

PLAC 5240: Collaborative Planning for Sustainability  
School of Architecture  
Dept. of Urban & Environmental Planning

Tuesdays, 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.  
PLAC 5240-001 (10155) Fall 2014  
Room 108, Campbell Hall

**Instructor:** Frank Dukes, Ph. D.; Director, Institute for Environmental Negotiation (924-2041; 434-996-6588 for last minute absences; FrankDukes@virginia.edu)

---

*Surveys of planners and other public officials consistently show conflict resolution and public engagement rank among the most valuable skills needed by professionals.*

Students will develop confidence in their ability to confront challenging issues, to assess the strengths and weaknesses of collaborative processes, to use best practices for engaging stakeholders and publics, and to design and conduct authentic public meetings, transformative community dialogues, and powerful consensus building processes.

Planners, elected officials, leaders of community organizations and public policy professionals find themselves confronted as never before by challenges to the very functions of government and to planning and policymaking.

The President's Commission on Sustainable Development found that conflicts "increasingly are exceeding the capacity of institutions, processes, and mechanisms to resolve them. Adversarial administrative, legal, and political processes ... typically stress points of conflict, dividing communities and neighbors. What is usually missing from the process is a mechanism to enable the many stakeholders to work together to identify common goals, values, and areas of interest through vigorous and open public discussion."

Leaders from all sectors – public, private, and nonprofit – need that mechanism: an ability to build consensus when faced with tough choices and conflicting interests. Knowledge and skills in collaboration can help these leaders change the course of conflict from acrimony and expensive combat to civil deliberation that explores new possibilities and addresses multiple needs.

"Collaborative Planning for Sustainability" proposes that communities can only be sustained ecologically, socially, and economically with informed, legitimated participation by citizens actively engaged in public life. Public decisions are generally better when developed by processes that are inclusive of diverse views, transparent and inviting to those such decisions affect, and responsive to participant needs. Such processes need to encourage behavior that builds relationships of integrity and trust and decisions that are creative, effective and legitimate. People yearn for accessible forums and processes to engage one another productively and safely, to speak of their own concerns, needs and aspirations, and even to learn the real needs of their neighbors. Such caring can engender conflict, which may be harmful, but authentic collaborative processes provide an opportunity to transform civic disarray into civic virtue.

Areas of focus for this year's course potentially include the following real world projects:

- The Dan River, and efforts to build community consensus for responding to a release of over 30,000 tons of coal ash in February 2014.
- The Appalachian coalfields of Southwest Virginia, including efforts to integrate economic

development, environmental protection and enhancement, and health with a focus on the Powell River watershed.

- Ash Lawn, home of the fifth President of the United States James Monroe (also one of the original founders of the University of Virginia), looking to build collaborative capacity to engage diverse stakeholders with a Monroe Institute for Common Ground.
- Redevelopment of Main Street, including addressing the legacy of racial segregation and discrimination that led to the destruction of Vinegar Hill and which continues to cast a shadow over contemporary planning.

Based upon student interest, groups will be formed to study these topics and to offer recommendations for developing a collaborative process to address selective issues. Learning to work effectively in groups and to plan and conduct effective collaborative projects will be important parts of the class.

### How You Will Learn:

This is a graduate level course that assumes that adult students have primary responsibility for their own learning. We will conduct this class with you as partners in learning. I invite you to consider knowledge a shared resource, and like other common resources one that can be nurtured with common cause or abused when responsibility is disregarded. We will devote in-class time to building shared expectations and norms to meet your own and your classmates' highest aspirations for learning with one another.

This class integrates theory and practice from the first session. The primary learning tools will be readings, class discussions, simulations, and interaction with classmates and other invited guests. Your primary requirements to take advantage of these opportunities are attention, initiative, risk and hard work! You can expect<sup>1</sup>:

#### Lots of:

Applying knowledge  
Problem solving  
Dialogue  
Facilitating  
Critical thinking  
Simulation  
Teams  
Hands on Individualized learning  
Self-directed learning

#### Very little:

Regurgitating facts  
Rote learning  
Lecture  
Telling  
Memorizing  
Observation  
Sole practitioners  
Passive listening  
One-size-fits-all  
Top-down learning

### Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Describe the problems with common public engagement and decision processes;

---

<sup>1</sup> \*adapted from Maura Singleton, [http://uvamagazine.org/features/article/adjusting\\_the\\_prescription/](http://uvamagazine.org/features/article/adjusting_the_prescription/)

- Conduct formal and informal situation assessments to understand the sources, dynamics and potential outcomes of public issues;
- Determine whether or not a case is suitable for a collaborative process;
- Describe the key components of collaborative process design;
- Design, conduct and evaluate authentic public meetings;
- Design, conduct and evaluate transformative community dialogues;
- Design, conduct and evaluate powerful consensus building processes;
- Describe what constitutes success in each of these processes.

### Texts

Judith E Innes, David E Booher. *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. 2010.

Forester, John. *Planning in the Face of Conflict: The Surprising Possibilities of Facilitative Leadership*. 2013.

Dukes et al., *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice*. University of Virginia Press, 2011.

Two texts will require only partial use and will be provided without charge in class:

E. F. Dukes and K. Firehock. *Collaboration: A Guide for Environmental Advocates*. 2001.

E. F. Dukes, M. Pisolish, J. Stephens. *Reaching for ~~Common~~ Higher Ground: Creating Purpose-driven, Principled & Powerful Groups*. 2000.

Selected articles, case studies and exercises will be provided.

Class size maximum: 20 students.

### GRADED ASSIGNMENTS:

- Ongoing shared journal and two synthesis essays. (30%).
- Active class participation (30%).
- A group report and presentation concerning recommendations for addressing a complex issue involving multiple stakeholders and publics (40%).

### GRADING:

An A is offered for outstanding work; a B is given for work which is truly satisfactory; a C is unacceptable for graduate participants.

Grading will be based on:

**30%: 8 short bi-weekly journal reflections and 2 synthesis reflections.**

For the first 8 classes beginning with class two (classes 2-9), you will keep a journal of your responses to the readings and class experiences. Your journal is a place to try out and explore ideas concerning course readings, guest visits, and discussions without worrying about being evaluated. It is a place to experiment and to ask yourself, "How accurately can I explain or describe my/this idea?" The point of the journal is to develop a regular, habitual practice of figuring out what you

think of the course materials and your participation in class. If you add to your journal consistently and regularly, you'll find that your thinking and your ability to make connections will deepen.

It is very important that you keep this journal on a consistent basis. While the content will not be graded, your completion of these writings on time for the first eight classes constitutes 20% of your grade. You are allowed one late entry, after which each late assignment counts 1% deducted from your grade.

The journal reflections and syntheses will have three parts:

**1) Pre-class Reading Reaction:** Beginning just prior to class two, each student will submit a pre-class reflection. By **5 p.m. on Mondays** before class, reflect on each assigned reading and explore a question that interests you. See if you can make connections between the readings and your interests, thinking about how they best fit together, and identifying where the discrepancies are. Do some of the materials disturb you? Why? Which readings resonate most with you? Why? Exploring some of these paths will allow you to take an analytically critical approach to the readings. You should be able to do this with 600-900 words and will be posted for all to see on your class blog.

**2) Afterthoughts:** Starting after the second class, and by **5 p.m. on Thursdays** after class, reflect back on the readings and class discussions and activities and describe what you take away. What seems important: quotes, images, ideas? Have you changed your thinking at all on the basis of the class? Have you understood some of the readings in a different light? Are there ideas that were generated in class that you will want to think about more fully? This should be about 500-700 words long and will be posted for all to see on your class blog.

**3)** You will also have **two summary reflections**, graded and worth 5% each, during the semester. The first is due **October 14** at noon. Look back at your journal and, in a 1,000-1,300 word essay, reflect on this question: Identify major ideas, themes, and threads related to collaborative planning and analyze how they have developed over the course of this semester. What is their significance for you so far?

Then by noon on **December 9** part 2 of your summary reflection will be due. It will be based on additional readings and class discussions covered since October 14 following the guidelines above. The reflection should be 1,000-1,300 words, and will include: What have you learned about collaborative planning? What have you learned about working in groups? What have you learned about yourself? How do your insights connect to your life, your personal values and convictions? What challenges do you find now either concerning collaborative planning, your work or your beliefs? How will you address those challenges in the future?

For this reflection I expect you to reflect on each of the main texts (Forester, Innes & Booher, and Dukes/Firehock/Birkhoff) as well as your in-class and group experiences.

Each of these two summary reflections will be graded as follows:

<b>0 - F</b> Did not complete assignment, or no apparent effort or thought.
---

**3 - C** Completed assignment. Demonstrates adequate preparation: knows basic facts, but does not show evidence of trying to interpret or analyze them.

**4 - B** Satisfactory effort. Demonstrates good preparation: knows case or reading facts well, has thought through implications of them.

Offers interpretations and analysis of case material (more than just facts) to class.

**5 - A+** Demonstrates excellent preparation: has analyzed material exceptionally well, relating it to other readings or material (e.g., course handouts, discussions, experiences, etc.).

Offers analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of readings and case material, e.g., puts together pieces of the discussion to develop new approaches that take the class further.

I do give weight to organization, writing style, and mechanics, as well as demonstrated understanding and presentation of issues.

### *30%: Class attendance and active participation.*

Attendance and participation in class is very important. Please show up on time, but if you are late don't let that stop you from participating once you arrive! And **please let me know in advance if you will miss a class**. Due to the experiential learning for this class, assignments are sometimes changed on a weekly basis, and you will need to make appropriate arrangements.

Beginning with class #2, participation is rated for each class on a scale from 0 (lowest) through 10 (highest), using the criteria below. While your participation is important for any class you take, this class by its experiential nature requires considerable involvement, including interaction with your classmates.

We each learn from what you offer to the class. **I encourage you to strive for a "10" for your own and others' benefit.**

Participation is graded on this basis:

**0 - F** Absent or without contribution.

**4 - C** Offers straightforward information (e.g., straight from the case or reading), without elaboration or very infrequently (perhaps once a class). Does not offer to contribute to discussion, but contributes to a moderate degree when called on.

Demonstrates sporadic involvement.

**7 - B** Contributes well to discussion in an ongoing way: responds to other students' points, thinks through own points, questions others in a constructive way, offers and supports suggestions that may be counter to the majority opinion.

Demonstrates consistent ongoing involvement.

**10 - A+** Contributes in a very significant way to ongoing discussion: keeps analysis focused, responds very thoughtfully to other students' comments, contributes to the cooperative argument-building, suggests alternative ways of approaching material and helps class analyze which approaches are appropriate, etc.

Demonstrates ongoing and very active involvement.

### *40%: Group Analysis and Recommendations.*

Class members will select a complex issue involving multiple stakeholders and publics. Working in small groups, you will report recommendations, which will be presented in class. A portion of the grade will be determined by peer evaluations of contributions to the project.

The first part of your group project, the project proposal, is due Sept. 21 at 5 p.m. See the class web site for an example of a project that was done very well.

- 1) Identify your specific objectives for the project (what you want to learn, what impact you want to have). Based on what you know now and understanding that your knowledge will increase considerably, what learning goals do you have that may be addressed by your choice of this project?
- 2) Develop a covenant for how you will work with one another in your project group, beginning first individually with the worksheet format handed out in class (start with "at our worst" based on previous class projects; then "at our best" based upon how you want your group to be; then continue keeping your group in mind);
- 3) Identify information and/or other resources that you know you will need to conduct the project;
- 4) Develop criteria by which you will evaluate your success upon completion of the project. These criteria should be based upon 1 and 2 above.

The written project report is due at the class presentation on Nov. 25 or December 2 and will include the following:

- 1) An agreement - your project group covenant - stating how you will work together with one another on this project, including ways in which you will hold one another accountable for that agreement (based upon #2 above)
- 2) a situation assessment that identifies key issues, stakeholders, and processes related to your chosen project;
- 3) a purpose statement with specific goals and objectives that your proposed process is designed to address;
- 4) a set of options and recommendations with appropriate justification for an authentic collaborative process or processes that will accomplish that purpose and goals;
- 5) an evaluation protocol that would assess whether and how those goals and objectives were accomplished.

Here are the criteria that I will use to grade your class project:

\* Demonstration of knowledge: are you familiar with the subject matter? is your knowledge helpful for your target audience(s)? did you do sufficient research that is particular enough for specific recommendations and broad enough in scope to demonstrate the big picture? (25 points)

\* Completing project objectives: did you learn what you indicated that you wanted to learn? Did

what you learn help others in the class learn as well? Does this work potentially have the impact on the public good that you were striving to have? (6 points)

\* Quality of discussion during and after your presentation: Do you ask evocative questions or make assertions that make people reflect? Do you leave sufficient time for questions and discussion? Can you respond appropriately to questions? (3 points)

\* Presentation style: is your presentation coordinated? does each group member know what is expected? do all group members contribute? does it keep your audience's interest? (3 points)

\* Contribution as an individual to the group project: (3 points) NOTE: I will ask each group member confidentially to evaluate on a scale of 0 to 3 the contribution of other group members to the project in terms of work and of quality of work and will incorporate that into my own observations of individual contributions.

### Course Topics and Anticipated Reading Assignments

Each class will typically integrate theory, empirical and experiential understanding (including case studies), and skill building. The course will combine concurrent examination of macro-level issues of democratic governance and mid- and micro-level strategic thinking and practice. General topics follow, although these will not necessarily be followed in this sequence in class:

#### Macro-level:

##### **Challenges of democratic governance**

What sustains democratic practice? 'Public good' is viewed as an oxymoron by a substantial portion of the population. Political alienation and community polarization seem to defy good governance. Good democratic processes, including community engagement, consensus building, and collaboration, are increasingly marginalized or even considered part of the problem. What role do collaborative processes play in building strong democracy?

- Dukes, Ch. 7. In Dukes et al., *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice*. University of Virginia Press, 2011.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224.

##### *Optional:*

- Dukes, E. Franklin. "Public Conflict Resolution: a Transformative Approach." *Negotiation Journal* 9(1): 45-57. 1993.
- Lukensmayer, Carolyn and S. Brigham. "Taking democracy to scale: large scale interventions—for citizens." *The Journal Of Applied Behavioral Science* 41(1): 47-60. 2005.
- Bourne, Greg. "Democracy and Civic Engagement: To What Extent Do Consensus-Building Processes Improve Democratic Participation and Decision Making?" In *Critical Issues Papers*, ed. S. Senecah. Washington, D.C., Association for Conflict Resolution: 70-85. 2002.

##### **Why Collaboration?**

How did the collaboration movement emerge? Who uses collaboration and for what types of issues? What types of collaborative processes exist? How wide is collaboration's use? What is its

impact?

- Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. A. "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century."
- Forester, John. Introduction, Chapter One, "Mediation and Collaboration in Architecture and Community Planning."
- Susskind, 272-279
- Elliot, M. and Bourne, G. *Evaluating the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency's Brownfields Facilitation Pilot Projects*. Report prepared for the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2005.
- Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. A. *Planning* Chapter One and Two.
- Firehock, Ch. 1. In Dukes et al., *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice*. University of Virginia Press, 2011.
- Dukes, *Guide*: pp. 1-8.

### Critiques and Challenges of Collaboration

What concerns exist about collaborative processes? Who makes those claims, based upon what forms of knowledge (research, experience, "gray" literature)? How can one determine the validity of claims pro and con?

- McCloskey, J. Michael. "The skeptic: collaboration has its limits." *High Country News*. 28 (9), p. 13. 1996.
- DeWeese, "How to Fight Back Against Sustainable Development."
- Dukes, *Guide*: pp. 9-12.
- Duany interview, "Control the Masses."
- Innes, J. "Consensus building: clarification for the critics." *Planning Theory* 3(1): 5-20. 2004.

Optional:

- Golten, Mary Margaret, M. Smith, and P. Woodrow. "Hammers in Search of Nails: Responding to Critics of Collaborative Processes." In *Critical Issues Papers*, ed. S. Senecah. Washington, D.C., Association for Conflict Resolution: 36-47. 2002.
- Kenney, Douglas S. *Arguing About Consensus: Examining the Case against Western Watershed Initiatives and Other Collaborative Groups in Natural Resource Management*. Boulder: Natural Resources Law Center at the University of Colorado School of Law. 2000.
- Amy, Douglas. *The Politics of Environmental Mediation*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1987.
- Coglianesse, Gary. "The limits of consensus." *Environment*. 41 (3), 28-33. 1999.
- Coggins, George Cameron. "Of Californicators, Quislings, and Crazies: Some Perils of Devolved Collaboration." *Chronicle of Community*. 2 (2). 1998.
- Peterson, M. Nils, Markus J. Peterson, and Tarla Rai Peterson. "Conservation and the Myth of Consensus." *Conservation Ecology*, 19 (3), June 2005.

### Building the Collaborative Community/Collaborative Governance

Can and should collaboration be made a first choice for a community when problems arise? Is collaborative governance possible? Is collaborative democracy real? What is the future of collaboration?

- Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. A. *Planning* Chapter Eight.
- Dukes, E. Franklin. "Why Conflict Transformation Matters: Three Cases." *Peace and Change* 6



(1). 1999.

Optional:

- Bernard, Ted and Young, J. *The Ecology of Hope: Communities Collaborate for Sustainability*. Gabriola Island, B.C., New Society Publishers. 1997.
- Carlson, Chris and J. Stephens. "Governance and Institutionalization: Sustaining Consensus-Based Processes for Improved Stakeholder Collaboration on Public Issues." In *Critical Issues Papers*, ed. S. Senecah. Washington, D.C., Association for Conflict Resolution: 86-98. 2002.

### **Mid- and Micro-Level:**

#### **Four Processes for Authentic Collaboration**

- *Designing and Conducting a Situation Assessment*
- *Designing and Conducting Authentic Public Meetings*
- *Designing and Conducting Transformative Community Dialogues*
- *Designing and Conducting Powerful Consensus Building Processes*
- *Designing and Conducting an Effective Evaluation*
- Forester: Chapters 3-6.

#### **Working Effectively in Groups**

There will be four elements that you will learn for this theme:

- *Building norms and expectations and groundrules for effective groups*
- *Characteristics of effective group process*
- *Facilitation and recording of groups*
- *Evaluating group work*
- Dukes, E. F. "The Basics of Effective Group Process." Handout.
- E. F. Dukes, M. Pisolish, J. Stephens. *Reaching for ~~Common~~ Higher Ground: Creating Purpose-driven, Principled & Powerful Groups*. [free loaner copies available for the duration of the class]

#### **When is a collaborative approach appropriate? When not?**

How can one decide when collaboration is appropriate? Are there circumstances in which collaboration would not be appropriate? Are there issues that are non-negotiable? Are there individuals or organizations with whom one would not negotiate?

- Dukes, Guide: pp. 13-21.
- Dukes, E. Franklin. "Why - and Why Not - Dialogue?" In *The Dialogue Forum Reflections*, G. Sigurdson. Ed. Vancouver, Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue, Simon Fraser University. 2005.
- Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. A. *Planning* Chapter Five.

#### **Designing and Conducting a Situation Assessment**

How can an one understand the dynamics of a challenging issue? How can one encourage participants to examine the appropriateness of various public processes for their desired outcomes? How may one best approach, conduct, and use an assessment?

- Bean, Martha; Fisher, Larry; Eng, Mike. "Assessment in Environmental and Public Policy Conflict Resolution: Emerging Theory, Patterns of Practice, and a Conceptual Framework." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 4, Summer 2007.
- Peter Adler and Douglas Thompson: "Situation Assessment: Mountaintop Mining/Valley Fill Issues in the Little Coal River Watershed, West Virginia."
- Dukes, E. F. "Sample Situation Assessment Protocol."
- Situation Assessment Graphic.

### Determining and Evaluating Success

How do collaborative groups monitor and evaluate their work? Who is responsible for implementation? Who determines what is success? How is success evaluated?

- *Guide*: pp. 52-55.
- Innes, Judith. "Evaluating Consensus Building." In *The Consensus Building Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement*, eds. L. Susskind, S. McKernan and J. Thomas-Larmer. Thousand Oaks, Sage. 1999.

Optional:

- Birkhoff, Juliana. "Evaluation and Research." In *Critical Issues Papers*, Series Editors Dukes, E. Franklin; Romero, Rosemary; and Taylor, Thomas. Washington, DC: Association for Conflict Resolution. 2002.

### Designing a Principled and Effective Process

What type of process is appropriate for which types of purposes? What should be done to ensure success? What protocols can be determined by participants themselves, and which by sponsors? How can you determine who needs to be involved, and in what ways?

- Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. A. *Planning* Chapter Six.
- *Guide*: pp. 22-28.
- Dukes, E. Franklin. "From Enemies, to Higher Ground, to Allies: the Unlikely Partnership Between the Tobacco Farm and Public Health Communities." In *Participatory Governance: Planning, Conflict Mediation and Public Decision-Making in Civil Society*. W. R. Lovan, M. Murray and R. Shaffer. London, Ashgate Press. 2004.
- Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution [now Association for Conflict Resolution]. *Best Practices for Government Agencies: Guidelines for Using Collaborative Agreement-Seeking Processes*. Washington, D.C., Association for Conflict Resolution [formerly Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution]. 1997.
- Dukes, E. Franklin. "Mt. Rogers Trails Dispute." In *For the Common Good: Case Studies in Consensus-Building and the Resolution of Natural Resource Controversies*, eds. P. Adler and K. Lowry. Forthcoming.

Optional:

- Elliott, M. "When the Parents Be Cancer-Free: Community Voice, Toxics, and Environmental Justice in Chattanooga, Tennessee." In *Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflicts*, eds. R. J. Lewicki, B. Gray and M. Elliott. Washington, D.C., Island Press. 2003.
- Beierle, Thomas C. and Cayford, Jerry. *Democracy in Practice: Public Participation in Environmental Decisions*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future. 2003.
- Susskind, Lawrence, S. McKernan, et al., Eds. *The Consensus Building Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement*. Thousand Oaks, Sage. 1999.

### Best Practices During a Collaborative Process

What role does a third-party facilitator or mediator play? What constitutes agreement? Is consensus required? How do issues get raised and addressed? How can conflictual relationships be transformed? What role do the news media play?

- *Guide*: pp. 29-42.
- Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. A. *Planning* Chapter Seven.
- Saunders, Hal and R. Slim. "Dialogue to Change Conflictual Relationships." *Higher Education Exchange*. 43-56. 1994.
- McDermott et al. in Dukes et al., "Effective Collaboration: Overcoming External Obstacles."
- Arlington Forum. "Civic Engagement: A Guide for Communities."

#### Optional:

- Daniels, S. E. and G. B. Walker. *Working Through Environmental Conflict: the Collaborative Learning Approach*. Westport, CT, Praeger: 2001.
- Leach, William and Paul Sabatier. "Facilitators, Coordinators, and Outcomes." In *The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution*, eds. R. O'Leary and L. B. Bingham. Washington, D.C., Resources for the Future: 148-171. 2003.
- Wondolleck, Julia M. and S. L. Yaffee. *Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 2000.

### Instructor Biography:

As Director of the Institute for Environmental Negotiation (IEN) at the University of Virginia, Dr. Dukes designs dispute resolution and public participation processes, mediates and facilitates, teaches and trains in the areas of public involvement, mediation, negotiation, and consensus building, and conducts research. He has worked at local, state, and federal levels on projects involving environment and land use, community development, education, health, and racial and ethnic diversity. He also has helped initiate and is faculty for the Virginia Natural Resources Leadership Institute, a year-long program that brings together representatives from industry, non-governmental organizations, public agencies, and communities to develop collaborative leadership around environmental issues. He is currently working on issues of environment and development in Virginia's coalfields and the Chesapeake Bay. He also leads an initiative titled "University and Community Action for Racial Equity" to understand and directly confront the legacy of harm of slavery and segregation involving the University of Virginia and surrounding communities.

As part of IEN's "Collaborative Stewardship Initiative," he initiated the "Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium" seeking to assess and understand local collaborative efforts involving natural resources and community development, and the "Best Practices Guidance Project." These efforts resulted in the publication of *Collaboration: A Guide for Environmental Advocates* in partnership with The Wilderness Society and the Audubon Society in July of 2001, and *Community-Based Collaboration: Bridging Socio-Ecological Research and Practice* in 2011.

His book *Resolving Public Conflict: Transforming Community and Governance* (Manchester University Press and St. Martin's Press, 1996) describes how public conflict resolution procedures can assist in vitalizing democracy, by engaging citizens productively in civic and community affairs, by aiding public entities in developing a responsive governance, and by enhancing society's capacity to solve difficult public problems. With two colleagues he is co-author of *Reaching for Common Higher Ground: Creating Purpose-driven, Principled & Powerful Groups* (Jossey-Bass, 2000), which describes how diverse groups and communities can create expectations for addressing conflict with integrity, vision, and creativity.

He received a B.A. from the University of Virginia and an M.S. and Ph.D. in Conflict Analysis and Resolution from George Mason University. He was previously operator of a piano restoration business for over 10 years in Albemarle County. He is a founding member and past chair of the Community Mediation Center of Charlottesville-Albemarle. He also serves as advisor to and trainer for University Mediation Services.

**Office Hours:**

My office is at the Institute for Environmental Negotiation, 2015 Ivy Road. Because of the nature of my work regular hours are not possible; however, students are invited and urged to "drop in" for discussion (you may wish to call ahead to make sure that I am there), or you may set an appointment for my office or at the School of Architecture after class.

-----

**Honor Policy:**

I trust every student in this course to comply fully with all of the provisions of the UVa Honor System. By enrolling in this course, you have agreed to abide by and uphold the Honor System of the University of Virginia, as well as the following policies specific to this course:

You are expected to share notes or study outlines and to collaborate with other students. What is most important when receiving assistance on an assignment – that is, when any of your writing is not entirely original - is to acknowledge fully other sources of ideas, whether a written resource or individuals you consult to complete an assignment. Check this link for a thorough explanation of what is appropriate use of resources and what is plagiarism: <http://www.virginia.edu/honor/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/PlagiarismSupplement2011.pdf>

All suspected violations will be forwarded to the Honor Committee and at my discretion, you may receive an immediate zero on that assignment regardless of any action taken by the Honor Committee.

If you believe you may have committed an Honor Offense, you may wish to file a Conscientious Retraction ("CR") by calling the Honor Offices at (434) 924-7602. A Conscientious Retraction (the "CR") allows students who have committed a potential Honor Offense to come forward before they have reason to believe that the Offense in question has come under suspicion by anyone. This policy has just been supplemented with an Informed Retraction, which allows a student who has been reported to the Honor Committee for an alleged Act of Lying, Cheating, or Stealing to take responsibility for the commission of the Honor Offense in question, and also to make amends for such Honor Offense, both by admitting such Offense to all affected parties and by taking a full two-semester Honor Leave of Absence from the University community.

More information can be found at [www.virginia.edu/honor](http://www.virginia.edu/honor). Your School of Architecture Honor representatives are Anna McMillen ([ahm8xs@virginia.edu](mailto:ahm8xs@virginia.edu)) and Brett Rappaport ([bhr6dz@virginia.edu](mailto:bhr6dz@virginia.edu)).

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the course honor policy.

Student Information

Your name: \_\_\_\_\_

Home town: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Major or Graduate Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Career Interests

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Other Interests (sports, music, drama, etc.):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Anything else I should know about you?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_