University of Waterloo

Faculty of Environment

**ENBUS 410**

**ENGAGING STAKEHOLDERS**

COURSE SYLLABUS

(January 11, 2021 version)

Professor: Dr. Jason Thistlethwaite

Contact Information: [j2thistl@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:Amelia.Clarke@uwaterloo.ca)

519-888-4567, Ext. 39102

Teaching Assistant: Guneet Sandhu

Contact Information: guneet.sandhu@uwaterloo.ca

TA Office Hours: By Appointment

Prof. Office Hours: By Appointment

**Course Description**

Traditionally, the role of corporations has been narrowly defined as a source of value creation for shareholders through the efficient use of resources and production of goods and services. Governments are responsible for ensuring that this value creation does not generate any unwelcome costs for society. Civil society actors work to hold corporations and governments accountable for actions that contribute to social harm. These distinctions are increasingly a point of contestation as corporate corruption, environmental degradation and social inequality question whether corporate value creation should reflect the interests of a broader group of stakeholders. In response, pluralities of different stakeholder relationships and partnerships have emerged between corporations, governments, and civil society organizations. These interactions constitute a new era and approach to corporate governance. Stakeholder engagement is not just an approach used by businesses; it is used by all organizational types, from government to civil society organizations. The purpose of this course is to explore stakeholder engagement theory and practice.

**Course Objectives**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comprehension | Be able to understand and critically examine the tensions that shape relationship between firms, society, governments and the natural environment. |
| Analysis | Explain and apply existing theoretical understandings of stakeholder engagement |
| Evaluating | Articulate and support your own views while confronting counter-arguments |
| Skills | Develop your ability to think critically, argue logically and communicate clearly. |

# **Course Materials**

There is no required text book for the course. The readings will be a combination of journal articles, research reports, news and websites. These will all be accessible through LEARN.

**Course Evaluation**

**Active learning discussions (30%)**

* Contribute to 2 active learning discussions throughout the term

**Stakeholder engagement plan (40%)**

**Northern Gateway Negotiation (group grade) (30%)**

* Position brief (20%)
* Presentation (10%)\*

\*will be recorded and submitted to dropbox on March 10th

**Assignment Schedule**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **Due Date** |
| Stakeholder engagement plan | Feb 10, 2021 11:59pm ET |
| Negotiation position brief and presentation | March 10, 2021 11:59pm ET |
| Active learning #1 | Feb 24th, 2021 11:59pm ET |
| Active learning #2 | April 14th, 2021 11:59pm ET |

**Class Schedule**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Module | Date | Week | Main Topic | Due Dates |
| Foundations of stakeholder engagement | Jan 13 | 1 | Introduction |  |
| Jan 20 | 2 | Stakeholder identification |  |
| Jan 27 | 3 | Stakeholder interests |  |
| Feb 3 | 4 | Engagement strategies |  |
| Feb 10 | 5 | International engagement | Stakeholder engagement plan |
| Feb 17 | 6 | Reading week |  |
| Feb 24 | 7 | Barriers to engagement | Active Learning #1 |
| Practicing stakeholder engagement | Mar 3 | 8 | Negotiation preparation |  |
| Negotiation | Mar 10 | 9 | Negotiation presentations | Brief and presentation |
| Mar 17 | 10 | Pandemic Break |  |
| Mar 24 | 11 | Negotiation game |  |
| Community engagement | Arp 7 | 12 | Examples from Practice: Covid-19 and social housing |  |
| Apr 14 | 13 | Examples from Practice: Anti-wind protests | Active Learning #2 |

