



Course Title: Networked Governance

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Course Status: | Elective |
| Instructors: | Wolfgang Reinicke (SPP) |
| Teaching Assistant | Jacqueline Dufalla |
| Number of credits: | 2 (11 sessions, no classes during reading week October 22-26) |
| Teaching Format: | Lectures, seminar discussions, case analysis, face to face with a practitioner |
| Semester: | Fall 2018 |
| Class Times: | Detailed course schedule below |
| Location: | tbd |
| Office Hours: | every Thursday from 12:00 to 13:00 or by appointment |

Overall Aim

This seminar focuses on the growing collaboration among public, private and nonprofit organizations to tackle complex public policy challenges at the national and in particular global level. While collaborative or networked governance has gained prominence in recent years, it remains under-researched and is often mismanaged when practiced. The seminar provides students with a conceptual overview of network governance at both the national and global level while also discussing critiques of networked governance and how they might be addressed. This is followed by a review and assessment of key elements of network management. We get further acquainted with the management of networks through an in depth case study and a live face to face conversation with a network founder and manager.

Course Summary

As public policy problems have become more and more complex, there has been a growing emphasis on replacing top down vertical governance structures such as bureaucracies with more integrated horizontal policy making networks. Such networks involve multiple actors (nodes) from different sectors (including public, for profit and non-profit) with multiple linkages (networks) through which public value is being created and the provision of public goods and services are planned, designed, produced, delivered, and evaluated in democratic societies.

Networked governance is said to offer innovative, flexible, targeted and fast responses that can better handle the complexities of today's governance challenges while at the same time directly engaging stakeholders, reinvigorating participation and countering democratic fatigue.

Governance through networks or partnerships has been especially prominent in the domain of global public policy. Global challenges defy jurisdictional boundaries and are resistant to the hierarchical bureaucratic routines of international organizations. Not only is it difficult to foster a broad based consensus among states to provide and finance global public goods but international organizations still lack the authority, legitimacy and expertise to act upon them. Global governance networks or multi-stakeholder partnerships are said to overcome many of these barriers to efficient and effective policy resolution.

This course introduces students to networked governance --as concept, process and management challenge and concrete application-- while also taking a critical look at its professed advantages vis a vis traditional forms of governance through hierarchies and/or markets.

The seminar is divided into six parts. In the first part we will explore the drivers that have pushed networks into the forefront of public policy making and examine the basic structural and operating characteristics and norms of networks by differentiating them from other forms of social organization and governance such as markets and hierarchies. By way of illustration, part two takes a more detailed look at a multi-stakeholder policy –its structure and operation. While governing by network is becoming ever more important, most public managers are not trained in how to lead through the use of networks or partnerships. Networks are complex and delicate organizations prone to failure due to improper design and careless management. Part three will thus look at some of the most important network design and management principles and their applications. Networked governance has not been without criticism from a number of angles and part four will look at those critiques. The fifth part of this course is dedicated to a detailed and in-depth case study of a global policy network that will allow us to examine, apply and review the different aspects covered in the course. In the sixth and final part of the seminar students will have the opportunity to directly engage with the founder of a multi-stakeholder partnership.

Prerequisites

There are no specific prerequisites for the course.

Aims of the Course

This this course seeks to achieve the following aims:

- to develop an understanding of the foundations of networked governance
- to appreciate the advantages and disadvantages of using cross-sectoral networks to address public policy problems

- to foster an understanding of the opportunities and challenges associated with cross-sectoral network management
- to provide insight into skills required to design and manage a multi-stakeholder network
- to delineate and examine the arguments of critics of networked governance
- through an in-depth case study and face to face encounter with a network manager to apply and critically reflect on the above learnings

Learning outcomes:

By the end of this seminar students should

- be familiar with the contemporary challenges of managing and implementing complex public policy challenges;
- be able to understand the basic structural and process characteristics of networks and how they differ from markets and hierarchies;
- become familiar and apply the basic skills necessary to design, manage and assess governance networks;
- become an effective leader of and manager in a multi-stakeholder network;
- be familiar with and understand the critiques of networked governance and how to address them;
- be able to critically examine, assess and evaluate existing multi-stakeholder governance networks.

