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

PPD 672

Collaborative Governance

Units 4

Term
Fall 2020

Course Lead
William D. Leach, PhD
leachw@price.usc.edu
(310) 270-8202

Table of Contents

Course Description

> *"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."*
>
> Source: 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. Discuss the history of collaborative governance in the United States.

2. Analyze the institutional and stakeholder context of public issues.

3. Compare the structure, procedures, and goals of various types of intersectoral collaboration such as advisory committees and public-private partnerships.

4. Evaluate whether collaborative strategies are appropriate in a given context, and argue for and against using collaborative versus conventional approaches.

5. Practice principled, interest-based negotiation in intersectoral contexts.

6. Design and facilitate intersectoral consensus-building processes.

7. Describe challenges in cross-cultural communication, and strategies to overcome them.

8. Communicate about collaborative governance through written and verbal presentations.

Textbooks and Materials

Required Books:

- *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, 2nd edition **or newer**, Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton (Penguin, 2011). Example ISBN-13: 978-0143118756
- One additional book on leadership, of the student's choice, subject to instructor approval. For a list of pre-approved books, refer to the Week 15 Discussion in Moodle.

Negotiation Simulation - License and Software:

- By the end of Week 3, students need to register for a personal account with iDecisionGames. The total cost of the registration and license fees is about $40.
- Detailed registration instructions will be provided within the LMS.

Articles and e-books:

- Straus, David (2002) *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions.* Berrett Koehler Press. ISBN: 978-1576751282
  - Available through the USC library: http://site.ebrary.com/lib/uscisd/detail.action?docID=10315440
- Weekly readings provided in a folder within the LMS.

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 Essay	20	15	2%	30%
Discussions (keep highest 15 of 19)	20	15	1%	15%
Group Case Study Presentation				
● Video Presentation	100	1	10%	10%
● Individual contributions to project	20	1	5%	5%
Negotiation Simulation Roleplays	20	2	5%	10%
Papers	100	2	15%	30%
TOTAL				**100%**

Graded Activity Categories

Individual Work (75%)

Short Essays (30%). Each week includes one short essay assignment that addresses the assigned readings for the week. Students are expected to write thoughtful responses that demonstrate detailed knowledge of the readings, and that use rational argument or evidence to support all claims. Students will post their short essay by Day 5

of each week in two places: a Turnitin assignment and a Discussion thread where classmates can read and discuss each other's essays.

Discussions (15%). Each week (except Week 13), students will read each other's short essays and will post follow-up questions or comments for at least two of their classmates by Day 7. Four weeks of the course include a second discussion assignment.

Papers (30%). Two major writing assignments (each approximately 2,500 words) are due in Weeks 10 and 14. Students will choose one of three flexible paper formats (Case Study Paper, Topic-or-Technique Paper, or Applications Paper), and will focus the paper on a suitable subject after receiving instructor approval. These two assignments give students opportunities to explore in depth specific subtopics of personal interest. For each paper, students will submit to the instructor a brief written description of the proposed topic at least three weeks in advance of the paper deadline. Students are encouraged to informally discuss topic ideas with the instructor at any time.

Group Work (25%)

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 (5%). 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 (10%)

- 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 discussion assignment "Pre-negotiation Notes"

- 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 and preparing a negotiation strategy.

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)

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

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

Due dates for all assignments are stated in day numbers. **Assignments are due no later than 11:55 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 the LMS. The evaluation critique memo and the final evaluation proposal will be submitted within the LMS using the embedded Turnitin service which evaluates the text for potential plagiarism. In the event of electronic submission problems via the LMS, you may provide duplicate submissions via e-mail as a matter of record of your timely submission.

File Naming Protocol

Please label all submitted files with your last name followed by the name of the assignment (e.g., Leach_critique.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 will avoid plagiarism allegations.

Written assignments uploaded as text documents should be single-spaced.

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.

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

Support Systems

Counseling and Mental Health - (213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call
studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling
Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1 (800) 273-8255 – 24/7 on call
suicidepreventionlifeline.org
Free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-9355(WELL), press "0" after hours – 24/7 on call
studenthealth.usc.edu/sexual-assault
Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm.

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED) - (213) 740-5086 | Title IX – (213) 821-8298
equity.usc.edu, titleix.usc.edu
Information about how to get help or help someone affected by harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and additional resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants.

Reporting Incidents of Bias or Harassment - (213) 740-5086 or (213) 821-8298
usc-advocate.symplicity.com/care_report
Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions to the Office of Equity and Diversity |Title IX for appropriate investigation, supportive measures, and response.

The Office of Disability Services and Programs - (213) 740-0776
dsp.usc.edu
Support and accommodations for students with disabilities. Services include assistance in providing readers/notetakers/interpreters, special accommodations for test taking needs, assistance with architectural barriers, assistive technology, and support for individual needs.

USC Campus Support and Intervention - (213) 821-4710
campussupport.usc.edu
Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

Diversity at USC - (213) 740-2101
diversity.usc.edu
Information on events, programs and training, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

USC Emergency - UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call
dps.usc.edu, emergency.usc.edu
Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

USC Department of Public Safety - UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-120 – 24/7 on call
dps.usc.edu
Non-emergency assistance or information.

