USC Price
Sol Price School of Public Policy
Graduate Programs in Public Administration

PPD 672

Collaborative Governance

4 Units

Term
Fall 2023

Instructor
William D. Leach, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

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.

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. 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/alma9910434 48694903731
- *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.

Live Sessions

Day 1 (Wednesday) of Weeks 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13.

6:00-7:30 pm Trojan Time (except Week 11 which is a two-hour session, 6-8pm)

Zoom link available in Blackboard.

Grading Policies

Grading Ranges for Final Course Grades

A	≥ 94%	B-	≥ 80%, < 84%	D+	≥ 67%, < 70%
A-	≥ 90% < 94%	C+	≥ 77%, < 80%	D	≥ 64%, < 67%
B+	≥ 87% < 90%	C	≥ 74%, < 77%	D-	≥ 60%, < 64%
B	≥ 84%, < 87%	C-	≥ 70%, < 74%	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 9 to 11.

Paper #2 can be submitted at any time during Weeks 12 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 *on video* with appropriate confidence, clarity, and enthusiasm, without exception (16)	Team members spoke *off camera* 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: • make a compelling argument rather than being purely descriptive? • raise especially insightful questions? • suggest novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic? • suggest original solutions? • support its ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or coherent explanations? • integrate material from readings, lectures, or outside materials? • specify clear conclusions? (even if the conclusion is fuzzy like, "we can't draw a conclusion without more information." If the latter, what information is needed?) • suggest directions for future research?	40	35	25	0
Source Material • Are sources cited for all data/information & ideas? • Is there a list of references in APA format? http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/	15	12	10	0
Writing Quality • Does the paper begin with a descriptive and inviting title? • Is the writing clear and concise? • Are the style, structure, grammar, spelling, and organization of your paper appropriate, and written in a manner that a college-educated layperson can follow?	15	12	10	0

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: • make a compelling argument rather than being purely descriptive? • raise especially insightful questions? • suggest novel or innovative ways of approaching the topic? • suggest original solutions? • support its ideas with empirical evidence, examples, and/or coherent explanations? • integrate material from readings, lectures, or outside materials? • specify clear conclusions? (even if the conclusion is fuzzy like, "we can't draw a conclusion without more information." If the latter, what information is needed?) • suggest directions for future research?	40	35	25	0
Source Material • Are sources cited for all data/information & ideas? • Is there a list of references in APA format? http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/	15	12	10	0
Writing Quality • Does the paper begin with a descriptive and inviting title? • Is the writing clear and concise? • Are the style, structure, grammar, spelling, and organization of your paper appropriate, and written in a manner that a college-educated layperson can follow?	15	12	10	0

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

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.

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 call or text me if you need my immediate attention.

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.

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.

Academic Integrity
The University of Southern California is foremost a learning community committed to fostering successful scholars and researchers dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and the transmission of ideas. Academic misconduct is in contrast to the university's mission to educate students through a broad array of first-rank academic, professional, and extracurricular programs and includes any act of dishonesty in the submission of academic work (either in draft or final form).

This course will follow the expectations for academic integrity as stated in the USC Student Handbook. All students are expected to submit assignments that are original work and prepared specifically for the course/section in this academic term. You may not submit work written by others or "recycle" work prepared for other courses without obtaining written permission from the instructor(s). Students suspected of engaging in academic misconduct will be reported to the Office of Academic Integrity.

Other violations of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, fabrication (e.g., falsifying data), knowingly assisting others in acts of academic dishonesty, and any act that gains or is intended to gain an unfair academic advantage.

The impact of academic dishonesty is far-reaching and is considered a serious offense against the university and could result in outcomes such as failure on the assignment, failure in the course, suspension, or even expulsion from the university.

For more information about academic integrity see the student handbook or the Office of Academic Integrity's website, and university policies on Research and Scholarship Misconduct.

Prohibition on Uploading Course Materials to Generative AI Services
Submitting assignment prompts or other course materials to an AI generator is a violation of intellectual property and is disallowed under the USC policy prohibiting distribution of course materials (Living our Unifying Values: The USC Student Handbook, p. 13).

Policy on Generative AI
The learning goals for the writing assignments in this course are (1) to prod students to expand their knowledge of course concepts through careful research and thoughtful writing, and (2) to teach students how to construct written arguments (in various formats such as essays, reports, memoranda) that are enlightening, credible, reliable, and professional.

Use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools such as Grammarly or generative AI tools such as ChatGPT is allowed in this course so long as it helps you achieve both of these learning goals, and so long as it otherwise adheres to the principles of academic integrity described elsewhere in this syllabus and in The USC Student Handbook.