Seminar Schedule and Overview

Please note: to make up for the holiday on November 1, a makeup class has been scheduled for November 6, time to be finalized during first class

| Section | Date & Time | Class title |
|---|---|---|
| Overview | September 20 15:30-17.10 | 1a. Seminar overview: structure, content, assignments, questions 1b. Public Value and shared power |
| Theoretical Frameworks & Conceptual Foundations | September 27 15:30-17.10 October 5 15:30-17.10 October 11 15:30-17.10 | 2. Markets, Hierarchies, Networks 3. Governance Networks 4. Networks and Global Governance |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Network Management | October 18 15:30-17.10 | 5. Network Management I |
| <i>Reading Week</i> | October 22-26 | <i>Identification of policy paper topic and 1st outline</i> |
| Network Management | Makeup Class November 6 17:20-19:00 or 15:30-17:10 November 8 15:30-17.10 | 6. Network Management II 7. Network Management III |
| Critique | November 15 15:30-17.10 | 8. Governance Networks: Critical Perspectives |
| Case Study | November 22 15:30-17.10 November 29 15:30-17.10 | 9. The World Commission on Dams (WCD) - Parts A, B & C 10. The World Commission on Dams (WCD) - Review & Reflection |
| Face to Face | December 6 15:30-17.10 | 11a. A Conversation with George Kell, Founding Director, UN Global Compact 11.b. Seminar Review |

Plagiarism

Plagiarism and various forms of academic dishonesty consist of misrepresentation by deception or by other fraudulent means and will be automatically referred to the SPP Academic Integrity Committee and invariably result in serious consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript, and/or suspension or expulsion from the university. It is YOUR responsibility to understand what constitutes plagiarism and academic dishonesty. See the CEU Code of Ethics and complete the Indiana plagiarism [test](#) on Moodle.

Grading

CEU uses a system of letter grades and grade points for evaluation:

| | |
|-----------|---------------------|
| A | 3.68 – 4.00 |
| A- | 3.34 – 3.67 |
| B+ | 3.01 – 3.33 |
| B | 2.68 – 3.00 |
| B- | 2.34 – 2.67 |
| C+ | 2.33 (minimum pass) |

Assignments & Grade

Class participation counts for 10% of the grade.

You are expected to come fully prepared to class having read the reading designated as “required”. For more on that see below. Reading some or all of the reading labelled “recommend” will help you better understand the concepts employed, develop a more critical perspective on the issues covered, have greater impact in the class discussion and support you in completing your various assignments.

Quizzes count for 20% of the grade.

There will be two unannounced quizzes lasting no more than 7 minutes each. The quizzes, which will take place at the beginning of the class and will test your familiarity with the “required” reading of a particular session.

Class presentation counts for 20-30% of the grade (depending on individual or group presentation)

You or your team will be asked to present an overview and discuss of one of the nine management challenges to be discussed in Sessions 5-7. You or your team will distribute a summary sheet of the nature of the management challenges and how to address them while highlighting potential risks and failures. You will be provided with a bibliography that you should feel free to expand on or include your own personal experiences. The presentation should last no more than 17 minutes followed by 8 minutes Q&A’s.

Policy paper final counts for 40-50% of the grade (see above).

You will write a policy paper (approx. 3,000 words) on a selected governance network of your choice and interest. The policy paper constitutes the main individual ‘practical exercise’ of the course therefore students will be expected to explore and discuss potential topics with the instructor and the teaching assistant early in the course. The paper should provide an overview of the particular policy challenge faced, why a network approach is conducive to addressing it; delineate some of the structural and process

challenges faced and experienced by the network and its managers; and ideally provide policy suggestions and solutions for improving network process and impact. Alternatively, the paper could be an in depth critique of an existing governance network. If so, the critique must be evidenced and the analysis needs to contain explicit and relatively detailed policy suggestions on how to address the criticism either by changing elements of the network itself or through an alternative governance mechanism.

A number of websites offer guidance on writing policy briefs. There is no definitive structure and you should build on that fits the issue you address. Two recommended resources are provided by Wesleyan University and the University of Texas.

