THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Course Number:	**SW 393T22**	**Instructor's Name:**	**Brook Son, MSSW**
Unique Number:	**63515**	**Office Number:**	**3.104**
Semester:	**Fall 2014**	**Office Phone:**	**854-4272 (M-F: 8a-5p)**
Meeting Time:	**Tues 2:30-5:30pm**	**Office Hours: Tues 1:30-2:30pm (BY APPT)**	
Meeting Place:	**2.122**	**E-Mail:**	**brook.son@co.travis.tx.us**

LEADERSHIP IN COMMUNITY BUILDING

I.	**Course Description**

Community building is the process of developing and sustaining partnerships between citizens and practitioners to bring about social change for the common good in a caring society. Emphasis in the course is given to theories, models, and action principles as well as skill development in community building. Key organizing concepts include leadership, social change, social capital, civil society, democracy, and social justice.

Since social change in a democracy usually "bubbles up" from the bottom, through small groups of people working together to improve quality of life in their community, the course is open to diverse students who want to develop knowledge and skills in community building, especially in behalf of vulnerable or disadvantaged populations.

II.	**Course Objectives**

By the end of the course the student will be able to:

1. Understand the need for community building and social change in civil society from diverse national and global perspectives;

2. Critique key concepts, theories, and models of community building;

3. Compare and contrast leadership roles and responsibilities, as well as strengths and limitations of citizens and practitioners in community building;

4. Apply theory and action principles of community building to a contemporary issue or case involving citizens and practitioners;

5. Demonstrate knowledge and skill in community building through a service learning project or case study;

6. Critique personal skills in community building as well as potential conflicts in ethics, values, or cultural orientations.

III.	Teaching Methods

Lectures, in-class activities, guest speakers, service learning projects

IV.	Required & Supplemental Reading Material

Each week students are responsible for a required list of readings. Students must attend class prepared to discuss reading on the required reading list. Your class participation grade will be reflective of both your level of participation in class and your preparedness to discuss assigned readings. Final Process Analysis Papers must include references from required readings throughout the semester.

The packet of required **readings can be made available for purchase** at Speedway Copies, University Towers, 715D West 23rd Street, Austin, Texas. (512-472-5353).

V.	Course Requirements

A. Class Participation (Maximum 20 points)

There are three levels of class participation: active, moderately active, and passive:

1. An active participant is involved in the class to the extent that she/he asks pertinent questions relevant to class readings and discussion, shares relevant insights, and contributes to the general learning through active contribution to in-class learning activities. Active participation will earn 20 points.

2. A moderately active participant is involved in the class to the extent that he/she actively listens, reacts to information, asks relevant questions when confused by course content, and contributes to the general learning with moderately active contribution to in-class learning activities. Moderately active participation earns 15 points.

3. A passive participant is involved in the class to the extent that she/he attends, seldom demonstrates active listening behaviors, seldom asks relevant questions, and contributes to the general learning with occasional contribution to in-class learning activities. Passive participation earns 5 points.

B. Community Building Projects (80 points)

Each participant must complete two community-building project papers for the course. The purpose of these papers is to develop knowledge and skills in community building preferably through a service learning project, or alternatively through case study. Each participant must obtain prior approval for the project from the course instructor. Students are encouraged to use their field placements to assess an issue of importance to the population(s) served by the agency.

1. Paper # 1. Collaborative Community Building Issue Analysis (30 pts)
Proposal due September 16, 2014
First draft due to for in-class peer review October 7, 2014
Final draft due October 21, 2012

This paper requires each participant to identify a community building issue that is relevant to the needs of vulnerable or disadvantaged populations. At least three key leaders in the community must consider the issue significant. In other words, a "significant constituency" must consider the issue an important one, worthy of and timely for consideration on the community agenda.

The instructor will provide a framework for the community building summary issue analysis. *The participant will utilize action research methods to complete various components of the paper*: Issue Identification, Issue Analysis, Alternative Solutions, and Strategic Recommendation.

Phase One (Due October 7): Each student must conduct research and draft a 5 – 7 page double-spaced summary issue analysis. This summary issue analysis will address all components of the instructor's framework provided in class. Students must bring two copies of the draft to class on October 10. Students will exchange drafts, review and makes substantive comments on each other's drafts during class. Feedback should include suggestions regarding style, format, clarity, readability, content, and specific suggestions regarding information in the issue analysis that could be omitted from the final draft.

Phase Two (Due October 21): Students should then consider suggestions and incorporate feedback that improves the quality of the final summary issue analysis. The final draft should be 2 – 4 pages, professionally formatted, clear, and concise. Each participant will be graded on the quality of the final product, as well as utilization feedback.

