Overview. The quality of public policy, management, and of governance systems often disappoints, especially in so-called ‘developing’ countries. Poverty, corruption, economic stagnation and poor quality public services are the norm in many countries and in many localities or for vulnerable socio-economic groups in even better-off countries. At the same time, many countries have in living memory made demonstrable, even transformative changes in the level of economic development and social indicators, suggesting that ‘development’ can be more than a chimera.

This course the context for and key drivers of the accelerating changes accompanying unequal development in the 21st century. We focus our attention onto a range of alternative approaches to “manage” development – that is, onto key strategies being advocated to achieve fundamental improvements in public-sector performance and development outcomes in some of the most challenging environments in the world.

The course will train students in three areas:
- diagnosing the drivers of development outcomes and governance performance in specific contexts;
- analyzing opportunities for, and constraints on, the use of reforms that dominate the public-sector reform debate in developing countries; and
- crafting realistic strategies from a ‘managerial’ perspective, understood broadly as the effort exerted from different vantage points in a governance system to promote positive change.

Development Management is a required course for students in the International Development Certificate Program (IDCP) at the University of Washington. Non-IDCP students are permitted in the class by instructor permission and subject to a maximum class size. The course also fulfills the values elective for Evans School students.

Basic approach. The course philosophy is comparative (drawing from a number of developing country contexts and specific case studies); critical (examining why so many reforms fail); and applied (asking what action might be successfully pursued in specific managements scenarios and what lessons might be drawn out for would-be reformers and public-sector managers). The first class examines the checkered history of public-sector reform attempts and the role that development professionals attempt to play. The course then examines eight key reform ideas – from democratization to decentralization, and
beyond – roughly one per week. The aim is not to attempt to be comprehensive, but to become familiar with a number of broad debates in the field and to stimulate and prepare you to continue your learning beyond the course.

**Student assessment.** There are three basic components to student work and assessment in this course. They are intended to directly contribute to your own learning and enable you to pursue your own distinctive learning objectives, within the framework of the course.

1. Discussion forum submissions – 40%: Beginning already in week one, you are asked to submit weekly posts responding to specific discussion questions covering the readings, case studies and/or debates. Guidelines on these submissions are found at the end of the syllabus.

2. Research project – 40%. You will write a carefully researched, approximately 2,500-word paper (or 4-5,000 word paper if jointly authored) together with a summary poster presentation, that falls into one of four types (for which, see separate guidelines):
   a. an **policy / program assessment**, that assesses a contemporary development intervention deemed to be innovative.
   b. an **donor organizational assessment**;
   c. a **country brief** with a focus on the status and effectiveness of development aid in a particular sector; or
   d. a **policy brief** that succinctly evaluates policy options to address a particular problem.

3. Class participation – 20%. Class participation will be assessed through a combination of the following:
   - Class attendance, which is required except by pre-arrangement and for standard reasons (sickness, etc.);
   - Two recommended (but not required) meetings with the professor during office hours over the course of the quarter, to review your research project and discussion forum submissions.
   - Contributions to one of several in-class debates, to which you will be assigned;
   - General contributions to class discussion.

**Texts.** The course will draw on readings from a number of books, articles and online material. We will cover several chapters from *International Development: Ideas, Experiences and Prospects* (Oxford University Press, 2015), for which all chapters and some supplemental materials such as interviews with the authors are available online at [http://www.developmentideas.info/study-guide/](http://www.developmentideas.info/study-guide/).

In addition, we will cover three case studies that must be separately purchased, as follows:

- Harvard Business Publishing: [http://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/54749882](http://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/54749882) for the two case studies:
a. “Fighting Bonded Labor in Rural India: Village Activist Gyarsi Bai Tackles an Entrenched System of Coercion”, and
b. “Governing the ‘Chinese Dream’: Corruption, Inequality and the Rule of Law”

http://case.hks.harvard.edu/female-genital-cutting-confronting-the-power-of-tradition-in-senegal/ for the purchase of one multimedia case – “Female Genital Cutting: Confronting the Power of Tradition in Senegal” (add to cart then purchase and download).