Grading of Policy Paper

| | |
|--|-----|
| Organization and presentation of information | 20% |
| Analysis of (history of) status quo and challenges | 35% |
| Quality of conclusions & recommendations | 20% |
| Drawing on sources and proper referencing | 10% |
| Quality of writing | 15% |

Required Formatting

In the interest of consistency, it is requested that you work in Chicago style. For more information you can consult the latest version of the Chicago Manual of Style (16th ed.) For reference purposes:

- http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html
- http://myrin.ursinus.edu/help/resrch_guides/cit_style_chicago.htm
- <http://dianahacker.com/pdfs/hacker-bish-cms.pdf>

Auditors

Students may register to audit this course if it is not oversubscribed and if they secure the approval of the instructor. Note, however, that to receive the AUD mark on your transcript you have to attend ALL classes and fulfil ALL requirements except the final paper.

Required and Further Reading

To ensure that our discussions are productive, inclusive but diverse and help us understand the topic it will be essential that you do the required reading.

The purpose of the further readings is to provide you with more in-depth coverage of each topic. Students interested in following up and deepening their understanding on any of the topics covered in this course are invited to get in touch with the instructor directly. Some topics covered in this course will be addressed at more detail in other courses offered by the instructor.

Reading groups are strongly encouraged in part to divide up the work, but more importantly to give you invaluable experience in summarizing others' ideas, getting your own ideas on the table, and talking about complex issues with people with a wide range of backgrounds and experiences.

Please note: This outline is accurate at the time of publication. Minor amendments may be made prior to the start and during the course of the term. The amendments will be reflected in the uploaded session on the Moodle.

Course Schedule

INTRODUCTION

1. Overview (September 20)

This first half (45 minutes) of this session is the perfect time to ask questions. It provides a general introduction to the seminar including an overview of its structure and content, what the seminar does and does not cover. This session also discusses learning aims and outcomes, readings and assignments, expectations and general policies including non-use of cell phones and limited use laptops in class, plagiarism and other issues. Part two of this session will introduce some of the broader contextual themes of the seminar. We will briefly get acquainted with two concepts that play an important role in this seminar: “public value” and “shared power”.

Required Readings

- O’Flynn, Janine. 2007. ‘From New Public Management to Public Value: Paradigmatic Change and Managerial Implications’, *The Australian Journal of Public Administration* 66(3): 353-366.
- Crosby, Barbara C. and Bryson, John M. 2005. *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. Jossey-Bass. Chapter 1.

Further Readings

- Stoker, G. 2006. ‘Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance?’, *American Review of Public Administration* 36(1): 41– 57.
- Rutgers, Mark R. 2015. ‘As Good as It Gets? On the Meaning of Public Value in the Study of Policy and Management’, *American Review of Public Administration* 45(1): 29-45.
- Moore, Mark H. 1995. *Creating public value: strategic management in government*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, Mark H. and Bennington, John. eds. 2011. *Public Value: Theory and Practice*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Moore, Mark H. 2013. *Recognizing public value*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

2. Markets, Hierarchies, Networks (September 27)

This session serves to introduce students to three basic forms of social organization or governance, markets, hierarchies and networks and delineates some of their most important distinguishing characteristics. In the second part we look at the evolution of social norms and how those norms underpin collective action absent of hierarchical structures and/or imposed rules and defying market driven individualism - a key feature of success in networked governance.

Required Readings

- Powell, Walter. 1990. 'Neither Market nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization', *Research in Organizational Behavior* 12: 295-336.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1983. 'The Strength of Weak Ties. A Network Theory Revisited', *Sociological Theory* 1: 201-233.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 2000. 'Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14(3): 137-158.

Further Readings

- Podolny, J.M. and Page, K.L. 1998. 'Network forms of organization', *American Review of Sociology* 24: 57-76.
- Powell, Walter and Grodal, Stine. 2005. *Networks of Innovators*. The Oxford Handbook of Innovation. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 3.
- Ostrom, Elinor, Walker, James and Gardner, Roy. 1992. 'Covenants With and Without a Sword: Self-Governance is Possible', *The American Political Science Review* 86(2): 404-417.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burt, Ronald. 2004. 'Structural Holes and Good Ideas', *The American Journal of Sociology* 110(2): 349-99.

3. Governance Networks (October 4)

This sessions takes a first close look at governance networks also referred to as collaborative governance or cross-sector collaboration. How do we explain their occurrence and more recently even their prominence in a changing environment of public management? What is the meaning of collaboration and why is a network structure particularly suited for collaboration? What is the purpose of collaborating in networks? What are the most important issues concepts and ideas in the field of networked public management?