In professional and academic writing, it is essential to cite sources for all evidence and ideas borrowed from others. The main purposes of proper citation are (1) to support your argument with evidence from reliable and credible sources, and (2) to give credit to other people whose intellectual product you have borrowed.

Do not cite generative AI tools in your writing because (a) such tools are not a credible and reliable source of information or analysis, and (b) these tools are not human sources that need to be credited for their "ideas" or "labor." (Similarly, avoid citing other unreliable or non-credible sources such as Wikipedia.org or ProCon.org, to name two. By the same token, there is usually no need to use citations to give credit to non-human writing and research aids including commonplace computerized tools such as internet search engines, PC software, or AI tools).

Course Content Distribution and Synchronous Session Recordings Policies
USC has policies that prohibit recording and distribution of any synchronous and asynchronous course content outside of the learning environment.

Recording a university class without the express permission of the instructor and announcement to the class, or unless conducted pursuant to an Office of Student Accessibility Services (OSAS) accommodation. Recording can inhibit free discussion in the future, and thus infringe on the academic freedom of other students as well as the instructor. (Living our Unifying Values: The USC Student Handbook, page 13).

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. (Living our Unifying Values: The USC Student Handbook, page 13).

Weekly Activity Schedule

* Denotes Price School authors.

Week 01: History and Evolution of Collaborative Governance	Due Date

Readings:
• *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management*
  o Preface
  o Introduction: collaborative public management as an emergent field." Jack Wayne Meek, pp. 1-15.
  o 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 *Community-Based Collaboration*.
• * Collaborative Democracy Network (2006) "A Call to Scholars and Teachers of Public Administration, Public Policy, Planning, Political Science, and Related Fields." *Public Administration Review* 66(s1):168-170.
Recommended Readings (optional):
• 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 *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century.* 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 *Toward Sustainable Communities: Transition and Transformations in Environmental Policy, Second Edition.* 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 *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition.* 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
Instructional Material: • O'Leary, Rosemary (2013) "Collaboration Across Boundaries: Ten Compelling Ideas." Eldon Fields Lecture, presented to the International City/County Management Association. **Readings:** • Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008) Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Practice,* 18(4), 543-571. • Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2010) "Stories from the Field." Chapter 3 in *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy* (Routledge). **Recommended Readings (optional):** • * Musso, Juliet, *Christopher Weare, Thomas Bryer, and *Terry L. Cooper (2011), "Toward 'strong democracy' in global cities? Social capital building, theory-driven reform, and the Los Angeles neighborhood council experience." *Public Administration Review* 71(1):102–111. • Kathi, Pradeep Chandra and *Terry L. Cooper (2005) "Democratizing the administrative state: Connecting neighborhood councils and city agencies." *Public Administration Review* 65(5):559-567. • * Cooper, Terry L ., Thomas A. Bryer, and Jack W . Meek (2006) "Citizen-centered collaborative public management." *Public Administration Review* 66(s1):76-88. • Jung, Yong-Duck, *Daniel Mazmanian & *Shui-Yan Tang (2009) "Collaborative governance in the United States and Korea: Cases in negotiated policymaking and service delivery." *International Review of Public Administration* 13(s1):1-11.	~
Week 02 Checkpoint: The instructor will form Case Study Groups this week	~
Week 02 Short Essay	Day 7

Week 03: Conflict Assessment & Process Design	Due Date

Readings:
 	
• Susskind, Lawrence and Jennifer Thomas-Larmer (1999) "Conducting a Conflict Assessment." Chapter 2 in *The Consensus Building Handbook* (Sage). http://web.mit.edu/publicdisputes/practice/cbh_ch2.html
• Straus, David (2002) "Involve the Relevant Stakeholders." Chapter 2 in *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions* (Berrett Koehler). http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440
• 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) *Global Business & Development Law Journal*. Focus on pp. 82-94, esp. Section II. C. "Conditions Favorable to Initiate a Collaborative Process."
Recommended Readings (optional):
 	
• Varvarovszky, Z. and Brugha, R. (2000). "How to do (or not to do) a stakeholder analysis." *Health Policy and Planning* 15(3):338-345.
• *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice,* edited by E. Franklin Dukes et al. (Univ. of Virginia, 2011)
    ○ Chapter 4, pp. 81-110, "Effective Collaboration Overcoming External Obstacles." Melanie Hughes McDermott, Margaret Ann Moote, and Cecilia Danks.
    ○ Chapter 5, pp. 111-145, "Collaborative Governance Integrating Institutions, Communities, and People." Gregg B. Walker and Susan L. Senecah.
    ○ Chapter 6, pp. 146-188, "Building a Theory of Collaboration." William D. Leach.
	~

Week 03 Live Session	Day 1
Week 03 Short Essay: Stakeholder Analysis	Day 7

Week 04: Building Consensus on Science & Policy	Due Date
Readings: • *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management* ○ 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 *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio- Ecological Research and Practice,* 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." *Environment 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." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 24(3): 591-622. **Recommended Readings (optional):** • Curtin, Charles (2011) "Integrating and Applying Knowledge from Community-Based Collaboratives Implications for Natural Resource Management." Chapter 2 in *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice,* edited by E. Franklin Dukes, et al. (Univ. of Virginia), pp. 19-44.	~
Week 04 Case Study Presentation (Group)	Day 7
Week 04 Short Essay: Collaborative Learning	Day 7

Week 05: Network Theory and Polycentric Governance	Due Date
Instructional Material: • Slide deck: McGinnis, Michael D. (2021) What is Polycentric Governance? A Quick Answer." Ostrom Workshop, Indiana University, Bloomington. **Readings:** • Nabatchi, T., Sancino, A., & Sicilia, M. (2017). "Varieties of participation in public services: The who, when, and what of coproduction." *Public Administration Review,* 77(5):766-776. **Recommended Readings (optional):** • *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management* ○ Ch. 2 "The collaborative governance networks literature: a comprehensive and systematic review." Göktuğ Morçöl, Eunsil Yoo, Shahinshah Faisal Azim, and Aravind Menon, pp. 36-49. • Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2021). "Chapter 2. The Concept of Co-creation: A Genealogy." In *Public governance as co-creation: A strategy for revitalizing the public sector and rejuvenating democracy.* Cambridge University Press.	~
Week 05 Live Session	Day 1
Week 05 Discussion: Case Study Reviews	Day 5
Week 05 CATME Peer Evaluations	Day 7
Week 05 Assignment TBD	TBD

Week 06: Facilitation & Communication Skills	Due Date
Readings: • Kaner, Sam (2014) "Introduction to the Role of Facilitator" and "Facilitative Listening Skills." Chapters 3 and 4 in *Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making, 3rd Edition* (Community at Work, Jossey-Bass). • Straus, David (2002) "Designate a Process Facilitator" and "Facilitative Leadership." Chapters 5 and 7 in *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions* (Berrett Koehler). http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440 **Recommended Readings (optional):** • PON (Project on Negotiation) (2012) "BATNA Basics: Boost Your Power at the Bargaining Table." Harvard Law School, Harvard University.	~
Week 06 Short Essay: Communication & Facilitation	Day 7
Checkpoint: Submission window opens for Paper #1 Case or Topic Proposal	N/A

Week 07: Principled Negotiation – Interests vs. Positions	Due Date
Instructional Material: • Video (18:45) William Ury (2010) "The walk from no to yes." Ted Talks. **Readings:** • *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Chapters 1-8. • *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management* ○ Ch. 3 "Negotiation within collaborative networks" Elise Boruvka and Lisa Blomgren Amsler, pp. 50-66. **Recommended Readings (optional):** • Duzert, Yann and *Frank Zerunyan (2015) *Newgotiation for Public Leaders: The Art of Negotiating for a Better Deal*. 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 *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition*. McGraw-Hill.	~
Week 07 Live Session	Day 1
Week 07 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7

Week 08: Public Participation & Civic Engagement	Due Date
Instructional Material: • Video (3:38) Richard Harwood: Harnessing Civic Engagement. • Video (2:30) Deliberative Polling • IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation **Readings:** • Creighton, James L. (2005) "Defining What Participation Is (and Is Not)." Chapter 1 in *The Public Participation Handbook* (John Wiley & Sons). • Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher (2004) "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century." Planning Theory & Practice 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. **Recommended Readings (optional):** • Fung, Archon (2006) "Varieties of participation in complex governance." *Public Administration Review* 66(s1):66-75. • Carlson, Chris (2008). "Understanding the spectrum of collaborative governance processes" in *A Practical Guide to Collaborative Governance.* Policy Consensus Initiative.	~
Week 08 Discussion: Public Engagement	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 08 Pre-negotiation Notes	Day 7
Week 08 Case or Topic Proposal for Paper #1	Day 7