Since you are taking this class, you may well be considering a career that has an international development dimension. I suggest you peruse some resources that can help you navigate your options. For example, if you type “international development careers” into amazon.com, you will find at least seven highly relevant and inexpensive source-books and guides, some of which are in the UW library. Don’t neglect to explore these. The development field is a complex one to break into, and it warrants early and systematic exploration.

**Other course fee:** There will be some cost associated with printing out the research poster; please see guidelines on research project below.

**Week One (9/30): Poverty, Policy Analysis, and Development**

(Please note that you are expected to have done the readings and prepared for the case study before coming to this first class.)

Objectives:
- Examine the complexity of poverty reduction and development, and of attempts to intervene to reach these objectives.
- Explore the problem of professional ethics in development.
- Get an overview of the course and its expectations.

Required Readings:
- *Rural Reform in Centropico* (this will form the basis of our discussion, so be sure to prepare carefully)

Additional resources:
- Video lecture by Robert Chambers, 2012: The challenges for participatory development in contemporary development practice - Part 1
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sh3Ugs-CvaQ  Professor Chambers takes the stage at about 22 minutes in.

- Hulme, D. “Ch. 5: Poverty in Development Thought: Symptom or Cause”: available at http://www.developmentideas.info/chapter/poverty-in-development-thought/

**Discussion forum: CASE STUDY - Rural Reform in Centropico**

Respond to the challenge below. Note: there is no need to deploy formal policy memo style, the focus is on substance here - as if these are notes for your presentation in class. Just be clear and self-explanatory.

To: D. Lawrence  
From: J. Judicio, Sec. of Rural Reform  
Re: Land reform strategy

I know you’ve been at work for a couple of weeks while I’ve been traveling, so sorry I haven’t been able to meet with you. Could you please give me your initial thoughts on a proposed land reform strategy? In doing so, please keep in mind:

* The need for practical and clear suggestions on the way forward, given...
* ...Centropico’s political environment and the opportunities and constraints it seems to hold (we need a strategy that will work in the current political environment); and
* ...the DRR’s administrative capacity (we need a strategy that will work with this department).

Just give me the outline of what you think I should do – “quick and dirty” as they say – and be prepared to briefly summarize your ideas (and critique those of other consultants who will be present) when I call on you next Friday.

**Discussion forum (2): Reaction to Chambers piece**

Chambers talks about ‘rural development tourism’ and various biases that inflict the development profession. Do any of his observations resonate with an experience you have had? Explain.

**Week Two (10/7): The Quest for “Good Governance”: The Case of Corruption Control**

Objectives:

- Explore the connection between good governance and development, as it has been posited by different analysts.
- Use corruption control, and the case of contemporary China and India, as a way to understand the governance-development connection.
Readings:

- Case: “Governing the Chinese Dream: Corruption, Inequality and the Rule of Law” (see Harvard Business Publishing packet for online purchase: http://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/54749882)
- Melanie Manion (2016) Taking China’s anticorruption campaign seriously, Economic and Political Studies, 4:1, 3-18

**Discussion forum: DEBATE - Comparing China and India’s Anti-Corruption Prospects**

Looking at the readings and any other evidence you may find, which country’s anti-corruption institutions have a better shot, in your view, at making meaningful, long-term difference to the quality of governance and development outcomes in that country? Be specific about your reasoning.

**Week Three (10/14): Decentralization**

Objectives:

- Explore decentralization as a theme underlying many public-sector reform strategies in developing countries – types of decentralization, their rationale, the wide range of experiences, and contemporary state of the debate.

Readings:


For the remaining readings, choose either Indonesia or Vietnam readings below:

If choosing Indonesia:


If choosing Vietnam:


**Discussion forum: DEBATE - Assessing decentralization**

White and Smoke, in “East Asia Decentralizes”, write “Though East Asia’s decentralization has come later than in some other parts of the world, it is now here to stay...the key question is no longer whether to decentralize. It is how best to design intergovernmental structures and manage the implementation process to achieve optimum results.” (p. 1). Using the articles on either Indonesia or Vietnam as your main evidence, do you agree or disagree with the above statement? State your evidence clearly.