**Detailed Course Outline - Readings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Week 1 (Jan 13)** | **Introduction to stakeholder engagement** |
| * Turcotte, M. (2017). Primer: Stakeholder engagement. Retrieved from <https://nbs.net/p/primer-stakeholder-engagement-6be49580-a73b-47a5-8fba-e831b2aeeaa9> | |
| **Week 2 (Jan 20)** | **Stakeholder identification** |
| * Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R. & Wood, D.J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review,* *22*(4), 853-886. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1997.9711022105 | |
| **Week 3 (Jan 27)** | **Stakeholder interests** |
| * Morris, J. & Baddache, F. (2012). *Back to Basics: How to Make Stakeholder Engagement Meaningful for Your Company*. BSR. * Applegate, L. (2008). *Stakeholder Analysis Tool*. HBS No. 9-808-161. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing. * Jepsen, A. L. & Eskerod, P. (2009). Stakeholder analysis in projects: Challenges in using current guidelines in the real world. *International Journal of Project Management,* *27*(4), 335-343. doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2008.04.002 | |
| **Week 4 (Feb 3)** | **Engagement strategies** |
| * Bowen, F., Newenham-Kahindi, A. & Herremens, I. (2010). When Suits Meet Roots: The Antecedents and Consequences of Community Engagement Strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics,* *95*(2), 297-318. doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0360-1 * IAP2 Canada. (2017). *Public Participation Spectrum*. Available on LEARN or here: <https://iap2canada.ca/Resources/Documents/0702-Foundations-Spectrum-MW-rev2%20(1).pdf> | |
| **Week 5 (Feb 10)** | **International perspectives on stakeholder engagement** |
| * Enabling guanxi management in china: A hierarchical stakeholder model of effective guanxi.*Journal of Business Ethics, 71*(3), 301-319. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9140-3 * Meyer, E. (2015). Getting to si, ja, oui, hai, and da: How to negotiate across cultures. *Harvard Business Review, 93*, 74. <https://hbr.org/2015/12/getting-to-si-ja-oui-hai-and-da> | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Week 6 (Feb 17)** | **Reading Week** |
| **Week 7 (Feb 24)** | **International perspectives on stakeholder engagement** |
| * Slawinksi, N. J. Pinkse, T. Busch, and S. B. Banerjee. (2017). The Role of Short-termism and Uncertainty Avoidance in Organizational Inaction on Climate Change: A Multi-level Framework. Business & Society. 56 (2): 253-282. * Herremans, I. M., Herschovis, M. S., & Bertels, S. (2009). Leaders and laggards: The influence of competing logics on corporate environmental action.*Journal of Business Ethics, 89*(3), 449-472. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-0010-z Su, C., Mitchell, R. K., & Sirgy, M. J. (2007). | |
|  | **Reading Week** |
|  | |
| **Week 8 (Mar 3)** | **Negotiation Preparation** |
| * Harvard Law School, Program on Negotiation. (2014). *Negotiation skills: Negotiation strategies and negotiation techniques to help you become a better negotiator.* Boston, MA: Harvard University. * Fisher, R., & Shapiro, D. (2006). *Beyond reason: Using emotions as you negotiate*(1st ed.). New York: Penguin Books. (read excerpt available on LEARN). | |
| **Week 9 (Mar 10)** | **Pipeline presentations recorded and submitted online** |
|  | |
| **Week 10 (Mar 17)** | **Pandemic Break** |
|  | |
| **Week 11 (Mar 24)** | **Pipeline negotiation game** |
| * Negotiation simulation information will be e-mailed to each group. | |
| **Week 12 (Apr 7)** | **Examples from practice: Covid-19 and social housing (Sarah Brown)** |
| * [House of Friendship - History](https://www.houseoffriendship.org/about-us/history/) * [House of Friendship - Values](https://www.houseoffriendship.org/about-us/mission-vision-values/) | |
| **Week 13 (Apr 14)** | **Examples from practice: Anti-wind energy in Ontario (Shawna Peddle)** |
| * Deignan, B., Harvey, E., & Hoffman-Goetz, L. (2013). Fright factors about wind turbines and health in ontario newspapers before and after the green energy act. *Health, Risk & Society, 15*(3), 234-250. doi:10.1080/13698575.2013.776015 | |

**Active Learning Discussions (30% - 2 x 15%)**

Students are required to participate in active learning via a response to questions based on lecture content in the course. Online participation will not be marked based on the quantity of engagement (e.g length), rather the quality. Each post should be no longer than 100-250 words. Feel free to include references in APA (e.g Author, Date) to the readings. Concise and clear responses are appreciate to accommodate the wide array of interests in the classroom. Each post will be marked out of a total of 10 using the following rubric.

Expectations

90%+ - able to initiate and facilitate the development of ideas

- comments are consistently insightful and raise questions or ideas that stimulate the learning of others

- demonstrates critical reflection on readings

- brings relevant and interesting resources (media, cases, articles) to the attention of others

70-80% - comments and questions demonstrate some critical analysis

- consistently shares ideas

- effort made to build on ideas of other posts

50-60% - raises occasional clarifying questions and comments

- comments often not of a critical nature and do not demonstrate integration of material

Below 50% - no consistent contribution

- little evidence of integrated learning

**Stakeholder engagement plan (40%)**

You have been hired as a consultant for a firm/organization to develop a stakeholder engagement process to enable them to collect perspectives for a plan they are developing. Choose one of the following organizations and plans for your assignment:

* Region of Waterloo – Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (in progress)
* University of Waterloo – Climate and Energy Action Plan
* Stewardship Ontario – Blue Box Program Plan (2018 version)
* Union Gas – Renewable Natural Gas Plan (hypothetical)
* Canadian Tire – Green Product Standards (hypothetical)
* Sierra Club Canada Foundation –Three-Year Strategic Plan (hypothetical)
* Public Safety Canada – National Flood Insurance Strategy (in progress)

For the purpose of the assignment we are going to assume that the organization/company is at the start of their plan development process although these are real plans that are currently being developed, or plans that hypothetically are being developed. They have done their internal and external scans based on existing reports and information, but now need to engage stakeholders to complete their scans of the current situation, and also to get stakeholder input on their draft plan content.