Required Readings

- Börzel, Tanja A. 1998. 'Organizing Babylon-On the Different Conceptions of Policy Networks', *Public Administration* 76(2): 253-273.
- Bryson, John M. and Crosby, Barbara C. 2008. 'Failing into cross-sector collaboration successfully' in L. B. Bingham and R. O'Leary eds., *Big ideas in collaborative public management*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. Pages: 55-78.
- Ansell, Chris, and Alison, Gash. 2008. 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(4): 543-571.

Further Readings

- Goldsmith, Stephen and Eggers, William D. 2004. *Governing by Network*. Washington: The Brookings Institution. Chapters 1, 2 and 3.

- Koliba, Christopher and Meek, Jack W. 2010. *Governance Networks in Public Administration*. Taylor and Francis. Chapters 1, 2 and 3.
- Kamensky, John M. and Burlin, Thomas J. 2004. *Collaboration: Using Networks and Partnerships*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield. Chapter 1.
- O’Leary, R. and Vij, N. 2012. ‘Collaborative public management: Where have we been and where are we going?’, *The American Review of Public Administration* 42(5): 507–522.
- Scarce, Diane, Kasper, Gabriel and McLeod Grant, Heather. 2010 Summer. *Working Wikily*. Stanford Social Innovation Review.
- Huxham, Chris. 2003. ‘Theorizing Collaboration Practice’, *Public Management Review* 5(3): 401-23.
- Pisano, Gary P. and Verganti, Roberto. 2008. ‘Which Kind of Collaboration Is Right for You?’, *Harvard Business Review* 86(12): 78-86.
- Huxham, Chris and Vangen, Siv. 2004. ‘Doing things collaboratively: Realizing the advantage or succumbing to inertia’, *Organizational Dynamics* 33: 190-200.
- Provan, Keith G. and Kenis, Patrick. 2008. ‘Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness’, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18: 229–252.

4. Networks and Global Governance (October 11)

At the global level too, governance networks so called Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) have become prominent institutional mechanisms to address the growing number transboundary challenges from environmental pollution and biodiversity destruction, criminal activity such as money laundering to gender equity, matters of human rights and humanitarian assistance. More recently, in the context the UN’s MDGs and SDGs, MSPs are seen as central to the implementation of an ambitious development agenda. This session provides an overview of the phenomenon of MSPs and its theoretical contexts, examines their operational structure and dynamics and provides a firsthand personal account on how MSPs found their way onto the global agenda of international institutions such as the World Bank and the United Nations.

Required Readings

- Dingwerth, Klaus and Pattberg, Philipp. 2009. ‘Actors, arenas and issues in global governance’, in: Jim Whitman ed., *Palgrave Advances in Global Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan: 41-65.
- Schäferhoff, Marco, Campe, Sabine, and Kaan, Christopher. 2009. ‘Transnational Public-Private Partnerships in International Relations: Making Sense of Concepts, Research Frameworks, and Results,’ *International Studies Review* 11: 451–474.
- Witte, Jan Martin, Benner, Thorsten and Reinicke, Wolfgang H. 2003. ‘Global Public Policy Networks: Lessons Learned and Challenges ahead’. *Brookings Review*.
- *Partnerships for the Sustainable Development Goals: A legacy review towards realizing the 2030 Agenda*. UNDESA, 2015.
- Browse and get acquainted with the resources on the Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform at <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnerships.html>