Week 09: Public/Private Partnerships & Contracting	Due Date
Readings: • * Zerunyan, Frank V. and Peter Pirnejad (4/2014). "From Contract Cities to Mass Collaborative Governance." *American City & County*. • Milward & Provan, K.G. (2000). Governing the hollow state. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Practice* 10(2), 359-379. • * Clayton, Tyrus Ross (2013). "Appendix: Use of Public Private Partnerships." In *Leading Collaborative Organizations.* iUniverse Press. • *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management* o 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. **Recommended Readings (optional):** • * Zerunyan, Frank V. and Steven R. Meyers (2010) "The use of public private partnerships for special districts and all levels of government." *California Special District* 5(3):28, 47-50. • Little, Richard G. (2010) "Beyond privatization: Rethinking private sector involvement in the provision of civil infrastructure." Chapter 3 in Ascher, W., Krupp, C. (Eds.) *Physical Infrastructure Development: Balancing the Growth, Equity, and Environmental Imperatives.* Palgrave. • Pagdadis, Sotiris A. et al. (2008) "A road map to success for public private partnerships of public infrastructure initiatives." *The Journal of Private Equity* 11(2):8-18.	~
Week 09 Live Session - Negotiation Roleplay #1	Day 1
Week 09 Short Essay	Day 7
Week 09 Post-negotiation Debrief	Day 7
Checkpoint: Submission window opens for Case or Topic Proposal for Paper #2	~

Week 10: Participatory Budgeting	Due Date

Instructional Material:
 • Video (1:36) What is Participatory Budgeting, Councilmember?
 • Video (4:18) Real Money, Real Power: Participatory Budgeting
 • Video (4:14) Deliberative Polling®
 Readings:
 • *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management*
    o 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." *Journal of Public Deliberation* 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
 Recommended (Participatory Budgeting):
 • Gordon, Victoria, Jeffery L. Osgood, Jr., and Daniel Boden (2017) *Participatory Budgeting in the United States: A Guide for Local Governments.* Routledge.
 • Gilman, H. R. (2016). *Democracy reinvented: Participatory budgeting and civic innovation in America.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
 • Pape, Madeleine and Lerner, Josh (2016) "Budgeting for Equity: How Can Participatory Budgeting Advance Equity in the United States?" *Journal of Public Deliberation* 12(2). http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol12/iss2/art9
 • Lerner, J. (2014). Everyone counts: Could participatory budgeting change democracy? Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
 Recommended (Multiparty Negotiation):
 • Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, D.M.; and B. Barry (2009) *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition.* McGraw-Hill.
    o 3.11 "Can't Beat Them? Then Join a Coalition."
    o 3.12 "Building and Maintaining Coalitions and Allegiances throughout Negotiations."
    o 3.13 "The Surprising Benefits of Conflict in Negotiating Teams."
	~

Week 10 Discussion: Participatory Budgeting	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 10 Paper #1	Day 7

Week 11: Cross-Cultural Communication and Collaboration	Due Date
Instructional Material: • Video (2:34) "Negotiating Across Cultures." *Harvard Business Review*, Feb. 25, 2016. • Video (2:17) "Getting to Yes Across Cultures." *Harvard Business Review*, Nov. 25, 2015. • Video (3:27) "International Business Card Savvy." Syndi Seid, BNETvideo, 2008. **Readings:** • Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, and B. Barry (2009) "Negotiation across Cultures." Section 5 in *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases. 6th Edition.* McGraw-Hill, pp. 321-361. **Recommended:** • Lopez-Littleton, V., & Blessett, B. (2015). "A framework for integrating cultural competency into the curriculum of public administration programs." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 21(4), 557-574.	~
Week 11 Live Session - Negotiation Roleplay #2 (2 hours)	Day 1
Week 11 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 11 Post-Negotiation Reflection	Day 7

Week 12: Collaborative Governance and Native Americans	Due Date
Readings: • *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management* ○ *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." Frontiers in Ecology 5(2), pp. 98-99 only.* **Recommended:** • USC History Department (2021) "Acknowledgement of the Tongva and Greater Indigenous Lands occupied by the University of Southern California." https://dornsife.usc.edu/hist/land-acknowledgement/ • The Nature Conservancy (2023) Indian Country 101 Training. Brie Fraley, North America Indigenous Landscapes and Communities Director. • California State Lands Commission Tribal Consultation Policy, https://www.slc.ca.gov/tribal-consultation/ • U.S. Department of the Interior, Tribal Consultation, https://www.doi.gov/priorities/tribal-consultation • The White House (Januray 26, 2021). Memorandum on Tribal Consultation and Strengthening Nation-to-Nation Relationships.	~
Week 12 Case or Topic Proposal for Paper #2	Day 7
Week 12 Short Essay	Day 7

Week 13: Online Dialogue and Deliberation	Due Date
Readings: • Rossini, Patrícia and Jennifer Stromer-Galley (2020) "Citizen Deliberation Online." *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Persuasion.* 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." *Political Studies.* April 1, 2020. doi:10.1177/0032321719890815 **Recommended:** • Aichholzer, Georg and Gloria Rose (2020) "Experience with Digital Tools in Different Types of e-Participation." Chapter 4 in *European E- Democracy in Practice.* 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 *European E-Democracy in Practice.* Springer, pp. 295-327.	~
Week 13 Live Session	Day 1
Week 13 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7

Week 14: Collaborative Governance & Democracy	Due Date

Instructional Material:
 	
• Video (5:36) "Organizations and Democracy" Charles Leadbeater, 2008.
 	
