

2015 DRI Symposium Bibliography

Dispute Resolution Institute

Follow this and additional works at: http://open.mitchellhamline.edu/dri_symposia

Dispute Resolution Institute, "2015 DRI Symposium Bibliography" (March 28, 2016). *DRI Symposia*. Paper 5.
http://open.mitchellhamline.edu/dri_symposia/2015/pre_symposium_information/5

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the DRI Projects at Mitchell Hamline Open Access. It has been accepted for inclusion in DRI Symposia by an authorized administrator of Mitchell Hamline Open Access. For more information, please contact sean.felhofer@mitchellhamline.edu.

2015 Symposium - An Intentional Conversation About
Public Engagement and Decision-Making:
Moving from Dysfunction and Polarization to Dialogue and Understanding

Resources on Public Engagement and Collaborative Governance

Chris Ansell & Alison Gash, *Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice*, 18 J. Pub. Admin. Res. & Theory 543 (2007).

Over the past few decades, a new form of governance has emerged to replace adversarial and managerial modes of policy making and implementation. Collaborative governance, as it has come to be known, brings public and private stakeholders together in collective forums with public agencies to engage in consensus-oriented decision making. In this article, we conduct a meta-analytical study of the existing literature on collaborative governance with the goal of elaborating a contingency model of collaborative governance. After reviewing 137 cases of collaborative governance across a range of policy sectors, we identify critical variables that will influence whether or not this mode of governance will produce successful collaboration. These variables include the prior history of conflict or cooperation, the incentives for stakeholders to participate, power and resources imbalances, leadership, and institutional design. We also identify a series of factors that are crucial within the collaborative process itself. These factors include face-to-face dialogue, trust building, and the development of commitment and shared understanding. We found that a virtuous cycle of collaboration tends to develop when collaborative forums focus on “small wins” that deepen trust, commitment, and shared understanding. The article concludes with a discussion of the implications of our contingency model for practitioners and for future research on collaborative governance.

Lisa Blomgren Bingham, *Collaborative Governance: Emerging Practices and the Incomplete Legal Framework for Public and Stakeholder Voice*, 2009 J. Disp. Resol. 269 (2009).

This article describes the broad range of processes through which citizens and stakeholders collaborate to make, implement, and enforce public policy. First, it briefly reviews collaborative and new governance. Second, it describes deliberative democracy; collaborative public or network management; and appropriate dispute resolution in the policy process. These three separate fields are part of a single phenomenon, namely the changing nature of citizen and stakeholder voice in governance. Third, it describes how these new forms of participation operate across the policy continuum. Fourth, it briefly reviews existing legal infrastructure for collaborative governance primarily from the perspective of federal administrative law.²⁰ I conclude that we need to revise our legal infrastructure to facilitate collaboration in a way that will strengthen our democracy.

Lisa Blomgren Bingham, *The Next Generation of Administrative Law: Building the Legal Infrastructure for Collaborative Governance*, 2010 Wis. L. Rev. 297 (2010).

This Article describes the map of statutory administrative law through those cross-cutting statutes that apply generally to all federal agencies. It argues that each major statute represents a balance among five fundamental values in the relationship between the government and the governed, a balance struck by Congress in a particular historical context and moment in time. These values are accountability, efficiency, transparency, participation, and collaboration. Second, it surveys the current law and practice of both in-person and technology-aided public participation , including recent developments through the Open Government Initiative, Open Government Dialogue, and Open Government Directive. Third, it argues that at this moment in history—in light of dramatic technology-driven changes in transparency—we need to reassess the balance among our five fundamental values to foster more participation and collaboration. In order to adjust those values to foster collaborative governance, it proposes to broaden agency authority to innovate through a Collaborative Governance Act (CGA) that defines public participation to include an increasingly rich variety of deliberative and participatory democratic practices. It proposes to model the CGA in structure on the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act by providing for an agency specialist, broad agency discretion to innovate in the use of participatory processes, and encouraging innovation by limiting judicial review.

2015 Symposium - An Intentional Conversation About
Public Engagement and Decision-Making:
Moving from Dysfunction and Polarization to Dialogue and Understanding

John M. Bryson, et al., *Designing Public Participation Processes*, Public Administration Review 1 (Jan.-Feb. 2013).