Extra credit but not expected: Include a comparison between Vietnam and Indonesia.

**Week Four (10/21):**

Guest Lecturer: Professor Mary Kay Gugerty...

**Week Five (10/28): Human Rights in Development**

Objectives:

• To explore the promotion of human rights as strategy and theme in development discourse.
• To encourage you to leave your comfort zone – wherever that may be – regarding your understanding of divergent opinions on these matters.
• To use the case study as a study of alternative approaches to the promotion of social change.

Readings:
Discussion Forum (1): DEBATE – Values underpinning development
Argue pro or contra the following proposition: “The development discourse has been dominated by the assumption that Western values, such as those touting specific forms of multiparty democracy or specific interpretations of human rights, as being ultimately universal values. In a multipolar world, this rhetorical smokescreen must end.”

Discussion Forum (2): CASE STUDY - Female Genital Cutting
Drawing on any of the readings for this week (and particularly Gready & Ensor) answer the following question: In way way does the Tostan concept and method to combat Female Genital Cutting reflect a human rights approach to development? Do you see any tensions associated with human rights and development that may be applicable to this case? Explain.

Week Six (11/4): Confronting the State; Reforming the State
Objectives:
- To explore specific proposals for strengthening core capacities of the state and bureaucracy.
- Through our case study, to explore ways in which non-state actors can seek to engage and pressure the state to reach their objectives.
- Through the “Innovations Forum”, to gain an appreciation for the diversity of new approaches in the development field today, and to assess their prospects.

Readings:
- Case: “Fighting Bonded Labor in Rural India: Village Activist Gyarsi Bai Tackles an Entrenched System of Coercion”

Further resource:

Discussion Forum: CASE STUDY – Fighting bonded labor in rural India
Answer the following questions in your post, using about one paragraph per question:

- How has a culture of social hierarchy based on gender and other status differences influenced the actions and perceptions of the parties in this case study?
- How have Gyarsi Bai and other activists used coalitions spanning multiple levels, and effective negotiation tactics, to expand their influence and challenge the status quo?
- Do you think the case holds lessons for development professionals, beyond the context of India and the issue of bonded labor? Elaborate.

Week Seven (11/18): Rethinking Development Assistance (1)

Objective:
- Over the next two weeks, to use the Donor Assessment Forum, readings, debate and guest speaker to explore the changing landscape of development assistance. This week,
we pay close attention to the strategic management challenge facing donors as control-oriented bureaucracies working in difficult and diverse country environments.

Readings:
- Fritzen, S. (manuscript) Strategic Management in International Aid Bureaucracies: The Donor-Decentralization Gap Reconsidered.

Discussion Forum: CASE STUDY – WHO Reform
Read the critiques of the WHO contained in the article from Foreign Affairs, then peruse the website devoted to WHO reform:
- http://www.who.int/about/who_reform/en, including its plans for Ebola prevention and lesson-drawing:
Put yourself in the following situation: A program planning staffer in the office of the Director-General (DG) of the WHO, Dr. Margaret Chan, you have been asked to brief the DG on the Foreign Affairs article’s critique of the WHO and assessing whether, in your own opinion, the current reform process sufficiently addresses the points it raises. Close with recommendations for the reform process arising from your reading of this Foreign Affairs article, if any. (Note: you do not have to deploy formal memo style in your response; think of it as self-explanatory notes to yourself encapsulating your analysis, which you would use as a roadmap to an oral briefing for the DG.)

Week Eight (12/2): Rethinking Development Assistance (2)

Objective:
- Continuation of last week’s exploration of the changing aid landscape. This week, special emphasis is placed on issues surrounding donor coordination and the Millenium Development Goals and their successor Sustainable Development Goals.

Readings:

• *Making Development Aid More Effective* - The 2010 Brookings Blum Roundtable Briefs (read the first two chapters, then go further into another two chapters of your choice)

• *Aiding Development: Assistance Reform for the 21st Century* (this is a broad overview and a relatively quick read - skim as needed)


**Discussion Forum: DEBATE – Development Goals**

Argue for or against the following proposition: “The attempt to define post-2015 ‘Sustainable Development Goals’ is flawed from the start; they will be as meaningless as the Millenium Development Goals were.”

For the debate of the week, read the following to kick off your understanding:


**Week Nine (12/9): Global Governance for Development**

**Objective:**

• This session closes the course by looking at the changing global context of development, which is creating tremendous pressures as well as opportunities. The theme is focusing on whether the supply of global governance institutions can meet the growing demand for the same, to give the world any chance of responding to cross-boundary problems, not least of which is climate change.

**Readings:**

• Case study: “Transboundary Haze: How Might The Singapore Government Minimise Its Occurrence?” Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy


Further resources:
• Swain, A. (2106) Chapter 41: Running Dry: Water, Development and Conflict, in the Palgrave Handbook of International Development

Discussion Forum (1): Case study: Transboundary haze
It is October, 2015, and Singapore is once again badly affected by transboundary haze, to the extent that it must close its schools on certain days. You are a political affairs analyst in the Office of the Prime Minister of Singapore. The PM is requesting a briefing on the deeper causes of, and potential approaches to dealing with, the transboundary haze issue, to prepare for a Press Conference with the Singaporean media and just before undertaking a trip to Jakarta to meet Indonesia’s President. Prepare your analysis for the Singaporean Prime Minister responding to this request. (Note: you do not have to deploy formal memo style in your response; think of it as self-explanatory notes to yourself encapsulating your analysis, which you would use as a roadmap to an oral briefing for the PM.)

Resources in addition to the Transboundary Haze case above:
• Transboundary Haze: How Might The Singapore Government Minimise Its Occurrence?
• http://thediplomat.com/2014/02/singapore-and-indonesia-an-uneasy-coexistence/

Discussion Forum (2): Debate: Development prospects
Argue pro or contra the following proposition: “Looking ahead 50 years, and all things considered, there is good reason to be more optimistic than pessimistic about the prospects for meaningful and sustainable human progress on a global level.”
Guidelines: Research Project

Objectives:
This project – resulting in an approximately 2,500 word paper (if singled authored) – is meant to give you an opportunity to pursue a topic of your interest, within broad parameters, while enabling the class to benefit, through the poster presentation sessions, from a series of thematically linked case studies. The paper serves as one of the focal point for discussion with the instructor during the two required office hour visits, which aim to help you to make connections with the rest of the course material. This is also an opportunity to hone research and presentation skills.

Assessment:
• 40% of course grade, of which, 25% is for final draft and 15% for poster presentation.
• You may collaborate with another student on this assignment if you wish. In this case, aim for an approximately 4,000-5,000 word paper. More than the length, the quality and insight should reflect the collaboration. The grade given will be the same for both students, but a statement regarding each student’s contributions to the paper will need to be submitted.
• Note that late or poorly developed first drafts will affect final draft grade.
• Assessment criteria:
  o For first draft:
    ▪ Shows serious work gathering and reviewing relevant information; solid work conceptualizing and defining the topic; good flow to the overall paper; engagement with instructor on the topic during office hours. (Note: does not need to be polished in the presentation and write-up at this stage, and can have incomplete analysis in some sections, so long as detailed outline is present.)
  o For final draft:
    ▪ Polished flow and presentation – good professional quality work; balanced, well grounded and insightful analysis, showing mastery of the topic; shows obvious effort, engagement and learning; shows integration of material and insights from the course in addition to own research.
  o For poster presentation:
    ▪ Thoughtful consideration given to the visual presentation of the material; effective communication of key points and messages in a visually stimulating and clear manner; effective in drawing student interest and contributing to lessons learned in the context of the course.