Readings:
 	
• *Handbook of Collaborative Public Management*
   o Ch. 14 "Democratizing network governance: The role of citizen input." Sofia Prysmakova-Rivera, pp. 228-240.
   o Ch. 15 "From collaborative responsiveness to collaborative empowerment." Thomas Andrew Bryer, pp. 241-251.
• Lee, Seulki, & Sonia M. Ospina (2022). "A Framework for assessing accountability in collaborative governance: A process-based approach." *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance,* 5(1): 63-75.
• * Leach, William D. (2006) "Collaborative Public Management and Democracy: Evidence from Western Watershed Partnerships." *Public Administration Review* 66(s1): 100-110.
 	
Recommended:
 	
• Peterson, M. Nils, Markus J. Peterson, and Tarla Rai Peterson (2005) "Conservation and the Myth of Consensus." *Conservation Biology* 19(3): 576–578.
• * Leach, William D. (2006) "Theories about Consensus-Based Conservation." *Conservation Biology* 20(2): 573–575.
• Peterson, M. Nils, Markus J. Peterson, and Tarla Rai Peterson (2006) "Why Conservation Needs Dissent." *Conservation Biology* 20(2): 576–578.
	~

Week 14 Short Essay	Day 7
Week 14 Paper #2	Day 7

Week 15: Collaborative Leadership	Due Date
Reading: • One book on leadership (For details, see Week 15 Short Essay in Blackboard)	~
Week 15 Discussion: Collaborative Governance Theory & Practice	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 15 Short Essay: Collaborative Leadership	Day 7
Week 15 Checkpoint: Course Evaluation	Day 7

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Academic Integrity:

The University of Southern California is a learning community committed to developing successful scholars and researchers dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and the dissemination of ideas. Academic misconduct, which includes any act of dishonesty in the production or submission of academic work, compromises the integrity of the person who commits the act and can impugn the perceived integrity of the entire university community. It stands in opposition to the university's mission to research, educate, and contribute productively to our community and the world.

All students are expected to submit assignments that represent their own original work, and that have been prepared specifically for the course or section for which they have been submitted. You may not submit work written by others or "recycle" work prepared for other courses without obtaining written permission from the instructor(s).

Other violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, fabrication (e.g., falsifying data), collusion, knowingly assisting others in acts of academic dishonesty, and any act that gains or is intended to gain an unfair academic advantage.

The impact of academic dishonesty is far-reaching and is considered a serious offense against the university. All incidences of academic misconduct will be reported to the Office of Academic Integrity and could result in outcomes such as failure on the assignment, failure in the course, suspension, or even expulsion from the university.

For more information about academic integrity see the student handbook or the Office of Academic Integrity's website, and university policies on Research and Scholarship Misconduct.

Please ask your instructor if you are unsure what constitutes unauthorized assistance on an exam or assignment, or what information requires citation and/or attribution.

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

[988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline](#) - *988 for both calls and text messages – 24/7 on call*
The 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline (formerly known as the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline) provides free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, across the United States. The Lifeline is comprised of a national network of over 200 local crisis centers, combining custom local care and resources with national standards and best practices. The new, shorter phone number makes it easier for people to remember and access mental health crisis services (though the previous 1 (800) 273-8255 number will continue to function indefinitely) and represents a continued commitment to those in crisis.

[Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP)](#) - *(213) 740-9355(WELL) – 24/7 on call*
Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender- and power-based harm (including sexual assault, intimate partner violence, and stalking).

[Office for Equity, Equal Opportunity, and Title IX (EEO-TIX)](#) - *(213) 740-5086*
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*
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 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) 740-0411*
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*
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*
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) 442-1200 – 24/7 on call*
Non-emergency assistance or information.

[Office of the Ombuds](#) - *(213) 821-9556 (UPC) / (323-442-0382 (HSC)*
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) 442-2850 or* otfp@med.usc.edu
Confidential Lifestyle Redesign services for USC students to support health promoting habits and routines that enhance quality of life and academic performance.

Other Resources Available to USC Price Students

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