Further Readings

- Prügl, Elisabeth and True, Jacqui. 2014. 'Equality means business? Governing gender through transnational public-private partnerships', *Review of International Political Economy* 21(6): 1137-1169.
- True, Jacqui. 2008. 'Global accountability and transnational networks: the Women Leaders' Network and Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation', *The Pacific Review* 21(1): 1-26.
- Vangen, Siv, and Winchester, Nik. 2014. 'Managing Cultural Diversity in Collaborations', *Public Management Review* 16(5): 686-707.
- Reinicke, Wolfgang H., Deng, Francis M. et al. 2000. *Critical Choices: The United Nations, Networks, and the Future of Global Governance*. Global Public Policy Institute.
- Zadek, Simon. 2008. 'Global collaborative governance: there is no alternative Corporate Governance', *The international journal of business in society* 8(4): 374-388.
- Ansell, Chris, Sondorp, Egbert, and Hartley Stevens, Robert. 2012. 'The Promise and Challenge of Global Network Governance: The Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network', *Global Governance* 13(3): 317-338.
- Witte, Jan M. and Reinicke, Wolfgang H. 2005. *Business Unusual. Facilitating United Nations Reform through Partnerships*. Commissioned by the United Nations Global Compact Office. New York, NY.
- Andonova, Liliana B. 2006: 'Globalization, Agency, and Institutional Innovation: The Rise of Public-Private Partnerships in Global Governance', *Andonova Goldfarb Center Working Paper No. 2006-004* March.
- Dodds, Felix. *Multi-stakeholder partnerships: Making them work for the Post-2015 Development Agenda*. Global Research Institute. University of North Carolina.
- Abbott, Kenneth W., Genschel, Philipp, Snidal, Duncan and Zangl, Bernhard. 2015. 'Orchestration: Global Governance through intermediaries,' in *International Organizations as Orchestrators*. Cambridge University Press: 3-36.

5. Network Management I (October 18)

Networked governance most often fails because network management is highly complex and requires an extensive skill set that network managers often lack. In the following three sessions (5-7) students will examine nine (3 in each session) management principles and skills that have proven to be key in explaining success or failure of networked governance. This list is not exhaustive but due to time constraints some selectivity had to be applied or critical skills are offered elsewhere at SPP such as in the case of the SFI module "Managing Cultural Diversity".

a) Design

Getting Started:

- Ingraham, Wallace Patricia and Getha-Taylor, Heather. 2008. 'Incentivizing Collaborative Performance: Aligning Policy Intent, Design, and Impact' in L.B. Bingham & R. O'Leary eds., *Big Ideas in Collaborative Public Management*. New York: M.E. Sharpe: Chapter 5.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

b) Trust

Getting Started:

- Huxam, Chris and Vangen, Siv. 2005. 'Coping with Trust' in *Managing to Collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage*. New York: Routledge: Chapter 9.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

c) Social Capital

Getting Started:

- Huppé, Gabriel A., Creech, Heather and Knoblauch, Doris. 2012. 'Developing Social Capital in Networked Governance Initiatives: A Lock-Step Approach', *International Institute for Sustainable Development*.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

OCTOBER 22-26: READING WEEK

Students are strongly encouraged to use this time to hone in on a paper topic for the final policy paper. They are expected to discuss their topic of choice and a first rough outline with the instructor or the teaching assistant soon thereafter.

6. Network Management II (makeup class November 6)

a) Power

Getting Started:

- Huxam, Chris and Vangen, Siv. 2005. 'Using Power' in *Managing to Collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage*. New York: Routledge. Chapter 10.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

b) Conflict

Getting Started:

- O’Leary, Rosemary and Bingham, Lisa Blomgren. 2007. *A Manager’s Guide to Resolving Conflicts in Collaborative Networks*. IBM Center for the Business of Government. Pages 24-29.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

c) Leadership

Getting Started:

- Crosby, Barbara C. 2010. ‘Leading in the shared-power world of 2020’, *Public Administration Review*, 70(Supplement), S69-S77.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

7. Network Management III (November 8)

a) Accountability

Getting Started:

- Forrer, John, Kee, James Edwin, Newcomer, Kathryn E. and Boyer, Eric. 2010. ‘Public–Private Partnerships and the Public Accountability Question’, *Public Administration Review* 70(3): 475-484.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

b) Performance

Getting Started:

- Voets, Joris, Van Dooren, Wouter, De Rynck, Filip. 2008. ‘A Framework For Assessing the Performance of Policy Networks’, *Public Management Review* 10(6): 773–790.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

c) Legitimacy

Getting Started:

- Klijn, E. H. and Skelcher, C. 2007. ‘Democracy and governance network: Compatible or not? Four conjectures and their implications’, *Public Administration* 85(3):587-608.

A selected bibliography will be distributed to the presenter(s) and will be made available on Moodle.

8. Governance Networks: Critical Perspectives & Responses (November 15)

Networked governance has not been without its critics. This criticism occurs at two levels which often intersect. First, networked governance has been criticized for its corporatist nature providing special access to powerful interests groups in particular the private sector. Such privileged positions it is said are used to “green-, white-, or blue wash” their activities in a particular policy domain. Second and related, networked governance has been criticized for its poor performance along such dimensions as transparency, legitimacy and impact. We will examine these criticisms looking at particular cases and explore potential remedies.