The paper will be in the form of a memorandum, position statement, or proposal aimed at persuading decision makers to place the issue on the community agenda for active consideration. The length of the final product will usually average 2 – 4 *single spaced*, typed pages. The product is intended to give decision makers a brief overview of the issue, key analytic findings, alternative solutions, and strategic recommendation.

Extra credit of 5 points will be given to participants who can document during the semester that their community building issue was presented orally and in writing to an "action group" or body of community decision makers (e.g., city council, neighborhood association, community planning council, consumer advocacy organization, planning board, commission, legislative committee, agency board, task force, interagency coordinating board, or administrative team) with the authority to decide and take action on the proposed strategy recommendation.

The following criteria will be used to grade this project:

A. COMPLETENESS AND THOROUGHNESS. Have all major components of the assignment have been **considered, understood, and successfully applied** with supporting documentation?

B. INCORPORATION OF COLLABORATIVE FEEDBACK. Was the final product **substantially improved** from the original draft? Was feedback understood and selectively incorporated?

C. ORGANIZATION AND CLARITY. Does the paper reflect **professional-quality** work? Is it well organized and written in a logical manner? Are there appropriate transitions headings used between sections? Are sentence structure, syntax, and grammar correct? Are references properly formatted (APA 6th Ed citation style).

D. ORIGINALITY AND CREATIVITY. Does the report demonstrate use of analytical skills in a way that indicates **critical analysis** above and beyond mere description of the components of the assignment?

2. Paper # 2. Community Building Process Analysis (50 pts)
Proposal due October 14, 2014
Project due December 2, 2012

The second paper gives each participant the opportunity to develop skills to resolve the community building issue analyzed in the first paper.

The partnership model presented by the instructor will guide the participant through this "process" side of community building, along with *readings of the course*. In addition to conceptual building blocks of the partnership model (membership, participation, shared responsibility, and leadership), each participant must apply action principles related to Agenda Building, Structure, Analysis, Technology, Ownership, and Stewardship.

The paper will be either a) a retrospective report on community building steps taken to resolve an issue during the semester; b) a prospective plan to resolve the issue in the future; or c) an analysis of a community building case that succeeded or failed in the past. The length of the paper will usually average 15 to 25 *double space*, typed pages, *excluding references and appendices*. STUDENT MUST APPLY REQUIRED COURSE READINGS TO THIS PAPER.

Criteria for Evaluation

The following criteria will be used to grade this project:

A. COMPLETENESS AND THROUGHNESS. Have all major components of the assignment have been **considered, understood, and successfully applied** with supporting documentation?
Maximum points = 26.

B. ORGANIZATION AND CLARITY. Does the paper reflect **professional-quality** work? Is it well organized and written in a logical manner? Are there appropriate transition headings used between sections? Are sentence structure, syntax, and grammar correct? Are references properly formatted (APA 6th Ed. Citation style)
Maximum points = 7.

C. ORIGINALITY AND CREATIVITY. Does the report demonstrate use of analytical skills in a way that indicates **critical analysis** above and beyond mere description of the components of the assignment?
Maximum Points = 7.

<u>Final Grade</u>

Class Participation and Readings	45%
Issue Analysis Paper (October 21)	15%
Community Building Process Paper (December 2)	<u>40%</u>
	100%

<u>Grading Scale</u>

94. 0 and Above	A
90.0 to 93.999	A-
87.0 to 89.999	B+
84.0 to 86.999	B
80.0 to 83.999	B-
677.0 to 79.999	C+
74.0 to 76.999	C
70.0 to 73.999	C-
67.0 to 69.999	D+
64.0 to 66.999	D
60.0 to 63.999	D-
Below 60.0	F

Graduate students must earn a minimum grade of C in the course for credit; also, graduate students must maintain an overall B average.

VI.	**Class Policies**

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION: Regular class attendance and participation are required. The schedule of due dates for assignments and the examination will be observed. A five-point penalty will be subtracted from the final grade for assignments

submitted after the due date. An individual exception will be made only in the event of unavoidable circumstances beyond the student's control. Should an emergency occur, the student must notify the instructor as soon as possible.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HONOR CODE: The core values of The University of Texas at Austin are learning, discovery, freedom, leadership, individual opportunity, and responsibility. Each member of the university is expected to uphold these values through integrity, honesty, trust, fairness, and respect toward peers and community.

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT IN CLASS: The professor expects students to act like professionals in class. This means students should arrive on time for class, be prepared to participate in the class discussion, and show respect for one another's opinions. We will not, nor should we, always agree with one another. In this environment we should be exposed to diverse ideas and opinions, and sometime we will not agree with the ideas expressed by others. However, the professor does require that students engage one another with respect and professionalism.

