

POLI 420A (3) ADVANCED TOPICS IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS (Participatory Governance)¹

SUMMER INTENSIVE SEMINAR

Section 951 - 1st term M W 10:00 - 13:00 B219

May 11 – June 18, 2015

Instructor: Paolo Spada

Email: pspada@mail.ubc.ca

Office hours: via appointment

This seminar examines the recent global diffusion of participatory governance innovations. Part one explores a variety of empirical applications in comparative prospective. Concrete examples will include participatory budgeting in Brazil and in the US, participatory poverty assessments in Indonesia, deliberative polling in China, citizens' assemblies in British Columbia, crowd-sourcing law-making in Iceland, and a few other examples of recent ITC governance innovations. Part two explores the concepts of governance and accountability in political science and introduces the some of the theoretical foundations of participatory governance. The seminar has four main objectives: 1) to provide students with an overview of the main theoretical justifications for participatory governance within the broader debate on governance in political science, 2) to introduce the students to rigorous qualitative and quantitative methodologies for policy program evaluation, 3) to explore the advantages and disadvantages of different designs of participatory governance innovations, 4) to develop a set of concrete skills that the students can apply both in academia and in the professional market. In particular the seminar will require the students to design and implement a research project that will generate a wiki style case study. The class is targeted to fourth year students in social science that have good research and writing skills. There are no formal pre-requisite, but the seminar is intensive, requires a significant amount of weekly readings and a propensity for group work.

¹ This seminar is an experimental teaching module prepared to explore the potential of the Participedia Project as a teaching tool. Part of the design and material used to construct this class was inspired by similar experimental modules implemented by Prof. John Gastil at Penn State University, and by Prof. Graham Smith at the University of Westminster. Some notes and presentations were adapted from material produced by Gemma Jamieson Malik and Robert Richards.

Class requirements:

- a) The class is intensive, thus each lecture combines the requirements of 2 traditional lectures. That implies that each class has a significant amount of readings (~70 pages per class, ~140 pages per week).
- b) The students are expected to submit 1 set of reading notes per class (see reading notes guidelines) via email (20 points) before the beginning of class. There are no reading notes required for the first class, and no readings assigned for the class on the 8th of June (when the first draft of the case study is due), thus a total of 10 sets of reading notes are required.
- c) In class participation (30 points) [attendance + presentations + group discussion].
- d) Weekly group assignment (50 points). Every week the students will have to complete a group assignment that will contribute to the completion of the final research project.
- e) Bonus points will be awarded on the basis of exceptional reading notes (+1).

Absence and Extenuating Circumstances:

- If you are unable to attend a seminar, then you must email me in advance with notice of absence (I have to adjust the discussion groups). Given the intensive nature of the class should there be more than 2 absences then you **MUST** obtain written Extenuating Circumstances via the Appropriate Office (see instructions at the following [link](#)).
- Even if you cannot attend the seminar you are still expected to submit reading notes via email. No late notes are accepted without written Extenuating Circumstances via the Appropriate Office.
- If you submit your homework late but within 24 hours or one working day of the specified deadline, 10% of the overall marks available for that element of assessment will be deducted, as a penalty for late submission, except for work which obtains a mark in the range 50 – 59%, in which case the mark will be capped at the pass mark (50%). If you submit your coursework more than 24 hours or more than one working day after the specified deadline you will be given a mark of zero for the work in question apart in case of Extenuating Circumstances.
- Late work and any claim of Extenuating Circumstances relating to coursework must be submitted at the earliest opportunity to ensure as far as possible that the work can still be marked. Late work will not normally be accepted if it is received more than five working days after the original coursework deadline.

Typical class:

The class starts at 10 am with 10 minutes of introduction/announcements/questions

- a) 3 groups of students will be **RANDOMLY** formed. Each group will be assigned a reading to discuss for 15 minutes with the objective of preparing a small 10 minutes presentation for the entire class.
- b) At the end of the group discussions I will select a student that will present the highlights of the group discussion to the entire class. There will be 5 minutes of Q&A for each presentation in which all the members of the group can answer questions.
- c) After all the 3 papers are presented there will be a plenary discussion on the joint relevance of the readings (20 minutes).

