opens for Paper #2 case or topic proposal	Week 11

Week 09: Public/Private Partnerships & Contracting	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • * Zerunyan, Frank V. and Peter Pirnejad (4/2014). "From Contract Cities to Mass Collaborative Governance." <i>American City & County</i>. • Milward & Provan, K.G. (2000). Governing the hollow state. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Practice</i> 10(2), 359-379. • * Clayton, Tyrus Ross (2013). "Appendix: Use of Public Private Partnerships." In <i>Leading Collaborative Organizations</i>. iUniverse Press. • <i>Handbook of Collaborative Public Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Ch. 7. "Hybridity and the search for the right mix in governing PPP collaboration." Erik Hans Klijn, Joop Koppenjan, and Rianne Warsen, pp. 113-128. <p>Recommended Readings (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • * Zerunyan, Frank V. and Steven R. Meyers (2010) "The use of public private partnerships for special districts and all levels of government." <i>California Special District</i> 5(3):28,47-50. • Little, Richard G. (2010) "Beyond privatization: Rethinking private sector involvement in the provision of civil infrastructure." Chapter 3 in Ascher, W., Krupp, C. (Eds.) <i>Physical Infrastructure Development: Balancing the Growth, Equity, and Environmental Imperatives</i>. Palgrave. • Pagdadis, Sotiris A. et al. (2008) "A road map to success for public private partnerships of public infrastructure initiatives." <i>The Journal of Private Equity</i> 11(2):8-18. 	~
Week 09 Short Essay	Day 7

Week 10: Participatory Budgeting	Due Date
<p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video (1:36) What is Participatory Budgeting, Councilmember? • Video (4:18) Real Money, Real Power: Participatory Budgeting • Video (4:14) Deliberative Polling® <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Handbook of Collaborative Public Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Ch. 13 "Collaboration in public budgeting." Marcia L. Godwin, pp. 213-227. • Lerner, Josh and Secondo, Donata (2012) "By the People, For the People: Participatory Budgeting from the Bottom Up in North America." <i>Journal of Public Deliberation</i> 8(2), Article 2. http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art2 • "Public Engagement in Budgeting" (2013) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/community_budget_5.5.14.pdf • "A Local Official's Guide to Public Engagement in Budgeting." (2010) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/gf103_peb.pdf <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gordon, Victoria, Jeffery L. Osgood, Jr., and Daniel Boden (2017) <i>Participatory Budgeting in the United States: A Guide for Local Governments</i>. Routledge. • Gilman, H. R. (2016). <i>Democracy reinvented: Participatory budgeting and civic innovation in America</i>. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. • Pape, Madeleine and Lerner, Josh (2016) "Budgeting for Equity: How Can Participatory Budgeting Advance Equity in the United States?" <i>Journal of Public Deliberation</i> 12(2). http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol12/iss2/art9 • Lerner, J. (2014). <i>Everyone counts: Could participatory budgeting change democracy?</i> Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. 	~
Week 10 Live Session	Day 1
Week 10 Discussion: Participatory Budgeting	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 10 Paper #1 submission deadline	Day 7

Week 11: Cross-Cultural Collaboration	Due Date
<p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video (4:40) "Managing Conflict Across Cultures." Jeanne Brett, Dispute Resolution Research Center, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University. • Video (2:34) "Negotiating Across Cultures." <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, Feb. 25, 2016. • Video (2:17) "Getting to Yes Across Cultures." <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, Nov. 25, 2015. • Video (3:27) "International Business Card Savvy." Syndi Seid, BNETvideo, 2008. <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Handbook of Collaborative Public Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Ch. 16 "Tribal sovereignty and the limits and potential of inter-governmental collaboration." Kathy Quick, pp. 253-267. • Adler, Peter S. and Juliana E. Birkhoff (2002) "Talking with Native Americans" in Building Trust: When Knowledge From "Here" Meets Knowledge From "Away" (Portland, OR: National Policy Consensus Center), pp. 14-15 only. • Sherman, Marlon (2007) "The promise and the challenge of cooperative conservation." <i>Frontiers in Ecology</i> 5(2), pp. 98-99 only. • Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, and B. Barry (2009) "Negotiation across Cultures." Section 5 in <i>Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition</i>. McGraw-Hill, pp. 321-361. <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lopez-Littleton, V., & Blessett, B. (2015). "A framework for integrating cultural competency into the curriculum of public administration programs." <i>Journal of Public Affairs Education</i>, 21(4), 557-574. 	~
Week 11 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 11 Paper #2 case or topic proposal deadline	Day 7

Week 12: Online Dialogue and Deliberation	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rossini, Patrícia and Jennifer Stromer-Galley (2020) "Citizen Deliberation Online." <i>The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Persuasion</i>. Edited by Elizabeth Suhay, Bernard Grofman, and Alexander H. Trechsel. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190860806.013.14 • Gastil John and Michael Broghammer (2020). "Linking Theories of Motivation, Game Mechanics, and Public Deliberation to Design an Online System for Participatory Budgeting." <i>Political Studies</i>. April 1, 2020. doi:10.1177/0032321719890815 <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aichholzer, Georg and Gloria Rose (2020) "Experience with Digital Tools in Different Types of e-Participation." Chapter 4 in <i>European E- Democracy in Practice</i>. Springer, pp. 93-140. • Korthagen, Iris and Ira van Keulen (2020) "Assessing Tools for E- Democracy: Comparative Analysis of the Case Studies." Chapter 12 in <i>European E-Democracy in Practice</i>. Springer, pp. 295-327. 	~
Week 12 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7

Week 13: Collaborative Governance & Democracy	Due Date
<p>Instructional Material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video (5:36) "Organizations and Democracy" Charles Leadbeater, 2008. <p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Handbook of Collaborative Public Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Ch. 14 "Democratizing network governance: The role of citizen input." Sofia Prysmakova-Rivera, pp. 228-240. ◦ Ch. 15 "From collaborative responsiveness to collaborative empowerment." Thomas Andrew Bryer, pp. 241-251. • * Leach, William D. (2006) "Collaborative Public Management and Democracy: Evidence from Western Watershed Partnerships." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 66(s1): 100-110. • Peterson, M. Nils, Markus J. Peterson, and Tarla Rai Peterson (2005) "Conservation and the Myth of Consensus." <i>Conservation Biology</i> 19(3): 576-578. • * Leach, William D. (2006) "Theories about Consensus-Based Conservation." <i>Conservation Biology</i> 20(2): 573-575. • Peterson, M. Nils, Markus J. Peterson, and Tarla Rai Peterson (2006) "Why Conservation Needs Dissent." <i>Conservation Biology</i> 20(2): 576-578. 	~
Week 13 Short Essay	Day 7

Week 14: Framing & Systems Thinking	Due Date
<p>Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal (2008) "The Power of Reframing." Chapter 1 in <i>Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 	~
Week 14 Live Session	Day 1
Week 14 Discussion: Framing & Systems Thinking	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 14 Paper #2 submission deadline	Day 7

Week 15: Collaborative Leadership	Due Date
<p>Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One book on leadership (For details, see Week 15 Short Essay in Blackboard) 	~
Week 15 Short Essay: Collaborative Leadership	Day 7
Week 15 Discussion: Collaborative Governance Theory & Practice	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 15 Checkpoint: Course Evaluation	Day 7