The purpose of this Theory to Practice article is to present a systematic, cross-disciplinary, and accessible synthesis of relevant research and to offer explicit evidence-based design guidelines to help practitioners design better participation processes. From the research literature, the authors glean suggestions for iteratively creating, managing, and evaluating public participation activities. The article takes an evidence-based and design science approach, suggesting that effective public participation processes are grounded in analyzing the context closely, identifying the purposes of the participation effort, and iteratively designing and redesigning the process accordingly.

Making Public Participation Legal, National Civic League (October, 2013).

Most of the laws that govern public participation in the United States are over thirty years old. They do not match the expectations and capacities of citizens today, they predate the Internet, and they do not reflect the lessons learned in the last two decades about how citizens and governments can work together. Increasingly, public officials and staff are wondering whether the best practices in participation are in fact supported – or even allowed – by the law.

Over the past year, the Working Group on Legal Frameworks for Public Participation has produced new tools, including a model local ordinance and model amendment to state legislation, in order to help create a more supportive, productive, and equitable environment for public participation. The Working Group has been coordinated by the **Deliberative Democracy Consortium** (DDC).

<http://www.nationalcivicleague.org/making-public-participation-legal/>

Tina Nabatchi and Lisa Blomgren Amsler, *Direct Public Engagement in Local Government*, The American Review of Public Administration 1 (2014).

Public engagement is an umbrella term that encompasses numerous methods for bringing people together to address issues of public importance. In this article, we focus on direct public engagement in local government, exploring what we know and proposing areas where more research is needed. We first define direct public engagement and distinguish it from related concepts and terms. We then introduce a simple framework for exploring variations in direct public engagement at the local level. Next, we use this framework to examine the extant literature on why, how, and to what effect direct public engagement in local government is used. Finally, we identify gaps in the literature and propose a research agenda for the future.

Kathryn S. Quick & Martha S. Feldman, *Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion*, 33(3) Journal of Planning Education and Research 272 (2011).

This article argues that participation and inclusion are independent dimensions of public engagement and elaborates the relationships of inclusion with deliberation and diversity. Inclusion continuously creates a community involved in defining and addressing public issues; participation emphasizes public input on the content of programs and policies. Features of inclusive processes are coproducing the process and content of decision making, engaging multiple ways of knowing, and sustaining temporal openness. Using a community of practice lens, we compare the consequences of participatory and inclusive practices in four processes, finding that inclusion supports an ongoing community with capacity to address a stream of issues.

2015 Symposium - An Intentional Conversation About Public Engagement and Decision-Making: Moving from Dysfunction and Polarization to Dialogue and Understanding

Facilitation skill Books

Gary T. Furlong, *Conflict Resolution Toolbox: Models and Maps for Analyzing, Diagnosing and Resolving Conflict* (2010).

Ron Kraybill & Evelyn Wright, *The Little Book of Cool Tools for Hot Topics: Group Tools to Facilitate Meetings When Things Are Hot* (2007).

Martha Lasley, *Facilitating with Heart: Awakening Social Personal Transformation and Social Change* (2010).

Lawrence Susskind, *Consensus Building Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement* (1999).

Public Engagement in local decision-making

Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement (Tina Nabatchi, John Gastil, Michael Weiksner, & Matt Leighninger eds., 2012).

Elena Fagotto & Archon Fung, *Sustaining public engagement: Embedded deliberation in local communities*, Everyday Democracy and the Kettering Foundation Occasional Paper, <http://www.everyday-democracy.org/en/Resource.136.aspx> (October 2009).

J.C. Thomas, *Citizen, customer, partner: Rethinking the place of the public in public management*, 73 Public Administration Review 786 (2013).

Public Engagement among Millennials

National Conference on Citizenship, *Millennials Civic Health Index* (2013), available at <http://www.ncoc.net/MillennialsCHI>.

Participatory Budgeting Project, participatorybudgeting.org

Our mission is to empower people to decide together how to spend public money. We create and support participatory budgeting processes that deepen democracy, build stronger communities, and make public budgets more equitable and effective.

99Rise.org:

99Rise is a network of activists and organizers dedicated to building a mass movement to reclaim our democracy from the domination of big money.

We believe that only by getting big money out of politics – by winning a democracy that responds to the real needs of "the 99%" – will we open the door to finally realizing the progressive promise of the American Dream.

We thus seek a Constitutional Amendment and supplemental federal legislation that would guarantee the principle of political equality, as well as ensure that neither private wealth nor corporate privilege could be used to exercise undue influence over elections and policymaking. To this end, we are committed to deploying the most powerful tool of social and political change: **strategic nonviolent resistance**.