15 minutes coffee break

- d) Group activity 45 minutes

Class ends at 12.45

READING LIST

1) Monday, May 11: Introduction: what is participatory governance and why it matters?

- Introduction (video of John Gaventa from the courser class on Citizens' Engagement)
- Get a taste of small group deliberation (exercise: define governance, define innovation, define participatory)
- Reviewing the syllabus, grading scheme
- Example of reading notes
- Example of in class presentation
- Introduce the group assignments and see example: [example 1](#) (A+); [example 2](#) (A+); [example 3](#) (B+)
- Overview of potential case studies
- Overview of the participedia interface
- Form groups

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES to complete the first week group homework:

- 1) take a look at participedia (www.participedia.net), create a login, conduct a search
- 2) select a case from the list
- 3) contact the organizers of the case via email to introduce yourself and explain what are you doing and that you want to interview them.
- 4) familiarize with the case input interface.
- 5) begin thinking about a research plan, and how to divide the work.
- 6) begin going through the provided checklist and identify what will be easy/difficult to do, what is available on secondary resources, what will require direct data collection in the interview
- 7) begin storing secondary sources on the case

2) Wednesday, May 13: What is participatory governance?

Mandatory readings:

- [Francis Fukuyama. 2013. "What is Governance?" Governance 26\(3\): 347-68 \[Total 22 pages\].](#)
- Fung, A.2006. "[Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance.](#)" Public Administration Review, Special Issue December 2006: 66-75 AND "[Putting the Public Back Into Governance: The Challenges of Citizen Participation and Its Future](#)" in Public Administration Review 25 February (2015) [TOTAL 20 pages].

- [Sherry R. Arnstein \(1969\). "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," JAIP, Vol. 35, No. 4, July, pp. 216-224](#) AND <http://tamarackcci.ca/blogs/community-animator/reflections-iap2-international-association-public-participation-spectrum> AND <http://www.iap2.org.au/documents/item/84> [Total 15 pages] <https://medium.com/@RedheadSteph/re-imagining-the-iap2-spectrum-9d24afdc1b2e>

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES to complete the homework:

- Complete familiarization with PP interface
- Complete a research plan to conduct the case study, divide the work and assign tasks
- Keep collecting secondary materials

HOMEWORK 1: due via email Monday May 18 (1 copy per group with all the names of group members)

- Written detailed research plan, with task assignments, for each member of the group.
- Completed checklist of what will be easy and what will be difficult to do (use the provided checklist).
- Copy of the email to the organizers of the process that will be studied, and eventual answer.
- List of available secondary sources, at least 5, of which at least 3 on the general methodology of the case (e.g., participatory budgeting, ideation software, citizen's assembly), at least 1 on the case itself.
- Create a stub in the PP website
- Upload the list of secondary sources on the stub in the appropriate section
- If pictures/movies of the case are available upload those

SKILL: writing a small motivated research proposal, group management

- **Monday, May 18: NO CLASS**

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES to complete the homework:

- Begin reading the secondary sources, identify from the checklist what is missing to complete the case. More precisely begin writing a word document divided in 3 sections:
- Section 1: methodology
This section describes the methodology of the case using at least 3 secondary sources
- Section 2: what's missing to complete the fixed fields?

This section lists one by one the fixed fields and provides an answer or adds a question mark if the information is not available in secondary sources

- Section 3: what's missing to complete the body of the case?

This section lists one by one the section of the body of the case (Problems and Purpose; History; Originating Entities and Funding; Participant Selection; Deliberation, Decisions, and Public Interaction; Influence, Outcomes, and Effects; Analysis and Lessons Learned) and links them to existing secondary sources that provide the answer or add a question mark if the section cannot be completed with secondary sources.

3) Wednesday, May 20: participatory budgeting I: origin and diffusion

Mandatory readings:

- [Wampler, Brian \(2012\) "Participatory Budgeting: Core principles and Key Impacts," Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 12](#) [Total 14 pages]
- The origin and diffusion of PB http://www.ces.uc.pt/myces/UserFiles/livros/1097_DG-25_bf.pdf Introduction (page 9 to 14) + Latin America (page 25 to 40). [Total 24 pages]
- Europe and North America: [25 years of PB worldwide](#) (Donata Secondo & Pamela Jennings, page 241-253) + http://www.ces.uc.pt/myces/UserFiles/livros/1097_DG-25_bf.pdf (Page 40-54). [Total 26 pages]

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES:

- a) Write a piece that defines the methodology of the case using 3 secondary sources
- b) Complete the word document
- c) Prepare a task plan of who is going to do what

HOMEWORK 2: due in class Monday May 25

Word document divided in 4 sections:

- Section 1: methodology
This section describes the methodology of the case using at least 3 secondary sources
- Section 2: what's missing to complete the fixed fields?
This section lists one by one the fixed fields and provides an answer or adds a question mark if the information is not available in secondary sources and needs to be gathered in the interview.
- Section 3: what's missing to complete the body of the case?
This section lists one by one the section of the body of the case (Problems and Purpose; History; Originating Entities and Funding; Participant Selection; Deliberation, Decisions, and Public Interaction; Influence, Outcomes, and Effects; Analysis and

Lessons Learned) and links them to existing secondary sources that contain the relevant information. You do not have to begin writing the sections, but you can.

SKILL: writing a small critical literature review, planning

4) Monday, May 25: participatory budgeting II: impact

Mandatory readings:

- Touchton, M. and Wampler, B. 2014. '[Improving Social Well-Being Through New Democratic Institutions](#)', *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(10): 1442-1469. [23 pages]
- [Ganuza, Ernesto and Baiocchi, Gianpaolo \(2012\) "The Power of Ambiguity: How Participatory Budgeting Travels the Globe," Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 8. \(14 pages\)](#)
- [Does participatory budgeting improve decentralized public service delivery?](#) Diether Beuermann, María. Amelina. p. cm. — (IDB Working Paper Series ; 547 2014) [30 pages]

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES:

- Prepare the informed consent
- Prepare the interview protocol with the organizers to fill the missing information,
- Contact the organizers conduct the interview.

6) Wednesday, May 27 [RESCHEDULED TO JUNE 25]

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES:

- Conduct the interview.
- Write a small report about the interview.

HOMEWORK 3: Due in class Monday June 1

Word document containing 3 sections:

- Email with acknowledgment of informed consent
- Interview protocol
- Report on the interview

SKILL: understanding what informed consent is and preparing, conducting and analyzing an interview

5) Monday, June 1: deliberative processes: citizens' assemblies and deliberative polls

Mandatory readings:

- Lang, Amy. “[But Is It For Real? The British Columbia Citizens’ Assembly as a Model of State-Sponsored Citizen Empowerment](#)” in *Politics and Society*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (2007). [32 pages]
- James, Fishkin; Robert, Luskin. (2005) “[Experimenting with a Democratic Ideal: Deliberative Polling and Public Opinion](#)” *Acta Politica*, Volume 40, Number 3, September , pp. 284-298(15) AND Bruce Ackerman and James S. Fishkin (2002). “[Deliberation Day](#)” in *Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 10, No 2: 129-132. [Total 19 pages]
- Landemore, Hélène, (2014) [Experimenting with crowdsourcing a constitution: Inclusive Constitution-Making: The Icelandic Experiment](#), *Journal of Political Philosophy* Volume 23, Issue 2, pages 166–191, June 2015 [25 pages]

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES:

- Write the case study

6) Wednesday, June 3: Community Driven Development

Mandatory readings:

- Mansuri, Ghazala and Rao, Vijayendra (2012). [Localizing Development: Does Participation Work?](#) (Policy Research Reports): OVERVIEW (page 1-14) [Total 14 pages]
- Dasgupta, Aniruddha; Beard, Victoria (2007) “[Community Driven Development, Collective Action and Elite Capture in Indonesia](#)” *Development and Change*, Volume 38, Number 2, March , pp. 229-249(21). [Total 17 pages]

Recommended

- Araujo, M.C., Ferreira, F.H.G., Lanjouw, P. and Ozler, B. (2006) “[Local Inequality and Project Choice: Theory and Evidence from Ecuador](#),” World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3997. SKIP THE MATHEMATICAL MODEL (page 8-16) and ROBUSTNESS CHECKS (page 26-27)
- La Ferrara, Eliana, (2002) ‘[Inequality and Participation: Theory and Evidence from Rural Tanzania](#)’, *Journal of Public Economics*, v85, n2 (August 2002): 235-73

RECOMMENDED GROUP ACTIVITIES:

- Write the case study

HOMEWORK 4: Due in class Monday June 8

Word document containing the first draft of the case study

SKILL: writing a report or a policy brief following a very precise framework

7) Monday, June 8: A primer on field experiments in participatory governance

NOTE: this class will be different from the others because it would be a lecture, NO READINGS NOTES REQUIRED. You are not expected to do the readings in advance.

