Course Description and Objectives

If public administrators are to serve the public, then the behaviors, preferences, and expectations of the public must be an object of understanding. Civic engagement is an area of emphasis for local governments per ICMA and nonprofit organizations must also wrestle with the demands and expectations of the public. Therefore, students of public administration must be able to navigate 1) the nature, identity, and behavior of citizens; 2) expectations regarding citizen contributions to public management and governance broadly understood; and 3) the tools and techniques that leverage citizen engagement in pursuit of the public good, broadly understood. However, these questions have very different answers and very different skill sets given paradigmatic divisions between market and political models of public administration. This class will address both.

Students should recognize that expectations for self-guided learning are greater in this course relative to other courses. In particular, students are asked to do the following:

1. Students must be prepared to discuss reading assignments. Students will be asked to contribute to discussions of readings.
2. Students must make informal presentations about homework.
3. Students must answer questions over readings that are not discussed in class.
4. Students must conduct applied research in a real world context.
5. Students must work closely with colleagues through formal and informal collaboration.

In summary, students should expect to read significant materials, to synthesize those materials, and to conduct independent projects with extensive research. The burden and joy of learning sits squarely on the student. My role as the instructor becomes more of a guide and evaluator.
Course Materials

The following books are required and available at local bookstores or online.


Other assigned course readings available on BB or for purchase digitally.

Course Evaluation and Grades

Below you will find a brief description of each component and their weight in the evaluation process. There are 1,000 possible points in the course.

1. **Class Projects (80%)**. Students will participate in the implementation of one or two citizen engagement activities associated with local governments. The class will work as a team with the instructor as the team lead. Grades will be assigned based upon the instructor's evaluation of the quality and quantity of your contributions and the degree of difficulty of your assignments. Periodic reports will be provided to update your progress.

2. **Final Exam (10%)**. You will have one exam at the end of the course. The exam will be comprehensive and cover both the literature, class projects, discussions, and guest speakers.

3. **Class discussions (10%)**. The instructor will evaluate your in class participation on a qualitative observational basis. This includes various written reports of observational assignments including a requirement to attend at least two arenas of public engagement.

Other Course Policies

Please see the Blackboard page for other policies set by the department.

**Students with Disabilities**

Any student who, because of a disabling condition, may require some special arrangements in order to meet course requirements should contact the instructor as soon as possible to make the necessary arrangements. Students should present appropriate verification of student disability to the instructor and reasonable accommodations will be made. However, no requirement exists that accommodations be made prior to completion of this approved University process.

**Withdrawals**

Students may withdraw from the course, but you must follow university procedures. The instructor is not responsible for failure to meet withdrawal deadlines.

**Classroom Civility**
Students must help maintain a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning. Please refrain from engaging in activities that are disruptive to the learning process such as tardiness, use of phones or other electronic devices, or engaging in other activities. Moreover, students should engage in civil discourse with their colleagues and instructor. Argumentation and debate do not necessitate the use of language that denigrates others. Students are encouraged to express their positions and opinions, even controversial ones, but they must do so in a civil manner. Failure to maintain a civil environment will be incorporated into your participation assessment.

Academic Ethics

The issue of academic ethics can be a problem and thus any instance of cheating, plagiarism, falsification, or failure to do original work for this course can result in one or more of the following consequences.

- Failing grade for assignment
- Failing course grade
- Recommendation for additional disciplinary action
- Requirement to do substitute assignments
- Removal from the PhD program or University

See Blackboard for an additional list of course policies that are an extension of this syllabus document.

Course Syllabus

The following schedule indicates our plan for the semester. The instructor will change the plan to facilitate course objectives. Students are responsible for any changes made to the syllabus that are announced in class or through announcements on Blackboard. Such announcements will be timely, but the nature of this course is flexibility for both students and the instructor. To facilitate such flexibility think about the course as three modules that may be relocated within the course calendar, but will be covered in the calendar. Please also recognize the heavy reading load early in the semester and be prepared to read the material before coming to class so you can discuss the material.

The course has three substantive objectives which are outlined below. The course schedule will be adjusted and changed to accommodate these objectives. In other words, the schedule will change.

1. Analytic Frameworks for Citizen Engagement
2. Applied Deliberative Democracy
   a. Forum Design
   b. Forum Implementation
   c. Forum Analysis and Response
3. Strategic Citizen Engagement
   a. Integrating Market Models with Deliberative Democracy
   b. Integrating Technology
   c. Citizen Engagement Planning and Budgeting
**COURSE SCHEDULE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 19</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction to the Class</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 26</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frameworks and Observations --- NO IN CLASS MEETING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nabatchi et al, 1-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frameworks and Observations --- Discussion, Case Studies, and Conceptual Orientation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be sure to have viewed the videos for discussion. Look at videos for and page for February 2nd at the BB course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nabatchi 4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>DCTA Case Study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review the DCTA website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review the DCTA engagement plan on BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Watch the following Board of Directors Meetings from DCTA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">October 2016 Public Meeting Video</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">June 2016 Public Hearing Presentation Denton/Alliance/Fort Worth Service</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">April 2016 Public Meeting Videos</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">Board Meeting – October 2016</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">Board Meeting – November 2016</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applied Direct Democracy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Watch the following videos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">Deliberative Polling in Europe</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">Deliberative Polling on Campus</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review the Japanese case study (see BB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 23  **Forum Design**  
- Nabatchi 8  
- TBD

March 2  **Forum Implementation**  
- Nabatchi 9  
- TBD

March 9  **Forum analysis and responses**  

March 16  **Spring Break**

March 23  
- Preparation and execution – see BB for reading/viewing assignments

March 30  
- Preparation and execution – see BB for reading/viewing assignments

April 6  
- Preparation and execution – see BB for reading/viewing assignments

April 13  
- Preparation and execution – see BB for reading/viewing assignments

April 20  **Integrating Market Models and Deliberative Democracy**  
- Van Ryzin and Immerwahr, “Importance-Performance Analysis of Citizen Satisfaction Surveys.” See BB.  
- Herian and Tomkins, “Citizen satisfaction survey data: Comparison of Derived-Importance Performance Approach.” See BB.  
- Clayton, MO and Westlake, TX surveys. See BB.  
- In class activity—please bring a laptop.

April 27  **Technology and Citizen Engagement**  

May 4  Planning and Budgeting for Citizen Engagement

• Guest speaker

May 11  Final Exam is due at 5:00PM