CLASSROOM CIVILITY. A course brings together a group of diverse individuals with various backgrounds. Students are influenced and shaped by such factors as ethnicity, gender, sex, physical abilities, religious and political beliefs, national origins, and sexual orientations, among others. We expect to learn from each other in an atmosphere of positive engagement and mutual respect. Social Work deals with complex and controversial issues. These issues may be challenging and uncomfortable, and it would be impossible to offer a substantive classroom experience that did not include potentially difficult conversations relating to challenging issues.

UNANTICIPATED DISTRESS. Students may experience unexpected and/or distressing reactions to course readings, videos, conversations, and assignments. If so, students are encouraged to inform the instructor. The instructor can be responsive and supportive regarding students' participation in course assignments and activities, but students are responsible for communicating clearly what kind of support is desired. If counseling is needed, students can contact a service provider of their choosing, including the UT Counseling Center at 512-471-3515 or online at www.utexas.edu/student/cmhc/.

POLICY ON SOCIAL MEDIA AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION. Public social networks are not private. Even when open only to approved or invited members, users cannot be certain that privacy will exist among the general membership of sites. If social work students choose to participate in such forums, please assume that anything posted can be seen, read, and critiqued. What is said, posted, linked to, commented on, uploaded, subscribed to, etc., can be accessed and archived, posing potential harm to professional reputations and prospective careers.

Social work students who use social media (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, etc.) and other forms of electronic communication (i.e. blogs, etc.) must be mindful of how their communication may be perceived by clients, colleagues, faculty, and others. Social work students are expected to make every effort to minimize material which could be considered inappropriate for a professional social worker in training. Because of this, social work students are advised to manage security settings at their most private levels and avoid posting information/photos or using any language that could jeopardize their professional image. Students are asked to consider the amount of personal information posted on these sites and are obliged to block any client access to involvement in the students' social networks. Client material should not be referred to in any form of

electronic media, including any information that might lead to the identification of a client or compromise client confidentiality in any way. Additionally, students must critically evaluate any material that is posted regarding community agencies and professional relationships, as certain material could violate the standards set by the School of Social Work, the Texas Code of Conduct for Social Workers, and/or the NASW Code of Ethics.

Social work students should consider that they will be representing professional social work practice as well as the University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work program while in the classroom, the university community, and the broader area communities.

POLICY ON SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY: Students who violate University rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since such dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. For further information, the student may refer to the Web Site of the Student Judicial Services, Office of the Dean of Students (http://www.utexas.edu/depts/dos/sjs/).

DOCUMENTED DISABILITY STATEMENT: Any student who requires special accommodations must obtain a letter that documents the disability from the Services for Students with Disabilities area of the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement (471-6259 voice or 471-4641 TTY for users who are deaf or hard of hearing). Present the letter to the professor at the beginning of the semester so that needed accommodations can be discussed. The student should remind the professor of any testing accommodations no later than five business days before an exam. For more information, visit http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/.

RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS: By UT Austin policy, students must notify the professor of a pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If the student must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, the professor will give the student an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

USE OF E-MAIL FOR OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE TO STUDENTS: Email is recognized as an official mode of university correspondence; therefore, students are responsible for reading their email for university and course-related information and announcements. Students are responsible to keep the university informed about changes to their e-mail address. Students should check their e-mail regularly and frequently—daily, but at minimum twice a week—to stay current with university-related communications, some of which may be time-sensitive. Students can find UT Austin's policies and instructions for updating their e-mail address at http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/emailnotify.php.

SAFETY: As part of professional social work education, students may have assignments that involve working in agency settings and/or the community. As such, these assignments may present some risks. Sound choices and caution may lower risks inherent to the profession. It is the student's responsibility to be aware of and adhere to policies and practices related to agency and/or community safety. Students should notify the professor regarding any safety concerns.

BEHAVIOR CONCERNS ADVICE LINE (BCAL): If students are worried about someone who is acting differently, they may use the Behavior Concerns Advice Line to discuss by phone their concerns about another individual's behavior. This service is provided through a partnership among the Office of the Dean of Students, the Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC), the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), and The University of Texas Police Department (UTPD). Call 512-232-5050 or visit http://www.utexas.edu/safety/bcal.

EMERGENCY EVACUATION POLICY: Occupants of buildings on the UT Austin campus are required to evacuate and assemble outside when a fire alarm is activated or an announcement is made. Please be aware of the following policies regarding evacuation:

- Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of the classroom and the building. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when you entered the building.
- If you require assistance to evacuate, inform the professor in writing during the first week of class.
- In the event of an evacuation, follow the professor's instructions.
- Do not re-enter a building unless you're given instructions by the Austin Fire Department, the UT Austin Police Department, or the Fire Prevention Services office.