Specifically your contract requests that you:

* Describe the purpose of the stakeholder engagement plan
* Identify who are the 5-10 key stakeholder groups that they should be consulting? For each:
  + Justify why these are the most important stakeholders
  + Are they primary or secondary stakeholders
  + Should they be consulted or should they be collaborated with?
  + What type of engagement is appropriate (transactional, transitional or transformational; or use IAP2’s spectrum instead)
* Map your assessment of the stakeholders using one of the frameworks offered in the course
  + (e.g, Mitchell et al’s 3 categories; Morris & Baddache’s 2x2; Applegate’s 2x2)
* What engagement tactics should be used for these stakeholders
  + Rationale for why these approaches are ideal
  + Which stakeholders will be engaged through each approach
  + What data will each approach create, and how is it useful in the plan development process.
* Give details on the design of one engagement tactic
  + How will you reach the stakeholder(s)
  + How will you gather their input
  + How will you keep them informed of how you used their input
* Conclude with the relevance of your plan to the client

If the client likes your plan, it is likely they will also hire you to run the process, so make sure your suggestions are feasible.

Your submission should be 4-6 pages (single spaced), not including a title page and references. You can format it with figures, tables, bullets and/or paragraphs, as you deem appropriate, but make sure that the entire document is coherent and each section is clear. References with a consistent format are required for this assignment if necessary, but no citations are needed.

Further details are provided in LEARN for this assignment, including the grading rubric.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mark | Expectations/Requirements |
| > 85% | Exceptional; Few or no technical errors (typos, spelling, grammar); clarity in writing style; coherent structure and flow; a degree of true originality; demonstration of very strong understanding of underlying substantive content; appropriate reference to source materials; paper presents a coherent and persuasive point of view |
| 75-85% | Very good; Few technical errors; strong understanding of underlying content; appropriate reference to source material; some attempt at originality; perhaps a few unreferenced points; paper well structured |
| 65-75% | Good; few technical errors; demonstrates solid understanding of material; well referenced; |
| 55-65% | Adequate; some technical errors; demonstrates a basic understanding of material; some structure |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 50-55% | Marginal; An unacceptable number of technical errors; little attempt to present coherent viewpoint; demonstrates a weak understanding of material; inappropriate or missing references; lack of structure |
| < 50% | Inadequate |

**Northern Gateway Stakeholder Assignment (30%)**

The objective of the Northern Gateway stakeholder assignment is to understand the process involved in multi-stakeholder negotiation over a complex issue facing multiple interests. It is also to understand the perspectives of different stakeholder groups. The class will be split into small groups and each group will be assigned a specific stakeholder. The assignment consists of two components that will be detailed on LEARN. Peer evaluations will be used to adjust individual grades from the group grade.

1. Policy brief (20%)

Each group will develop a policy position based on research for the Northern Gateway Pipeline. The objective of the policy brief is to understand a stakeholder’s role, interests and objectives in the pipeline negotiation.

1. Presentation (10%)

The brief will inform a presentation to class on your group’s position. Presentation skills are critical components of stakeholder engagement. As such, the presentation will be evaluated as if you are professionals. Record your presentation using Microsoft Teams and submit your recording to the presentation dropbox for review.

**Late Assignments and Papers**

It is expected that all course assessments be handed in on the date and time that they are due. Failure to do so will result in a mark reduction of 5% for the first day and 2% for every day thereafter to a maximum of 20%. Any assessment item that is more than 10 days late requires the instructor’s permission to hand in.

**Course Communication**

Communication by the instructor to students will be sent to students ‘uwaterloo’ email through LEARN or through postings to course LEARN site. Students are responsible for ensuring prompt retrieval of course messages. Any communication from students should be via their ‘uwaterloo’ account. Any e-mail sent to the instructor should include “ENBUS 410” in the subject.

**University and Faculty Requirements and Notices**

* + Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. [www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/](http://www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/)
  + Students who are unsure what constitutes an academic offence are requested to visit the on-line tutorial at <http://www.lib.uwaterloo.ca/ait/>
  + Research Ethics: Please also note that the ‘University of Waterloo requires all research conducted by its students, staff, and faculty which involves humans as participants to undergo prior ethics review and clearance through the Director, Office of Human Research and Animal Care (Office). The ethics review and clearance processes are intended to ensure that projects comply with the Office’s Guidelines for Research with Human Participants (Guidelines) as well as those of provincial and federal agencies, and that the safety, rights and welfare of participants are adequately protected. The Guidelines inform researchers about ethical issues and procedures which are of concern when conducting research with humans (e.g. confidentiality, risks and benefits, informed consent process, etc.). If the development of your research proposal consists of research that involves humans as participants, the please contact the course instructor for guidance and see [www.research.uwaterloo.ca/ethics/human/](http://www.research.uwaterloo.ca/ethics/human/)
  + Note for students with disabilities: The Office for Persons with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term.
  + Religious Observances: Please inform the instructor at the beginning of term if special accommodation needs to be made for religious observances that are not otherwise accounted for in the scheduling of classes and assignments.
  + **Grievance:** A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm). When in doubt please contact your Undergraduate Advisor for details.
  + **Discipline:** A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offence, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. For information on categories of offences and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71, Student Discipline, [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm). For typical penalties check Guidelines for Assessment of Penalties, [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm)
  + **Appeals:** A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than a petition) or Policy 71 –(Student Discipline) may be appealed if there are grounds. A student who believes he/she has a ground for an appeal should refer to Policy 72 (Student Appeals) [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm)