

University of Waterloo
Faculty of Environment

ENBUS 410
ENGAGING STAKEHOLDERS
COURSE SYLLABUS
(January 2, 2019 version)

Professor: Dr. Jason Thistlethwaite
Contact Information: j2thistl@uwaterloo.ca
519-888-4567, Ext. 39102

Teaching Assistant: Marsha Paley
Contact Information: mleang@uwaterloo.ca

Class times: Mondays 11:30am – 2:20 pm
Classroom: PAS 1229

TA Office Hours: in EV1-356 + by appointment
Prof. Office Hours: Mondays from 10:00am-11:00 am in EV3-4267 (+ 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

Weekly seminar participation (25%)

- Attendance (6% = 0.5 points / class)
- Active participation in activities, quality of engagement in the class (19%)

Stakeholder engagement plan (30%)

Northern Gateway Negotiation (group grade) (25%)

- Position brief (15%)
- Presentation (10%)

Reflection (20%)

Assignment Schedule

Assignment	Due Date
Stakeholder engagement plan	Feb 11, 2019 11:59pm
Negotiation position brief and presentation	March 11, 2019 11:59pm (before class starts)
Reflection	April 10, 2019 11:59pm

Class Schedule

Module	Date	Week	Main Topic	Due Dates
Foundations of stakeholder engagement	Jan 7	1	Introduction	
	Jan 14	2	Stakeholder identification	
	Jan 21	3	Stakeholder interests mapping	
	Jan 28	4	Engagement strategies	
	Feb 4	5	Sustainability and engagement	
	Feb 11	6	International perspectives	Engagement plan
	Feb 18		Reading week	
Practice	Feb 25	7	Examples from Practice	
Negotiation	Mar 4	8	Negotiation preparation	
	Mar 11	9	Negotiation presentations	Brief and presentation
	Mar 18	10	Negotiation game	
Practice	Mar 25	11	Examples from Practice	
	Apr 1	12	Examples from Practice	
	Apr 10			Reflection

Detailed Course Outline - Readings

January 7 (week 1)	Introduction to stakeholder engagement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turcotte, M. (2017). Primer: Stakeholder engagement. Retrieved from https://nbs.net/p/primer-stakeholder-engagement-6be49580-a73b-47a5-8fba-e831b2aeeaa9
January 14 (week 2)	Stakeholder identification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 22(4), 853-886. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1997.9711022105 • Kassinis, G. & Vafeas, N. (2006). Stakeholder pressure and environmental performance. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 49(1), 145-159. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2006.20785799
January 21 (week 3)	Stakeholder interests
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morris, J. & Baddache, F. (2012). <i>Back to Basics: How to Make Stakeholder Engagement Meaningful for Your Company</i>. BSR. • Applegate, L. (2008). <i>Stakeholder Analysis Tool</i>. 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. <i>International Journal of Project Management</i>, 27(4), 335-343. doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2008.04.002
January 28 (week 4)	Engagement tactics
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bowen, F., Newenham-Kahindi, A. & Herremens, I. (2010). When Suits Meet Roots: The Antecedents and Consequences of Community Engagement Strategy. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>, 95(2), 297-318. doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0360-1 • Glor-Bell, J. & Clarke, A. (2011). Community Engagement in University of British Columbia's Climate Action Plan (pp. 39-60). Leal Filho (Ed.) <i>World Trends on Education for Sustainable Development</i>. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Scientific Publishers. • IAP2 Canada. (2017). <i>Public Participation Spectrum</i>. Available on LEARN or here: https://iap2canada.ca/Resources/Documents/0702-Foundations-Spectrum-MW-rev2%20(1).pdf
February 4 (week 5)	Sustainability and stakeholder engagement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strand, R. 2014. Strategic Leadership of Corporate Sustainability. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>. 123: 687-706. • Slawinski, 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. <i>Business & Society</i>. 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. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>, 89(3), 449-472. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-0010-z

February 11 (week 6)	International perspectives on stakeholder engagement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Su, C., Mitchell, R. K., & Sirgy, M. J. (2007). Enabling guanxi management in china: A hierarchical stakeholder model of effective guanxi. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>, 71(3), 301-319. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9140-3 • Hoque, A., Clarke, A., & Huang, L. (2016). Lack of stakeholder influence on pollution prevention. <i>Organization & Environment</i>, 29(3), 367-385. doi:10.1177/1086026615623057 • van Huijstee, M., & Glasbergen, P. (2008). The practice of stakeholder dialogue between multinationals and NGOs. <i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management</i>, 15(5), 298-310. doi:10.1002/csr.171
February 18	Reading Week
February 25 (week 7)	Examples from Practice: Insurance and climate change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hoffman, Andrew. 2015. Travelers Insurance: Focusing on Climate Change and Natural Disaster Risk. University of Michigan. W93C47. Available on LEARN. • Thistlethwaite, Jason and Michael Wood. (2018). “Insurance and Climate Change Risk Management: Re-scaling to Look Beyond the Horizon,” <i>British Journal of Management</i>, 29: 279-298. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8551.12302
March 4 (week 8)	Negotiation Preparation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvard Law School, Program on Negotiation. (2014). <i>Negotiation skills: Negotiation strategies and negotiation techniques to help you become a better negotiator</i>. Boston, MA: Harvard University. • Fisher, R., & Shapiro, D. (2006). <i>Beyond reason: Using emotions as you negotiate</i> (1st ed.). New York: Penguin Books. (read excerpt available on LEARN). • Meyer, E. (2015). Getting to si, ja, oui, hai, and da: How to negotiate across cultures. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 93, 74.
March 11 (week 9)	Pipeline presentations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See assignment handout for additional readings for each group.
March 18 (week 10)	Pipeline negotiation game
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation simulation information will be e-mailed to each group.
March 25 (week 11)	Examples from Practice: Small and medium sized enterprises (Dr. Sarah Burch)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GATE Survey Report: Governing and Accelerating Transformative Entrepreneurship. University of Waterloo. https://uwaterloo.ca/sustainability-policy-research-on-urban-transformations-lab/sites/ca.sustainability-policy-research-on-urban-transformations-lab/files/uploads/files/revised_gate_survey_report_1.pdf • Westman, L, Luederitz, C., Kundurp, A., Mercado, A.J., Weber, O., and Burch, S. L. Conceptualizing business as social actors: A framework for understanding sustainability actions in small and medium sized enterprises. <i>Business Strategy and the Environment</i>, Online. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2256
April 1 (week 12)	Examples from practice: Wind energy in Ontario (Shawna Peddle)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <i>Health, Risk & Society</i>, 15(3), 234-250. doi:10.1080/13698575.2013.776015 • Check LEARN for more.

Participation (25%)

Each student in the course needs to contribute to the learning of others. To ensure we achieve this objective, each student should be prepared to comment on all of the required readings. Pre-class preparation not only involves reading the materials, but also reflection on potential discussion questions. Also, there will be a number of guests throughout the course, so read their bios before class (see LEARN for more information).

Specifically participation will be based on:

- Attending class (0.5 points / class x 12 classes) = 6 points
- Actively participating in class/quality of engagement in class = 19 points. This requires speaking in class, such as reporting back from small group discussions, speaking during the negotiation, asking questions of the professor, and commenting during class discussions.

Attendance will be taken in class, and weekly notes will be kept regarding your active participation and quality of engagement.

Ultimately your participation grades will fall in these ranges based on the above calculations:

Below expectations (below 70%)	Meets expectations (70-79%)	Exceeds expectations (80-100%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Raises occasional clarifying questions and comments○ Comments often not of a critical nature and do not demonstrate integration of material○ Unprepared for course activities/discussions○ Provides little to no contribution to peer learning○ Frequently absent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Comments and questions demonstrate some critical analysis○ Consistently shares ideas○ Effort made to build on ideas of others○ Contributes to a supportive learning environment○ Attends most classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 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○ Very well prepared for in-class activities

Stakeholder engagement plan (30%)

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:
 - o Justify why these are the most important stakeholders
 - o Are they primary or secondary stakeholders
 - o Should they be consulted or should they be collaborated with?
 - o 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
 - o (e.g. Mitchell et al's 3 categories; Morris & Baddache's 2x2; Applegate's 2x2)
- What engagement tactics should be used for these stakeholders
 - o Rationale for why these approaches are ideal
 - o Which stakeholders will be engaged through each approach
 - o 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
 - o How will you reach the stakeholder(s)
 - o How will you gather their input
 - o 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
> 25	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
20 to 22	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
17 to 20	Good; few technical errors; demonstrates solid understanding of material; well referenced;
15 to 17	Adequate; some technical errors; demonstrates a basic understanding of material; some structure

13 to 15	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
< 15	Inadequate

Northern Gateway Stakeholder Assignment (25%)

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 (15%)

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.

2. 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. Dress accordingly.

Reflection Assignment (20%)

Drawing on the material presented throughout the course, including the negotiation and guest lectures, provide your opinion on the relevance of the theory to practice. This should be a well-structured essay, written using academic writing (consistent citation format). Your submission should be 2-3 pages, single spaced, not including your title page or references.

More details are provided on this assignment through LEARN, including the grading rubric.

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/
- ◆ 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/
- ◆ **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. 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. For typical penalties check Guidelines for Assessment of Penalties, 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

TurnItIn

Text matching software (TurnItIn) will be used to screen assignments in this course. This is being done to verify that use of all materials and sources in assignments is documented. Students will be given an option if they do not want to have their assignment screened by Turnitin. Let the instructor know if you desire an alternative.