IMPORTANT

Please note the following:

1. University policies governing scholastic honesty, as presented in the General Information Bulletin and the brochure prepared by Students for Academic Integrity, apply to this course.

2. All case studies, exercises, and reports are to be word-processed and single-spaced.

3. The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA) is the style manual to be used by all students for both projects.

VII. Course Outline

Unit 1. Introduction to Community Building

- o Overview of course objectives and community building approaches
- o Definition of key concepts: community, community building, volunteer citizens, paid professionals, democratic participation, citizenship, professionalism, social capital, social justice, social change, and civil society
- o Overview of the partnership model of community building
- o Preliminary identification of service learning projects or case studies in community building
- o Professional mission of social workers in community building

Required Readings (September 9)

Putnam, R. (1993). The prosperous community: Social capital and public Life. *The American Prospect, 13,* 35-43.

Putnam, R., & Feldstein, L. (2003). *Better together: Restoring the American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster, pp. 98-118.

Poole, D. L. (2002). Community partnerships for school-based services: Action principles. In A. R. Roberts & G. J. Greene (eds.). *Social Workers' Desk Reference.* New York: Oxford University Press, 539-544.

Warner, M. (1999). Social capital construction and the role of the local state. *Rural Sociology, 64,* 373-393.

Bacon, D. (2001, September). Revitalizing civil society in Northern Ireland: Social capital formation in three faith-based organizations (FBOs). Centre for Voluntary Action Studies. University of Ulster, Ireland. Paper presented at the 7th Researching the Voluntary Sector Conference, NCVO Headquarters, London.

Supplemental Readings

Chaskin et al. (2001). *Community Capacity.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Grogan, P. S., & Proscio, T. (2000). *Comeback cities: A blueprint for urban neighborhood revival.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Putnam, R. (2001). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Schorr, L. (1997). *Common purpose.* New York: Anchor Books.

Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community: The reinvention of American society.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ewalt, P., Freeman, E., & Poole, D. L. (1998). *Community building: renewal, well-being, and shared responsibility.* Washington, DC: NASW.

Unit 2. The Need for Community Building

- o Public Trust
- o Economics
- o Politics
- o Diversity
- o Social Justice

Required Readings (Sept. 16)

Bilken, D. P. (1983). *Community organizing.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 64-91.

Daly, J., & Cobb, J. (1989). From individualism to person-in-community. *For the Common Good.* Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 159-175.

Morris, R. (1986). *Rethinking social welfare: Why care for the stranger?* New York: Longman, 82-99.

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 121-185.

Ehrenberg, J. (1999). Introduction. *Civil society: The critical history of an idea.* New York: New York University, ix-xvi.

Dionne, E. J. (1995). *Why Americans hate politics.* New York: Simon Shuster, 9-29.

Lasch, C. (1978). *The culture of narcissism.* New York: Norton, 219-236.

Maathai, Wangari.(2005). *Embracing Democratic Governance, Human Rights and the Environment.* Agenda, No. 65, Women and Leadership (2005*), pp. 12-16*

Unpublished material: Wangari Maathai and the Green Belt Movement in Kenya. Found at: www.greenbeltmovement.org

Supplemental Readings

Elshtain, J. B. (1995). *Democracy on trial.* New York: Basic Books

Kemmis, D. (1990). *Community and the politics of place.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Warren, M. (ed.). (1999). *Democracy and trust.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust.* New York: Free Press.

Unit 3. Approaches to Community Building

- o Community Development
- o Community Planning
- o Community Organizing
- o Community Management

Required Readings (September 23)

Sanders, I. (1970). The concept of community development. In Cary, I. (ed.). *Community Development as Process.* (pp.9-31).

Kretzmann, J.P., & McKnight, J.L. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out.* Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications, 1-11.

Manning, G., Curtis, K., & McMillen, S. (1996). *Building community: The human side of work.* Cincinnati, OH: Thompson Executive Press, 65-69.

Poole, D. L. (in press). Rural community building strategies. In R. Lohmann & N. Lohmann (eds.). *Rural Social Work Practice.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Zizys, Kosny, Bonnell (2004). Review of Social Planning Acitivities in Toronto. Social Development and Administration Division , Community and Neighbourhood Services Department, City of Toronto.

Kettl. (2000). *The global pubic management revolution.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 50-73.

Beneviste, G.(1977). The Politics of Expertise. Berkely, CA: The Glendessary Press. pp119-134.

- o Membership
- o Participation
- o Shared Responsibility
- o Leadership

Required Readings (September 30)

Poole, D. Figure 1. Community Building: The Partnership Model. (1 page)

Falck, H. (1988). The membership perspective of human behavior. *Social work: The membership perspective.* New York: Springer, pp. 29-53.

Falck, H. (1988). Community social work in the membership perspective. *Social work: The membership perspective.* New York: Springer, pp. 159-184.

Chrislip, D.D., & Larson, C.E. *Collaborative Leadership*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 127-164.

Homan, M. (1999). Things to know about yourself. *Rules of the game: Lessons from the field of community change.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole, pp.83-111.

Moroney, R. (1988). *Shared Responsibility.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter, pp. 1-30.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). The servant as leader. *Servant leadership.* New York: Paulist Press, 7-48

Lasker R., Weiss, E. (2003). Broadening Participation in Community Problem Solving: a multidisciplinary model to support collaborative practice research. Journal of Urban Health Vol 80, No1. pp 14-49.

Lucas, J. R. Chapter 8. *Democracy and Participation.* Baltimore, MD: Penguin, pp. 136-165.

Supplemental Readings

Chaskin et al. (2001). Leadership Development. *Building Community Capacity.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 27-59.

Watts, D. J. (2003). *Six degrees: The science of a connected age.* New York: W.W. Norton, Chapter 1, "The connected age," pp. 19-42.

Dees, J. G., Emerson, J., & Economy, P. (2002). *Strategic tools for social Entrepreneurs.* New York: Wiley.

Smale, G. et al. (1988). *Community social work: A paradigm for change.* London: National Institute for Social Work.

Lewis, G. (1998). Citizenship. In G. Hughes (ed.). *Imaging welfare futures* (pp. 103-150). London: Routledge.

Eriksen, E., & Weigard, J. (2000). The end of citizenship? New roles challenging the political order. In C. McKinnon & I. Hampsher-Monk (eds.). *The demands of citizenship.* New York: Continuum.

Tolbert, C. M., Irwin, M. D., Lyson, T. A., & Nucci, A. R. (2002). Civic community in small-town America: How civic welfare is influenced by local capitalism and civic engagement. *Rural Sociology, 67,* 90-113.

Lukas, J. R. (1995). *Responsibility.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Conger, J. A., & Benjamin, B. (1999). *Building Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W., & Burt, N. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Maritain, J. (1948). *The person and the common good.* London: Geoffrey.

Udoidem, S. (1988). *Authority and the common good.* New York: University Press of America.

Raskin, M. G. (1986). *The common good: Its politics, policies and philosophies.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jordan, B. (1989). *The common good: Citizenship, morality, and self-interest.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Covey, S. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Young, D. R. (1990). Champions of change: Entrepreneurs in social work. In H. H. Weisman (ed.). *Serious Play* (pp. 126-135). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Brinckerhoff, P. C. (2000). *Social entrepreneurship*: *The art of mission-based venture development.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bryson, J. M., & Cosby, B. C. (1992). *Leadership for the common good.*

Unit 5. Agenda Building

- o Agenda
- o Agenda Building
- o Agenda Status
- o Group Approach
- o Constituency Group
- o Symbol Utilization
- o Social Networks
- o Community Decision-Making

Required Readings (October 7)

Cobb, R., Elder, C. (1983). Agenda-building and democratic politics; The problem of agenda-building in past political inquiry. *Participation in American politics: The dynamics of agenda building.*

Cobb, R., Elder, C. (1983). Issue creation and agenda content; Issue characteristics and relevant publics. *Participation in American politics: The dynamics of agenda building.*

Cobb, R., Ross, J. Ross, M. (1976). Agenda Building as Comparative Political Process. *The America Political Science Review,* Vol. 70, No. 1. pp 126-138.

Poole, D. L. (1997). Achieving national goals in health prevention with community organization: The "bottom up" approach. *Journal of Community Practice, 4,* 77-92.

Kettner, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1990) Understanding social problems; Problem Analysis/Problem Assessment; Selecting an Appropriate Intervention Strategy," *Designing and Managing Programs.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 31-76.

Kettner, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1990). Setting goals and objectives; Designing and structuring the change effort; Resource planning; Evaluation. *Designing and managing programs.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 111-155.

Supplemental Readings:

Dahl, R. (1956). A preface to democratic theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lipsky, M. (1968). Protest as a political resource. *American Political Science Review, 62.*

Connolly, P., & York, P. (June, 2003). *Building the capacity of capacity builders: A study of management support and field-building organizations in the nonprofit sector.* New York: The Conservation Company.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters.* New York: Simon & Schuster. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole, pp. 83-111.

Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). *The semi-sovereign people.* New York: Holt.

Wood, R. (2003). The counter-action to evil. *The gospel according to Tolkein.* Louisville, KY: Westminister John Know Press, 75-116.

Unit 6. Analysis

- o Action research
- o Traditional research
- o Participatory methods
- o Issue identification
- o Issue definition
- o Issue analysis
- o Incidence
- o Prevalence
- o Etiology
- o Value-critical analysis

Required Readings (October 14)

Bilken, D. P. (1983). Action research. *Community organizing.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 241-275.

Kelly, J. G. (1988). Participative ownership *A guide to conducting prevention Research in the community*. New York: Haworth, 125-139.

Jansson, B. (1994). Selecting options and writing proposals; Strategies of policy persuasion. *Social policy: From theory to policy practice.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole, pp. 188-212, 238-266.

Horowitz, C. Robinson, M., Seifer, S. (2009). *Key Issues in Outcomes Research. Community-Based Participatory Research From Margin to Mainstream: Are Researchers Prepared?* Department of Health Policy, Department of Medicine, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY (C.R.H.); Bethel Gospel Assembly,Harlem, NY (M.R.); and Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Department of Health Services, University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine, Seattle (S.S.).

Huang, H. (2010). What is Good Action Research? Why the Resurgent Interest? *Action Research. Vol. 8.* Pp 93-109.

Flynn, J. (1992). Essentials in the presentation of policy analysis. *Social agency policy: Analysis and presentation for community practice.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall, pp. 249-260.

Moroney, R. (1981). Policy analysis within a value theoretical framework. In R. Haskins & J. Gallagher (eds.). *Models for Analysis of Social Policy.* Norwood, NJ: ABLEX, 78-101.

Supplemental Readings:

Poole, D. L., & Carlton, T. (1986). A model for analyzing utilization of maternal and child health services. *Health & Social Work, 11,* 209-222.

Hess, P. M., Mullin, E. J. (eds.) (1995). *Practitioner-researcher partnerships.* Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Unit 7. Structure

Group Dynamics
- o Structure
- o Representation
- o Voluntary associations
- o Group decision-making
- o Governance board
- o Committee Management

Group Functioning
- o Task force
- o Commission
- o Partnerships
- o Coalition

Required Readings (October 21)

Theilen, G., & Poole, D. L. (1986). Educating leadership for effecting community change through voluntary associations. *Journal of Social Work Education,* 19, 34-44.

De Souza Briggs, X. (2003). *Planning Together: How (and How Not) to Engage Stakeholders in Charting a Course.* The Art and Science of Community Problem-Solving Project at Harvard University. At: www.community-problem-solving.net

Tropman, J. E., Johnson, H. R., & Tropman, E. J. (1979). Committee types and functions. *Essentials of committee management.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 140-204.

Ephross, P. H., & Vassil, T. V. (1988). *Groups that work: Structure and process.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1-6, 43-55, 99-165.

Waddell, S., & Brown, L. D. (1997). *Fostering intersectoral partnering: A guide to promoting cooperation among government, business, and civil society actors.* Boston: Institute for Development Research.

There will be additional readings and resources on governance and group process.

Supplemental Readings:

Chaskin et al. (2001). Collaborations, partnerships, and organizational networks. *Building Community Capacity.* New York: Aldine de Gruyte, pp. 123-158.

Bertcher, H. J. (1979). *Group participation: Techniques for leaders and members.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tropman, J. E. (1997). *Successful community leadership.* Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Corey, M., & Corey, G. (1992). *Groups: Process and practice.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Fatout, M., & Rose, S. R. (1995). *Task Groups in Social Services.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kramer, R. (1981). *Voluntary associations in the welfare state.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Murdoch, J. (2000). Networks—a new paradigm of rural development? *Journal of Rural Studies, 16,* 407-419.

Waddell, S., & Brown, L. D. (1997). *A guide to promoting cooperation among government, business, and civil society actors.* Boston: Institute for Development Research.

Kravitz, S. L. (1990). *Building coalitions in the human services.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Unit 8. Technology

- o Innovation
- o Technology
- o Program design
- o Resource planning
- o Boundary spanning
- o Creativity
- o Stakeholder involvement
- o Champions of innovation

Required Readings (October 28)

Smale, G. M. (1993). The nature of innovation and community-based practice. In E. Martinez-Brawley (ed.). *Transferring technology in the personal social services*. Washington, DC: NASW Press, pp.14-27.

Damanpour, F. (1987). The adoption of technological, administrative, and ancillary innovations: Impact of organizational factors. *Journal of Management, 13,* 675-688.

Laird, J., & Hartman, A. (1990). Crossing boundaries and exploring metaphors. In H. H. Weisman (ed.). *Serious Play* (pp. 8-26). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Schon, D. (1963). Champions of radical new inventions. *Harvard Business Review, 41,* 77-86.

Young, D. (1990). Champions of change: Entrepreneurs in social work. In Weissman, H. (ed.). *Serious play: Creativity and innovation in social work.* Washington, DC: NASW Press, pp. 126-135.

Supplemental Readings:

Hoffman, R. C., & Hegarty, W. H. (1993). Top management influence on innovations: Effects of executive characteristics and social culture. *Journal of Management, 19,* 549-574.

Poole, D. L., & Zugazaga, C. B. (2003). Conceptualizing prevention as the first line of offense against homelessness: Implications for the federal continuum of care. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 23,* 409-424.

Rothman, J., Erlich, J., & Teresa, J. G. (1976). Promoting innovation. *Promoting innovation and change in organizations and communities.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 23-57.

Rothman, J., Erlich, J. L., & Teresa, J. G. (1981). *Changing organizations and community programs.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rothman, J. *Social R & D: Research and development in the human services.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Miller, W. C. (1987). *The creative edge: Fostering innovation where you work.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Poole, D. L. (1997). The SAFE Project: Partnerships in health, mental health, and education to prevent early school failure. *Health & Social Work, 22,* 282-288.

Poole, D. L. (1997). Achieving national health goals in prevention through community partnerships: The "bottom-up" approach. *Journal of Community Practice, 4,* 77-92.

Ettlie, J. E., & Reza, E. M. (1992). Organizational integration and process *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 795-827.

Hage, J., & Dewar, R. (1973). Elite values versus organizational structure in predicting innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 18,* 279-290.

Howell, J. M., & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Champions of technological innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35,* 317-341.

Nohria, N., & Gulati, R. (1996). Is slack good or bad for innovation? *Academy of Management Journal, 39,* 1245-1264.

Rosner, M. M. (1968). Economic determinants of organizational innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 12,* 614-625.

Wise, L. R. (1999). The use of innovative practices in public and private sectors: The role of organizational and individual factors. *Public Productivity & Management Review, 23,* 150-168.

Unit 9. Ownership

- o Ownership
- o Relevant publics
- o Issue expansion
- o Social significance
- o Complexity
- o Conflict management
- o Education
- o Persuasion
- o Confrontation

Required and Supplemental Readings (November 4)

Cobb, R. W., & Elder, C. D. (1983). Approaches to the study of conflict management; The dynamics of issue expansion. *Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda Building.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, pp. 36-62, 110-129, 130-140.

Ephross, P. H., & Vassil, T. V. (1988). Conflict. *Groups that work: Structure and process.* New York: Columbia University Press, 75-98.

Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in.* New York: Penguin, 4-87.

Netting, F. E., Kettner, P. M., & McMurtry, S. L. (1995). Selecting appropriate tactics. In J. Tropman, J. Erlich, & J. Rothman (eds.) *Tactics and techniques of community intervention (pp. 171-186).* Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock. New York: The Free Press.

Supplemental Readings:

Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals.* New York: Random House.

Bilken, D. P. (1983). Social protest; Legal advocacy; Community education: Using the media; Negotiations and lobbying. *Community organizing.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 97-126, 127-154, 155-177, 218-240.

Chin, R., & Benne, K. D. (1972). General strategies for effecting changes in human systems. In G. Zaltman, P. Kotler, & I. Kaufman (eds.) (1972). *Creating social chang.* New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Gusfield, J. (1981). Introduction: The culture of public problems. *The Culture of Public Problems.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1-23.

Simmel, G. (1955). *Conflict and the web of group-affiliations.* New York: Free Press, 13-55.

Unit 10. Stewardship

- o Stewardship
- o Accountability
- o Commitment
- o Change stabilization
- o Process evaluation
- o Outcome evaluation
- o Empowerment evaluation
- o Community building impact

Required and Supplemental Readings (November 11)

Kettner, P., Daley, M., & Nichols, A. (1985). Implementing change. *Initiating change in organizations and communities.* Monterrey, CA: Brooks/Cole, pp. 288-306.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 3-20.

Maynard, G., & Poole, D. L. (1998). Stewardship: The distinguishing Characteristic of not-for-profit health care. *Health & Social Work, 23,* 3-7.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1973). The complexity of joint action. *Implementation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp.87-124.

Fetterman, D. M. (1996). Empowerment evaluation: An introduction to theory and practice. In D. M. Fetterman, S. J. Kaftarian, & A. Wandersman (eds.) *Empowerment Evaluation: Knowledge and Tools for Self-Assessment and Accountability* (pp. 3-46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Supplemental Readings:

Dugan, M. A. (1996). Participatory and empowerment evaluation: Lessons Learned in training and technical assistance. In D. M. Fetterman, S. J. Kaftarian, & A. Wandersman (eds.) *Empowerment Evaluation: Knowledge and Tools for Self-Assessment and Accountability* (pp. 277-303). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Damanpour, F., & Gopalakrishnan, S. (2001). The dynamics of the adoption of product and process innovations. *Journal of Management Studies, 38,* 45-65.

Gummer, B. (1990). Overcoming barriers to innovation in social service organizations. In Weissman, H. H. (ed.) *Serious Plan: Creativity and Innovation in Social Work* (pp. 162-173. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (2000). Deliberative democratic evaluation. In K. E. Ryan & L. DeStefano (eds.). *Evaluation as a Democratic Process: Inclusion, Dialogue, and Deliberation* (pp. 3-12). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Poole, D. L., Ferguson, M., & Schwab, A. J. (in press). Managing process innovations in welfare reform technology. *Administration in Social Work.*

Poole, D. L., Davis, J., Reisman, J., & Nelson, J. (2001). Improving the quality of outcome-based measurement plans. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 11,* 405-421.

DeStefano (eds.). *Evaluation as a Democratic Process: Inclusion, Dialogue, and Deliberation* (pp. 77-84). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Fabricant, M. (1990). Commitment, perseverance, and social innovation: The sheltering movement. In H. H. Weisman (ed.). *Serious Play* (pp. 235-243). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Williams, W. (1980). *The implementation perspective: A guide for managing social service delivery programs.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Light, P. C. (1998). *Sustaining innovation: Creating nonprofit and government organizations that improve naturally.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dougherty, D., & Hardy, C. (1996). Sustained product innovation in large, mature organizations: Overcoming innovation-to-organization problems. *Academy of Management Journal, 39,* 1120-1153.

Note: There will be class time set aside for project consultation on both November 10 and 17

Unit 11. Community Building in a Caring Society

Required and Supplemental Readings (November 18)

Wooley, F. (2001). The strengths and limits of the voluntary sector. *ISUMA,* 21-27.

Poole, D. L., Ferguson, M., DiNitto, D., & Schwab, A. J. (2002). The capacity of community-based organizations to local innovations in welfare reform: Early findings from Texas. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 12,* 261-276.

Poole, D. L. (2003). Scaling up CBOs for second-order devolution in welfare reform. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 12,* 261-276.

Brown, L. D., & Kalegaonkar, A. (1999). *Addressing civil society's challenges: Support organizations as emerging institutions.* Boston: Institute for Development Research.

Lawson, D. M. (1991). A troubled but giving nation: A search for meaning. *Give to live.* La Jolla, CA:ALTI Publishing, 3-17.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Penguin Books, 25-51.

Supplemental Readings:

Portes, A., & Landolt, P. (1996). The downside of social capital. *The American Prospect, 21,* 18-21+.

Schulman, M. D., & Anderson, C. The dark side of the force: A case study of Restructuring and social capital. *Rural Sociology, 64,* 351-372.

Ferguson, M., Poole, D. L., DiNitto, D., & Schwab, A. J. (200?) Raising a flag of caution in the race for community-based approaches to Rural welfare reform: Early findings from Texas. *Southern Rural Sociology, 18,* 204-221.

Poole, D. L., & Colby, I. (2002). Do neighborhood centers have the capacity to be instruments of change in human services? *Social Work, 47,* 142-152.

Poole, D. L. (1998). Building community capacity to promote social and public health: Challenges for universities. In P. L. Ewalt, E. M. Freeman, & D. L. Poole (eds.), *Community Building: Renewal, Well-Being…*

Curia Generalizia Agostiniana. (2003). Second principle of the social doctrine of the church: Community and the common good. *Justice & Peace, 2(8).* Retrieved February 20, 2000 at http://www.aug.or/english/justiciaypaz/boletin.htm.

Chaskin et al. (2001). Conclusions: Possibilities, limitations, and next steps. *Building Community Capacity.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, Textbook, 181-248.

Uvin, P., Pankaj, S. J., & Brown, L. D. (2000). *Scaling up NGO programs in India: Strategies and debates.* Boston: Institute for Development Research.

Schorr, L. B. (1989). *Within our reach.* New York: Anchor Books.

Titmuss, R. M. (1970). *The gift relationship.* New York: Vintage Books.

Oldfield, A. (1990). *Citizenship and community: Civic republicanism and the modern world.* New York: Routledge.

Riordan, P. (1996). *A politics of the common good.* Dublin, Ireland: Institute of Public Administration. *The culture of citizenship: Inventing Postmodern civic culture. Available at http://www.civsoc.com.*

Poole, D. L. Retooling for community health partnerships in primary care and prevention. *Health & Social Work, 22,* 2-4.

Note: November 25: Class does not meet, Thanksgiving break; December 2: Final papers due and class wrap-up