- Gerber & Green: Preface and Chapter 1: Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation
- Benjamin Olken (2009) <http://www.povertyactionlab.org/publication/monitoring-corruption-evidence-field-experiment-indonesia>
- Farrar et Al. (2008) [Disaggregating Deliberation's Effects: An Experiment within a Deliberative Poll](#)

GROUP ACTIVITY: In Class Presentation of the Case Studies

8) Wednesday, June 10: ITC tools for participatory governance

- Online deliberation: Mark Klein, Spada P. & R. Calabretta [Enabling Deliberations in a Political Party Using Large-Scale Argumentation: A Preliminary Report](#) [17 pages]
- Brian D. Loadera & Dan Mercea [NETWORKING DEMOCRACY? Social media innovations and participatory politics](#) [15 pages]

Recommended

- [Goodman, Nicole Janine, Jon H. Pammett, and Joan De Bardeleben. 2010. A Comparative Assessment of Electronic Voting. Elections Canada](#) (page 15 to 39).
- [The Emergence of Civic Tech: Investments in a Growing Field](#) (Knight Foundation 2013)

GROUP ACTIVITY: In Class Presentation of the Case Studies

HOMEWORK 5: Due in class Monday June 15

Word document containing a detailed scorecard for other groups case studies, plus suggestion and recommendations for improvement.

SKILL: learning how to present in groups and give constructive feedback

9) Monday, June 15: Transparency and open government

- “[Does Transparency Improve Governance](#)” in *Annual Review of Political Science* Vol. 17 (February 2014): 65-87 with Stephen Kosack.
- “[Infotopia: Unleashing the Power of Democratic Transparency](#)” in *Politics and Society* Vol. 41 (2013): 183-212
- Read https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Snowden and watch https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XEVlyP4_11M (**warning:** this is a satire video with some vulgar language. The video however moves two fundamental critiques to Snowden strategy, what are they?)

10) Wednesday, June 18: Challenges to participatory governance

- Shapiro, Ian “[Optimal deliberation?](#)” *Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol.10, no. 2 (June 2002), pp. 196-211. [**17 pages**]
- Watkins, David “[Deliberation, Agonism, and Non-Domination: Mapping Democratic Theory.](#)” Paper prepared for APSA 2012. [**26 pages**]

And understand the design and results of:

- Spada, Paolo and Vreeland, James Raymond (2013) “[Who Moderates the Moderators? The Effect of Non-neutral Moderators in Deliberative Decision Making.](#)” *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 9: Iss. 2, Article 3. [**17 pages**]
- Karpowitz, C. F., Mendelberg, T., & Shaker, L. (2012). [Gender Inequality in Deliberative Participation.](#) *American Political Science Review*, 106(3), 533-547. [**16 pages**]

12) (Make-up class for May 27) Monday June 21: Governance and participatory and deliberative democracy.

- Pateman <http://faculty.arts.ubc.ca/jbeatty/Pateman.pdf> AND Pateman, C. 2012. ‘[Participatory Democracy Revisited](#)’, *Perspectives on Politics*, 10(1): 7-19.
- Mansbridge et al. (2012) “[A Systemic approach to deliberative democracy.](#)”

- PETER JOHN, GRAHAM SMITH AND GERRY STOKER “[Nudge Nudge, Think Think: Two Strategies for Changing Civic Behaviour.](#)” The Political Quarterly, Vol. 80, No. 3.

HOMEWORK 6: Due in my mailbox Monday June 28 AND via email

- Word document containing the finalized and updated case study
- Separate word document containing a detailed and motivated answer to all comments/criticism and describes what has changed from the first draft.
- Upload everything in Participedia

SKILL: learning how to incorporate edits and provide a justified response