Timeline:
• Friday, October 7: Topic proposals due by midnight (submit on google doc: )
• Monday, October 10: Topic allocation finalized (email from instructor)
• Next 3 weeks: First consultation with instructor (see google doc sign-up sheet)
• Thursday, November 3 (12 noon): First draft due (submit on canvas).
• Friday, November 4: Innovations (i.e. policy /program assessment) poster presentation in class.
• **Next 3 weeks:** Second consultation with instructor (see google doc sign-up sheet)
• Friday, November 18: Donor assessment poster presentation in class.
• Friday, December 2: Country aid brief poster presentation in class.
• Friday, December 9 (final class session): Global governance brief poster presentation in class.
• Friday, December 16: Final paper due (submit on canvas)

**Guidelines:**
There are four categories of research papers, each with its distinctive features. Most of the general advice contained here - [http://www.pep-net.org/sites/pep-net.org/files/typo3doc/pdf/CBMS_country_proj_profiles/Philippines/CBMS_forms/Guidelines_for_Writing_a_Policy_Brief.pdf](http://www.pep-net.org/sites/pep-net.org/files/typo3doc/pdf/CBMS_country_proj_profiles/Philippines/CBMS_forms/Guidelines_for_Writing_a_Policy_Brief.pdf) - is applicable across the four categories, though there is no specific outline that must be followed.

**Policy / program assessment.** For this category, identify a contemporary development intervention that you deem to be innovative. The intervention could be a particular policy in a particular country (for example, Cambodia's use of NGOs to manage district health systems); a donor / NGO program or grassroots initiative (for example, the launch of [ipaidabribe.com](http://ipaidabribe.com) by the Indian NGO Janagraaha); or a broader type of intervention (for example, social funds, community-driven development, use of impact bonds, or microfinance). Describe the problem it is meant to address and the context for its emergence and development. Present a logic model for the intervention (for which, see resources below). Assess available evidence on its effectiveness. Assess its prospects for expansion, upscaling or replicability in different contexts. (Note there is no presumption here that the approach must be successful; many will be controversial and contested in their impacts and prospects, which should emerge in your analysis.)

**Resources:**
- **You may find some interesting examples of innovations, and insights about how the field is attempting to promote them,** in: Ramalingam, B. and Bound, K. (2016) “Innovation for International Development: Navigating the Paths and Pitfalls”, available at [https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/innovation_in_international_development_v7.pdf](https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/innovation_in_international_development_v7.pdf) (but again, no need to do more than skim here to find material of interest)

**Donor organizational assessment.** For this category, choose a significant aid donor, which can fall into any number of types – international NGOs, foundations, bilateral donor programs, multilateral organizations etc. After an overview of the donor’s trajectory (activities, funding, policy framework, governance), draw on whatever resources you can find (primary and secondary) to assess the contributions, strengths and weaknesses of the donor. What key proposals can you identify that could enhance the donor’s effectiveness?
Resources:

- **Country aid brief.** This category will appeal to students with a strong interest in a particular type of problem or a particular country. For one of the Sustainable Development Goals (or a target under one of the goals, if it is helpful to be more focused), assess the prospects and trajectory of the country in question, the role aid has played to date, and the policy and aid agenda related to the goal going forward. How do you assess the country’s prospects for making substantial progress toward the goal in the coming decade? On what factors will such progress hinge?

- **Global governance brief.** In this category, you will succinctly evaluate the current state global collective action mechanisms to address a problem of global significance. Examples include: global health, labor migration, refugee movements, climate change, combating human trafficking, rebuilding failed states etc. Describe the nature and evolution of the problem; identify key actors, resources and motivations; and assess the functioning and trajectory of institutional arrangements to coordinate effective, cross-border action. Assess major proposals currently in play for improving the state of play, and their prospects.

**Poster presentation guidelines:**
During the forum for your assigned category, you along with 7-10 others in your category will post your poster on the classroom wall. While you stand next to your poster, the other 27 or so students will make rounds visiting the various posters, and you will engage their questions and comments for about half an hour in total. We will then reconvene as a class to discuss cross-cutting themes and lessons that we can draw out of the various posters.

Excellent advice for the creation of research posters is found here:
- [http://guides.nyu.edu/posters](http://guides.nyu.edu/posters)
- [https://www.whitman.edu/academics/signature-programs/whitman-undergraduate-conference/guidelines-for-presenters/guidelines-for-poster-presenters#overview](https://www.whitman.edu/academics/signature-programs/whitman-undergraduate-conference/guidelines-for-presenters/guidelines-for-poster-presenters#overview) (see in particular links to poster-design tutorials on this site)
- [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1876493/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1876493/)

Please note that there are several large format printers that students have access to on campus (try the Health Sciences lab or Creative Communications: [https://f2.washington.edu/fm/c2/posters](https://f2.washington.edu/fm/c2/posters), and you can also order them online for what may be a cheaper rate (see: posterpresentations.com and makesigns.com). There is some
cost associated with printing out a poster (depending on size, about $40-50); if this is prohibitive for anyone, it is acceptable to create a poster through normal page-sized print-outs arranged on a (for instance, 42" x 56") posterboard.
**Guidelines: Debates and Cases (Oral Presentation)**

**Objectives:**
The objective for the debate format is to explore different sides of controversial issues in development policy or the development discourse more generally. As in all complex debates, there is likely to be elements of truth in both sides of the debate, but sometimes insights crystalize best when cases are presented in as strong a form as possible. The debates should assist us in synthesizing material in the course readings, and in some cases push us to out of our comfort zone (to either take a stand in a debate – which can be uncomfortable for some - or to acknowledge and incorporate alternative viewpoints into one’s own).

The objective for the cases covered is to put you in an actor-oriented, action-forcing perspective – a “development management” perspective – in which you will have to balance opportunities against constraints on multiple levels. Again, the hope is that you will be able to integrate insights from throughout the course to address the case question at hand.

**Topics:**
We are covering five debates and five case studies, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case / Debate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/30</td>
<td><strong>Case: Rural Reform in Centropico</strong> Recommendations on the design of a land reform program amid political turmoil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/7</td>
<td><strong>Debate: Comparing China and India’s Anti-Corruption Prospects</strong> Looking at the readings and any other evidence you may find, which country’s anti-corruption institutions have a better shot, in your view, at making meaningful, long-term difference to the quality of governance and development outcomes in that country? Be specific about your reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td><strong>Debate: Assessing decentralization</strong> White and Smoke, in “East Asia Decentralizes”, write “Though East Asia’s decentralization has come later than in some other parts of the world, it is now here to stay...the key question is no longer whether to decentralize. It is how best to design intergovernmental structures and manage the implementation process to achieve optimum results.” (p. 1). Using the articles on either Indonesia or Vietnam as your main evidence, do you agree or disagree with the above statement? State your evidence clearly. Extra credit but not expected: Include a comparison between Vietnam and Indonesia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/28</td>
<td><strong>Debate: Values underpinning development</strong> Argue pro or contra the following proposition: “The development discourse has been dominated by the assumption that Western values, such as those touting specific forms of multiparty democracy or specific interpretations of human rights, as being ultimately universal values. In a multipolar world, this rhetorical smokescreen must end.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |   | **Case: Female Genital Cutting: Confronting the Power of Tradition in Senegal**  
Questions TBA |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 11/4 | **Case: Fighting Bonded Labor in Rural India**  
How have Gyarsi Bai and other activists used coalitions spanning multiple levels, and effective negotiation tactics, to expand their influence and challenge the status quo? |
| 7 | 11/18 | **Case: World Health Organization Reform**  
A program planning staffer in the office of the Director-General (DG) of the WHO, Dr. Margaret Chan, you have been asked to brief the DG on the Foreign Affairs article’s critique of the WHO and assessing whether, in your own opinion, the current reform process sufficiently addresses the points it raises. Close with recommendations for the reform process arising from your reading of this Foreign Affairs article, if any. |
| 8 | 12/2 | **Debate: Development Goals**  
Argue for or against the following proposition: “The attempt to define post-2015 ‘Sustainable Development Goals’ is flawed from the start; they will be as meaningless as the Millenium Development Goals were.” |
| 9 | 12/2 | **Debate: Development prospects**  
Argue pro or contra the following proposition: “Looking ahead 50 years, and all things considered, there is good reason to be more optimistic than pessimistic about the prospects for meaningful and sustainable human progress on a global level.” |
| 9 | 12/2 | **Case: Transboundary Haze in Singapore**  
You are a political affairs analyst in the Office of the Prime Minister of Singapore. The PM is requesting a briefing on the deeper causes of, and potential approaches to dealing with, the transboundary haze issue, to prepare for a Press Conference with the Singaporean media and just before undertaking a trip to Jakarta to meet Indonesia’s President. |

**Guidelines:**  
In week one, you will be asked to sign up for either a case or debate above. Your task will be to prepare to lead off the discussion with a succinct (3-5 min maximum) presentation of your point of view, together with others that have been so assigned. For debates, you are asked to coordinate with others of the same side (pro or contra) in the debate, so that you can make the most effective statement for your point of view. For case studies, there is no need to coordinate in advance, but you should have worked out a coherent point of view on the case and be prepared to critique the proposals of others.

**Assessment:**  
As noted in the syllabus, your assigned case or debate presentation counts towards your class participation grade (which itself is 20% of overall grade).

Criteria: Premium will be placed in these oral briefings / debate statements on clarity, succinctness, insight, coherence, practicality and responsiveness to the views of others.
Guidelines: Discussion posts

Objectives
The discussion posts facilitate your engagement with and learning from the material from week to week. Since they are visible to the entire class, they facilitate learning from one another. And they stand in for a more traditional exam format as a means for assessing your overall learning from the course.

Guidelines
Submit your posts to the appropriate topic on the Canvas discussion forum by Thursday, 12 noon before Friday’s class. The forum will be set up so that posts can only be received up to this time; however, if you encounter a technical problem, you can always email me shortly thereafter.

Assessment
You are required to submit a discussion post in at least 6 of the 9 weeks of the course, and encouraged to submit to all of the weeks. (If you submit more than 6, I will take use the best six in calculating the grade, and will also consider it positively with respect to class participation.) As a general guideline, you should aim for about half a page to a full page (single spaced) submission per post (about 350 words). However, in some weeks, two discussion topics (e.g. a debate and a case study) are posted; and in those weeks, you are encouraged to post more briefly on each topic (for a total of about a page per week) - this still counts as posting in one of the six weeks. Length is not as important as being clear, self-explanatory and insightful in your posts. Your aim is to show that you have really engaged with the material and landed on a coherent point of view over the entire length of the course.

Unlike the research paper, the posts are not intended to be a form of professional writing per se. They should be clear and self-explanatory, but you are free to adopt a range of formats suitable for the material at hand. And the writing will not be assessed based on how polished it is or how well it corresponds to a format (such as a classic policy memo), provided it is clear and functional.

Your posts will be reviewed on a weekly basis and assigned one of three summary grades:

a) a check indicates work that shows an expected level of engagement with the material and effort (would correspond to a grade range of about 3.3-3.6) 
b) a “check-plus” indicates deeper insight achieved, greater integration with other material in the course, and going above-and-beyond expectation in terms of effort. (would correspond to a grade of >3.6).
c) a “check-minus” indicates a post that shows superficial engagement with the material – probably the result of a rushed job (would correspond to a grade of <3.3).

The two recommended office consultations will be a key opportunity to review the work submitted to date and to provide more feedback, though you are welcome to request feedback at any point.
An actual grade, which is worth 40% of the overall course grade, will only be given for the overall “portfolio” of the posts, and at the end of the course. However, you can ask for an approximate grade to date on the posts at any time.
Google Document: Debate / Case presentation sign-up sheet