Required Reading

- Ottaway, Marina. 2001. ‘Corporatism Goes Global. International Organizations, Nongovernmental Organization Networks, and Transnational Business’, *Global Governance* 7(3): 265-292.
- Martens, Jens. 2007. Multistakeholder Partnerships-Future Models of Multilateralism? Dialogue On Globalization, Occasional Papers Number 29. Friedrich Ebert Foundation, Berlin: 31-62.
- Beisheim, Marianne and Simon, Nils. 2016. *Multi-stakeholder partnerships for implementing the 2030 Agenda: Improving accountability and transparency*. Analytical Paper for the 2016 ECOSOC Partnership Forum.
- Zammit, Ann. 2003. ‘A New Development Strategy and True Test of Corporate Responsibility’ in *Development at Risk. Rethinking UN-Business Partnerships*. The South Centre and UNRISD. Geneva: 259-276.
- Coles, Romand. 2010. ‘Collaborative Governance and Civic Empowerment: A Discussion of Investing in Democracy: Engaging Citizens in Collaborative Governance’, *Perspectives on Politics* 8(2): 601-604.

Further Readings

Cases:

- Warner, Jeroen F. 2006. ‘More sustainable participation? Multi-stakeholder platforms for integrated catchment management’, *Water Resources Development* 22(1): 15–35.
- Echeverria, John D. 2001. ‘No success like failure: The Platte River Collaborative Watershed Planning Process’, *William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review* 25(3): 559-604.
- Weir, Margaret, Rongerude, Jane and Ansell, Christopher K. 2009. ‘Collaboration Is Not Enough Virtuous Cycles of Reform in Transportation Policy’, *Urban Affairs Review* 44(4): 455-489.
- Leach, William D. 2006. ‘Collaborative Public Management and Democracy: Evidence from Western Watershed Partnerships’, *Public Administration Review* 66: 100–110.

A Critical Legal Perspective:

- NeJaime, Douglas. 2009. ‘When New Governance Fails’, *Ohio State Law Journal* 70(2): 323-330, 347-363 and 400-402.

Additional Literature:

- Pattberg, Philipp et al. eds. 2012. *Public-Private Partnerships for Sustainable Development. Emergence, Influence and Legitimacy*. Edward Elgar Publishing, UK. Chapter 4.
- Andonova, Liliana B. and Levy, Marc A. 2003. 'Franchising Global Governance: Making Sense of the Johannesburg Type II Partnerships', in Olav Schram Stokke and Øystein B. Thommessen eds., *Yearbook of International Cooperation on Environment and Development*. London: 19-31.
- Utting, Peter and Zammit, Ann. 2006: Beyond Pragmatism. Appraising UN-Business Partnerships. Markets, Business and Regulation Programme Paper Number 1. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. Geneva. Pages 20-27 and 32-41.
- Zammit, Ann. 2003. A New Development Strategy and True Test of Corporate Responsibility in Zammit Ann. *Development at Risk. Rethinking UN-Business Partnerships*. The South Centre and UNRISD. Geneva. Pages: 259-276.
- Sousa, David J., and McGrory Klyza, Christopher. 2007. 'New Directions in Environmental Policy Making: An Emerging Collaborative Regime or Reinventing Interest Group Liberalism?' *Natural Resources Journal* 47(2): 378-382 and 441-444.
- McCloskey, Michael. 2000. 'Problems with using collaboration to shape environmental public policy', *Valparaiso University Law Review* 34(2): 423-434.
- Bull, Benedicte and McNeill, Desmond. 2010. 'From Business Unusual to Business as Usual' in: Magdalena Bexell and Ulrika Mörth eds., *Democracy and Public-Private Partnerships in Global Governance*. Palgrave MacMillan. Chapter 6.

9. Case Study Part I: The World Commission on Dams (WCD) (November 22)

This is the first of two sessions discussing the case of the World Commission on Dams (WCD) a multi-stakeholder network. The primary role of this network is standard setting. Among others we will explore the origins and rationale of the WCD. We will analyze the interests and incentives of the principal participants, the evolution of its principles and the final outcome generated by the WCD.

Required Readings

- Benner, Thorsten and Beffert, David. 2004. *Making Global Public Policy: The World Commission on Dams*. Berlin: Hertie School of Governance. Case 1-2004. Parts A, B and C.
- Briscoe, John. 2001. 'The World Commission on Dams: Lessons Learned About Setting Global Standards' in Christopher D. Gerrard, Marco Ferroni, and Ashoka Mody eds., *Global Public Policies and Programs: Implications for Financing and Evaluation Proceedings from a World Bank Workshop*. The World Bank, Washington D.C.

Further Readings

- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2002. 'Partnerships as a Social Network Mediator for Resolving Global Conflict. The Case of the World Commission on Dams,' *International Journal of Public Administration* 25(11): 1281-1310.

- Dingwerth, Klaus. 2007. *The New Transnationalism. Transnational Governance and Democratic Legitimacy*. Basingstoke, N.Y.: 52-98.
- Goulet, Denis. 2005. 'Global Governance, Dam Conflicts, and Participation,' *Human Rights Quarterly* 27(3): 881-907.
- Dubash, Navroz K. 2011. 'World Commission on Dams' in: Thomas N. Hale and David Held eds., *Handbook of Transnational Governance: Institutions and Innovations*. Cambridge: Polity Press: 202-210.

10. Case Study Part II: The World Commission on Dams (WCD) continued (November 29)

The purpose of this session is to assess the management of the WCD paying particular attention to the skills discussed in Sections 5-7. In addition, we will assess the longer term influence and impact the development debate surrounding a large dams.

Required Readings

- Khagram, Sanjeev. 1999. *Beyond Temples and Tombs: Towards Effective Governance for Sustainable Development through the World Commission on Dams*. Case Study for the UN Vision Project on Global Public Policy Networks.
- Takahashi, Lois M. and Smutny, Gayla. 2002. 'Collaborative Windows and Organizational Governance: Exploring the Formation and Demise of Social Service Partnerships', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 31(2): 165-185.
- Briscoe, John. 2010. 'Overreach and Response: The Politics of the WCD and its Aftermath', *Water Alternatives* 3(2): 399-415.
- Leslie, Jacques, Large Dams Just Aren't Worth the Cost, *International New York Times*. August 22, 2014. Online.
- Ansar et al. 2014. 'Should we build more large dams? The actual costs of hydropower megaproject development', *Energy Policy* (69): 43-56.

11. a. Face to Face: A Conversation with Georg Kell, Founding Director, UN Global Compact (December 6)

Based on a set of questions developed by the class, students will engage Georg Kell in a one hour conversation discussing his own experiences and lessons learned with networked governance. The Global Compact, too, has received ample criticisms and students are encouraged to ask Georg Kell to respond to those critics.

Required Readings

- Kell, G. 2013. '12 Years later: Reflections on the Growth of the UN Global Compact', *Business and Society* 52(I): 31-52.
- Rasche, A., Waddock, S., and McIntosh, M. 2012. 'The United Nations Global Compact: Retrospect and Prospect', *Business and Society* 52(I): 6-30.
- Sethi, S. P. and Schepers, D. H. 2013. 'United Nations Global Compact: The promise-performance gap', *Journal of Business Ethics* 118: 561-576.
- Hurd, Ian. 2003. 'Labor Standards through International Organizations. The Global Compact in Comparative Perspective', *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 11: Autumn.
- Nolan, Justine. 2005. 'The United Nations Compact with Business. Hindering or Helping the Protection of Human Rights?', *University of Queensland Law Journal* 24(2): 445-466.

Further Readings

- Ruggie, John. G. 2002. 'The Theory and Practice of Learning Networks. Corporate Social Responsibility and the Global Compact', *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 5: Spring.
- Berliner, D. and Prakash, A. 2012. 'From norms to programs: The United Nations Global Compact and global governance', *Regulation & Governance* 6(2): 149–166
- Brown, Jill A., Clark, Cynthia and Buono, Anthony F. 2016. 'The United Nations global compact: Engaging implicit and explicit CSR for global governance', *Journal of Business Ethics* 1-14.
- Bernhagen, Patrick and Mitchell, Neil J. 2010. 'The Private Provision of Public Goods: Corporate Commitments and the United Nations Global Compact' *International Studies Quarterly* 54(4):1175-1187.

11. b. Seminar Review (December 6)

Time permitting we will have short review and Feedback session.