Live Sessions

Day 2 (Thursday) of Weeks 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 14.

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

For details on how to join the live sessions in Zoom, refer to the Live Session Schedule in the LMS.

Weekly Activity Schedule

* Denotes Price School authors.

Week 01: History and Evolution of Collaborative Governance	Due Date
Readings: ● *Community-Based Collaboration,* Preface and Chapter 1. ● *Collaborative Democracy Network (2006) "A Call to Scholars and Teachers of Public Administration, Public Policy, Planning, Political Science, and Related Fields." *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 Assignment: Interests Survey	Day 5
Week 01 Short Essay	Day 5
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: Case Study Groups	~
Week 02 Live Session	Day 2
Week 02 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 02 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 03: Conflict Assessment & Stakeholder Analysis	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. <u>Focus on pp. 82-94, esp. Section II. C. "Conditions Favorable to Initiate a Collaborative Process."</u> **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.	
Week 03 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 03 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 04: 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. **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 04 Live Session	Day 2
Week 04 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 04 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 04 Assignment: Case Study Presentation (Group)	Day 7

Week 05: Facilitation Skills for Intersectoral Leadership	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 Univ.	~
Week 05 Short Essay 1	Day 5
Week 05 Discussion 1: Communication & Facilitation	Day 5
Week 05 Discussion 2: Case Study Reviews	Day 5
Week 05 Discussion 3: Pre-negotiation Notes	Day 7
Week 05 Assignment 1: CATME Peer Evaluations	Day 7
Week 06: Building Consensus on Science & Policy	Due Date
Readings: ● *Community-Based Collaboration,* Chapters 2-3. ● Karl, Herman A., Lawrence E. Susskind, and Katherine H. Wallace (2007) "A Dialogue, Not a Diatribe: Effective Integration of Science and Policy through Joint Fact Finding." *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.	~
Week 06 Live Session	Day 2
Week 06 Assignment: Negotiation Roleplay #1	Day 2
Week 06 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 06 Discussion 1: Collaborative Learning	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 06 Discussion 2: Post-negotiation Debrief	Day 7

Week 07: Effective Process Design	Due Date
Readings: ● *Community-Based Collaboration*, Chapters 4-6. **Recommended Readings (optional):** ● Lewicki, Roy J., D. M. Saunders, D.M.; and B. Barry (2009) *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases.* 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 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 07 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 07 Assignment: Topic Submission for Paper #1	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. ● "Planning Public Engagement: Key Questions for Local Officials" (2012) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/key_questions_3.pdf ● "A Local Official's Guide to Online Public Engagement" (2012) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/a_local_officials_guide_cp_2-27.pdf ● "Online Engagement Guide" (2014) Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, CA. http://www.ca-ilg.org/online-engagement-guide **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.	~

http://www.kitchentable.org/sites/ktd/files/documents/A-Practical-Guide-Excerpt.pdf	
Week 08 Live Session	Day 2
Week 08 Assignment: Negotiation Roleplay #2	Day 2
Week 08 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 08 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: 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. **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 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 09 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7

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®: It's Not A Come-On From A Cult. It's A New Kind Of Poll!	~

Readings:
- 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:
- Gordon, Victoria, Jeffery L. Osgood, Jr., and Daniel Boden (2017) *Participatory Budgeting in the United States: A Guide for Local Governments.* Routledge Press.
- 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.

Week 10 Live Session	Day 2
Week 10 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 10 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 10 Assignment: Paper #1	Day 7
Week 11: Cross-Cultural Collaboration	Due Date

Instructional Material: ~
- Video (4:40) "Managing Conflict Across Cultures." Jeanne Brett, Dispute Resolution Research Center, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University.
- Video (2:34) "Negotiating Across Cultures." Harvard Business Review, February 25, 2016.
- Video (2:17) "Getting to Yes Across Cultures." Harvard Business Review, November 25, 2015.

Readings:
- 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. ● 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.	
Week 11 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 11 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 11 Assignment 1: Topic Submission for Paper #2	Day 7
Week 12: Online Dialogue and Deliberation	Due Date
Instructional Material: ● Coming soon. TBD. **Readings:** ● Coming soon. TBD.	~
Week 12 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 12 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 13: Collaborative Governance & Democracy	Due Date
Instructional Material: ● Video (5:36) "Organizations and Democracy" Charles Leadbeater, 2008. **Readings:** ● *Leach, William D. (2006) "Collaborative Public Management and Democracy: Evidence from Western Watershed Partnerships." *Public Administration Review* 66(s1): 100-110. ● 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 13 Short Essay	Day 5

Week 13 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 14: Framing & Systems Thinking	**Due Date**
Readings: ● Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal (2008) "The Power of Reframing." Chapter 1 in *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*	~
Week 14 Live Session	Day 2
Week 14 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 14 Discussion	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 14 Assignment: Paper #2	Day 7
Week 15: Collaborative Leadership	**Due Date**
Reading: ● One book on leadership (For details, see Discussion 1)	~
Week 15 Short Essay	Day 5
Week 15 Discussion 1: Collaborative Leadership	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 15 Discussion 2: Intersectoral Theory & Practice	Initial Post: Day 5 Replies: Day 7
Week 15 Checkpoint: Course Evaluation	Day 7