Please enter your name twice, putting a * next to your first choice, by Thursday, Sept 5, 12 noon. I’ll let you know the final allocation in class the next day. (Note: the hope is we can get assignments for week 2 squared away during the first class itself.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case / Debate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td><strong>Debate: Assessing decentralization</strong>&lt;br&gt;White and Smoke, in “East Asia Decentralizes”, write “Though East Asia’s decentralization has come later than in some other parts of the world, it is now here to stay...the key question is no longer whether to decentralize. It is how best to design intergovernmental structures and manage the implementation process to achieve optimum results.” (p. 1). Using the articles on either Indonesia or Vietnam as your main evidence, do you agree or disagree with the above statement? State your evidence clearly.&lt;br&gt;1._____________________ 2. ______________________ 3. <em><em><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong>&lt;br&gt;4.</strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></em> 5.</em>____________________ 6. <em><em><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong>&lt;br&gt;7.</strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></em> 8.</em>____________________ 9. ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/28</td>
<td><strong>Debate: Values underpinning development</strong>&lt;br&gt;Argue pro or contra the following proposition: “The development discourse has been dominated by the assumption that Western values, such as those touting specific forms of multiparty democracy or specific interpretations of human rights, as being ultimately universal values. In a multipolar world, this rhetorical smokescreen must end.”&lt;br&gt;1._____________________ 2. ______________________ 3. <em><em><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong>&lt;br&gt;4.</strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></em> 5.</em>____________________ 6. <em><em><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong>&lt;br&gt;7.</strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></em> 8.</em>____________________ 9. ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/28</td>
<td><strong>Case: Female Genital Cutting: Confronting the Power of Tradition in Senegal</strong>&lt;br&gt;Questions TBA&lt;br&gt;1._____________________ 2. ______________________ 3. <em><em><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong>&lt;br&gt;4.</strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></em> 5.</em>____________________ 6. ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11/4</td>
<td><strong>Case: Fighting Bonded Labor in Rural India</strong>&lt;br&gt;How have Gyarsi Bai and other activists used coalitions spanning multiple levels, and effective negotiation tactics, to expand their influence and challenge the status quo?&lt;br&gt;1._____________________ 2._____________________ 3.<em><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong>&lt;br&gt;4.</strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></em> 5._____________________ 6. ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td><strong>Case: World Health Organization Reform</strong>&lt;br&gt;A program planning staffer in the office of the Director-General (DG) of the WHO, Dr. Margaret Chan, you have been asked to brief the DG on the Foreign Affairs article’s critique of the WHO and assessing whether, in your own opinion, the current reform process sufficiently addresses the points it raises. Close with recommendations for the reform process arising from your reading of this Foreign Affairs article, if any.&lt;br&gt;1._____________________ 2._____________________ 3.<em><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong><strong>&lt;br&gt;4.</strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></strong></em> 5._____________________ 6. ______________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8    | 12/2 | **Debate: Development Goals**<br>Argue for or against the following proposition: “The attempt to define post-
| 9 | 12/2 | **Debate: Development prospects**  
Argue pro or contra the following proposition: “Looking ahead 50 years, and all things considered, there is good reason to be more optimistic than pessimistic about the prospects for meaningful and sustainable human progress on a global level.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 | 12/2 | **Case: Transboundary Haze in Singapore**  
You are a political affairs analyst in the Office of the Prime Minister of Singapore. The PM is requesting a briefing on the deeper causes of, and potential approaches to dealing with, the transboundary haze issue, to prepare for a Press Conference with the Singaporean media and just before undertaking a trip to Jakarta to meet Indonesia’s President. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please arrange at least two consultations in block one and block two, to go over your initial development of a research paper, and to receive feedback on and plan improvements to the submitted first draft. You are welcome to sign up for additional times, and to request an appointment outside of the times below if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15:</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:35:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 10:55:</td>
<td>11:00 – 11:15:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 – 11:35:</td>
<td>11:40 – 11:55:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLOCK ONE: Pre-First Draft Submission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15:</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:35:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 10:55:</td>
<td>11:00 – 11:15:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 – 11:35:</td>
<td>11:40 – 11:55:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15:</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:35:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 10:55:</td>
<td>11:00 – 11:15:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 – 11:35:</td>
<td>11:40 – 11:55:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15:</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:35:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 10:55:</td>
<td>11:00 – 11:15:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 – 11:35:</td>
<td>11:40 – 11:55:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15:</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:35:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 10:55:</td>
<td>11:00 – 11:15:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:

Monday – 10/31
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:

Wednesday – Nov 2
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:

**BLOCK TWO: Post-First Draft Submission**

Wednesday – Nov 9
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:

Monday – Nov 14
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:

Wednesday – Nov 16
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:
Wednesday – Nov 23
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:

Wednesday – Nov 30
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55:

Wednesday – December 7
10:00 – 10:15:
10:20 – 10:35:
10:40 – 10:55:
11:00 – 11:15:
11:20 – 11:35:
11:40 – 11:55: